

**Opposition to The Proposed Redmond Public Safety Fees Proposal
FACT SHEET – Public Education – Questions/Concerns for Residents to
Pose/Submit to the Redmond City Council.**

Please:

1. Email, call or write the Mayor and City Councilors to voice your opposition to the current public safety fee proposal.
2. **Attend the proposed Public Safety Fee Proposal Public Hearing on Monday January 22, 2018 at City Hall at 5:30 pm – SAVE THE DATE** – Express your views.
3. Feel free to copy all and/or any portion of this document as an element of your letter or email to the Mayor or City Councilors that reflect your views.
4. Share this document with other City of Redmond residents.
5. Post this document to social media sites for public education.

Redmond Oregon Mayor & City Council

Mayor, George Endicott
George.Endicott@ci.redmond.or.us
541-948-3219

Councilor, Tory Allman
Tory.Allman@ci.redmond.or.us
541-923-7710

Councilor Jon Bullock
jon.bullock@ci.redmond.or.us

Councilor, Joe Centanni
Joe.Centanni@ci.redmond.or.us
541-350-1013

Councilor, Camden King
Camden.King@ci.redmond.or.us
541-280-2258

Councilor, Ginny McPherson
Ginny.McPherson@ci.redmond.or.us
Phone: 541.923.7710

Councilor, Jay Patrick

Jay.Patrick@ci.redmond.or.us

541-508-8408

This Group is called **SCRAP IT** – **S**incerely **C**oncerned **R**esidents of Redmond **A**gainst the **P**roposal for more Police staff via **I**ncreased **T**axes.

We SUPPORT:

1. Our City
2. Our Neighborhoods
3. Public Safety (including fire & rescue, EMT's, human services personnel, CPS, law enforcement agencies, and their personnel and families in every form.
4. Open public discourse & dialog
5. The rights of citizens and residents to be heard by their elected officials.
6. Our elected officials and staff in the City of Redmond.

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this document is to:

- a. Provide a written record of the viewpoints of those opposed to the City of Redmond Public Safety Fee Proposal.
- b. Provide a document that serves to provide a public education resource.
- c. Serve as a source to inspire collaborative dialog generate alternative proposals.
- d. Provide a fact check to the information provided by the City of Redmond – and make alternative facts known to the public.
- e. Provide a resource for City of Redmond Residents to voice their opposition to this exercise of taxation without representation.

Justification for Opposition:

Re: Questions and Feedback from The Public – Proposed City of Redmond Public Safety Fee - Fact Check and Recommendations

Sunday, January 16, 2018

3

1. Residents of the City of Redmond deserve the opportunity to vote on this issue at the polls in May 2018. This is NOT a matter the Redmond City Council should unilaterally impose on City Residents.
2. City of Redmond Residents have already paid for adequate public safety personnel.
3. The proposed fee/tax is regressive – it impacts those the most who can afford it the least. The either \$6 or \$8 per annum proposed fee effective extinguishes the annual Social Security increase by City residents who rely on the same.
4. This is a perpetuity fee/tax in its current form. Translation: There is no end date and/or reduction of said fee over time.
5. There are no prohibitions/safeguards against increasing said fee/tax over time that requires a vote of City residents.
6. Redmond PD current staffing level of sworn personnel is at or above that metric for other comparably sized cities in Oregon.
7. Public safety in Redmond is neither currently impaired and/or imperiled.
8. Redmond PD has added 8 officers since 2013 – more than any other City Department.
9. The proposed fee/tax to City residents increases an already escalating cost of living.
10. The population growth rates of the City of Redmond do NOT merit these aggressive increases in Redmond PD staffing via fees and taxes to City residents. Furthermore, estimates of future population growth for the City of Redmond is moderating vs. previous inaccurate estimates. Past growth estimates for explosive population growth in Redmond, Oregon have never materialized.
11. Neither the FBI nor the USDOJ issue “recommendations” for staffing City Police Departments in the U.S. Grants approved to study the issue of Police Department staffing in cities are REQUIRED to contain a written disclosure/disclaimer that

Re: Questions and Feedback from The Public – Proposed City of Redmond Public Safety Fee - Fact Check and Recommendations

Sunday, January 16, 2018

4

the Office of Community Oriented Policing (grant funding arm of the USDOJ) are required to contain so that misrepresentations of “recommended by the FBI and/or USDOJ” are NOT distributed to the public in the politics that surround this issue in local U.S. communities.

12. The slide on the City of Redmond Powerpoint presentation relied upon to inform/educate Redmond citizens as to the merits of the proposed public safety fee is filled with facts and figures that are spurious – and demand retraction and correction. Frankly, many “facts” advanced by the City in their public education efforts have been misleading. One example is the slide that identifies 14 other current Oregon cities who have public safety fees. (See fact check section below) The undisclosed facts are a. some of the identified cities use those funds to build police facilities – not additions to current levels of sworn police department personnel b. some cities used the fees to raise current officer salaries to bring salary levels in line with other comparably sized communities c. Some have approved fees to avoid sworn personnel lay-offs. d. Some used fees to form their own City Police Department. E. some have used fees to add non-sworn personnel.
13. There are some 242 cities in the state of Oregon. Less than 8 have assessed fees for staff additions to sworn police department personnel FTE. $8/242 = 3.3\%$ --- This is an incredibly minute number. The vast majority of these cities are very small cities (see below section of Oregon cities with public safety fees).
14. The City of Redmond is growth oriented – authorizing numerous major residential housing developments during the past 24-36 months. Yet, no Growth Impact Fees have been attributed to those developments as planning for the rising costs of providing public safety to those growth developments that will most certainly require stretching current public safety deployment resources. This oversight negatively impacts existing residents.
15. Authorized by charter/code or whatever legal authority – The Mayor and City Council should tread very carefully, and be acutely averse to unilaterally imposing substantial cost of living increases via public safety fees/or any other fees and taxes on City residents in the absence of a City wide ballot measure.
16. Just as any family must manage their revenues and expenses – the City must do the same as the families who reside here. If a healthcare crisis occurs for a family, we sell our financed RV/boat or other assets and use the cash flow to pay for the healthcare crisis. The City of Redmond must do the same, identifying assets that

