

Marion County Clerk Letter

Dear Fellow Marion County Voters:

At the November 4, 1997 Special Election you will be asked to make some important choices on a variety of measures. Through your vote by mail ballot you will decide on two state measures, five county measures and city measures in Salem, Woodburn and St. Paul.

This voter pamphlet is provided to help you become a well informed voter. In this pamphlet you will find the actual texts of all measures and additional explanatory statements for the local measures designed to provide you with impartial and fair information to help you make an informed decision. Some measures also have had arguments filed by those supporting and/or opposing the measures. Information about the two state measures is found in the state voter pamphlet you will receive in the mail.

On page 4 of this pamphlet you will find information showing you how to correctly mark your ballot and return it to the elections office so it may be counted on November 4. You will find voter registration information on page 3.

Page 23 contains a listing of locations in several communities where you may deposit your ballot up to 8:00 p.m. on election day if you choose not to mail it.

If you have any questions about voter registration or voting, please contact Marion County Elections at 588-5041, or 800-655-5388 if you are out of the local calling area.

Sincerely,
Al Davidson
Marion County Clerk

Measure 24-89: City of St. Paul

Referred to The People by The City Council

Measure Requiring A City Wide Vote On All Annexations

QUESTION: Shall all future annexations, including delayed, unless mandated by law, require a majority vote of the electors to be valid?

SUMMARY: Annexation is the legal process to bring property inside the City limits. Under current law, all annexation requests are approved or disapproved by the City Council or in the discretion of the City Council referred to the voters. This proposal would change that and amend the City Charter to require that an annexation request must be voted on by the citizens of St. Paul, and receive a majority vote, before such request is approved. The request would still have to meet all land use laws.

Explanatory Statement:

This measure would amend the St. Paul City Charter to require that all annexations to the City (unless mandated by State law), be approved by a majority vote of the electors of the City. The exact text of the Charter amendment would be as follows:

"Chapter I, Section 3. BOUNDARIES.

Section 3. BOUNDARIES. The corporate limits of the City shall include all territory encompassed by its boundaries as they now exist or hereafter are modified by a majority of the voters. Unless mandated by State Law, annexations, delayed or otherwise, to the City of St. Paul, may only be approved by a prior majority vote among the electorate. The City Recorder shall keep in the office at City Hall at least two copies of this Charter in each of which the City Recorder shall maintain an accurate, up-to-date description of the boundaries. The copies and descriptions shall be available for public inspection at any time during regular office hours of the City Recorder."

Presently, the State law provides for methods by which the City can annex territory into the City. Traditionally, the City has annexed territory into the City with the consent of the property owner and the passage of an Ordinance by the City Council. The matter did not have to be submitted to a vote of the people of the City. This amendment would require the City to submit the matter to a vote of the electors of the City. In order for the territory to be annexed, there would have to be a favorable vote by a majority of the electors voting in the election. This amendment specifically states that it includes "annexations, delayed or otherwise." It is the intention that it includes all types of annexations. The provision specifically excludes any annexations mandated by State law, such as for a health hazard.

Submitted by:
Sam McKillip, Mayor
City of St. Paul

Arguments in Favor:

PROTECT OUR COMMUNITY FROM OVER-DEVELOPMENT
VOTE YES On MEASURE 24-89

St. Paul has recently been inundated with requests from developers to annex more land into the city so that they can begin building more houses than St. Paul has seen constructed in the last 30 years.

Presently the decision to annex or not to annex rests in the hands of City Council. Although they receive information from city planners, concerned citizens, and consulting firms, they are now free to vote for their own interests.

At present, just 3 City Council members are able to decide the fate of St. Paul. Take for example the recent Sept. 2nd City Council Meeting. After hearing reports from professional advisors (the City Manager, City Lawyer, and the representative from the Council of City Government) recommending that City Council not accept an application for annexation, 3 Council members went ahead and voted to accept the developer's application anyway.

St. Paul residents need to have some control over their future. After all, we live here. Let us work together to keep St. Paul what it is today. PROTECT OUR VISION OF A SMALL CLOSE COMMUNITY NOT THE VISION THAT DEVELOPERS HAVE IN MIND FOR US.

VOTE YES ON MEASURE 24-89

Rosemary Koch	Nellie Ferschweiler
Barbara Boedigheimer	Rosella McKay
Donna Smith	Joseph McKay
Jean Manegre	Robert McKay
Donna Miller	Mary McKay
Albert Bernard	Jim Zielinski
	Carolyn Zielinski

(This information provided by Jim & Carolyn Zielinski)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Marion County nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument. Marion County does not correct errors in spelling or grammar.

No arguments opposed to this measure were filed.

MEASURE NO. 24-90: City of Salem

Referred to The People by The City Council

Fee Increases For City Permits

QUESTION: Shall fees for certain city permits be increased?

SUMMARY: This measure would allow fees for planning, fire and sign permits to be increased to help cover city costs of providing these services.

Explanatory Statement:

The Salem City Council has determined that the following fees are subject to the election requirements established by the passage and implementation of Measure 50. Ballot Measure 24-90 permits the City to increase the fees listed below.

Planning

The increased planning fees will make planning services more self-supported by fees and less reliant on property tax revenues.

	From(\$)	To(\$)
Comprehensive Plan/Zone Change (Residential and Non-Residential)	1,900	2,500
Comprehensive Plan Change (Residential and Non-Residential)	1,000	2,500

UGA Permit (Plus \$3 [to increase to \$5] for every acre in excess of 5)	1,200	2,100
Zoning Adjustment	350	400
Applicant Initiated Interpretation	350	1,500
Conditional Use	1,100	1,500
Greenway Development Permit	395	1,300
Mobile Home Park (plus \$3 [increase to \$5] per dwelling unit for every unit in excess of 5)	1,700	3,000
PUD: Tentative Plan (plus \$3 [increase to \$5] per unit for every unit/lot in excess of 5)	1,200	3,250
PUD: Final Plan (plus \$3 [increase to \$5] per unit for every unit/lot in excess of 5)	500	1,300
Variance (Non-Residential or Residential)	1,000	1,200
Zone Change: Non-Residential	1,900	2,500
Zone Change: Residential	1,100	1,700
Exception to Dispersal Policy	185	1,000
Specified Use Conference	180	400
Partition	700	1,300
Subdivision (plus \$3 [increase to \$5] per lot for every lot over 5)	1,700	2,800
Legal Lot Opinion	85	600
Expedited Subdivision (plus \$5 for every lot in excess of 5)	3,700	5,300
Expedited Partitioning	1,700	2,500
Annexation (plus \$3 [increase to \$5] per acre for every acre over 5)	350	2,500
Appeals (partitions and adjustments - non-neighborhood association)	100	1,000
Appeals (partitions and adjustments - by neighborhood association)	0	125
Appeals (mobile parks, UGA, subdivision - non-neighborhood association)	100	1,500
Appeals (all others - non-neighborhood association)	445	1,500
Verification of Land Use	15	125
Plans Check - multi family (plus \$1 [to increase to \$2] per dwelling unit for every unit in excess of 5)	15	20
Plans Check (all other)	30	35
Pre-application Conference (\$100 [to increase to \$500] of this fee may be applied to subsequent land use application filed within 90 days of conference)	200	500
Street Name Application	345	725

