

Oregon Property Tax Statistics

Fiscal Year 2023-24

150-303-405 (Rev. 07-24)



Cover photo: Tulip field in Woodburn, Oregon. Credit kanonsky.

Disclaimer: This report is not for the purpose of providing legal advice.

Source credit is requested and appreciated.

Suggested citation:

Oregon Department of Revenue Research Section. *Oregon Property Tax Statistics: Fiscal Year 2023-24*. Salem, OR: Oregon Department of Revenue, 2024.

For information on how to receive additional copies, contact:

Oregon Department of Revenue Research Section

955 Center St NE Salem, OR 97301-2555 503-945-8383 dor.research@dor.oregon.gov

Statistical publications are also available on our web site: www.oregon.gov/dor/stats

Taxpayer Assistance Information Do you have questions or need help?

www.oregon.gov/dor 503-378-4988 or 800-356-4222 questions.dor@dor.oregon.gov

Contact us for ADA accommodations or assistance in other languages.

¿Tiene alguna pregunta o necesita ayuda?

www.oregon.gov/dor 503-378-4988 or 800-356-4222 preguntas.dor@dor.oregon.gov

Comuníquese con nosotros para solicitar adaptaciones de la ADA (Ley sobre Estadounidenses con Discapacidades) o asistencia en otros idiomas.

Oregon Property Tax Statistics

Fiscal Year 2023-24

Prepared by

Research Section
Principal Analysts: David Brimmer and Yasu Tanaka

Oregon Department of Revenue Salem OR 97301-2555

150-303-405 (Rev. 07-24)

| I. | Introduction | 1 |
|------|---|----|
| II. | Highlights | 3 |
| III. | Basic Property Tax Concepts in Historical Context | 9 |
| | Pre-Measure 5 | 9 |
| | Measure 5 | 9 |
| | Measure 50 | 10 |
| IV. | How the Property Tax System Works | 17 |
| | 1. Assessment | 17 |
| | General Procedure | 17 |
| | Exemptions and Special Assessments | 18 |
| | Assessment Appeals | 19 |
| | 2. Tax Authority and Tax Due Calculation | 19 |
| | Tax Authority and Types of Taxes | 19 |
| | Determination of Tax and Compression | 20 |
| | 3. Urban Renewal | 21 |
| | 4. Tax Collection | 22 |
| | 5. Tax Relief | 22 |
| | 6. How Property Taxes are Determined for an Individual Property | 23 |
| v. | Detailed Tables | 25 |
| | Data Disclaimer | 25 |

| | | Page |
|---------|---|------|
| Assessi | nent | 27 |
| 1.1 | Total Assessed Value by Property Class | 28 |
| 1.2 | Total Measure 5 Value and Assessed Value by County and Property Type | 29 |
| 1.3 | Total Assessed Value of Centrally Assessed Property by County | 30 |
| 1.4 | Total and Net Assessed Value of Property by County | 31 |
| 1.5 | Measure 5 Value and Net Assessed Value of Property, Property Tax Imposed, and Average Tax Rates by Type of Taxing District | 32 |
| 1.6 | Measure 5 Value and Net Assessed Value of Property, Property Tax Imposed and Average Tax Rates by County | 33 |
| 1.7 | Assessed and Real Market Value of Fully and Partially Exempt Property by County | 34 |
| 1.8 | Assessed and Real Market Value of Specially Assessed Farmland and Forestland | 35 |
| 1.9 | Property Value Appeals Board (PVAB), formerly called the Board of Proper Tax Appeals (BOPTA) by County | • |
| Tax Aı | ıthority and Tax Due Calculation | 37 |
| 2.1 | Tax Imposed by Category of Tax and County | 38 |
| 2.2 | Tax Imposed by Category of Tax and Type of District | 39 |
| 2.3 | Tax Extended, Tax Imposed, and Compression Loss by County | 40 |
| 2.4 | Tax Extended, Tax Imposed, and Compression Loss by Type of Taxing District | 41 |
| 2.5 | Tax Imposed and Compression Loss by County | 42 |
| 2.6 | Tax Imposed and Compression Loss by Type of Taxing District | 43 |
| Urban | Renewal | 45 |
| 3.1 | Urban Renewal Excess Value Used and Revenue by Urban Renewal Plan Area | 46 |
| 3.2 | Urban Renewal Division of Tax Revenue by Agency, County, Type of Levy, and District Type | |
| Tax Co | ollection | 61 |
| 4 | Property Tax Certified, Collected, and Uncollected for FY 2022-23, by County | 63 |
| ppendi | x: Glossary | 63 |
| | • | |

| II. | Highlights | | |
|------|-------------|--|----|
| | Exhibit 1a | Oregon Property Values | 3 |
| | Exhibit 1b | Oregon Property Taxes Imposed | 3 |
| | Exhibit 2 | Property Taxes Imposed by Type of District | 4 |
| | Exhibit 2b | Property Taxes Imposed by Type of Tax | 4 |
| | Exhibit 3 | Type of Property Taxes Imposed by Type of District | 5 |
| | Exhibit 4 | Average Growth in Taxes by Levy Type, FY 1997-98 to 2023-24 | 6 |
| | Exhibit 5 | Percent of Total Taxes Imposed by Property Class | 7 |
| | Exhibit 6 | Effective Tax Rates by County | 8 |
| III. | Basic Prope | rty Tax Concepts in Historical Content | |
| | Exhibit 7 | Assessed and Real Market Value of Property in Oregon | 10 |
| | Exhibit 8 | Average Growth in City/Rural Property Values, FY 1997-98 to FY 2023-24 | 11 |
| | Exhibit 9 | Average Growth in Taxes by Decade | 12 |
| | Exhibit 10 | Property Taxes Imposed, FY 1968-69 to 2023-24 | 12 |
| | Exhibit 11 | Annual Growth in Property Taxes Imposed, FY 1968-69 to 2023-24 | 13 |
| | Exhibit 12 | Average Tax Rate Per \$1,000 of RMV and AV, FY 1980-81 to 2023-24 | 13 |
| | Exhibit 13 | Property Taxes as Share of Oregon Personal Income, FY 1968-69 to 2023-24 | 14 |
| | Exhibit 14 | Percentage of Annual Property Tax Collected by EOY, FY 200-01 to 2022-23 | 15 |
| IV. | How the Pro | operty Tax System Works | |
| | Exhibit 15 | Simplified Property Tax Calculation for a Residential Property | 24 |
| | | | |

Oregon's property tax is one of the most important sources of revenue for the public sector in Oregon, raising \$9.145 billion for local governments in Fiscal Year (FY) 2023–24. Only state personal income tax collections exceed property tax collections as a single source of state and local tax revenue.

This publication describes Oregon's property tax system through the presentation of statistical information. It presents assessed values, market values, and taxes imposed by county and type of taxing district. The publication contains a brief overview of Oregon's property tax system since 1990. The report contains the following sections:

- *Highlights:* This section illustrates distinguishing features of FY 2023–24 and recent trends in Oregon's property tax system.
- Basic Property Tax Concepts in Historical Context: This section briefly describes the property tax system in Oregon, including a history of significant changes.
- How the Property Tax System Works: This section explains the steps of the property tax process in Oregon.
- Detailed Tables: These tables contain information on property values and taxes imposed, by both county and type of district. Taxes collected and uncollected by county are also included.
- Appendix: This final section contains a glossary of the terms used in the publication.

The information in this publication is presented primarily by county or district type. Property values reported within this publication are based on a January 1 assessment date prior to the fiscal year reported. For example, values reported for FY 2023–24 refer to value that existed as of January 1, 2023. Tax imposed for FY 2023–24 refers to the tax bills sent out in October 2023. Additional information about property taxes is available in three other Department of Revenue publications:

- Oregon Property Tax Statistics Supplement, Fiscal Year 2023-24 provides extensive detail on property taxes and assessed values at the taxing district level, as well as property class information and city-level data on property tax rates.
- A Brief History of Oregon Property Taxation discusses the history of property taxation, with a focus on major changes that happened during the 1990s.
- The *State of Oregon 2023–2025 Tax Expenditure Report* contains detailed information about property tax exemptions.

All of these reports are available on the Oregon Department of Revenue website: www.oregon.gov/dor/stats.

¹ See Section IV (4) "Tax Collection" for more information on the annual calendar of dates used in the assessment process.

The total real market value of taxable property in Oregon in FY 2023–24 was almost \$1.023 trillion,² an increase of 6.1 percent from the previous year. Exhibit 1a provides an overview of total assessed value (AV) and the real market value (RMV)³ of taxable property in Oregon. Exhibit 1b provides an overview of property taxes imposed for fiscal years 2022–23 and 2023–24. Total assessed value, the property value subject to tax, grew by 4.8 percent in FY 2023–24 to a total of \$527 billion.⁴ Property taxes imposed in Oregon totaled \$9.145 billion in FY 2023–24, a growth of 5.1 percent from FY 2022-23. Since 1997-98, the first fiscal year following implementation of Measure 50, annual growth in property taxes imposed has averaged 5.2 percent per year.

| Exhibit 1a—Oregon Property Values | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|------------|----------------|--|--|--|--|
| Dollars in millions | | | | | | | |
| | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | Percent Change | | | | |
| Total Real Market Value | 964,669 | 1,023,232 | 6.1% | | | | |
| Total Assessed Value | 502,996 | 527,118 | 4.8% | | | | |
| Total Net Assessed Value | 485,240 | 511,899 | 5.5% | | | | |
| Exhibit 1b—Oregon Pro | perty Taxes Impo | osed | | | | | |
| | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | Percent Change | | | | |
| Operating Taxes* | 7,078 | 7,525 | 6.3% | | | | |
| Bond Taxes | 1,313 | 1,382 | 5.3% | | | | |
| Urban Renewal Taxes** | 307 | 238 | -22.6% | | | | |
| Total All Taxes | 8,698 | 9,145 | 5.1% | | | | |

Note: For a discussion of the terms please refer to Section 3, Basic Tax Concepts in Historical Context or the glossary.

Assessed value of residential property represents more than half of all assessed property value (51 percent). When tract property, which is property available for residential development, is included, this increases to 60 percent of all assessed property value. The three Portland metropolitan area counties (Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington) contain 54 percent of the residential property value in Oregon and property taxes within these counties account for 54

Exhibit 1a Orogan Brons

^{*}Operating taxes are property taxes from the permanent, local option, and gap bond rates that are used to fund the general operating budgets of taxing districts, and generally subject to Measure 5 limits.

^{**}Urban renewal taxes include property tax revenue from tax increment financing and special levies.


² This reflects property values as of January 1, 2023 and does not include value of properties exempt from taxation.

³ Only the taxable portion of properties are included in the total real market value reported here. Data comes from county reporting on the Measure 5 Value (M5V) of all assessed property. M5V is the property value to which Measure 5 tax rate limits are applied. For properties that are not partially or fully exempt or specially assessed, M5V is equal to Real Market Value (RMV).

⁴ See subsection "Measure 50" on page 10 for a description of taxable assessed and real market values.

percent of the total tax imposed across the state. Properties in cities make up 66 percent of statewide assessed value and 73.6 percent of total property tax extended.

Statewide, the ratio of assessed value to real market value decreased from 0.521 in FY 2022–23 to 0.515 in FY 2023–24. A decreasing AV/RMV ratio means that actual property value is growing faster than assessed values; growth in assessed values are generally capped at 3 percent per year for existing properties. Exhibit 7 on page 10 shows the trend for real market value of taxable property and assessed value.



*Percentages may not add up to 100%, as they are rounded to the nearest percent.

There were 1,222 districts that imposed property taxes in Oregon in 2023–24. Exhibit 2a illustrates the relative share of property taxes that each type of district imposes, with K-12 schools and Education Service Districts (ESDs) receiving the largest share (41 percent of the total). Cities (21 percent), counties (17 percent), and community colleges (4 percent) are the next largest district categories. All other special districts, such as fire, road, library, water, hospital, and park districts represent the largest number of districts, but impose only 14 percent of the taxes. The share of taxes by district type has been very stable over time.

Exhibit 2b shows the four primary types of property tax levies, by the share of revenue they raise: 1) permanent rates,⁵ 2) bond levies, 3) local option levies (also called local option taxes), and 4) urban renewal revenues. Property taxes from permanent rates are the most significant portion of property taxes, representing 73 percent of all property taxes imposed.

Compression, the process of reducing the property tax owed on an individual property due to rate limitations created by Measure 5 (1990), reduces the amount of tax imposed in the state. Taxes are categorized as school or as general government with different limits imposed for each. In FY 2023–24, compression reduced total taxes owed by \$155 million. Measure 5 compression is best measured as a percentage of taxes that would have otherwise been collected (tax extended) if not

_

⁵ For simplicity, we include the only remaining gap bond - the Portland pension levy - with the permanent rates in the Highlights section. See Section IV (2) for more information on gap bond levies.

for the Measure 5 rate limitations.⁶ Statewide compression as a percentage of tax extended for districts subject to the Measure 5 rate limitations (excluding urban renewal) was 2.0 percent for FY 2023–24, slightly increased from the 1.9 percent in FY 2022–23.

Properties in cities account for 87.5 percent of taxes compressed statewide in FY 2023–24. This relatively larger portion of compression in cities is due to general government compression. Over 99 percent of general government compression is within cities because the addition of city levies is often enough to bring individual properties above the general government tax limit of \$10 per thousand dollars of real market value. In addition, urban renewal division of tax moves taxes that would have been subject to the school tax limit of \$5 per thousand dollars of real market value into the general government category. Seven districts, mostly cities and school districts, had over 10 percent of their extended tax amounts subject to the Measure 5 limitations compressed in FY 2023–24, and three districts had more than 20 percent compressed. More data on compression can be found on the detailed tables 2.3 through 2.6 in Section V of this report.

Exhibit 3 presents a composition of taxes by type of taxing district for FY 2022–23 and FY 2023–24. It is worth noting that statewide figures presented here result from a wide range of individual district characteristics. For example, when large taxing districts have substantial changes in their tax levies, they can noticeably impact the statewide totals. The largest 25 districts by total assessed value accounted for about 34 percent of all property taxes imposed (excluding urban renewal) in FY 2023–24. Detailed data about specific taxing districts, including the assessed and real market value of taxable property within a district, the types of levies used by districts, and division of tax for urban renewal plan areas are available in the Oregon Property Tax Statistics Supplement on the Oregon Department of Revenue website: www.oregon.gov/dor/stats.

| Exhibit 3—Type of Property | Taxes Imposed by Type of District, |
|----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24 | |

| Dollars in millions | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-------|---------|------|-------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| | Perm | anent F | Rate | Loc | al Opti | on | | Bond | | | Total | |
| Type of District | 22-23 | 23-24 | % CH | 22-23 | 23-24 | % CH | 22-23 | 23-24 | % CH | 22-23 | 23-24 | % CH |
| Counties | 1,208 | 1,286 | 6.5% | 175 | 193 | 10.1% | 72 | 72 | 0.3% | 1,455 | 1,552 | 6.6% |
| Cities | 1,528 | 1,617 | 5.8% | 165 | 176 | 6.4% | 104 | 112 | 7.7% | 1,797 | 1,905 | 6.0% |
| K-12 & ESDs | 2,418 | 2,550 | 5.5% | 272 | 283 | 4.3% | 881 | 934 | 5.9% | 3,571 | 3,767 | 5.5% |
| Community Colleges | 221 | 232 | 5.1% | 0 | 0 | N/A | 119 | 118 | -0.8% | 340 | 350 | 3.0% |
| Special Districts | 965 | 1,032 | 7.0% | 126 | 155 | 22.4% | 136 | 146 | 7.2% | 1,227 | 1,333 | 8.6% |
| Total District Taxes | 6,339 | 6,718 | 6.0% | 739 | 807 | 9.2% | 1,313 | 1,382 | 5.3% | 8,391 | 8,907 | 6.2% |
| Urban Renewal Agencies | | | | | | | | | | 307 | 238 | -22.6% |
| Total | | | | | | | | | | 8,698 | 9,145 | 5.1% |

⁶ See subsection "Determination of Tax and Compression" on page 20 for more information on how compression is calculated.

Several points related to this table are worth noting:

• Taxes from permanent rates grew by 6 percent in FY 2023–24, while the yearly growth in permanent rate taxes since Measure 50 was 4.8 percent. Exhibit 4 shows the average growth in taxes for each levy type since FY 1997–98. See Table 2.2 on page 39 for more information on the breakdown of tax imposed by the various district types.

| Exhibit 4—Average Growth in Taxes |
|-----------------------------------|
| by Levy Type, |
| FY 1997-98 to FY 2023-24 |

| Levy Type | Avg. Annual Growth |
|---------------|--------------------|
| Permanent | 4.8% |
| Local Option | 14.7% |
| Bond | 5.3% |
| Urban Renewal | 4.4% |
| Total | 5.2% |


- Overall, local option taxes increased by 9.2 percent from the last fiscal year, accounting for 8.7 percent of total property taxes imposed.
- Bond revenues, the primary funding for capital projects, increased by 5.3 percent since last year. Almost 76 percent of all bond taxes imposed in FY 2023–24 were for education districts.
- Statewide, 197 school districts imposed property taxes this year. Nineteen of those districts had a local option levy and 127 had one or more bond levies. Overall, 34 percent of property taxes imposed by K-12 districts were collected through these two types of levies.

Urban renewal revenue from taxation of excess value and from urban renewal special levies decreased by 22.6 percent in FY 2023–24⁷ due to city of Portland removing a large number of plan areas. A total of 129 urban renewal plan areas raised revenue from division of tax in 2023–24, while 108 urban renewal plan areas increased the amount of revenue they received compared with FY 2022–23. Four of those are new plan areas that did not report last year. For details on the amount of revenue raised for specific urban renewal plan areas and agencies, see detailed Table 3.1 and Table 3.2 starting on page 46.

Exhibit 5 displays the percentage of total property taxes imposed by each primary property class for FY 2023–24. As shown, residential properties make up most of the property taxes imposed, followed by commercial and locally assessed industrial properties, and tract land.

⁷ See Section IV (3) "Urban Renewal" on page 21 for more information on the financing of urban renewal agencies.





*Locally-assessed industrial and commercial property classes were merged into a single class in 2013.

**DOR-Appraised refers to centrally-assessed companies and large industrial properties that are appraised by the Department of Revenue.

Exhibit 6, on the following page, presents the average ad valorem⁸ tax rate for all properties within each county. Pactual tax imposed on any individual property is calculated on an individual property basis, and imposed tax amounts differ depending upon a property's particular circumstances. In general, taxes are calculated based on taxing district rates applied to the assessed value of a property, but operating taxes are limited to no more than \$10 per \$1000 dollars of RMV for general government districts, and \$5 per \$1000 of RMV for education districts. Overall, in FY 2023–24 statewide imposed property taxes averaged \$17.35 per \$1000 of AV, and \$8.94 per \$1000 of RMV. The average tax rate per assessed value rose this year compared to last year, while the average tax rate per real market value declined slightly. This happened because the real market value increased this year at a faster rate than the assessed value, which is limited by the 3 percent growth limit that was introduced by Measure 50.

⁸ See the glossary, page 63, for specific definitions of terms.

⁹ Tax rates in Exhibit 6 differ from those presented in Table 1.6 on page 33 because urban renewal taxes are excluded from the rates presented in Table 1.6.

¹⁰ The calculation of property taxes is explained in more detail in Section IV.

¹¹ Only the taxable portion of properties are included in the total real market value reported here. Data comes from county reporting on the Measure 5 Value (M5V) of all assessed property. M5V is the property value to which Measure 5 tax rate limits are applied. For properties that are not partially or fully exempt or specially assessed, M5V is equal to Real Market Value (RMV).

Exhibit 6—Total Property Tax Imposed, Total Measure 5 Value, Total Assessed Value, and Average Effective Tax Rates by County, FY 2023-24

| Total Tax Imposed | | Total Measure 5 Value (M5V)* | Total Assessed Value (AV) | Average Tax Rate | Average Tax Rate |
|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| County | (Thousands of Dollars) | (Thousands of Dollars) | (Thousands of Dollars) | (per \$1000 of M5V) | (per \$1000 of AV) |
| Baker | 27,208 | 3,266,939 | 1,967,881 | \$8.33 | \$13.83 |
| Benton | 192,406 | 20,206,138 | 10,776,944 | \$9.52 | \$17.85 |
| Clackamas | 1,122,644 | 117,353,947 | 63,593,258 | \$9.57 | \$17.65 |
| Clatsop | 109,765 | 16,305,298 | 8,045,793 | \$6.73 | \$13.64 |
| Columbia | 96,515 | 11,695,770 | 6,641,508 | \$8.25 | \$14.53 |
| Coos | 86,015 | 13,485,298 | 6,682,437 | \$6.38 | \$12.87 |
| Crook | 42,080 | 7,021,484 | 3,127,765 | \$5.99 | \$13.45 |
| Curry | 32,346 | 6,270,759 | 3,822,250 | \$5.16 | \$8.46 |
| Deschutes | 519,710 | 80,494,440 | 32,203,361 | \$6.46 | \$16.14 |
| Douglas | 129,272 | 18,008,985 | 11,732,438 | \$7.18 | \$11.02 |
| Gilliam | 13,132 | 1,411,759 | 1,139,886 | \$9.30 | \$11.52 |
| Grant | 9,125 | 1,098,766 | 698,896 | \$8.31 | \$13.06 |
| Harney | 10,244 | 1,221,252 | 721,586 | \$8.39 | \$14.20 |
| Hood River | 45,737 | 6,987,558 | 3,299,684 | \$6.55 | \$13.86 |
| Jackson | 364,035 | 44,590,909 | 25,754,848 | \$8.16 | \$14.13 |
| Jefferson | 39,385 | 5,485,198 | 2,380,122 | \$7.18 | \$16.55 |
| Josephine | 91,411 | 15,815,864 | 9,574,807 | \$5.78 | \$9.55 |
| Klamath | 84,789 | 14,184,709 | 7,002,754 | \$5.98 | \$12.11 |
| Lake | 11,390 | 1,445,496 | 843,079 | \$7.88 | \$13.51 |
| Lane | 691,451 | 83,877,140 | 41,526,522 | \$8.24 | \$16.65 |
| Lincoln | 145,884 | 18,006,680 | 9,684,249 | \$8.10 | \$15.06 |
| Linn | 220,870 | 23,978,550 | 13,023,072 | \$9.21 | \$16.96 |
| Malheur | 36,339 | 4,493,108 | 2,724,370 | \$8.09 | \$13.34 |
| Marion | 537,881 | 57,849,267 | 31,758,641 | \$9.30 | \$16.94 |
| Morrow | 57,300 | 8,110,121 | 3,963,527 | \$7.07 | \$14.46 |
| Multnomah | 2,348,936 | 210,405,126 | 100,145,137 | \$11.16 | \$23.46 |
| Polk | 122,891 | 14,867,072 | 7,732,422 | \$8.27 | \$15.89 |
| Sherman | 20,092 | 1,609,881 | 1,309,433 | \$12.48 | \$15.34 |
| Tillamook | 72,367 | 12,245,459 | 6,296,186 | \$5.91 | \$11.49 |
| Umatilla | 126,162 | 13,566,112 | 7,739,393 | \$9.30 | \$16.30 |
| Union | 34,392 | 4,116,328 | 2,448,455 | \$8.35 | \$14.05 |
| Wallowa | 11,973 | 2,242,768 | 1,032,228 | \$5.34 | \$11.60 |
| Wasco | 52,399 | 6,257,817 | 3,353,280 | \$8.37 | \$15.63 |
| Washington | 1,465,144 | 152,132,176 | 82,619,276 | \$9.63 | \$17.73 |
| Wheeler | 3,314 | 364,800 | 194,538 | \$9.08 | \$17.04 |
| Yamhill | 170,476 | 22,758,758 | 11,558,287 | \$7.49 | \$14.75 |
| Statewide | 9,145,080 | 1,023,231,730 | 527,118,311 | \$8.94 | \$17.35 |

Notes: Total Tax Imposed includes all taxing districts, all urban renewal division of tax, and all urban renewal special levies. *Measure 5 Value (M5V) is the property value to which Measure 5 tax rate limits are applied. For properties that are not partially exempt or specially assessed, Measure 5 Value is equal to Real Market Value (RMV). Previous editions of this report have reported the M5V as the RMV, but the description here has been changed to more clearly indicate what values are being reported.

Basic Property Tax Concepts in Historical Context

Local governments in Oregon began taxing property before statehood, but the structure of the tax changed very little until the 1990s when two statewide ballot measures dramatically altered the system. To find more detailed information on the history of Oregon property taxes, please refer to the publication *A Brief History of Oregon Property Taxation* that can be found on the Oregon Department of Revenue website: www.oregon.gov/dor/stats. Refer to the glossary for an explanation of key terms.

Pre-Measure 5

Prior to Measure 5, which became effective beginning in FY 1991–92, Oregon had a pure levybased property tax system. Each taxing district calculated its own tax levy based on its budget needs. County assessors estimated the real market values of all property in the state. At this time, a property's real market value and the value it was taxed on were generally the same, except for exempt and specially assessed properties. The levy amount for each taxing district was then divided by the total real market value of taxable property in the district to arrive at a district tax rate. One consequence of this part of the calculation was that property tax exemptions had no effect on taxing districts, as other taxpayers in a district would pay more to make up the difference. The taxes each district imposed equaled its tax rate multiplied by the real market value of all the properties within the district's boundaries. The tax rate for an individual property depended on the combination of taxing districts in which it resided. Taxes for each property were calculated by adding the tax rates for the relevant taxing districts, in which the property lies within, to arrive at a consolidated tax rate. That tax rate was multiplied by the value of the property to determine the tax imposed on that property. Most tax levies were constitutionally limited to an annual growth rate of 6 percent, and levies that would increase by more than 6 percent required voter approval.

Measure 5

Starting in FY 1991–92, Measure 5 introduced constitutional limits on the taxes imposed on individual properties. The individual property tax limits of \$5 per \$1,000 value for school taxes and \$10 per \$1,000 value for general government taxes applied only to operating taxes not bonds. If the total taxes for either school or general government exceeded the set limits for a property, then each corresponding taxing district would have its tax rate reduced proportionately until the tax limit was reached. This process of reducing taxes based on Measure 5 rate limits is called compression and the resulting tax reduction is referred to as compression loss. The Measure 5 value (M5V) of a property is used to check the individual property tax limits mentioned above and is generally equal to the real market value (RMV) except for specially assessed property (e.g., farm and forest lands) and partially exempt property. RMV is the amount the assessor has calculated the property could sell for in an arm's length market transaction on January 1 of the assessment year.


¹² The limit for school taxes was \$15 per \$1,000 real market value in 1991-92. It was reduced by \$2.50 each year until it reached a rate of \$5 per \$1,000 real market value in 1995-96.

Measure 50

The objective of Measure 50, passed in 1997, was to reduce property taxes in FY 1997–98 and to control their future growth. It achieved these goals by making three changes: shifting district permanent taxing authority from levy based to rate based and permanently limiting those rates, 13 reducing the value a property was taxed on to the assessed values and limiting annual growth of that taxable assessed value. In the rate-based property tax system created by Measure 50, exemptions from property taxes reduce the total revenue collected, instead of shifting the tax burden. Assessed value is the value of the property subject to taxation for a given year and is the lower of the property's maximum assessed value (MAV) and the real market value. Measure 50 separated a property's AV from its real market value beginning in tax year 1997–98 when a property's MAV was set at 90 percent of the property's 1995–96 real market value. Measure 50 also limited a property's MAV to no more than 103 percent of its previous year's MAV (assuming no substantial improvements were made to the property). To calculate the MAV for a new property, the assessor multiplies the RMV by the changed property ratio (CPR) for the class of property in the county. The CPR is the ratio of MAV to RMV for existing properties in the county; each class of property (residential, commercial/industrial, farmland, etc.) generally has its own CPR. When implemented in 1997–98, the overall effect of Measure 50 was an average effective tax rate reduction of 11 percent compared to the previous tax year.

Exhibit 7 displays the relationship between total assessed value and real market value of taxable property¹⁴ for the past few decades.





¹³ Districts were allowed to continue gap bond levies to meet the funding commitments that were made prior to 1996.

¹⁴ Only the taxable portion of properties are included in the total real market value reported here. Data comes from county reporting on the Measure 5 Value (M5V) of all assessed property. M5V is the property value to which Measure 5 tax rate limits are applied. For properties that are not partially or fully exempt or specially assessed, M5V is equal to Real Market Value (RMV).

Exhibit 8—Average Yearly Growth, FY 1997-98 to FY 2023-24 Assessed Real Market Value Value 15 Growth Growth

4.6%

3.9%

6.5%

5.6%

Inside City Limits

Outside City Limits

Due to Measure 50 requirements, FY 1997–98 total assessed value fell 12.5 percent below the prior year and 21 percent below the FY 1997–98 real market value. Since FY 1997–98, statewide assessed value has been increasing each year. However, in most years after FY 1997–98, assessed values have grown at a rate slower than real market values because the maximum assessed values of unchanged individual properties are subject to the

Measure 50 constitutional 3 percent annual growth limit. This is especially true for properties inside city limits, where assessed value has averaged 4.6 percent growth since FY 1997–98 and the real market value of taxable property has grown by 6.5 percent yearly. Total assessed value and real market value of properties inside city limits grew by more than those outside of city limits in FY 2023–24. Property inside city limits saw 4.6 percent assessed value growth and 6.5 percent real market value growth, while assessed value outside city limits experienced 3.9 percent growth and real market values grew by 5.6 percent. Exhibit 8 shows the average yearly growth rate for assessed value and real market value of taxable property since the implementation of Measure 50 for properties within city limits and those outside of city limits.

The two most prominent sources of growth in total assessed value are changes in the value of existing property and construction of new property. While Measure 50 generally limits the growth of maximum assessed value on existing properties to 3 percent, the assessed value of an existing property can increase by more than 3 percent if the property had major renovations, new improvements, or if the property is rezoned in such a way that it increases the sale value. New property, such as a newly built home, directly adds to the growth of the total assessed value in an area.

Both Measure 5 and Measure 50 were aimed at limiting property taxes. Exhibits 9, 10, and 11 display the trend in Oregon property taxes imposed for the last several decades. ¹⁵ Property taxes imposed averaged between 8 to 9 percent annual growth from the 1960s through the 1980s. Measure 5 took effect in tax year 1991–92, and property taxes declined for several years. Measure 50 took effect in tax year 1997–98, and the average growth rate of the amount of taxes imposed has been about 5.2 percent per year since.

Oregon Department of Revenue, Research Section


¹⁵ Exhibits 9, 10, and 11 show figures for property tax imposed in actual dollars; they are not adjusted for inflation or population growth, and they do not account for any property tax relief programs, such as Homestead Deferral. See "Tax Relief" starting on page 22 for more information on current programs. For more on the history of Oregon's property tax relief programs, see *A Brief History of Oregon Property Taxation*; available on the DOR Research website.