current fiscal realities demand they must dispose of. And use this cash flow/proceeds of sale to fund City priorities demanding the same.

17. Public safety is the most common response to community surveys of resident concerns/priorities across the U.S. – Redmond, Oregon is neither unique nor an exception to the respondents of community survey data reality.
18. There are innumerable ways to raise revenue for the City of Redmond vs. proposing to “raise the price.” This is clearly indicative of a shallow and superficial consideration of other strategic possibilities.
19. The suggestion that levy revenue provided by a publicly approved public safety levy approved by the public is “unstable” by the City Finance Director (funds provided by the levy do not match up chronologically as cash available to pay salaries when due) is a spurious assertion, at best. Putting in place a revolving credit line with a financial institution backed by levy revenues and the full faith and credit of the City smoothes out cash flow and provides the City Finance Director to draw salary funds from the revolving credit line as needed - and repay the credit line back down as levy revenues are collected.
20. The many iterations of the City presentations to the public have been so noted. Unfortunately, “facts” contained in earlier/most recent versions of said information contain a myriad of inaccuracies. This leaves the City vulnerable to the legalities surrounding misleading the public on this proposal for resident consideration.

Executive Summary:

1. City of Redmond residents deserve vastly more resources to consider other than a Powerpoint presentation, FAQ’s and public hearings with the City’s Public Safety Committee members (some of whom are directly employed by the City Police Department). Thus, the Mayor and City Council are duty bound to engage an independent, duly qualified public policy research firm to engage and explore the myriad of fiscal alternatives available to the City of Redmond – including – an independent needs assessment of the public safety personnel needs of the Redmond Police Department – as well as evaluating the effectiveness of current law enforcement management approaches exercised by the Redmond PD - to insure that current methods and resources are being utilized to the optimal

Re: Questions and Feedback from The Public – Proposed City of Redmond Public Safety Fee - Fact Check and Recommendations

Sunday, January 16, 2018

6

extent possible. Please refer to the study completed by Portland State University for the City of Creswell, Oregon. (Portland State University. Hatfield School of Government - Center for Public Service as an example):

https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/publicservice_pub/22/

2. The public safety in Redmond is not currently impaired and/or imperiled. Thus, there is no substantive legitimacy for a rush to judgment on the sole, current proposal. It's time to pause, and use pertinent time and resources to engage a duly qualified, independent third party to analyze this matter – from all angles – before succumbing to a myopic consideration of the sole proposal currently brought before the Council and community for consideration.
3. The City Council must consider the adoption of Public Safety Growth Impact Fees for ongoing growth (Consider what Syracuse City, Utah has done) - “Impact fees are a reasonable means of funding growth-related infrastructure which has been built with a capacity designed to serve future development. An Impact Fee Analysis is required to accurately assess the true impact of a particular user upon the City’s infrastructure and to preclude existing users from subsidizing new growth. Impact fees are calculated based upon the portion of the cost of capital infrastructure that relates to growth. This method also takes into account current deficiencies and does not place a burden on future development to solve those deficiencies.”
4. When one Google’s “public safety fee” you will notice that the notion of a “public safety fee” is almost wholly a creation of small cities in Oregon – many of which are vastly less populous than Redmond – and these fees varies widely in both their origins and intended uses.
5. Complete a City-wide RESIDENT survey for the proposed Public Safety Fee. Send the survey out in ALL the City’s monthly Utility Bills in March 2018 with results presented to the Community and City Council in late May 2018. Allow residents to ask free form questions that will be grouped, shared and answered by City Staff in the survey results.
6. The City of Redmond City shall complete an evaluation and make available for public consumption:
 - A. City Assets available for disposable.

Re: Questions and Feedback from The Public – Proposed City of Redmond Public Safety Fee - Fact Check and Recommendations

