

WASHINGTON COUNTY  
PUBLIC SAFETY REVIEW COMMITTEE

FINAL REPORT

Summary

Introduction

The Washington County Public Safety Review Committee, a task force of county citizens, elected officials and police officials, was appointed by Washington County Sheriff Bill Probstfield in October 1985 and charged with responsibility to:

---

1. Define the level of police services that should be delivered to all county residents.
2. Determine those police services that might be more cost effectively delivered on a centralized basis.
3. Determine how police services should be funded.

Between November, 1985 and May, 1986, the Committee met 13 times, reviewing the need for and delivery of the full range of police services in Washington County, including patrol services, and how to pay for them.

Conclusion

The level of police service provided to residents of Washington County is uneven, varying from one area of the county to another. In the cities of Washington County, the level of service ranges from 1.1 to 2.9 sworn police officers per 1,000 population, according to the County Auditor's report of November 1985. In the unincorporated area, the level of service is approximately .77 sworn police officers per 1,000 population.

The Committee concludes that it is desirable for every resident of the County to have available a level of police service, at minimum, of 1.0 sworn police officer per 1,000 population.

Residents of the county should have the opportunity to approve additional funding resources that are directed at increasing the level of police services to at least the minimum of 1.0 sworn police officer per 1,000.

### Recommendations

This report provides recommendations on the responsibility for the delivery of police services in Washington County, on measures for consideration to reduce the overall costs of police in Washington County, and on options that may be exercised by residents of the unincorporated area of Washington County to obtain an increased level of police services if they desire.

#### A. Responsibility:

Cities in Washington County should be responsible for delivery of police services within their boundaries. The County should be responsible for delivery of police services in the unincorporated areas of the County. Specifically, the Sheriff should be responsible for the protection of all lives and property of Washington County citizens outside cities, and for providing assistance to police agencies within cities as mutually agreed.

#### B. Cost-effective Service

1. To reduce existing and potential duplication, the Washington County Sheriff's Department, in cooperation with the cities, should develop a long-range plan for providing a countywide, computerized records system. The system would include, at a minimum, incident and investigative reports and crime analysis, plus suspect, incidence and vehicle information.
2. Sheriff should provide the following police services to all County residents:
  - Swat Team
  - Forensic Services
  - Narcotics Investigation
  - Jail Operations
3. In addition, the Sheriff could be responsible for delivery of police training and crime prevention services, to be designed in cooperation with the cities.

4. The Sheriff and other public safety officers in the County should pursue more cost-effective and efficient approaches to conducting major felony investigations, including but not limited to:

- Homicide
  - Armed robbery
  - Kidnapping
  - Rape
  - Fraud
  - Arson
  - Child abuse
  - Burglary
- 

5. The Committee recognizes that the assumption of increased responsibility for centralized police services by the Sheriff could reduce the level of patrol services the Department is able to provide if no additional funding sources are available. However, the Committee believes the Sheriff must maintain patrol services in the unincorporated area of the County.

C. Funding the Service

1. Countywide Sheriff services, as identified in this report, should be funded through the Washington County General Fund.
2. Any increase in patrol services provided by the Sheriff in neighborhoods of residents living in the unincorporated areas of the County should be funded outside Washington County's General Fund.
3. Residents of the urban unincorporated areas in Washington County should give consideration to receiving police services from a city through annexation or incorporation.
4. Residents of the unincorporated areas of the County should be allowed to contract for increased patrol services from the Sheriff's Department. The option should also exist for these residents to receive these services from cities under an intergovernmental agreement.
5. Washington County should consider these options for funding increased patrol services, including:
  - county service district
  - contract with a private corporation  
(e.g., homeowners' assn.)
  - local improvement district
  - special service district

If changes in state law are needed to allow any of these options to be employed, Washington County should review, in cooperation with the cities, what changes may be necessary, and complete this review in time for possible introduction of legislation at the 1987 regular session of the State Legislature.

6. Capital outlay and startup costs for a new computerized record-keeping system, maintained by the Sheriff and serving all County residents, should be funded through a special countywide levy. Operating expenses after startup for this system should be funded through the County's General Fund. Any future major capital investment related to Sheriff Dept. services offered countywide should be funded on a similar basis.
- 

D. Communications:

Intercommunication between cities, the County and neighborhoods in the County about maintaining and funding an adequate level of police service throughout Washington County must be given a high priority. In addition, expanded and more creative approaches to keep the public informed about police services provided in Washington County should be developed by the County in cooperation with the cities.

A new standing mechanism to evaluate on-going progress to reach these goals should be established.

WASHINGTON COUNTY  
PUBLIC SAFETY REVIEW COMMITTEE

FINAL REPORT

I. Background

A. The Washington County Public Safety Review Committee (PSRC) was appointed by Sheriff Bill Probstfield in October, 1985, and charged with:

- ° Defining the level of service that should be delivered to all county residents.
- ° Determining those police services that might be more cost effectively delivered on a centralized basis.
- ° Determining how law enforcement services should be funded.

The list of appointees appears in Attachment A.

