

## CITY OF GRESHAM

**Measure No. 26-38****BALLOT TITLE****CITY OF GRESHAM TAX BASE FOR PUBLIC SAFETY**

**QUESTION:** Shall City of Gresham have a new tax base of \$17,334,299 beginning with 1996-97 fiscal year?

**SUMMARY:** The City of Gresham Budget Committee proposes a new tax base to fund current and expanded public safety services. All City tax base property taxes go into the General Fund. The City intends to use all tax base revenue for police and fire services. In 1993 City voters approved a three-year Public Safety serial levy outside the tax base for community policing and fire services. That levy ends this year. This measure adds to the current tax base to continue public safety services at the current level and pay for expansion of police and fire services.

The new city tax base for fiscal year 1996/97 would be \$17,334,299. City voters approved the current tax base in 1980. The Oregon Constitution permits tax bases to increase by 6% each fiscal year without voter approval. The City tax base for the current fiscal year is \$13,617,264. The new tax base would start July 1, 1996.

This property tax levy is subject to the \$10 limit of section 11b, Article XI of the Oregon Constitution (1990 Measure 5). The revenues will be used exclusively for other governmental purposes.

fund.

The City Council adopted Resolution No. 2005 that establishes a Financial Management Policy to use all tax base property tax revenues for police and fire services. For many years, City tax base property tax revenues have been less than the combined budgets of the Police and Fire Departments. The proposed \$17,334,299 new tax base will generate net revenue of about \$16,150,060. This will pay about 70% of the \$23,071,642 total budgeted cost of police and fire services for fiscal year 1996-97. The balance is paid from other non-property tax General Fund revenues.

Article XI, section 11 of the Oregon Constitution provides for voter approval of new tax bases. City voters approved the current tax base in 1980. The Constitution also authorizes tax bases to increase at the rate of 6% per year, and to increase from the value of property annexed to the City. Since 1980 there have been many annexations of land to the City. The value of that property together with 6% annual tax base growth permitted by the Constitution have resulted in the current year City tax base of \$13,617,264.

Submitted by

Phyllis R. Brough  
City Recorder/Elections Official  
City of Gresham

**EXPLANATORY STATEMENT**

This measure proposes a new City of Gresham tax base to continue the current level of community policing and fire and emergency services and provide some additional services. For the past three years these services have been funded by a Public Safety Levy approved by the voters in June 1993. If the new tax base is not approved, the City will not have funds to maintain the current level of police and fire services. This measure will provide about \$2.6 million to replace the \$2.3 million Public Safety Levy that ends June 30, 1996.

The new tax base will continue the current level of Fire and Emergency Services and Community Policing services funded by the Public Safety Levy including:

- three community policing zone offices and programs,
- community resources officers and services,
- increased CPR training for citizens,
- 24-hour access to police records and services,
- advanced training for paramedics,
- desk officer program for convenient customer service,
- traffic enforcement and investigations,
- 24-hour fire command staff,
- more effective officer use from crime analysis.

The new tax base will increase Public Safety services including:

- improved disaster preparedness,
- more community emergency medical services training,
- improved violent crimes investigations,
- improved fire fighting capability,
- expanded drug investigation and enforcement,
- increased citizen CPR training,
- emergency communications equipment and replacement

# CITY OF GRESHAM

## Measure No. 26-38

### ARGUMENT IN FAVOR

Vote Yes on 26-38,  
Gresham's Public Safety Tax Base.  
Keep Gresham safe.  
Now—and in the future.

Remember 1980?

Gresham's population was 33,005.  
Police responded to 9,337 calls for help.  
There were 1,113 fire & emergency responses.

A pizza cost \$5,  
A dental check-up cost \$25.  
Basic phone service cost \$9.63.

Gresham voters last approved a tax base increase.

Remember 1995?

Gresham's population was 77,240.  
Police responded to 34,898 calls for help.  
There were 7,515 fire & emergency responses.

A pizza cost \$10.59,  
A dental check-up cost \$78.80.  
Basic phone service cost \$20.58.

Gresham residents reported in a survey that public safety was their main concern and they wanted increased police, fire and emergency services.

Remember May 21, 1996.

A pizza, trip to the dentist and basic phone service all cost more in 1996 than they did in 1980.

So do police, fire and emergency services.

This is the day to vote for Gresham's future.

Remember May 21, 1996.

Vote Yes on 26-38,  
Gresham's Public Safety Tax Base.  
Keep Gresham safe.  
Now—and in the future.