Sunday, January 16, 2018

7

- B. Obtain a current appraisal on the Juniper Golf Club property with an eye toward the essential rezoning for single family residential development within the boundaries of said property.
- C. Assemble an itemized list of all occupied City property that could be mortgaged and serviced through statutory debt coverage ratios.
- D. Assemble an itemized list of all undeveloped City property that can be sold.
- E. Complete a comprehensive review of city fees to evaluate “cost recovery” fees vs. raising fees to create reasonable excess cash flow to further support public safety resource requirements.
- F. Consider fees and ordinances to provide “growth impact fees” to support the essential expansion of City services – including public safety.
- G. The League of Oregon Cities used the Oregon State Police, LEDS data to develop tables regarding full-time sworn personnel in city police departments showing the officers per 1,000 from lowest to highest, and by population group (also ranked lowest to highest). City Staff shall UPDATE those tables for the City Council and City residents to examine. By what date can you provide this essential information for Oregon cities in Redmond's cohort group in cities with populations of 20-50,000.
- H. Implement a tip-line phone number that is NOT for emergencies (beyond the Police non-emergency number). This is a resource for people who want to give the police department a tip or information regarding criminal activity without having to speak to an officer. Implement an ABANDONED VEHICLE hotline. These calls can be reviewed by non-sworn personnel and may not require responses from sworn officers.
- I. A report prepared on behalf of Oregon League of Cities states: “Utility surcharges are very flexible and not limited by Measure 5 or 50, but likely must be approved as taxes.” **See:** <http://www.orcities.org/portals/17/conference/2014/handouts/friday/4CreativeRevenue926pm2.pdf> The proposed fee is regressive, impacting most negatively Redmond City residents who can least afford it. Furthermore, it does not equitably account for the reality that non-residents of Redmond require Redmond Police resources.

J. “No national standard exists for how many officers departments should have per capita. That's in part due to the fact that population totals don't fully reflect demands placed on law enforcement agencies or differences across jurisdictions. Politically-driven mandates, predetermined minimum staffing-levels and budget constraints are among the **many factors** that typically play a role in determining employment levels for police departments.”

<http://www.governing.com/gov-data/safety-justice/police-officers-per-capita-rates-employment-for-city-departments.html>

K. When the economy cratered in 2007, many cities and counties passed additional levies and raised taxes in 2008 and 2010. However, Redmond decided to hold cost increases down, use urban renewal funding to continue with previously planned projects, etc. as short-term fiscal management policies until the economy picked up again. Unfortunately, the City has not seen the increased growth and expansion of the tax base it was anticipating would accompany improved economic conditions. Furthermore, the City failed to recognize the impact of Measure 50 and Measure 5 on future property tax revenues with the declines in property valuation during the Great Recession and their subsequent rebound. Why not? This is a failure of prudent fiscal management forecasting. With the General Fund’s cash reserve and current cash flows from property tax revenues now inadequate, the City Council is required to cut services, increase taxes or fees, or some combination of the above – including other alternatives identified herein.

I. ORIGIN:

(source: <http://www.usobserver.com/archive/aug-09/oregon-surcharges.htm>)

“The Oregon Supreme Court gave municipalities a way to raise revenues without going to the voters for approval: they can now simply add a “surcharge” (fee) to monthly water bills.

In a Jan. 19, 2007, decision the court upheld an earlier one by the Oregon Tax Court, thereby ending a five-year legal battle between the city of Jacksonville and 12 residents who considered the fee an unconstitutional tax.

Re: Questions and Feedback from The Public – Proposed City of Redmond Public Safety Fee - Fact Check and Recommendations

Sunday, January 16, 2018

9

The Supreme Court ruled that the surcharge – intended for police and fire services -- isn't a property tax, so Jacksonville did not circumvent the restrictions set forth in state constitution. (See: <http://caselaw.findlaw.com/or-supreme-court/1066155.html>).

The Jacksonville Decision, as it's called, sets a "legal precedent for other financially strapped jurisdictions that are looking for ways to raise money," Paul Wyntergreen, Jacksonville city administrator, told the Medford Mail Tribune."

See also: The Oregon Supreme Court's decision in *Roseburg School Dist. v. City of Roseburg*, 316 Or. 374, 851 P.2d 595 (1993), establishes the appropriate analytical framework for determining whether a fee or charge constitutes a tax on property subject to Measure 5.

II. QUESTIONS From the Public – See Above and Below:

For the below – please reference:

See: <http://www.ci.redmond.or.us/government/departments/public-safety-fee-faqs>

See: City of Redmond Powerpoint Presentation:
<http://www.ci.redmond.or.us/home/showdocument?id=13842>

The City of Redmond/Police Department Public Safety Fee FAQ's state:

The City currently has 38 sworn police officers. A staff of 38 officers is only one more than the City had in 2008, when our population was approximately 25,000. Staffing has not kept pace with population growth and we have fallen below the industry which recommends we have 46 officers for a City of our size (approximately 28,000).

Question 1 - What is the specific industry standard you are referring to that recommends 46 officers?

Question 1A - Where your slide indicates State is 1.65 and Redmond is 1.35 - What is the source of this data?

Note:

Research published by the U.S. Department of Justice outlines such a [performance-based approach](#) to staffing, which relies, in part, *on examining 911 calls*.

The Oregon League of Cities states:

*“The average number of **officers per thousand gets smaller as the population groups get bigger**. Cities with more than 10,000 population have an average number of officers per thousand that **is less than the statewide average**.”*

Question 1-A - If this is the case why ask City of Redmond residents to fund increases in Redmond Police Department staffing?

Question 2 - It appears from the [Powerpoint](#) you have shared with City of Redmond residents - you examined the 23,000 911 calls you refer to in the FAQ's as recommended by the U.S. Department of Justice. What was the year of those 23,000 calls? Do you have a record of calls by year for the last 8 years? Please provide to City residents and City Council.

Note:

Despite its cheerleaders, the “workload” approach to staffing City Police Departments is **rarely utilized**. In fact, **it’s the least commonly used method**, according to an [analysis](#) published by [The International City/County Management Association’s \(ICMA\) Center for Public Safety Management](#):

The ICMA also states: (<https://icma.org/articles/5-myths-about-police-metrics>)

Myth 1: Response time is the most important measure of police performance.

