

# FULL TEXT OF BALLOT TITLES—NOVEMBER 5, 2024

## MULTNOMAH COUNTY • STATE OF OREGON

ONLY THE CAPTION AND QUESTION WILL APPEAR ON YOUR OFFICIAL BALLOT AND ONLY THE APPROPRIATE MEASURES FOR EACH PRECINCT WILL APPEAR ON THAT PRECINCT’S BALLOT.

<b>STATE MEASURES</b>		<b>Proposed by Initiative Petition</b>	<b>Proposed by Initiative Petition</b>
<b>Referred to the People by the Legislative Assembly</b>	<p><b>Estimate of Financial Impact:</b> This measure amends the Constitution to create a Commission responsible for deciding the salaries of certain elected officials. The money for the salaries will come from the General Fund. The measure itself does not decide the moneys needed to cover the salaries. The fiscal impact to the state, for chosen salaries and commission staff, could not be determined. There is no fiscal impact on local governments.</p>	<p><b>118 Increases highest corporate minimum taxes; distributes revenue to eligible individuals; state replaces reduced federal benefits</b></p> <p><b>Result of “Yes” Vote:</b> “Yes” vote increases corporate minimum tax on Oregon sales exceeding \$25,000,000; eliminates tax cap; distributes revenue to eligible individuals; state replaces any reduced federal benefits.</p> <p><b>Result of “No” Vote:</b> “No” vote retains existing corporate minimum taxes on Oregon sales; twelve tax brackets impose different tax amounts, capped at \$100,000 tax on sales exceeding \$100,000,000.</p> <p><b>Summary:</b> Current law requires corporations to pay higher of either tax on taxable income or corporate minimum tax. Except S corporations, minimum tax amount determined by tax bracket based on corporation’s Oregon sales; minimum tax capped at \$100,000 for \$100,000,000 or more in sales. Beginning 2025, measure removes minimum tax cap; increases minimum tax on all corporations with Oregon sales exceeding \$25,000,000 by imposing additional tax of 3% for sales above \$25,000,000. Measure directs Department of Revenue to equally distribute increased revenue (minus certain costs) to all individuals residing more than 200 days annually in Oregon. Revenue distribution does not affect individual eligibility for state benefits; measure requires replacement of reduced federal benefits if distribution negatively affects individual’s benefits under any need-based program. Other provisions.</p> <p><b>Estimate of Financial Impact:</b> The measure establishes a new gross receipts tax as the minimum tax for certain corporations. According to the Legislative Revenue Office, indirect economic costs of the measure include a 1.3 percent increase in prices of goods and services and reductions in jobs, wages and personal incomes. Corporate tax revenues are estimated to increase by \$1.3 billion in 2023-25, \$14.7 billion in 2025-27, and \$15.6 billion in 2027-29.</p> <p>New revenue raised will be used to issue annual rebates to eligible individuals in Oregon. An estimated \$13.6 billion will be required for rebate distributions in 2025-2027 and an estimated \$17.1 billion will be required in 2027-29. Administrative costs and any additional payments will be deducted from the amount to be distributed.</p> <p>Known administrative costs are estimated to be \$1.6 million General Fund and 22 permanent positions in the 2023-25 biennium and \$48.2 million General Fund and 199 additional permanent positions in the 2025-27 biennium at the Oregon Department of Revenue. The measure will generate a significant workload increase processing applications for the rebate, verifying the identity and eligibility of those applying for the rebates, reviewing payments and tax refunds for fraudulent activity, handling appeals, increasing customer inquiries, increasing audit and collections activity for the new tax, and increasing technology programming. Other major expenses are unknown but could be significant for expenses such as payments for rebate checks, prepaid debit cards, mailings associated with the program, legal fees, and public information costs.</p> <p>Individuals who lose federal benefits because of the rebate will be held harmless with additional payments. The costs associated with this provision are unknown. Rebates that are declined by eligible individuals will be available to fund services for senior citizens, health care, and public early childhood education through high school. The impact from these declined rebates is unknown.</p> <p>Following the initial phase-in, total biennial costs of the rebate program are expected to exceed the new biennial revenue. Estimated indirect impacts on personal income tax revenue are reductions of \$12 million in 2023-25, \$199 million in 2025-27, and \$207 million in 2027-29. Lastly, changes to the economy are projected to reduce state revenue by roughly \$11 million in 2023-25, \$150 million in 2025-27 and \$400 million in 2027-29.</p> <p>The corporate kicker will increase by an estimated \$1.3 billion in 2025-27, and transfers to the Rainy Day Fund from the General Fund will be reduced.</p> <p>Impact to local governments is unknown.