Fire

The increased fire permit fees will make the fire inspection program more self-supported by fees and less dependent upon property tax revenues.

	From(\$)	To(\$)
Extra Hazard Use Permits (first)	42.50	75
Extra Hazard Use Permits (subsequent)	25	50
Water Capacity Permit < 1,000 Gallons	8	15
Water Capacity Permit > 1,000 Gallons	14	25
Combination Water Capacity Permit < 200 gallons	8	15
Special Activity Permit	67.50	100
Above Ground flammable Tank Removal	27.50	50
Underground Flammable Tank Removal	82.50	125
Hourly Cost Recovery Rate	23	25
Reinspection Fee - per Hour	27.50	50

Signs

The increased sign permit fees will make the sign inspection program more self-supported by fees.

	From(\$)	To(\$)
<u>Signs Except Outdoor Advertising Signs</u>		
Permanent Sign Permit	85	125
Face Change	30	65
<u>Outdoor Advertising Signs (Billboards)</u>		
0 - 300 Square Feet	300	650
301 Square Feet and Larger	300	650
For each added 100 square feet or fraction thereof exceeding 301 square feet	Base + 25	Base + 50
Annual Maintenance Inspection Fee	25	65
<u>Temporary Sign Permit</u>		
Temporary Banner (good for 1 month)	30	35
Temporary Pennant (good for 6 months)	30	65
Temporary Balloon (good for 14 days)	30	35
Temporary Sign (good for 1 month) (firework and Christmas tree stands)	30	35
<u>Other Sign Permit</u>		
Sign Removal for Repair and Return	35	40
Wall Facade for Signs	85	125
Removal Agreement	100	127.50
Sign Appeal to Hearings Officer (new name)	1,000	1,000
Sign Code Interpretation	500	575
Banner Across Liberty Street (minimum \$ 50 [increase to \$87.50] per banner)	10/day	17.50/day

Penalty Fees (The fee for any sign permit where the applicant begins work prior to obtaining a sign permit required by this chapter, shall be double the fee specified.)

Double Fee Double Fee

Reinspection Fee - (Per inspection or reinspection when such portion of the work for which the installer has not requested an extension of time prior to the final inspection date assigned, and when such portion of work for which inspection is called is not complete or when corrections called for are not made. Reinspection fees may be assessed for deviating from the plans requiring approval of the Building Official. No additional inspection of the work will be performed until the reinspection fees have been paid.)

n/a 35

Submitted by:
Mike Swaim, Mayor
City of Salem

No arguments in favor of or opposed to this measure were filed.

MEASURE NO. 24-91: City of Salem

Referred to The People by The City Council

New and Increased Library Fees

QUESTION: Shall new fee for nonresident's library card be adopted, fee for library parking meters be increased?

SUMMARY: This measure would allow a new fee of up to \$40 per year for library cards for non-residents of the city. It would also increase the library parking meter rate from \$.25 per hour to \$.50 per hour, the same rate as parking meters on the street.

Explanatory Statement:

The Salem City Council has determined that the following fees are subject to the election requirements established by the passage and implementation of Measure 50. Ballot Measure 24-91 permits the City to increase the fees listed below.

Library

The proposed non-resident library fee and increased parking meter fee will be used to fund library programs.

	From (\$)	TO (\$)
Library cards for non-resident use	0	up to 40/yr
Library parking meters	0.25/hr	0.50/hr

Submitted by:

Mike Swaim, Mayor
City of Salem

No arguments in favor of or opposed to this measure were filed.

MEASURE NO. 24-92: City of Salem

Referred to The People by Initiative Petition

Charter Amendment Requiring Systems Development Charges Allowed by Law

QUESTION: Shall city charter be amended to require systems development charges to extent law allows and limit deferred payment of charges?

SUMMARY: Amends city charter. Requires systems development charges to extent allowed by state law and constitutions. Requires development permit applicants to pay charges upon all development affecting, including connecting to public capital improvements. Requires methodology designed to allocate to new development full cost of existing or proposed improvements to extent affected by new development. Requires reimbursement fees for increased improvement use, improvement fees for increasing improvement capacity. Limits deferred payment to no later than issuance of certificate of occupancy. Requires implementation within 180 days of passage.

Explanatory Statement:

No Explanatory Statement was filed because the measure is by Initiative Petition.

Argument in Favor:

League of Women Voters supports Measure 24-92 because:

- * Our increasing property taxes and sewer and water rates are subsidizing new growth; this should not continue. Costs of capital improvements (sewer, water, transportation, parks, storm drainage) caused by new growth should be paid by new growth. Measure 24-92 provides a needed policy statement in Salem's Charter to ensure new growth pays its fair share of the cost of services.
- * Measure 24-92 requires new growth to pay up to, but not more than its fair share of capital improvement costs. The Measure's requirement that System Development Charges (SDC's) must be levied at the "full extent allowed by state law" means SDC's equal to the actual cost of growth-related services.
- * Measure 24-92 relies on existing state law passed in 1989 and supported by the building industry and cities as a fair way to pay for growth. It does not contain new, untested, or radical ideas. It simply requires Salem to do what state law already authorizes it to do--enact fair SDC'S.
- * Measure 24-92 expands Salem's current SDC's to include a charge for storm drainage and flood control facilities.