Committee members were selected to ensure balanced representation of Washington County residents and to include local law enforcement expertise.

B. Through May 13, 1986, the Committee held 13 meetings, ten with benefit of an outside facilitator, and three with members only discussing the issues. (Attachment B lists meetings of the Committee.)

C. The agendas of initial meetings of the committee in November, December and early January included background presentations:

- ° County Auditor Alan Percell, Survey of police services in Washington County.
- ° County Assistant Administrator Charles Cameron, Washington County General Fund support for law enforcement.
- ° Sheriff Probstfield, consolidation of law enforcement services by the Sheriff.
- ° David Lawrence, Urban Services Manager, City of Portland, expanded delivery of law enforcement services by cities following annexation.
- ° Percell, establishment of a service district for special assessment of residents to receive law enforcement services.
- ° Dr. Charles Tracy, Portland State University, and Larry Conrad, Urban Services Manager, City of Beaverton, PSU report on services funding in Washington County, and summary of Beaverton urban services study.

Following these initial meetings through January 7, 1986, the Committee completed a mission statement for its work, and reached some tentative conclusions about level of law enforcement service, responsibilities for delivery of service, and funding. See Attachment C for a copy of this product.

In January and February, the Committee met for further discussion of these conclusions. From these meetings emerged a consensus worksheet of statements related to the Committee's charge for possible incorporation in its final report.

---

~~At meetings in March and April, the Committee reviewed and revised those statements, and developed its final report.~~

---

## II. Conclusions

The first statement developed by the Committee addresses the level of law enforcement service that the Committee felt it was desirable to deliver to all county residents.

### Discussion:

- A. There are four basic components of a criminal justice system: (1) law enforcement, patrol, investigation and prevention, (2) prosecution, (3) court system, and (4) corrections. For the system to be effective it must be in balance. Any weak link can cause ineffectiveness in the rest of the system.
- B. Some county law enforcement services, such as the county jail, the district attorney's office, crime prevention, and the juvenile department are provided to both city and unincorporated area residents. The sheriff's patrol focuses on unincorporated areas. Limited sheriff patrol service is provided inside cities.

- C. The units of government in Washington County vary substantially in size, financial resources, public safety service needs. As the county auditor's review shows, three of twelve cities currently contract with the Sheriff (Tualatin, Durham, King City), but these contract agreements will end at mid-year.

Nine of twelve cities have their own police departments varying in size from Beaverton with a \$2.8 million police budget and 61 staff, to Banks with \$32,500 budget and a half-time police chief.

Most jurisdictions handle calls for assistance by dispatching a uniformed officer. Durham, Gaston, North Plains, and the Sheriff, by contrast, respond to some non-life-threatening calls by taking a telephone report or referral to another agency.

---

Eight of the nine non-contract cities indicate frequent information sharing with the Sheriff on major felony cases. Most of the non-contract cities indicate they ask the Sheriff to provide a limited amount of scientific investigation support, and four of the cities indicate the Sheriff is asked on occasion to transport prisoners and mental patients.

Hillsboro, North Plains, and Banks ask the Sheriff to assist them with the investigation of some felonies.

- D. Studies by the Washington County Auditor and City of Beaverton demonstrate that a substantially higher level of service is provided in the cities than in the unincorporated area.

- Police budget per capita for 1984-85 was \$36.91 per capita in the unincorporated areas protected by the Sheriff. In the same year, police budgets for the cities ranged from \$68.12 to \$72.84 per capita -- about twice as much.
- The level of police service provided to residents of Washington County is uneven, varying from one area of the county to another. In the cities of Washington County, the level of service ranges from 1.1 to 2.9 sworn police officers per 1,000 population, according to the County Auditor's report of November 1985. In the unincorporated area, the level of service is approximately .77 sworn police officers per 1,000 population.
- Staff per square mile was .16 in the unincorporated area, versus 1.5 to 3.9 in cities.

Although there is no uniform standard for police protection in the U.S., 80% of all U.S. counties have between 1 and 3 officers per 1,000 residents.

- E. Washington County has been among the most rapidly growing and rapidly urbanizing counties in Oregon in the past two decades. Approximately 55% of Washington County's population is unincorporated and approximately 45% is within a city. About 9% of the unincorporated population lives in rural areas outside the regional urban growth boundary. The County's future population is expected to be increasingly more suburban and urban. Population is expected to grow between 47.7% and 65.9% during the next twenty years for a year 2005 population in excess of 400,000.

---

Population projections suggest that future growth will not be spread evenly. Higher than normal employment and population growth is projected for Tualatin, Tigard, Forest Grove, and the Sunset Corridor.

---

Law enforcement requirements increase as density increases. It is commonly viewed that there is a difference between a "rural" level of service and an "urban" level of service. Density, for example, is a key factor in the rate of criminal activity. It follows that Public Safety and Justice Services will experience increased demand beyond that anticipated by simple population growth.