The Facts: Failure to identify and prioritize calls when they are received and dispatched is almost certain to lead to inefficient use of resources. And reviewing “average” response times to all calls is meaningless.

Myth 2: An increase in calls for service requires a corresponding increase in resources for the department.

The Facts: *“Performance is not directly related to call volume. This myth is based on the assumption that every call for service requires the same amount of time from officers. But that’s not the case. In fact, Matarese estimates that **an increase in calls by as much as 50% can require minimal or no increase in resources.**”*

Myth 4: If crime rates increase, the department should hire more police officers.

The Facts: *If crime rates increase, it suggests that the police are ineffective in combating crime. Adding officers under these conditions essentially provides*

incentives for poor performance. Far more important is reviewing the strategies and tactics to reduce crime and routinely measuring the effects of those efforts. And, as suggested before, crime rates are not necessarily linked directly to police response; they are influenced by other factors.

City of Redmond Police Dept. Powerpoint indicates the Below – Out of a reported 23,000 calls for service:

- A. Traffic/Complaints, Person Stops, Parking - over 2,500 calls per year.
- B. Suspicious Circumstances or Persons - Almost 2,000 calls per year.
- C. Public/Officer Assists - About 1,800 calls per year.
- D. All Other Calls for Service - almost 1,000 calls per year.
- E. Animal Control - Over 500 calls per year.
- F. Vehicle (Abandoned, Impounded, Repossessed) - approx. 550 calls per year.

Question 3 Isn't a public education effort merited when it comes to reducing calls to 911 requesting Redmond PD assistance?

Question 4 Do you have any breakdown on Redmond PD calls for assistance from businesses vs. individual residents?

Question 5 Isn't using part-time and reserve officers to handle some categories of these calls for service in order....at least a re-evaluation?

The City of Redmond/Police Department Public Safety Fee FAQ's state:

4. How will the Community benefit from additional police officers? Increasing the size of the Redmond Police Department by six officers will result in six direct benefits to community safety:

Question 6 - Why isn't more DUII enforcement identified in the benefits to the community - and alcohol related situations that require Redmond Police Officer engagement?

Question 7 - What percentage of 911 calls that require Redmond Police Officer response involve alcohol?

The City of Redmond/Police Department Public Safety Fee FAQ's state:

Since 2013, we have added eight officers. However, our population and growth continues to outpace the City's ability to keep up with services, particularly public

safety. Our current population is around 28,500 and our sworn officer count is 38, 8 officers less than the recommended number for a city of our size.

Question 8 - The Redmond Police Dept. has added 8 officers in a period of 4 years although population growth has only grown by a few thousand. **Are alcohol involved calls recorded in calls on the Powerpoint as "drug related (subtracting DUI which we assume may include both alcohol and drugs?"**

[The City of Redmond/Police Department Public Safety Fee FAQ's state:](#)

The fee level under discussion would be \$6.00/month.

Question 9 - **Initially, this fee was proposed to City Residents as between \$6 and \$8 per month. What happened to the \$8 per month suggestion?**

Question 10 -

[League of Oregon Cities data](#) reveals (Cities 20,000 - 50,000 in population) that for Oregon Cities, *Redmond's officer compliment per 1,000 residents is at the higher end of Officer FTE per 1,000 residents. **How do you respond to that?***

Question 11 In 2009, The League of Oregon Cities used the Oregon State Police, LEDS data to develop tables regarding full-time sworn personnel in city police departments showing the officers per 1,000 from lowest to highest, and by population group (also ranked lowest to highest).

REQUEST - It would be prudent to have City Staff UPDATE those tables for the City Council and City residents to examine. By what date can you provide this essential information for Oregon cities in Redmond's cohort group in cities with populations of 20-50,000 **(there were 17 such cities in 2009 with an average staffing of Police Officers per 1,000 residents of 1.35 - EXACTLY where you show Redmond PD to be in 2018).** The Oregon League of Cities states:

"The average number of officers per thousand gets smaller as the population groups get bigger. Cities with more than 10,000 population have an average number of officers per thousand that is less than the statewide average."

Question 12 – [The City of Redmond Powerpoint](#) shared with the public identifies one objective of becoming the "[Safest City in Oregon.](#)" **Question** - Currently, what is the

Re: Questions and Feedback from The Public – Proposed City of Redmond Public Safety Fee - Fact Check and Recommendations

Sunday, January 16, 2018

13

safest City in Oregon? How do City of Redmond residents know that we have achieved or fallen short of attaining that goal? What are the metrics and where are we now?

1. Hubbard 3,386

Previous rank: 1

Violent Crimes per 1,000: 0.00

Property Crimes per 1,000: 8.98

Source: FBI Crime Report statistics from 2015

October 16, 2017: <https://www.safewise.com/blog/safest-cities-oregon/>

Population: 3,386

Note: Hubbard experienced a homicide/suicide in August 2017 killing a family of 4 (committed by the father in the family). Due to this crime, Hubbard will vacate its ranking as the safest city in Oregon.

Question 13: What is the dollar amount of sworn Police Officer overtime the Redmond Police Department paid in 2017 or 2016? --- the latest figures available...Will the deployment of 6 new officers reduce that sum? If so, by how much?