- * Measure 24-92 requires currently-exempt commercial and industrial development to pay improvement fees for sewer, water, and parks.
- * Artificially low SDC's cannot be justified in the name of affordable housing. Affordable housing is achieved by building houses people can afford. And offering rent and mortgage loan assistance targeted to low-income households. Why should we subsidize housing for all homebuyers, regardless of their income?
- * SDC's do not restrict growth. Many rapidly growing Oregon cities have higher SDC's than Salem's. Builders in other cities recognize the benefits of smart growth. Why not Salem?
- * Citizens should decide how costs of growth are financed. City Council's current policy is that the community should subsidize growth. If you think growth should pay its fair share, vote YES on Measure 24-92.

*(This information provided by Roz Shirack,
President, League of Women Voters)*

HEADLINE: " '96 EXISTING HOME SALES HIT RECORD"
(Statesman-Journal 1-28-97)

HEADLINE: " '96 HOUSING STARTS HIT 8 YEAR HIGH"
(Statesman-Journal 1-23-97)

WHO PROFITS FROM THIS GROWTH?

Let's look at the public records for Deer Ridge Park Estates.

Developer's average land cost per lot	\$ 2,900
Developer invested for improvements - per lot	\$13,630
Total investment per lot	\$16,530
Average Deer Ridge Park Estates lot sales price	\$36,000
Minus Developer's land and improvement costs	-\$16,530
Developer's average PROFIT per lot	\$19,470

That's 118% profit!

To those same lots, the city committed an additional \$24,000 per lot worth of streets, sewer lines, water lines, schools, libraries, police and fire protection, land fill costs, etc. The developer's modest portion of those same services and facilities was \$2,350.

That leaves \$21,650 that the rest of the community is stuck with!

Where does this \$21,650 per lot come from?

HEADLINE: "Water and Sewer Rates Increase Wednesday....."

to climb steadily through the year 2010, until the combined monthly bill hits about \$180"
(Statesman-Journal 12-31-96)

Where is the "profit" for the community?

HEADLINE: "Oregon's Quality of Life Falters"

(Statesman-Journal 12-31-96)

Had enough? Vote "YES" on Measure 24-92.

*(This information provided by Jerry Scott,
Citizens For Responsible Growth)*

CITIZENS FOR RESPONSIBLE GROWTH is a group of your neighbors who believe that we can no longer afford to pay the price we have been paying for "growth". These "growth costs" are called systems development charges, or "SDC's".

Currently Salem's SDC's are about the lowest in the state!

That means that we have been paying more to subsidize "growth" In Salem than most other cities in the state!

Measure 24-92 helps to right this wrong. It puts the full force of the state law into our city's charter. It can dramatically improve the economic future of our city because **this measure requires "growth" to pay more of its share** of the costs of streets, water, sewer, storm drainage, and parks.

Are you fed up with:

- watching our water and sewer rates skyrocket?
- our property taxes rising dramatically?
- watching our neighborhood streets deteriorate while new streets are being built on the edge of town?
- being told that "we have no money for parks"?
- watching your tax dollars subsidize multi-million dollar corporations?
- watching our streets and basements flood from runoff from new parking lots, warehouse roofs, and streets?

Then vote "Yes". "Yes for smart growth".

With "smart growth" more of your hard earned money is returned to the community where it belongs. And less of it goes into the pockets of developers and land speculators.

As always, positive changes like this are dependent on your vote.

It's very simple. You can vote YES on 24-92!

THANK YOU!

*(This information provided by Richard Reid,
Citizens For Responsible Growth)*

Arguments Against:

Please Vote No on Measure 24-92

Measure 24-92 TAKES AWAY LOCAL CONTROL

Legislators from Portland to Ontario would determine the level charged. Do you want to give up your control to those with no stake in our community?

Measure 24-92 DISCRIMINATES AGAINST THOSE IN NEED

Low-priced new homes, Habitat for Humanity and other non-profit organizations will be hurt because this measure imposes a flat charge of an additional estimated \$8000-\$20,000 that is not dependent on the home or apartment value.

Measure 24-92 ATTACKS HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

The Salem Housing Authority, in a 1997 study, found that when their family clients obtained decent housing, household incomes went up noticeably. Affordable housing needs to be preserved. No one knows how much this measure would add per month onto mortgage or rent payments, making it harder than ever for low income and first time homebuyers to buy a home or rent an apartment.

Measure 24-92 UNFAIR

80% of new homebuyers already live in Salem and are paying taxes/fees/utilities when they buy or build a new home. This measure imposes an unknown penalty for that choice. Some estimates range as high as an extra \$20,000. New residents moving into Salem, causing "growth", who buy or rent existing housing, pay nothing!

Measure 24-92 BAD FOR BUSINESS

This measure would make Salem the least competitive city in Oregon for attracting new jobs and services for ourselves, our children, and our grandchildren.

Measure 24-92 NOT THE ANSWER

Elected officials and citizens on all sides of this issue deserve an opportunity to determine a fair level of charges that new construction should pay now and in the future. We do not need an extreme, inflexible measure locked into the city charter.

FOR FAIRNESS, FOR YOUR CHILDREN'S AND
GRANDCHILDREN'S FUTURE, FOR HOUSING
AFFORDABILITY, VOTE NO ON MEASURE 24-92

(This information provided by John Baker and Debbie Baker)

Measure 24-92- a charter amendment to *raise system development charges on homes and businesses by an estimated 300%-- puts Salem's future at risk:*

* Measure 24-92 was drafted by anti-growth activists without public hearings or legal review. The result?

The author can't even say how much his new "housing tax" increase would be! **24-92 asks for a blank check from city residents!**

* **Can Salem families really afford a huge increase in housing taxes?** What kind of community will result when young families have to live outside of Salem to buy their own home?

* **Even worse, working families pay a heavier burden!** Houses for low and middle income families are hit with the same increase that expensive luxury homes will be forced to pay.

* There are **no exemptions** from this outrageous increase! Affordable housing, churches, day care, and senior facilities are all charged the same high tax as mansions!

* "COMMUNITY" has always meant something to the people of Salem. We are all a part of planning for our city and that means **sharing the responsibility for making sure our children have good schools, parks and a safe place to live.** Measure 24-92 does away with responsible planning and citizen choices.

* Finally, Measure 24-92 would backfire on Salem. New homes and businesses will move outside city limits to avoid the new tax-causing **more urban sprawl, more traffic, and loss of open space.** And when the city loses these people, it loses the revenue too.

Read all of Measure 24-92 for yourself. It's one **secret charter amendment** Salem doesn't need. And remember, 24-92 alters the city charter so mistakes can't be easily corrected. If it passes, we're all stuck with this extreme law.