*(This information furnished by Gussie McRobert and  
Bob Wiggin, Citizens for Public Safety)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

### ARGUMENT IN FAVOR

Vote Yes on 26-38.  
For 6 cents a week, you can help  
Keep Gresham safe.  
Now—and in the future.

In 1993, Gresham voters said they wanted to try neighborhood based police, fire and emergency services for 3 years. The benefits are impressive. That 3-year levy ends June 30, 1996. Vote Yes on 26-38 to make these benefits permanent.

Gresham now has one of the best records in the country for saving heart attack victims. 93/96 levy funded training is the key.

Fires are now put out sooner. A levy funded incident commander now oversees fire scenes and directs fire fighters' actions for greater efficiency.

Three community zoning offices have been opened and staffed. Along with the Desk Officer program they have helped people resolve problems before they become police statistics.

Traffic enforcement has increased 50%.

Police now have access to regional and national data bases to help solve crimes.

Productivity has increased by basing staffing on calls for service.

A Yes vote on 26-38 makes these benefits permanent.

Vote Yes on 26-38 to improve  
emergency service benefits for an  
additional 6 cents a week.

26-38 also increases drug enforcement, upgrades communications systems, establishes a reserve fund for future replacement of that equipment at no additional taxpayer cost and trains Neighborhood Emergency Teams to help people help themselves the first 72 hours after a disaster. A Yes vote on 26-38 costs the owner of a \$100,000 home only 6 cents a week more than the 93/96 levy. All property taxes are dedicated to police, fire and emergency services.

Vote Yes on 26-38.  
For 6 cents a week, you can help  
keep Gresham safe.  
Now—and in the future.

*(This information furnished by Bob Wiggin and Gussie  
McRobert, Citizens for Public Safety)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

# CITY OF GRESHAM

## Measure No. 26-38

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

#### IF THE CITY COUNCIL WERE SELLING USED CARS,...

...they would have the Fraud Division working on their case right now.

The Mayor and her tag-alongs on the Council are asking you to trust them and to believe that if you approve a new Tax Base for the City, the entire tax levy, plus 6 percent compounded year after year forever and ever, will go solely for some vague concept call "Public Safety."

It would be impossible for citizens of the City to hold future City Councils to such a reckless pledge made by this Council. The only way to tie the hands of future City Councils is to amend the City Charter—and that takes a 60 percent favorable vote.

The City Attorney, the Mayor and the rest of City Council all know (or should know) that there is no provision in Oregon Law which allows a city's tax base to be dedicated to a specific public service. Yet they are ignoring the advice of experts in the field who have told them precisely that, and are counting on fooling the people just one more time.

We don't even have to wait for future budgets to get a clear picture of the City's plans. We all know how, during the recent budget meetings, the City Manager wanted some of this "public safety" money to hire another clerk for her office, how the City Attorney wanted "public safety" money to buy some stationery and how the Parks and Recreation folks had their hand out for some "public safety" money to do something or the other.

If they would be this blatant even before the election, try to imagine their glee when after the election, they "suddenly discover" that their promise to use the funds only for public safety isn't worth the paper it's written on and they are free to use the money for any City program they can dream up.

Vote "No" on Measure 26-38.

*(This information furnished by Tom Dennehy,  
The Citizen Oversight Committee)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

#### What's Gresham Going to Do with All That Money?

Despite the City's careful, lawyerly chosen words, the difference between a "Yes" vote and a "No" vote on this measure is about \$2.9 million in the City's taxing authority.

Is \$2.9 million too much to ask for "public safety"? As explained elsewhere, this money is not really permanently dedicated to any specific City program no matter what the City would like you to believe. But look at how much trouble the City has had spending this year's levy—they had to go out and pave a parking lot with some of the surplus money just to use it up.

When City officials got caught making improper expenditures, they promised to return some of it to the taxpayers, but only if we would give them a new Tax Base big enough to cover the refund. Talk about chutzpah!

The City will tell you that the proposed increase in the Tax Base simply converts the current 3 year serial levy into a more "stable" source of funds. But remember that the current "temporary" serial levy included a number of one-time-only expenses such as for new communication equipment and beefing up of the liability fund.

Since these expenditures have already been made, why are these one-time-only taxes being converted to permanent taxes?

To put the tin hat on it, although the money is surplus in the current fiscal year, they are asking us to give them permanent authority to collect the same amount (plus 6 percent) every year from here to eternity.