Exhibit 9 displays the average annual increase in property taxes for each of the last six decades as well as for the last four years since 2020.

| Exhibit 9—Average Annual Growth in imposed Property Taxes in Oregon, by Decade | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Time Period | Avg. Annual Growth | | | | | | |
| 1960 - 1969 | 9.1% | | | | | | |
| 1970 - 1979 | 8.5% | | | | | | |
| 1980 - 1989 | 9.0% | | | | | | |
| 1990 - 1999 | 1.8% | | | | | | |
| 2000 - 2009 | 5.9% | | | | | | |
| 2010 - 2019 | 4.2% | | | | | | |
| 2020 - 2024 | 5.1% | | | | | | |

Note: Growth in imposed tax is not adjusted for inflation or population changes.

Exhibit 10 displays the total property taxes imposed from 1968–69 to 2023–24, while Exhibit 11 displays the annual growth over a similar period. In the most recent fiscal year, annual imposed tax growth was about 5.1 percent, slightly lower than the average annual growth rate of imposed taxes since Measure 50 took effect. Note that Measure 5 started in the 1991–92 tax year, was fully phased-in in the 1995–96 tax year, and Measure 50 took effect in the 1997–98 tax year.









Exhibit 12 provides another angle from which to view the reduction in property taxes due to Measures 5 and 50. It shows the average tax rate per \$1,000 of Assessed Value (AV) and Real Market Value (RMV)¹⁶ over the last several decades. In the decade prior to Measure 5, the rate averaged about \$23 per \$1,000 of RMV. This fiscal year the rate is \$9.02 per \$1,000 of real market value and \$17.29 per \$1,000 of AV.






Oregon Department of Revenue, Research Section

¹⁶ Only the taxable portion of properties are included in the total real market value reported here. Data comes from county reporting on the Measure 5 Value (M5V) of all assessed property. M5V is the property value to which Measure 5 tax rate limits are applied. For properties that are not partially or fully exempt or specially assessed, M5V is equal to Real Market Value (RMV).

Yet another way to interpret the effects of Measures 5 and 50 are in terms of the relationship between property tax and personal income. Exhibit 13 displays the share of Oregon personal income that property taxes represent. Prior to the limits of the 1990s, the percentage of property tax to personal income was around 5 percent. During the 1990s, the percentage dropped to a range of 3 to 4 percent where it has remained.






^{*}Personal income data from U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis

The Department of Revenue receives annual information on property tax collections from the 36 counties in July. Exhibit 14 presents the percentage of property taxes collected by the end of the fiscal year from FY 1998–99 to the most recent complete fiscal year: FY 2022–23. The percent of tax collected by the end of the fiscal year as a proportion of total property tax imposed has varied within a small range since FY 2000–01, with a gradual upward trend. The proportion of total property tax collected ranged from a low of 92.8 percent in 1998-99 to a high of 95.6 percent in 2021–22. During the years following the global financial crisis in 2007 and 2008, there was a slight decrease in the collections rate, from 94.4 percent in 2006–07 to 93.2 percent in 2008–09.

Exhibit 14—Percentage of Annual Property Tax Collected by End of Year, FY 2000-01 to FY 2022-23



^{*}The Percent Collected axis begins at 90% to highlight minor variations since FY 2000-01.

How the Property Tax System Works

This section provides an overview of property tax administration and introduces the detailed tables in Section V.

- 1. Assessment: Explains the process of assigning taxable values to properties.
- **2.** Tax Authority and Tax Due Calculation: Provides an overview of types of taxes and an explanation of how tax limits are calculated.
- 3. Urban Renewal: Explains operations of urban renewal agencies.
- **4.** *Tax Collection*: Explains when and how property taxes are collected.
- 5. Tax Relief: Describes tax relief programs that are currently in effect.
- **6.** How Property Taxes are Determined for an Individual Property: Offers an example of how property tax imposed is calculated for a hypothetical property.

1. Assessment

General Procedure

The process of identifying and assigning a value to taxable property is called assessment. County assessors assess most property and prepare the assessment rolls for each county, which is a listing of all taxable property as of January 1 of each year. Assessment identifies the values of the properties that will be the tax base to which property tax rates apply. Table 1.1 in Section V of this report displays assessed value by county and property class. Table 1.2 displays real market value of taxable property¹⁷ and AV by county, and type of property.

The Oregon Department of Revenue assesses some property, including centrally assessed property (companies assessed under ORS 308.505, also referred to as utilities), and large industrial properties with an improvement value greater than \$1 million. Utilities are placed on a separate assessment roll, which is transferred to the county assessment roll prior to the preparation of tax bills. Small railcar utility properties, which represent less than 1 percent of the total value of all utility property, cannot be attributed to specific counties. Assessors do not put the value of small railcars on the roll; owners of these utilities pay taxes to the state, which then distributes the tax revenue to counties. Table 1.3 shows the AV of state centrally assessed property by type of company, prior to application of exemptions and/or special assessments. Since the implementation of Measure 50 in 1997–98, assessors track the assessed value and real market value for each property, in addition to any specially assessed property and exempt property.

Net assessed value (NAV) is the value used to calculate district tax rates for dollar levies and is calculated by summing the total assessed value, state fish and wildlife property value, nonprofit

¹⁷ Only the taxable portion of properties are included in the total real market value reported here. Data comes from county reporting on the Measure 5 Value (M5V) of all assessed property. M5V is the property value to which Measure 5 tax rate limits are applied. For properties that are not partially or fully exempt or specially assessed, M5V is equal to Real Market Value (RMV).

housing property value, and subtracting urban renewal excess value (see Table 1.4 for breakdown of values) for all areas covered by a taxing district. Both state fish and wildlife property and nonprofit housing property are added to total assessed value because, while they are technically exempt and do not pay property taxes directly to taxing districts, the state makes equivalent payments to taxing districts. Considering the property tax revenues derived from urban renewal excess value go to urban renewal agencies instead of local taxing districts, NAV does not include urban renewal excess value. ¹⁸ Table 1.5 shows RMV and NAV by type of taxing district, while Table 1.6 has a breakdown of RMV and NAV by county.

Exemptions and Special Assessments

Certain property owners receive exemptions from property taxation or have their properties assessed in a special way. The value of an exempt property is adjusted prior to being placed on the roll by the assessor. When the Legislature grants such exemptions, it is usually to pursue socially desirable outcomes such as helping educational and charitable organizations, encouraging economic development in Oregon, protecting wildlife and forestlands, or to comply with federal law. Property can also be exempt from taxation because of the complexity associated with taxing the property (e.g., personal property for personal use).

The three primary ways of reducing the assessed value of property are:

- Full exemption: A property is wholly exempt from property taxation.
- *Partial exemption:* Partial property exemptions may exempt only a percentage of value, or only part of a property may qualify for an exemption.
- *Special assessment:* Specially assessed properties are valued using different methods from other properties, which results in a lower taxable value than would be the case if the usual assessment practice was used.

Some tax exemptions require local taxing districts to approve of the use of the exemption if it would affect the districts' tax revenue. Table 1.7 presents AV and RMV by county for three broad categories of exemptions:

- Public exemptions (mostly property owned by governments of different levels);
- Social welfare exemptions, and
- Business, housing, and other exemptions.

Table 1.8 provides AV and RMV for farmland and forestland by county. Assessed value for farmland and forestland denotes assessed value of the specially assessed property.

Detailed information on property tax exemptions and special assessment can be found in the *State of Oregon Tax Expenditure Report 2023-2025*, available on the Oregon Department of

¹⁸ Please see Section IV (3) "Urban Renewal", for more information.

Revenue website: www.oregon.gov/dor/stats. This document is a companion document to the 2023–25 *Governor's Budget*.

Assessment Appeals

A property owner can appeal the valuation of their property to the local Property Value Appeals Board (PVAB), formerly called the Board of Property Tax Appeals (BOPTA). ¹⁹ Petitions to the Board must be filed between the date of delivery of tax statements, which is no later than October 25, through December 31. Petitions are filed in the office of the county clerk in the county where the property is located.

A property owner or assessor may appeal the PVAB decision regarding property value to the Magistrate Division of the Oregon Tax Court. Magistrate decisions can be appealed to the Regular Division of the Tax Court. Decisions of the Regular Division of the Tax Court can be appealed to the Oregon Supreme Court.

Owners of industrial property appraised by the Oregon Department of Revenue must file their appeals directly with the Magistrate Division of the Oregon Tax Court, rather than with the PVAB. Detailed information about the appeal process can be found on the Oregon Department of Revenue website.

Table 1.9 contains information about accounts appealed, the AV of appealed accounts, and net reductions that resulted from PVAB decisions.

2. Tax Authority and Tax Due Calculation

Tax Authority and Types of Taxes

Oregon statutes allow for the establishment of a wide variety of local entities which can impose tax to provide services. Examples include counties, cities, school districts, sanitary districts, and water control districts. Most properties in Oregon reside within six to 12 different taxing districts. There are 1,222 districts that imposed property taxes in Oregon this year.

Property taxes are comprised of three primary parts: 1) permanent rate and gap bond levies, 2) local option levies, and 3) bond levies. In addition, urban renewal agencies get a portion of their revenue from the aforementioned levies, and can, in some cases, also impose special levies.²⁰

Measure 50 established *permanent rate limits* for each taxing district based on the operating taxes that each district historically had charged prior to the measure. When new taxing districts are formed, voter approval is required to establish the permanent rates. Districts are allowed to impose tax on properties up to their authority by notification to the county assessor. The

¹⁹ In addition to a property owner, a person who holds an interest in a property that obligates the person to pay the taxes imposed on the property may appeal the valuation to PVAB.

²⁰ See subsection 3, Urban Renewal, on page 21 for more information.

permanent rate limits cannot be increased by any means, but districts can choose to tax for less than the maximum allowed amount.

Gap bond levies are operating levies used to pay off indebtedness that was incurred prior to the passage of Measure 50. The indebtedness had been paid out of operating taxes prior to passage of Measure 50, and to protect that ability to pay indebtedness, Measure 50 allowed for the gap bond operating taxes to continue to be imposed beyond the permanent rate authority. Because these levies were not part of the Measure 50 permanent rate calculations in 1997, after the indebtedness was paid off, they were reduced and then added to the permanent rate authority. This preserved the district's overall operating tax authority at a level that would have been calculated if the gap bond levies had been included in the permanent rate limit calculations in 1997. Only one gap bond levy remains, the Pension Levy for the City of Portland; however, that levy has special consideration in the Oregon Constitution.

Districts can, with voter approval, establish *local option levies* (or *local option taxes*) for an existing taxing district. Local option levies are a temporary taxing authority in addition to the district's permanent rate authority but are limited to 10 years at most. Typically, local option levies are established to fund specific operations of a district such as road repair or the operation of a library.

Bond levies require voter approval and are a temporary levy that is exclusively used to repay a bond that is utilized to fund construction and other capital projects. Unlike most other tax levies in Oregon, bond taxes are levy-based and raise a specific dollar amount spread across all taxable properties in the taxing district. Bond levy rates are not included when calculating Measure 5 rate limits for an individual property, also referred to as being "outside the limit."

Table 2.1 displays taxes levied by type of tax and county, while Table 2.2 shows the same information broken out by type of taxing district for FY 2023-24.

Determination of Tax and Compression

Measure 50 replaced most tax levies with fixed permanent tax rates. In addition to the permanent levies, temporary levies can be imposed through local options, bonds, or urban renewal special levies. For some levies, usually only levies to repay bonds or urban renewal special levies, county assessors compute the tax rates by dividing the levy amounts by the net assessed value within the taxing district. Those tax rates are then added to the permanent tax rates to compute the total rate to be *extended* to a property. The *tax extended* to a property is the total tax rate multiplied by the assessed value of the property.

Since Measure 5 limits must be tested, tax extended is not necessarily the tax imposed. The limits are \$5 per \$1,000 RMV for education taxes, and \$10 per \$1,000 RMV for general government taxes. These limits are applied only to operating taxes (including urban renewal), not bond levies. For each property, the assessor compares education taxes with the education limit and general governmental taxes with the general government limit. If the amount of property tax extended exceeds the Measure 5 limits, then taxes are *compressed* in a specific order until they

meet the limit. First, local option taxes are proportionally reduced, possibly to zero. If there are no local option taxes or they have been reduced to zero, the permanent tax rates for each taxing district are then reduced proportionately.²¹ Total tax after compression is called *tax imposed* and is the amount billed to the property owner(s).

Table 2.3 shows tax extended, tax imposed, and compression amounts by county. Table 2.4 provides the breakdown by type of taxing district. Tables 2.5 and 2.6 demonstrate changes in tax imposed (both inside and outside the Measure 5 limit) and compression, by county and by type of taxing district for FY 2022-23 to FY 2023-24.

3. Urban Renewal

Urban renewal agencies were designed to address issues of blight, which can impair property values and lower tax revenues. In Oregon, urban renewal agencies receive most of their revenues through a *tax increment financing* mechanism. Urban renewal agencies can be approved by counties or cities with the objective of eliminating blight within an area. Urban renewal agencies do not have the authority to impose taxes (except for special levies), but they do get a portion of the property tax revenue that would otherwise have gone to taxing districts if the agency did not exist. When an urban renewal plan area is created (plan areas are created and administered by urban renewal agencies), the assessed value of the property within the area's boundaries is frozen at the amount calculated from the most recently certified tax roll prior to the plan's approval. The agency then raises revenue in subsequent years from any value growth above the frozen amount. This value growth is referred to as the *increment* or *excess value*.

A tax rate is calculated for the urban renewal plan as the consolidated tax rate for the relevant taxing districts within the geographic boundaries of the plan. These urban renewal taxes, referred to as "tax off the increment," are calculated as the consolidated tax rate multiplied by the value of the increment. The sharing of tax between taxing districts that each get a portion of the tax imposed on the *frozen base value* and urban renewal agencies that get the tax imposed on the excess value is also referred to as urban renewal *division of tax*.

Over the years, there have been a variety of different types of urban renewal plans that include different levies in their consolidated tax rate. These can be broadly categorized as follows:

- Reduced rate plans, which include permanent rate and gap bond levies, and bond levies passed before October 6, 2001, but do not include local option levies.
- Standard rate plans, which include permanent rate and gap bond levies, all bond levies, and local option levies passed before January 2, 2013. Local option levies passed after January 1, 2013 can be included if the urban renewal agency files an impairment certificate under the procedure outlined in ORS 457.445(4).

²¹ Gap bond levies are reduced also, if present.

• Permanent rate plans, which only include permanent rate and gap bond levies. All plans created after September 28, 2019 are permanent rate plans.

Most urban renewal agencies that have plan areas adopted before December 1996 can also impose special levies. These levies compensate urban renewal agencies for the revenue loss caused by the implementation of Measure 50. Special levies, as well as division of tax revenues, are subject to the tax limitations of Measure 5.

Table 3.1 provides information on the amount of excess value, and the revenue from excess value and special levies, broken down by urban renewal agency, plan area, and county. Table 3.2 displays the amount of increment tax imposed by urban renewal agencies broken down by urban renewal agency, the type of district within which the excess value growth occurred, and by county.

4. Tax Collection

Once the tax rates and Measure 5 tax rate limits are applied to each property, the assessor certifies the assessment roll and turns it over to the tax collector. The tax collector bills and collects all taxes and makes periodic remittances of collections to taxing districts. Tax statements mailed to property owners list the assessed value of the property and the taxes imposed by each taxing district. Statements also indicate how much tax is inside and how much is outside the Measure 5 property tax limits and the amount of taxes due after the limits have been applied.

Based on property values assessed as of January 1, taxes are levied and become a lien on property effective July 1. Tax payments are due on November 15 of the same calendar year. Under the partial payment schedule, the first one-third of taxes is due on November 15, the second one-third on February 15, and the remaining one-third on May 15. If the taxpayer makes the full tax payment by November, a discount of 3 percent is allowed; a 2 percent discount is allowed for a two-thirds payment made by November 15. For late payments, interest accrues at a rate of 1.33 percent per month (16 percent annual rate). If taxes remain unpaid after three years from the beginning of delinquency date, counties then initiate property foreclosure proceedings. Table 4 shows tax uncollected for the most recent complete fiscal year: FY 2022-23.

5. Tax Relief

In addition to the many value exemptions and special assessments that can apply to a property, there are two primary programs to directly assist Oregonians with property taxes, the Senior Citizen's Property Tax Deferral Program and the Disabled Citizen's Property Tax Deferral Program. These programs are collectively referred to as the Senior and Disabled Citizens Property Tax Program.

The first deferral program, the Senior Citizen's Property Tax Deferral Program, allows homeowners 62 years or older who meet certain income, asset, and property related requirements to defer all property taxes. Under the Senior Citizen's Property Tax Deferral Program, the state

pays the property taxes of participants and charges the homeowner 6 percent simple interest on the deferred amount. Homeowners are not required to pay the taxes or interest to the state until they die, sell, or no longer inhabit their home (except for medical reasons). The income eligibility requirement is indexed to inflation and is \$58,000 for 2023-24 property tax year deferrals. Once approved, senior citizens are eligible for continued deferral in future years so long as they continue to recertify that they meet eligibility requirements every two years (prior to the scheduled program sunset date in 2032).

The second deferral program, the Disabled Citizen's Property Tax Deferral Program, began in 2001 and is similar to the Senior Citizen's Property Tax Deferral Program in that the same income, asset, and property limitations apply, and property taxes are deferred at 6 percent simple interest. However, this program is for disabled homeowners who are eligible for or receive Social Security Disability benefits. Age limitations do not apply to this program. This program is also scheduled to sunset in 2032.

For more information visit the Oregon Department of Revenue website: www.oregon.gov/dor.

6. How Property Taxes are Determined for an Individual Property

Exhibit 15 on the following page shows the process used to determine the property tax bill for an individual property. Most property in Oregon is located within six to 12 different taxing districts. Each of these districts will have a billing rate, and the sum of those rates will equal the consolidated tax rate for the property. The assessed value of a property multiplied by the consolidated tax rate results in the tax extended. The non-bond taxes paid to K-12, education service, and community college districts are subject to the Measure 5 education limit of \$5 per \$1000 of value, while the non-bond taxes paid to all other districts are subject to the Measure 5 general government limit of \$10 per \$1000 of value. If either the school or the general government tax extended amount is greater than the respective Measure 5 limit allows, then the tax is compressed down to the limit. In compressing non-bond tax, local option taxes are first reduced to zero. If further reduction is needed after all local option taxes have been reduced, then the non-bond taxes for each district are reduced proportionately. The final tax (non-bond tax plus bond tax) is referred to as the tax imposed, and this is the amount the property owner must pay.

Exhibit 15—Simplified Property Tax Calculation for a Residential Property **Taxing District Levies Assessed Value of Property** Permanent **Gap Bonds** for prior year Local Option UR Special Levies Bonds times sum of district levy rates equals 1.03 **Total District Tax Rate** (3 Percent Growth in Assessed Value)* **Taxing District Types** equals K - 12 County **Education Service** City **Assessed Value Community College** Special of Property **Districts UR** for current year Plan Area times sum of each district's total tax rate **Consolidated Tax Rate for Consolidated Tax Rate** properties within code area equals Tax Extended minus **The Effect of Compression** after Testing Against **Measure 5 Limits** equals **Final Tax** Imposed on Property

^{*}If improvements were made to the property during the previous year, then the assessed value could grow more than 3 percent. Assessed value calculation above is for a property with real market value greater than assessed value.

Data Disclaimer

The county assessor offices provide all data contained within the following tables except for the values for property assessed by the Department of Revenue. In constructing a statewide dataset from individual county information, the Department of Revenue attempts to identify and resolve reporting errors, inconsistencies, and unusual circumstances.

Unfortunately, the department cannot always obtain missing or unreported data or resolve all inconsistencies. So, it is important for users of this information to be aware that there are occasionally discrepancies in the tables because of inconsistencies or gaps in the data reported by counties.

Rather than letting these data discrepancies prevent the publication of available information, the Department of Revenue attempts to provide available information as clearly as possible. For example, this report includes tables with missing data but strives to clearly identify the gaps. Because this publication is designed to be a description of the property tax system at the time taxes were certified using true and correct figures, the report does not included estimates where actual data was unavailable.

All the following detailed tables are also available on the department website: www.oregon.gov/dor/stats.

- Table 1.1 Total Assessed Value by County and Property Class
- Table 1.2 Total Measure 5 Value and Assessed Value by County and Property Type
- Table 1.3 Total Assessed Value of Centrally Assessed Utility Property
- Table 1.4 Total Assessed and Net Assessed Value of Property by County
- Table 1.5 Total Measure 5 and Net Assessed Value of Property, Property Tax Imposed, and Average Tax Rates, by Type of Taxing District
- Table 1.6 Total Measure 5 Value and Net Assessed Value of Property, Property Tax Imposed, and Average Tax Rates, by County
- Table 1.7 Assessed and Real Market Value of Fully and Partially Exempt Property by County
- Table 1.8 Assessed and Real Market Value of Specially Assessed Farmland and Forestland by County
- Table 1.9 Appeals to Property Value Appeals Board (PVAB), formerly called the Appeals to Board of Property Tax Appeals (BOPTA) by County

| | ounty (Thous | sands of Dollar | 5) | | | | roperty Clas | | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------|---------------------------|-----------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|--------------|------------------------|----------------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| County | Residential | Commercial/ Industrial | Tract | Farm / Forest | Multi-Housing | Recreation/ Misc | Personal | Machinery & Equipment* | Manufactured Structures | Utilities | Total A Classe |
| Baker | 565,441 | 168,345 | 194,278 | 346,020 | 24,186 | 25,081 | 47,188 | 79,467 | 6,034 | 512,148 | 1,968,18 |
| Benton | 5,359,465 | 1,211,527 | 1,587,965 | 834,202 | 822,387 | 2,650 | 226,886 | 355,444 | 66,675 | 309,744 | 10,776,94 |
| Clackamas | 38,893,078 | 8,609,052 | 2,742,353 | 4,282,010 | 3,587,961 | 971,026 | 1,178,780 | 929,702 | 270,721 | 2,130,094 | 63,594,77 |
| Clatsop | 4,427,302 | 1,055,437 | 1,016,709 | 302,298 | 179,009 | 72,498 | 186,507 | 491,611 | 31,472 | 282,949 | 8,045,79 |
| Columbia | 2,085,681 | 590,004 | 1,534,796 | 1,015,798 | 94,542 | 17,113 | 94,701 | 257,460 | 51,002 | 900,409 | 6,641,508 |
| Coos | 3,893,907 | 995,154 | 55,637 | 760,836 | 275,247 | 117,490 | 130,603 | 79,231 | 100,841 | 273,492 | 6,682,437 |
| Crook | 1,580,072 | 320,969 | 286,597 | 295,611 | 40,235 | 38,693 | 72,492 | 22,162 | 242,919 | 228,015 | 3,127,76 |
| Curry | 1,684,389 | 449,367 | 1,064,999 | 304,372 | 27,050 | 1,140 | 38,892 | 76,694 | 115,433 | 59,912 | 3,822,250 |
| Deschutes | 13,423,959 | 4,007,863 | 6,223,099 | 716,618 | 1,339,290 | 4,485,243 | 890,105 | 168,862 | 95,659 | 852,663 | 32,203,36 |
| Douglas | 3,673,303 | 1,435,741 | 2,732,991 | 1,596,062 | 484,689 | 38,619 | 260,082 | 301,832 | 183,788 | 1,025,293 | 11,732,402 |
| Gilliam | 61,953 | 177,290 | 8,800 | 143,661 | 1,216 | 0 | 35,191 | 0 | 813 | 710,962 | 1,139,886 |
| Grant | 170,794 | 62,950 | 157,894 | 224,391 | 4,970 | 17,054 | 12,242 | 12,383 | 4,399 | 31,820 | 698,896 |
| Harney | 171,485 | 126,412 | 28,369 | 176,855 | 4,841 | 5,484 | 13,921 | 0 | 106,412 | 87,806 | 721,586 |
| Hood River | 1,106,465 | 590,204 | 703,220 | 450,853 | 69,113 | 11,021 | 106,665 | 119,360 | 19,994 | 122,791 | 3,299,684 |
| Jackson | 12,682,582 | 4,139,367 | 4,291,273 | 1,608,915 | 803,339 | 14,975 | 520,351 | 335,270 | 230,127 | 1,128,648 | 25,754,848 |
| Jefferson | 778,923 | 222,588 | 145,591 | 224,065 | 24,901 | 32,066 | 43,692 | 58,154 | 247,177 | 602,966 | 2,380,122 |
| Josephine | 2,819,714 | 1,120,589 | 3,635,405 | 1,087,451 | 209,810 | 53,382 | 141,318 | 62,481 | 101,514 | 343,142 | 9,574,80 |
| Klamath | 2,471,273 | 1,079,036 | 1,430,003 | 447,456 | 103,675 | 94,160 | 156,239 | 0 | 96,777 | 1,120,236 | 6,998,856 |
| Lake | 165,412 | 72,351 | 143,962 | 271,391 | 0 | 29,776 | 12,522 | 11,787 | 5,219 | 130,659 | 843,079 |
| Lane | 20,925,930 | 6,890,016 | 5,641,955 | 2,090,884 | 2,417,143 | 8,073 | 871,012 | 1,068,442 | 403,286 | 1,209,782 | 41,526,522 |
| Lincoln | 6,317,074 | 1,205,586 | 516,517 | 494,457 | 154,068 | 196,843 | 118,640 | 215,981 | 98,556 | 366,588 | 9,684,309 |
| Linn | 4,760,923 | 2,175,667 | 1,848,678 | 1,793,321 | 539,308 | 44,570 | 412,352 | 637,122 | 171,066 | 640,063 | 13,023,072 |
| Malheur | 537,181 | 415,653 | 331,402 | 572,356 | 27,372 | 39,960 | 55,317 | 162,936 | 63,772 | 518,421 | 2,724,370 |
| Marion | 15,584,747 | 5,478,233 | 3,416,999 | 2,080,525 | 1,895,259 | 495,881 | 751,329 | 400,655 | 308,164 | 1,346,848 | 31,758,64 |
| Morrow | 236,357 | 987,882 | 146,185 | 574,551 | 34,015 | 40,524 | 883,293 | 405,916 | 24,159 | 630,646 | 3,963,52 |
| Multnomah | 58,482,393 | 20,727,496 | 528,334 | 561,161 | 8,575,788 | 33,284 | 3,933,793 | 2,296,039 | 148,555 | 4,858,295 | 100,145,13 |
| Polk | 4,500,931 | 589,812 | 657,553 | 1,099,360 | 390,720 | 0 | 107,897 | 48,083 | 72,421 | 265,644 | 7,732,42 |
| Sherman | 27,833 | 45,428 | 9,769 | 125,630 | 0 | 8,845 | 10,404 | 0 | 18,798 | 1,062,726 | 1,309,43 |
| Tillamook | 4,216,107 | 476,635 | 678,158 | 427,273 | 31,060 | 38,956 | 59,770 | 158,809 | 20,377 | 189,040 | 6,296,18 |
| Umatilla | 2,328,062 | 1,327,753 | 857,897 | 933,770 | 127,740 | 93,829 | 554,190 | 284,474 | 56,092 | 1,175,587 | 7,739,39 |
| Union | 901,231 | 365,940 | 264,443 | 517,286 | 44,331 | 8,582 | 44,846 | 0 | 13,462 | 288,336 | 2,448,45 |
| Wallowa | 247,832 | 85,186 | 158,499 | 273,490 | 5,695 | 128,895 | 11,527 | 1,230 | 14,487 | 106,584 | 1,033,42 |
| Wasco | 1,085,207 | 464,622 | 206,803 | 350,946 | 75,246 | 67,543 | 251,930 | 130,164 | 298,878 | 423,535 | 3,354,87 |
| Washington | 47,866,670 | 15,856,502 | 1,500,363 | 2,530,158 | 4,939,537 | 0 | 3,528,166 | 3,327,550 | 123,644 | 2,946,687 | 82,619,27 |
| Wheeler | 23,568 | 5,068 | 22,642 | 93,381 | 0 | 2,409 | 632 | 0,027,000 | 25,306 | 21,532 | 194,53 |
| Yamhill | 5,088,570 | 1,586,142 | 1,419,501 | 1,856,325 | 271,144 | 122,551 | 298,658 | 340,842 | 145,753 | 428,803 | 11,558,28 |
| Unallocated Utilities | 0,000,0.1 | 1,000, 11_ | 1, 110,00 | 1,000,122 | 2.,,, | 122,00 | 200,011 | 0.0,0.2 | , .0, | 20,627 | 20,62 |
| Jnallocated Uthities | | | | | | | 16,062,135 | 12,840,141 | 3.983.751 | 20,021 | 527,139,68 |

Unallocated properties are small, privately owned railcar companies that pay property taxes to the state which are then distributed back to county governments.

* The reporting of machinery and equipment is not consistent across counties. In some cases machinery and equipment is not reported seperately from accounts in other property classes.

