Local Property Tax Option for School Districts

House Committee on Revenue February 7, 2018

Legislative Revenue Office

Contents

- Background Information M5 and M50
- Local Option History and Current Use
- Constitutional and Statutory Constraints in detail How Constraints Work
- Lessons for Us, Finance Types
- Not an Assessment on M5 and M50
- Not about School Funding Adequacy/Inadequacy

Measure 50 on top of Measure 5

- In 1997, Ballot Measure 50 amended the constitution to add a new limit to Oregon's local property tax system
- Measure 50 property tax limit is usually lower than the 1990 Measure 5 limit
- The difference is generally referred to as the tax "gap"
- Measure 50 allowed use of this gap with various restrictions
- School districts needed legislative approval to use the gap

Before Discussing Local Option, Quick Look at Property Tax Imposed (Education)

									Average Tax Rate (\$/1000)				
	Real Mar	ket Value (RM)	V)	Net Asses	sed Value (NA	AV)	Propert	y Tax Impose	d	RMV B	ase	NAV B	ase
District Type	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	% CH	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	% CH	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	% CH	FY 15-16 F	Y 16-17 F	Y 15-16 F	Y 16-17
School	506,045,130	559,008,915	10.5	358,817,931	373,337,569	4.0	2,363,237	2,463,908	4.3	4.67	4.41	6.59	6.60
Education Service	506,008,194	558,964,892	10.5	358,784,406	373,300,412	4.0	117,520	122,388	4.1	0.23	0.22	0.33	0.33
Community College	496,491,861	549,241,437	10.6	351,895,768	366,188,649	4.1	233,210	255,869	9.7	0.47	0.47	0.66	0.70
	Permanent Authority		Local Option		Bonds		Total						

District Type	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	% CH	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	% CH	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	% CH	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	% CH
School	1,657,960	1,729,050	4.3	155,413	170,418	9.7	549,864	564,440	2.7	2,363,237	2,463,908	4.3
Education Service	117,520	122,388	4.1	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	117,520	122,388	4.1
Community College	161,644	168,718	4.4	0	0	0.0	71,566	87,151	21.8	233,210	255,869	9.7

<u>Source</u>: Oregon Department of Revenue, Property Tax Statistics

Inception of Local Option Taxes for Schools: HB 2753 (1999)

- Allowed school districts to seek voter approval of a local option property tax for operational expenses (5-year limit)
- Excluded local option tax from local revenue in the school funding equalization formula
- Made taxes excluded equal to the least of
 - (1) Measures 5 and 50 tax gap,
 - (2) 10% of formula revenue, or
 - (3) \$500 per weighted student (or per extended ADMw)
- Allowed districts to collect less than the full tax approved by voters
- Excess collections over-the-cap flow into the pool of formula revenue

Excluded local option revenue from formula

- SB 550 (2003) increased the limits on the amount of local option revenue that are excluded from the definition of local revenues in the formula revenue to the lesser of (1) 15% of the district's formula revenue or (2) \$750 per extended ADMw
- HB 2641 (2007) increased limits (1) to \$1,000 per weighted student and (2) to 20% of formula revenue; still the lesser of the two
- **HB 2641 (2007)** also escalated the \$1,000 limit by 3% per year beginning in 2008-09. In 2016-17 the limit was \$1,304.77, and in 2017-18 the limit is \$1,343.92

First Local School Option Tax (Corvallis 509J, 1999)

\$3 million/year levy for 5 years – the first year, ended up imposing \$1.3 million, losing \$1.7 million due to compression; in all five years, imposed \$7 million, compression loss was \$8 million

Since 1999, 75 local school option tax measures passed and 84 failed

SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 509J (CORVALLIS)

Measure No. 02-83

BALLOT TITLE

LOCAL-OPTION SERIAL LEVY

QUESTION: Shall the District be authorized to collect a local option tax levy in an aggregate total amount of \$15,000,000?

This measure may cause property taxes to increase more than three percent.

SUMMARY: This measure may be passed only at an election with at least 50 percent voter turnout. This measure authorizes the District to levy a property tax in the amount of \$3,000,000 each year commencing the fiscal year 2000-2001 for five consecutive years for a total tax levy of \$15,000,000. The taxes would be used to finance district operations, including to continue essential maintenance of school buildings, to reduce overcrowding, to buy materials and textbooks, and to partially restore counseling, music, art and physical education services, and to fund other district operations. If this measure is not approved, the district will face additional significant reductions in staff and services.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

Local Impacts of the Levy

The money from this tax levy will be used to help fill holes created by several million dollars in cuts at the service level in the district over the past eight years. This levy will allow the district to operate at the same level of services provided in 1998-99.

