

September 18, 1979
1:30 p.m.

REGULAR MEETING
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Commissioners'
Conference Rm.

1. COMMISSIONERS' ANNOUNCEMENTS AND BUSINESS

a. Committee Reports

1) Metropolitan Wastewater Management Commission

Freeman reported that testimony had been taken on Site C and that Sites A-1 and A-2 had been eliminated.

2) Tri-Agency Animal Control

Rust reported continuing progress in stepping up enforcement provisions, including a scale of fines, etc. There would be a public hearing October 5 on the new proposals, after which a proposed ordinance would be presented to the Commissioners. Among the new provisions would be a proposal for a three-quarter time officer to look into sheep molesting problems. t'Hooft inquired about the money and requested to see a record of how it was spent. Rust said that there was a regular budget, including compensation for farmers whose sheep were lost, but it was now proposed to use at least part of this money in a preventive program. Freeman remarked that people were cited for having their dogs run loose, and then the cases were thrown out of court. Rust stated that such decisions were discretionary for the municipal judge, but not for the County. t'Hooft said that he would like to see an analysis of the Greenhill situation, suggesting the possibility of saving some money by sharing facilities with them. Rust said that Tri-Agency had met with representatives of Greenhill the day their closure was announced and that they would be working together. They would need \$100,000 to keep up their facility. t'Hooft remarked that if the County had to spend money on new facilities, it might well share with Greenhill.

3) Economic Improvement Commission

t'Hooft reported that the effect of removing this Commission from L-COG would be approximately a \$6,000 gain for the County. He announced the meeting of the L-COG Executive Committee for Thursday at 4:00 p.m.

4) Rust read a letter from the US Department of Labor commending the County for its administration. t'Hooft pointed out that the CETA Committee would have some positions terminated as of June 30, and that new nominees would be needed.

b. PRESENTATION/Jail Overcrowding Study

Don Chalmers, Jail Overcrowding Committee, presented a detailed report listing recommendations to alleviate the overcrowding at the jail. Among these recommendations was a work release program, which would

provide facilities at \$14 per bed, per day as compared with the jail cost of \$33. For the pretrial population, one more custody referee to release people on their own recognizance could cut out an estimated 10,500 person-days over a period of a year. He said that for municipal cases, there was no custody release officer and that all jurisdictions would benefit from a cooperative agreement providing a custody release officer. Another suggestion was for a minimum security facility of approximately eight beds, in which costs were estimated to be \$26 per day, per bed. The Committee suggested that a 25 to 30 bed reduction could be achieved by supervised release. If police officers used citations in place of custody for minor crimes, there could be a saving of approximately two beds per day. Chalmers also suggested a computer-based flagging and tracking system for those in the jail so that no one would be held longer than necessary, which sometimes happened. Answering questions, Chalmers said that if money was spent on programs suggested by the Committee, the County would save more money than it spent. He cited the low figure of five percent not showing up for citations as an indication of a careful screening and release. He said the cities, too, would benefit from citations in lieu of custody because they would save on transportation to and from jail. t'Hooft inquired about the possibility of judges putting more people in jail if it were less crowded, and Chalmers said that he thought, if judges had more options such as the minimum security, they might well be used. Regarding the post-trial situation, Chalmers said that 10 percent of the jail population had been through trial and were awaiting sentence and that presentence reports took between two and six weeks. If that time could be reduced, a saving would occur there. A work release program which the state was giving up locally, could be operated by the County at a cost of \$14 per bed per day and through earnings of the inmates could benefit not only them but their families and the victims of their crimes. The state had designed good standards for such facilities for people who were not hardened criminals. Several other areas were suggested for further study. Rutherford suggested complimenting the Committee and referring the recommendations to staff and to the Community Adult Corrections Committee. Weinstein added his compliment but said one should proceed with caution on state programs. He said he thought more attention should be paid to crime prevention particularly among young people, and said he would be willing to put up money for that kind of program. Chalmers replied that the Committee may be coming to the County for money for the juvenile corrections program.

Rust suggested reporting back on nonmonetary items that could be implemented immediately. General Administrator Morgan said it was necessary to consider the impact on staff, to secure a policy statement from the Board and then a time table for getting commitment from the Sheriff, District Attorney and courts. Freeman said that cities should be included also.

Dave Burks, Sheriff, cited a program tried two years ago and said the present suggestion in his opinion was a band-aid approach. In any event, it would cost money. Rust asked about a possible time frame of one or two months, and Burks replied two months. Rust moved that the report be accepted; that recommendations be referred to the Adult

Corrections Committee, the General Administrator's Office and the staff; that all nonmonetary items be worked on in the next two months; that the Board ask for cooperation from other agencies, and that a fiscal impact be implemented in the 80-81 budget. Rutherford seconded, all voted aye and the motion carried.

