



Oregon Fire District Directors Association, Special Districts Association and the Oregon Fire Chiefs Association Oppose SB 422

The Oregon Fire District Directors Association (OFDDA), representing approximately 160 rural fire protection districts, and the Oregon Fire Chiefs Association, representing 528 Fire Chiefs and Senior Fire Officers from 225 Districts and Departments, oppose SB 422.

- Special Districts are formed for the purpose of providing a **single** specified service to those they serve. They are authorized to tax their constituents for the purpose of providing those services.
- If voters wish to have additional law enforcement or any other service, they may currently vote to fund those services. If not, they may choose not to fund them. It is up to the voters.
- Rural Fire Protection Districts believe it breaks voter trust to collect for one service, then use the dollars collected to fund a different type of service, circumventing the intent of the voters who believe they are paying for fire protection.
- Rural Fire Protection Districts take seriously their commitment to the public to provide fire protection. Making them responsible, either directly or indirectly, for funding other services seriously compromises their ability to make decisions in the best interest of the citizens to protect them against loss of life and property due to fire.
- Funding options are already available to law enforcement. Counties may put forth levies to voters for Enhanced Service Districts, just as is being successfully accomplished in both Clackamas and Washington counties. If citizens wish to have additional coverage, they can already choose to fund it, rather than leaving it up to fire districts to choose for them.
- In the event of another economic downturn, fire district Boards will be placed in the position of having to choose between fire protection funding and law enforcement funding, creating a conflict of interest.
- Fire Service entities throughout the State oppose 422 for the reasons mentioned above.

Please vote NO on SB 422