Table 1.2 Measure 5 Value (M5V) and Total Assessed Value (AV) of Taxable Property FY 2023-24 by County and Type of Property (Thousands of Dollars)

| | Real | Property | Persona | I Property | Manufacture | ed Structures | Centrally-Asses | ssed (Utilities) | То | tal |
|------------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------|-------------|
| County | M5V* | AV | M5V* | AV | M5V* | AV | M5V* | AV | M5V* | AV |
| Baker | 2,493,456 | 1,402,510 | 47,188 | 47,188 | 6,942 | 6,034 | 719,352 | 512,148 | 3,266,939 | 1,967,881 |
| Benton | 19,509,081 | 10,173,640 | 226,886 | 226,886 | 116,397 | 66,675 | 353,774 | 309,744 | 20,206,138 | 10,776,944 |
| Clackamas | 113,493,941 | 60,013,663 | 1,178,780 | 1,178,780 | 469,347 | 270,721 | 2,211,879 | 2,130,094 | 117,353,947 | 63,593,258 |
| Clatsop | 15,771,440 | 7,544,865 | 187,081 | 186,507 | 54,526 | 31,472 | 292,251 | 282,949 | 16,305,298 | 8,045,793 |
| Columbia | 10,346,776 | 5,595,395 | 94,723 | 94,701 | 111,694 | 51,002 | 1,142,577 | 900,409 | 11,695,770 | 6,641,508 |
| Coos | 12,888,067 | 6,177,501 | 130,603 | 130,603 | 188,280 | 100,841 | 278,348 | 273,492 | 13,485,298 | 6,682,437 |
| Crook | 6,671,600 | 2,809,799 | 72,492 | 72,492 | 48,977 | 17,459 | 228,415 | 228,015 | 7,021,484 | 3,127,765 |
| Curry | 5,981,131 | 3,608,013 | 38,892 | 38,892 | 189,124 | 115,433 | 61,613 | 59,912 | 6,270,759 | 3,822,250 |
| Deschutes | 78,447,316 | 30,364,934 | 890,105 | 890,105 | 237,810 | 95,659 | 919,209 | 852,663 | 80,494,440 | 32,203,361 |
| Douglas | 16,469,530 | 10,263,274 | 260,743 | 260,082 | 247,193 | 183,788 | 1,031,520 | 1,025,293 | 18,008,985 | 11,732,438 |
| Gilliam | 557,158 | 392,919 | 35,191 | 35,191 | 978 | 813 | 818,431 | 710,962 | 1,411,759 | 1,139,886 |
| Grant | 1,048,717 | 650,435 | 12,242 | 12,242 | 5,962 | 4,399 | 31,845 | 31,820 | 1,098,766 | 698,896 |
| Harney | 1,061,684 | 613,136 | 13,934 | 13,921 | 8,020 | 6,723 | 137,614 | 87,806 | 1,221,252 | 721,586 |
| Hood River | 6,660,786 | 3,050,235 | 106,665 | 106,665 | 22,506 | 19,994 | 197,601 | 122,791 | 6,987,558 | 3,299,684 |
| Jackson | 42,305,607 | 23,875,722 | 521,351 | 520,351 | 615,311 | 230,127 | 1,148,640 | 1,128,648 | 44,590,909 | 25,754,848 |
| Jefferson | 4,766,815 | 1,724,003 | 43,694 | 43,692 | 14,290 | 9,461 | 660,400 | 602,966 | 5,485,198 | 2,380,122 |
| Josephine | 15,159,975 | 8,988,832 | 141,331 | 141,318 | 169,627 | 101,514 | 344,931 | 343,142 | 15,815,864 | 9,574,807 |
| Klamath | 12,396,095 | 5,629,502 | 156,833 | 156,239 | 263,295 | 96,777 | 1,368,485 | 1,120,236 | 14,184,709 | 7,002,754 |
| Lake | 1,176,754 | 694,679 | 12,522 | 12,522 | 5,306 | 5,219 | 250,914 | 130,659 | 1,445,496 | 843,079 |
| Lane | 80,671,463 | 39,042,443 | 883,901 | 871,012 | 873,854 | 403,286 | 1,447,921 | 1,209,782 | 83,877,140 | 41,526,522 |
| Lincoln | 17,251,936 | 9,080,963 | 119,239 | 118,640 | 258,237 | 118,058 | 377,268 | 366,588 | 18,006,680 | 9,684,249 |
| Linn | 22,486,840 | 11,799,590 | 412,352 | 412,352 | 371,081 | 171,066 | 708,276 | 640,063 | 23,978,550 | 13,023,072 |
| Malheur | 3,781,048 | 2,086,860 | 55,318 | 55,317 | 85,875 | 63,772 | 570,867 | 518,421 | 4,493,108 | 2,724,370 |
| Marion | 55,060,115 | 29,352,299 | 751,329 | 751,329 | 589,675 | 308,164 | 1,448,148 | 1,346,848 | 57,849,267 | 31,758,641 |
| Morrow | 3,287,440 | 2,425,429 | 4,064,593 | 883,293 | 41,987 | 24,159 | 716,101 | 630,646 | 8,110,121 | 3,963,527 |
| Multnomah | 200,308,363 | 91,025,509 | 4,389,325 | 4,196,745 | 254,704 | 64,588 | 5,452,735 | 4,858,295 | 210,405,126 | 100,145,137 |
| Polk | 14,325,895 | 7,286,460 | 107,897 | 107,897 | 148,426 | 72,421 | 284,854 | 265,644 | 14,867,072 | 7,732,422 |
| Sherman | 457,030 | 217,504 | 10,605 | 10,404 | 31,321 | 18,798 | 1,110,925 | 1,062,726 | 1,609,881 | 1,309,433 |
| Tillamook | 11,969,112 | 6,026,999 | 59,770 | 59,770 | 26,768 | 20,377 | 189,809 | 189,040 | 12,245,459 | 6,296,186 |
| Umatilla | 11,075,718 | 5,953,524 | 555,090 | 554,190 | 66,551 | 56,092 | 1,868,752 | 1,175,587 | 13,566,112 | 7,739,393 |
| Union | 3,588,239 | 2,105,908 | 44,900 | 44,846 | 20,527 | 13,462 | 462,661 | 284,240 | 4,116,328 | 2,448,455 |
| Wallowa | 2,095,030 | 899,631 | 11,527 | 11,527 | 29,578 | 14,487 | 106,633 | 106,584 | 2,242,768 | 1,032,228 |
| Wasco | 4,844,432 | 2,378,937 | 251,936 | 251,930 | 550,774 | 298,878 | 610,675 | 423,535 | 6,257,817 | 3,353,280 |
| Washington | 145,180,591 | 76,020,780 | 3,528,625 | 3,528,166 | 279,911 | 123,644 | 3,143,049 | 2,946,687 | 152,132,176 | 82,619,276 |
| Wheeler | 341,284 | 171,339 | 632 | 632 | 1,262 | 1,034 | 21,622 | 21,532 | 364,800 | 194,538 |
| Yamhill | 21,642,045 | 10,685,074 | 299,458 | 298,658 | 361,770 | 145,753 | 455,486 | 428,803 | 22,758,758 | 11,558,287 |
| Total | 965,572,510 | 480,132,306 | 19,717,754 | 16,325,087 | 6,767,886 | 3,332,150 | 31,173,581 | 27,328,769 | 1,023,231,730 | 527,118,311 |

Notes: Value totals may differ slightly from values reported elsewhere due to differences in data sources.

^{*} Measure 5 Value (M5V) is the property value to which Measure 5 tax rate limits are applied. For properties that are not partially exempt or specially assessed, Measure 5 value is equal to Real Market Value (RMV). Previous editions of this report have reported the M5V as the RMV, but the description has been changed to more clearly indicate what values are being reported.

Table 1.3 Total Assessed Value of Centrally Assessed Property FY 2023-24 by County and Type of Utility Property (Thousands of Dollars)

| | Air | | | | | | Private Rail | Rail | Water | |
|--|----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| County | Transportation | Communication | Electric | Gas | Pipeline Gas | Pipeline Oil | Cars | Transportation | Transportation | Total Utilities |
| Baker | 17 | 103,384 | 286,891 | 8,542 | 25,379 | 4,416 | 10,426 | 72,818 | 0 | 511,87 |
| Benton | 842 | 129,685 | 94,439 | 51,853 | 0 | 0 | 13,425 | | | 309,57 |
| Clackamas | 0 | 534,259 | 1,265,684 | 290,728 | 21,061 | 695 | 7,638 | | 1,472 | |
| Clatsop | 621 | 95,092 | 106,880 | 50,998 | 0 | 0 | 3,668 | 7,780 | 17,713 | 282,75 |
| Columbia | 0 | 64,423 | 702,835 | 323,366 | 481 | 0 | 6,212 | 13,181 | 15,887 | 1,126,38 |
| Coos | 8,502 | 147,854 | 86,803 | 30,026 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 293 | 273,47 |
| Crook | 0 | 39,140 | 238,885 | 4,961 | 6,199 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 289,18 |
| Curry | 234 | 54,162 | 4,643 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,460 | 60,49 |
| Deschutes | 85,369 | 306,321 | 221,290 | 82,979 | 72,793 | 0 | 15,233 | 35,146 | 0 | 819,13 |
| Douglas | 283 | 277,862 | 607,817 | 69,707 | 11,904 | 0 | 10,158 | 46,850 | 0 | 1,024,58 |
| Gilliam | 0 | 15,285 | 2,331,858 | 0 | 23,774 | 0 | 6,665 | 38,642 | 1,535 | 2,417,75 |
| Grant | 0 | 30,472 | 4,075 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34,54 |
| Harney | 0 | 33,394 | 103,867 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 137,26 |
| Hood River | 28 | 37,830 | 25,978 | 16,973 | 75 | 0 | 3,520 | 29,816 | 8,238 | 122,45 |
| Jackson | 79,805 | 316,798 | 510,027 | 198,824 | 5,103 | 0 | 6,144 | 28,850 | 0 | 1,145,55 |
| Jefferson | 0 | 47,760 | 491,302 | 6,364 | 41,043 | 0 | 10,243 | 24,986 | 0 | 621,69 |
| Josephine | 115 | | 168,614 | 39,206 | 2,569 | 0 | 3,283 | | | 343,07 |
| Klamath | 689 | 183,767 | 610,013 | 69,347 | 182,388 | 0 | 45,744 | 99,523 | 375 | , - ,- |
| Lake | 0 | , | 180,560 | 0 | 29,122 | 0 | 0 | | | 200,20 |
| Lane | 107,460 | 572,243 | 248,244 | 147,817 | 9,897 | 15,130 | 37,263 | | | 1,200,12 |
| Lincoln | 751 | 113,942 | 155,003 | 81,628 | 0 | 0 | 6,638 | | | 000,00 |
| Linn | 0 | -, | 226,512 | 96,434 | 22,569 | 8,421 | 26,756 | | | 000,22 |
| Malheur | 0 | , | 418,320 | 10,956 | 6,529 | 2,405 | 3,600 | | | 518,30 |
| Marion | 711 | 444,396 | 603,835 | 225,412 | 16,104 | 8,907 | 19,106 | | | ,- , |
| Morrow | 0 | -, | 1,681,554 | 3,100 | 76,746 | 0 | 4,315 | | | |
| Multnomah | 1,276,438 | 1,322,535 | 1,575,327 | 214,765 | 10,893 | 44,444 | 45,689 | | | |
| Polk | 0 | , | 98,523 | 96,352 | 0 | 0 | 6,732 | | | 269,75 |
| Sherman | 0 | , | 1,407,957 | 0 | 66,872 | 0 | 2,570 | | | 1,520,15 |
| Tillamook | 321 | 83,546 | 105,046 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 100,01 |
| Umatilla | 2,049 | 160,426 | 713,253 | 28,133 | 58,887 | 7,348 | 27,906 | | , | |
| Union | 731 | 54,767 | 109,619 | 28,381 | 14,153 | 4,321 | 9,502 | | | 284,18 |
| Wallowa | 0 | - / - | 95,984 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | , |
| Wasco | 0 | , - | 165,412 | 14,087 | 17,215 | 0 | 26,779 | | | |
| Washington | 1,305 | 1,218,729 | 1,216,098 | 486,335 | 0 | 2,952 | 12,166 | , | 0 | 2,000,01 |
| Wheeler | 0 | | 111 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 21,10 |
| Yamhill | 7 | 119,104 | 228,325 | 62,291 | 0 | 0 | 9,659 | 12,487 | 0 | 431,87 |
| Total | 1,566,279 | 7,200,370 | 17,091,587 | 2,739,600 | 721,755 | 99,039 | 381,038 | 1,317,627 | 251,815 | 31,369,11 |
| Unallocated Utilities Statewide Total | 0 1,566,279 | 0 7,200,370 | 0 17,091,587 | 0 2,739,600 | 0 721,755 | 99.039 | 20,627 401,665 | | | |

Notes: Unallocated properties are small, privately owned railcar companies that pay property taxes to the state which are then distributed to counties. Utility values reported in this table include property value that may be partially or fully exempt leading to discrepancies with other tables.

| | Total | | | Urban | |
|-----------------|-------------|------------|----------|--------------|-------------|
| | Assessed | Non-Profit | Fish & | Renewal | Net Assesse |
| County | Value | Housing | Wildlife | Excess Value | |
| Baker | 1,967,881 | 0 | 308 | 0 | 1,968,18 |
| Benton | 10,776,944 | 0 | 0 | 82,267 | 10,694,67 |
| Clackamas | 63,593,258 | 1,519 | 0 | 2,368,055 | 61,226,7 |
| Clatsop | 8,045,793 | 0 | 672 | 186,631 | 7,859,83 |
| Columbia | 6,641,508 | 684 | 3,017 | 196,047 | 6,449,10 |
| Coos | 6,682,437 | 0 | 0 | 362,547 | 6,319,89 |
| Crook | 3,127,765 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,127,7 |
| Curry | 3,822,250 | 868 | 4 | 98,535 | 3,724,58 |
| Deschutes | 32,203,361 | 0 | 0 | 577,131 | 31,626,23 |
| Douglas | 11,732,438 | 10,972 | 0 | 147,595 | 11,595,8 |
| Gilliam | 1,139,886 | 3,034 | 0 | 0 | 1,142,9 |
| Grant | 698,896 | 0 | 565 | 6,710 | 692,7 |
| Harney | 721,586 | 0 | 0 | 3,556 | 718,0 |
| Hood River | 3,299,684 | 0 | 0 | 152,224 | 3,147,4 |
| Jackson | 25,754,848 | 20,240 | 32 | 512,082 | 25,263,0 |
| Jefferson | 2,380,122 | 0 | 0 | 90,689 | 2,289,4 |
| Josephine | 9,574,807 | 2,574 | 0 | 206,104 | 9,371,2 |
| Klamath | 7,002,754 | 0 | 23 | 59,073 | 6,943,7 |
| Lake | 843,079 | 95 | 963 | 0 | 844,1 |
| Lane | 41,526,522 | 14,773 | 0 | 914,276 | 40,627,0 |
| Lincoln | 9,684,249 | 0 | 60 | 460,431 | 9,223,8 |
| Linn | 13,023,072 | 0 | 0 | 557,321 | 12,465,7 |
| Malheur | 2,724,370 | 1,119 | 288 | 0 | 2,725,7 |
| Marion | 31,758,641 | 0 | 0 | | 30,600,7 |
| Morrow | 3,963,527 | 0 | 6 | 11,542 | 3,951,9 |
| Multnomah | 100,145,137 | 36,280 | 1,292 | 3,707,869 | 96,474,8 |
| Polk | 7,732,422 | 0 | 0 | 299,370 | 7,433,0 |
| Sherman | 1,309,433 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 1,309,4 |
| Tillamook | 6,296,186 | 0 | 0 | 84,205 | 6,211,9 |
| Umatilla | 7,739,393 | 0 | 252 | 89,406 | 7,650,2 |
| Union | 2,448,455 | 0 | 1,432 | 52,837 | 2,397,0 |
| Wallowa | 1,032,228 | 0 | 1,197 | 0 | 1,033,4 |
| Wasco | 3,353,280 | 0 | 3,248 | 102,218 | 3,254,3 |
| Washington | 82,619,276 | 0 | 0 | 2,700,961 | 79,918,3 |
| Wheeler | 194,538 | 1,181 | 0 | 0 | 195,7 |
| Yamhill | 11,558,287 | 0 | 0 | 138,089 | 11,420,1 |
| Statewide Total | 527,118,311 | 93,339 | 13,394 | 15,325,620 | 511,899,42 |

Table 1.5 Measure 5 Value* of Property, Net Assessed Value of Property, Property Tax Imposed, and Average Tax Rate FY 2022-23 and 2023-24 by Type of Taxing District (Thousands of Dollars)

| | | | | | | | | | | Ave | rage Tax | Rate (\$/10 | 00) |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|-------|-------------|---------------|------|------------|---------------|-------|----------|----------|-------------|----------|
| | Measure | 5 Value (M5V) |)* | Net Assess | sed Value (NA | V) | Propert | y Tax Imposed | l | M5V E | Base* | NAV | Base |
| District Type | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-2024 | % CH | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-2024 | % CH | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-2024 | % CH | FY 22-23 | FY 23-24 | FY 22-23 | FY 23-24 |
| County | 964,640,744 | 1,023,199,780 | 6.1% | 485,240,039 | 511,899,423 | 5.5% | 1,455,482 | 1,551,967 | 6.6% | 1.51 | 1.52 | 3.00 | 3.03 |
| City | 648,899,196 | 685,095,503 | 5.6% | 315,004,464 | 333,349,808 | 5.8% | 1,797,327 | 1,905,058 | 6.0% | 2.77 | 2.78 | 5.71 | 5.71 |
| School | 964,485,704 | 1,022,895,947 | 6.1% | 485,190,879 | 511,782,165 | 5.5% | 3,411,361 | 3,597,819 | 5.5% | 3.54 | 3.52 | 7.03 | 7.03 |
| Education Service | 964,517,518 | 1,023,067,185 | 6.1% | 485,203,998 | 511,862,264 | 5.5% | 159,766 | 169,442 | 6.1% | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.33 | 0.33 |
| Community College | 949,327,559 | 1,006,457,426 | 6.0% | 476,025,508 | 501,790,616 | 5.4% | 339,640 | 349,915 | 3.0% | 0.36 | 0.35 | 0.71 | 0.70 |
| Cemetery | 53,403,615 | 58,818,602 | 10.1% | 29,939,898 | 31,278,841 | 4.5% | 3,733 | 3,908 | 4.7% | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.12 | 0.12 |
| Fire | 461,014,611 | 501,546,257 | 8.8% | 242,599,976 | 258,315,138 | 6.5% | 501,352 | 551,294 | 10.0% | 1.09 | 1.10 | 2.07 | 2.13 |
| Health | 176,415,422 | 197,280,210 | 11.8% | 87,071,471 | 92,136,244 | 5.8% | 49,351 | 52,465 | 6.3% | 0.28 | 0.27 | 0.57 | 0.57 |
| Park | 255,654,779 | 273,791,280 | 7.1% | 126,626,233 | 132,361,120 | 4.5% | 121,481 | 129,858 | 6.9% | 0.48 | 0.47 | 0.96 | 0.98 |
| Port | 550,304,296 | 576,234,434 | 4.7% | 270,567,510 | 286,760,808 | 6.0% | 26,115 | 27,479 | 5.2% | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.10 | 0.10 |
| Road | 67,536,623 | 71,600,324 | 6.0% | 34,507,798 | 36,478,687 | 5.7% | 14,719 | 15,671 | 6.5% | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.43 | 0.43 |
| Sanitary | 6,261,731 | 7,108,370 | 13.5% | 3,394,927 | 3,545,612 | 4.4% | 2,868 | 2,919 | 1.8% | 0.46 | 0.41 | 0.84 | 0.82 |
| Water Supply | 9,816,802 | 10,812,608 | 10.1% | 5,299,166 | 5,521,146 | 4.2% | 6,715 | 6,556 | -2.4% | 0.68 | 0.61 | 1.27 | 1.19 |
| Water Control | 611,223,286 | 636,874,155 | 4.2% | 301,612,151 | 318,998,513 | 5.8% | 23,796 | 26,020 | 9.3% | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.08 | 0.08 |
| Vector Control | 199,682,182 | 212,920,830 | 6.6% | 107,939,024 | 113,316,442 | 5.0% | 8,225 | 8,603 | 4.6% | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.08 | 0.08 |
| Service | 827,052,511 | 855,779,286 | 3.5% | 413,030,544 | 426,770,620 | 3.3% | 148,856 | 157,827 | 6.0% | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.36 | 0.37 |
| Other | 716,533,569 | 757,288,893 | 5.7% | 352,470,724 | 372,396,413 | 5.7% | 320,144 | 350,413 | 9.5% | 0.45 | 0.46 | 0.91 | 0.94 |
| Statewide Total | 964,668,720 | 1,023,231,730 | 6.1% | 485,240,045 | 511,899,423 | 5.5% | 8,390,930 | 8,907,214 | 6.2% | 8.7 | 8.7 | 17.29 | 17.4 |

Notes: Not all taxing districts impose tax each year; this table only includes districts that imposed tax in the specified year.

⁻ The category "Other" includes taxing districts such as library, transit, and public utility districts.

⁻ Tax rates are applied to net assessed value. It includes nonprofit housing value and state fish and wildlife value and excludes urban renewal excess value.

⁻ Property taxes imposed excludes special assessments and taxes allocated to urban renewal agencies.

⁻ Previous editions of this report have reported the M5V as the RMV, but the description has been changed to more clearly indicate what values are being reported. Measure 5 Value (M5V) is the property value to which Measure 5 tax rate limits are applied. For properties that are not partially exempt or specially assessed, Measure 5 value is equal to Real Market Value (RMV).

Table 1.6 Measure 5 Value of Taxable Property, Net Assessed Value of Property, Property Tax Imposed, and Average Tax Rate FY 2022-23 and 2023-24 by County (Thousands of Dollars)

| | | | | | | | | | | | _ | Rate (\$/10 | • |
|-----------------|-------------|---------------|-------|--------------|--------------|--------|-------------|--------------|-------|------------|---------|-------------|----------|
| | Measure 5 V | ٠, , | | Net Assessed | , , | | Property Ta | • | | M5V B | | NAV | |
| County | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-2024 | % CH | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-2024 | % CH | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-2024 | % CH | FY 22-23 F | Y 23-24 | FY 22-23 | FY 23-24 |
| Baker | 3,030,789 | 3,266,939 | 7.8% | 1,952,889 | 1,968,189 | 0.8% | 26,670 | 27,208 | 2.0% | 8.80 | 8.33 | 13.66 | 13.82 |
| Benton | 18,551,250 | 20,206,138 | 8.9% | 10,291,784 | 10,694,677 | 3.9% | 183,117 | 190,109 | 3.8% | 9.87 | 9.41 | 17.79 | 17.78 |
| Clackamas | 110,643,407 | 117,353,947 | 6.1% | 58,117,240 | 61,226,722 | 5.4% | 1,019,588 | 1,088,658 | 6.8% | 9.22 | 9.28 | 17.54 | 17.78 |
| Clatsop | 14,527,101 | 16,305,298 | 12.2% | 7,242,725 | 7,859,834 | 8.5% | 100,345 | 107,715 | 7.3% | 6.91 | 6.61 | 13.85 | 13.70 |
| Columbia | 11,350,840 | 11,695,770 | 3.0% | 6,263,677 | 6,449,162 | 3.0% | 89,615 | 94,040 | 4.9% | 7.89 | 8.04 | 14.31 | 14.58 |
| Coos | 11,661,020 | 13,485,298 | 15.6% | 6,122,019 | 6,319,890 | 3.2% | 79,328 | 80,411 | 1.4% | 6.80 | 5.96 | 12.96 | 12.72 |
| Crook | 6,141,512 | 7,021,484 | 14.3% | 2,865,835 | 3,127,765 | 9.1% | 38,605 | 42,080 | 9.0% | 6.29 | 5.99 | 13.47 | 13.45 |
| Curry | 5,861,408 | 6,270,759 | 7.0% | 3,574,043 | 3,724,587 | 4.2% | 29,586 | 31,407 | 6.2% | 5.05 | 5.01 | 8.28 | 8.43 |
| Deschutes | 73,168,841 | 80,494,440 | 10.0% | 29,951,563 | 31,626,230 | 5.6% | 473,681 | 511,443 | 8.0% | 6.47 | 6.35 | 15.81 | 16.17 |
| Douglas | 16,691,462 | 18,008,985 | 7.9% | 11,102,367 | 11,595,814 | 4.4% | 121,535 | 127,153 | 4.6% | 7.28 | 7.06 | 10.95 | 10.97 |
| Gilliam | 1,334,714 | 1,411,759 | 5.8% | 1,090,308 | 1,142,920 | 4.8% | 12,525 | 13,132 | 4.9% | 9.38 | 9.30 | 11.49 | 11.49 |
| Grant | 1,007,886 | 1,098,766 | 9.0% | 671,097 | 692,752 | 3.2% | 8,742 | 9,027 | 3.3% | 8.67 | 8.22 | 13.03 | 13.03 |
| Harney | 1,163,586 | 1,221,252 | 5.0% | 691,559 | 718,030 | 3.8% | 9,716 | 10,185 | 4.8% | 8.35 | 8.34 | 14.05 | 14.18 |
| Hood River | 6,580,515 | 6,987,558 | 6.2% | 3,046,758 | 3,147,460 | 3.3% | 42,965 | 44,114 | 2.7% | 6.53 | 6.31 | 14.10 | 14.02 |
| Jackson | 43,792,677 | 44,590,909 | 1.8% | 24,207,562 | 25,263,038 | 4.4% | 343,469 | 357,180 | 4.0% | 7.84 | 8.01 | 14.19 | 14.14 |
| Jefferson | 4,785,558 | 5,485,198 | 14.6% | 2,072,516 | 2,289,433 | 10.5% | 34,754 | 38,030 | 9.4% | 7.26 | 6.93 | 16.77 | 16.61 |
| Josephine | 15,027,063 | 15,815,864 | 5.2% | 9,048,307 | 9,371,276 | 3.6% | 86,860 | 89,250 | 2.8% | 5.78 | 5.64 | 9.60 | 9.52 |
| Klamath | 11,848,003 | 14,184,709 | 19.7% | 6,607,136 | 6,943,704 | 5.1% | 79,921 | 83,907 | 5.0% | 6.75 | 5.92 | 12.10 | 12.08 |
| Lake | 1,400,879 | 1,445,496 | 3.2% | 889,223 | 844,136 | -5.1% | 11,847 | 11,390 | -3.9% | 8.46 | 7.88 | 13.32 | 13.49 |
| Lane | 77,479,432 | 83,877,140 | 8.3% | 39,071,214 | 40,627,019 | 4.0% | 645,930 | 678,090 | 5.0% | 8.34 | 8.08 | 16.53 | 16.69 |
| Lincoln | 15,539,649 | 18,006,680 | 15.9% | 8,882,172 | 9,223,878 | 3.8% | 134,152 | 139,807 | 4.2% | 8.63 | 7.76 | 15.10 | 15.16 |
| Linn | 22,348,424 | 23,978,550 | 7.3% | 11,869,682 | 12,465,751 | 5.0% | 204,738 | 213,361 | 4.2% | 9.16 | 8.90 | 17.25 | 17.12 |
| Malheur | 3,827,780 | 4,493,108 | 17.4% | 2,593,363 | 2,725,777 | 5.1% | 34,689 | 36,339 | 4.8% | 9.06 | 8.09 | 13.38 | 13.33 |
| Marion | 55,191,679 | 57,849,267 | 4.8% | 29,256,503 | 30,600,790 | 4.6% | 494,954 | 518,019 | 4.7% | 8.97 | 8.95 | 16.92 | 16.93 |
| Morrow | 6,982,481 | 8,110,121 | 16.1% | 3,759,690 | 3,951,991 | 5.1% | 53,359 | 57,127 | 7.1% | 7.64 | 7.04 | 14.19 | 14.46 |
| Multnomah | 208,773,182 | 210,405,126 | 0.8% | 89,180,859 | 96,474,841 | 8.2% | 2,122,290 | 2,273,853 | 7.1% | 10.17 | 10.81 | 23.80 | 23.57 |
| Polk | 13,706,633 | 14,867,072 | 8.5% | 7,147,899 | 7,433,052 | 4.0% | 110,830 | 117,504 | 6.0% | 8.09 | 7.90 | 15.51 | 15.81 |
| Sherman | 811,317 | 1,609,881 | 98.4% | 644,850 | 1,309,467 | 103.1% | 10,117 | 20,092 | 98.6% | 12.47 | 12.48 | 15.69 | 15.34 |
| Tillamook | 10,837,440 | 12,245,459 | 13.0% | 5,955,887 | 6,211,981 | 4.3% | 67,272 | 71,514 | 6.3% | 6.21 | 5.84 | 11.30 | 11.51 |
| Umatilla | 11,848,484 | 13,566,112 | 14.5% | 7,387,993 | 7,650,239 | 3.5% | 119,027 | 124,729 | 4.8% | 10.05 | 9.19 | 16.11 | 16.30 |
| Union | 3,916,375 | 4,116,328 | 5.1% | 2,285,040 | 2,397,051 | 4.9% | 32,122 | 33,454 | 4.1% | 8.20 | 8.13 | 14.06 | 13.96 |
| Wallowa | 2,173,296 | 2,242,768 | 3.2% | 992,863 | 1,033,425 | 4.1% | 11,509 | 11,973 | 4.0% | 5.30 | 5.34 | 11.59 | 11.59 |
| Wasco | 5,831,739 | 6,257,817 | 7.3% | 3,087,616 | 3,254,310 | 5.4% | 48,735 | 50,711 | 4.1% | 8.36 | 8.10 | 15.78 | 15.58 |
| Washington | 145,221,596 | 152,132,176 | 4.8% | 76,267,089 | 79,918,315 | 4.8% | 1,346,169 | 1,432,200 | 6.4% | 9.27 | 9.41 | 17.65 | 17.92 |
| Wheeler | 330,263 | 364,800 | 10.5% | 182,490 | 195,718 | 7.2% | 3,074 | 3,314 | 7.8% | 9.31 | 9.08 | 16.85 | 16.93 |
| Yamhill | 21,280,443 | 22,758,758 | 6.9% | 10,866,229 | 11,420,199 | 5.1% | 159,093 | 168,684 | 6.0% | 7.48 | 7.41 | 14.64 | 14.77 |
| Statewide Total | 964,668,720 | 1,023,231,730 | 6.1% | 485,240,045 | 511,899,423 | 5.5% | 8,390,930 | 8,907,214 | 6.2% | 8.7 | 8.7 | 17.29 | 17.40 |

Notes: NAV includes nonprofit housing value and state fish and wildlife value and excludes urban renewal excess value.

Property taxes imposed excludes taxes allocated to urban renewal agencies and special assessments.

⁻ Measure 5 Value (M5V) is the property value to which Measure 5 tax rate limits are applied. For properties that are not partially exempt or specially assessed, Measure 5 value is equal to Real Market Value (RMV). Previous editions of this report have reported the M5V as the RMV, but the description has been changed to more clearly indicate what values are being reported.

