

**RCW 29A.36.210 Property tax levies—Ballot form.** (1) The ballot proposition authorizing a taxing district to impose the regular property tax levies authorized in RCW 36.68.525, 36.69.145, 67.38.130, 84.52.069, or 84.52.135 must contain in substance the following:

"Will the . . . . . (insert the name of the taxing district) be authorized to impose regular property tax levies of . . . . . (insert the maximum rate) or less per thousand dollars of assessed valuation for each of . . . . . (insert the maximum number of years allowable) consecutive years?

Yes . . . . .   
No . . . . .

Each voter may indicate either "Yes" or "No" on his or her ballot in accordance with the procedures established under this title.

(2) The ballot proposition authorizing a taxing district to impose a permanent regular tax levy under RCW 84.52.069 must contain in substance the following:

"Will the . . . . . (insert the name of the taxing district) be authorized to impose a PERMANENT regular property levy of . . . . . (insert the maximum rate) or less per thousand dollars of assessed valuation?

Yes . . . . .   
No . . . . .

[2010 c 106 § 301; 2004 c 80 § 2; 2003 c 111 § 921. Prior: 1999 c 224 § 2; 1984 c 131 § 3. Formerly RCW 29.30.111.]

**Effective date—2010 c 106:** See note following RCW 35.102.145.

**Effective date—2004 c 80:** See note following RCW 84.52.135.

**Application—1999 c 224:** See note following RCW 84.52.069.

**Purpose—1984 c 131 §§ 3-9:** "The purpose of sections 3 through 6 of this act is to clarify requirements necessary for voters to authorize certain local governments to impose regular property tax levies for a series of years. Sections 3 through 9 of this act only clarify the existing law to avoid credence being given to an erroneous opinion that has been rendered by the attorney general. As cogently expressed in Attorney General Opinion, Number 14, Addendum, opinions rendered by the attorney general are advisory only and are merely a "prediction of the outcome if the matter were to be litigated." Nevertheless, confusion has arisen from this erroneous opinion." [1984 c 131 § 2.]