That's why Citizens Against Unfair Taxes-a coalition of your neighbors-says VOTE "NO" on the housing tax increase.

Please join us in voting "NO" on Measure 24-92.

It goes too far.

It doesn't make sense.

*(This information provided by Jeanne L. Arana,
Citizens Against Unfair Taxes)*

SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT CHARGES IN OREGON

Some have claimed that Salem's Systems Development Charges (SDCs) are "a lot less than other communities". That's nonsense. Here are some comparisons for a new single family home*:

Portland -	\$3,000
Springfield -	\$3,700
Corvallis -	\$3,800
Medford -	\$4,000
Salem -	\$4,250
Washington Co -	\$4,500
Eugene-	\$4,600

Albany -	\$5,100
Lake Oswego -	\$6,000
Ashland -	\$6,100
Tualatin -	\$6,800
Gresham -	\$7,100
Wilsonville -	\$7,300
Hillsboro -	\$7,900
Salem -	\$20,000

(potential under Measure 24-92)

If Measure 24-92 passes, Salem's SDC could go to unbelievable heights and make homes and apartments unaffordable to all but the well-to-do. Our homes and businesses would carry the highest tax burden in Oregon, making us the most expensive, least competitiveness in the state. That's foolish and irresponsible.

VOTE NO ON MEASURE 24-92.

*All figures approximate. Source of existing charges: City of Eugene study, December 1996

*(This information provided by Eric Meurer,
Marion-Polk Building Industry Association)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Marion County nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument. Marion County does not correct errors in spelling or grammar.

MEASURE NO. 24-93: City of Woodburn

Referred to The People by The City Council

Referral Of Ordinance Imposing motor Vehicle Fuel Tax

QUESTION: Shall the City of Woodburn adopt an ordinance imposing a motor vehicle fuel tax?

SUMMARY: The ordinance imposes a tax of two cents per gallon, in addition to the existing one cent tax, on motor vehicle fuel sold, used or distributed within the City of Woodburn.

Revenues collected by this tax shall be used only for resurfacing and repair of city streets.

The City Council intends to repeal this ordinance when revenue received by the city from any additional future statewide or regional gas tax is determined to be equal to or greater than the revenue generated by this tax.

Explanatory Statement:

This ballot measure will impose a two cent per gallon tax on motor vehicle fuels sold within the city limits of Woodburn. It is in addition to the existing one cent fuel tax approved by city voters in September 1989.

Proceeds from this fuel tax, estimated to be approximately \$220,000 per year, will be dedicated by ordinance to the resurfacing and repavement of existing city streets. The working title of the ordinance is, in fact, the "Woodburn Pavement Preservation Ordinance".

Over 48% of Woodburn's street mileage has not been resurfaced in more that 20 years and some 12% has not been resurfaced in over 35 years. Allocation of funds will be prioritized based on need and age of streets citywide. Examples of streets in need of repair include, but are not limited to, portions of Evergreen, Lincoln, Umpqua and South Settlemier, as well as James, Johnson, Myrtle, Columbia and Linda Streets.

Technical experts note that the rate of pavement deterioration accelerates drastically after it reaches a certain age, depending on volume of use and other factors. The cost of reconstructing a deteriorated street can be up to five timeshigher than normal pavement protection done in a timely manner.

Proceeds from this tax will not be used for construction of new streets or related improvements. New construction, major upgrades or capacity improvements are funded from different sources, including the city's Traffic Impact Fee imposed on developers, which cannot be used for routine maintenance. The proposed fuel tax will not be used to improve streets that should properly be funded by Local Improvement Districts (LIDs). Developers are required to construct new residential streets to city standards prior to dedicating them for public use. Fundamentally, growth is expected to pay its own way.

The city council has determined that a "user charge" funding source of this nature is a preferable alternative to a property tax or bond for street purposes, because it bears a clearer correlation to travel and driving habits. This tax will be paid by those who use the streets, including those who are merely visiting but also contribute to the wear and tear of the streets. It is estimated that some75% of fuel sold in Woodburn is purchased by non-residents.

The need for this additional funding has been discussed for over four years in connection with the city's transportation planning process. In cooperation with local fuel dealers and the dealers' statewide association, the city council delayed a similar measure, originally scheduled for the May 1997 election. This was to allow for legislative implementation of a statewide transportation funding package that would have been of equivalent benefit to Woodburn. No such package resulted, and Woodburn's street repair needs continue to grow.

The ordinance reflects the governing body's intent to repeal this fuel tax if and when a regional or statewide transportation funding package is enacted which is determined to provide the City of Woodburn revenues equal to or greater than would be generated by this tax.

Submitted by:

Chris Childs, City Administrator
City of Woodburn

Arguments in Favor:

We are encouraging you to Vote YES on Woodburn's proposed additional two cent Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax.

This two-cent fuel tax will yield about \$200,000 a year which will be used to repair Woodburn's streets. The City has already identified a number of streets which will be repaired first. Drive around Woodburn and you'll see a lot of streets that are in desperate need of repair. The pavement has worn away and the streets are turning to gravel.

In the past few years there has been an explosion of growth in Woodburn: more houses, apartments, businesses, and more cars and trucks using our city streets. More traffic means streets wear out faster. This additional traffic is hard on our streets. Some of our streets haven't been repaired since 1962.

We understand that a lot of people who live in Woodburn live on limited incomes and don't have money to throw away. We don't like taxes either, but this tax is needed and we believe this is a fair tax, The only people who will pay are drivers, who pull up to the gas pumps whether they live here or not, people who use our streets should share the burden keeping our streets repaired. Delaying repairs will add to the cost. We need to fix our streets before they deteriorate more.

If you drive 5000 miles a year and get 20 miles to the gallon that equates to about 250 gallons of gas a year. This means, that if you buy all of your gas in Woodburn you will only pay an extra \$5 a year for gas. That works out to 42 cents a month. 42 cents won't even buy a cup of coffee. What better way to repair our streets without putting another burden on homeowners. This will also get revenue from trucks that tear up our streets.

We encourage you to join us in Voting Yes to save Woodburn's streets on November 4.