Do a simple Reality Check of your own. The extra \$2.9 million included in this proposal is supposed to fund about 20 new positions in "public safety." Clearly, there's a lot of padding in this proposal.

And remember, this goes on year after year after year, with 6 percent added on each year. How big will our police and fire departments grow?

Vote "No" on Measure 26-38.

*(This information furnished by Steve Beal, Executive Club)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

# CITY OF PORTLAND

## Measure No. 26-39

### BALLOT TITLE

#### PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION

AMENDS CHARTER. ESTABLISHES TERM LIMITS FOR CITY'S ELECTIVE OFFICES

**QUESTION:** Shall City Charter be amended, limiting number of terms served in elective offices and changing length of terms for commissioners?

**SUMMARY:** Presently, Portland's City Charter provides that terms of office for Mayor, Auditor and Commissioners each shall be four years with no limit on the number of terms a person may serve. This amendment provides that no person shall serve more than two four-year terms in the office of Mayor or Auditor. Commissioner terms are limited to three two-year terms or six years in office. Time already served in office counts, except terms presently being served may be completed.

### ARGUMENT IN FAVOR

As Chief Petitioner for **Oregon Term Limits--"Congratulations, Portland voters!"** for qualifying the first city-wide initiative in 12 years. It took 26,000 signatures of Portland voters to get the democratic opportunity to vote for **TERM LIMITS** May 21.

#### Why TERM LIMITS?

Frequent rotation in office is an uncomplicated **democratic tradition** for all elective offices. Since there has been democracy, there have been term limits:

**"One principle of liberty is for all to rule and be ruled in turn."**—Aristotle's "Politics", Book 6, Chapter 2

Presently there is **no limit** on the number of times **Portland** officials may be reelected.

**Presidents** are limited to two terms. **Governors** and **statewide offices** in Oregon and 39 other states are limited to **two terms or less**.

In 1992, one million voters—a 70% consensus majority—approved limits on **State Representatives and Senators**. The measure passed in all Oregon counties and by 2-to-1 in the Portland metropolitan area.

**Congressional term limits** petitions are circulating for the November ballot in Oregon and 12 other states.

Most of the country's greatest cities have **term limits**.

**Portland should lead in government reform – not fall behind.**

#### Career Politicians Oppose TERM LIMITS Because Passage Would...

- Bring forward qualified citizen candidates from outside "the system" for **more competitive elections** and **more balanced representation**.
- Enable more people with **new ideas and energy** to serve in office.
- Prevent career politicians from becoming **corrupt power brokers**.
- **Establish a distance** between politicians and special interest groups with their campaign donations. Term limits won't solve **all** our campaign problems, but it's a **critical first step**.

#### TERM LIMITS

**It's something we can do**  
to end Politics-as-Usual and  
restore pride and trust in our government.

**May 21, join me in voting "YES" on 26-39,  
for CITY TERM LIMITS.**

Note: This measure's limits are the same that apply for President, Governor, and the State Legislature.

*(This information furnished by Paul Farago)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

## CITY OF PORTLAND

**Measure No. 26-39****ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION****LEADERSHIP FOR PORTLAND—NOT A REVOLVING DOOR!  
CAST YOUR NO VOTE AGAINST #26-39**

As citizens and elected leaders who care about Portland's future, we join with friends and neighbors across our city in urging you to vote **NO** against **City Ballot Measure 26-39**.

**We are speaking out against Measure 26-39 because it would**

- double the number and expense of city elections.
- create a permanent campaign environment in city hall.
- reduce independence and experience in city government.
- increase the power of unelected bureaucrats and lobbyists.
- turn city hall into a municipal revolving door.

Portland's tradition of good government depends on responsible, independent leadership. We are opposed to **Measure 26-39** because we believe it threatens to undermine Portland's good government tradition in several ways:

**MORE ELECTION EXPENSE** By cutting city commissioner terms from four to two years, **Measure 26-39** would double the expense of city elections, and create a permanent campaign environment within city hall. More elections would mean more campaigning and fundraising by our elected officials.

**POWER TO THE UNELECTED** By encouraging constant campaigning and fundraising at city hall, **Measure 26-39** would give more power to lobbyists, civil servant and special interests, at the costs of neighborhoods, citizens and taxpayers.

**LESS EFFECTIVE & INDEPENDENT** By creating a revolving door approach to elections, **Measure 26-39** would mean political infighting within city government with respect to police, parks, streets, water, transit, fire protection, budget control and other vital services.