Table 1.7 Summary of Assessed (AV) and Real Market Value (RMV) of Fully and Partially Exempt Property FY 2023-24 by County (Thousands of Dollars)

| | _ | | | | | | Busii | ness/Housin | • | | | |
|------------|---------|------------|-------------|---------|------------|------------|---------|-------------|------------|---------|------------|-------------|
| _ | | blic Exemp | | | Welfare Ex | - | | Exemption | | | Total | |
| County | # Accts | AV | RMV | # Accts | AV | RMV | # Accts | AV | RMV | # Accts | AV | RMV |
| Baker | 1,392 | 0 | 675,495 | 151 | 0 | 96,812 | 638 | 43,629 | 108,136 | 2,181 | 43,629 | 880,443 |
| Benton | 1,310 | 125,821 | 2,672,498 | 394 | 38,479 | 891,278 | 1,651 | 152,492 | 326,297 | 3,355 | 316,792 | 3,890,073 |
| Clackamas | 4,157 | 0 | 10,575,949 | 1,198 | 0 | 3,066,485 | 5,940 | 1,009,067 | 2,577,131 | 11,295 | 1,009,067 | 16,219,564 |
| Clatsop | 3,119 | 0 | 6,499,423 | 533 | 0 | 427,500 | 1,954 | 139,716 | 493,330 | 5,606 | 139,716 | 7,420,252 |
| Columbia | 895 | 0 | 249,845 | 1,367 | 0 | 569,573 | 1,407 | 191,999 | 595,221 | 3,669 | 191,999 | 1,414,639 |
| Coos | 2,353 | 0 | 2,811,648 | 309 | 27 | 128,384 | 2,521 | 239,848 | 585,748 | 5,183 | 239,875 | 3,525,780 |
| Crook | 822 | 681 | 795,877 | 106 | 1,365 | 148,162 | 886 | 88,151 | 4,551,127 | 1,814 | 90,197 | 5,495,167 |
| Curry | 1,899 | N/A | N/A | 165 | N/A | N/A | 1,356 | 111,288 | 223,874 | 3,420 | 111,288 | 223,874 |
| Deschutes | 2,776 | 0 | 1,975,274 | 400 | 162,490 | 854,397 | 5,487 | 747,319 | 1,913,796 | 8,663 | 909,809 | 4,743,467 |
| Douglas | 5,024 | 79 | 2,602,307 | 865 | 1,676 | 322,850 | 6,776 | 547,230 | 1,197,912 | 12,665 | 548,985 | 4,123,069 |
| Gilliam | 451 | 436 | 68,326 | 40 | 0 | 8,012 | 193 | 105,947 | 1,905,658 | 684 | 106,383 | 1,981,996 |
| Grant | 1,013 | 0 | 648,794 | 58 | 0 | 11,588 | 475 | 21,878 | 54,348 | 1,546 | 21,878 | 714,729 |
| Harney | 1,371 | 0 | 1,895,271 | 68 | 0 | 31,964 | 85 | 9,171 | 17,001 | 1,524 | 9,171 | 1,944,235 |
| Hood River | 676 | 0 | 1,048,716 | 109 | 0 | 463,318 | 2,193 | 64,855 | 231,641 | 2,978 | 64,855 | 1,743,675 |
| Jackson | 3,830 | 0 | 4,323,872 | 871 | 0 | 1,048,161 | 18,427 | 1,019,442 | 1,885,491 | 23,128 | 1,019,442 | 7,257,524 |
| Jefferson | 937 | 991 | 1,366,232 | 96 | 899 | 142,504 | 734 | 65,671 | 189,344 | 1,767 | 67,561 | 1,698,080 |
| Josephine | 2,022 | 560 | 1,031,855 | 381 | 35,104 | 373,260 | 5,642 | 734,738 | 1,431,744 | 8,045 | 770,402 | 2,836,859 |
| Klamath | 2,800 | 57 | 1,246,471 | 318 | 5 | 292,662 | 2,299 | 224,169 | 548,987 | 5,417 | 224,232 | 2,088,120 |
| Lake | 1,569 | 0 | 2,046,284 | 79 | 1,137 | 17,485 | 345 | 24,933 | 48,125 | 1,993 | 26,070 | 2,111,894 |
| Lane | 7,788 | 72,363 | 12,831,518 | 1,764 | 317,053 | 6,142,813 | 8,757 | 1,092,589 | 3,290,302 | 18,309 | 1,482,005 | 22,264,633 |
| Lincoln | 3,376 | 199 | 1,625,250 | 482 | 33 | 538,927 | 6,002 | 216,468 | 606,428 | 9,860 | 216,700 | 2,770,605 |
| Linn | 1,800 | 4,075 | 1,877,086 | 674 | 29,062 | 780,433 | 2,362 | 819,932 | 1,498,681 | 4,836 | 853,069 | 4,156,199 |
| Malheur | 2,240 | 0 | 2,943,613 | 162 | 0 | 282,657 | 529 | 31,901 | 80,953 | 2,931 | 31,901 | 3,307,223 |
| Marion | 2,790 | 62,098 | 6,767,700 | 1,252 | 168,292 | 3,686,840 | 11,861 | 1,150,460 | 3,601,299 | 15,903 | 1,380,850 | 14,055,839 |
| Morrow | 43 | 1,362 | 70,151 | 14 | 1.144 | 9,733 | 297 | 5.126.831 | 10,182,649 | 354 | 5,129,337 | 10,262,533 |
| Multnomah | 7,836 | 139,625 | 23,924,731 | 4,717 | 2,114,464 | | 12,204 | | 14,726,415 | 24,757 | 5,084,870 | 56,569,816 |
| Polk | 731 | 0 | 1,587,291 | 328 | 0 | 305,839 | 1.966 | 271,970 | 571,170 | 3,025 | 271,970 | 2,464,300 |
| Sherman | 311 | 0 | 20,858 | 35 | 0 | 2,319 | 41 | 64,680 | 510,962 | 387 | 64,680 | 534,139 |
| Tillamook | 2,135 | 0 | 1,578,409 | 300 | 0 | 285,098 | 1,404 | 247,649 | 468,595 | 3,839 | 247,649 | 2,332,102 |
| Umatilla | 2,434 | 0 | 2,727,113 | 428 | 0 | 462,746 | 1,089 | 205,491 | 4,415,672 | 3,951 | 205,491 | 7,605,531 |
| Union | 638 | 0 | 647,506 | 214 | 0 | 153,718 | 379 | 59,155 | 105,490 | 1,231 | 59,155 | 906,713 |
| Wallowa | 765 | 0 | 1,458,950 | 108 | 0 | 36,387 | 348 | 17,222 | 53,974 | 1,221 | 17,222 | 1,549,311 |
| Wasco | 1,070 | 8,276 | 307,264 | 164 | 4,911 | 168,664 | 1,517 | 82,216 | 2,001,521 | 2,751 | 95,403 | 2,477,449 |
| Washington | 4,653 | 186,281 | 8,608,675 | 1,834 | 865,458 | 6,240,757 | 19,865 | | 37,910,454 | 26,352 | 4,645,956 | 52,759,886 |
| Wheeler | 465 | 0 | 220,532 | 25 | 000,400 | 1,424 | 135 | 4,876 | 11,103 | 625 | 4,876 | 233,059 |
| Yamhill | 1,227 | 167 | 1,045,911 | 504 | 1,100 | 615,274 | 2,552 | 184,784 | 497,531 | 4,283 | 186,051 | 2,158,716 |
| | , | | 1,0-10,011 | | • | • | , | , | | , | , | |
| Total* | 78,718 | 603,069 | 110,776,693 | 20,513 | 3,742,699 | 46,526,690 | 130,317 | 21,542,769 | 99,418,111 | 229,548 | 25,888,537 | 256,721,494 |

Notes: N/A indicates that the county was unable to provide the data. Refer to glossary for explanation of categories.

AV refers to the assessed value of the taxable portion of the property listed on the roll. Fully exempt properties would have an AV equal to zero.

* Total values reported are not the statewide totals because not all counties reported data for all exemptions.

Table 1.8 Assessed Value (AV) and Real Market Value (RMV) of Specially Assessed Farmland and Forestland FY 2023-24 by County (Thousands of Dollars)

| | | Farm | ı Use | | | For | estland | | | Tota | al | |
|------------|---------|------------|-----------|------------|---------|-----------|-----------|------------|---------|------------|-----------|------------|
| County | # Accts | # Acres | AV | RMV | # Accts | # Acres | AV | RMV | # Accts | # Acres | AV | RMV |
| Baker | 4,065 | 851,236 | 92,397 | 1,068,340 | 576 | 39,899 | 2,591 | 71,645 | 4,641 | 891,136 | 94,988 | 1,139,985 |
| Benton | 3,462 | 100,368 | 86,583 | 837,155 | 3,621 | 175,682 | 83,137 | 687,559 | 7,083 | 276,050 | 169,720 | 1,524,714 |
| Clackamas | 9,346 | 122,525 | 117,675 | 3,860,823 | 8,607 | 237,672 | 108,414 | 2,966,339 | 17,953 | 360,197 | 226,090 | 6,827,162 |
| Clatsop | 346 | 13,630 | 4,720 | 167,024 | 1,531 | 288,069 | 164,824 | 539,909 | 1,877 | 301,699 | 169,544 | 706,933 |
| Columbia | 1,415 | 40,968 | 14,408 | 399,563 | 5,492 | 300,644 | 169,398 | 2,164,430 | 6,907 | 341,612 | 183,806 | 2,563,993 |
| Coos | 2,646 | 78,787 | 33,550 | 35,804 | 6,231 | 534,407 | 260,934 | 470,819 | 8,877 | 613,194 | 294,484 | 506,624 |
| Crook | 2,420 | 763,559 | 47,779 | 57,845 | 242 | 77,873 | 6,648 | 13,065 | 2,662 | 841,432 | 54,427 | 70,910 |
| Curry | 1,979 | 41,447 | 13,979 | N/A | 3,407 | 263,718 | 103,405 | N/A | 5,386 | 305,165 | 117,384 | N/A |
| Deschutes | 2,842 | 153,111 | 16,790 | 1,020,425 | 608 | 73,112 | 6,599 | 250,832 | 3,450 | 226,223 | 23,390 | 1,271,257 |
| Douglas | 7,387 | 264,630 | 79,038 | 821,339 | 10,553 | 1,072,798 | 433,443 | 1,056,376 | 17,940 | 1,337,428 | 512,481 | 1,877,715 |
| Gilliam | 1,238 | 673,136 | 105,997 | 187,741 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,238 | 673,136 | 105,997 | 187,741 |
| Grant | 2,250 | 926,823 | 41,646 | 1,079,619 | 779 | 127,436 | 10,182 | 199,233 | 3,029 | 1,054,259 | 51,828 | 1,278,852 |
| Harney | 4,501 | 1,525,002 | 116,255 | 1,035,550 | 48 | 7,468 | 480 | 7,867 | 4,549 | 1,532,470 | 116,734 | 1,043,417 |
| Hood River | 1,736 | 22,069 | 55,393 | 432,822 | 945 | 44,697 | 10,618 | 141,017 | 2,681 | 66,766 | 66,011 | 573,839 |
| Jackson | 4,823 | 187,051 | 38,603 | 1,539,728 | 5,307 | 441,267 | 94,684 | 764,538 | 10,130 | 628,317 | 133,287 | 2,304,266 |
| Jefferson | 1,931 | 424,581 | 64,791 | 1,146,968 | 79 | 79,248 | 6,986 | 88,883 | 2,010 | 503,829 | 71,777 | 1,235,851 |
| Josephine | 934 | 18,424 | 11,102 | 130,520 | 5,743 | 163,655 | 21,667 | 459,791 | 6,677 | 182,079 | 32,769 | 590,310 |
| Klamath | 6,216 | 589,553 | 107,493 | 549,375 | 1,752 | 634,858 | 59,091 | 397,436 | 7,968 | 1,224,411 | 166,584 | 946,811 |
| Lake | 3,558 | 788,395 | 114,464 | 1,003,879 | 615 | 289,558 | 25,227 | 136,082 | 4,173 | 1,077,953 | 139,691 | 1,139,961 |
| Lane | 6,261 | 152,333 | 89,992 | 1,392,679 | 11,311 | 799,708 | 365,987 | 1,973,597 | 17,572 | 952,041 | 455,980 | 3,366,276 |
| Lincoln | 933 | 13,430 | 4,393 | 106,751 | 4,432 | 335,350 | 206,844 | 830,335 | 5,365 | 348,780 | 211,236 | 937,087 |
| Linn | 6,846 | 347,907 | 287,131 | 3,063,779 | 4,097 | 454,033 | 203,747 | 856,336 | 10,943 | 801,940 | 490,878 | 3,920,115 |
| Malheur | 6,311 | 1,299,868 | 260,051 | 2,168,451 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6,311 | 1,299,868 | 260,051 | 2,168,451 |
| Marion | 9,487 | 264,700 | 325,430 | 2,927,849 | 2,008 | 47,112 | 18,192 | 433,011 | 11,495 | 311,812 | 343,622 | 3,360,860 |
| Morrow | 2,095 | 1,018,188 | 134,337 | 1,265,001 | 114 | 13,615 | 1,024 | 21,677 | 2,209 | 1,031,804 | 135,361 | 1,286,677 |
| Multnomah | 1,176 | 22,185 | 45,027 | 566,340 | 1,526 | 30,278 | 13,080 | 422,276 | 2,702 | 52,463 | 58,108 | 988,616 |
| Polk | 4,627 | 168,233 | 142,842 | 1,770,204 | 3,329 | 213,499 | 100,143 | 671,907 | 7,956 | 381,732 | 242,985 | 2,442,111 |
| Sherman | 1,612 | 401,952 | 91,869 | 204,107 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,612 | 401,952 | 91,869 | 204,107 |
| Tillamook | 1,280 | 30,321 | 30,839 | 237,057 | 1,964 | 183,438 | 98,255 | 314,634 | 3,244 | 213,759 | 129,094 | 551,691 |
| Umatilla | 8,357 | 1,341,249 | 408,709 | 2,369,671 | 611 | 70,820 | 6,389 | 65,138 | 8,968 | 1,412,069 | 415,097 | 2,434,809 |
| Union | 3,448 | 492,823 | 101,735 | 653,124 | 794 | 141,692 | 12,420 | 105,174 | 4,242 | 634,515 | 114,155 | 758,298 |
| Wallowa | 2,759 | 656,345 | 57,990 | 1,216,536 | 452 | 140,288 | 12,660 | 226,186 | 3,211 | 796,634 | 70,650 | 1,442,722 |
| Wasco | 2,973 | 758,796 | 147,014 | 828,181 | 923 | 158,849 | 4,560 | 53,643 | 3,896 | 917,645 | 151,573 | 881,824 |
| Washington | 5,021 | 108,679 | 105,751 | 1,550,696 | 4,817 | 163,241 | 79,775 | 979,752 | 9,838 | 271,920 | 185,526 | 2,530,448 |
| Wheeler | 1,003 | 566,977 | 28,773 | 562,054 | 358 | 186,258 | 13,128 | 194,194 | 1,361 | 753,235 | 41,901 | 756,249 |
| Yamhill | 5,805 | 172,102 | 107,427 | 2,647,079 | 4,350 | 155,646 | 72,894 | 1,199,048 | 10,155 | 327,748 | 180,321 | 3,846,127 |
| Total* | 133.089 | 15,401,384 | 3.531.973 | 38.904.081 | 97.222 | 7,945,886 | 2,777,426 | 18,762,728 | 230,311 | 23,347,270 | 6,309,399 | 57,666,809 |

Notes: "Forestland" includes designated forestland, highest and best use forestland, and small tract forestland.

N/A indicates that the county was unable to provide the data.

^{*} Total values reported are not the statewide totals because not all counties provided complete data.

Table 1.9 Assessed Value Reductions Resulting From Board of Property Value Appeals Board (PVAB) Actions FY 2022-23, By County

| | Accounts | | of Accounts | | in Assessed | Percent of Total Appealed | Reduction as Percent of | |
|------------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------|-------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|-------|
| County | Appealed | 11 (1) | | Adjusted | Value (\$) | | | |
| Baker | 11 | ,, | , | 0 | , | | | |
| Benton | 27 | , -, | | 3 | , | | | |
| Clackamas | 184 | , , | | 72 | 15,519,307 | | | |
| Clatsop | 5 | , , | | 1 | , | | | |
| Columbia | 9 | -, | | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Coos | 12 | | | 5 | ,, | | | |
| Crook | 6 | , | | 4 | , | | | |
| Curry | 9 | ,, | | 0 | | | | |
| Deschutes | 62 | | | 0 | | | | |
| Douglas | 72 | 8,424,728 | 4,430,363 | 33 | 3,994,365 | | | |
| Gilliam | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Grant | 0 | | ~ | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Harney | 2 | 483,250 | 483,250 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Hood River | 8 | 14,110,840 | | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Jackson | 30 | , , | 44,606,631 | 2 | , | | | |
| Jefferson | 5 | | | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Josephine | 26 | | 25,857,300 | 6 | 169,200 | | | |
| Klamath | 179 | 33,668,310 | 33,482,419 | 2 | 185,891 | 0.55% | 0.09% | 0.00% |
| Lake | 11 | 1,082,798 | 1,082,798 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Lane | 218 | 488,213,081 | 464,987,203 | 86 | 23,225,878 | | 10.94% | 0.06% |
| Lincoln | 38 | 72,700,000 | 72,258,710 | 10 | 441,290 | 0.61% | 0.21% | 0.00% |
| Linn | 33 | 139,707,272 | 80,368,082 | 7 | | | 27.94% | 0.48% |
| Malheur | 2 | | 2,297,898 | 0 | | | | |
| Marion | 87 | 184,772,440 | 179,996,970 | 10 | 4,775,470 | | | |
| Morrow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Multnomah | 535 | 2,907,738,040 | 2,820,026,422 | 188 | 87,711,618 | 3.02% | 41.30% | 0.09% |
| Polk | 1 | 1,486,240 | 1,400,000 | 1 | 86,240 | 5.80% | | |
| Sherman | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Tillamook | 9 | 1,986,550 | 1,911,730 | 4 | 74,820 | 3.77% | | |
| Umatilla | 30 | 50,725,560 | 45,164,490 | 3 | 5,561,070 | 10.96% | 2.62% | 0.07% |
| Union | 13 | | | 0 | | | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Wallowa | 2 | 157,110 | 0 | 1 | 157,110 | 100.00% | 0.07% | 0.02% |
| Wasco | 9 | 7,082,075 | 5,585,446 | 5 | 1,496,629 | 21.13% | 0.70% | 0.05% |
| Washington | 121 | 286,376,815 | | 24 | | | 3.32% | 0.01% |
| Wheeler | 1 | | | 0 | | | | |
| Yamhill | 8 | | | 1 | 334,736 | | | |
| Total* | 1,765 | 5,528,196,038 | 5,315,813,495 | 468 | 212,382,543 | 3.84% | 100% | 0.049 |

Notes: Number of Accounts does not include withdrawn petitions. PVAB formerly called the Board of Property Tax Appeals (BOPTA). *Total values are not statewide totals because of unavailable data.

Detailed Tables – Tax Authority & Tax Due Calculation

- Table 2.1 Tax Imposed by Category of Tax and County
- Table 2.2 Tax Imposed by Category of Tax and Type of District
- Table 2.3 Tax Extended, Imposed, and Compression Loss by County
- Table 2.4 Tax Extended, Imposed, and Compression Loss by Type of Taxing District
- Table 2.5 Tax Imposed and Compression Loss by County
- Table 2.6 Tax Imposed and Compression Loss by Type of Taxing District

Table 2.1 Tax Imposed from 2022-23 to 2023-24 by Category of Tax and County (Thousands of Dollars)

| by Calegory 0 | r ux unu o | ounty (Th | ououna | | -, | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|------------------|---------------|------------|---------------|------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------|------------|------------|--------|------------|------------|-------|
| | Permar | ent Authori | ty | Lo | cal Option | | Gap B | onds | | Bon | ds | | | Total | |
| County | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | % CH | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | % CH | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | % CH | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | % CH | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | % CH |
| Baker | 24,757 | 25,297 | 2.2% | 878 | 894 | 1.8% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 1,036 | 1,017 | -1.8% | 26,670 | 27,208 | 2.0% |
| Benton | 131,163 | 136,263 | 3.9% | 28,159 | 29,437 | 4.5% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 23,796 | 24,409 | 2.6% | 183,117 | 190,109 | 3.8% |
| Clackamas | 743,082 | 783,177 | 5.4% | 99,319 | 120,531 | 21.4% | 337 | 356 | 5.5% | 176,850 | 184,595 | 4.4% | 1,019,588 | 1,088,658 | 6.8% |
| Clatsop | 77,759 | 83,652 | 7.6% | 5,675 | 6,106 | 7.6% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 16,911 | 17,956 | 6.2% | 100,345 | 107,715 | 7.3% |
| Columbia | 67,933 | 69,953 | 3.0% | 10,200 | 12,504 | 22.6% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 11,482 | 11,583 | 0.9% | 89,615 | 94,040 | 4.9% |
| Coos | 70,436 | 72,725 | 3.2% | 2,177 | 2,271 | 4.3% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 6,715 | 5,415 | -19.4% | 79,328 | 80,411 | 1.4% |
| Crook | 35,893 | 39,230 | 9.3% | 197 | 25 | -87.3% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 2,515 | 2,825 | 12.3% | 38,605 | 42,080 | 9.0% |
| Curry | 28,247 | 29,466 | 4.3% | 333 | 352 | 5.7% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 1,006 | 1,590 | 58.0% | 29,586 | 31,407 | 6.2% |
| Deschutes | 382,885 | 413,932 | 8.1% | 11,698 | 13,735 | 17.4% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 79,099 | 83,776 | 5.9% | 473,681 | 511,443 | 8.0% |
| Douglas | 117,532 | 122,914 | 4.6% | 577 | 594 | 3.1% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 3,426 | 3,645 | 6.4% | 121,535 | 127,153 | 4.6% |
| Gilliam | 12,118 | 12,716 | 4.9% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 406 | 417 | 2.5% | 12,525 | 13,132 | 4.9% |
| Grant | 8,565 | 8,841 | 3.2% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 177 | 185 | 4.6% | 8,742 | 9,027 | 3.3% |
| Harney | 9,503 | 9,965 | 4.9% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 212 | 220 | 3.7% | 9,716 | 10,185 | 4.8% |
| Hood River | 30,689 | 31,716 | 3.3% | 6,068 | 6,384 | 5.2% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 6,208 | 6,015 | -3.1% | 42,965 | 44,114 | 2.7% |
| Jackson | 299,679 | 312,775 | 4.4% | 9,078 | 9,421 | 3.8% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 34,712 | 34,984 | 0.8% | 343,469 | 357,180 | 4.0% |
| Jefferson | 24,588 | 26,949 | 9.6% | 4,177 | 4,673 | 11.9% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 5,989 | 6,408 | 7.0% | 34,754 | 38,030 | 9.4% |
| Josephine | 69,102 | 71,098 | 2.9% | 17,066 | 17,672 | 3.5% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 692 | 480 | -30.6% | 86,860 | 89,250 | 2.8% |
| Klamath | 72,471 | 76,557 | 5.6% | 1,077 | 1,169 | 8.5% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 6,373 | 6,182 | -3.0% | 79,921 | 83,907 | 5.0% |
| Lake | 11,322 | 10,883 | -3.9% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 525 | 508 | -3.3% | 11,847 | 11,390 | -3.9% |
| Lane | 474,252 | 493,114 | 4.0% | 71,817 | 83,201 | 15.9% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 99,861 | 101,775 | 1.9% | 645,930 | 678,090 | 5.0% |
| Lincoln | 106,216 | 110,281 | 3.8% | 7,815 | 8,917 | 14.1% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 20,120 | 20,609 | 2.4% | 134,152 | 139,807 | 4.2% |
| Linn | 131,776 | 138,383 | 5.0% | 43,421 | 46,081 | 6.1% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 29,542 | 28,897 | -2.2% | 204,738 | 213,361 | 4.2% |
| Malheur | 32,325 | 33,901 | 4.9% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 2,364 | 2,438 | 3.1% | 34,689 | 36,339 | 4.8% |
| Marion | 389,550 | 407,442 | 4.6% | 8,185 | 8,567 | 4.7% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 97,219 | 102,010 | 4.9% | 494,954 | 518,019 | 4.7% |
| Morrow | 48,362 | 50,960 | 5.4% | 1,531 | 1,619 | 5.8% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 3,466 | 4,548 | 31.2% | 53,359 | 57,127 | 7.1% |
| Multnomah | 1,391,971 | 1,505,753 | 8.2% | 202,181 | 203,070 | 0.4% | 189,613 | 200,864 | 5.9% | 338,525 | 364,166 | 7.6% | 2,122,290 | 2,273,853 | 7.1% |
| Polk | 83,421 | 86,563 | 3.8% | 4,564 | 5,304 | 16.2% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 22,845 | 25,637 | 12.2% | 110,830 | 117,504 | 6.0% |
| Sherman | 10,105 | 20,078 | 98.7% | 13 | 14 | 7.7% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 10,117 | 20,092 | 98.6% |
| Tillamook | 52,094 | 54,337 | 4.3% | 6,030 | 6,782 | 12.5% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 9,148 | 10,396 | 13.6% | 67,272 | 71,514 | 6.3% |
| Umatilla | 97,929 | 102,170 | 4.3% | 375 | 445 | 18.5% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 20,723 | 22,114 | 6.7% | 119,027 | 124,729 | 4.8% |
| Union | 28,045 | 29,407 | 4.9% | 764 | 782 | 2.4% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 3,313 | 3,265 | -1.4% | 32,122 | 33,454 | 4.1% |
| Wallowa | 10,841 | 11,080 | 2.2% | 0 | 196 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 668 | 696 | 4.3% | 11,509 | 11,973 | 4.0% |
| Wasco | 45,746 | 47,922 | 4.8% | 248 | 293 | 17.9% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 2,741 | 2,496 | -8.9% | 48,735 | 50,711 | 4.1% |
| Washington | 898,985 | 948,127 | 5.5% | 191,981 | 212,659 | 10.8% | 482 | 501 | 3.9% | 254,721 | 270,914 | 6.4% | 1,346,169 | 1,432,200 | 6.4% |
| Wheeler | 3,001 | 3,240 | 8.0% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 74 | 74 | 0.3% | 3,074 | 3,314 | 7.8% |
| Yamhill | 126,500 | 135,504 | 7.1% | 2,940 | 3,095 | 5.3% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 29,653 | 30,085 | 1.5% | 159,093 | 168,684 | 6.0% |
| Statewide Total | 6,148,843 | 6,516,370 | 6.0% | 738,545 | 806,792 | 9.2% | 190,432 | 201,720 | 5.9% | 1,313,110 | 1,382,331 | 5.3% | 8,390,930 | 8,907,214 | 6.2% |
| Notes: Gap Bonds | refer to the Cit | y of Portland | pension le | evy. See Sect | ion IV (2) for r | more inform | nation on types | of levies. | | | | | | | |

Section V: Detailed Tables - Tax Authority and Tax Due Calculation

Table 2.2 Tax Imposed from FY 2022-23 and 2023-24 by Category of Tax and Type of District (Thousands of Dollars)

| | Perma | nent Authori | ty | Lo | cal Option | | Ga | p Bonds | | _ | Bonds | | | Total | |
|-------------------|------------|--------------|------|------------|------------|-------|------------|------------|------|------------|------------|--------|------------|------------|-------|
| District Type | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | % CH | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | % CH | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | % CH | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | % CH | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | % CH |
| County | 1,207,981 | 1,286,496 | 6.5% | 175,211 | 192,975 | 10.1% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 72,290 | 72,496 | 0.3% | 1,455,482 | 1,551,967 | 6.6% |
| City | 1,337,696 | 1,415,617 | 5.8% | 165,229 | 175,758 | 6.4% | 190,432 | 201,720 | 5.9% | 103,970 | 111,963 | 7.7% | 1,797,327 | 1,905,058 | 6.0% |
| School | 2,258,308 | 2,380,934 | 5.4% | 271,712 | 283,326 | 4.3% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 881,340 | 933,558 | 5.9% | 3,411,361 | 3,597,819 | 5.5% |
| Education Service | 159,766 | 169,442 | 6.1% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 159,766 | 169,442 | 6.1% |
| Community College | 220,513 | 231,763 | 5.1% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 119,127 | 118,152 | -0.8% | 339,640 | 349,915 | 3.0% |
| Cemetery | 3,663 | 3,837 | 4.8% | 69 | 71 | 1.7% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 3,733 | 3,908 | 4.7% |
| Fire | 403,745 | 431,228 | 6.8% | 74,537 | 96,464 | 29.4% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 23,070 | 23,602 | 2.3% | 501,352 | 551,294 | 10.0% |
| Health | 39,028 | 41,087 | 5.3% | 5,718 | 6,116 | 7.0% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 4,605 | 5,262 | 14.3% | 49,351 | 52,465 | 6.3% |
| Park | 104,508 | 109,439 | 4.7% | 1,680 | 1,812 | 7.9% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 15,293 | 18,606 | 21.7% | 121,481 | 129,858 | 6.9% |
| Port | 25,102 | 26,469 | 5.4% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 1,013 | 1,010 | -0.3% | 26,115 | 27,479 | 5.2% |
| Road | 14,489 | 15,430 | 6.5% | 222 | 233 | 5.0% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 8 | 8 | 0.0% | 14,719 | 15,671 | 6.5% |
| Sanitary | 1,469 | 1,523 | 3.7% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 1,399 | 1,396 | -0.2% | 2,868 | 2,919 | 1.8% |
| Water Supply | 3,266 | 3,376 | 3.4% | 1,409 | 1,455 | 3.2% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 2,040 | 1,726 | -15.4% | 6,715 | 6,556 | -2.4% |
| Water Control | 23,468 | 25,692 | 9.5% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 328 | 328 | 0.0% | 23,796 | 26,020 | 9.3% |
| Vector Control | 5,972 | 6,247 | 4.6% | 2,252 | 2,356 | 4.6% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 8,225 | 8,603 | 4.6% |
| Service | 50,586 | 52,909 | 4.6% | 19,927 | 20,775 | 4.3% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 78,343 | 84,143 | 7.4% | 148,856 | 157,827 | 6.0% |
| Other | 289,283 | 314,879 | 8.8% | 20,578 | 25,451 | 23.7% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 10,283 | 10,083 | -1.9% | 320,144 | 350,413 | 9.5% |
| Statewide Total | 6,148,843 | 6,516,370 | 6.0% | 738,545 | 806,792 | 9.2% | 190,432 | 201,720 | 5.9% | 1,313,110 | 1,382,331 | 5.3% | 8,390,930 | 8,907,214 | 6.2% |

Notes: This table does not include property taxes for urban renewal.

The category "Other" includes taxing districts such as library, transit, and public utility districts.

Gap Bonds refer to the City of Portland pension levy.