- F. The urban areas of the county are clearly delineated by the year 2000 regional urban growth boundary. Within the urban growth boundary the cities of Durham and King City have no surrounding unincorporated areas. The Cities of Sherwood, Gaston, Tualatin, Hillsboro, North Plains, Cornelius and Forest Grove can be expected to annex their adjacent unincorporated areas within the urban growth boundary because city sewer water and sewer services will be necessary for urban development.

Upon annexation, those cities will provide a full range of municipal services, including an urban level of police protection. The areas between Hillsboro and Beaverton, north of Beaverton, and between Beaverton, Portland and Tigard have sewer, water, parks, and fire protection available at an urban level. It is these areas where the long-term urban level police protection problem is located.



Statement:

With this background, the Committee first developed a conclusion statement about the floor, or minimum level, of service each resident of Washington County should receive.

The Committee's discussions focused frequently on the provision of law enforcement services in the unincorporated areas of Washington County. From a consensus that the present level of service is inadequate, especially in the urbanized, unincorporated areas, and unlikely to improve under the current method of funding from the General Fund, the committee wrote language that would describe its view that it is desirable that expanded service be available to these residents.

The intent of this statement is that residents of the unincorporated area would act on the option for increased service if they felt the police services they were receiving were not adequate to meet their needs:

The level of police service provided to residents of Washington County is uneven, varying from one area of the county to another. In the cities of Washington County, the level of service ranges from 1.1 to 2.9 sworn police officers per 1,000 population, according to the County Auditor's report of November 1985. In the unincorporated area, the level of service is approximately .77 sworn police officers per 1,000 population.

The Committee concludes that it is desirable for every resident of the County to have available a level of police service, at minimum, of 1.0 sworn police officer per 1,000 population.

Residents of the county should have the opportunity to approve additional funding resources that are directed at increasing the level of police services to at least the minimum of 1.0 sworn police officer per 1,000.

### III. Recommendations

Based on this conclusion about level of service, the Committee then proceeded to draft recommendations on responsibility, cost-effectiveness, and funding for future delivery of police services in Washington County.

#### A. Responsibility

Looking at the mix of public law enforcement agencies providing protection in Washington County, the Committee stated its view of which agencies or jurisdictions should be responsible to ensure that police services are provided in the various areas of the County.

The Committee also addressed directly the responsibility of the Sheriff, the chief law enforcement officer of the County, for police services in Washington County.

Statement:

Cities in Washington County should be responsible for delivery of police services within their boundaries. The County should be responsible for delivery of police services in the unincorporated areas of the County. Specifically, the Sheriff should be responsible for the protection of all lives and property of Washington County citizens outside cities, and for providing assistance to police agencies within cities as mutually agreed.

B. Cost-effective service.

Discussion:

---

The Committee reviewed the current set of law enforcement and other justice services provided in Washington County. There is duplication of service within the delivery system. That duplication emerges in record keeping systems, administration, communications, investigative services and training activities.

Services that could be provided by the Sheriff to all residents either on a centralized basis or in cooperation with cities were examined. The purpose of this review was to determine the potential for more cost-effective law enforcement throughout the County. As seen in Attachment D, the Sheriff presented, through his assistant Sherre Calouri, his views of how centralizing, or consolidating, services might increase cost-effective delivery.

The Committee identified activities and services that represented potential areas for improved cost effectiveness, based on changes in responsibility as to which jurisdiction delivers these services. Delivery of police, or patrol, services was not included in these proposed rearrangements, leaving that function to be handled as described in Section I.

Statements:

The proposed changes in approach are:

1. To reduce existing and potential duplication, the Washington County Sheriff's Department, in cooperation with the cities, should develop a long-range plan for providing a countywide, computerized records system which would include, at a minimum, incident and investigative reports and crime analysis, plus suspect, incidence and vehicle information.

The Committee identified those services that should be delivered directly by the Sheriff on a centralized basis to all residents of the County:

2. The Sheriff should provide the following services to all County residents:

- SWAT Team
- Forensic Services
- Narcotics Investigation
- Jail Operations

The Committee identified other services that might be delivered centrally by the Sheriff once a design on how those services were to be delivered was approved by the cities:

3. In addition, the Sheriff could be responsible for delivery of training and crime prevention services, to be designed in cooperation with the cities.

The Committee also recognized potential for improvement in the delivery of services related to major felony investigations. It did not propose an approach, but urged further exploration by the County and the cities:

4. The Sheriff and other public safety officers in the County should pursue more-cost-effective and efficient approaches to conducting major felony investigations, including but not limited to:

- Homicide
- Armed robbery
- Kidnapping
- Rape
- Fraud
- Arson
- Child abuse
- Burglary

Reviewing the potential impact of the changes proposed in the recommendations above, the Committee added:

5. The Committee recognizes that the assumption of increased responsibility for centralized law enforcement services by the Sheriff could reduce the level of patrol services the Department is able to provide, if no additional funding sources are available. However, the Committee believes the Sheriff must maintain patrol services in the unincorporated area of the County.