Maintenance: The average age of our schools is 46 years, and buildings district-wide require more and more repairs, including leaky roots, faulty plumbing and heating and ventilation problems. Many ongoing repairs are being postponed. Providing safe and comfortable facilities are essential for student learning. In addition, in 2000-2001 the district faces a \$1.25 million deficit when our current maintenance bond expires. Unless this levy is approved, the maintenance budget must one again be paid from the districts' general fund, causing substantial cuts in other programs. Even with the passage of this levy, only day-to-day maintenance needs will be addressed.

Overcrowding: Currently, some classes in middle and high schools in the district range from 32 to 42 students. Passage of this ballot measure would avoid further increases and reduce the most severe overcrowding.

Materials and Supplies: Many classrooms in our district do not have enough textbooks for all students. Materials and supplies have been steadily reduced in all areas in an effort to maintain educational programs. All students deserve adequate, up-to-date materials if we expect them to learn. Staff also need appropriate materials and supplies to do their jobs.

What will happen if the levy fails?

With current funding leves from the legislature, the district faces more substantial cuts that will reduce staff, increase class size and eliminate programs. Since the passage of Ballot Measure 5, the district lost over 100 classroom teachers and has seen significant reductions in counseling, music, art and physical/education, elective and extra-curricular activities, as well as a loss in funding for needed building maintenance and repairs. Without the tax levy, 509J will continue to see the erosion of essential services and resources that

help provide a quality education in a safe setting for the children of the Corvallis community.

How will my property taxes change if I vote yes?

Since the passage of Ballot Measure 50, the amount each property owner will pay for tax levies varies, depending on the year their property was assessed and the amount to the assessment. The average net levy cost is estimated to be \$0.78 per \$1,000 of assessed value in the first year.

Is this a long term solution?

Passage of this ballot measure is only a temporary and partial answer to school funding needs. A full answer will have to come from the state legislature through a policy change in the distribution of state funds.

Submitted by Corvallis School District 509J Kathy Rodeman, Fiscal Manager

NO ARGUMENTS FOR OR AGAINST THIS MEASURE WERE FILED.

11

2016-17 School District Local Option Taxes Imposed: 20 School Districts

<u>Source</u>: Oregon Department of Revenue, Property Tax Statistics

School Dustrict	Loc Option Imposed
Ashland SD #5	\$3,328,036
Beaverton 48J School	\$29,848,550
Condon 25J School	\$117,943
Corvallis 509J School	\$4,699,502
Crow-Applegate-Lorane 66 School	\$142,379
Eugene 4J School	\$12,321,046
Falls City 57 School	\$79,730
Hood River 1 School	\$2,207,659
Lake Oswego 7J School	\$9,950,576
Morrow 1 School	\$418,238
Pendleton 16 School	\$278,987
Philomath 17J School	\$450,854
Portland Public Schools	\$86,878,829
Riverdale 51J School	\$815,158
Seaside 10 School	\$1,207,973
Sisters 6J School	\$1,156,065
Siuslaw 97J School	\$1,171,662
Sweet Home 55 School	\$187,173
Tigard/Tualatin 23J School	\$8,133,012
West Linn 3J School	\$7,024,839
State Total	\$170,418,211

History of Imposed School Local Option Taxes





RMV vs. NAV History (State Total) – School Districts



Why Compression Loss?

Local Option Compression				
	Property A	Property B	After compression	Property C
Real Market Value (RMV)	<mark>\$100,000</mark>	<mark>\$100,000</mark>	\$100,000	<mark>\$130,000</mark>
Assessed Value	<mark>\$70,000</mark>	<mark>\$90,000</mark>	\$90,000	<mark>\$90,000</mark>
M50 permanent rate on education	\$5.00 per \$1000	\$5.00 per \$1000	\$5.00 per \$1000	per \$5.00\$1000
Voter Approved School Local Option Rate	\$1.00 per \$1000	\$1.00 per \$1000	\$1.00 per \$1000	per \$1.00\$1000
M5 limit on Education (\$5 per \$1,000 RMV)	=100,000 \$500 *5/1000		\$500	\$650
Permanent rate tax	=70,000* \$350 5/1000		\$450	\$450
Local Option tax	=70,000* \$70 1/1000		compression loss \$50 = 90-50=40	\$90
Total Tax	\$420	\$540	\$500	\$540