</p>	<p><b>119 Cannabis retailers/processors must remain neutral regarding communications to their employees from labor organizations; penalties</b></p> <p><b>Result of “Yes” Vote:</b> “Yes” vote requires cannabis retailers/processors to agree to remain neutral when labor organizations communicate with employees about collective bargaining rights; licensure/certification penalties possible.</p> <p><b>Result of “No” Vote:</b> “No” vote retains current labor laws; no requirement that cannabis retailers/processors agree to remain neutral on communications between their employees and labor organizations.</p> <p><b>Summary:</b> Current law generally guarantees employees’ rights to organize and collectively bargain. Measure requires agreement between cannabis retailers/processors and a labor organization that meets the definition of labor organization under the National Labor Relations Act and whose operations are independent of the retailer/processor. At minimum, agreement must require that retailer/processor will remain neutral when labor organization representatives communicate with employees about collective bargaining rights. Oregon Liquor and Cannabis Commission must require such signed agreement or attestation of such agreement, in addition to existing licensure or certification requirements for cannabis retailers/processors. Failure to have a signed agreement or attestation, or to follow the agreement, may result in penalties, including fines or the denial, suspension, or revocation of retailer’s/processor’s license or certificate.</p> <p><b>Estimate of Financial Impact:</b> This measure will increase state government costs by approximately \$0.6 million in the first year. Ongoing costs will increase by approximately \$0.8 million each subsequent year. The estimated costs include six new positions to verify application documents and monitor compliance. The increased costs will be paid for by license application fees. There is no financial impact to local governments.</p>
<b>Referred to the People by the Legislative Assembly</b>	<b>Referred to the People by the Legislative Assembly</b>	<p><b>115 Amends Constitution: Authorizes impeachment of statewide elected officials by Oregon Legislature with two-thirds vote by each House; establishes process</b></p> <p><b>Result of “Yes” Vote:</b> “Yes” vote authorizes and establishes a process for the Oregon Legislature to impeach statewide elected officials; House initiates impeachment with two-thirds vote; Senate tries and convicts with two-thirds vote; Chief Justice of Oregon Supreme Court oversees impeachment trial.</p> <p><b>Result of “No” Vote:</b> “No” vote retains current law that does not authorize the Oregon Legislature to impeach and remove statewide elected officials.</p> <p><b>Summary:</b> Amends the Oregon Constitution to grant the Oregon House of Representatives the power to impeach statewide elected officials in the executive branch, and to grant the Oregon Senate the power to try an impeachment received from the House. Currently, the statewide elected officials of the executive branch are the Governor, the Secretary of State, the State Treasurer, the Attorney General and the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor and Industries. At present, the only way to remove these officials is through recall election. The measure permits the House to impeach for malfeasance, corrupt conduct in office, willful neglect of constitutional duty or other felony or high crime. Requires “yes” vote of at least two-thirds (40) of Representatives to send impeachment resolution to Senate. Requires Senate to conduct impeachment trial and requires “yes” vote of at least two-thirds (20) of Senators to convict. The Chief Justice of the Oregon Supreme Court would preside over an impeachment trial. A convicted official is removed from office and disqualified from other public office.</p> <p><b>Estimate of Financial Impact:</b> This measure amends the constitution to allow the House of Representatives to impeach statewide elected officials. The measure requires the Senate to try any impeachment received from the House. The Chief Justice presides over the trial. The financial impact on state government is indeterminate because impeachment trials do not have a set length and could happen outside of regularly scheduled sessions. There is no fiscal impact on local governments.</p>	<p><b>117 Gives voters option to rank candidates in order of preference; candidate receiving majority of votes in final round wins</b></p> <p><b>Result of “Yes” Vote:</b> “Yes” vote gives voters the option to rank candidates in order of preference for specified federal and statewide offices. Establishes process for tallying votes in rounds, with the candidate receiving the fewest votes in each round being defeated and votes for the defeated candidate going to the voter’s next-highest ranked active candidate. Requires that candidate must receive majority of votes in final round of voting to win election.</p> <p><b>Result of “No” Vote:</b> “No” vote maintains current voting system. Voter selects one candidate for federal and statewide offices. Candidate with most votes wins. Majority of votes not required for candidate to win election.