Table 2.3 Tax Extended, Tax Imposed, and Compression due to Measure 5 Rate Limits FY 2023-24 by County and Limit Category (Dollars)

| | | Tax Extended | | | Tax Imposed | | Compres \$ Reduction | sion % of Tax |
|-----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------------|------------------|
| County | Incido Limit | Outside Limit | Total | Incido Limit | Outside Limit | Total | S Reduction Due to Limit | |
| Baker | 26,996,831 | 1,017,038 | 28,013,869 | 26,190,638 | 1.017.038 | 27,207,676 | 806.193 | 3.0% |
| Benton | 167,867,140 | 24,408,611 | 192,275,751 | 165,700,196 | 24,408,611 | 190,108,807 | 2,166,944 | 1.3% |
| Clackamas | | | | | | | | 1.1% |
| | 914,250,627 | 184,595,272 | 1,098,845,900 | 904,063,149 | 184,595,272 | 1,088,658,422 | 10,187,478 | |
| Clatsop | 90,407,681 | 17,956,491 | 108,364,172 | 89,758,237 | 17,956,492 | 107,714,729 | 649,445 | 0.7% |
| Columbia | 83,095,156 | 11,583,221 | 94,678,377 | 82,456,936 | 11,583,221 | 94,040,156 | 638,242 | 0.8% |
| Coos | 75,269,060 | 5,415,060 | 80,684,119 | 74,996,300 | 5,415,059 | 80,411,359 | 272,778 | 0.4% |
| Crook | 39,473,932 | 2,824,997 | 42,298,929 | 39,254,692 | 2,824,999 | 42,079,691 | 219,247 | 0.6% |
| Curry | 29,823,374 | 1,589,869 | 31,413,244 | 29,817,524 | 1,589,870 | 31,407,395 | 5,859 | 0.0% |
| Deschutes | 428,847,621 | 83,776,496 | 512,624,116 | 427,666,444 | 83,776,498 | 511,442,942 | 1,181,270 | 0.3% |
| Douglas | 124,400,540 | 3,644,854 | 128,045,395 | 123,508,432 | 3,644,856 | 127,153,288 | 899,858 | 0.7% |
| Gilliam | 12,919,383 | 416,539 | 13,335,922 | 12,715,729 | 416,540 | 13,132,269 | 203,654 | 1.6% |
| Grant | 8,876,678 | 185,338 | 9,062,016 | 8,841,369 | 185,338 | 9,026,707 | 35,317 | 0.4% |
| Harney | 10,182,267 | 219,833 | 10,402,100 | 9,965,282 | 219,833 | 10,185,115 | 216,987 | 2.1% |
| Hood River | 38,941,634 | 6,014,520 | 44,956,155 | 38,099,966 | 6,014,520 | 44,114,487 | 841,690 | 2.2% |
| Jackson | 323,084,605 | 34,983,644 | 358,068,249 | 322,196,740 | 34,983,646 | 357,180,386 | 887,927 | 0.3% |
| Jefferson | 32,259,247 | 6,408,386 | 38,667,634 | 31,621,842 | 6,408,387 | 38,030,229 | 637,410 | 2.0% |
| Josephine | 88,831,092 | 480,221 | 89,311,313 | 88,769,571 | 480,222 | 89,249,793 | 61,542 | 0.1% |
| Klamath | 78,323,928 | 6,181,695 | 84,505,623 | 77,725,810 | 6,181,686 | 83,907,496 | 598,154 | 0.8% |
| Lake | 11,058,888 | 507,584 | 11,566,472 | 10,882,900 | 507,589 | 11,390,490 | 175,982 | 1.6% |
| Lane | 581,797,909 | 101,774,803 | 683,572,712 | 576,315,126 | 101,774,803 | 678,089,929 | 5,482,783 | 0.9% |
| Lincoln | 119,329,669 | 20,608,949 | 139,938,617 | 119,198,454 | 20,608,952 | 139,807,406 | 131,229 | 0.1% |
| Linn | 188,271,061 | 28,897,131 | 217,168,193 | 184,464,282 | 28,897,129 | 213,361,412 | 3,806,822 | 2.0% |
| Malheur | 34,360,926 | 2,438,331 | 36,799,258 | 33,900,654 | 2,438,331 | 36,338,985 | 460,263 | 1.3% |
| Marion | 418,063,457 | 102,010,388 | 520,073,845 | 416,008,670 | 102,010,395 | 518,019,065 | 2,054,849 | 0.5% |
| Morrow | 54,420,476 | 4,547,899 | 58,968,375 | 52,579,207 | 4,547,900 | 57,127,106 | 1,841,274 | 3.4% |
| Multnomah | 2,014,087,317 | 364,166,436 | 2,378,253,753 | 1,909,686,100 | 364,166,429 | 2,273,852,528 | 104,401,323 | 5.2% |
| Polk | 92,075,628 | 25,637,461 | 117,713,089 | 91,866,700 | 25,637,463 | 117,504,162 | 208,932 | 0.2% |
| Sherman | 20,987,113 | 0 | 20,987,113 | 20,091,878 | 0 | 20,091,878 | 895,235 | 4.3% |
| Tillamook | 61,271,612 | 10,395,618 | 71,667,230 | 61,118,529 | 10,395,623 | 71,514,152 | 153,101 | 0.3% |
| Umatilla | 105,467,736 | 22,113,636 | 127,581,372 | 102,615,216 | 22,113,637 | 124,728,853 | 2,852,532 | 2.7% |
| Union | 30,498,042 | 3,265,242 | 33,763,284 | 30,189,135 | 3,265,242 | 33,454,376 | 308,914 | 1.0% |
| Wallowa | 11,317,016 | 696,295 | 12,013,311 | 11,276,335 | 696,294 | 11,972,630 | 40,681 | 0.4% |
| Wasco | 49,756,521 | 2,496,359 | 52,252,879 | 48.214.682 | 2.496.359 | 50,711,041 | 1,541,839 | 3.1% |
| Washington | 1,170,900,017 | | 1,441,813,985 | 1,161,286,275 | 270,913,980 | 1,432,200,255 | 9,613,931 | 0.8% |
| Wheeler | 3,302,424 | 73,780 | 3,376,204 | 3,240,423 | 73,780 | 3,314,203 | 62,001 | 1.9% |
| Yamhill | 139,046,021 | 30,085,365 | 169,131,386 | 138,598,986 | 30,085,365 | 168,684,351 | 447,035 | 0.3% |
| Statewide Total | 7.679.862.630 | 1,382,331,330 | 9.062.193.961 | 7,524,882,408 | 1,382,331,360 | 8.907.213.768 | 154,988,722 | 2.0% |

Notes: Taxes in the "Outside Limit" category are not subject to Measure 5 limits.

Differences between "Outside Limit" tax extended and tax imposed is due to rounding done at the district level.

Difference between imposed and extended amounts are caused by compression and rounding done at the district level.

Urban renewal revenues are not included in this table.

Table 2.4 Tax Extended, Tax Imposed, and Compression due to Measure 5 Rate Limits FY 2023-24 by Type of Taxing District and Limit Category (Dollars)

| | | Tax Extended | | | Tax Imposed | | Compres | ssion |
|-------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------------|---------------|--------------|----------|
| | | | | | · | | \$ Reduction | |
| District Type | Inside Limit | Outside Limit | Total | Inside Limit | Outside Limit | Total | Due to Limit | Extended |
| County | 1,500,278,439 | 72,496,016 | 1,572,774,455 | 1,479,470,605 | 72,496,025 | 1,551,966,631 | 20,808,591 | 1.4% |
| City | 1,841,667,277 | 111,962,766 | 1,953,630,043 | 1,793,094,951 | 111,962,747 | 1,905,057,697 | 48,577,012 | 2.6% |
| School | 2,735,632,005 | 933,557,639 | 3,669,189,644 | 2,664,260,886 | 933,557,639 | 3,597,818,525 | 71,373,184 | 2.6% |
| Education Service | 171,534,708 | 0 | 171,534,708 | 169,442,206 | 0 | 169,442,206 | 2,092,799 | 1.2% |
| Community College | 233,937,348 | 118,151,795 | 352,089,143 | 231,763,280 | 118,151,823 | 349,915,103 | 2,174,319 | 0.9% |
| Cemetery | 3,934,942 | 0 | 3,934,942 | 3,907,845 | 0 | 3,907,845 | 27,106 | 0.7% |
| Fire | 529,616,016 | 23,601,555 | 553,217,571 | 527,692,551 | 23,601,559 | 551,294,110 | 1,923,660 | 0.4% |
| Health | 47,726,586 | 5,261,889 | 52,988,475 | 47,203,585 | 5,261,892 | 52,465,477 | 523,016 | 1.1% |
| Park | 111,458,343 | 18,606,279 | 130,064,622 | 111,251,704 | 18,606,280 | 129,857,984 | 206,652 | 0.2% |
| Port | 26,734,742 | 1,009,961 | 27,744,703 | 26,469,276 | 1,009,961 | 27,479,237 | 265,479 | 1.0% |
| Road | 15,665,200 | 7,998 | 15,673,198 | 15,663,291 | 7,999 | 15,671,289 | 1,910 | 0.0% |
| Sanitary | 1,522,764 | 1,395,954 | 2,918,718 | 1,522,571 | 1,395,954 | 2,918,525 | 193 | 0.0% |
| Water Supply | 4,831,235 | 1,725,668 | 6,556,904 | 4,830,814 | 1,725,669 | 6,556,483 | 421 | 0.0% |
| Water Control | 26,017,096 | 328,249 | 26,345,345 | 25,691,586 | 328,249 | 26,019,835 | 325,551 | 1.3% |
| Vector Control | 8,739,965 | 0 | 8,739,965 | 8,603,177 | 0 | 8,603,177 | 136,791 | 1.6% |
| Service | 76,036,417 | 84,142,688 | 160,179,105 | 73,684,133 | 84,142,692 | 157,826,826 | 2,352,366 | 3.1% |
| Other | 344,529,548 | 10,082,872 | 354,612,420 | 340,329,948 | 10,082,870 | 350,412,819 | 4,199,672 | 1.2% |
| Statewide Total | 7,679,862,630 | 1,382,331,330 | 9,062,193,961 | 7,524,882,408 | 1,382,331,360 | 8,907,213,768 | 154,988,722 | 2.0% |

Notes: The category "Other" includes taxing districts such as library, transit, and public utility districts.

Taxes in the "Outside Limit" category are not subject to the Measure 5 rate limits.

Differences between "Outside Limit" tax extended and tax imposed is due to rounding done at the district level.

Urban renewal revenues are not included in this table.

Table 2.5 Tax Imposed and Compression due to Measure 5 Limits FY 2022-23 and 2023-24 by County (Thousands of Dollars)

| | Insid | e the Limit | | Outsi | de the Limit | | Total | Tax Imposed | | Compressio | n Due to M5 l | Limits |
|-------------------------------------|------------|-------------|-------|------------|--------------|--------|------------|-------------|-------|------------|---------------|--------|
| County | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | % CH | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | % CH | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | % CH | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | % CF |
| Baker | 25,635 | 26,191 | 2.2% | 1,036 | 1,017 | -1.8% | 26,670 | 27,208 | 2.0% | 828 | 806 | -2.7% |
| Benton | 159,321 | 165,700 | 4.0% | 23,796 | 24,409 | 2.6% | 183,117 | 190,109 | 3.8% | 2,291 | 2,167 | -5.4% |
| Clackamas | 842,738 | 904,063 | 7.3% | 176,850 | 184,595 | 4.4% | 1,019,588 | 1,088,658 | 6.8% | 9,185 | 10,187 | 10.9% |
| Clatsop | 83,434 | 89,758 | 7.6% | 16,911 | 17,956 | 6.2% | 100,345 | 107,715 | 7.3% | 468 | 649 | 38.7% |
| Columbia | 78,133 | 82,457 | 5.5% | 11,482 | 11,583 | 0.9% | 89,615 | 94,040 | 4.9% | 605 | 638 | 5.4% |
| Coos | 72,613 | 74,996 | 3.3% | 6,715 | 5,415 | -19.4% | 79,328 | 80,411 | 1.4% | 303 | 273 | -10.1% |
| Crook | 36,090 | 39,255 | 8.8% | 2,515 | 2,825 | 12.3% | 38,605 | 42,080 | 9.0% | 164 | 219 | 33.7% |
| Curry | 28,580 | 29,818 | 4.3% | 1,006 | 1,590 | 58.0% | 29,586 | 31,407 | 6.2% | 6 | 6 | -5.0% |
| Deschutes | 394,583 | 427,666 | 8.4% | 79,099 | 83,776 | 5.9% | 473,681 | 511,443 | 8.0% | 995 | 1,181 | 18.8% |
| Douglas | 118,108 | 123,508 | 4.6% | 3,426 | 3,645 | 6.4% | 121,535 | 127,153 | 4.6% | 851 | 900 | 5.7% |
| Gilliam | 12,118 | 12,716 | 4.9% | 406 | 417 | 2.5% | 12,525 | 13,132 | 4.9% | 203 | 204 | 0.4% |
| Grant | 8,565 | 8,841 | 3.2% | 177 | 185 | 4.6% | 8,742 | 9,027 | 3.3% | 41 | 35 | -13.9% |
| Harney | 9,503 | 9,965 | 4.9% | 212 | 220 | 3.7% | 9,716 | 10,185 | 4.8% | 253 | 217 | -14.1% |
| Hood River | 36,757 | 38,100 | 3.7% | 6,208 | 6,015 | -3.1% | 42,965 | 44,114 | 2.7% | 931 | 842 | -9.6% |
| Jackson | 308,757 | 322,197 | 4.4% | 34,712 | 34,984 | 0.8% | 343,469 | 357,180 | 4.0% | 844 | 888 | 5.3% |
| Jefferson | 28,765 | 31,622 | 9.9% | 5,989 | 6,408 | 7.0% | 34,754 | 38,030 | 9.4% | 576 | 637 | 10.6% |
| Josephine | 86,168 | 88,770 | 3.0% | 692 | 480 | -30.6% | 86,860 | 89,250 | 2.8% | 78 | 62 | -21.6% |
| Klamath | 73,548 | 77,726 | 5.7% | 6,373 | 6,182 | -3.0% | 79,921 | 83,907 | 5.0% | 898 | 598 | -33.4% |
| Lake | 11,322 | 10,883 | -3.9% | 525 | 508 | -3.3% | 11,847 | 11,390 | -3.9% | 236 | 176 | -25.3% |
| Lane | 546,069 | 576,315 | 5.5% | 99,861 | 101,775 | 1.9% | 645,930 | 678,090 | 5.0% | 5,142 | 5,483 | 6.6% |
| Lincoln | 114,032 | 119,198 | 4.5% | 20,120 | 20,609 | 2.4% | 134,152 | 139,807 | 4.2% | 146 | 131 | -9.9% |
| Linn | 175,197 | 184,464 | 5.3% | 29,542 | 28,897 | -2.2% | 204,738 | 213,361 | 4.2% | 4,035 | 3,807 | -5.7% |
| Malheur | 32,325 | 33,901 | 4.9% | 2,364 | 2,438 | 3.1% | 34,689 | 36,339 | 4.8% | 386 | 460 | 19.3% |
| Marion | 397,735 | 416,009 | 4.6% | 97,219 | 102,010 | 4.9% | 494,954 | 518,019 | 4.7% | 2,060 | 2,055 | -0.2% |
| Morrow | 49,893 | 52,579 | 5.4% | 3,466 | 4,548 | 31.2% | 53,359 | 57,127 | 7.1% | 1,878 | 1,841 | -1.9% |
| Multnomah | 1,783,765 | 1,909,686 | 7.1% | 338,525 | 364,166 | 7.6% | 2,122,290 | 2,273,853 | 7.1% | 91,047 | 104,401 | 14.7% |
| Polk | 87,985 | 91,867 | 4.4% | 22,845 | 25,637 | 12.2% | 110,830 | 117,504 | 6.0% | 225 | 209 | -6.9% |
| Sherman | 10,117 | 20,092 | 98.6% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 10,117 | 20,092 | 98.6% | 408 | 895 | 119.4% |
| Tillamook | 58,124 | 61,119 | 5.2% | 9,148 | 10,396 | 13.6% | 67,272 | 71,514 | 6.3% | 150 | 153 | 2.4% |
| Umatilla | 98,305 | 102,615 | 4.4% | 20,723 | 22,114 | 6.7% | 119,027 | 124,729 | 4.8% | 3,079 | 2,853 | -7.4% |
| Union | 28,809 | 30,189 | 4.8% | 3,313 | 3,265 | -1.4% | 32,122 | 33,454 | 4.1% | 283 | 309 | 9.1% |
| Wallowa | 10,841 | 11,276 | 4.0% | 668 | 696 | 4.3% | 11,509 | 11,973 | 4.0% | 35 | 41 | 17.6% |
| Wasco | 45,994 | 48,215 | 4.8% | 2,741 | 2,496 | -8.9% | 48,735 | 50,711 | 4.1% | 1,419 | 1,542 | 8.6% |
| Washington | 1,091,448 | 1,161,286 | 6.4% | 254,721 | 270,914 | 6.4% | 1,346,169 | 1,432,200 | 6.4% | 8,100 | 9,614 | 18.7% |
| Wheeler | 3,001 | 3,240 | 8.0% | 74 | 74 | 0.3% | 3,074 | 3,314 | 7.8% | 95 | 62 | -34.9% |
| Yamhill | 129,440 | 138,599 | 7.1% | 29,653 | 30,085 | 1.5% | 159,093 | 168,684 | 6.0% | 455 | 447 | -1.7% |
| Statewide Total Note: Urban renewal | 7,077,820 | 7,524,882 | 6.3% | 1,313,110 | 1,382,331 | 5.3% | 8,390,930 | 8,907,214 | 6.2% | 138,696 | 154,989 | 11.7% |

Table 2.6 Tax Imposed and Compression due to Measure 5 Limits FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24 by Type of Taxing District (Thousands of Dollars)

| | Insid | e the Limit | | Outsid | de the Limit | | Total | Tax Imposed | | Compression Due to M5 Limits | | |
|-------------------|------------|-------------|-------|------------|--------------|--------|------------|-------------|-------|------------------------------|------------|--------|
| District Type | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | % CH | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | % CH | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | % CH | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | % CH |
| County | 1,383,192 | 1,479,471 | 7.0% | 72,290 | 72,496 | 0.3% | 1,455,482 | 1,551,967 | 6.6% | 20,268 | 20,809 | 2.7% |
| City | 1,693,357 | 1,793,095 | 5.9% | 103,970 | 111,963 | 7.7% | 1,797,327 | 1,905,058 | 6.0% | 46,910 | 48,577 | 3.6% |
| School | 2,530,020 | 2,664,261 | 5.3% | 881,340 | 933,558 | 5.9% | 3,411,361 | 3,597,819 | 5.5% | 58,665 | 71,373 | 21.7% |
| Education Service | 159,766 | 169,442 | 6.1% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 159,766 | 169,442 | 6.1% | 1,673 | 2,093 | 25.1% |
| Community College | 220,513 | 231,763 | 5.1% | 119,127 | 118,152 | -0.8% | 339,640 | 349,915 | 3.0% | 1,937 | 2,174 | 12.2% |
| Cemetery | 3,733 | 3,908 | 4.7% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 3,733 | 3,908 | 4.7% | 29 | 27 | -6.9% |
| Fire | 478,281 | 527,693 | 10.3% | 23,070 | 23,602 | 2.3% | 501,352 | 551,294 | 10.0% | 1,415 | 1,924 | 35.9% |
| Health | 44,746 | 47,204 | 5.5% | 4,605 | 5,262 | 14.3% | 49,351 | 52,465 | 6.3% | 551 | 523 | -5.2% |
| Park | 106,188 | 111,252 | 4.8% | 15,293 | 18,606 | 21.7% | 121,481 | 129,858 | 6.9% | 187 | 207 | 10.7% |
| Port | 25,102 | 26,469 | 5.4% | 1,013 | 1,010 | -0.3% | 26,115 | 27,479 | 5.2% | 261 | 265 | 1.9% |
| Road | 14,711 | 15,663 | 6.5% | 8 | 8 | 0.0% | 14,719 | 15,671 | 6.5% | 2 | 2 | 10.9% |
| Sanitary | 1,469 | 1,523 | 3.7% | 1,399 | 1,396 | -0.2% | 2,868 | 2,919 | 1.8% | 0 | 0 | -18.8% |
| Water Supply | 4,675 | 4,831 | 3.3% | 2,040 | 1,726 | -15.4% | 6,715 | 6,556 | -2.4% | 1 | 0 | -62.9% |
| Water Control | 23,468 | 25,692 | 9.5% | 328 | 328 | 0.0% | 23,796 | 26,020 | 9.3% | 317 | 326 | 2.6% |
| Vector Control | 8,225 | 8,603 | 4.6% | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 8,225 | 8,603 | 4.6% | 143 | 137 | -4.4% |
| Service | 70,513 | 73,684 | 4.5% | 78,343 | 84,143 | 7.4% | 148,856 | 157,827 | 6.0% | 2,206 | 2,352 | 6.6% |
| Other | 309,861 | 340,330 | 9.8% | 10,283 | 10,083 | -1.9% | 320,144 | 350,413 | 9.5% | 4,129 | 4,200 | 1.7% |
| Statewide Total | 7,077,820 | 7,524,882 | 6.3% | 1,313,110 | 1,382,331 | 5.3% | 8,390,930 | 8,907,214 | 6.2% | 138,696 | 154,989 | 11.7% |

Notes: The category "Other" includes taxing districts such as library, transit, and public utility districts.

Urban renewal revenues are not included in this table.

Detailed Tables – Urban Renewal

- Table 3.1 Urban Renewal Excess Value Used and Revenue Received by Urban Renewal Plan Area
- Table 3.2 Urban Renewal Division of Tax Revenue by Type of Levy and District Type

Section V: Detailed Tables - Urban Renewal

| | | | • | | · · | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|------------|----------------------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-------------|-------------------|------------|-----------------------------|---------------|
| | | | 5 W.I | . Hered | D 6 5 | W-1 | Revenue fro | | | T-4-1 D | |
| Agonov | Plan Area | County | Excess Value FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | Revenue from Ex | cess Value FY 2023-24 | Levi | ies FY 2023-24 | FY 2022-23 | Total Revenue FY 2023-24 | % CH |
| Agency City of Philomath | Philomath UR Plan Area | Benton | 52,545,692 | 59,094,964 | 813,757 | 907,758 | 0 | 0 | 813,757 | 907,758 | 11.69 |
| City of Corvallis | South Corvallis UR Plan Area | Benton | 18,462,932 | 23,171,697 | 250,028 | 310,190 | 0 | 0 | 250.028 | 310.190 | 24.1% |
| City of Estacada | Estacada Plan Area | Clackamas | 32,251,696 | 31,355,762 | 486,311 | 471,999 | 0 | 0 | 486,311 | 471,999 | -2.9 % |
| Clackamas County | N Clackamas Revitalization UR Plan Area | Clackamas | 383,931,263 | 436.993.501 | 5,061,128 | 5.749.884 | 0 | 0 | 5.061.128 | 5.749.884 | 13.6% |
| City of Gladstone | Gladstone 1 UR Plan Area | Clackamas | 80,562,288 | 83,965,145 | 1,101,770 | 1,148,185 | 0 | 0 | 1,101,770 | 1,148,185 | 4.29 |
| City of Lake Oswego | East End Lake Oswego UR Plan Area | Clackamas | 389,536,669 | 401,815,386 | 6,639,712 | 6,854,767 | 0 | 0 | 6,639,712 | 6,854,767 | 3.2% |
| City of Lake Oswego | Lake Grove Village Center UR Plan Area | Clackamas | 221,744,360 | 228,767,803 | 3,123,181 | 3,222,189 | 0 | 0 | 3,123,181 | 3,222,189 | 3.2% |
| City of Oregon City | Oregon City Downtown/N. End UR Plan Area | Clackamas | 210,125,713 | 0 | 3,308,517 | 3,222,109 | 0 | 0 | 3,308,517 | 3,222,109 | -100.0% |
| City of Wilsonville | Wilsonville Yr2000 UR Plan Area | Clackamas | 283,061,867 | 0 | 3,653,348 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,653,348 | 0 | -100.0% |
| City of Wilsonville | Wilsonville West Side UR Plan Area | Clackamas | 401,210,000 | 122,100,000 | 5,179,321 | 1,572,981 | 0 | 0 | 5,179,321 | 1,572,981 | -69.6% |
| City of Wilsonville | Wilsonville Twist BioScience #24 | Clackamas | 401,210,000 | 76.765.120 | 0,179,321 | 988.195 | 0 | 0 | 0,179,321 | 988.195 | 0.0% |
| City of Wilsonville | Coffee Creek UR Plan Area | Washington | | 62,115,620 | 533,477 | 705,909 | 0 | 0 | 533,477 | 705,909 | 32.3% |
| , | | • | 47,435,212 | | | | - | - | · | | |
| City of Sandy | Sandy UR Plan Area | Clackamas | 114,108,967 | 115,895,463 | 1,895,435 | 1,921,060 | 0 | 0 | 1,895,435 | 1,921,060 | 1.4% |
| City of Canby | Canby UR Plan Area | Clackamas | 299,460,325 | 313,619,865 | 4,752,229 | 4,984,201 | ŭ | 0 | 4,752,229 | 4,984,201 | 4.9% |
| City of Molalla | Molalla UR Plan Area | Clackamas | 61,667,830 | 65,196,649 | 921,435 | 973,999 | 0 | 0 | 921,435 | 973,999 | 5.7% |
| City of Milwaukie | Milwaukie UR Plan Area | Clackamas | 49,207,900 | 60,847,843 | 613,908 | 793,582 | • | 0 | 613,908 | 793,582 | 29.3% |
| City of Happy Valley | Happy Valley UR Plan Area | Clackamas | 283,206,321 | 430,732,519 | 3,379,518 | 5,140,692 | 0 | 0 | 3,379,518 | 5,140,692 | 52.1% |
| City of Astoria | Astoria East UR Plan Area | Clatsop | 21,102,161 | 23,958,214 | 338,000 | 384,048 | ŭ | 0 | 338,000 | 384,048 | 13.6% |
| City of Seaside | South East Seaside Plan Area | Clatsop | 50,955,657 | 66,193,116 | 594,706 | 775,239 | 0 | 0 | 594,706 | 775,239 | 30.4% |
| City of Warrenton | Warrenton UR Plan Area | Clatsop | 96,479,483 | 96,479,183 | 891,565 | 891,430 | 0 | 0 | 891,565 | 891,430 | 0.0% |
| City of Rainier | Rainier Waterfront UR Plan Area | Columbia | 17,881,686 | 18,126,698 | 291,901 | 292,888 | 0 | 0 | 291,901 | 292,888 | 0.3% |
| Columbia County | Port Westward UR Plan Area | Columbia | 8,600,000 | 0 | 82,190 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82,190 | 0 | -100.0% |
| City of St Helens | St Helens UR Plan Area | Columbia | 88,706,095 | 101,079,567 | 1,109,746 | 1,264,564 | 0 | 0 | 1,109,746 | 1,264,564 | 14.0% |
| City of Scappoose | Scappoose UR Plan Area | Columbia | 20,656,827 | 76,841,099 | 246,113 | 917,051 | 0 | 0 | 246,113 | 917,051 | 272.6% |
| Coos County | Coos County North Bay UR Plan Area | Coos | 35,833,478 | 47,539,916 | 313,582 | 414,089 | 0 | 0 | 313,582 | 414,089 | 32.1% |
| City of Bandon | Bandon 1 UR Plan Area | Coos | 42,734,092 | 45,010,316 | 403,948 | 415,017 | 0 | 0 | 403,948 | 415,017 | 2.7% |
| City of Bandon | Bandon 2 UR Plan Area | Coos | 20,523,804 | 21,581,101 | 193,904 | 198,811 | 0 | 0 | 193,904 | 198,811 | 2.5% |
| City of Coos Bay | Coos Bay Downtown UR Plan Area | Coos | 95,984,288 | 103,515,711 | 1,434,479 | 1,524,583 | 538,505 | 587,131 | 1,972,984 | 2,111,714 | 7.0% |
| City of Coos Bay | Coos Bay Empire UR Plan Area | Coos | 64,128,898 | 68,705,857 | 958,237 | 1,011,670 | 0 | 0 | 958,237 | 1,011,670 | 5.6% |
| City of North Bend | North Bend Downtown UR Plan Area | Coos | 41,172,135 | 38,411,521 | 594,853 | 546,666 | 371,921 | 323,331 | 966,775 | 869,997 | -10.0% |
| City of Coquille | Coquille UR Plan Area | Coos | 35,621,824 | 37,782,444 | 557,086 | 582,687 | 0 | 0 | 557,086 | 582,687 | 4.6% |
| City of Brookings | Brookings Downtown UR Plan Area | Curry | 78,740,736 | 85,103,065 | 743,891 | 804,070 | 0 | 0 | 743,891 | 804,070 | 8.1% |
| City of Gold Beach | City of Gold Beach Urban Renewal Area | Curry | 12,541,970 | 13,431,758 | 125,251 | 134,088 | 0 | 0 | 125,251 | 134,088 | 7.1% |
| City of Redmond | Redmond Downtown UR Plan Area | Deschutes | 197,541,777 | 206,284,653 | 3,052,073 | 3,230,552 | 0 | 0 | 3,052,073 | 3,230,552 | 5.8% |
| City of Redmond | Redmond South UR Plan Area | Deschutes | 34,488,783 | 58,759,854 | 531,542 | 918,749 | 0 | 0 | 531,542 | 918,749 | 72.8% |
| City of Bend | Bend Juniper Ridge UR Plan Area | Deschutes | 128,095,356 | 129,403,420 | 1,650,700 | 1,701,645 | 0 | 0 | 1,650,700 | 1,701,645 | 3.1% |
| City of Bend | Murphy Crossing UR Plan Area | Deschutes | 54,119,687 | 60,659,749 | 695,797 | 792,358 | 0 | 0 | 695,797 | 792,358 | 13.9% |
| City of Bend | Bend Core UR Plan Area | Deschutes | 60,930,896 | 61,138,504 | 781,680 | 798,511 | 0 | 0 | 781,680 | 798,511 | 2.2% |
| City of Sisters | Sisters Downtown UR Plan Area | Deschutes | 35,140,953 | 37,998,442 | 452,126 | 499,966 | 0 | 0 | 452,126 | 499,966 | 10.6% |
| City of La Pine | La Pine UR Plan Area | Deschutes | 14,743,179 | 22,886,605 | 205,244 | 324,948 | 0 | 0 | 205,244 | 324,948 | 58.3% |
| City of Roseburg | Diamond Lake urban Renewal | Douglas | 45,984,997 | 63,263,131 | 669,620 | 926,872 | 0 | 0 | 669,620 | 926,872 | 38.49 |
| City of Winston | Winston Division UR Plan Area | Douglas | 14,126,877 | 17,643,684 | 217,814 | 272,025 | 0 | 0 | 217,814 | 272,025 | 24.9% |
| City of Reedsport | Reedsport Urban Renewal Division | Douglas | 13,919,119 | 13.968.641 | 233,819 | 239,710 | 0 | 0 | 233,819 | 239,710 | 2.5% |
| City of Myrtle Creek | Myrtle Creek Urban Renewal Plan Area | Douglas | 27,772,039 | 33,715,074 | 371,357 | 457,220 | 0 | 0 | 371,357 | 457,220 | 23.1% |