*(This information provided by Helen L Frazier,
Save Woodburn's Streets Committee)*

Arguments Against:

TOP TEN REASON THE WOODBURN CITY GOVERNMENT NEEDS TO INCREASE OUR GAS TAXES

- 10) The Price of Gas in Woodburn just isn't high enough to entice I-5 commuters to stop.
- 9) The Citizens of Woodburn can afford to give the government another \$200,000 in taxes.
- 8) According to the Woodburn City Council, small businesses won't be hurt by an increase in taxes.
- 7) Why would anyone stop in Hubbard to buy gas when they can pay at least 3 cents more per gallon in Woodburn?
- 6) The State Legislature didn't raise your taxes, so somebody has to!
- 5) The City of Woodburn wants to win the race to \$2 per gallon!

- 4) Ballot Measure 5 decreased our taxes so much we can afford to pay a few more bucks at the pump.
- 3) 43 cents per gallon in Federal, State, and Local gas taxes just isn't enough.
- 2) Nobody who lives in Woodburn really buys their gas here.
- 1) Our vote in favor of Ballot Measure 47's tax reduction was a mistake! We really want our taxes raised!

IF THIS DOESN'T CONVINC YOU THE CITY

NEEDS OUR MONEY

NOTHING WILL!

VOTE NO ON MEASURE 24-93 THIS NOVEMBER 4.

(This information provided by Kevin Baker)

The voters of Woodburn sent a clear message to the government when we overwhelmingly passed Ballot Measure 47 to lower our taxes. But the City of Woodburn just isn't listening.

Because Measure 47 means the City is getting less of our hard-earned money, the City has decided to try to increase our taxes another way ... this time at the gas pump.

Not satisfied with the \$100,000 it takes from us each year with a special 1 cent per gallon Woodburn gas tax, the City now wants you to **triple** that tax by adding another 2 cents per gallon! *If this measure passes, we will be paying 45 ¢ per gallon in federal, state and local taxes for gas!*

The city claims it needs the money to fix local roads. But that's what the original penny tax was for. What has the City been doing with the extra \$100,000 per year that we give it?

The truth is that this new gas tax is just a scheme to get around Ballot Measure 47. ***By raising your taxes by at least \$200,000***, the City is just trying to recover the taxes it lost due to Measure 47.

Don't be fooled. The government just wants more of our hard-earned money. That's why, unlike other Willamette Valley communities, the City of Woodburn taxes every from local businesses and telephone service, to utilities and hotels.

The City of Woodburn has never seen a tax it didn't like. It's time we tell the Woodburn City Government that our taxes are high enough ... especially at the pump.

Vote NO on Measure 24-93 this November 4

(This information provided by Thomas W. Mann)

THEY CAN'T BE SERIOUS!

ANOTHER 2 ¢ TAX PER GALLON ON GAS IN WOODBURN!

THEY WANT US TO GIVE THE GOVERNMENT ANOTHER \$200,000 A YEAR?

DIDN'T WE JUST TELL THEM WITH OUR VOTE ON BALLOT MEASURE 47 THAT WE WANT LOWER TAXES?

Talk about missing the boat! The City of Woodburn is trying to convince us that they need more money to fix roads. But before you hand over your wallet, you should ask a few important questions:

- 1) What is the City doing with the \$100,000 it is collecting each year from the current 1cent Woodburn gas tax?
- 2) Who is going to bear the brunt of this tax increase, you or people traveling past Woodburn on I-5?
- 3) How can the City Council say this increase won't hurt anybody when everyone knows that taxes hurt everyone? There's no such thing as a free lunch; those taxes will be passed on to the consumer.
- 4) Have you ever seen the City repave a perfectly good road, yet ignore a terrible road? Is that how our money should be spent?
- 5) Are you willing to pay 3 cents in local gas taxes, 18 cents in federal gas taxes, 24 cents in state gas taxes, and who knows how much in future gas tax increases?
- 6) Has the City ever seen a tax it *didn't* like? Did you know the City already taxes hotels, your phone bill, your electricity bill, your cable bill, your local business, and your gas?

How much money is enough? Clearly, the City of Woodburn thinks there will never be enough money. But, they just don't get it.

Tell the City enough is enough. **Vote NO** on Measure 24-93 this November 4.

(This information provided by Marc Nelson)

Dear Friends:

The City of Woodburn is proposing an increase of our local gas taxes by \$200,000! ***I am against this increase*** and would like to tell you why.

As you know, in the past I have opposed huge boondoggle transportation projects, like the recent North-South light rail, and the Legislature's bloated special-interest transportation package. Neither of these projects proved they would serve the public good, and were more about raising taxes for government to increase spending than actually improving our transportation system.

The proposed Woodburn gas tax increase falls into this same category: it only will provide more money for government, and will not improve our situation in Woodburn.

The most significant transportation issue we face in Woodburn is the I-5 interchange, and the congestion it creates. This is the state's responsibility, and no City tax dollars will go to pay for that project.

Another issue addressed by City officials is the fact that Woodburn has many unpaved roads. However, this gas tax increase will not be spent on new paving projects, just repairing and maintaining current roads.

So the question is how bad are our roads. Obviously, there are roads that need some repair work. Every community has them. But, we already pay an extra penny at the pump in Woodburn that raises about \$100,000 a year to help pay for those repairs. This tax is on top of the money we give the city in local business taxes, utility taxes, phone taxes, hotel taxes, and other local taxes the City has created to raise money for the government. If the roads are in bad shape, what is the City doing with all our money?

Instead of trying to tax its way out of its responsibility, the City should use existing revenues to repair our roads. I urge a NO vote on Measure 24-93.

Patti Milne,
State Representative

*(This information provided by Patti Milne,
State Representative)*

MEASURE NO. 24-94: Marion County

Submitted to the Voters by the Board of Commissioners

Marion County Motor Vehicle Diesel Fuel License Tax Ordinance

QUESTION: Shall Marion County enact a tax of up to 3 cents per gallon for road repair, maintenance and safety improvements?

SUMMARY: This measure would enact a tax of up to three cents per gallon on diesel fuel sold in the county. The tax would be paid mainly by wholesalers, who would be licensed. Refunds would be given for fuel used in some farm and forestry work. Proceeds could only be used for repair, maintenance and safety improvements of roads and would be shared with cities. The tax could not exceed three cents per gallon without voter approval. The tax would be reduced within a local jurisdiction that imposed its own tax. The tax would be reduced by any increase in the state fuel tax earmarked for counties and cities. Revenue would be distributed as follows: 40% to the county; 40% to the cities (divided according to population); 10% for projects in the SKATS boundary area of Salem-Keizer; and 10% for projects in areas immediately surrounding the other cities in Marion County.