**SAY NO TO MORE ELECTION EXPENSE  
& LESS CITIZEN CONTROL  
VOTE NO AGAINST MEASURE 26-39**

Neil Goldschmidt	Jewel Lansing	Connie McCreedy
	Former City Auditor	Former Mayor
Charles Jordan	Mike Lindberg	

*(This information furnished by Neil Goldschmidt)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

**ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION****MEN & WOMEN OF PORTLAND  
LAW ENFORCEMENT SPEAK OUT  
AGAINST MEASURE 26-39**

No one takes a more direct interest in the caliber and character of our elected city leaders than the men and women of Portland law enforcement. The public safety of our streets, neighborhoods, businesses and our entire city depends upon maintaining good working relationships between police and elected city officials.

**WHY ACTIVE & RETIRED POLICE OPPOSE #26-39**

We believe that **Measure 26-39** would threaten the relationship between law enforcement and elected leaders. We believe that **Measure 26-39** would tend to undermine the experience and independence of the elected officials responsible to the people for police and public safety.

**Measure 26-39** would reduce the terms of city commissioners from four years to two years. As a result, the number of elections would double. In addition, 26-39 would limit commissioners to a total of six years on the job.

In Portland, mayors and city commissioners do more than debate public issues and pass ordinances. Under our commission form of city government, they are responsible for several city agencies on a full-term basis, such as the Bureau of Police.

We need effective, independent leadership in city government. Turning city elections into a revolving door for politicians will definitely hurt law enforcement in Portland.

For these reasons, we ask that you join with us in voting **NO** on elections day.

**THE FOLLOWING ACTIVE-DUTY AND RETIRED PORTLAND POLICE OFFICERS URGE YOU TO VOTE NO AGAINST MEASURE 26-39:**

Dan Noelle  
Vera Pool  
Tom Potter

*(This information furnished by Vera Pool)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

# Measure No. 26-39

## ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

### TWICE THE ELECTIONS...AT DOUBLE THE COST? VOTE NO on MEASURE 26-39

Measure 26-39 would amend the Portland city charter, with serious consequences for citizens and taxpayers.

As active members of Portland's regional and neighborhood business community, we support local government reform that makes elected leaders more effective at providing basic services and more efficient in managing tax dollars. Measure 26-39 does the opposite.

**IMPACT OF 26-39** We oppose 26-39 because 26-39 would create serious problems for city government:

- **CUT COMMISSION TERMS IN HALF** Terms for city commissioner would be reduced from four to two years.
- **DOUBLE ELECTION COSTS** Twice the elections under 26-39 would mean double the burden for taxpayers.
- **ENCOURAGE ELECTIONEERING** With constant campaigns, elected officials would concentrate less on problems, more on fundraising and politicking.
- **UNLEASH THE BUREAUCRACY** Increased electioneering and campaigning would lead to more power in the hands of staff and consultants.
- **MINDING THE CITY'S BUSINESS** These alterations proposed under 26-39 are the opposite of a sound, business-like approach to city government. We need effective elected leaders who mind the city's business—instead of constantly worrying about their own re-election.

### LOCAL PORTLAND BUSINESS LEADERS ASK YOU TO VOTE NO:

D.W. Owens - Foster Area Business Association  
 Wilma Caplan  
 Don McClave  
 Jim Kelly - Rejuvenation, Inc.  
 Jim Bernau - President Norwester Brewing Co.  
 Tom Kelly  
 Jeff Bachrach

*(This information furnished by D.W. Owens,  
Foster Area Business Association)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

## ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

### NEIGHBORHOODS & COMMUNITY LEADERS OPPOSE #26-39

We believe that Portland's tradition of community citizenship and strong neighborhoods demands independent, effective leadership by elected officials who are responsible to the voters for their job performance.

That is why we are opposed to #26-39. In the name of "reform" this measure would actually increase election costs, increase insider control, and decrease the accountability of elected officials to voters in every part of Portland.

We are concerned because...

- **SAY NO TO DOUBLE ELECTIONS** #26-39 would reduce the term of city commissioners from four years to two years. This would mean twice the elections (and twice the fundraising) at double the cost to taxpayers.
- **SAY NO TO INSIDER INFLUENCE** By encouraging more campaigning and fundraising, #26-39 would increase the influence of developers, special interests and other insiders throughout city government.
- **SAY NO TO REDUCED ACCOUNTABILITY** Because insiders would gain influence under #26-39, politicians would become less accountable to the neighborhoods for police, fire protection, streets, parks, sewers, water and other services.

