BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF EXPRESSING OPPOSITION TO BALLOT MEASURE #5 RESOLUTION NO. 90-1342

INTRODUCED BY COUNCILORS TOM DEJARDIN, JIM GARDNER, RUTH MCFARLAND, AND DAVID SAUCY

WHEREAS, Oregonians will vote November 6, 1990 on Ballot Measure #5, which proposes to limit property tax rates for local governments throughout the state; and

WHEREAS, voters within the Metropolitan Service District approved a property tax base for the Metro Washington Park Zoo in the regular primary election on May 15, 1990; and

WHEREAS, the passage of Measure #5 would result in significant revenue reductions for governments within the region, which would affect their ability to provide adequate services to maintain the quality of life of the region's citizens; and

WHEREAS, it is in Metro's interest as a regional government to help assure that local governments in the region are able to continue to provide the services that the people need and which they have supported; and

WHEREAS, Measure #5 would eliminate the current provision of state law which requires uniformity of the tax rate within a district, which would cause inequity among the taxpayers who help support the Zoo; and

WHEREAS, Measure #5 would severely limit the voters' ability to approve tax rate increases to support or enhance programs and services they determine are worthwhile; and WHEREAS, the effects of inflation will annually erode the real operating funds of local governments affected by Measure #5's tax rate limit; and

WHEREAS, the Oregon Legislative Revenue Office estimates that the Metro Washington Park Zoo would suffer a 10.3% reduction in its tax rate effective July 1, 1991, with an immediate revenue loss of \$564,000; and

WHEREAS, the lost revenue would force the Metro Council to enact some combination of service reductions and fee increases at the Zoo which are contrary to its goals of providing the broadest possible range of cultural, educational, and recreational opportunities to the greatest number of people and is therefore not in the people's best interest; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

That the Metro Council opposes Ballot Measure #5 because it will impair the ability of the Metro Washington Park Zoo to achieve its stated goals in the areas of education, recreation, culture, conservation, and economic development, and it will reduce the ability of local governments in the region to provide needed services, and urges the voters of the District and throughout the State of Oregon to vote against it on November 6.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District this 25th day of October, 1990.

Tanya Collier, Presiding Officer

ZOO COMMITTEE REPORT

RESOLUTION NO. 90-1342, EXPRESSING OPPOSITION TO BALLOT MEASURE #5

Date: October 25, 1990 Presented by: Councilor McFarland

<u>COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION</u>: At the October 18, 1990 Zoo Committee meeting, Councilors McFarland, DeJardin, Gardner, and Saucy discussed the potential impact of Ballot Measure #5 on the funding and operations of the Zoo. They reached consensus that the Zoo Committee and the Metro Council should express their opposition to the Ballot Measure and take steps to educate the public of the Measure's effect on the Zoo. Subsequent discussions resulted in the drafting and submittal of Resolution No. 90-1342.

<u>COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/ISSUES</u>: In its discussion of possible legislative items, the Committee raised the issue of Ballot Measure #5's impact on the Zoo. Committee members had received copies of a report from Multnomah County Tax Supervising and Conservation Commission which estimated that Zoo property tax revenues would be reduced some 17% in Multnomah County. The report estimates the dollar amount of this reduction in Multnomah County would be approximately \$455,000 in fiscal year 1991-1992. No figures were available from Washington and Clackamas counties. Zoo staff has estimated the total revenue reduction to fall within a range of \$500,000 to \$600,000.

Committee members discussed ways to let the public know the effects on the Zoo of the Measure #5 property tax limitation. Members agreed that a news release or press conference would be appropriate. Subsequent discussions led to the conclusion that the Council should be asked to take a formal position on Ballot Measure #5, in order to raise Metro's level of participation in the discussion of the issue and to give clear direction to Council members of the full Council's stand.

Timing dictates the unusual procedure of bringing this Resolution to the full Council without prior reference to a Committee. The October 25 meeting is the last Council meeting before the November 6 election. If the Council is to take a position on this issue, it must do so at this meeting.

cs:90-1342.rpt

TAX SUPERVISING & CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Multnomah County, Oregon

1510 Portland Building

Portland, Oregon 97204

1120 S.W. Fifth Avenue 503/248-3054

RECEIVED OCT 1 8 1990

Information Memorandum

October 15, 1990

Subject: Ballot Measure No. 5 - Rate Limit

We have compiled information from the Multnomah County 1990-91 Assessment and Tax Roll and applied the tax rate limits proposed in Ballot Measure No. 5. The results are shown in the attached table. If the POPs measure were in effect this year the results would be approximately as shown, with some important exceptions.