Question 14 : What is the difference between a fee and a tax from the City's standpoint?

Question 15 - Would it be possible for City staff to prepare and provide the City Council and City residents with a table of annual percentage *annual* increases in City of Redmond provided public utilities (water, sewer etc.) for each year during the last 10 years please – as part of this process? (eg., the cost of living in the City of Redmond has been increasing more rapidly than population growth).

Question 16 - Baker City Herald May 2017 - "Yet it seems to us that city officials see residents' pocketbooks, rather than the city's accounts, as the savior. *The proposed public safety fee amounts to a regressive tax, the burden of which falls most heavily on people who can least afford it.*" **How do you respond to that?**

Question 17 - What is the current value of undeveloped land currently owned by the City of Redmond? Is this valuation identified by property within the City's 2017/2018 Budget?

Question 18 – In Baker City in May 2017, the public safety fee was approved as follows: *\$5 per month per household fee (\$10 per business) designed to stave off potential layoffs of two police officers and two firefighters.* **Is a higher public safety fee for businesses contemplated or will it be considered by the City Staff and recommended to the Redmond City Council?**

Question 19 – The City owns the Juniper Golf Course - it now requires – and has for many years – required the City to fund approx. \$400,000 in debt payments per year – as the cash flow generated from Juniper Golf course operations remains insufficient to pay the annual debt service required. These funds (\$400,000 per annum along with the proceeds of the sale to say - a developer) and its subsequent development would contribute mightily to the City of Redmond’s requirement for cash to pay our Police Officers. **Is this being given serious consideration along with disposal of other assets the City owns? What is the current assessed value of Juniper Golf Course? What is the remaining debt on Juniper Golf Course?**

20. The Mayor and Redmond City Council certainly has other options to consider regarding the funding proposed for the addition of Police Personnel. These include disposal of assets, refinancing certain City occupied properties, cutting the budget allocations to other projects/departments, implementing a sales/alcoholic beverage tax, a myriad of other options (See Liberty Missouri’s innovative consideration: <https://libertymissouri.gov/2604/Public-Safety-Sales-Tax>). **Where is the analysis from City staff on these options?,**

20. Does the City of Redmond have the ability to mortgage certain City occupied structures and use those funds to support public safety resources?

Question 21 - [per The of Redmond Powerpoint](#) presented to the public, although the survey results indicate that 62% of respondents indicated public safety as a priority:

- 21 A. How many respondents were there?
- 21. B. The proposed public safety fee was not disclosed in this survey was it?
- 21 C. Isn’t it appropriate to recognize and disclose that community surveys of citizens by municipal governments - throughout the U.S. - routinely identify public safety as a high priority - if not the highest priority - for residents who respond? Thus, shouldn’t it be disclosed that “public safety” is not a unique response to Redmond, Oregon.

- 22. According to the [National League of Cities](#), “Public safety” means not only putting an end to the levels of crime and violence that impact the everyday lives of our residents, but just as importantly, delivering lifesaving rescue services, preventing fires, and preparing for and responding effectively to foreign and domestic terrorism, natural and manmade disasters, and pandemic events.” **Isn’t it more accurate to identify the City of Redmond’s proposed fee as “Police Personnel Fee” and/or a “City Funding Deficit Fee?”**

Question 23 - Public Safety Fees by Cities in Oregon - per the [City of Redmond Powerpoint](#) presented to the public: 13 cities in Oregon have some form of a public safety fee - **UK = Unknown**

Re: Questions and Feedback from The Public – Proposed City of Redmond Public Safety Fee - Fact Check and Recommendations

Sunday, January 16, 2018

15

The following is an analysis of the Oregon cities that have some form of public safety fee – [as identified in the Powerpoint](#) provided to the public by the City of Redmond.

1. Baker City –

Year Fee Implemented: 2017 –

Fee amount: \$3.00

Population 9,828

Sworn Officers: 15 (does not include Chief)

Officers per 1,000 = 1.53

Reason: Avoid Lay-offs

Other: *\$5 per month per household fee (\$10 per business) designed to stave off potential layoffs of two police officers and two firefighters.*

Disposal of assets - The city also included in this year's budget \$286,000 in potential revenue from selling property in the industrial park.

Baker City Herald May 2017 –

"Yet it seems to us that city officials see residents' pocketbooks, rather than the city's accounts, as the savior. The proposed public safety fee amounts to a regressive tax, the burden of which falls most heavily on people who can least afford it."

The police and fire departments have each added one full-time employee over the past three years. The police department's workforce equates to 17.5 full-time staff, and the fire department's is 13.

2. Stanfield

Year Fee Implemented - 2014

Fee Amount - \$5.00 –

Population: 2,215

Officers per 1,000 = 2.20

Sworn Officers: 4 (Includes Chief who patrols)

Reason: Increase Police Officer Salaries to Comparables

Other:

"The Public Safety Fee that went into effect last year has allowed the City *to increase police officer salaries to the point that they are competitive with other cities of a similar size* The current salary of \$38,400, City Manager Blair Larsen said. The public safety fee is projected to bring in \$44,288.46 this fiscal year, he said, and the revenue can only be used for officer salaries."

3. Gresham 2012/14

Population: 106,00

Year Fee Implemented: 2012/14

Fee Amount: \$7.50

Officers per 1,000 = 1.23 (2009 LOC)

Sworn Officers: 124 (2009 LOC)

Does NOT include Chief

Reason: Stave off cuts to police and fire services.