Section V: Detailed Tables – Urban Renewal

| Table 3.1 Urban Rene | wal Excess Value Used and Revenue | or FYs 2022- | 23 and 2023-24 by | Urban Renew | al Plan Area (Dolla | ars) | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|
| | | _ | Excess Value | | Revenue from Ex | | Revenue fro Levi | es . | | Total Revenue | |
| Agency | Plan Area | County | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | % CH |
| City of Sutherlin | Sutherlin Urban Renewal Plan Area | Douglas | 10,168,647 | 18,454,062 | 123,744 | 223,042 | 0 | 0 | 123,744 | 223,042 | 80.2% |
| City of John Day | John Day Housing Incentive Plan Area | Grant | 5,388,157 | 6,709,677 | 79,212 | 98,640 | 0 | 0 | 79,212 | 98,640 | 24.5% |
| City of Burns | Burns UR Plan Area | Harney | 15,559,138 | 3,555,951 | 253,174 | 59,189 | 0 | 0 | 253,174 | 59,189 | -76.6% |
| City of Hood River | Waterfront UR Plan Area | Hood River | 80,681,376 | 83,464,771 | 902,108 | 933,180 | 0 | 0 | 902,108 | 933,180 | 3.4% |
| City of Hood River | Hood River Heights Business Plan Area | Hood River | 26,900,284 | 30,263,601 | 300,448 | 337,985 | 0 | 0 | 300,448 | 337,985 | 12.5% |
| Hood River County | Windmaster UR Plan Area | Hood River | 33,843,697 | 38,495,878 | 307,942 | 351,006 | 0 | 0 | 307,942 | 351,006 | 14.0% |
| City of Medford | Medford City Center UR Plan Area | Jackson | 311,927,062 | 326,947,429 | 4,179,862 | 4,381,314 | 0 | 0 | 4,179,862 | 4,381,314 | 4.8% |
| City of Jacksonville | Jacksonville UR Plan Area | Jackson | 64,156,779 | 67,126,181 | 638,845 | 668,429 | 0 | 0 | 638,845 | 668,429 | 4.6% |
| City of Phoenix | Phoenix UR Plan Area | Jackson | 40,051,607 | 47,711,480 | 591,284 | 704,044 | 0 | 0 | 591,284 | 704,044 | 19.1% |
| City of Central Point | Downtown & E. Pine St Corridor Rev Plan Area | Jackson | 62,898,116 | 70,296,544 | 984,368 | 1,100,574 | 0 | 0 | 984,368 | 1,100,574 | 11.8% |
| City of Culver | City Of Culver UR Plan Area | Jefferson | 5,835,665 | 5,685,862 | 92,244 | 90,015 | 0 | 0 | 92,244 | 90,015 | -2.4% |
| City of Madras | Madras City UR Plan Area | Jefferson | 51,737,302 | 56,818,080 | 771,403 | 845,386 | 0 | 0 | 771,403 | 845,386 | 9.6% |
| City of Madras | Madras Housing UR Plan Area | Jefferson | 13,261,697 | 28,185,205 | 197,429 | 419,145 | 0 | 0 | 197,429 | 419,145 | 112.3% |
| City of Grants Pass | Grants Pass Urban Renewal Plan Area | Josephine | 191,176,404 | 206,104,344 | 2,013,476 | 2,161,292 | 0 | 0 | 2,013,476 | 2,161,292 | 7.3% |
| City of Klamath Falls | Klamath Town Center UR Plan Area | Klamath | 13,199,330 | 14,018,070 | 193,864 | 208,944 | 0 | 0 | 193,864 | 208,944 | 7.8% |
| City of Klamath Falls | Lakefront UR Plan Area | Klamath | 34,347,365 | 36,209,000 | 505,313 | 541,309 | 0 | 0 | 505,313 | 541,309 | 7.1% |
| City of Klamath Falls | Spring Street UR Plan Area | Klamath | 5,449,639 | 8,845,857 | 79,458 | 131,571 | 0 | 0 | 79,458 | 131,571 | 65.6% |
| City of Eugene | Eugene Downtown UR Plan Area | Lane | 206,661,910 | 204,316,795 | 2,877,338 | 2,844,116 | 0 | 0 | 2,877,338 | 2,844,116 | -1.2% |
| City of Eugene | Riverfront UR Plan Area | Lane | 204,736,138 | 260,251,989 | 3,530,767 | 4,473,412 | 0 | 0 | 3,530,767 | 4,473,412 | 26.7% |
| City of Veneta | Veneta Downtown UR Plan Area | Lane | 64,990,550 | 66,225,494 | 973,700 | 994,124 | 0 | 0 | 973,700 | 994,124 | 2.1% |
| City of Coburg | Coburg Industrial Park UR Plan Area | Lane | 30,951,759 | 32,690,320 | 449,068 | 473,452 | 0 | 0 | 449,068 | 473,452 | 5.4% |
| City of Springfield (SED) | Glenwood UR Plan Area | Lane | 111,120,276 | 118,435,412 | 1,508,322 | 1,606,560 | 0 | 0 | 1,508,322 | 1,606,560 | 6.5% |
| City of Springfield (SED) | Springfield Downtown UR Plan Area | Lane | 122,916,435 | 149,337,719 | 1,668,282 | 2,026,517 | 0 | 0 | 1,668,282 | 2,026,517 | 21.5% |
| City of Florence | Florence UR Plan Area | Lane | 68,826,226 | 71,210,572 | 784,174 | 811,310 | 0 | 0 | 784,174 | 811,310 | 3.5% |
| City of Creswell | Creswell UR Plan Area | Lane | 7,604,490 | 11,807,375 | 84,346 | 131,193 | 0 | 0 | 84,346 | 131,193 | 55.5% |
| City of Waldport | Waldport 2 UR Plan Area | Lincoln | 6,647,040 | 7,243,830 | 87,415 | 95,140 | 0 | 0 | 87,415 | 95,140 | 8.8% |
| City of Waldport | Rds End/Villages at Cascade Head Plan Area | | 25,550,059 | 37,033,547 | 350,754 | 508,675 | 0 | 0 | 350,754 | 508,675 | 45.0% |
| City of Newport | Newport South Beach UR Plan Area | Lincoln | 180,659,339 | 187,551,879 | 2,530,103 | 2,627,028 | 0 | 0 | 2,530,103 | 2,627,028 | 3.8% |
| , | • | | | | | | 0 | 0 | | | 3.6% |
| City of Newport | Mclean Point Plan Area | Lincoln | 4,500,710 | 4,656,030 | 64,277 | 66,296 | 0 | _ | 64,277 | 66,296 | |
| City of Newport | Northside Plan Area | Lincoln | 93,235,692 | 99,332,642 | 1,349,312 | 1,437,718 | 0 | 0 | 1,349,312 | 1,437,718 | 6.6% 7.4% |
| City of Panea Bay | Yachats UR Plan Area | Lincoln | 54,172,085 | 58,199,475 | 512,019 322,681 | 549,831 | 0 | 0 | 512,019 | 549,831 | 9.5% |
| City of Depoe Bay | Depoe Bay Plan Area Toledo UR Plan Area | Lincoln | 33,426,380 27.891,430 | 36,434,250 29.979.030 | 408,255 | 353,334 438.866 | 0 | 0 | 322,681 | 353,334 | 9.5% 7.5% |
| City of Toledo City of Lebanon | NW Lebanon 2 UR Plan Area | Lincoln | 56,500,000 | 58,299,999 | 926,798 | 858,615 | 0 | 0 | 408,255 926,798 | 438,866 858,615 | 7.5% -7.4% |
| City of Lebanon | Cheadle Lake Lebanon 3 UR Plan Area | Linn | 28,783,420 | 32,920,667 | 476,445 | 544,359 | 0 | 0 | 476.445 | 544.359 | 14.3% |
| City of Lebanon | North Gateway UR Plan Area | Linn | 59,426,555 | 63,014,823 | 976,219 | 930,629 | 0 | 0 | 976,219 | 930,629 | -4.7% |
| City of Lebanon | Lebanon Downtown UR Plan Area | Linn | 2,754,907 | 3,824,623 | 44,631 | 55.737 | 0 | 0 | 44.631 | 55.737 | 24.7% |
| City of Lebanon | Mill Race UR Plan Area | Linn | 7,672,282 | 10,283,608 | 125,607 | 151,222 | 0 | 0 | 125,607 | 151,222 | 20.4% |
| City of Harrisburg | Harrisburg UR Plan Area | Linn | 37,900,570 | 20.032.043 | 473,418 | 224.988 | 0 | 0 | 473.418 | 224,988 | -52.5% |
| City of Albany | Central Albany UR Plan Area | Linn | 331,329,723 | 368,945,404 | 5,319,368 | 5,822,120 | 0 | 0 | 5,319,368 | 5,822,120 | 9.5% |
| City of Salem | JORY APARTMENT TIF | Marion | 12,392,180 | 34,707,188 | 183,103 | 519,309 | 0 | 0 | 183,103 | 519,309 | 183.6% |
| City of Salem | Mcgilchrist UR Plan Area | Marion | 84,283,272 | 94,462,574 | 1,272,045 | 1,426,697 | 0 | 0 | 1,272,045 | 1,426,697 | 12.2% |

Section V: Detailed Tables - Urban Renewal

| Table 3.1 Urban Rene | ewal Excess Value Used and Reven | ue for FYs 2022 | -23 and 2023-24 b | y Urban Renew | al Plan Area (Dolla | ars) | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------------|------------|-------------|------------|------------|---------------|---------|
| | | | Excess Valu | ıe Used | Revenue from Ex | cess Value | Revenue fro | | | Total Revenue | |
| Agency | Plan Area | County | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | % СН |
| City of Salem | Riverfront/Downtown UR Plan Area | Marion | 287,088,819 | 268,295,173 | 4,350,190 | 4,061,463 | 3,545,619 | 3,188,301 | 7,895,808 | 7,249,764 | -8.2% |
| City of Salem | Mill Creek UR Plan Area | Marion | 113,453,343 | 243,938,023 | 1,715,744 | 3,694,546 | 0 | 0 | 1,715,744 | 3,694,546 | 115.3% |
| City of Salem | South Waterfront UR Plan Area | Marion | 35,075,230 | 35,593,581 | 525,424 | 531,602 | 0 | 0 | 525,424 | 531,602 | 1.2% |
| City of Salem | North Gateway UR Plan Area | Marion | 301,863,820 | 332,931,265 | 4,574,443 | 5,045,830 | 0 | 0 | 4,574,443 | 5,045,830 | 10.3% |
| City of Salem | West Salem UR Plan Area | Polk | 115,011,642 | 126,567,206 | 2,071,467 | 2,280,564 | 0 | 0 | 2,071,467 | 2,280,564 | 10.1% |
| City of Woodburn | Woodburn UR Plan Area | Marion | 59,188,653 | 72,163,331 | 948,533 | 1,156,582 | 0 | 0 | 948,533 | 1,156,582 | 21.9% |
| City of Silverton | Silverton UR Plan Area | Marion | 68,211,596 | 69,994,581 | 951,389 | 976,499 | 0 | 0 | 951,389 | 976,499 | 2.6% |
| City of Turner | Turner Downtown UR Plan Area | Marion | 5,137,844 | 5,765,220 | 72,246 | 81,060 | 0 | 0 | 72,246 | 81,060 | 12.2% |
| City of Boardman | Central Boardman UR Plan Area | Morrow | 11,178,884 | 5,265,951 | 167,352 | 78,930 | 0 | 0 | 167,352 | 78,930 | -52.8% |
| City of Boardman | West Boardman UR Plan Area | Morrow | 5,771,205 | 6,275,837 | 86,035 | 94,093 | 0 | 0 | 86,035 | 94,093 | 9.4% |
| City of Portland (PP) | Downtown UR Plan Area | Multnomah | 333,045,356 | 0 | 7,339,439 | 0 | 5,744,004 | 0 | 13,083,443 | 0 | -100.0% |
| City of Portland (PP) | 82nd & Division UR Plan | Multnomah | 3,400,000 | 0 | 35,587 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35,587 | 0 | -100.0% |
| City of Portland (PP) | Cully Neighborhood UR Plan | Multnomah | 0 | 10,756,152 | 0 | 157,513 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 157,513 | NA |
| City of Portland (PP) | South Park Blocks UR Plan Area | Multnomah | 244,492,441 | 0 | 5,364,175 | 0 | 3,829,336 | 0 | 9,193,511 | 0 | -100.0% |
| City of Portland (PP) | Central East Side UR Plan Area | Multnomah | 541,034,423 | 15,176,200 | 9,632,514 | 240,813 | 0 | 0 | 9,632,514 | 240,813 | -97.5% |
| City of Portland (PP) | Convention Center UR Plan Area | Multnomah | 247,680,690 | 0 | 5,440,088 | 0 | 4,786,670 | 0 | 10,226,758 | 0 | -100.0% |
| City of Portland (PP) | Lents Town Center UR Plan Area | Multnomah | 1,103,739,857 | 1,169,781,387 | 23,898,776 | 25,658,277 | 0 | 0 | 23,898,776 | 25,658,277 | 7.4% |
| City of Portland (PP) | Macadam UR Plan Area | Multnomah | 1,154,713,806 | 1,210,122,316 | 25,554,596 | 26,834,484 | 0 | 0 | 25,554,596 | 26,834,484 | 5.0% |
| City of Portland (PP) | N Interstate Corridor UR Plan Area | Multnomah | 2,613,136,968 | 211,856,000 | 47,909,137 | 3,832,133 | 0 | 0 | 47,909,137 | 3,832,133 | -92.0% |
| City of Portland (PP) | Gateway UR Plan Area | Multnomah | 348,875,119 | 369,401,829 | 7,119,792 | 7,802,118 | 0 | 0 | 7,119,792 | 7,802,118 | 9.6% |
| City of Gresham (GRC) | Rockwood/W Gresham UR Plan Area | Multnomah | 475,091,896 | 583,101,746 | 7,033,893 | 8,618,780 | 0 | 0 | 7,033,893 | 8,618,780 | 22.5% |
| City of Troutdale | Troutdale Riverfront UR Plan Area | Multnomah | 10,951,160 | 11,569,750 | 163,629 | 173,008 | 0 | 0 | 163,629 | 173,008 | 5.7% |
| City of Wood Village | Wood Village UR Plan Area | Multnomah | 41,507,970 | 41,943,080 | 596,167 | 602,473 | 0 | 0 | 596,167 | 602,473 | 1.1% |
| City of Fairview | Fairview (Mult.) UR Plan Area | Multnomah | 47,526,103 | 84,160,163 | 699,541 | 1,238,943 | 0 | 0 | 699,541 | 1,238,943 | 77.1% |
| City of Independence | Independence UR Plan Area | Polk | 74,826,245 | 79,161,459 | 1,049,813 | 1,110,704 | 0 | 0 | 1,049,813 | 1,110,704 | 5.8% |
| City of Dallas | Dallas Downtown UR Plan Area | Polk | 20,504,013 | 19,186,364 | 238,324 | 222,801 | 0 | 0 | 238,324 | 222,801 | -6.5% |
| City of Dallas | South Dallas UR Plan Area | Polk | 0 | 6,507,589 | 0 | 75,422 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75,422 | N/A |
| City of Monmouth | Monmouth UR Plan Area | Polk | 56,130,319 | 67,947,533 | 724,490 | 877,295 | 0 | 0 | 724,490 | 877,295 | 21.1% |
| City of Garibaldi | Garibaldi UR Plan Area | Tillamook | 14,062,524 | 15,283,750 | 146,486 | 158,550 | 0 | 0 | 146,486 | 158,550 | 8.2% |
| City of Tillamook | Tillamook UR Plan Area | Tillamook | 66,606,627 | 68,921,315 | 671,224 | 694,527 | 0 | 0 | 671,224 | 694,527 | 3.5% |
| City of Pendleton | Pendleton UR Plan Area | Umatilla | 73,164,052 | 70,076,135 | 1,146,403 | 1,101,573 | 0 | 0 | 1,146,403 | 1,101,573 | -3.9% |
| City of Hermiston | Hermiston UR Plan Area | Umatilla | 16,832,001 | 19,325,939 | 291,688 | 331,481 | 0 | 0 | 291,688 | 331,481 | 13.6% |

Section V: Detailed Tables – Urban Renewal

| | | | Excess Valu | ie Used | Revenue from Ex | cess Value | Revenue fro | m Special | • | Total Revenue | |
|-------------------------|--|------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|------------|-------------|------------|------------|---------------|---------|
| Agency | Plan Area | County | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | % CF |
| City of Hermiston | Prairie Meadows UR Plan Area | Umatilla | 0 | 3,600 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| City of La Grande | La Grande UR Plan Area | Union | 52,422,181 | 52,837,073 | 931,301 | 937,154 | 0 | 0 | 931,301 | 937,154 | 0.6% |
| City of The Dalles | Columbia Gateway Downtown UR Plan Area | Wasco | 0 | 102,217,667 | 1,722,715 | 1,688,155 | 0 | 0 | 1,722,715 | 1,688,155 | -2.0% |
| Tualatin Dev Commission | Southwest and Basalt Creek Dev Area | Washington | 12,381,366 | 118,554,691 | 140,101 | 1,351,225 | 0 | 0 | 140,101 | 1,351,225 | 864.5% |
| City of Sherwood | Old Town UR Plan Area | Washington | 95,618,088 | 0 | 1,618,741 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,618,741 | 0 | -100.0% |
| City of Sherwood | Sherwood 2021 Urban Renewal Plan | Washington | 43,927,233 | 90,742,907 | 549,863 | 1,138,323 | 0 | 0 | 549,863 | 1,138,323 | 107.0% |
| City of North Plains | North Plains UR Plan Area | Washington | 67,933,343 | 71,051,317 | 780,461 | 816,895 | 0 | 0 | 780,461 | 816,895 | 4.7% |
| City of Tigard | Tigard UR Plan Area | Washington | 70,085,780 | 80,036,073 | 839,897 | 960,195 | 0 | 0 | 839,897 | 960,195 | 14.3% |
| City of Tigard | Tigard Triangle Urban Renewal Plan | Washington | 113,622,732 | 142,039,746 | 1,363,288 | 1,706,613 | 0 | 0 | 1,363,288 | 1,706,613 | 25.2% |
| City of Hillsboro | North Hillsboro UR Plan Area | Washington | 894,362,495 | 1,323,554,797 | 10,330,379 | 15,301,110 | 0 | 0 | 10,330,379 | 15,301,110 | 48.1% |
| City of Hillsboro | Downtown Hillsboro UR Plan Area | Washington | 189,072,969 | 223,858,634 | 2,180,194 | 2,581,389 | 0 | 0 | 2,180,194 | 2,581,389 | 18.4% |
| City of Beaverton | Central Beaverton UR Plan Area | Washington | 432,523,717 | 473,183,952 | 6,387,833 | 7,113,493 | 0 | 0 | 6,387,833 | 7,113,493 | 11.4% |
| City of Forest Grove | Forest Grove UR Plan Area | Washington | 58,186,330 | 73,520,624 | 684,773 | 866,255 | 0 | 0 | 684,773 | 866,255 | 26.5% |
| City of Banks | Banks Urban Renewal Plan Area | Washington | 8,457,333 | 9,442,297 | 92,010 | 102,850 | 0 | 0 | 92,010 | 102,850 | 11.8% |
| City of Cornelius | Cornelius UR Plan Area | Washington | 18,170,710 | 32,860,207 | 214,698 | 388,760 | 0 | 0 | 214,698 | 388,760 | 81.1% |
| City of Carlton | Carlton UR Plan Area | Yamhill | 17,820,803 | 19,485,627 | 258,379 | 282,480 | 0 | 0 | 258,379 | 282,480 | 9.3% |
| City of McMinnville | McMinnVille UR Plan Area | Yamhill | 52,724,155 | 54,856,333 | 675,303 | 729,267 | 0 | 0 | 675,303 | 729,267 | 8.0% |
| City of Dundee | Dundee UR Plan Area | Yamhill | 19,575,927 | 27,628,323 | 217,508 | 307,046 | 0 | 0 | 217,508 | 307,046 | 41.2% |
| City of Newberg | City of Newberg UR Plan Area | Yamhill | 0 | 34,200,162 | 0 | 451,388 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 451,388 | N/A |
| City of Lafayette | City of Lafayette UR Plan Area | Yamhill | 0 | 1,918,228 | 0 | 21,529 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21,529 | N/A |

| Table 3.2 l | Urban Renewal Division | on of Tax Revenเ | ue for FYs 202 | 2-23 and 20 | 23-24 by Ag | ency, Cour | ity, Type of | Levy, and D | istrict Type (| Dollars) | |
|-------------|------------------------|------------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------|----------------|--------------|---------|
| | | | Permanent/0 | Sap Bonds | Local (| Option | Bor | nds | T | otal Revenue | |
| County | Agency | District Type | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | % CH |
| Benton | City of Philomath | County | 115,226 | 129,538 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115,226 | 129,538 | 12.4% |
| Benton | City of Philomath | City | 264,050 | 299,214 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 264,050 | 299,214 | 13.3% |
| Benton | City of Philomath | Education | 296,409 | 333,287 | 0 | 0 | 8,438 | 0 | 304,847 | 333,287 | 9.3% |
| Benton | City of Philomath | Other | 129,633 | 145,718 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129,633 | 145,718 | 12.4% |
| Benton | City of Corvallis | County | 40,413 | 50,612 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40,413 | 50,612 | 25.2% |
| Benton | City of Corvallis | City | 94,095 | 118,094 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94,095 | 118,094 | 25.5% |
| Benton | City of Corvallis | Education | 96,226 | 120,865 | 0 | 0 | 2,406 | 0 | 98,632 | 120,865 | 22.5% |
| Benton | City of Corvallis | Other | 16,889 | 20,620 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16,889 | 20,620 | 22.1% |
| Clackamas | City of Estacada | County | 95,983 | 93,324 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95,983 | 93,324 | -2.8% |
| Clackamas | City of Estacada | City | 86,223 | 83,859 | 0 | 0 | 5,069 | 4,341 | 91,292 | 88,200 | -3.4% |
| Clackamas | City of Estacada | Education | 163,549 | 159,037 | 0 | 0 | 37,854 | 36,413 | 201,403 | 195,450 | -3.0% |
| Clackamas | City of Estacada | Other | 97,633 | 95,026 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97,633 | 95,026 | -2.7% |
| Clackamas | Clackamas County | County | 1,129,796 | 1,288,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,129,796 | 1,288,400 | 14.0% |
| Clackamas | Clackamas County | City | 71,976 | 77,899 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71,976 | 77,899 | 8.2% |
| Clackamas | Clackamas County | Education | 2,220,591 | 2,525,608 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,220,591 | 2,525,608 | 13.7% |
| Clackamas | Clackamas County | Other | 1,638,764 | 1,857,977 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,638,764 | 1,857,977 | 13.4% |
| Clackamas | City of Gladstone | County | 193,583 | 201,793 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 193,583 | 201,793 | 4.2% |
| Clackamas | City of Gladstone | City | 388,058 | 404,386 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 388,058 | 404,386 | 4.2% |
| Clackamas | City of Gladstone | Education | 466,442 | 486,120 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 466,442 | 486,120 | 4.2% |
| Clackamas | City of Gladstone | Other | 53,687 | 55,886 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53,687 | 55,886 | 4.1% |
| Clackamas | City of Lake Oswego | County | 1,468,735 | 1,515,390 | 0 | 0 | 34,075 | 35,496 | 1,502,811 | 1,550,885 | 3.2% |
| Clackamas | City of Lake Oswego | City | 3,037,085 | 3,133,402 | 0 | 0 | 72,677 | 85,245 | 3,109,762 | 3,218,647 | 3.5% |
| Clackamas | City of Lake Oswego | Education | 3,128,440 | 3,227,508 | 0 | 0 | 1,463,984 | 1,499,699 | 4,592,424 | 4,727,208 | 2.9% |
| Clackamas | City of Lake Oswego | Other | 412,542 | 426,967 | 0 | 0 | 145,354 | 153,249 | 557,896 | 580,216 | 4.0% |
| Clackamas | City of Oregon City | County | 504,483 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 504,483 | 0 | -100.0% |
| Clackamas | City of Oregon City | City | 925,205 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 925,205 | 0 | -100.0% |
| Clackamas | City of Oregon City | Education | 1,235,272 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,235,272 | 0 | -100.0% |
| Clackamas | City of Oregon City | Other | 643,557 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 643,557 | 0 | -100.0% |
| Clackamas | City of Wilsonville | County | 1,751,260 | 617,331 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,751,260 | 617,331 | -64.7% |
| Clackamas | City of Wilsonville | City | 1,820,293 | 632,350 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,820,293 | 632,350 | -65.3% |
| Clackamas | City of Wilsonville | Education | 4,213,461 | 1,476,654 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4,213,461 | 1,476,654 | -65.0% |
| Clackamas | City of Wilsonville | Other | 1,581,133 | 540,750 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,581,133 | 540,750 | -65.8% |
| Clackamas | City of Sandy | County | 274,307 | 278,595 | 0 | 0 | 10,080 | 10,220 | 284,387 | 288,815 | 1.6% |
| Clackamas | City of Sandy | City | 469,538 | 476,816 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 469,538 | 476,816 | 1.6% |
| Clackamas | City of Sandy | Education | 627,451 | 637,185 | 0 | 0 | 200,511 | 199,862 | 827,961 | 837,047 | 1.1% |
| Clackamas | City of Sandy | Other | 313,550 | 318,381 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 313,550 | 318,381 | 1.5% |
| Clackamas | City of Canby | County | 725,677 | 760,603 | 0 | 0 | 26,406 | 27,623 | 752,083 | 788,226 | 4.8% |
| Clackamas | City of Canby | City | 1,008,944 | 1,053,577 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,008,944 | 1,053,577 | 4.4% |
| Clackamas | City of Canby | Education | 1,647,705 | 1,725,636 | 0 | 0 | 642,122 | 684,410 | 2,289,827 | 2,410,046 | 5.3% |
| Clackamas | City of Canby | Other | 633,964 | 663,864 | 0 | 0 | 67,411 | 68,487 | 701,375 | 732,351 | 4.4% |

| Table 3.2 L | Jrban Renewal Divisi | on of Tax Revenu | ue for FYs 202 | 2-23 and 20 | 23-24 by Agen | cy, Coun | ty, Type of L | evy, and Di | istrict Type (| Dollars) | |
|-------------|----------------------|------------------|----------------|-------------|---------------|----------|---------------|-------------|----------------|--------------|---------|
| | | | Permanent/0 | Sap Bonds | Local Opti | on | Bond | ds | To | otal Revenue | |
| County | Agency | District Type | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | FY 2022-23 FY | | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | % CH |
| Clackamas | City of Molalla | County | 148,510 | 156,994 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 148,510 | 156,994 | 5.7% |
| Clackamas | City of Molalla | City | 324,606 | 343,161 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 324,606 | 343,161 | 5.7% |
| Clackamas | City of Molalla | Education | 346,939 | 366,720 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 346,939 | 366,720 | 5.7% |
| Clackamas | City of Molalla | Other | 101,379 | 107,124 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101,379 | 107,124 | 5.7% |
| Clackamas | City of Milwaukie | County | 88,381 | 115,430 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88,381 | 115,430 | 30.6% |
| Clackamas | City of Milwaukie | City | 151,758 | 198,114 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 151,758 | 198,114 | 30.5% |
| Clackamas | City of Milwaukie | Education | 213,008 | 277,859 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 213,008 | 277,859 | 30.4% |
| Clackamas | City of Milwaukie | Other | 160,762 | 202,179 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 160,762 | 202,179 | 25.8% |
| Clackamas | City of Happy Valley | County | 680,613 | 1,035,234 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 680,613 | 1,035,234 | 52.1% |
| Clackamas | City of Happy Valley | City | 189,847 | 289,001 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 189,847 | 289,001 | 52.2% |
| Clackamas | City of Happy Valley | Education | 1,640,994 | 2,495,231 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,640,994 | 2,495,231 | 52.1% |
| Clackamas | City of Happy Valley | Other | 868,065 | 1,321,225 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 868,065 | 1,321,225 | 52.2% |
| Clatsop | City of Astoria | County | 32,162 | 36,591 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32,162 | 36,591 | 13.8% |
| Clatsop | City of Astoria | City | 171,864 | 195,185 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 171,864 | 195,185 | 13.6% |
| Clatsop | City of Astoria | Education | 123,320 | 140,144 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 123,320 | 140,144 | 13.6% |
| Clatsop | City of Astoria | Other | 10,654 | 12,128 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,654 | 12,128 | 13.8% |
| Clatsop | City of Seaside | County | 78,062 | 101,492 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78,062 | 101,492 | 30.0% |
| Clatsop | City of Seaside | City | 155,654 | 208,884 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 155,654 | 208,884 | 34.2% |
| Clatsop | City of Seaside | Education | 271,931 | 353,438 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 271,931 | 353,438 | 30.0% |
| Clatsop | City of Seaside | Other | 89,058 | 111,425 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89,058 | 111,425 | 25.1% |
| Clatsop | City of Warrenton | County | 147,948 | 147,898 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 147,948 | 147,898 | 0.0% |
| Clatsop | City of Warrenton | City | 161,118 | 161,092 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 161,118 | 161,092 | 0.0% |
| Clatsop | City of Warrenton | Education | 532,737 | 532,762 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 532,737 | 532,762 | 0.0% |
| Clatsop | City of Warrenton | Other | 49,762 | 49,679 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49,762 | 49,679 | -0.2% |
| Columbia | City of Rainier | County | 24,269 | 24,707 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24,269 | 24,707 | 1.8% |
| Columbia | City of Rainier | City | 78,888 | 77,701 | 0 | 0 | 28,277 | 28,150 | 107,165 | 105,851 | -1.2% |
| Columbia | City of Rainier | Education | 97,287 | 98,946 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97,287 | 98,946 | 1.7% |
| Columbia | City of Rainier | Other | 62,313 | 63,384 | 867 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63,180 | 63,384 | 0.3% |
| Columbia | Columbia County | County | 11,498 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11,498 | 0 | -100.0% |
| Columbia | Columbia County | City | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Columbia | Columbia County | Education | 40,803 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,362 | 0 | 46,165 | 0 | -100.0% |
| Columbia | Columbia County | Other | 24,214 | 0 | 312 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24,526 | 0 | -100.0% |
| Columbia | City of St Helens | County | 123,779 | 141,046 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 123,779 | 141,046 | 14.0% |
| Columbia | City of St Helens | City | 169,189 | 192,751 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 169,189 | 192,751 | 13.9% |
| Columbia | City of St Helens | Education | 484,739 | 552,274 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 484,739 | 552,274 | 13.9% |
| Columbia | City of St Helens | Other | 332,040 | 378,493 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 332,040 | 378,493 | 14.0% |
| Columbia | City of Scappoose | County | 28,807 | 107,153 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28,807 | 107,153 | 272.0% |
| Columbia | City of Scappoose | City | 66,606 | 247,894 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66,606 | 247,894 | 272.2% |
| Columbia | City of Scappoose | Education | 111,567 | 415,577 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111,567 | 415,577 | 272.5% |
| Columbia | City of Scappoose | Other | 39,133 | 146,427 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39,133 | 146,427 | 274.2% |