Ballot Measure No. 5 will become effective July 1, 1991 if approved by the voters in November. The measure imposes a rate limit of \$10 per \$1,000 assessed value for all non-school units which includes the County, the five cities, the Port, Metro, water and fire districts. The \$10 rate limit is in addition to the existing dollar levy limit as it relates to the tax base, special levies, serial and continuing levies. Excluded from the limit are levies for voter approved capital construction/improvement bonds.

Measure No. 5 revenues for 1991-92 will be obtained from 1991 assessed values which remain to be established. Other exceptions to the amounts shown under the column "Measure #5 Revenue in Multco" are:

- 1. Computations are for Multnomah County only. Levy reductions originating in Washington and Clackamas Counties for the Joint Districts (Portland, the Port and Metro) have not been computed.
- 2. It is assumed that the county school fund, presently \$1,422,000 will be charged against the school rate and not the \$10 non-school rate limit.
- 3. The Attorney General has identified various revenues as being charges against property and subject to the \$10 limit. None of the subject charges are recognized in the estimates shown in the table.
- 4: No allowance is made for urban renewal charges which might be chargeable to the \$10 limit.

The measure provides that if the rate exceeds \$10, taxes on property are to be reduced evenly by the percentage necessary to meet the limit. Percentages may vary from property to property with the possibility that a uniform \$10 rate would be assessed to all properties. If such rate uniformity would be applied, revenues to the County, the Port and Metro would increase 3 to 5%.

		Assessed	Value - ØØØ	Total <u>Rate</u>	Operating Levy Rate	Operating Levy in Multco	Measure #5 Revenue in Multco	% Reduction
	•	Total <u>AV</u>	AV in Multco					
Multnomah County	\$	20,175,534	\$ 20,175,534	\$4.9655	\$4.9655	\$100,217,859	\$ 77,980,148	22% .
Cities:		•				• •		
Fairview	\$	68,270	\$ 68,270	\$2.1842	\$2.1842	\$ 149,119	\$ 134,355	10%
Gresham		2,127,744	2,127,744	4.9948	4.7728	10,155,321	10,155,321	0
Portland		15,932,571	15,873,503	8.7983	8.5677	135,999,555	98,812,537	27%
Troutdale		183,901	183,901	4.4215	4.3890	807,160	609,098	25%
Wood Village		65,948	65,948	1.7172	1.6514	108,909	102,878	6%
· · · · ·		· · · ·	•			•		
Special Districts:					: ·	•		
Port	· \$	42,338,117	\$ 20,175,534	\$.3193	\$.0972	\$ 1,961,142	\$ 1,538,505	22%
Metro		38,546,572	19,945,910	.2710	.1323	2,638,995	2,193,853	17%
Fire Districts:	•	50 400	A FO (00				· · · ·	
FD 4 - Sylvan	\$		• •	\$2.1744	\$2.1744	\$ 127,177	\$ 127,177	0
FD 10 - Powellhurst FD 11 - Riverdale		1,320,855	1,320,855	3.7200	3.7200	4,914,243	4,705,275	4%
FD 14 - Corbett		209,082	177,218	1.8246	1.8246	323,361	323,361	0
		92,690	92,690	1.9861	1.9861	187,953	187,953	0
FD 20 - Skyline		44,131	44,131	•8562	.8562	37,965	37,965	0
FD 30 - S. Island		41,454	41,454	1.2201	1.2201	50,718	50,718	0
Water & Road Districts	::	1	:					
Alto Park WD	\$	6,896	\$ 6,896	\$2.2349	\$2.2349	\$ 15,412	\$ 15,412	0
Burlington WD		11,726	11,726	6.3576	6.3576	74,648	65,306	12%
Corbett WD		75,208	75,208	.9073	9073	68,625	68,236	0
Skyline RD		4,127	4,127	.4324	.4324	1,785	1,785	0
Ramsey RD		5,392	5,392	1.1498	1.1498	6,200	6,200	0
Valley View WD		61,206	61,206	2.1986	2.1986	134,567	134,567	0