Explanatory Statement:

Approval of this measure would authorize a diesel fuel tax of up to three cents per gallon to raise money for maintenance, repair and safety improvements on county roads and city streets.

BACKGROUND

Current road maintenance revenues are not sufficient to keep pace with the county's growing population and increased usage of its road system. A diesel fuel tax would be dedicated exclusively to road maintenance, preservation and safety improvements. Many roads in Marion County are rated in fair or

poor condition. Property taxes do not go to road maintenance, preservation or safety improvements.

TAX IMPOSED

The tax is generally collected from wholesale dealers bringing diesel fuel into the county for sale, distribution or use within the county. Each wholesale dealer is required to have a county license and pay a monthly tax of up to three cents for each gallon of diesel fuel brought into the county. Since the tax may be passed along by wholesale dealers to the retail level, the tax in effect will be paid primarily by the public in its purchase of diesel fuel.

ADMINISTRATION

The tax will be collected and administered by the county or its designee. Much of the ordinance deals with the technical aspects of administration. Dealers are subject to penalties, including license revocation, for failure to comply with ordinance requirements.

EXEMPTIONS/REFUNDS

The ordinance exempts from the tax: diesel fuel used for vehicles other than motor vehicles on public roads, such as in boats, airplanes or stationary power equipment; fuel used by vehicles on private property, including farms and on logging roads not maintained by public bodies; sales to the United States Armed Forces; fuel exported from the county.

USE OF REVENUES - DISTRIBUTION TO CITIES

The ordinance provides that the net revenue "shall be used only for the construction, reconstruction, improvement, repair, maintenance, operation and use of public highways, roads and streets and roadside rest areas within the incorporated and unincorporated areas of the county as may be allowed by Article IX, Section 3a of the Oregon Constitution." By law, none of the diesel fuel tax proceeds can be used for any other purpose. Under the ordinance, the proceeds will be distributed to cities and the county: 40% to the county and 40% to the cities. 20% will be earmarked for areas immediately surrounding the cities. The county, and most cities, have developed road maintenance, preservation and safety improvement programs. If this measure is passed, Marion County will use the tax revenues to further its road maintenance program.

AMENDMENTS

Major features of the ordinance, such as the maximum amount of the tax, exemptions and the use of the money raised cannot be changed except by a future vote of the people.

EFFECTIVE DATE

The ordinance would take effect July 1, 1998. The tax will first be imposed on a date on or after the effective date, to be determined by board resolution.

Submitted by:
Randall Franke, Chair
Marion County Board of Commissioners

Arguments in Favor:

Please ask yourself....

1. Do you drive on any City or County roads to go work or to shop?
2. Does your mail carrier, package or pizza delivery driver use City or County roads to deliver your mail, packages or spicy hot pizza?
3. Do visitors from out-of-area travel over City or County roads to visit the Capitol, see the sights, eat at restaurants, shop, or just meet with friends, go to the River or get to a park?
4. Do you ever drive on City or County roads to eat at restaurants, visit friends, go on vacation, take your children to school, get to a sports event or to a concert?
5. Do rock and gravel truck drivers, builders, realtors, legislators, retirees, emergency service providers or doctors ever use roads or benefit from a good County or City road system?
6. Do farmers, exporters, or business owners use County or City roads to get products, goods or employees to and from their place of business?
7. Do transit and school bus companies use County and City roads?
8. Did you vote YES for diesel, gasoline, vehicle registration, rock and gravel extraction, motel and related fees or taxes to help pay for road repairs or improvements and related needs?
9. Did you vote YES for the whole package and all five parts: 24-94 diesel, 24-95 gasoline, 24-96 \$10 registration, 24-97 motel and campground stays, and 24-98 natural resource extraction?

Thank you for voting.
D. Miles

(This information provided by D. Miles)

Arguments Against:

Dear Marion County Voters

I urge a NO VOTE on the Marion County tax increases. Marion County voters want government growth limited but our Commissioners have ignored Ballot Measures #47 and #50.

Marion County has not responded to its voters demands to streamline programs and services for more efficient and cost-effective government.

I live in Salem and chaired the County Budget Committee for a number of years. We worked to keep faith with County voters. I know it's not easy to make program and service cuts and deny budget increase requests ... but we did.

The City of Salem showed real leadership by crafting its budget reflective of local voter direction for less not more government. Real reductions. Real job cuts. Tough, honest decisions reached with a great deal

of public involvement.

In contrast, Marion County Commissioners have moved to increases taxes on their own. It's a tax grab. I cannot support a patchwork of added taxes on gasoline, aggregate, vehicle registration, diesel fuel and hotel/motel accommodations. We need to get our Marion County house in order first.

Marion County must work for a positive Growth and Tax Management Plan that incorporates rather than excludes the needs of voters in all our cities and supports other taxing district needs in the County.

Public taxation policy should not be set through a series of local patchwork political campaigns that force local taxing districts to fight with each other. Marion County should be a leader in creating a taxation plan that fosters cooperation, compromise and consolidation of government programs.

I will continue to fight for Marion County taxpayers. Commissioner Mary Pearmine has told me she is not going to run for re-election. I intend to campaign for her vacant position.

I won't let you down. Please let me know your thoughts. Write to me % P.O. Box13282, Salem, OR 97309, or send E-Mail to MRyan22328@aol.com

Sincerely,
Mike Ryan

(This information provided by Mike Ryan)

MEASURE NO. 24-95: Marion County

Submitted to the Voters by the Board of Commissioners

Marion County Motor Vehicle Nondiesel Fuel License Tax Ordinance

QUESTION: Shall Marion County enact tax of up to 3 cents per gallon for nondiesel fuel for road repair and improvements?

SUMMARY: This measure would enact a tax of up to three cents per gallon on gasoline and motor vehicle fuel except diesel, sold in the county. The tax would be paid mainly by wholesalers, who would be licensed. Refunds would be given for fuel used in some farm and forestry work. Proceeds could only be used for repair, maintenance and safety improvements of roads and would be shared with cities. The tax could not exceed three cents per gallon without voter approval. The tax would be reduced within a local jurisdiction that imposed its own tax. The tax would be reduced by any increase in the state fuel tax earmarked for counties and cities. Revenue would be distributed as follows: 40% to the county; 40% to the cities (divided according to population); 10% for projects in the SKATS boundary area of Salem-Keizer; and 10% for projects in areas immediately surrounding the other cities in Marion County.