Bruce Crest  
 Laurel Butman  
 Kay Collier

Anthony R. Palermini  
 Sandi Hansen

*(This information furnished by Bruce Crest)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

# CITY OF PORTLAND

## Measure No. 26-39

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

#### IS MEASURE 26-39 GOOD FOR FAMILIES & SENIORS?

As long-time Portland voters and residents, we have many concerns about leadership at city hall. We are especially concerned with the services we receive in our neighborhoods, and the cost of these services to local taxpayers, especially families and seniors.

In evaluating **Measure 26-39**, our main question is this: Is **Measure 26-39** good for Portland. Will it serve the interests of Portland's families and seniors?

#### THE ANSWER IS NO

After examining the issue, we are opposed to **Measure 26-39**. We urge our friends and neighbors, children, and grandchildren in North Portland, East Portland, the Westside and every neighborhood in our city to vote **NO**.

**We say NO to Measure 26-39 for the following reasons:**

**DOUBLE ELECTIONS** **Measure 26-39** would make city commissioners run for office every two years instead of every four. Cutting commissioner terms in half doubles the cost of elections, and forces constant campaigning and fundraising within city government.

**INSIDER POLITICS** By requiring more elections, **Measure 26-39** would encourage even more fundraising, electioneering and lobbying at city hall, by incumbents, candidates and special interests. Under this system, downtown insiders would enjoy a clear advantage over neighborhoods and senior.

**Here is what Measure 26-39 means, more or less:**

- more elections, more fundraising and more power for insiders
- less accountability to neighborhoods, seniors and families.

**SENIORS, LONG-TIME RESIDENTS AND FAMILIES  
PLEASE JOIN US  
VOTE NO on MEASURE 26-39**

Richard J. Schmidt  
Chairman East Co. Senior Advisory Board

Estill Deitz

Vivian Grubb

Ester D. McGinnis

*(This information furnished by Richard J. Schmidt,  
East County Senior Advisory Board)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

#### LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF PORTLAND OPPOSES MEASURE 26-39

The League of Women Voters of Portland strongly urges you to vote **NO** on **Measure 26-39**. We believe in the individual liberties guaranteed by the Constitution. The League is convinced that individual rights now protected by the Constitution should not be weakened or abridged.

The right to vote is basic to our democratic form of government. We should not undercut the voters' right to elect the person they prefer by setting up an arbitrary system to limit a government official's term.

Term limits are already in effect. They are called **ELECTIONS** and in Portland they are held every four years. Voters can reelect those who are doing a good job, or replace them.

By slashing a city commissioner's term from four years to two, **Measure 26-39** undermines these duly elected government official's effectiveness and increases the influence of lobbyists and special interest groups.

By imposing unnecessary restrictions on voter choice, **Measure 26-39** ignores the fact that Portland voters are already using the ballot box to ensure change when they want it.

#### WHY WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO

Under Portland's unique Reform Charter, voters elect a mayor and four city commissioners. Unlike other Oregon cities, where appointed officials run day-to-day affairs under a part-time council, each Portland commissioner is a full-time manager, directly responsible for several city agencies. **Measure 26-39** is:

**UNNECESSARY** Under **Measure 26-39**, Portland's mayor would be limited to two terms. However, since 1933, only one mayor has served more than two terms.

**EXPENSIVE** Under **Measure 26-39**, Portland voters would be subjected to a perpetual election cycle, with increased costs to taxpayers, and non-stop fundraising by elected city officials.

**LESS EFFECTIVE** **Measure 26-39** would make city officials increasingly dependent upon special interests and unelected advisors. To make city government work, we need more independence and experience—not less.

#### PORTLAND LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

*(This information furnished by Deborah Aiona,  
League of Women Voters of Portland)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

# Measure No. 26-46

## BALLOT TITLE

### GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND AUTHORIZATION

**QUESTION:** Shall the District be authorized to contract a general obligation bonded indebtedness in an amount not to exceed \$32,100,000? If the bonds are approved, they will be payable from taxes on property or property ownership that are not subject to the limits of Article XI, Section 11b of the Oregon Constitution.

**SUMMARY:** This measure, if approved, would authorize the District to issue general obligation bonds in an amount not to exceed \$32,100,000. Bond proceeds would be used to replace roofs, acquire real property, improve, repair and expand schools and buildings; add computers and instructional and communication technology; remodel for safety, security, and earthquake requirements; improve to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act; and pay all costs incidental thereto. The bonds would mature over a period not to exceed 21 years.

## EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

The Gresham-Barlow School District is asking voters to approve a bond measure in the amount of \$32.1 million to be repaid over a period of up to 21 years. The funds will be used for:

- major repair and renovation at all eighteen of the district's existing schools and facilities,
- improved classroom technology opportunities for students in all schools,
- increased safety at neighborhood schools throughout the district, and
- the purchase of a limited amount of land for future school sites to accommodate the population growth expected in this area.

Approval of the measure is estimated to cost the taxpayer an average of 49 cents per thousand dollars of assessed evaluation over the repayment period.

### Background

The Gresham-Barlow School District was created in May of 1994 as a result of the state-mandated unification process. While the district itself is new, most of its schools are not. In fact, four Gresham-Barlow schools date from the early 1900s and four others are more than thirty years old. Over this extended period of time, the wear and tear of everyday use has resulted in the need for significant long-term repairs and maintenance that cannot be adequately funded through the annual operating budget. The Board of Directors believes that a bond measure, which by law can only be used for new facilities, remodeling, technology, property, and major repairs, is the only means by which the community's schools can be brought up to standard.

### Increased School Safety

Students, teachers, parents, and community members who use our schools deserve safe and secure classrooms, playgrounds, and facilities. The Gresham-Barlow School Bond Measure will provide more than \$3 million for school security, safety and code compliance. Seismic strengthening will make schools much safer in the event of an earthquake. Improved fire protection and emergency lighting will also enhance school safety. In addition, safety funding will help schools comply with indoor air quality standards and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

### Necessary Long-Term Repairs

The bond measure will protect the community's existing \$200 million investment in its schools with \$20 million in major maintenance and repair projects. Bond funds will be spent on roofs, boilers, plumbing, windows, floors, electrical systems, as well as for a limited amount of increased space within existing buildings.

### Improved Classroom Technology

Today's students, the workers and citizens of tomorrow, must understand how to use modern computers and advanced technology. The Gresham-Barlow School Bond Measure will provide \$8 million to ensure direct computer access for every student in every school. Not only will it provide computers for every classroom, it will link all students to libraries and other information sources from around the world.

### Benefits for Every School and Student

In conclusion, students throughout the entire district will benefit from the \$32.1 million Gresham-Barlow School Bond Measure because it will fund new computers and improved technology, increased student safety measures, and necessary long-term maintenance in every school.

Submitted by

James Carlile  
Superintendent

**No arguments AGAINST this measure were filed.**



## Measure No. 26-46

### ARGUMENT IN FAVOR

#### **Decades Old Schools Need Your Support!**

The Gresham-Barlow School District is asking voters to approve a bond measure in the amount of \$32.1 million to be repaid over a period of up to 21 years. The funds will be used for major repair and renovation at all of the district's existing schools and facilities, four of which were built in the early 1900's and four more of which are more than thirty years old. Bond measure proceeds will also provide improved classroom technology opportunities for students in all schools and increased school safety throughout the district. The average cost per thousand dollars of assessed evaluation over the repayment period is estimated to be 49 cents. That's about \$4.90 per month for the owner of a house valued at \$120,000.

#### **Vote Yes to Protect Your Investment!**

Protect the \$200 million investment you and the rest of the community have already made in your schools. An estimated \$20 million of the measure's proceeds will go for major maintenance and repair projects including new roofs, boilers, plumbing systems, windows, floors, and electrical systems. Some increased capacity will also be added to accommodate growing enrollment.

#### **Students Need Access to Up-To-Date Technology!**

To compete and succeed in the new global economy of tomorrow, today's students must understand how to use modern computers and advanced technology. This measure provides \$8 million to ensure direct computer access to every student in every school, including **at least four** computers in every classroom and linkage to information sources from around the world.

#### **Dollars Needed for School Safety!**

The bond measure will provide more than \$3 million for school safety and code compliance. Seismic strengthening will make schools much safer in the event of an earthquake. Improved fire protection and emergency lighting will also enhance school safety. In addition, safety funding will help schools comply with indoor air quality standards and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

*(This information furnished by Mike Hill, Director,  
Citizens for Schools)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

# Measure No. 3-63

## BALLOT TITLE

### BOND MEASURE FOR ROAD IMPROVEMENTS

**QUESTION:** Shall City issue general obligation bonds to pay for capital improvements to roads in an amount not to exceed \$6,970,000? If the bonds are approved, they will be payable from taxes on property or property ownership that are not subject to the limits of Section 11b, Article XI of the Oregon Constitution.

