

STAFF MEASURE SUMMAR CARRIER:

House Committee on General Government and Consumer Protection

REVENUE: No revenue impact

FISCAL: Fiscal statement issued

Action: Without Recommendation as to Passage and Be Referred to the Committee on Rules
Vote: 8 - 0 - 0**Yeas:** Cameron, Clem, Conger, Matthews, Sheehan, Smith J., Holvey, Whisnant**Nays:** 0**Exc.:** 0**Prepared By:** Jan Nordlund, Administrator**Meeting Dates:** 3/3, 4/20

WHAT THE MEASURE DOES: Prohibits a district or city from requiring a landowner to consent to future annexation in exchange for providing extraterritorial service when the district or city is providing the service for another local government pursuant to an intergovernmental agreement. Voids consent of a landowner to future annexation made prior to the effective date of this Act if the district or city demanded consent in exchange for a service it would provide outside its boundaries for another local government pursuant to an intergovernmental agreement.

ISSUES DISCUSSED:

- Specific experiences of landowners in Marion and Lane Counties
- “Hostage” annexations occurring through intergovernmental agreements
- Definition of “services”
- Court of Appeals decision in *Bear Creek Valley Sanitation v. City of Medford*

EFFECT OF COMMITTEE AMENDMENT: No amendment.

BACKGROUND: Through intergovernmental agreements, a city or special district may provide services to property owners outside its territory, on behalf of the county. Some property owners have claimed that the city or special district held them “hostage” by requiring them to consent to annexation in order to receive those services.