</p> <p><b>Summary:</b> Current state law requires voters to select only one candidate for each office on the ballot. The candidate with the most votes after a single vote tally wins, even if not a majority. This measure gives voters the option to rank candidates in order of preference using “ranked choice voting.” Under the measure, voters may choose to rank only one candidate or multiple candidates for each office, as well as write in candidate(s). Votes are counted toward each voter’s highest-ranked candidate. If no candidate receives a majority of votes, votes are tallied automatically in rounds. The candidate receiving the fewest votes in each round is defeated. A defeated candidate’s votes go to the voter’s next highest-ranked candidate. The process continues until one candidate has a majority of votes. The measure applies to the nomination and election of President, United States Senator, Representative in Congress, Governor, Secretary of State, State Treasurer and Attorney General, and election of the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor and Industries. The measure requires the Secretary of State to establish a program to educate voters about how ranked choice voting elections will be conducted. Authorizes local governments to adopt ranked choice voting for elections for local offices. Local governments that adopted ranked choice voting before 2025 may continue to use current method or modify it. The measure applies to elections beginning in 2028.</p> <p><b>Estimate of Financial Impact:</b> This measure establishes ranked choice voting for federal, state, and some local elected offices. The Secretary of State must create rules for carrying out ranked choice voting and educate voters about ranked choice voting. The Secretary of State and County Clerks must present two reports to interim legislative committees by September 15, 2026. If the measure is passed by Oregon voters, ranked choice voting must be effective by January 1, 2028.</p> <p>The measure is estimated to cost the state government \$0.9 million during the 2023-25 biennium. This cost is to pay for needed staff and consulting services for the Secretary of State to begin carrying out the measure. In the 2025-27 biennium, the cost of the measure is estimated to grow to \$5.6 million. This is to continue funding staff and consulting services, as well as outreach and IT needs.</p> <p>The cost of the measure is less known for local government. County Clerks estimate that the measure will cost \$2.3 million initially. This funding will be used to improve technology, train staff, and test the new system. Every statewide election will cost an additional \$1.8 million for added printing and logistics. Software and maintenance contract costs will cost an additional \$0.4 million per year.</p>
<b>Referred to the People by the Legislative Assembly</b>	<p><b>116 Amends Constitution: Establishes “Independent Public Service Compensation Commission” to determine salaries for specified officials; eliminates legislative authority to set such salaries</b></p> <p><b>Result of “Yes” Vote:</b> “Yes” vote amends Oregon Constitution to establish a commission to determine salaries paid by state to specified officials, replacing current practice of establishing such salaries by legislation; provides that determinations of the commission are automatically funded.</p> <p><b>Result of “No” Vote:</b> “No” vote retains current law whereby salaries paid by state to specified officials are established by legislation.</p> <p><b>Summary:</b> Under current law, the salaries paid by the state to many public officials are set by statute and can be changed only through legislation. This measure authorizes establishment of a body named the Independent Public Service Compensation Commission to determine salaries paid by the state to the Governor, the Secretary of State, the State Treasurer, the Attorney General, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor and Industries, judges of the Supreme Court, judges of other courts under the administration of the judicial branch of state government, state Senators, state Representatives and district attorneys. Determinations of the commission would not be subject to review or modification by the Legislative Assembly, the Governor or any other official. The measure provides that the membership of the commission is to be established by law, except that the following classes of individuals are ineligible for membership: officers and employees of the state, lobbyists, and immediate family members of such officers, employees and lobbyists. The measure provides that moneys sufficient to pay for the commission’s salary determinations are automatically appropriated from the General Fund without the need for a further appropriation by law.</p>	<p><b>Measure 26-255: Amends Charter, charter amendments require approval by majority of votes.</b></p> <p><b>Question:</b> Shall the Charter be amended such that changes require the approval of a majority of electors voting on the measure?</p> <p><b>Summary:</b> The Gresham Charter, adopted In 1978 and last amended in 2012, is the constitution of the City of Gresham. This amendment is referred to the voters on behalf of the Gresham Charter Review Committee (CRC); a committee of Gresham citizens.