**SUMMARY:** Bonds will be used to repair the City's existing road system. Repairs include re-pavement, reconstruction and safety improvements. If passed, approximately 38 City roads are planned for repair over a five year period. The specific road projects will be incorporated into the City's Capital Improvement Plan.

Bonds will be issued in several series to keep tax rates down. The estimated maximum annual tax rate is \$.19 per thousand of assessed valuation. The owner of a \$150,000 house would pay \$28.50 per year.

The levy for the bonds will not reduce property tax collections for other units of local government pursuant to Section 11b, Article XI of the Oregon Constitution or implementing legislation.

sand of assessed value. If enacted, the owner of a \$150,000 house would pay an additional \$28.50 in property taxes for that year.

Submitted by  
Jeffrey G. Condit,  
City Attorney  
City of Lake Oswego

## EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

This bond measure for road improvements is referred to the voters by the Lake Oswego City Council. A "yes" vote would authorize the City to issue bonds in an amount not to exceed \$6,970,000, payable from property taxes, limited to paying for road and street improvements.

Bond proceeds would be used to repair the City's existing road system. Currently, City road improvements are funded primarily from state gas tax revenues shared with the City. These revenues are insufficient to fund repairs to all the streets identified as needing repairs. Putting off regular capital repairs can create safety problems and can require much more expensive reconstruction in the future.

City staff has identified 38 streets throughout the City as needing capital repair, including: Andrews, North Shore, Boones Ferry, Bryant, Greentree and Jean Roads; Iron Mountain Boulevard; McNary Parkway; Kruse Way; and Oak and McVey Streets. A complete list and a map of the proposed street projects are on file at the City Recorder's Office (635-0236). Repairs proposed for these roads include pavement overlays, rehabilitation, and, in the most severe cases, reconstruction of the street.

Bond funds will not be used to build new roads or for routine maintenance.

If this bond measure is passed by the voters, the 38 road projects will be added to the City's Capital Improvement Plan for completion over the next five years. The total amount of the bond measure is based upon staff estimate of the cost to repair the 38 streets. Actual costs may vary. Any changes that may be required because of an unforeseen change in costs will be made pursuant to the annual public Capital Improvement Plan review process.

Bonds will be issued in several series to keep the tax rate down. The estimated maximum annual tax rate would be \$.19 per thou-

**No arguments FOR or AGAINST this measure were filed.**

# WASHINGTON COUNTY E.S.D.

## Measure No. 34-48

### BALLOT TITLE

#### WASHINGTON COUNTY EDUCATION SERVICE DISTRICT CAPITAL CENTER GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND

**QUESTION:** Shall the District issue \$39.5 million in bonds to construct a Regional High School? If the bonds are approved, they will be payable from taxes on property or property ownership that are not subject to the limits of section 11b, Article XI of the Oregon Constitution.

**SUMMARY:** Bond proceeds will be used to finance the acquisition of land and facilities, constructing, equipping and furnishing a facility to house the new Washington County Regional High School, a component of the CAPITAL Center, an education and business partnership representing all Washington County school districts and participating businesses; making site improvements, and acquiring interactive video communications equipment, and to pay all costs incidental thereto. The bonds would mature in not to exceed 20 years. Cost estimate is 12 cents per \$1,000 assessed value.

expansion of student business partnerships.

- **Technology & Equipment** to provide state-of-the-art resources to its students, including interactive communications equipment.

#### How Much?

This school bond measure would cost the property taxpayer an estimated average of 12 cents per \$1000 of assessed value during the life of the bonds. This amounts to an estimated average of \$15.60 per year or \$1.30 per month on a \$130,000 home. The bonds will mature in 20 years or less.

Submitted by

John Young, Superintendent  
Washington County E.S.D.

### EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

#### What is the CAPITAL Center?

Developed in partnership with local business and education, the CAPITAL Center is an innovative educational opportunity serving citizens of Washington County including students from all seven Washington County high school districts.

The regional high school will provide enhanced educational and career opportunities for students. The CAPITAL Center will offer these opportunities in the areas of business and management, engineering/technology, health services, natural resources, arts and communications and human services.

#### Why?

Through business partnerships, the CAPITAL Center high school will provide Washington County students with hands-on work experience required to meet the demands of the workplace of the future. Economic diversity, global communication and the rapid movement of technology are just a few of the challenges facing tomorrow's workforce. Competition is fierce. As they prepare to enter the workforce or college, high school students must begin to develop the skills required to meet these challenges.