| Table 3.2 | Urban Renewal Divis | ion of Tax Revenu | ie for FYs 202 | 2-23 and 20 | 23-24 by Agenc | y, Coun | ty, Type of | Levy, and D | istrict Type (| Dollars) | |
|-----------|---------------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|---------|-------------|-------------|----------------|--------------|--------|
| | | | Permanent/0 | Sap Bonds | Local Option | n | Bor | ıds | To | otal Revenue | |
| County | Agency | District Type | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | FY 2022-23 FY | | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | % CH |
| Coos | Coos County | County | 38,042 | 50,707 | 0 | 0 | 7,737 | 0 | 45,779 | 50,707 | 10.8% |
| Coos | Coos County | City | 82 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 84 | 3.2% |
| Coos | Coos County | Education | 201,936 | 268,227 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 201,936 | 268,227 | 32.8% |
| Coos | Coos County | Other | 65,785 | 95,071 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65,785 | 95,071 | 44.5% |
| Coos | City of Bandon | County | 68,299 | 71,844 | 0 | 0 | 13,800 | 0 | 82,099 | 71,844 | -12.5% |
| Coos | City of Bandon | City | 28,887 | 30,440 | 0 | 0 | 20,057 | 20,151 | 48,944 | 50,591 | 3.4% |
| Coos | City of Bandon | Education | 323,369 | 340,417 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 323,369 | 340,417 | 5.3% |
| Coos | City of Bandon | Other | 143,440 | 150,976 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 143,440 | 150,976 | 5.3% |
| Coos | City of Coos Bay | County | 172,086 | 185,083 | 0 | 0 | 34,775 | 0 | 206,861 | 185,083 | -10.5% |
| Coos | City of Coos Bay | City | 1,015,386 | 1,091,974 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,015,386 | 1,091,974 | 7.5% |
| Coos | City of Coos Bay | Education | 904,668 | 973,039 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 904,668 | 973,039 | 7.6% |
| Coos | City of Coos Bay | Other | 265,800 | 286,157 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 265,800 | 286,157 | 7.7% |
| Coos | City of North Bend | County | 44,424 | 41,451 | 0 | 0 | 8,999 | 0 | 53,424 | 41,451 | -22.4% |
| Coos | City of North Bend | City | 254,520 | 237,476 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 254,520 | 237,476 | -6.7% |
| Coos | City of North Bend | Education | 218,432 | 203,749 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 218,432 | 203,749 | -6.7% |
| Coos | City of North Bend | Other | 68,477 | 63,991 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68,477 | 63,991 | -6.6% |
| Coos | City of Coquille | County | 38,285 | 40,602 | 0 | 0 | 7,771 | 0 | 46,056 | 40,602 | -11.8% |
| Coos | City of Coquille | City | 216,445 | 229,607 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 216,445 | 229,607 | 6.1% |
| Coos | City of Coquille | Education | 191,372 | 202,983 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 191,372 | 202,983 | 6.1% |
| Coos | City of Coquille | Other | 103,213 | 109,495 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103,213 | 109,495 | 6.1% |
| Curry | City of Brookings | County | 47,151 | 50,995 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47,151 | 50,995 | 8.2% |
| Curry | City of Brookings | City | 296,285 | 320,214 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 296,285 | 320,214 | 8.1% |
| Curry | City of Brookings | Education | 345,808 | 373,798 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 345,808 | 373,798 | 8.1% |
| Curry | City of Brookings | Other | 54,646 | 59,063 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54,646 | 59,063 | 8.1% |
| Curry | City of Gold Beach | County | 7,519 | 8,048 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7,519 | 8,048 | 7.0% |
| Curry | City of Gold Beach | City | 29,290 | 31,376 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29,290 | 31,376 | 7.1% |
| Curry | City of Gold Beach | Education | 63,471 | 67,940 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63,471 | 67,940 | 7.0% |
| Curry | City of Gold Beach | Other | 24,972 | 26,723 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24,972 | 26,723 | 7.0% |
| Deschutes | City of Redmond | County | 282,004 | 336,897 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 282,004 | 336,897 | 19.5% |
| Deschutes | City of Redmond | City | 1,021,708 | 1,163,365 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,021,708 | 1,163,365 | 13.9% |
| Deschutes | City of Redmond | Education | 1,329,493 | 1,513,833 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,329,493 | 1,513,833 | 13.9% |
| Deschutes | City of Redmond | Other | 950,411 | 1,135,205 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 950,411 | 1,135,205 | 19.4% |
| Deschutes | City of Bend | County | 294,043 | 318,485 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 294,043 | 318,485 | 8.3% |
| Deschutes | City of Bend | City | 679,793 | 701,590 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 679,793 | 701,590 | 3.2% |
| Deschutes | City of Bend | Education | 1,327,561 | 1,369,331 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,327,561 | 1,369,331 | 3.1% |
| Deschutes | City of Bend | Other | 826,781 | 903,110 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 826,781 | 903,110 | 9.2% |
| Deschutes | City of Sisters | County | 42,786 | 48,548 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42,786 | 48,548 | 13.5% |
| Deschutes | City of Sisters | City | 92,814 | 100,362 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92,814 | 100,362 | 8.1% |
| Deschutes | City of Sisters | Education | 169,214 | 182,952 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 169,214 | 182,952 | 8.1% |
| Deschutes | City of Sisters | Other | 147,311 | 168,105 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 147,311 | 168,105 | 14.1% |

| Table 3.2 U | Jrban Renewal Divisi | on of Tax Revenu | ue for FYs 202 | 2-23 and 20 | 23-24 by Agen | cy, Coun | ty, Type of I | Levy, and D | istrict Type (| Dollars) | |
|-------------|----------------------|------------------|----------------|-------------|---------------|----------|---------------|-------------|----------------|--------------|--------|
| | | | Permanent/0 | Sap Bonds | Local Opti | on | Bon | ds | To | otal Revenue | |
| County | Agency | District Type | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | FY 2022-23 FY | | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | % CH |
| Deschutes | City of La Pine | County | 17,952 | 29,233 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17,952 | 29,233 | 62.8% |
| Deschutes | City of La Pine | City | 29,163 | 45,287 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29,163 | 45,287 | 55.3% |
| Deschutes | City of La Pine | Education | 80,774 | 125,399 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80,774 | 125,399 | 55.2% |
| Deschutes | City of La Pine | Other | 77,354 | 125,029 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77,354 | 125,029 | 61.6% |
| Douglas | City of Roseburg | County | 50,945 | 70,177 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50,945 | 70,177 | 37.8% |
| Douglas | City of Roseburg | City | 385,821 | 536,179 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 385,821 | 536,179 | 39.0% |
| Douglas | City of Roseburg | Education | 230,137 | 316,911 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 230,137 | 316,911 | 37.7% |
| Douglas | City of Roseburg | Other | 2,717 | 3,605 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,717 | 3,605 | 32.7% |
| Douglas | City of Winston | County | 15,649 | 19,548 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15,649 | 19,548 | 24.9% |
| Douglas | City of Winston | City | 60,149 | 75,102 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60,149 | 75,102 | 24.9% |
| Douglas | City of Winston | Education | 75,765 | 94,650 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75,765 | 94,650 | 24.9% |
| Douglas | City of Winston | Other | 66,251 | 82,726 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66,251 | 82,726 | 24.9% |
| Douglas | City of Reedsport | County | 14,962 | 15,004 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14,962 | 15,004 | 0.3% |
| Douglas | City of Reedsport | City | 83,267 | 83,502 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83,267 | 83,502 | 0.3% |
| Douglas | City of Reedsport | Education | 74,284 | 74,481 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74,284 | 74,481 | 0.3% |
| Douglas | City of Reedsport | Other | 61,306 | 66,723 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61,306 | 66,723 | 8.8% |
| Douglas | City of Myrtle Creek | County | 30,867 | 37,489 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30,867 | 37,489 | 21.5% |
| Douglas | City of Myrtle Creek | City | 180,740 | 219,401 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 180,740 | 219,401 | 21.4% |
| Douglas | City of Myrtle Creek | Education | 158,088 | 191,901 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 158,088 | 191,901 | 21.4% |
| Douglas | City of Myrtle Creek | Other | 1,662 | 8,429 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,662 | 8,429 | 407.1% |
| Douglas | City of Sutherlin | County | 11,259 | 20,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11,259 | 20,500 | 82.1% |
| Douglas | City of Sutherlin | City | 57,277 | 103,938 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57,277 | 103,938 | 81.5% |
| Douglas | City of Sutherlin | Education | 51,424 | 93,401 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51,424 | 93,401 | 81.6% |
| Douglas | City of Sutherlin | Other | 3,783 | 5,203 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,783 | 5,203 | 37.5% |
| Grant | City of John Day | County | 15,517 | 19,314 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15,517 | 19,314 | 24.5% |
| Grant | City of John Day | City | 16,103 | 20,057 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16,103 | 20,057 | 24.6% |
| Grant | City of John Day | Education | 29,074 | 36,212 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29,074 | 36,212 | 24.6% |
| Grant | City of John Day | Other | 18,517 | 23,056 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18,517 | 23,056 | 24.5% |
| Harney | City of Burns | County | 66,079 | 15,445 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66,079 | 15,445 | -76.6% |
| Harney | City of Burns | City | 68,090 | 15,930 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68,090 | 15,930 | -76.6% |
| Harney | City of Burns | Education | 84,580 | 19,771 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84,580 | 19,771 | -76.6% |
| Harney | City of Burns | Other | 34,425 | 8,043 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34,425 | 8,043 | -76.6% |
| Hood River | City of Hood River | County | 152,326 | 161,020 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 152,326 | 161,020 | 5.7% |
| Hood River | City of Hood River | City | 302,231 | 319,537 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 302,231 | 319,537 | 5.7% |
| Hood River | City of Hood River | Education | 596,820 | 630,905 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 596,820 | 630,905 | 5.7% |
| Hood River | City of Hood River | Other | 151,179 | 159,703 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 151,179 | 159,703 | 5.6% |
| Hood River | Hood River County | County | 47,823 | 54,445 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47,823 | 54,445 | 13.8% |
| Hood River | Hood River County | City | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Hood River | Hood River County | Education | 187,163 | 213,099 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 187,163 | 213,099 | 13.9% |
| Hood River | Hood River County | Other | 72,957 | 83,462 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72,957 | 83,462 | 14.4% |

| Table 3.2 l | Urban Renewal Divisio | on of Tax Revenเ | ue for FYs 202 | 2-23 and 20 | 23-24 by Agen | ıcy, Coun | ty, Type of L | evy, and D | istrict Type (l | Dollars) | |
|-------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|---------------|------------|-----------------|--------------|-------|
| | | | Permanent/0 | Sap Bonds | Local Opt | ion | Bond | is | To | otal Revenue | |
| County | Agency | District Type | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | FY 2022-23 FY | | | FY 2023-24 | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | % CH |
| Jackson | City of Medford | County | 626,549 | 656,200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 626,549 | 656,200 | 4.7% |
| Jackson | City of Medford | City | 1,650,907 | 1,731,009 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,650,907 | 1,731,009 | 4.9% |
| Jackson | City of Medford | Education | 1,644,734 | 1,724,461 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,644,734 | 1,724,461 | 4.8% |
| Jackson | City of Medford | Other | 257,672 | 269,645 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 257,672 | 269,645 | 4.6% |
| Jackson | City of Jacksonville | County | 128,920 | 134,889 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 128,920 | 134,889 | 4.6% |
| Jackson | City of Jacksonville | City | 118,122 | 123,592 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 118,122 | 123,592 | 4.6% |
| Jackson | City of Jacksonville | Education | 338,525 | 354,198 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 338,525 | 354,198 | 4.6% |
| Jackson | City of Jacksonville | Other | 53,278 | 55,750 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53,278 | 55,750 | 4.6% |
| Jackson | City of Phoenix | County | 80,346 | 95,660 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80,346 | 95,660 | 19.1% |
| Jackson | City of Phoenix | City | 145,739 | 173,544 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 145,739 | 173,544 | 19.1% |
| Jackson | City of Phoenix | Education | 204,175 | 243,081 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 204,175 | 243,081 | 19.1% |
| Jackson | City of Phoenix | Other | 161,023 | 191,759 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 161,023 | 191,759 | 19.1% |
| Jackson | City of Central Point | County | 125,985 | 140,867 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125,985 | 140,867 | 11.8% |
| Jackson | City of Central Point | City | 280,158 | 313,273 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 280,158 | 313,273 | 11.8% |
| Jackson | City of Central Point | Education | 330,823 | 369,768 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 330,823 | 369,768 | 11.8% |
| Jackson | City of Central Point | Other | 247,402 | 276,667 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 247,402 | 276,667 | 11.8% |
| Jefferson | City of Culver | County | 20,560 | 20,064 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20,560 | 20,064 | -2.4% |
| Jefferson | City of Culver | City | 36,114 | 35,240 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36,114 | 35,240 | -2.4% |
| Jefferson | City of Culver | Education | 33,062 | 32,272 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33,062 | 32,272 | -2.4% |
| Jefferson | City of Culver | Other | 2,507 | 2,440 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,507 | 2,440 | -2.7% |
| Jefferson | City of Madras | County | 230,274 | 300,528 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 230,274 | 300,528 | 30.5% |
| Jefferson | City of Madras | City | 266,357 | 347,609 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 266,357 | 347,609 | 30.5% |
| Jefferson | City of Madras | Education | 351,610 | 458,901 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 351,610 | 458,901 | 30.5% |
| Jefferson | City of Madras | Other | 120,592 | 157,493 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120,592 | 157,493 | 30.6% |
| Josephine | City of Grants Pass | County | 112,003 | 120,813 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112,003 | 120,813 | 7.9% |
| Josephine | City of Grants Pass | City | 790,119 | 851,596 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 790,119 | 851,596 | 7.8% |
| Josephine | City of Grants Pass | Education | 1,028,303 | 1,108,681 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,028,303 | 1,108,681 | 7.8% |
| Josephine | City of Grants Pass | Other | 83,050 | 80,202 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83,050 | 80,202 | -3.4% |
| Klamath | City of Klamath Falls | County | 87,700 | 99,266 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87,700 | 99,266 | 13.2% |
| Klamath | City of Klamath Falls | City | 275,988 | 312,390 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 275,988 | 312,390 | 13.2% |
| Klamath | City of Klamath Falls | Education | 196,083 | 222,045 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 196,083 | 222,045 | 13.2% |
| Klamath | City of Klamath Falls | Other | 218,865 | 248,124 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 218,865 | 248,124 | 13.4% |
| Lane | City of Eugene | County | 523,902 | 592,458 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 523,902 | 592,458 | 13.1% |
| Lane | City of Eugene | City | 2,880,503 | 3,252,824 | 0 | 0 | 158,813 | 191,789 | 3,039,317 | 3,444,614 | 13.3% |
| Lane | City of Eugene | Education | 2,297,519 | 2,591,407 | 0 | 0 | 521,812 | 658,667 | 2,819,331 | 3,250,074 | 15.3% |
| Lane | City of Eugene | Other | 25,556 | 30,382 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25,556 | 30,382 | 18.9% |
| Lane | City of Veneta | County | 83,004 | 84,629 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83,004 | 84,629 | 2.0% |
| Lane | City of Veneta | City | 365,761 | 372,878 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 365,761 | 372,878 | 1.9% |
| Lane | City of Veneta | Education | 367,696 | 374,816 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 367,696 | 374,816 | 1.9% |
| Lane | City of Veneta | Other | 157,239 | 161,801 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 157,239 | 161,801 | 2.9% |

| Table 3.2 Urban Renewal Division of Tax Revenue for FYs 2022-23 and 2023-24 by Agency, County, Type of Levy, and District Type (Dollars) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|---------------|---------------------|------------|---------------|---------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|-------|
| | | | Permanent/Gap Bonds | | Local Option | | Bond | s | To | tal Revenue | |
| County | Agency | District Type | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | FY 2022-23 FY | 2023-24 | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | % CH |
| Lane | City of Coburg | County | 39,595 | 41,798 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39,595 | 41,798 | 5.6% |
| Lane | City of Coburg | City | 116,074 | 122,580 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116,074 | 122,580 | 5.6% |
| Lane | City of Coburg | Education | 172,994 | 182,711 | 0 | 0 | 79,330 | 82,981 | 252,323 | 265,692 | 5.3% |
| Lane | City of Coburg | Other | 41,076 | 43,382 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41,076 | 43,382 | 5.6% |
| Lane | City of Springfield (SED) | County | 298,977 | 341,720 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 298,977 | 341,720 | 14.3% |
| Lane | City of Springfield (SED) | City | 1,019,800 | 1,171,209 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,019,800 | 1,171,209 | 14.8% |
| Lane | City of Springfield (SED) | Education | 1,294,380 | 1,480,238 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,294,380 | 1,480,238 | 14.4% |
| Lane | City of Springfield (SED) | Other | 563,448 | 639,911 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 563,448 | 639,911 | 13.6% |
| Lane | City of Florence | County | 87,955 | 90,982 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87,955 | 90,982 | 3.4% |
| Lane | City of Florence | City | 196,857 | 203,626 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 196,857 | 203,626 | 3.4% |
| Lane | City of Florence | Education | 325,780 | 337,090 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 325,780 | 337,090 | 3.5% |
| Lane | City of Florence | Other | 173,583 | 179,613 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 173,583 | 179,613 | 3.5% |
| Lane | City of Creswell | County | 9,695 | 15,098 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9,695 | 15,098 | 55.7% |
| Lane | City of Creswell | City | 20,209 | 31,434 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20,209 | 31,434 | 55.5% |
| Lane | City of Creswell | Education | 41,629 | 64,719 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41,629 | 64,719 | 55.5% |
| Lane | City of Creswell | Other | 12,813 | 19,942 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12,813 | 19,942 | 55.6% |
| Lincoln | City of Waldport | County | 18,728 | 20,407 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18,728 | 20,407 | 9.0% |
| Lincoln | City of Waldport | City | 15,078 | 16,430 | 0 | 0 | 2,067 | 2,154 | 17,145 | 18,584 | 8.4% |
| Lincoln | City of Waldport | Education | 35,801 | 39,003 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35,801 | 39,003 | 8.9% |
| Lincoln | City of Waldport | Other | 15,741 | 17,147 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15,741 | 17,147 | 8.9% |
| Lincoln | City of Lincoln City | County | 71,977 | 104,281 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71,977 | 104,281 | 44.9% |
| Lincoln | City of Lincoln City | City | 104,598 | 151,821 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104,598 | 151,821 | 45.1% |
| Lincoln | City of Lincoln City | Education | 137,429 | 199,142 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 137,429 | 199,142 | 44.9% |
| Lincoln | City of Lincoln City | Other | 36,751 | 53,431 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36,751 | 53,431 | 45.4% |
| Lincoln | City of Newport | County | 784,867 | 822,006 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 784,867 | 822,006 | 4.7% |
| Lincoln | City of Newport | City | 1,446,154 | 1,515,567 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,446,154 | 1,515,567 | 4.8% |
| Lincoln | City of Newport | Education | 1,499,699 | 1,570,476 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,499,699 | 1,570,476 | 4.7% |
| Lincoln | City of Newport | Other | 212,972 | 222,993 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 212,972 | 222,993 | 4.7% |
| Lincoln | City of Yachats | County | 152,763 | 164,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 152,763 | 164,100 | 7.4% |
| Lincoln | City of Yachats | City | 9,282 | 9,961 | 0 | 0 | 8,060 | 8,361 | 17,342 | 18,322 | 5.7% |
| Lincoln | City of Yachats | Education | 291,918 | 313,659 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 291,918 | 313,659 | 7.4% |
| Lincoln | City of Yachats | Other | 49,995 | 53,749 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49,995 | 53,749 | 7.5% |
| Lincoln | City of Depoe Bay | County | 94,231 | 102,740 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94,231 | 102,740 | 9.0% |
| Lincoln | City of Depoe Bay | City | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Lincoln | City of Depoe Bay | Education | 180,084 | 196,335 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 180,084 | 196,335 | 9.0% |
| Lincoln | City of Depoe Bay | Other | 48,365 | 54,259 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48,365 | 54,259 | 12.2% |
| Lincoln | City of Toledo | County | 78,618 | 84,540 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78,618 | 84,540 | 7.5% |
| Lincoln | City of Toledo | City | 144,451 | 155,270 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144,451 | 155,270 | 7.5% |
| Lincoln | City of Toledo | Education | 150,250 | 161,478 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150,250 | 161,478 | 7.5% |
| Lincoln | City of Toledo | Other | 34,936 | 37,579 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34,936 | 37,579 | 7.6% |

| Table 3.2 | Urban Renewal Divisio | n of Tax Revenเ | ue for FYs 202 | for FYs 2022-23 and 2023-24 by Agency, County, Type of Levy, and District Type (Dollars) | | | | | | | |
|-----------|-----------------------|-----------------|--|--|---------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|-----------|--|------------|----------------|
| County | Agency | District Type | Permanent/Gap Bonds FY 2022-23 FY 2023-24 | | Local Option FY 2022-23 FY 2023-24 | | Bonds FY 2022-23 FY 2023-24 | | Total Revenue FY 2022-23 FY 2023-24 | | % CH |
| Linn | City of Lebanon | County | 197,328 | 213,767 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 197,328 | 213,767 | 8.3% |
| Linn | City of Lebanon | City | 758,757 | 824,250 | 0 | 0 | 24,715 | 27,871 | 783,472 | 852,121 | 8.8% |
| Linn | City of Lebanon | Education | 898,468 | 975,080 | 0 | 0 | 263,108 | 58,026 | 1,161,576 | 1,033,106 | -11.1% |
| Linn | City of Lebanon | Other | 397,773 | 430,953 | 0 | 0 | 9,551 | 10,614 | 407,324 | 441,567 | 8.4% |
| Linn | City of Harrisburg | County | 48,257 | 25,505 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48,257 | 25,505 | -47.1% |
| Linn | City of Harrisburg | City | 120,586 | 63,753 | 0 | 0 | 10,770 | 0 | 131,355 | 63,753 | -51.5% |
| Linn | City of Harrisburg | Education | 211,415 | 111,720 | 0 | 0 | 36,941 | 0 | 248,356 | 111,720 | -55.0% |
| Linn | City of Harrisburg | Other | 45,451 | 24,009 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45,451 | 24,009 | -47.2% |
| Linn | City of Albany | County | 421,919 | 469,852 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 421,919 | 469,852 | 11.4% |
| Linn | City of Albany | City | 2,119,592 | 2,360,231 | 0 | 0 | 84,824 | 94,430 | 2,204,416 | 2,454,661 | 11.4% |
| Linn | City of Albany | Education | 1,786,320 | 1,988,840 | 0 | 0 | 883,874 | 883,108 | 2,670,194 | 2,871,948 | 7.6% |
| Linn | City of Albany | Other | 22,839 | 25,659 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22,839 | 25,659 | 12.3% |
| Marion | City of Salem | County | 2,704,050 | 3,251,574 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,704,050 | 3,251,574 | 20.2% |
| Marion | City of Salem | City | 5,506,611 | 6,592,246 | 0 | 0 | 132,561 | 147,456 | 5,639,172 | 6,739,701 | 19.5% |
| Marion | City of Salem | Education | 5,128,505 | 6,141,921 | 0 | 0 | 342,809 | 378,039 | 5,471,315 | 6,519,960 | 19.2% |
| Marion | City of Salem | Other | 877,878 | 1,048,775 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 877,878 | 1,048,775 | 19.5% |
| Marion | City of Woodburn | County | 176,318 | 214,941 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 176,318 | 214,941 | 21.9% |
| Marion | City of Woodburn | City | 352,831 | 430,286 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 352,831 | 430,286 | 22.0% |
| Marion | City of Woodburn | Education | 317,373 | 387,015 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 317,373 | 387,015 | 21.9% |
| Marion | City of Woodburn | Other | 102,011 | 124,341 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102,011 | 124,341 | 21.9% |
| Marion | City of Silverton | County | 206,335 | 211,684 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 206,335 | 211,684 | 2.6% |
| Marion | City of Silverton | City | 250,091 | 256,710 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 250,091 | 256,710 | 2.6% |
| Marion | City of Silverton | Education | 372,828 | 382,616 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 372,828 | 382,616 | 2.6% |
| Marion | City of Silverton | Other | 122,135 | 125,489 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122,135 | 125,489 | 2.7% |
| Marion | City of Turner | County | 15,542 | 17,435 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15,542 | 17,435 | 12.2% |
| Marion | City of Turner | City | 18,042 | 20,225 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18,042 | 20,225 | 12.1% |
| Marion | City of Turner | Education | 28,536 | 32,002 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28,536 | 32,002 | 12.1% |
| Marion | City of Turner | Other | 10,126 | 11,398 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,126 | 11,398 | 12.6% |
| Morrow | City of Boardman | County | 63,729 | 43,579 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63,729 | 43,579 | -31.6% |
| Morrow | City of Boardman | City | 64,877 | 44,307 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64,877 | 44,307 | -31.7% |
| Morrow | City of Boardman | Education | 81,782 | 55,898 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81,782 | 55,898 | -31.7% |
| Morrow | City of Boardman | Other | 42,998 | 29,240 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42,998 | 29,240 | -32.0% |
| Multnomah | City of Portland (PP) | County | 27,238,654 | 12,350,673 | 0 | 0 | 2,010,377 | 1,562,573 | 29,249,031 | 13,913,247 | -52.4% |
| Multnomah | City of Portland (PP) | City | 45,809,349 | 20,499,499 | 0 | 0 | 1,231,881 | 1,065,260 | 47,041,230 | 21,564,758 | -54.2% |
| Multnomah | City of Portland (PP) | Education | 37,285,872 | 16,810,954 | 0 | 0 | 8,267,072 | 7,059,369 | 45,552,944 | 23,870,323 | - 47.6% |
| Multnomah | City of Portland (PP) | Other | 9,195,160 | 4,136,529 | 0 | 0 | 1,255,738 | 1,040,481 | 10,450,898 | 5,177,010 | -50.5% |
| Multnomah | City of Gresham (GRC) | County | 2,059,318 | 2,525,682 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,059,318 | 2,525,682 | 22.6% |
| Multnomah | City of Gresham (GRC) | City | 1,713,188 | 2,100,089 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,713,188 | 2,100,089 | 22.6% |
| Multnomah | City of Gresham (GRC) | Education | 2,557,829 | 3,130,032 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,557,829 | 3,130,032 | 22.4% |
| Multnomah | City of Gresham (GRC) | Other | 703,558 | 862,977 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 703,558 | 862,977 | 22.7% |

| Table 3.2 Urban Renewal Division of Tax Revenue for FYs 2022-23 and 2023-24 by Agency, County, Type of Levy, and District Type (Dollars) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|---------------|-------------|---------------------|---------------|--------------|-------|------------|------------|---------------|-------|--|
| | | | Permanent/0 | Permanent/Gap Bonds | | Local Option | | Bonds | | Total Revenue | | |
| County | Agency | District Type | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | FY 2022-23 FY | | | FY 2023-24 | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | % CH | |
| Multnomah | City of Troutdale | County | 47,395 | 50.076 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47,395 | 50,076 | 5.7% | |
| Multnomah | City of Troutdale | City | 41,168 | 43,521 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41,168 | 43,521 | 5.7% | |
| Multnomah | City of Troutdale | Education | 58,979 | 62,477 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58,979 | 62,477 | 5.9% | |
| Multnomah | City of Troutdale | Other | 16,087 | 16,935 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16,087 | 16,935 | 5.3% | |
| Multnomah | City of Wood Village | County | 180,271 | 182,160 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 180,271 | 182,160 | 1.0% | |
| Multnomah | City of Wood Village | City | 129,745 | 131,105 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129,745 | 131,105 | 1.0% | |
| Multnomah | City of Wood Village | Education | 224,554 | 226,907 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 224,554 | 226,907 | 1.0% | |
| Multnomah | City of Wood Village | Other | 61,597 | 62,300 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61,597 | 62,300 | 1.1% | |
| Multnomah | City of Fairview | County | 206,291 | 365,361 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 206,291 | 365,361 | 77.1% | |
| Multnomah | City of Fairview | City | 165,822 | 293,553 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 165,822 | 293,553 | 77.0% | |
| Multnomah | City of Fairview | Education | 256,989 | 455,097 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 256,989 | 455,097 | 77.1% | |
| Multnomah | City of Fairview | Other | 70,439 | 124,932 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70,439 | 124,932 | 77.4% | |
| Polk | City of Independence | County | 128,341 | 135,815 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 128,341 | 135,815 | 5.8% | |
| Polk | City of Independence | City | 343,396 | 363,317 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 343,396 | 363,317 | 5.8% | |
| Polk | City of Independence | Education | 434,322 | 459,564 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 434,322 | 459,564 | 5.8% | |
| Polk | City of Independence | Other | 143,754 | 152,009 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 143,754 | 152,009 | 5.7% | |
| Polk | City of Dallas | County | 35,131 | 43,872 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35,131 | 43,872 | 24.9% | |
| Polk | City of Dallas | City | 85,997 | 107,673 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85,997 | 107,673 | 25.2% | |
| Polk | City of Dallas | Education | 112,041 | 140,218 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112,041 | 140,218 | 25.1% | |
| Polk | City of Dallas | Other | 5,154 | 6,460 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,154 | 6,460 | 25.3% | |
| Polk | City of Monmouth | County | 96,315 | 116,545 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96,315 | 116,545 | 21.0% | |
| Polk | City of Monmouth | City | 202,648 | 245,282 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 202,648 | 245,282 | 21.0% | |
| Polk | City of Monmouth | Education | 325,780 | 394,405 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 325,780 | 394,405 | 21.1% | |
| Polk | City of Monmouth | Other | 99,746 | 121,063 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99,746 | 121,063 | 21.4% | |
| Tillamook | City of Garibaldi | County | 21,068 | 22,901 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21,068 | 22,901 | 8.7% | |
| Tillamook | City of Garibaldi | City | 40,022 | 43,500 | 0 | 0 | 5,324 | 5,150 | 45,347 | 48,650 | 7.3% | |
| Tillamook | City of Garibaldi | Education | 69,141 | 75,130 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69,141 | 75,130 | 8.7% | |
| Tillamook | City of Garibaldi | Other | 10,929 | 11,870 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,929 | 11,870 | 8.6% | |
| Tillamook | City of Tillamook | County | 99,808 | 103,241 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99,808 | 103,241 | 3.4% | |
| Tillamook | City of Tillamook | City | 119,986 | 124,166 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 119,986 | 124,166 | 3.5% | |
| Tillamook | City of Tillamook | Education | 367,221 | 379,954 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 367,221 | 379,954 | 3.5% | |
| Tillamook | City of Tillamook | Other | 84,209 | 87,167 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84,209 | 87,167 | 3.5% | |
| Umatilla | City of Pendleton | County | 206,069 | 198,048 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 206,069 | 198,048 | -3.9% | |
| Umatilla | City of Pendleton | City | 475,872 | 457,227 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 475,872 | 457,227 | -3.9% | |
| Umatilla | City of Pendleton | Education | 414,558 | 398,257 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 414,558 | 398,257 | -3.9% | |
| Umatilla | City of Pendleton | Other | 49,904 | 48,041 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49,904 | 48,041 | -3.7% | |
| Umatilla | City of Hermiston | County | 46,896 | 54,112 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46,896 | 54,112 | 15.4% | |
| Umatilla | City of Hermiston | City | 100,350 | 115,692 | 0 | 0 | 4,083 | 0 | 104,433 | 115,692 | 10.8% | |
| Umatilla | City of Hermiston | Education | 101,594 | 116,961 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101,594 | 116,961 | 15.1% | |
| Umatilla | City of Hermiston | Other | 38,765 | 44,717 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38,765 | 44,717 | 15.4% | |