</p> <p>The CRC determined the current Charter denies the will of the majority of voters approving a Charter change.</p> <p>The Charter requires voter approval to change any word, phrase, grammar, or punctuation in the document. The current Gresham Charter requires that amendments must receive 60% or more of the votes In favor of the change.</p> <p>If this ballot measure is approved, any amendment of the Charter would still require voter approval. Charter Section 45A would be amended to change the voter approval requirement to “A majority of votes cast on the proposed measure”.</p> <p>This measure has no known fiscal impact.</p> <p>This measure would take effect when approved by at least sixty percent (60%) of the votes cast for or against this measure.</p>	<p><b>Measure 26-256: Amends Gresham Charter; urban renewal actions consistent with state law.</b></p> <p><b>Question:</b> Shall the City Charter be amended to make Urban Renewal actions consistent with existing state law; requires no new taxes?</p> <p><b>Summary:</b> The Gresham Charter, adopted In 1978 and last amended In 2012, is the constitution of the City of Gresham.</p> <p>If approved, this measure would amend the Charter to be consistent with existing state law, allowing the City Council, as the governing body charged with the powers authorized by state law, to perform any act or carry out any function to approve Urban Renewal Plans and substantial changes to Urban Renewal Plans.</p> <p>Amending the Charter allows Gresham to be more efficient and responsive to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Job creation opportunities</li> <li>o Public safety investments</li> <li>o Investments in public infrastructure</li> <li>o Changes In the economy</li> <li>o Changes In community needs and priorities</li> </ul> <p>State law assures voters are involved with Urban Renewal Plan decisions. City is required to conduct public outreach and hold a public hearing before approving a new plan or making substantial changes to an existing plan.</p> <p>Urban Renewal is not a new or additional tax. This amendment does not authorize the creation of a new tax.</p> <p>Additional Information is available at <a href="http://GreshamOregon.gov/Urban-Renewal">GreshamOregon.gov/Urban-Renewal</a></p>
		<b>CITY OF GRESHAM</b>	<b>CITY OF LAKE OSWEGO</b>
		<b>Referred to the People by the City Council</b>	<b>Referred to the People by the City Council</b>
		<p><b>Measure 3-618: Allows road safety project, driveway realignment on specific park property.</b></p> <p><b>Question:</b> Shall Lake Oswego amend the Charter to allow Clackamas County to improve road safety using 0.4 acres of Stevens Meadows?</p> <p><b>Summary:</b> The City owns Stevens Meadows, a park of about 28 acres outside City limits in Clackamas County. The County is responsible for Stafford and Childs Roads adjacent to the park.</p> <p>The County has determined improvements to the Stafford/Childs intersection are necessary to ease congestion and reduce injuries from accidents. The road improvements, which will be paid for and constructed by the County, will reduce crashes, ease traffic congestion, and create bike lanes and safe pedestrian paths. The County estimates the road improvements will decrease the crashes by 88% at the intersection. The County needs to use about 0.2 acres for these road improvements. The project will also realign an existing gravel driveway used for park maintenance, affecting an area of about 0.2 acres.</p> <p>The City Charter prohibits the City from allowing roads on Stevens Meadows. If adopted, this measure would amend the Charter, allowing the City to enable County use of up to 0.4 acres of Stevens Meadows for the limited purposes of public safety road improvements and driveway realignment.</p>	<p><b>Measure 3-618: Allows road safety project, driveway realignment on specific park property.</b></p> <p><b>Question:</b> Shall Lake Oswego amend the Charter to allow Clackamas County to improve road safety using 0.4 acres of Stevens Meadows?</p> <p><b>Summary:</b> The City owns Stevens Meadows, a park of about 28 acres outside City limits in Clackamas County. The County is responsible for Stafford and Childs Roads adjacent to the park.</p> <p>The County has determined improvements to the Stafford/Childs intersection are necessary to ease congestion and reduce injuries from accidents. The road improvements, which will be paid for and constructed by the County, will reduce crashes, ease traffic congestion, and create bike lanes and safe pedestrian paths. The County estimates the road improvements will decrease the crashes by 88% at the intersection. The County needs to use about 0.2 acres for these road improvements. The project will also realign an existing gravel driveway used for park maintenance, affecting an area of about 0.2 acres.</p> <p>The City Charter prohibits the City from allowing roads on Stevens Meadows. If adopted, this measure would amend the Charter, allowing the City to enable County use of up to 0.4 acres of Stevens Meadows for the limited purposes of public safety road improvements and driveway realignment.</p>