The CAPITAL Center is the response proposed by local businesses and educators to meet this formidable task. Supplementing the core curriculum, this regional high school will deliver hands-on work experience and teach students the skills necessary to succeed in the workplace of the future.

#### What is the CAPITAL Center Bond Measure?

In cooperation with local businesses and high school districts, the Washington County Education Service District has developed a \$39.5 million school bond measure enabling the community to provide an adequate and effective learning center for as many as 2,000 students beginning in approximately the fall of 1997. This school bond measure includes, but is not limited to:

- **Purchasing Land and Constructing** a regional high school to provide an effective learning environment and meet demands of future student enrollment.
- **Work Experience Program Facilities** to accommodate

**No arguments FOR or AGAINST this measure were filed.**

CITY OF FAIRVIEW

Measure No. 26-40

BALLOT TITLE

PROPOSED NEW TAX BASE FOR CITY OF FAIRVIEW

QUESTION: Shall a new Tax Base of \$772,079.00, be established for the City of Fairview, commencing July 1, 1996.

SUMMARY: To provide \$296,503.00 in additional funds for police protection services for the residents of the City, over and above those funds already providing existing General Fund Services which include police services, planning, fire protection and parks. The present City tax base is \$475,576.00 for the current fiscal year 1995-96. The unanimous opinion of the City Council is that to enable the City to provide the stated increased level of police protection and to continue other General Fund services that a new tax base of \$772,079.00, to commence July 1, 1996, is needed. If the new tax base is approved, the City will not levy the 6% annual increase to which it would be entitled for fiscal 1996-97.

This property tax base measure is subject to the limits of Section 11b, Article XI of the Oregon Constitution. (1990 Measure 5). The revenues provided will be used exclusively for governmental purposes other than education.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

Measure 26-40 asks the voters of the City of Fairview to increase the existing tax base by \$296,503 to be used exclusively to expand the Fairview Police Department.

The increased funds would be used for:

- 1) the continuation of the Sergeant's position which is currently funded with a federal COPS grant for three years and which cannot be renewed;
2) the addition of two police officers which would give the City of Fairview six police officers, as well as a Sergeant and Chief, which is sufficient for a city of 6,000—projected to be reached by 1998;
3) the addition of one clerical support person for the police department who will provide the necessary record-keeping and administrative duties not now available; and
4) the purchase of one additional police vehicle to keep the city up-to-date on the number of vehicles necessary for a force of this size.

The expansion of the existing tax base by \$296,503 will allow the City of Fairview to continue its tradition of providing "community policing" to all residents and businesses within the city limits.

Submitted by Marilyn Holstrom City Administrator

No arguments FOR or AGAINST this measure were filed.

ROCKWOOD WATER DISTRICT

Measure No. 26-43

BALLOT TITLE

DISSOLUTION OF THE ROCKWOOD WATER DISTRICT

QUESTION: Shall Rockwood Water District be dissolved now that district water service is provided by Rockwood Water Peoples Utility District?

SUMMARY: Rockwood Water District (RWD) is a special district formed under ORS ch 264. In 1990 voters within RWD formed Rockwood Water Peoples Utility District (RWPUD) under ORS ch 261. A city cannot annex or withdraw property from a PUD. RWD transferred all district assets to RWPUD. RWPUD now provides water service. This measure proposes dissolving RWD now that its assets are transferred and its affairs settled. A "yes" vote will dissolve the district. A "no" vote will continue the existence of Rockwood Water District.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

Rockwood Water District is a municipal corporation and special district duly formed under ch 264 of the laws of State of Oregon. In May of 1990 electors within the geographic area of Rockwood Water District voted to form the Rockwood Water Peoples Utility District under ORS ch 261. A Peoples Utility District cannot have its assets and property withdrawn or annexed by a city under Oregon law. Rockwood Water District signed an Inter-governmental Agreement with the Rockwood Water Peoples Utility District in June of 1990 and eventually transferred all water district assets, funds, water lines, contracts for water, real property and improvements, and rights of way to Rockwood Water Peoples Utility District, and Rockwood Water Peoples Utility District then employed former Rockwood Water District employees. Having performed its functions, transferred rights and property and reviewed the winding down of the affairs of Rockwood Water District, the Board places the question of dissolution before the voters. A yes vote will dissolve the district. All water service functions will continue to be performed by Rockwood Water Peoples Utility District.

Submitted by Duane E. Robinson District Manager

No arguments FOR or AGAINST this measure were filed.