2. GENERAL ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

a. REPORT BACK/Planning Commission Appointments

General Administrator Morgan reported back on an examination of Planning Commission appointments and their relation to requirements of the Code for appointments in certain categories to be limited for an affidavit statement related to business, occupation, etc. The result was that the present practice did not violate the statute. However, during the study, it occurred to him and County Counsel that the present practice might not go far enough in dealing with conflicts of interest in other appointments. Some appointees might not even be aware of a possible conflict of interest, but it was just good business practice to look into this matter, not only when making appointments but in a periodic filing of business interests by appointees. A detailed report by County Counsel on the subject was available in memorandum form. Rust asked for a copy and also inquired how the annual reports would be implemented. Morgan stated that he would devise an annual statement that would go somewhat beyond what the statute requests, a standard form of report for all appointments. Legal Counsel Hendriksen said that she thought it would be essential for all future Planning Commission members. Rutherford thought it would be too much to include all committees. Morgan asked for an expression of opinion about people who had contracts with the County. Rust said that he would not recommend anyone for a committee who had any pecuniary interest related to that committee's activities. t'Hooft mentioned that at the time of the appointment there might be no possible conflict of interest but that it could develop later. Rust suggested leaving it to Morgan to develop a program.

b. APPROVAL/Reclassification of One Corrections Specialist to One Senior Corrections Officer (Public Safety)

Morgan explained that this was for a person to work in the County work release program. Rutherford moved approval; t'Hooft seconded. Freeman inquired about the requirements imposed for the program. Morgan said he would come back to the Board if there was anything that wasn't covered by present directions. On the question, Weinstein abstained, the other four Commissioners voted aye and the motion carried.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

a. CONTINUED DISCUSSION AND ACTION/Project SORT

Craig Starr summarized what the report was about and asked that it be accepted and referred to the staff. Because of the postponement from last week, the consultant, Mr. Detlefsen, was away on vacation. After

brief discussion it was decided to postpone accepting the report until Mr. Detlefsen's return.

b. CONTINUED DISCUSSION/Priority List for Cutting the Operating and Capital Budget for Solid Waste

Rich Owings presented more details on the report given last week and asked for direction concerning the level of services and of dollars the Board was willing to support. He presented charts which detailed budget comparisons, stating that the base budget allowed for an inflation rate of 10 percent per year for the next two years. Regarding the Resource Recovery Facility, no money had been budgeted for its operation because of doubt about its acceptance before next July. It would cost about \$36,000 a month to operate the plant. He gave additional figures on seven-day operation of the sites, including holidays. Also presented were figures on leachate monitoring and various types of laboratory analysis.

Concerning recycling incentives, he stated that there was \$10,000 in the budget plus the 10 percent inflation allowance. It now went to BRING, but could be diverted to other nonprofits, since BRING was coming very close being self-supporting. Rutherford stated that Florence people were inquiring why BRING did not operate there anymore. Owings said there had been some difficulty in keeping the place clean, seeing that boxes were full, etc.

Craig Starr presented additional details on the base budget and answered some questions about the kinds of analysis done at present. Regarding leachate, he stated that none of the present permits required monitoring for this. Answering questions about groundwater, Starr stated that testing was carried on of river water upstream and downstream from Cottage Grove and samples were done at the Day Island fill twice a year. He presented charts on the priorities for reduction in capital expenditures and pointed out the effect of those cuts on reduction of operating costs.

Owings stated that staff would be back next week with proposed ordinances for the serial levy and for the bond issue. Rust asked what the Resource Advisory Committee's recommendation was for level of service, and Owings replied it was the base budget. After some discussion about seven-day operation, Owings suggested the alternative of rotating closed days at sites which were near to each other. Freeman suggested doubts about trying to make the November ballot. Rust said that he would favor going to a February election.

Weinstein read a statement regarding the operation of a solid waste program by private enterprise. He introduced Mr. Nick Schnell and his son, who were in the garbage collection business. Schnell stated that he was against recycling and favored mandatory commercial garbage collection. George Schnell stated that their business depended on volume and that costs went up whenever an account was lost. When costs went up the majority of people were forced to haul their own garbage.

Freeman asked Morgan about the time frame, and the latter stated that because of a question concerning the Comprehensive Plan, the necessity to get Bond Counsel advice and other problems, he would favor a February election in order to have fuller information and a long-term plan. Hendriksen explained what some of the legal problems were. After further discussion about an election date, Owings suggested he would come back the following week with ballot titles with quantities omitted.

4. EMERGENCY BUSINESS (No business)
5. EXECUTIVE SESSION as per ORS 192.660 (Commissioners' Conference Room)
 - a. Litigation; b. Personnel Matters; c. Negotiations

t'Hooft moved to adjourn to Executive Session as per ORS 192.660 for purposes of litigation, personnel matters and negotiations. Freeman seconded, all voted aye and the motion carried.

Reba Charles
Recording Secretary to the Board