Explanatory Statement:

Approval of this measure would authorize a gas and motor vehicle fuel tax of up to three cents per gallon to raise money for maintenance, repair and safety improvements on county roads and city streets. Diesel fuel would be exempted from the tax.

BACKGROUND

Current road maintenance revenues are not sufficient to keep pace with the county's growing population and increased usage of its road system. A gas tax would be dedicated exclusively to road maintenance, preservation and safety improvements. Many roads in Marion County are rated in fair or poor condition. Property taxes do not go to road maintenance, preservation or safety improvements.

TAX IMPOSED

The tax is generally collected from wholesale dealers bringing gas fuel into the county for sale, distribution or use within the county. Each wholesale dealer is required to have a county license and pay a monthly tax of up to three cents for each gallon of gasoline or fuel brought into the county. Since the tax may be passed along by wholesale dealers to the retail level, the tax in effect will be paid primarily by the public in its purchase of gasoline fuel.

ADMINISTRATION

The tax will be collected and administered by the county or its designee. Much of the ordinance deals with the technical aspects of administration, Dealers are subject to penalties, including license revocation, for failure to comply with ordinance requirements.

EXEMPTION/REFUNDS

The ordinance exempts from the tax: all diesel fuel, and other fuel used for vehicles other than motor vehicles on public roads, such as in boats, airplanes or stationary power equipment; fuel used by vehicles on private property, including farms and on logging roads not maintained by public bodies; sales to the United States Armed Forces; fuel exported from the county.

USE OF REVENUES - DISTRIBUTION TO CITIES

The ordinance provides that the net revenue "shall be used only for the construction, reconstruction, improvement, repair, maintenance, operation and use of public highways, roads and streets and roadside rest areas within the incorporated and unincorporated areas of the county as may be allowed by Article IX, Section 3a of the Oregon Constitution." By law, none of the gas tax proceeds can be used for any other purpose.

Under the ordinance, the proceeds will be distributed to cities and the county: 40% to the county and 40% to the cities. 20% will be earmarked for areas immediately surrounding the cities. The county, and most cities, have developed road maintenance, preservation and safety improvement programs. If this measure is passed, Marion County will use the tax revenues to further its road maintenance program.

AMENDMENTS

Major features of the ordinance, such as the maximum amount of the tax, exemptions and the use of the money raised cannot be changed except by a future vote of the people.

EFFECTIVE DATE

The ordinance would take effect July 1, 1998. The tax will first be imposed on a date on or after the effective date, to be determined by board resolution.

Submitted by:
Randall Franke, Chair
Marion County Board of Commissioners

No arguments in favor of this measure were filed.

Arguments Against:

TWO WRONGS DON'T MAKE A RIGHT, VOTE NO ON THE MARION COUNTY GAS TAX!

Voters are being asked to approve a 3 cent county gas and diesel tax on November 4th.

WHY?

Because the legislature failed to pass any increase in the statewide gas tax, the county now wants to impose a 3 cent tax. What the legislature did was wrong, we need to maintain and improve our transportation systems, especially in the high growth areas of the state. It is also wrong for the county to abandon the traditional way we fund our roads by imposing new county gas and diesel taxes. And as we all know, two wrongs don't make a right.

WHAT SHOULD WE DO ?

We should **VOTE NO** on the county gas tax and urge our state legislators to fund our highway system. We need to tell them that we want a statewide solution that responsibly funds transportation projects, not a patchwork of local county taxes.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF WE APPROVE A COUNTY TAX ?

If we start funding our highways at the county level the state legislature will be wary of passing any new state gas taxes. That means that our overall system of roads and highways will begin to deteriorate and each county and city will face an increasing burden trying to maintain their roads. Once we start down this path the ability to pass a reasonable statewide gas tax increase that will work to the benefit of all Oregonians becomes next to impossible.

Oregon has been funding their road construction and maintenance through the state gas tax since the late twenties, increasing or imposing a new county gas tax is a drastic step away from that time tested formula. We need to tell our political leaders that two wrongs don't make a right: fund roads adequately at the state legislature, and **VOTE NO ON THE COUNTY GAS TAX!**

*(This information provided by Steve O'Toole,
Oregon Petroleum Marketers Association)*

MEASURE NO. 24-96: Marion County

Submitted to the Voters by the Board of Commissioners

Marion County Vehicle Registration Fee For Roads

QUESTION: Shall Marion County establish a vehicle registration fee to repair and maintain safe roads?

SUMMARY: This measure establishes a Marion County motor vehicle registration fee not to exceed \$10 per year. The fee will not be paid for vehicles exempted by state law. Revenue may be used only to make safe, maintain, repair and operate existing roads in Marion County. This revenue will be shared with cities in the county for repair and maintenance of city streets.

The tax imposed by this measure is not subject to the limitations of Sections 11 and 11b of the Oregon Constitution and will be used for non-education governmental purposes.

Explanatory Statement:

Approval of this measure will address the immediate repair and maintenance needs of the road and bridge system in Marion County, and the cities in the county. Road and bridge conditions are deteriorating as a result of extreme weather, increased use, and age. Revenues from the measure will be used to improve the condition and safety of roads and bridges. Maintaining the existing system will reduce future repair and construction costs.

Federal, state and local resources are inadequate to maintain existing roads and bridges. The state legislature has not increased transportation fees since 1991. Safety improvements are needed because of increased stress on bridge structures. Measure revenues will allow bridge safety improvements, including strengthening against earthquakes, and needed road improvements.

This measure sets a county annual motor vehicle registration fee in addition to the current state fee (i.e. an additional \$10.00 per year for an automobile, and \$9.00 per year for a motorcycle). Under state law some vehicles are exempt from the fee including farm vehicles and certain trucks. Marion County will use its portion of this revenue to make safe, repair, maintain, and operate its roads and bridges.

Failure to take care of the existing system of roads and bridges will result in increased need for major rehabilitation. The American Public Works Association estimates that every \$1.00 spent on pavement maintenance saves \$5.00 on major rehabilitation. By maintaining roads and bridges today, more costly future repairs can be reduced.

Submitted by:
Randall Franke, Chair
Marion County Board of Commissioners

No arguments in favor of or opposed to this measure were filed.

MEASURE NO. 24-97: Marion County

Submitted to the Voters by the Board of Commissioners

Marion County Transient Occupancy Tax

QUESTION: Should Marion County levy a 6% occupancy tax on short-term rentals of hotel rooms and any stays in recreational sites?