### C. Funding

#### Discussion:

The Committee then discussed ways and means of funding its service proposals. Background information on funding included these observations:

- 
- Expenditures for law enforcement services in Washington County have not been growing as rapidly as population growth. The Sheriff's budget has been relatively stable over the last several years. Court decisions however have required that additional resources be allocated to the jail resulting in a shifting of funds from patrol services to jail services. Manpower for patrolling is reduced by about 1/3 its late 1970s level.
  - The Auditor's report of October 1985 showed the true cost of contract services, and indicated that the cities contracting for services were not paying the full cost of the services received. The county subsidizes the three contract cities by almost \$.5 million, according to the report.

The County's view on law enforcement funding was summarized by Charles Cameron.

- 31%, or \$10.3 million of the general fund, supports public safety and justice services (Sheriff, corrections, DA, juvenile).
- 43% of the Sheriff's budget is allocated to police, or patrol, services and investigations; 27% to services (civil, records, communications); 26% to jail services; 3% to administration.
- County can't take funds out of other limited resources to add support to the Sheriff's department.

- The County has for many years been unsuccessful in passing a tax base. (The current \$4.25 million tax base was adopted in 1916.) Ongoing uncertainty over budgets has been a long pattern in Washington County, making it difficult to plan ahead and develop strong programs. County reliance on special levies has repeatedly caused layoff notices to employees, including sheriff's deputies. The pattern locally and nationally has been declining revenues at all levels of government. These trends are expected to continue.
- The existing operating levy for Washington County's general fund expires in 1987. The police officers association initiated in \$22.4 million serial levy voted on at the March 25, 1986 special election. This was defeated.

Included in the Committee's discussion was a consideration that there may be geographic differences between the source of funding and where various services are used in the County. County and city officials have raised the issue of "double taxation" or "urban subsidy". Specifically, city officials ask whether city residents who pay for city police service subsidize residents who live in unincorporated areas and receive law enforcement services paid for by all taxpayers in the county.

The information that is available does indicate an imbalance in law enforcement funding in favor of the unincorporated areas; however, there is a similar imbalance in other services in favor of the cities.

The choices for residents of unincorporated areas to obtain increased law enforcement services were varied. Not all choices might be acceptable, some members indicated, expressing concern that some residents living in the urban unincorporated area may not be ready to be annexed. One or two members of the committee felt that the level of service now provided by some cities may be beyond what's desired by these residents.

Statements:

The first two statements developed by the Committee relate to who should pay:

1. Countywide Sheriff services ,as identified in this report, should be funded through the Washington County General Fund.
2. Any increase in patrol services provided by the Sheriff in neighborhoods of residents living in the unincorporated areas of the County should be funded outside Washington County's General Fund.

Next came statements on how increased services might be funded:

3. Residents of the urban unincorporated areas in Washington County should give consideration to receiving police services from a city through annexation or incorporation.
4. Residents of the unincorporated areas of the County should be allowed to contract for increased patrol services from the Sheriff's Department. The option should also exist for these residents to receive these services from cities under an intergovernmental agreement.
5. Washington County should consider these options for funding increased patrol services,including:
  - County service district
  - Contract with a private corporation  
(e.g., homeowner's assoc.)
  - Local improvement district
  - Special service district

Based on a presentation by Washington County Counsel John Junkin, in which he cited law and his views on what options may or may not be legally viable at present, the Committee added:

If changes in state law are needed to allow any of these options to be employed, Washington County should review, in cooperation with the cities, what changes may be necessary, and complete this review in time for possible introduction of legislation at the 1987 regular session of the State Legislature.

Referring back to their proposal for developing a countywide, computerized records system, the members of the Committee agreed this was a priority need, and should be addressed in the near future. It also agreed that funding of this and other capital improvements to support Sheriff Department services should be handled as follows:

6. Capital outlay and startup costs for a new computerized record-keeping system, maintained by the Sheriff and serving all County residents, should be funded through a special countywide levy. Operating expenses after startup for this system should be funded through the County's General Fund. Any future major capital investment related to Sheriff Dept. services offered countywide should be funded on a similar basis.
-

D. Communications

Discussion:

The Committee members felt that the reason for concerns and confusion about the level and funding of law enforcement services in Washington County is because most County residents lack basic information. Given the need for possible future changes in how law enforcement services are to be delivered and funded, the Committee felt it is especially critical that information channels be expanded and cooperative efforts to resolve problems be assured:

Statement:

---

Intercommunication between cities, the County and neighborhoods in the County about maintaining and funding an adequate level of police service throughout Washington County must be given a high priority. In addition, expanded and more creative approaches to keep the public informed about law enforcement services provided in Washington County should be developed by the County in cooperation with the cities.

A new standing mechanism to evaluate on-going progress to reach these goals should be established.