Other:

On December 4, 2012 the City Council passed a 17-month temporary fee supporting Public Safety and Parks. Council voted to extend the fee on June 5, 2014. This fee is charged to residences and businesses through the Utility Billing System. The revenue is split between the Police, Fire and Parks departments, with 95% going to public safety and 5% to parks.

The goal staffing level for the Gresham Police Department is a total FTE ratio of 1.30 sworn officers per thousand and a total FTE ratio of 1.79 per thousand population.

Considering: “*projects tackling new approaches to traditional services like public safety.*”

The Police, Fire and Parks Fee of \$7.50 per month is charged to single-family households, multifamily property owners and businesses to help maintain essential police positions and keep our fire stations open.

The Gresham City Council on Tuesday voted unanimously to make permanent an expiring \$7.50 monthly utility fee to help stave off cuts to police and fire services, two weeks after voters rejected a property tax increase intended for that purpose.

Those \$7.50 monthly charges, collected over 17 months through June, will bring in close to \$5 million. That amount is roughly equivalent to paying for 20 police officers, two fire stations and half of the city's parks maintenance crew for the past year.

Gresham Resident comments:

“*I will be more than happy to vote my displeasure with the mayor and the whole city council for forcing this on us. Can't wait for the election. Can the voters in Gresham vote to kill the tax???*”

4.Newberg-Dundee

Year Fee Implemented: 2016

Amount of Fee: Started at \$2.00 now \$3.00

Population: 26,000

Officers per 1,000 = 1.34 -

Sworn Officers - 35 (Does NOT Include Chief)

Re: Questions and Feedback from The Public – Proposed City of Redmond Public Safety Fee - Fact Check and Recommendations

Sunday, January 16, 2018

17

Reason for Fee: Hire 3 officers

Other: Public Safety Fee - goes to a special fund to hire and maintain 3 new Police Officers positions. *Initially* - An order establishing a public safety fee (PSF) in the amount of two (\$2.00) dollars per residential meter equivalency (RME) per month for the purpose of funding two communications officer positions (non-sworn personnel). Territory covered by the PD also includes George Fox University.

5. City: Creswell

Year Fee Implemented: 2015

Amount of Fee: \$6.25 – now \$6.75 (2018)

Population: 5,292

Sworn Officers per 1,000: 1.5*

Sworn Officers: 3 FT and 1 half time. CONTRACTED with Lane Co. Sheriff's Office.

Reason for Fee: To Add 3.5 Officers and have a dedicated f/t City Police Dept.

Other: *Creswell *contracts* with Lane County Sheriff Office for 3 full-time Deputies and a 1/2 time Sergeant. Last November (2016) the citizens of Creswell voted on Ballot Measure #20-257 which would have expanded police coverage to 24 hours a day, 7 days a week and been paid for through additional property taxes. The citizens of Creswell overwhelmingly voted "NO"! In 2017 there will be no increase to property taxes and police coverage will not expand to 24 hours per day/7 days per week.

"create a fee for service within the corporate limits of the city of Creswell. However, it is not intended to provide full funding for police services."

Creswell – 2017/2018 Budget - "The public safety fee is proposed to increase in fiscal year 2017-18 from \$6.25 per month to \$6.75 per month to offset the cost further of making the Sergeant full-time within the City Limits. Fiscal year 2017-2018 projection is \$184,150, an increase of \$10,444 compared to the 2016-2017 adopted budget." Since 2014/2015 this fee has increased from \$165,188 to \$184,150 in 2017/2018 – an 11.4% increase over 4 years.

6. City: Oregon City

Year Fee Implemented: 2015

Amount of Fee: \$6.50

Population: 36,286

Sworn Officers per 1,000: 1.2

Sworn Officers: 44

Reason for Fee: to build a new police station on the old Mt. Pleasant Elementary School property. The city's vision of a new police station has it housing the Oregon City Municipal Court and a large public meeting area.

Other:

7.City: Keizer

Year Fee Implemented: November 2017

Amount of Fee: \$4.00 per month

Population: 38,980

Sworn Officers per 1,000: 1.07

Sworn Officers: 42

Reason for Fee: The fee will be used to add and equip five police officers, increasing the number of officers from 37 to 42 or approximately 1.1 officers per 1,000 residents.

Other:

Single family residential and non-residential locations will be billed a combined \$8.00 per month or \$16.00 per bi-monthly billing and multi-family dwellings will be billed a combined \$6.90 per dwelling unit per month or \$13.80 per dwelling unit per bi-monthly billing. • \$3.45 per unit per month or \$6.90 per unit per bi-monthly billing for multi-family dwelling units. • \$1.12 per month or \$2.24 per bi-monthly billing for low income and residents over the age of 75. The fee is estimated to generate approximately \$600,000 per year and may only be used to pay for police related services.

8.City: Philomath

Year Fee Implemented: 2017

Amount of Fee: \$10.00

Population: 4,676

Sworn Officers per 1,000: 1.95

Sworn Officers: 9

Reason for Fee: Avoid lay offs.

Other:

“With the General Fund’s cash reserve now depleted, the City Council was forced to cut services, increase taxes or fees, or some combination of the two.”