---

**Measure 3-619: Prohibits psilocybin businesses within the City of Lake Oswego.**

**Question:** Shall the City of Lake Oswego prohibit psilocybin service centers and the manufacture of psilocybin products within the City?

**Summary:** State law authorizes the manufacturing, transportation, delivery, sale, and purchase of psilocybin, the psychedelic drug found in certain mushrooms, in Oregon. A city may “opt-out” by adopting an ordinance prohibiting the establishment of licensed psilocybin product manufacturers and/or psilocybin service centers within their boundaries. A city that “opts-in” may also adopt local time, place, and manner restrictions on psilocybin product manufacturers and/or psilocybin service centers that are in addition to those already imposed by state law.

The City adopted an ordinance prohibiting the establishment of psilocybin product manufacturers and psilocybin service center operators (collectively, “psilocybin facilities”) within the City. State law requires that this ordinance must be approved by the voters before it may take effect. The City Council also adopted an ordinance imposing local time, place, and manner restrictions on psilocybin facilities in addition to those already imposed by state law.

Approval of this measure would prohibit psilocybin facilities within the City. Rejection of the measure would allow psilocybin facilities within the City subject to state and local restrictions.

---

**CITY OF PORTLAND**

Referred to the People by the City Council

---

**Measure 26-249: Amends Charter: Deletes outdated, redundant requirements to approve utility franchises.**

**Question:** Shall Charter be amended to streamline Council approval of utility franchise agreements and remove outdated, burdensome and redundant requirements?

**Summary:** The Charter Commission proposed a measure to streamline the approval of franchise agreements, which authorize a utility to use City streets to provide residents with utility services.

Currently, City Council must approve franchises using a lengthy and outdated process described in Chapter 10, Article 2 of the Charter.

If the measure is approved, the following requirements would be deleted:

- Redundant filing with Auditor
- Objection process
- Publication of lengthy franchise in newspaper
- Extended time between reading of ordinance to approve franchise
- Extended effective date
- Written acceptance by franchisee

Instead, Council would grant franchises by ordinance, in accordance with standard ordinance publication, public testimony, adoption and effective date provisions in Charter and code. Other provisions.