ATTACHMENT A

PUBLIC SAFETY REVIEW COMMITTEE

Kelly D. Jennings, Assistant Chief  
Tigard Police Department  
9020 SW Burnham Rd.  
Tigard, OR 97223  
ph - 639-6168

Ralph Blair, Chief  
Cornelius Police Department  
P. O. Box 607  
Cornelius, OR 97113  
ph - 640-1881

---

Charles Cameron, Assistant County Administrator  
150 N. First  
Hillsboro, OR 97124  
ph - 648-8676

Don Newell, Chief  
Beaverton Police Department  
4950 SW Hall Blvd.  
Beaverton, OR 97005  
ph - 643-4646

Bob Dervedde, Hillsboro City Council  
633 SE 26th Ave.  
Hillsboro, OR 97123  
ph - 226-1555

Kent Freeman, Beaverton Neighborhood Rep.  
11655 SW Allen #21  
Beaverton, OR 97005  
ph - 644-6737

Reid Iford, Metzger Community Planning Organization  
9970 SW Greenburg Rd.  
Tigard, OR 97223  
ph - 639-7756

Delna Jones, Legislator  
P. O. Box 5666  
Aloha, OR 97006  
ph - 242-5624

Wes Myllenbeck, Chairman  
Board of County Commissioners  
150 N. First  
Hillsboro, OR 97124  
ph - 648-8681

Attachment A (cont')  
Public Safety Review Committee  
page 2

Ron Popkin  
Cedar Hills Homeowners Assoc.  
11735 SW Terra Linda  
Beaverton, OR 97005  
ph - 644-5718

Ann Schmidt, Executive Director  
Oregon Council of Crime & Delinquency  
718 W. Burnside, Room 208  
Portland, OR 97209  
ph - 228-5397

---

Mike Soloman, City Manager  
City of Forest Grove  
1924 Council  
Forest Grove, OR 97116  
ph - 357-7171 Ext. 221

Luanne Thielke, Mayor  
City of Tualatin  
18880 SW Martinazzi Ave.  
Tualatin, OR 97062  
ph - 692-1195

Mary Tobias, Mayor; acting Chair of the Committee  
City of Sherwood  
435 Roy Rd.  
Sherwood, OR 97140  
ph - 645-1141

Dr. Charles Tracy  
Portland State University  
Administration of Justice Dept.  
P. O. Box 751  
Portland, OR 97207  
ph - 229-4014

Jan Wegener  
Oak Hills Homeowners Assoc.  
15535 NW Norwich Circle  
Beaverton, OR 97006  
ph - 645-8559

Denise Won  
Boundary Commission  
320 SW Stark, Suite 530  
Portland, OR 97204  
ph - 229-5307

ATTACHMENT B

WASHINGTON COUNTY  
PUBLIC SAFETY REVIEW COMMITTEE

Meeting Schedule

November 5, 1985	Open Meeting
November 19	Committee Discussion: Is There a Problem with Public Safety in Washington County?
<hr/>	
December 3	Presentations: How Much Law Enforcement Do We Need?
December 17	Presentations: Which Agencies Should Protect Us in the Future?
January 7, 1986	Presentations: How Should Law Enforcement Be Funded?
January 14	General Committee Discussion of Issues
January 28	General Committee Discussion of Issues
February 11	General Committee Discussion of Issues
March 11	Review of Committee Recommendations
April 2	Review of Committee Recommendations
April 14	Review of Draft of Committee's Final Report
April 28	Review of Final Report
May 13	Review of Final Report; Approval of Draft Language

**Meeting Dates:**

[illegible]

ATTACHMENT C

WASHINGTON COUNTY  
PUBLIC SAFETY REVIEW COMMITTEE

MISSION:

The Committee acknowledges the charge presented to it by the Sheriff which calls for a review of law enforcement services provided by the Sheriff's Department. The review will generally:

- a) define the level of law enforcement service that should be delivered by the Sheriff to all County residents;
- b) determine those law enforcement services that might be more cost effectively delivered on a centralized basis by the Sheriff; and
- c) determine how law enforcement services provided by the Sheriff should be funded.

In conducting this review, the Committee will seek information on law enforcement services provided by cities in Washington County, as well as the Sheriff.

In determining appropriate levels and cost-effectiveness in the delivery of law enforcement services, the Committee will consider options for different areas within the County, including rural areas, urban unincorporated areas, smaller cities, and larger cities.

In deciding how law enforcement should be funded, the Committee will focus on long-term funding solutions

An additional objective of the Committee is to provide opportunities for public education on law enforcement issues.

The Committee anticipates that the assigned period of its charge will be too brief to develop solution the full range of Washington County's law enforcement problem. In its response to the Sheriff's charge, the Committee may wish to recommend practical, interim solution in some instances as first steps toward long-term resolution of the issues presented to it.

OBJECTIVE A: Define the level of law enforcement service that should be delivered by the Sheriff to all County residents.

COMMITTEE'S PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS/LEVEL OF SERVICE:

1. Adequacy of Service

<u>Cities</u>	<u>Current</u>	<u>Future</u>
Large	Generally adequate	Long-term outlook is bleak in most areas unless stable funding, new revenue mechanisms are provided;
Small	Generally adequate	cities with adequate tax bases currently (Beaverton, Forest Grove) have some flexibility.
<u>Sheriff</u>		
Urban unincorporated	Inadequate	
Rural	Mixed	
Contract cities	Generally adequate	

2. Major Factors That Affect Service Level

- Need for consistent source(s) of funds for law enforcement.
- Growth - Steady increase overall; varied rate in different areas of the county.
- Public understanding of the need for law enforcement services, and how they are presently delivered in Washington County.