This is a General Fund Fee – “The new **General Fund** Fee (The Philomath City Council passed a new fee to support the General Fund, *including* public safety, parks and city administration on June 12, 2017. The fee is \$10 per month) is intended to replenish the ending cash balance over the next five years while allowing the City to continue to

provide roughly the same level of city services. The City Council and Budget Committee will evaluate the ongoing need for the General Fund Fee on an annual basis.”

9.City: North Bend

Year Fee Implemented: 2017

Amount of Fee: \$5.00

Population: 9,789

Sworn Officers per 1,000: 1.63

Sworn Officers: 16

Reason for Fee: Hire 4 additional Police Officers

Other: Reduce officer overtime by \$200,00 per annum.

10.City: Central Point

Year Fee Implemented: July 1, 2015

Amount of Fee: \$1.00

Population: 18,328

Sworn Officers per 1,000: 1.25

Sworn Officers: 23

Reason for Fee: 2015 - The Central Point Budget Committee approved the creation of a public safety utility fee with the intention of dedicating the new revenue to a second Central Point School Resource Officer (SRO) position. During the 2015-2017 budget hearings, the public safety utility fee was presented as \$1.00 per utility account per month.

Other:

A request for water or sewer service, a building permit, or the occupancy of an unserviced building will automatically initiate appropriate billing for public safety fee.

Has a Parks Maintenance Fee of \$1.00 per meter.

11.City: Medford

Year Fee Implemented: 2007

Amount of Fee: \$7.42 – Unable to confirm

Population: 81,636

Sworn Officers per 1,000: 1.26

Sworn Officers: 104

Reason for Fee: UK

Other:

12.City: Jacksonville

Year Fee Implemented: 2003

Amount of Fee: \$35.00

Population: 2,898

Sworn Officers per 1,000: 1.72

Sworn Officers: 5 (includes Chief)

Reason for Fee: Go from volunteer to full-time police department.

Other:

“Litigation started in 2002 when voters rejected a \$2.8 million five-year levy on the November ballot, intended to sustain operations of the local fire department and fund a changeover from a volunteer to a full-time force, with paid career firefighters, new equipment, a new truck and a new fire station. This would have been paid for by the property owners, but *the voters as a whole felt it was either too expensive or not necessary or both. In any case, they said no.*”

“The city council unanimously approved (some said rubberstamped) the surcharge at its April 1 meeting the following year – despite an outpouring of public comment against it. Former city Mayor Clara Wendt told the council the fee was “unacceptable,” and accused them of “taking the coward’s way out and soaking its citizens” by supporting the surcharge.”

“Also, from the owner’s standpoint, a property tax is deductible – a fee is not. So by not being part of the property tax, it’s not deductible from your taxes.”

“From now on the best way to fight a surcharge is to make sure a city council doesn’t pass one in the first place – but if it does, to vote the council members out of office with the understanding that the next council will repeal the fee.”

13.City: Ashland

Year Fee Implemented: 2017

Amount of Fee: \$.50 (fifty cents) – Jan 2018 - raised to \$2.50.

Population: 20,078

Sworn Officers per 1,000: 1.3

Sworn Officers: 28

Reason for Fee: Add 5 sworn police officers. The council in March 2017 authorized hiring five new officers.

Other:

Re: Questions and Feedback from The Public – Proposed City of Redmond Public Safety Fee - Fact Check and Recommendations

Sunday, January 16, 2018

21

Considering: “Transient Occupancy Tax Increase: Each 1% increase funds an additional Police Officer, Also provides \$250,000 for Tourism Infrastructure.”

January 4, 2018 – “The council committed to the hiring in early April 2017 without a funding mechanism in place. Since then, it has voted to increase property tax rate 4.5 cents per \$1,000 assessed valuation, place a flat fee of 50 cent per month on the utility bill and rely on the marijuana tax receipts to fund the first two officers – each of whom will cost the city \$110,000 a year.

After much debate at the Tuesday meeting, the council voted to approve hiring the additional two officers using funds from a temporary “Public Safety Support Fee” of \$2 per month on utility bills – on top of a 50 cent surcharge that will take effect July 1 2017 to help pay for the first two officers – with the council continues to review long-term solutions.”

Notes:

From the study by the ICMA:

How many officers do you really need? December 2013

About the ICMA: The International City/County Management Association (ICMA) is a 100 year old, non-profit professional association of local government administrators and managers, with approximately 9,000 members located in 32 countries. Since its inception in 1914, ICMA has been dedicated to assisting local governments in providing services to its citizens in an efficient and effective manner. Our work spans all of the activities of local government – parks, libraries, recreation, public works, economic development, code enforcement, Brownfield’s, public safety, etc.

Perhaps the City of Redmond requires a comprehensive, independent study of prospective solutions to its current public safety challenges, as conducted by the City of Creswell, Oregon in August 2015. Prepared by: The Center for Public Service Mark O. Hatfield School of Government Portland State University August 15, 2015

As stated clearly in the following study:

An ICMA Center for Public Safety Management White Paper - *An analysis of police department staffing: How many officers do you really need? A Review of 62 Police Agencies Analyzed by the ICMA /CPSM:*

https://icma.org/sites/default/files/305747_Analysis%20of%20Police%20Department%20Staffing%20-%20McCabe.pdf

“Communities need to consider many important issues when determining appropriate police staffing levels. The data presented here are rarely used in contemporary police management, but are far better than the staffing allocation and deployment approaches currently in use. *City, town, and department officials need to use reliable data to make these important staffing decisions. Relying on antiquated and unreliable methods to make one of the most financially important and critical decisions with respect to the quality of life and safety of a community is ill-advised.* “(emphasis is mine).

