

W. S. B.

**Joint Elected Officials Questions on Public Safety District  
Proposed Metro Plan Amendment  
Worksession/Pubic Hearing  
April 19, 2005**

**Worksession**

1. How do you reconcile that the need is financial, however the evaluation criteria are land use? Bettman
2. Does it matter that the need has nothing to do with land use? Bettman
3. 1<sup>st</sup> Whereas in the Order, what is the boundary of the proposed service district? Bettman
4. Who pays for the public safety services for someone that lives inside the donut hole and commits a crime outside the donut hole? Bettman
5. Amendment is glaringly inconsistent because if it was consistent, you wouldn't need to render all the policies that the amendment is inconsistent with, moot. Policy 15 a, b, c, and d are basically neutralized with the "notwithstanding" language. **How is that internally consistent within the Metro Plan?** Bettman
6. The services "including but not limited to" lists services that are provided by the cities. The list of services seems inconsistent with the rationale that the list of specific services is limited, but yet the services include those on the list but are not limited to those services. Bettman
7. Some of the services are provided by an urban entity. **If an urban entity funds services, is it not a provider of the service?** Bettman
8. 70% of the County's General Fund represents \$35 million. How much will the new PSD displace of the \$35 million and how much from the new revenue stream will be substituted for the \$35 million? Bettman
9. **It seems that it is a slight of hand to use the "notwithstanding" language to make the proposed amendment not internally inconsistent. Would like legal feedback.** Kelly
10. **Does it matter legally, what the definition of who provides services? If you provide funding are you a provider of the service?** Kelly
11. Packet does not provide description of tax rate for the district, what services provided, what services that the cities now provide would go away because of compression? Kelly
12. **What is the specific list of public safety services that are required by statute?** Bettman
13. Doesn't it cost more to provide services in the rural area than in the urban area? Did the Planning Commissions address any of the financial issues? The Planning Commission only applied the Metro Plan amendment criteria? Did the Planning Commission compare the services being recommended verses those required by statute? Bettman
14. If a city opts out of the proposed district, do the citizens of the city get to vote on the proposed district? Woodrow
15. If there is a countywide vote, but some cities opt out, isn't the County still mandated by statute to provide the public safety services? Bettman

16. Why did Lane County decide to do the Metro Plan amendment first, before going to the 10 small cities to get their support first? Bettman
17. Could there be a defacto shifting of funding if one community got into compression and the full funding responsibility wasn't able to be put on that community, and would that responsibility shift to other communities that weren't experiencing compression? Pape
18. What ideas does the County have to address the effect of compression for Eugene that would mitigate the \$6.3 million per year? Kelly

### **Public Hearing**

1. Do the same amendment criteria apply to a fire district, library district or park district? Sorenson
2. Is creation of a public safety district within urban growth boundaries consistent with the Statewide Planning Goals? Sorenson
3. Was there any testimony at the planning commissions about growth inducing policies outside the urban growth boundaries to create a public safety district that would extend outside the urban growth boundary? Sorenson
4. **Will ask city staff a question on the effect of compression on future city levies?** Bettman
5. County sponsored HB3301 would remove the prohibition on overlapping districts and would eliminate the cities authority to approve or disapprove. The proposed Metro Plan amendment removes Policy 15. b which requires the 3 Metro Area general purpose governments to concur with the proposal to form the service district. **Doesn't the proposed amendment override this provision and result in the City giving up it's authority?** Bettman
6. Could creation of PSD be made contingent on all of the other city's approval of the proposed PSD? Sorenson
7. If the cities approve the district formation, would the Board of Commissioners set the level of taxation and the level of compression, or do the cities have a role? Sorenson
8. What role do the cities have in setting the rate once they agree to the formation of the district? Sorenson
9. **What language in Policy 15 is restrictive?** Bettman
10. Is the \$20 million that would be generated for the PSD in addition to the \$35 million already spent for public safety from the County General Fund? Bettman
11. Is there anything that the cities have that could pre-empt the effects of compression if the PSD levy is approved? Pape
12. Is compression based on market value? Ballew
13. As market value fluctuates, doesn't it affect the amount of compression? Ballew
14. What is the tax rate that would generate \$20 million for the PSD? Ralston
15. Can the County, independent of the PSD, soften the problem of compression for fire protection districts, Willamalane, etc.? Sorenson
16. Can the County give money to other districts or the cities? Sorenson
17. What will be the effect of compression on the Glenwood Urban Renewal District? Lundberg

18. What is the ceiling of the deficit of public safety services the County is trying to plug with the PSD? No total number has been put to the need that the County has identified? Bettman
19. Are we asking approval of the district before we know what the financial costs of the services are? Bettman
20. **Would this policy amendment allow the County to locate correction facilities outside the UGB?** Sorenson

Testimony:

1. Fred Simmons
2. David Hinkley
3. Charles Biggs
4. Laurie Seigel - **Metro Plan Ch 3 Sect G Public Facilities and Services Policies are impacted by the proposed amendment and the proposed amendment would be inconsistent with this section of the Metro Plan.**
5. Rob Handy
6. Mona Lindstromberg
7. Jim Hale