3. What's Needed

- Expanded public information about law enforcement services: what's available, how they can be obtained, who's responsible.
- More investigation capability.
- More patrol (better and faster response).
- More centralization of services (e.g., SWAT, Investigations, computerized records).
- Better ability to plan and develop resources.
- Improved management information systems.
- Public understanding of the relationship between law enforcement and associated justice services -- corrections, prosecution. Issues: who controls, who pays, inadequacy of funding in these areas affects law enforcement funding.

OBJECTIVE B: Determine those law enforcement services that might be more cost effectively delivered on a centralized basis by the Sheriff.

COMMITTEE'S PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS:

1. The unincorporated urbanized area is the most likely focus area for any possible change in approach. Residents in these areas may not be ready for change; it may take a service crisis to produce change. On the other hand, residents in some portions of the unincorporated area (Metzger) are actively considering options for change.
2. The options for change in the unincorporated area most discussed are contract arrangements with the Sheriff, annexation by cities, and creation of a county service district with a special assessment for services.
3. The rural unincorporated area would not appear to be addressed by options discussed.
4. It may be useful to identify a set of centralized law enforcement services that the Sheriff could provide countywide.
5. There may be a need to establish a base level of law enforcement service to be provided uniformly countywide.

OBJECTIVE C: Determine how law enforcement services provided by the Sheriff should be funded.

COMMITTEE'S PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS:

1. There is a geographic difference between the source of funding and where the services are used. Who receives is different than who pays. The magnitude of the difference is significant in the case of law enforcement in favor of the unincorporated area. However, the flow moves the other way for some services such as human and public health services.

## Objective C (cont'd):

2. In order to receive more law enforcement services, residents of the unincorporated area must pay increased property taxes to cities, the county, a service district, or purchase services from a security company.
3. If no property tax increases are forthcoming or if increased efficiency in delivery of service is desired, then the options are to:
  - a) Consolidate or centralize services
  - b) Assign Sheriff corrections. Assign cities patrol and other law enforcement services
  - c) reduce to "basic" law enforcement services
4. The question may be how to maintain the current level of law enforcement service in the urban unincorporated area and how to pay for it.



# AGENDA

Continued from 4/14/87 meeting

## WASHINGTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

*Records*  
*CAO*  
*RED*  
*MTG*

Agenda Category Public Hearing

Agenda Title Formation of Enhanced Sheriff's Patrol District: Adopt Feasibility Report and Initiate Formation

To be presented by Charles Cameron, County Administrator

### SUMMARY (Attach Supporting Documents if Necessary)

A key component of the County 2000 Program is the formation of an ORS Chapter 451 Service District as the funding and administrative structure for providing enhanced Sheriff's patrol in the urban area. As provided by statute, a report has been prepared which demonstrates the feasibility of this approach.

The attached Resolution and Order adopts this feasibility report, imposes a five-year sunset clause on the proposed district and directs that the proposal be forwarded to the Portland Metropolitan Area Boundary Commission.

Assuming a favorable decision from the Boundary Commission, this matter will come back before the Board for a final hearing and possibly setting an election date.

### DEPARTMENTS REQUESTED ACTION:

Conduct public hearing on whether to initiate formation and on feasibility report conclusions.

Adopt the Resolution and Order, together with the feasibility report.

*Feasibility Report filed in Records*

### COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S RECOMMENDATION:

You received the feasibility report at your April 7 Worksession exclusive of the following appendices: Analysis of County Service District Options (January, 1987), Preliminary Feasibility Study (December, 1986), Feasibility Data Base (April 1987), Detailed Public Safety Cost Estimates, Legal Description of District, Public Safety Review Committee Report, Washington County 2000 Materials, Resolution and Order, H.B. 2907.

They are at the Clerk's desk for your review.

Agenda Item No. *5c*  
Date: *4-21-87*

*RED 87-80*

FILED

MAY 4 1987

Washington County  
County Clerk

IN THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
FOR WASHINGTON COUNTY, OREGON

In the Matter of Adopting an Order )  
and Feasibility Report Declaring )  
Intention of the Board to Initiate )  
Formation of an ORS Chapter 451 )  
Service District for Enhanced )  
Sheriff's Patrol for the Urban )  
Area and Forwarding Said Propo- )  
sal to the Portland Metropolitan )  
Area Local Government Boundary )  
Commission )

RESOLUTION AND ORDER  
NO. 87-80

This matter having come before the Board of County  
Commissioners for public hearing at its regularly scheduled  
meeting of April 21, 1987; and

It appearing to the Board that the Board has adopted the  
"County 2000 Program" as the policy framework for addressing the  
needs of the citizens of Washington County for governmental  
services and to ensure that such services are provided in the  
most efficient and effective manner; and

It appearing to the Board that the provision of an adequate  
level of Sheriff's patrol for the urban area is one of the most  
pressing needs identified by the citizens of Washington County to  
protect the health, welfare and safety of individuals and  
property; and