Recommendations:

1. City of Redmond residents deserve vastly more resources to consider other than a Powerpoint presentation, FAQ’s and public hearings with the City’s Public Safety Committee members (some of whom are directly employed by the City Police Department). Thus, the Mayor and City Council are duty bound to engage an independent, duly qualified public policy research firm to engage and explore the myriad of fiscal alternatives available to the City of Redmond – including – an independent needs assessment of the public safety personnel needs of the Redmond Police Department – as well as evaluating the effectiveness of current law enforcement management approaches exercised by the Redmond PD - to insure that current methods and resources are being utilized to the optimal extent possible. Please refer to the study completed by Portland State University for the City of Creswell, Oregon. (Portland State University. Hatfield School of Government - Center for Public Service as an example):

https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/publicservice_pub/22/

2. The public safety in Redmond is not currently impaired and/or imperiled. Thus, there is no substantive legitimacy for a rush to judgment on the sole, current proposal. It’s time to pause, and use pertinent time and resources to engage a duly qualified, independent third party to analyze this matter – from all angles – before succumbing to a myopic consideration of the sole proposal currently brought before the Council and community for consideration.

Re: Questions and Feedback from The Public – Proposed City of Redmond Public Safety Fee - Fact Check and Recommendations

Sunday, January 16, 2018

23

3. The City Council must consider the adoption of Public Safety Growth Impact Fees for ongoing growth (Consider what Syracuse City, Utah has done) - “Impact fees are a reasonable means of funding growth-related infrastructure which has been built with a capacity designed to serve future development. An Impact Fee Analysis is required to accurately assess the true impact of a particular user upon the City’s infrastructure and to preclude existing users from subsidizing new growth. Impact fees are calculated based upon the portion of the cost of capital infrastructure that relates to growth. This method also takes into account current deficiencies and does not place a burden on future development to solve those deficiencies.”
4. When one Google’s “public safety fee” you will notice that the notion of a “public safety fee” is almost wholly a creation of small cities in Oregon – many of which are vastly less populous than Redmond – and these fees varies widely in both their origins and intended uses.
5. Complete a City-wide RESIDENT survey for the proposed Public Safety Fee. Send the survey out in ALL the City’s monthly Utility Bills in March 2018 with results presented to the Community and City Council in late May 2018. Allow residents to ask free form questions that will be grouped, shared and answered by City Staff in the survey results.
6. City shall complete an evaluation and make available for public consumption:
 - L. Assets available for disposable.
 - M. Obtain a current appraisal on the Juniper Golf Club property with an eye toward the essential rezoning for single family residential development within the boundaries of said property.
 - N. Assemble an itemized list of all occupied City property that could be mortgaged and serviced through statutory debt coverage ratios.
 - O. Assemble an itemized list of all undeveloped City property that can be sold.
 - P. Complete a comprehensive review of city fees to evaluate “cost recovery” fees vs. raising fees to create reasonable excess cash flow to further support public safety resource requirements.
 - Q. Consider fees and ordinances to provide “growth impact fees” to support the essential expansion of City services – including public safety.

- R. The League of Oregon Cities used the Oregon State Police, LEDS data to develop tables regarding full-time sworn personnel in city police departments showing the officers per 1,000 from lowest to highest, and by population group (also ranked lowest to highest). Have City Staff UPDATE those tables for the City Council and City residents to examine. By what date can you provide this essential information for Oregon cities in Redmond's cohort group in cities with populations of 20-50,000.
- S. Implement a tip-line phone number that is NOT for emergencies. It's a resource for people who want to give the police department a tip or information regarding criminal activity *without having to speak to an officer*. Implement an ABANDONED VEHICLE hotline. These calls can be reviewed by non-sworn personnel and may not require responses from sworn officers.
- T. A report prepared on behalf of Oregon League of Cities states: “Utility surcharges are very flexible and not limited by Measure 5 or 50, *but likely must be approved as taxes.*” **See:**
<http://www.oregocity.org/portals/17/conference/2014/handouts/friday/4CreativeRevenue926pm2.pdf>
- U. “No national standard exists for how many officers departments should have per capita. That's in part due to the fact that population totals don't fully reflect demands placed on law enforcement agencies or differences across jurisdictions. Politically-driven mandates, predetermined minimum staffing-levels and budget constraints are among the **many factors** that typically play a role in determining employment levels for police departments.”
<http://www.governing.com/gov-data/safety-justice/police-officers-per-capita-rates-employment-for-city-departments.html>
- V. When the economy cratered in 2007, many cities and counties passed additional levies and raised taxes in 2008 and 2010. However, Redmond decided to hold cost increases down, use urban renewal funding to continue with previously planned projects, etc. as short-term fiscal management measures until the economy picked up again. Unfortunately, the City has not seen the increased growth and expansion of the tax base it was anticipating would accompany improved economic conditions. Furthermore, the City failed to recognize the impact of Measure 50 and Measure 5 on future property tax revenues. With the General Fund's cash reserve now inadequate (by policy), the City Council is required to cut services, dispose of assets and

**Re: Questions and Feedback from The Public – Proposed City of Redmond Public Safety
Fee - Fact Check and Recommendations**

Sunday, January 16, 2018

25

reduce debt service on other existing obligations, or some combination of the
thereof.