The City Budget Office determined the measure has no direct financial impact.

---

**Measure 26-250: Amends Charter: Adds Independent Portland Elections Commission.**

**Question:** Shall Charter be amended to add Independent Portland Elections Commission to oversee public financing of elections, other election-related programs?

**Summary:** The Charter Commission proposed a measure to add the Independent Portland Elections Commission to Chapter 3 of the Charter.

Currently, an Elections Commission is established by code, which can be amended by City Council. If the measure passes, the Elections Commission would be added to the Charter, which means the Election Commission provisions can only be amended by an affirmative vote of a majority of voters.

The Elections Commission will continue to be responsible for implementing the City’s public financing of elections as provided by ordinance and, if the measure passes, any other election or campaign finance-related law or program delegated by the Council or Auditor.

The Elections Commission will continue to consist of nine City residents appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by Council. Under the measure, the Elections Commission will notify the Mayor and Council of funds required for the public financing of elections program and other duties. The Council continues to determine the Elections Commission’s budget. Other provisions.

The City Budget Office determined the measure has no direct financial impact.

---

**Measure 26-251: Amends Charter: Updates authority to manage parks, sewers and stormwaters.**

**Question:** Shall Charter be amended to update City authority regarding recreational and natural areas (defined), sewers and stormwaters?

**Summary:** Charter Commission proposed measure to update City authority, last amended in 1966, to manage recreational and natural areas, sewers and stormwaters.

If measure passes:

- Charter Section 12-101, describing parks management, would add “recreational and natural areas” as defined term to mean parks, playgrounds, forests, wetlands and human-built, natural facilities. Remaining language would be streamlined.

- A section would be added to City’s specific powers in Charter Section 2-105(a) clarifying that City may perform sewer, stormwater management—including protecting, restoring, remediating, altering, improving, expanding, filling, grading, or managing flow—in channels, riparian areas, floodplains, waterfronts, lakes, ponds, wetlands, other waters, natural systems, constructed equivalents.

- Charter Section 11-301 would be amended to clarify that storm drainage may use natural systems, constructed equivalents.

- Charter Section 11-302 would be amended to streamline language, last updated in 1970, related to service charges deposited into Sewage Disposal Fund. Charter will continue to require Council to spend Fund only on uses “reasonably related” to sewage, stormwater conveyance, disposal and purification.

Other provisions.

City Budget Office determined measure has no direct financial impact.

---

**Measure 26-252: Amends Charter: Deletes vague, archaic and inconsistent language.**

**Question:** Shall Charter be amended to delete vague, archaic language and use a consistent definition of “protected classes”?

**Summary:** The Charter Commission proposed a measure to delete vague, archaic and inconsistent language in the Charter.

If the measure passes, the following language in the Charter would be amended:

- Delete Charter Section 2-105(a)(50) to remove vague, archaic language to “prohibit persons from roaming the streets at unseasonable hours”. Deleting this section of the City’s specific powers would not impair the City’s general powers and authority to protect and support public health and safety.
- Delete vague, archaic language to regulate “offensive” businesses in Charter Section 2-105(a)(36). City would retain authority to regulate businesses that create or constitute a nuisance.
- Use consistent language to define “protected classes” as those classes protected “under local ordinance, or state or federal law” in Charter Chapters 2, 4 and 12.
- Replace “disability” with “incapacity” in Charter Chapter 2 to reflect the fact that disabled residents may serve as City officials.

The City Budget Office determined the measure has no direct financial impact.

---

**Measure 26-253: Amends Charter: Removes citywide vote requirement for mandatory building weatherization.**

**Question:** Shall Charter be amended to allow City to mandate weatherization of structures built before 1979 without a citywide vote?

**Summary:** The Charter Commission proposed a measure to delete Charter Section 1-108 and allow the City to mandate weatherization of pre-1979 structures without a citywide vote.

Currently, the City cannot mandate weatherization for any structure built before September 1, 1979, unless Council refers the weatherization mandate to voters. This limit was added to the Charter in 1980 through a vote on an initiative petition.