It appearing to the Board that an integral component of the  
County 2000 Program is the creation of a service delivery

//////////

//////////

COUNTY COUNSEL, WASHINGTON COUNTY  
HILLSBORO, OREGON 97101-3747

1 mechanism which will charge benefitted properties for services in  
2 an equitable manner at rates which reflect actual costs and  
3 maximize local citizen input into the determination of an  
4 appropriate service level; and

5 It appearing to the Board that County staff and consultants  
6 have conducted exhaustive studies, that the Board is in receipt  
7 of a report entitled "Analysis of County Service District  
8 Options", dated March, 1987, which summarizes said studies and  
9 recommends the creation of a County 451 Service District for  
10 enhanced Sheriff's patrol as the best structure for meeting those  
11 goals and, further, is in receipt of a specific feasibility  
12 analysis dated April, 1987, which addresses and demonstrates the  
13 economic feasibility of said proposal; and

14 It appearing to the Board that the County has conducted a  
15 major citizen involvement process, including town hall meetings,  
16 appearances before interested organizations and extensive media  
17 coverage so as to inform the public and receive input on the  
18 County 2000 Program, culminating in a public hearing on this date  
19 at which testimony was heard and considered; now, therefore, it is

20 RESOLVED AND ORDERED that the Board of County Commissioners  
21 for Washington County hereby declares its intent to initiate the  
22 formation of an ORS Chapter 451 County Service District for the  
23 purpose of providing enhanced Sheriff's patrol services in the  
24 urban portion of Washington County; and it is further

25 //////////////

26 //////////////

1           RESOLVED AND ORDERED that the name of this ORS Chapter 451  
2 District shall be the Washington County Enhanced Sheriff's Patrol  
3 District and the boundaries and purpose of said district shall be  
4 as set forth in the feasibility report dated April 1987, attached  
5 and by this reference incorporated herein as Exhibit "A" and  
6 further, that the analysis and conclusions of said report are  
7 accepted for the purpose of presentation to the Boundary  
8 Commission; and it is further

9           RESOLVED AND ORDERED that, subject to adoption of HB 2907 by  
10 the 64th Oregon Legislative Assembly, said district shall  
11 dissolve on the close of fiscal year 1992-1993 unless a  
12 determination of public need for continued existence is made; and  
13 it is further

14           RESOLVED AND ORDERED that the County Administrative Office  
15 shall immediately forward a certified copy of this Order to the  
16 Portland Metropolitan Area Local Government Boundary Commission.  
17 Such action shall suspend local formation proceedings, as  
18 provided in ORS 199.476, until the decision of the Boundary  
19 Commission is filed. At that time, the County shall resume the  
20 local process to complete formation, as provided by statute; and  
21 it is further

22           RESOLVED AND ORDERED that, in the interim, the County shall  
23 continue its extensive citizen involvement process on the County  
24 2000 Program; and it is further

25           RESOLVED AND ORDERED that the County Administrative Office  
26 and all other departments of the County shall take such actions

1 as are necessary to assist the Boundary Commission in its  
2 decision and to implement the provisions of this Resolution and  
3 Order.

4 Dated this 21st day of April, 1987.

5 5 VOTES AYE

6 BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
7 FOR WASHINGTON COUNTY

8  
9 Bonnie L. Keys  
10 Chairman

11 Mary E. Placencia  
12 Recording Secretary

## IX. CONSISTENCY WITH BOUNDARY COMMISSION POLICY

One of the key objectives of the feasibility study is to assess whether the proposed service district is consistent with policies and practices of the Portland Metropolitan Area Local Government Boundary Commission. As discussed earlier, the Boundary Commission must approve formation of a county service district.

The proposal for a local urban police service district has been drafted, in large measure, to satisfy Boundary Commission requirements. The Washington County 2000 plan, too, has been specifically designed to be consistent with Boundary Commission policy.

This section analyzes the feasibility of the proposed service district from the Boundary Commission's perspective.

### Boundary Commission Requirements

Boundary Commissions are established under Oregon law to provide a forum for resolving boundary questions in metropolitan areas. Specific Boundary Commission functions, outlined in ORS 199.410:

- o Provide a method for guiding the creation and growth of special districts.
- o Assure adequate quality and quantity of public services, and the financial integrity of each local government unit.
- o Provide an impartial forum to resolve local government jurisdictional questions.
- o Ensure that boundary determinations are consistent with local comprehensive planning and that the timing, phasing, and availability of services be taken into consideration when making a boundary determination.

The Portland Area Boundary Commission has gained considerable experience, over more than a decade, throughout the Metropolitan Area, in deciding issues of district formation, boundary changes, annexations, and incorporations. Over this period, the Commission has evolved a well-defined set of standards for reviewing various types of service and boundary proposals. These policies and standards further clarify the Commission's approach to its decisions under ORS 199.400.