1990-91 ASSESSMENT & TAX ROLL vs. BALLOT MEASURE NO. 5

live Revenue

OPERATING LEVY (AFTER OFFSETS)							
/	THE ALETALET				PERCENT		
1	TAX DISTRICT	CURRENT LAW	MEASURE 5	DECREASE	DECREASE		
١.			174,703	1010100000114			
	HULTNOMAH 14 R F P D HULTNOMAH 20 R F P D	175,366 34,162	34, 162	663	0.4		
	HULTNOMAH 30 R F P D	49,443	49,443	•	•		
	PORTLAND J PORT	3,866,543	3,505,087	361,456	9.3		
	PORTLAND J-BOND 1973 PORT	3,300,343	3, 303, 007	301,438	9.5		
	SKYLINE CREST ROAD DIST	1,736	1,736		•		
	RAMSEY-WALMAR ROAD	6,214	6.214		•		
	ALTO PARK WATER DIST	14,478	14,478		•		
	BURLINGTON WATER DIST	71,779	67.757	4,022	5.6		
	CORBETT WATER DIST	64,587	64,579	4,022	2.0		
	DARLINGTON WATER DIST	0	0	•	•		
	GILBERT WATER DIST	ō	ò		•		
	HAZELWOOD WATER DIST	ő	0	•			
	LUSTED WATER DIST	G	0				
	PALATINE HILL J WATER DIST	0	a	•	•		
	PLEASANT HOME J WATER DIST	0	0	•			
	POWELL VALLEY RO WATER DIST	0	0	-			
	RICHLAND WATER DIST	a	0				
	RCCXWOOD WATER DIST	a	ō		•		
	ROSE CITY WATER DIST	0	Q	-			
	SYLVAN WATER DIST	0	0				
	VALLEY VIEW WATER DIST	130,664	130,664				
	CENTRAL COUNTY 3 SERVICE DIS	٥	٥		2		
	DUNTHROPE-RIVERDALE 1 SRV DI	Q	٥		-		
\rightarrow	METRO J SERVICE DIST	5,497,957	4,933,186	564,771	10.3		
1	WEST HILLS 2 SERV. DIST.	٥	0				
	NORTHWEST FRONT UR	2,228,032	683,496	1,544,536	69.3		
	DOWN TOWN UR	12,444,968	3,817,758	8,627,210	69.3		
	ST JOHN UR	18,592	5.704	:2,889	69.3		
	SOUTH PARK BLOCK UR	3,285,602	1,007,928	2,277,674	69.3		
	CENTRAL EAST SIDE UR	115,772	35,515	80,256	69.3		
	COLUMBIA S. SHORE UR	1,121,416	393,912	727,503	64.9		
	CONVENTION CENTER U.R.	٥	٥				
01	K COUNTY						
, 01	POLK COUNTY	1,883,592	1,857,542	24 260			
	DALLAS	889,373	889,373	26,050	1.4		
	FALLS CITY	50,696	50,696	-	•		
	INDEPENDENCE	402,656	402,656	-	•		
	MONMOUTH	378,580	378,580				
	DALLAS 2 SCHOOL	4,745,298	3,967,097	778,200	16.4		
	CENTRAL 131 SCHOOL	4,558,833	3,319,213	1,239,620	27.2		
	PERRYDALE 21 SCHOOL	533,856	283,651	250,205	46.9		
	FALLS CITY 57 SCHOOL	137,761	137,761				
	POLK (E) ESO	582,076	458,212	123,864	21.3		
	POLK (H) ESD	291,548	229,506	62,042	21.3		
	DALLAS CEMETERY	21, 136	21,136				
	FIR CREST CEMETERY	10,063	10,063				
	HILLTOP CEMETERY	15,033	15,033				
	PEDEE CEMETERY	1,397	1,397				
	SALT CREEK CEMETERY	0	0				
	SOUTHEAST REPO	488,521	488,521				
	SOUTHWEST & F P D	98,621	98,621				
	SPRING VALLEY R F P D	22,239	22,239	-			
	PEDEE RFPD	1,149	1,149				
	GRAND RONDE SWR DIST	0	0				
	AMERICAN BOTTOM WATER CONTRO	591	591				
	ASH CREEK WATER CONTROL JONT CREEK WID	13,667	13,667				
	SOUNT ASH CREEK WID	0 Q	0				
	POLK SHOD	ů ů	0	•	•		
		•	•	•	•		
SHI	ERMAN COUNTY						
	SHERMAN COUNTY	1,059,906	925,031	134,875	12.7		
	GRASS VALLEY	10,684	7,834	2,850	26.7		
	MORO	36,999	19,673	17,326	46.8		
	RUFUS	15,736	11,558	4,178	26.6		
	WASCO	19,783	15,064	4,724	23.9		
-	RUFUS 3 SCHOOL	270,790	191,081-	79,709	29.4		
*							

19