| Table 3.2 U | Irban Renewal Division | of Tax Revenu | ue for FYs 202 | 2-23 and 20 | 23-24 by Agenc | y, Coun | ty, Type of I | Levy, and Di | strict Type (l | Dollars) | |
|-------------|--------------------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|----------------|---------|---------------|--------------|----------------|------------|--------|
| | | | Permanent/Gap Bonds | | Local Option | | Bonds | | Total Revenue | | |
| County | Agency | District Type | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | FY 2022-23 FY | | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | % CH |
| Union | City of La Grande | County | 153,727 | 154,999 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 153,727 | 154,999 | 0.8% |
| Union | City of La Grande | City | 385,455 | 388,774 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 385,455 | 388,774 | 0.9% |
| Union | City of La Grande | Education | 271,615 | 274,045 | 0 | 0 | 96,385 | 94,903 | 368,000 | 368,948 | 0.3% |
| Union | City of La Grande | Other | 24,119 | 24,434 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24,119 | 24,434 | 1.3% |
| Wasco | City of The Dalles | County | 420,947 | 412,554 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 420,947 | 412,554 | -2.0% |
| Wasco | City of The Dalles | City | 298,481 | 292,567 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 298,481 | 292,567 | -2.0% |
| Wasco | City of The Dalles | Education | 591,802 | 579,867 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 591,802 | 579,867 | -2.0% |
| Wasco | City of The Dalles | Other | 411,485 | 403,168 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 411,485 | 403,168 | -2.0% |
| Washington | Tualatin Dev. Commission | County | 27,394 | 266,236 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27,394 | 266,236 | 871.9% |
| Washington | Tualatin Dev. Commission | City | 25,561 | 245,014 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25,561 | 245,014 | 858.6% |
| Washington | Tualatin Dev. Commission | Education | 65,965 | 627,958 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65,965 | 627,958 | 851.9% |
| Washington | Tualatin Dev. Commission | Other | 21,181 | 212,018 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21,181 | 212,018 | 901.0% |
| Washington | City of Sherwood | County | 313,491 | 203,855 | 0 | 0 | 6,129 | 0 | 319,620 | 203,855 | -36.2% |
| Washington | City of Sherwood | City | 459,923 | 299,068 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 459,923 | 299,068 | -35.0% |
| Washington | City of Sherwood | Education | 731,478 | 475,749 | 0 | 0 | 365,291 | 0 | 1,096,769 | 475,749 | -56.6% |
| Washington | City of Sherwood | Other | 243,779 | 159,651 | 0 | 0 | 48,513 | 0 | 292,292 | 159,651 | -45.4% |
| Washington | City of North Plains | County | 152,726 | 159,736 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 152,726 | 159,736 | 4.6% |
| Washington | City of North Plains | City | 147,461 | 154,258 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 147,461 | 154,258 | 4.6% |
| Washington | City of North Plains | Education | 367,594 | 384,406 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 367,594 | 384,406 | 4.6% |
| Washington | City of North Plains | Other | 112,681 | 118,495 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112,681 | 118,495 | 5.2% |
| Washington | City of Tigard | County | 412,906 | 498,262 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 412,906 | 498,262 | 20.7% |
| Washington | City of Tigard | City | 460,640 | 557,321 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 460,640 | 557,321 | 21.0% |
| Washington | City of Tigard | Education | 993,957 | 1,203,456 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 993,957 | 1,203,456 | 21.1% |
| Washington | City of Tigard | Other | 335,681 | 407,769 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 335,681 | 407,769 | 21.5% |
| Washington | City of Hillsboro | County | 2,433,734 | 3,477,933 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,433,734 | 3,477,933 | 42.9% |
| Washington | City of Hillsboro | City | 3,971,636 | 5,672,074 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,971,636 | 5,672,074 | 42.8% |
| Washington | City of Hillsboro | Education | 5,857,170 | 8,366,773 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,857,170 | 8,366,773 | 42.8% |
| Washington | City of Hillsboro | Other | 248,035 | 365,719 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 248,035 | 365,719 | 47.4% |
| Washington | City of Beaverton | County | 971,527 | 1,062,154 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 971,527 | 1,062,154 | 9.3% |
| Washington | City of Beaverton | City | 1,827,566 | 2,182,628 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,827,566 | 2,182,628 | 19.4% |
| Washington | City of Beaverton | Education | 2,216,713 | 2,422,903 | 0 | 0 | 50,390 | 0 | 2,267,103 | 2,422,903 | 6.9% |
| Washington | City of Beaverton | Other | 1,321,638 | 1,445,808 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,321,638 | 1,445,808 | 9.4% |
| Washington | City of Forest Grove | County | 130,746 | 165,229 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130,746 | 165,229 | 26.4% |
| Washington | City of Forest Grove | City | 230,012 | 290,776 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 230,012 | 290,776 | 26.4% |
| Washington | City of Forest Grove | Education | 311,020 | 393,007 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 311,020 | 393,007 | 26.4% |
| Washington | City of Forest Grove | Other | 12,995 | 17,244 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12,995 | 17,244 | 32.7% |
| Washington | City of Banks | County | 19,006 | 21,219 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19,006 | 21,219 | 11.6% |
| Washington | City of Banks | City | 16,658 | 18,599 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16,658 | 18,599 | 11.7% |
| Washington | City of Banks | Education | 46,081 | 51,460 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46,081 | 51,460 | 11.7% |
| Washington | City of Banks | Other | 10,265 | 11,573 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,265 | 11,573 | 12.7% |

| Table 3.2 U | Irban Renewal Divis | ion of Tax Revenı | ue for FYs 202 | 2-23 and 202 | 23-24 by Agen | cy, Coun | ty, Type of I | _evy, and D | istrict Type (| Dollars) | |
|-----------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|----------|---------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|---------|
| | | | Permanent/Gap Bonds | | Local Option | | Bonds | | Total Revenue | | |
| County | Agency | District Type | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | FY 2022-23 FY | 2023-24 | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | % CH |
| Washington | City of Cornelius | County | 40,772 | 73,803 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40,772 | 73,803 | 81.0% |
| Washington | City of Cornelius | City | 72,357 | 130,813 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72,357 | 130,813 | 80.8% |
| Washington | City of Cornelius | Education | 97,443 | 176,318 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97,443 | 176,318 | 80.9% |
| Washington | City of Cornelius | Other | 4,125 | 7,827 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4,125 | 7,827 | 89.7% |
| Yamhill | City of Carlton | County | 45,930 | 50,210 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45,930 | 50,210 | 9.3% |
| Yamhill | City of Carlton | City | 89,276 | 97,597 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89,276 | 97,597 | 9.3% |
| Yamhill | City of Carlton | Education | 101,625 | 111,112 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101,625 | 111,112 | 9.3% |
| Yamhill | City of Carlton | Other | 21,549 | 23,562 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21,549 | 23,562 | 9.3% |
| Yamhill | City of McMinnville | County | 135,808 | 141,147 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135,808 | 141,147 | 3.9% |
| Yamhill | City of McMinnville | City | 264,364 | 192,947 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 264,364 | 192,947 | -27.0% |
| Yamhill | City of McMinnville | Education | 266,890 | 277,319 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 266,890 | 277,319 | 3.9% |
| Yamhill | City of McMinnville | Other | 8,241 | 117,854 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8,241 | 117,854 | 1330.1% |
| Yamhill | City of Dundee | County | 50,438 | 71,199 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50,438 | 71,199 | 41.2% |
| Yamhill | City of Dundee | City | 45,243 | 63,842 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45,243 | 63,842 | 41.1% |
| Yamhill | City of Dundee | Education | 102,527 | 144,765 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102,527 | 144,765 | 41.2% |
| Yamhill | City of Dundee | Other | 19,301 | 27,241 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19,301 | 27,241 | 41.1% |
| Yamhill | City of Newberg | County | 0 | 88,118 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88,118 | N/A |
| Yamhill | City of Newberg | City | 0 | 98,918 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98,918 | N/A |
| Yamhill | City of Newberg | Education | 0 | 178,935 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 178,935 | N/A |
| Yamhill | City of Newberg | Other | 0 | 85,418 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85,418 | N/A |
| Yamhill | City of Lafayette | County | 0 | 4,921 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4,921 | N/A |
| Yamhill | City of Lafayette | City | 0 | 6,672 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6,672 | N/A |
| Yamhill | City of Lafayette | Education | 0 | 9,664 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9,664 | N/A |
| Yamhill | City of Lafayette | Other | 0 | 272 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 272 | N/A |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| District Totals | S** | County | 52,286,349 | 39,878,409 | 0 | 0 | 2,160,150 | 1,635,912 | 54,446,499 | 41,514,321 | -23.8% |
| | | City | 91,048,877 | 70,219,150 | 0 | 0 | 1,789,179 | 1,680,358 | 92,838,056 | 71,899,508 | -22.6% |
| | | Education | 98,580,786 | 83,645,112 | 0 | 0 | 13,267,688 | 11,635,478 | 111,848,473 | 95,280,590 | -14.8% |
| | | Other | 27,812,174 | 23,800,307 | 1,179 | 0 | 1,526,566 | 1,272,831 | 29,339,918 | 25,073,139 | -14.5% |
| Statewide To | vtale. | | 269.728.185 | 217.542.978 | 1,179 | 0 | 18,743,583 | 16.224.580 | 288.472.947 | 233.767.557 | -19.0% |
| State wide 10 | nais | | 209,720, 105 | 217,342,3 70 | 1,179 | U | 10,743,503 | 10,224,560 | 200,412,941 | 233,707,337 | -13.070 |

Notes: N/A indicates that the plan did not divide tax that year or that the plan area did not exist that year. If the %CH column has an N/A this means that this is the first year the plan levies a tax. The category "Education" includes K-12, Community Colleges, and ESD's.

Revenue reported does not include revenue from urban renewal special levies.

Detailed Tables – Tax Collection

Table 4 – Property Tax Certified, Collected, and Uncollected, for FY 2022–23, by County

| County | Total Property Tax Certified | Total Property Taxes Collected* | Net Total Adjustments** | % Net Total Adjustments | Total Property Tax Uncollected | % Property Tax Uncollected |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Baker | 27,702,052 | 26,428,848 | -717,392 | 2.6% | 555,813 | 2.0% |
| Benton | 186,104,691 | 178,612,830 | -5,301,030 | 2.8% | 2,190,831 | 1.2% |
| Clackamas | 1,066,817,445 | 1,021,268,231 | -29,883,820 | 2.8% | 15,665,393 | 1.5% |
| Clatsop | 103,377,022 | 97,861,438 | -2,791,193 | 2.7% | 2,730,891 | 2.6% |
| Columbia | 93,852,753 | 89,477,893 | -2,381,538 | 2.5% | 1,993,322 | |
| Coos | 86,188,662 | 80,790,438 | -2,343,864 | 2.7% | 3,054,360 | |
| Crook | 39,223,430 | 37,245,907 | -1,113,028 | 2.8% | 864,495 | |
| Curry | 30,946,037 | 29,254,465 | -821,501 | 2.7% | 870,071 | 2.8% |
| Deschutes | 484,010,620 | 466,608,108 | -13,011,034 | 2.7% | 4,391,478 | |
| Douglas | 125,659,002 | 117,220,792 | -3,694,437 | 2.9% | 4,743,773 | |
| Gilliam | 12,613,440 | 12,132,858 | -359,040 | 2.8% | 121,542 | |
| Grant | 9,819,094 | 9,171,625 | -239,144 | 2.4% | 408,325 | |
| Harney | 10,365,709 | 9,072,228 | -259,499 | 2.5% | 1,033,982 | |
| Hood River | 45,009,440 | 43,107,109 | -1,231,330 | 2.7% | 671,002 | |
| Jackson | 353,757,089 | 336,965,834 | -9,951,144 | 2.8% | 6,840,111 | |
| Jefferson | 36,184,123 | 34,269,983 | -965,430 | 2.7% | 948,711 | 2.6% |
| Josephine | 91,019,510 | 86,376,292 | -2,383,247 | 2.6% | 2,259,971 | 2.5% |
| Klamath | 84,767,834 | 79,304,904 | -2,631,946 | 3.1% | 2,830,984 | |
| Lake | 13,309,880 | 12,382,261 | -414,614 | 3.1% | 513,005 | |
| Lane | 661,842,119 | 632,590,503 | -18,404,889 | 2.8% | 10,846,727 | |
| Lincoln | 140,668,960 | 133,911,733 | -3,756,714 | 2.7% | 3,000,513 | |
| Linn | 213,099,033 | 202,991,935 | -5,842,191 | 2.7% | 4,264,907 | |
| Malheur | 35,133,203 | 33,479,024 | -870,743 | 2.5% | 783,436 | |
| Marion | 517,005,590 | 493,324,742 | -14,595,889 | 2.8% | 9,084,959 | |
| Morrow | 54,070,120 | 52,042,657 | -1,540,052 | 2.8% | 487,412 | |
| Multnomah | 2,292,168,650 | 2,193,595,013 | -66,673,006 | 2.9% | 31,900,631 | 1.4% |
| Polk | 116,433,766 | 111,315,116 | -3,180,738 | 2.7% | 1,937,911 | 1.7% |
| Sherman | 10,198,062 | 9,884,477 | -251,234 | 2.5% | 62,351 | 0.6% |
| Tillamook | 69,092,712 | 66,014,296 | -1,794,944 | 2.6% | 1,283,471 | 1.9% |
| Umatilla | 121,439,004 | 115,352,905 | -4,040,683 | 3.3% | 2,045,415 | |
| Union | 33,750,222 | 31,817,144 | -866,697 | 2.6% | 1,066,381 | 3.2% |
| Wallowa Wasco | 12,282,256 | 11,609,385 | -360,937 | 2.9% | 311,934 | |
| | 50,986,562 | 48,472,584 | -1,529,165 | 3.0% | 984,814 | |
| Washington | 1,384,838,782 | 1,327,198,125 | -45,061,608 | 3.3% | 12,579,049 | |
| Wheeler Yamhill | 3,616,386 161,542,082 | 3,379,735 153,686,987 | -94,652 -4,197,414 | 2.6% 2.6% | 142,000 3,657,680 | |
| Statewide Total | 8,778,895,339 | 8,388,218,404 | -253,555,784 | 2.9% | 137,127,651 | 1.69 |

Ad Valorem Tax. Tax levied as a percentage of a property's value. English translation of the Latin term ad valorem is "according to value".

Additional taxes. Revenues for taxing districts, including penalty upon reclassification, because of various statutory provisions:

- **Farmland.** Additional tax and penalty paid when farmland changes use and becomes ineligible for farm use assessment.
- **Forestland.** Additional tax and penalty paid when forestland becomes ineligible for forestland assessment.
- Small tract. Additional tax and penalty paid when land becomes ineligible for Western Oregon Small Tract preferential tax treatment.
- Open space. Additional tax and penalty paid when open space land becomes ineligible for preferential tax treatment.
- **Historic property.** Additional tax and penalty paid when property is no longer used as a historic site.
- Late filing fee. Penalty amount paid for failure to file a personal property return on time under ORS 308.302.
- Clerical error. Additional tax paid because of the correction of a clerical error under ORS 311.206.
- Other. Other additional taxes and penalties, such as those resulting from a reclassification of an enterprise zone (ORS 285.617) or riparian land (ORS 308.798).

Arm's length transaction. Transaction between an informed buyer and informed seller who are not related or on close terms, and who are presumed to have roughly equal bargaining power not involving a confidential relationship.

Assessed value (AV). Value of property subject to taxation. Under the provisions of Measure 50, the maximum assessed value for the 1997–98 fiscal year was set at 90 percent of the 1995–96 assessed value for each property in the state. The maximum assessed value for each property is allowed to grow a maximum of 3 percent per year (unless a significant change to the property occurs). In general, the taxable assessed value is equal to the lower of the maximum assessed value, or the real market value of the property. Assessed value does not include the exemptions allowed for property.

Assessment. The process of identifying and assigning a value to taxable property.

Assessment roll. A listing of all taxable property in a county as of January 1 of each year.

Average effective tax rate. Average rate computed for an area by dividing the taxes imposed in that area by the value of the taxable property.

Billing rate. Tax rate expressed in dollars per \$1,000 of assessed property value.

Board of Property Tax Appeals (BOPTA). County board that hears taxpayer appeals of property assessment. Property owners can file appeals between the date of delivery of tax statements, which is no later than October 25 through December 31. Refunds are granted when appeals are successful. Taxpayers may

appeal the BOPTA decision to the Magistrate Division of the Oregon Tax Court. Name changed to Property Value Appeals Board (PVAB) in 2024.

Bond levies. Property tax levies to pay principal and interest on district bonded debt.

Business, housing, and miscellaneous exemptions. Exempt value of certain business, housing, and miscellaneous other properties that are partially or totally exempt from property taxation. The qualifying exemptions include:

- Personal Property for Personal Use.
 Tangible personal property held by the owner for personal use. Examples of personal property include household goods, furniture, appliances, personal effects, clothing, etc.
- Veterans' exemptions. Exemption applies to the assessed value of the home site and personal property of a disabled veteran or their surviving spouse.
- **Historic property.** Improved property that has been specially assessed due to its historic designation.
- Enterprise zones. Certain business properties within designated enterprise zones that qualify for exemption for a limited number of years, under provisions included in ORS Chapter 285C. To be eligible, a business must meet several conditions relating to type of business activity and requirements for hiring and investment.
- Commercial facilities under construction. Certain commercial buildings in the process of construction that qualify for exemption from

- property taxation for not more than two consecutive years, under ORS 307.330 and 307.340.
- All other business, housing, and miscellaneous exemptions. These include alternative energy systems, farm labor camps, housing for low-income rental, multiple-unit housing in core areas, nonprofit homes for the elderly, pollution control facilities, port and airport property leased, etc.

Centrally assessed property. Taxable property assessed by the Department of Revenue, including electric and communication utilities, rail transportation, air transportation, water transportation, gas pipelines, private railcars, and others.

Changed property ratio (CPR). The ratio of average maximum assessed value to average real market value for unchanged properties. (Averages are determined by property class by county.) This ratio is used in calculating the assessed values of new properties, improvements, and other additions to the tax roll. See Oregon Administrative Rule 150-308-0170 for more information regarding CPRs.

Code area. Geographic unit established by a county assessor and identified by a code number representing a unique combination of taxing districts. All properties in a code area pay taxes to the same taxing districts.

Compression. The process of reducing taxes as required by the Measure 5 property tax rate limits approved in 1990. The limits are \$5 per \$1000 of value for education districts and \$10 per \$1000 of value for all other districts. Compression is computed on a property-by-property basis,

first by reducing local option taxes. If further reduction is necessary to not exceed the limits, all other non-bond taxes are reduced proportionately.

Compression loss. Amount of reduction in taxes due to Measure 5 compression.

Consolidated tax rate. Sum of the billing rates of all taxing districts that impose taxes in a given code area. Billing rates are calculated prior to any compression that may result from Measure 5 property tax rate limits.

Deferral programs. More information related to the Senior and Disabled Deferral program can be found at the Oregon Department of Revenue website: www.oregon.gov/dor/deferral

Deferred Billing Credits. Prior to 2017-18 counties could allow taxpayers to defer payments for disputed property taxes if the dollar amount was more than a million dollars. The county temporarily credited the account for a portion of the amount of disputed tax to avoid paying penalty interest if the tax dispute is eventually lost. Replaced by Potential Refund Credits starting in tax year 2017-18.

District tax rate. Computed by adding together the permanent rate, the local option rate, the gap bond rate, and the bond rate for the district. Tax rate expressed in dollars and cents per \$1,000 of property value.

Division of tax. The process of, and revenue from, apportioning tax to urban renewal agencies based on the relationship between the frozen base value and the growth of value ("excess value" or "increment") of properties in a particular geographic area (urban renewal plan area). The tax is split between urban renewal

agency and taxing district in the same proportion as the ratio of excess value to frozen value.

Elderly Rental Assistance (ERA). For more information, see Oregon Housing and Community Services: www.oregon.gov/ohcs

Excess value. See urban renewal excess value.

Exempt property. Properties that are not taxed under the property tax system. See public exemptions, social welfare exemptions, and business, housing, and miscellaneous exemptions.

Existing urban renewal plan area.

Urban renewal plan area that 1) existed in December 1996, 2) chose an option (see Urban renewal option), and 3) established a maximum amount of indebtedness by July 1998.

Farm use special assessment. Special assessment at less than full assessed value for land (ORS 308A.062–308A.068).

Fiscal Year (FY). The term fiscal year as used in this publication refers to July 1 through the following June 30. FY 2023-24 would therefore be July 1, 2023 through June 30, 2024.

Fish and Wildlife. Total assessed value of state Fish and Wildlife Commission property. While not subject to property tax, the commission makes equivalent payments to counties under ORS 496.340.

Forestland special assessment. Special assessment at less than full assessed value of land used for growing timber.

Frozen base value. The assessed value of property within an urban renewal plan area at the time that the plan was created.

Full local option authority. Estimate of the amount of tax that could be levied if a district were to use the full amount of local option levies passed by voters.

Full permanent rate authority. Estimate of the amount of tax that could be levied if a district were to use its entire permanent rate.

Gap bonds. Principal and interest obligations of districts that are paid for with operating revenues rather than with the proceeds of a bond levy. The only remaining property levy that is considered a gap bond levy is the Pension Levy in Portland. However, this levy has special treatment under the Oregon Constitution.

Inside the Limit. Imposed taxes subject to the constitutionally prescribed Measure 5 rate limits.

Joint taxing district. A taxing district that crosses county lines.

Levy based property tax system. Tax system in which levies are determined by budget needs of a taxing district (which in many cases must be approved by voters), and tax rates are calculated as levies divided by total assessed value in a district. The alternative is a rate-based tax system.

Local option levies. Property tax levies beyond the revenues generated by permanent tax rates. Local option levies may be approved by voters in any regular May or November election. If a vote for a local option is held at any other time, then that election must have at least 50 percent voter participation.

Locally assessed property. Taxable property assessed by county assessors,

including real property, personal property, and manufactured structures.

Manufactured structures value. Total assessed value of all manufactured structures, which includes mobile homes (ORS 801.333).

Market value. See real market value.

Measure 5. Constitutional tax rate limitations passed by voters in November 1990, which can be found at Article XI, Section 11b of the Oregon Constitution. Measure 5 limits school taxes to \$5 per \$1,000 of value and non-school taxes to \$10 per \$1,000 of value. Levies to pay bond principal and interest for capital construction projects are outside the limitation.

Measure 5 Value. Value to which Measure 5 rate limits are applied. Measure 5 Value is equal to real market value for all properties that are not specially assessed, partially exempt, or fully exempt. See ORS 310.165 for more information.

Measure 50. A constitutional amendment approved by voters in 1997. For 1997-98, Measure 50 set the maximum assessed value of every property to 90 percent of its 1995-96 assessed value. Measure 50 then limited the annual growth in maximum assessed value of existing property to 3 percent. In addition, Measure 50 led to the replacement of most dollar-based levies with permanent tax rates.

Mobile homes. See manufactured structures.

Net assessed value (NAV). Value used to calculate district tax rates for dollar levies. It is total assessed value, plus nonprofit housing value and state fish and wildlife

value, minus urban renewal excess value used.

Net tax for collection. Total tax for collection minus total credits. (See total credits for description.)

Nonprofit housing value. Total assessed value of property removed from the roll for nonprofit housing purposes. This property consists of land and improvements owned by nonprofit corporations to provide permanent housing, recreational and social facilities, and care to elderly persons. Under ORS 307.244, qualifying property receives a funded exemption from the property tax, but the county receives an equivalent payment from the state.

Operating taxes. A colloquial term for all property taxes subject to the Measure 5 limits. Taxes from the permanent, local option, and gap bond rates that are used to fund the general operating budgets of the taxing districts.

Outside the Limit. Taxes imposed outside of the constitutionally prescribed Measure 5 rate limits. In current law this is essentially limited to tax levies to repay bonded indebtedness.

Permanent tax rates. Permanent taxing rate for each taxing district, expressed in dollars per \$1,000 of assessed value. This rate is the maximum rate a district may use without approval by voters; districts may use any rate below this maximum.

Personal property value (Business).

Total assessed value of personal property, including machinery, equipment, and office furniture. In 2016-17, personal property for business use that totaled to less than \$16,500 in value, excluding personal property manufactured structures,

were not required to pay property tax and were not included in assessed value. The limit is indexed for inflation. Personal property for personal use is exempt from taxation.

Plan area. See urban renewal plan area.

Potential Refund Credits. For certain kinds of tax disputes if the dollar amount exceeds \$1 million dollars the assessor may choose to offer a potential refund credit. In these cases, the taxpayer will pay all or some of the disputed tax, which is then placed in a separate interest-earning account. At the resolution of the legal dispute, the money and interest are distributed to the taxpayer or government, based on the case outcome. Only applies to tax years 2017-18 and later. See ORS 305.286 for more. See also: Deferred Billing Credits.

Property Value Appeals Board (PVAB). See Board of Property Tax Appeals (BOPTA).

Public exemptions. Property owned by federal, state, or local governments (including counties, cities and towns, and school districts) is generally exempt from property taxation. Private property leased or used for a public purpose may also qualify, depending on the specific situation.

Public utility. Property described in ORS 308.515. See centrally assessed property.

Rate-based property tax system. Tax system in which tax rates are set by law or by voters, and levies are calculated as rates times assessed value. Oregon's tax system is predominately a rate-based system.

Real market value (RMV). Real market value of all property, real and personal, is

the amount in cash that could reasonably be expected to be paid by an informed buyer to an informed seller, both acting without compulsion in an arm's length transaction occurring as of the assessment date for the tax year.

Real property value. Total assessed value of real property, including land, buildings, structures, and improvements. The following property classes are included within real property:

- Commercial land. Unimproved property that has commercial use as its highest and best use.
- Commercial property. Improved property that has commercial use as its highest and best use.
- Farm and range property. Land or land and buildings with a highest and best use of the production of agricultural crops, feeding and management of livestock, dairying, any other agricultural or horticultural use, or any combination thereof.
- Farm and range zoned property. Land or land and buildings located within an exclusive farm-use zone assessed as farm-use land.
- Farm and range unzoned property.
 Land or land and buildings assessed as unzoned farmland.
- Forestland and forest property.

 Consists of land with a highest and best use of growing and harvesting trees of a marketable species, and land that has been designated as forestland.
- Improvement. Includes any building, wharf, bridge, ditch, flume, reservoir, well, tunnel, fence, street, sidewalk, machinery, aqueduct, and all other

- structures and superstructures (ORS 87.005).
- **Industrial land.** Unimproved property that has industrial use as its highest and best use.
- Industrial property. Improved property that is a single plant or a complex of properties engaged in manufacturing or processing a product. The Department of Revenue or county may be responsible for appraisal of industrial property.
- **Multiple housing land.** Unimproved property that has multiple housing use (five living units or more) as its highest and best use.
- Multiple housing property. Improved property that has multiple housing use (five living units or more) as its highest and best use.
- **Recreation land.** Unimproved property that has recreational use as its highest and best use.
- Recreational property. Improved property that provides recreational opportunities as its highest and best use.
- **Residential land.** Unimproved property that has residential use as its highest and best use.
- **Residential property.** Improved property that has residential use as its highest and best use.
- **Tract land.** Unimproved acreage with a highest and best use other than farm, range, or timber production.
- Tract property. Improved acreage with a highest and best use other than farm, range, or timber production.

Roll. See Assessment roll.

Social welfare exemptions. Assessed value of properties owned by private organizations and used for educational, religious, or developmental purposes is exempt from property taxes. The qualifying organizations include:

- Fraternal organizations (ORS 307.136).
- Literary and charitable organizations (ORS 307.130).
- Religious organizations (ORS 307.140).
- Burial grounds (ORS 307.150).
- All other social welfare. Includes private schools and day care facilities, public libraries privately owned, senior centers privately owned, etc.

Special levy. See urban renewal special levy.

Specially assessed property. Property that is assessed at less than its full value. See farm use special assessment and forestland special assessment.

Supervisory orders. Orders to the counties from the Department of Revenue to correct the values of centrally assessed utility accounts on the tax rolls. These orders are related to corrections in valuations, not appeals.

Taxable value. See assessed value.

Taxes added to rolls. Additional taxes generated when a final order is entered in an appeal, omitted property is included, or other error corrections are made.

Tax extended. Amount of tax calculated *before* the Measure 5 rate limits are applied. If, for an individual property,

taxes exceed Measure 5 limits, then the taxes for that property are reduced to the limits.

Tax imposed. Taxes to be paid by taxpayers *after* the Measure 5 rate limits have been applied. For individual properties, the tax imposed always will be less than or equal to the tax extended.

Tax increment financing. A financial tool designed to tax the increases in property value that occur over time in a specific geographic area. Given the frozen base value of the property at the time such a plan area is established, any growth in value ("excess value") is taxed to raise revenue.

Tax increment revenue. Revenue raised from taxing the growth in value ("excess value" or "increment") of properties in each geographic area.

Taxing district. A local government entity that imposes property taxes (e.g., county, city, K-12 school district). A district may cross county lines. For example, the City of Portland District includes portions of the city that are located in Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington counties.

Tax limit category. Under the 1990 Measure 5 constitutional property tax limitation, taxes are divided into three categories: 1) inside the general government limits, 2) inside the education limit, and 3) outside the limit. All taxes, other than bond levies for capital construction, which are used for non-school purposes, fall inside the general government limit of \$10 per \$1,000 of value. All taxes, other than bond levies, that are used for education purposes fall inside the education limit of \$5 per \$1,000 of value. All bond levies used for capital

construction fall outside the limit. Of the current types of levies, permanent rate, local option, gap bond, and pension levy taxes are subject to the limitations.

Total amount of property tax certified.

Amount of taxes charged by the tax collector as certified by the assessor and authorized by the county clerk. The total includes taxes on real property, personal property, manufactured structures, and public utilities. The amount reported by counties generally includes taxes relating to special assessments and in-lieu payments for fish and wildlife property and nonprofit housing property.

Total assessed value. Sum of assessed values of all taxable properties on the roll.

Total credits. Includes discount allowed for prompt payments, personal property taxes canceled by order of county clerk, real property foreclosures, and other corrections or cancellations.

Total levy. Total levy submitted by the district, including the local option levy and the levy for bonded indebtedness.

Total taxes collected. Taxes collected by the tax collector during the fiscal year ending June 30. Tax collections are reported separately from interest and penalty collections.

Unallocated utilities. Small, private railcar companies that pay property taxes to the state. These taxes are distributed by the state to county governments.

Urban renewal. A program designed to help communities improve and redevelop areas that are physically deteriorated, unsafe, or poorly planned.

Urban renewal agency. Entity responsible for administering urban

renewal programs. Urban renewal agencies can be organized by city governments or county governments. They oversee activities in urban renewal plan areas. An urban renewal agency can administer multiple plan areas.

Urban renewal excess value. Total assessed value of property in urban renewal plan areas in excess of the base assessed values when the plan areas were established. This is also called the "increment."

Urban renewal option. Funding option that the urban renewal plan uses. Only "existing" plan areas could choose option 1, 2, or 3 (see existing urban renewal plan). Plan areas that are not "existing" can raise revenue as described under "Other" below.

- Option 1 plan areas receive full division of tax revenue from all levies except local option and bond levies passed after October 6, 2001. A special levy on all taxable property in the municipality may be used to reach the plan area's maximum revenue authority.
- Option 2 plan areas cannot receive division of tax revenue, but a special levy may be used to raise revenue up to the plan area's maximum revenue authority from properties in the municipality.
- Option 3 plan areas had their revenue from division of tax limited when the option was selected. These plan areas receive division of tax revenue up to their limit and may impose a special levy on all taxable property in the municipality up to their maximum revenue authority.

Appendix: Glossary

• Other plan areas that did not select an option, but were *adopted before*October 6, 2001, raise division of tax revenue from all levies, but cannot use a special levy. Other plans that were *adopted after* October 6, 2001 must exclude local option and bond levies passed after October 6, 2001 when calculating division of tax revenue; they also cannot use a special levy. All plans created after September 28, 2019 are permanent rate plans; it only includes permanent rate and gap bond levies.

Urban renewal plan area. Geographic area in which urban renewal activity takes place. It is the "excess" value in urban renewal plan areas that determines the

amount of tax to raise for urban renewal agencies.

Urban renewal shared value. The assessed value of property that is both 1) within the district that covers part of a plan area, and 2) within the boundaries of the urban renewal agency. It also includes portions of a district that are within a plan area but outside the area of the urban renewal agency. Property owners within the shared value area may have part of their taxes allocated for urban renewal rather than for their tax districts.

Urban renewal special levy. Levy imposed by an urban renewal agency if the amount of revenue raised from excess value is below its revenue-raising authority.