### Review of Service District Benefits

From the vantage point of the Boundary Commission, the proposed district has numerous advantages. In summary, the district meets the Commission's statutory requirements:

- o Assures adequate quality of police services--significantly better than current service.
- o Raises the amount of services available.
- o Maintains--and improves--the financial integrity of each affected local government unit. Does not hinder annexation/incorporation. Lowers the potential County tax burden on city residents, leaving taxing capacity for city purposes.
- o Is consistent with local planning.
- o Provides a timely solution, making enhanced service available at the earliest possible date.

Benefits of the service district proposal include:

1. Elimination of the "urban subsidy":

Urban police patrols, together with rural road maintenance, represent the largest segments of the so-called "urban subsidy". This term describes the portion of county-wide taxes collected within cities which is then spent by the County on services delivered primarily outside the cities. The service district provides a method to eliminate this unfair subsidy by charging benefited properties directly for the cost of urban services.

2. The Washington County 2000 plan is consistent with Boundary Commission policy:

Boundary Commission policy emphasizes that urban services are most logically delivered by full service cities. The Washington County 2000 plan clearly identifies countywide services to be provided by the County, while calling for municipal services to be funded by the ultimate beneficiaries of the service, or transferred to other agencies.

3. The proposed district would be temporary:

Washington County has asked the Oregon Legislature to establish a "sunset" provision for county service districts, giving the County and Boundary Commission a way to guarantee the district does not become a permanent fixture.

4. Does not compete with existing service providers:

At present, there is no alternative service provider ready to serve the affected area. Later, transition agreements with cities in the urban areas will be in place to ensure close coordination that smooths the transition to other options as they become available.

5. Cities support the proposed district:

Washington County has involved the County's cities in the design of the district and has gained their backing.

6. The district prevents illogical boundaries:

The single urban police district proposed has been configured to maximize the opportunity for the orderly transitioning of police service to cities within a five year period. No new illogical boundaries are established which could hinder service efficiency under either the interim or eventual arrangements.

7. Adequate quality and quantity of services are provided:

As analyzed earlier in this report, the proposed district will deliver more services and higher quality services than are currently available. Patrol staffing will double. Emergency response time will drop. Police will respond to calls which today may go unanswered. A potential crisis identified by the Public Safety Review Committee will be averted.

8. The financial integrity of each governmental unit is assured:

The district's major objective is to provide badly needed additional funding. These new revenues are to be in the form of increased property taxes to be paid by district residents and businesses. Only the County is affected -- there are no other immediate financial impacts on other



jurisdictions. Over the five year interim period, the service district offers a mechanism to assist nearby cities in stabilizing their financial integrity through possible future annexations or incorporations.

The district will also help to prevent any long term blight which might occur in the interim period, thereby safeguarding the cities from possible long term liabilities which could be inherited upon annexation or incorporations. In addition, city taxpayers will no longer be asked to support (through their county taxes) municipal level policing in the unincorporated areas.

9. The police service district is consistent with comprehensive planning:

Oregon planning law requires cities to plan for future services in and around their boundaries. Washington County and the Boundary Commission have mutually encouraged the cities to agree on future service boundaries which cover the County's entire unincorporated urban area.

When the cities have completed this task, and their future boundaries coincide, the future service patterns within the County will be known. The cities and the County will then be able to plan jointly to assure that adequate services, reasonably priced, are delivered throughout the urban area.

10. The district reinforces Boundary Commission policy:

The Boundary Commission has stressed a policy that all urban designated areas should eventually become part of a full service city. The proposed district is specifically designed as an interim method to fund minimum law enforcement services while residents examine their future service options such as becoming part of a full service city.

#### X. SCHEDULE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

The County has targeted FY 1988-89 as the startup year for the police service district. This schedule is designed to achieve that objective while leaving adequate time for review by the Boundary Commission and for voter involvement as many as two times prior to ultimate operation of the District. The potential need for two separate votes requires that the County work closely with the Boundary Commission to meet the Commission's information needs, thereby reducing that portion of the schedule from the statutory limit of 120 days to approximately 90 days, while still leaving ample time for Boundary Commission public processes.

#### COUNTY SERVICE DISTRICTS TIME SCHEDULE

-Initial County 2000 Community Presentations	Feb.26/Mar.5, 12, 19, 1987
-Board Discussion of County Service District (CSD) Options	Mar 24, 1987
-Board Receives CSD Economic Feasibility Studies	Apr 7, 1987
-Board Submits CSD Proposals to Boundary Commission	Apr 14, 1987
-Boundary Commission Files Approval with Board	Jul 15, 1987
-Board Hearing on CSD Formation (Calls for Election if 100 signatures received)	Aug 6, 1987
-File Ballot Title	Aug 12, 1987
-Election Date (District Formation)	Sept 15, 1987
-Election Date (District Funding)	Nov 3, 1987
-Law Enforcement District Begins	July 1, 1988

XI. APPENDICES

- A. White Paper (january report to board)
- B. Preliminary Feasibility Study (december)
- C. Washington County Urban Services Database
- D. Detailed Cost Estimates - from sheriffs report
- E. Legal Description of District
- F. Public Safety Review Committee Final Report
- G. Washington County 2000 Materials
- H. Resolution and Order
- I. H.B. 2907

Appendices are at the Clerk's desk for your review.