If the measure is approved, the City would be able to mandate building weatherization without referring the mandate to voters.

The City Budget Office determined the measure has no direct financial impact.

---

**CITY OF TROUTDALE**

---

**Measure 26-248: Prohibits additional recreational marijuana retailers in Troutdale, allows existing retailers.**

**Question:** Shall Troutdale prohibit additional recreational marijuana retailers in the city, but allow existing retailers and other types of marijuana businesses?

**Summary:** State law regulates both recreational and medical marijuana operations, including and retailers.

State law allows a city council to adopt ordinances to be referred to the voters that prohibit the establishment of any of registered or licensed marijuana activities, while allowing existing activities to continue.

Approval of this measure will prohibit the establishment of additional recreational marijuana retailers within the city. Existing recreational marijuana retailers, all producers, processors and wholesalers, as well as medical marijuana registrants will not be affected by this ordinance.

If this measure is approved, the city will be ineligible to receive distributions of state marijuana tax revenues and will be unable to impose a local tax or fee on the production, processing or sale of marijuana or any product into which marijuana has been incorporated.

Existing recreational marijuana retailers in the City may continue to offer for sale marijuana and marijuana products such as concentrates, extracts, edible products, and other products intended for human consumption and use in compliance with state law.

---

**PARKROSE SCHOOL DISTRICT**

---

**Measure 26-254: Parkrose School District Levy to Maintain Teachers and Classroom Support**

**Question:** Shall district maintain teachers, classroom support; by requesting levy of \$1.25 per \$1,000 assessed value for five years beginning 2025? This measure may cause property taxes to increase more than three percent.

**Summary:** Parkrose School Districts is asking for a local option levy that will bring in an estimated \$3.6 million in the first year and is projected to fund approximately 28 teachers and classroom support staff annually over five years.

This local option levy would:

- Support a well-rounded education for Parkrose children, including career and technical programs and enrichments and electives, so students graduate with college and career ready skills.
- Provide classroom supports, such as educational assistants and reading specialists for students struggling with academic or emotional behavioral health issues.
- Help maintain class sizes and prevent significant increases across the district.

Levy rate proposed is \$1.25 per \$1,000 assessed property value.

No levy funds will be spent for administration. Funds will be kept in a separate account/fund with; independent community oversight to verify that funds are only used as approved by voters.

The levy will raise an estimated \$3.6 million in 2025-2026; \$3.7 million in 2026-2027; \$3.8 million in 2027-2028; \$3.9 million in 2028-2029; and \$4.1 million in 2029-30.

*The estimated tax cost for this measure is an ESTIMATE ONLY based on the best information available from the county assessor at the time of estimate and may reflect the impact of early payment discounts, compression and the collection rate.*

---

**SAUVIE ISLAND RURAL FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT**

---

**Measure 26-257 Continuation of Five-Year Local Option Levy for General Operating Purposes**

**Question:** Shall the District continue a \$0.3500 per \$1,000.00 of assessed value for five years for operating purposes beginning 2025-2026? This measure renews current local option taxes.

**Summary:** The taxes proposed will be used for general operating purposes for the Sauvie Island R.F.P.D. #30J. Anticipated uses of funds include state required medical testing for all firefighters, required Federal and OSHA testing of equipment and of firefighters use of equipment, physical testing of firefighters and their abilities, annual servicing and safety inspections of vehicles and equipment, including funds for replacement, and continuing volunteer training and certification.

The rate is estimated to raise the following amounts: \$74,750.00 in 2025/2026, \$76,395.00 in 2026/2027, \$78,075.00 in 2027/2028, \$79,793.00 in 2028/2029 and \$81,548.00 in 2029/2030.

The estimated tax cost for this measure is an ESTIMATE ONLY based on the best information available from the county assessor at the time of estimate and may reflect the impact of early payment discounts, compression and the collection rate.