Permanent Rate and Local Option Compression

	Local Option Approved		If RMV declines a year after			after	
Real Market Value (RMV)	\$130,000		\$1	20,000			
Assessed Value	\$95,000		\$	97,850			
M50 permanent rate on education	\$5.50	per \$1000		\$5.50	per \$1000		
Voter Approved School Local Option Rate	\$1.00	per \$1000		\$1.00	per \$1000		
M5 limit on Education (\$5 per \$1,000 RMV)	\$650	(=130*5)		\$600	(=120*5)		
Permanent rate tax	\$523	(=95*5.5)		\$538	compression	n loss = 0	
Local Option tax	\$95	(=95*1)		\$62 Compression loss = 98-62		2 = 36	
Total Tax	\$618			\$600			

Permanent Rate and Local Option Compression

	If RMV declines further after two years		If RMV recovers in three years	If RMV rises further in four years
			,	
Real Market Value (RMV)	\$105,000		\$130,000	\$140,000
Assessed Value	\$100,786		\$103,809	\$106,923
M50 permanent rate on education	\$5.50 per \$1000		\$5.50per \$1000	\$5.50 per \$1000
Voter Approved School Local Option Rate	\$1.00 per \$1000		\$1.00 per \$1000	\$1.00 per \$1000
M5 limit on Education (\$5 per \$1,000 RMV)	\$525		\$650	\$700
Permanent rate tax	\$525 Compression	n loss = 554-525 = 29	\$571 compression loss = 0	\$588 compression loss = 0
Local Option tax	\$0 Compression	n loss = 101	\$79 Compression loss = 104-7	79 = 25 \$107 Compression loss = 0
Total Tax	\$525		\$650	\$695

Imposed Property Tax - Schools

School: State Total (\$ millions)

FY	Permanent	% ch	Local	% ch	Compression	% ch	
FT	Rate	70 CH	Option	70 CH	loss		
2011-12	1,438.9	1.9%	94.8	11.2%	74.5	70.2%	
2012-13	1,457.7	1.3%	86.9	-8.3%	97.3	30.6%	
2013-14	1,504.1	3.2%	113.2	30.3%	110.5	13.6%	
2014-15	1,581.1	5.1%	134.1	18.5%	88.1	-20.3%	
2015-16	1,658.0	4.9%	155.4	15.9%	82.9	-5.9%	
1016-17	1,729.1	4.3%	170.4	9.7%	73.2	-11.6%	
2017-18*	1,809.8	4.7%	185.8	9.0%			

*early look

Lessons from Tables and Examples

- Real estate market often lags behind the economy
- Compression applies to local option first and then permanent rate based levy
- In general, as RMV increases, NAV also increases often with lags
- As RMV increases, compression loss declines, also often with lags
- In general, improvement in compression loss (less compression loss) will be felt more sharply in local option levy than permanent rate based levy (unless a total wipeout of local option revenue led to permanent rate based compression, or there was a permanent rate based compression without local option)

About PPS Local Option Tax in 2014



Portland Public Schools levy renewal for schools and educational programs.

Question: Shall district support schools; redirect funds from urban renewal; levy \$1.99 per \$1,000 assessed value for five years beginning 2015?

This measure renews current local option taxes.

Summary: PPS' current local option levy was approved by voters in 2011 to provide funding for schools over 5 years. In 2013, the Oregon Legislature ended the diversion of some local option levy revenues to certain urban renewal districts for levies passed after January 2013. Renewal of local option levy will direct approximately \$4 million more to the approved purpose of supporting education, without increasing taxes. The renewed levy will provide \$64.3 million, equivalent to 640 teaching positions.

This renewed local option levy would:

- Continue to fund teaching positions;
- Help to maintain or reduce class size;
- Support programs for a comprehensive education.

Levy cost remains \$1.99 per \$1,000 assessed property value, the same as the 2011 levy.

Funds will be placed in a sub-account, and independent citizen oversight will review expenditures to verify that funds are used as approved by voters. This measure would replace the 2011 levy.

The levy will produce an estimated \$64.3 million in 2015-2016; \$66.2 million in 2016-2017; \$68.2 million in 2017-2018; \$70.2 million in 2018-2019; and \$72.3 million in 2019-2020.

M-35

HB 2632 (2013) applies to local options passed after January 1, 2013



Property Tax Data on Multnomah County

FY	RMV	% ch	NAV	% ch	Compression loss	% ch
2011-12	95,390	-6.1%	57,541	2.8%	80.5	70.6%
2012-13	93,767	-1.7%	58,678	2.0%	100.0	24.3%
2013-14	98,111	4.6%	60,622	3.3%	109.5	9.4%
2014-15	108,209	10.3%	63,519	4.8%	90.6	-17.2%
2015-16	119,611	10.5%	66,142	4.1%	75.5	-16.7%
1016-17	139,376	16.5%	68,832	4.1%	65.4	-13.4%
2017-18*						