SUMMARY: Renters of hotels, motels, inns and similar units for less than thirty days and any stays at recreational camp and R.V. sites would pay a six percent tax. Rentals of less than \$5 per day, private homes, medical stays and non-profit facilities used for non-profit purposes would be exempt. Funds would be used for tourism promotion and development and county park infrastructure development. Tax would not apply in cities unless the city asks to be included. Measure includes a collection mechanism. The tax under this ordinance would begin July 1, 1998.

The tax imposed by this measure is not subject to the limitations of Sections 11 and 11b of the Oregon Constitution and will be used for non-education governmental purposes.

Explanatory Statement:

This measure creates a six percent tax on the amount paid for transient lodging and recreational camp and RV sites in unincorporated Marion County. The tax will not be collected inside cities unless a city specifically asks to be included. The tax will fund tourism development and promotion under a regional tourism plan commenced in 1991 for Marion and Polk Counties and the Salem Convention and Visitors Association (SCVA). Presently this plan is implemented by the VISIT Group (Valley Inter-cooperative Strategies to Increase Tourism), a cooperative effort of community groups, businesses, government and individuals whose purpose is promoting the two-county region as a viable visitor destination.

Funding for these activities from the two counties has come from lottery economic development funds. SCVA contributes transient lodging tax funds generated within the city of Salem.

Using these funds, the VISIT Group has developed a travelers information radio station, regional promotional brochures, bed and breakfast directory, heritage sites and tours directory and has promoted economic development projects relating to tourism in the North Santiam Canyon and other communities.

Although not required, in Marion County the proposed six percent transient occupancy tax will presently replace the county's contribution of lottery funds to support VISIT's activities. The tax would raise an estimated \$166,000 annually. A minimum of 80% of the net amount collected will be dedicated to tourism promotion and development; a maximum of 20% will be used for county park infrastructure development.

Overnight renters of hotels, motels, inns and similar facilities will pay the tax for stays of less than 30 days. Recreational campsite and recreational vehicle park occupants will pay the tax for their entire stay.

The management of each facility will be allowed to keep five percent of the tax it collects to cover the cost of remittance to the county. Both privately and publicly owned facilities, including state parks, will collect the tax. Non-profit overnight facilities used for non-profit purposes, private homes, medical facilities and daily rental of less than \$5.00 are exempt.

The county board of commissioners will designate a tax administrator who will be responsible for collecting the tax from lodging and recreational camping facilities. The tax administrator may grant extensions for payment, impose interest and penalties against lodging facilities for delinquent payment, nonpayment and fraud, record liens against the personal property of lodging facilities that fail to remit taxes, bring collection actions, and make refunds. Any person aggrieved by any action of the tax administrator may appeal to the board of commissioners.

This tax will become effective on July 1, 1998.

Submitted by:
Randall Franke, Chair
Marion County Board of Commissioners

No arguments in favor of or opposed to this measure were filed.

MEASURE NO. 24-98: Marion County

Submitted to the Voters by the Board of Commissioners

Referral of Ordinance Imposing Fee on Depletion of Natural Resources

QUESTION: Shall Marion County impose a fee on the depletion of natural resources mined in the county?

SUMMARY: Proposed ordinance imposes a fee of thirty cents per ton on sand, gravel, rock and other similar natural resources mined in Marion County. This ordinance will raise about \$850,000 per year, depending on mining production. Except for administration costs, all revenue raised under this ordinance will be dedicated to land use planning and enforcement, traffic safety enforcement, acquisition, maintenance and improvement of Marion County parks, construction, reconstruction, repair, maintenance and other improvement of public roads in Marion County, community based programs to reduce child abuse.

The tax imposed by this measure is not subject to the limitations of Sections 11 and 11b of the Oregon Constitution and will be used for non-education governmental purposes.

Explanatory Statement:

Marion County has significant deposits of gravel, sand, stone, ore and other aggregate materials used for road and building construction. These resources are being extracted at the rate of approximately three million tons per year and are not a renewable resource. Costs to the county associated with aggregate extraction include:

- Planning for aggregate sites in compliance with Oregon state law.
- Repairing damage to roads from vehicles moving aggregate.
- Issuing permits, inspecting, monitoring and enforcing compliance with conditions placed on extraction sites such as noise restrictions, dust abatement and protection of surface and ground water.
- Planning for the use of sites after mining is completed.

The proposal would establish a tax of 30c per ton of aggregate extracted in unincorporated areas of Marion County. This would produce an estimated \$900,000 per year in revenues. No more than eight percent may be used for administration and collection of the tax. The annual net revenue, approximately \$828,000, is dedicated to the following services.

Roads: Forty percent, approximately \$331,000, of the proposed tax would be used for repairing, widening and strengthening county roads around aggregate extraction sites near Turner, the Willamette River and other specific locations.

Planning: Marion County is required by state law to determine the quality and quantity of aggregate resources, identify where aggregate extraction and other surrounding land uses are in conflict and protect significant aggregate sites from new development and uses that would conflict with extraction. Six sites are currently in various stages of the land use process. Fifteen percent of the revenue, an estimated \$124,000, would help compensate for the loss of state and local revenues that have resulted in a 24-percent cut in staffing in the Planning Division.

Parks: Operations of Marion County's 14 developed and five undeveloped parks are currently funded with revenues from Oregon's recreational vehicle registration fee. This amount is inadequate to properly protect, maintain, improve and develop park facilities or acquire land for future parks and open space. Fifteen percent of the revenue, approximately \$124,000, would be dedicated to county parks.

Traffic Safety Enforcement: The Sheriff's Office reports that it receives a number of calls from citizens concerned about traffic safety issues around the aggregate industry. Approximately \$124,000, or 15 percent of the revenue, would be available each year for law enforcement response to possible speed, weight and highway safety violations.

Child Abuse Reduction: State funding for Marion County Children and Families Commission programs has been reduced approximately \$70,000 annually. Local funding is restricted due to the property tax cuts of Measures 47/50 while Marion County's population continues to grow. Some taxes on the depletion of natural resources have historically been dedicated to public benefit, as taxes on harvested timber are dedicated to supporting public schools. Of revenues from a tax on mining 15 percent, an estimated \$124,000 annually, would be dedicated to community based programs working to reduce child abuse. The tax would become effective July 1, 1998.

Submitted by:
 Randall Franke, Chair
 Marion County Board of Commissioners

No arguments in favor of or opposed to this measure were filed.