

MINUTES & NOTICE OF BOARD ACTION

BOOK 153 PAGE 0287

APPROVED March 3, 1993

LANE COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS



This document, upon approval in a public meeting by the Board of County Commissioners, serves as official minutes of such meetings as required under the Open Meetings Law, ORS 192.650.

Pursuant to notice made by mailing agendas to news media, a selected list of jurisdictions and individuals in Lane County, a meeting of the Board of County Commissioners was held.

Questions should be directed to The Board Office Specialist 3, ext. 4203.

February 9, 1993
2:00 p.m.

REGULAR MEETING
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Harris Hall
Main Floor

Chair Steve Cornacchia presided with Ellie Dumdi, Marie Frazier and Jack Roberts. Jerry Rust excused. Sharon Giles, Recording Secretary.

This meeting convened late, at 2:20 p.m.

9. COMMISSIONERS' ANNOUNCEMENTS

To be held later in the meeting.

10. PUBLIC HEARINGS

a. ORDER 93-2-9-10/In the Matter of Selecting 1993 OCDBG Projects.

Peter Thurston, Community and Economic Development Coordinator, reviewed the agenda item with the Board.

In response to a question from Cornacchia, Thurston indicated that of the \$14 million available, it has historically been spread around; but, that it is a true competition with a point structure.

Cornacchia opened the Public Hearing.

Douglas Harclerod, Lane County District Attorney, 33830 Oak Springs Lane, presented a proposal for a Regional Children's Advocacy Center and provided Board members with a handout. He indicated that the grand jury for children would be held there and that it would be a counseling center. He noted that the law requires the District Attorney to set up a multi-disciplinary, interagency child abuse team to deal with such cases, which would be headquartered at the facility. He stated that 41% of the 1991 felony sex charges in Lane County came from other agencies outside Eugene and Springfield.

Jim Forbes, Executive Director of Looking Glass, 3800 Vine Maple Drive, spoke regarding the Regional Children's Advocacy Center and the goal of providing a regional facility for thorough assessments of child abuse. He outlined the structure as planned. He added that the location needed to be in Eugene, in close proximity to the Courthouse. He stated that Looking Glass currently has offices in Cottage Grove, Florence and Oakridge. Forbes said the services provided at the Center would be primarily intake and assessment of the child abuse case.

Harcleroad spoke again about the budget. He stated that the CDBG funds would be used toward site acquisition and renovation, which was estimated at \$300,000 - \$400,000. In addition, there would be materials and services, start up costs, personnel and operating costs. He also included an estimate for video rooms capability for rural outreach.

Carl West, 1638 First St., Mapleton, stated that he represented the Mapleton Water District for a public works request. He distributed material to the Board which indicated that the Block Grant Proposal is to cover the purchase and installation of a 100,000 gallon storage tank to be located adjacent to the existing treatment facility in Berkshire Creek at an estimated cost of \$247,000, which would serve the purpose of getting the District in compliance with the State water quality standards and allow extra storage. He indicated that the State of Oregon had recently placed the Mapleton Water District on a "Water Quality Deficiency List" for not meeting the CT time factor.

Dave Rodriguez, indicated that he was with the Oregon Rivers Museum, and asked for support of their OCDBG proposal under the "Destination Facilities" category, which does not compete with the County's present listing of priority projects. He stated that the project is for \$350,000 for addressing the master plan. In response to questions from Cornacchia, Thurston noted that there is a separate on-going open category under which the "Destination Facilities" fall. He clarified that if a public works project was chosen, then another competitive category from housing, community facilities or handicapped accessibility could not be applied for under the April 2 deadline. In response to a question from Cornacchia, Thurston stated that the Destination Facilities category still had to meet the national criteria. Cornacchia asked Rodriguez to explain how the Rivers Museum would contribute towards achieving economic benefits for low and moderate income people in their communities. Rodriguez replied that the tourism aspect would create new opportunities for family wage jobs.

Cornacchia closed the Public Hearing. In response to a question from Frazier, Thurston stated that the cities get block grant funds directly from the federal government, so they would not be eligible to do a joint application on the Regional Children's Advocacy Center.

Roberts indicated an interest in the Regional Children's Advocacy Center, stating that it could have a real impact as the need is clear. Cornacchia expressed concern about where the resources were to come from to run the Advocacy Center. He stated that the number of unknowns with the Oregon Rivers Museum project make it difficult to be competitive. He noted that the Mapleton projects seems most likely to succeed, although his choice would be the Advocacy Center if he were more confident of its competitiveness. He noted that Mapleton could have some problems because they have received funding in the past.

Thurston stated that water projects are typically highly ranked and that Mapleton's only hurdle is meeting the income guidelines. He noted that if the study came through, the project would be very competitive. With regard to the Advocacy Center, he commented that it would take hard work to secure an intergovernmental agreement; but, if there was strong commitment, then he thought it would be competitive.

Cornacchia asked Harclerod and Forbes if other resources had been identified. Harclerod stated the Center could be run by volunteers if need be. Forbes explained that the intent is not to duplicate services, but to provide a neutral, child-friendly facility in coordination with other agencies. He indicated that they would be looking for other resources through Title 19, various Trusts, etc. Roberts noted that the Relief Nursery tries to stay separate from law enforcement so as not to undermine what they are trying to do.

Frazier stated that she supported the staff recommendation for Mapleton. She noted that the Advocacy Center project is worthy, but there would be a struggle to get it ready on a timeline. She indicated her commitment, though, to help the Center in any way possible.

Thurston commented that competitive applications are time-consuming and that the Advocacy Center's more extensive proposal would be necessary in 30 days or there would be the need to have two parallel applications (Advocacy Center and Mapleton) going at the same time. Roberts stated that he thinks Forbes, Harclerod and Solin could put it all together. Forbes indicated that he would be prepared to return to the Board with more detailed information, with Thurston's oversight, by February 28. And, at that time, if they had determined they were not able, they would come back prepared to say so. In response to a question from Frazier, Thurston noted that the only other funds he knew of for Mapleton were FHA loans, but not grants. Thurston stated that Mapleton had until July to be in compliance with the new rules, but there was no way to determine when compliance would be enforced. Board members indicated their willingness to support Mapleton's needs in the legislative agenda during the upcoming United Front trip to Washington, D.C. Frazier commented that she needed to see an on-going revenue source in order to support

the Advocacy Center. Cornacchia noted that he would want to hear from Thurston that the Advocacy Center meets the application requirements and is competitive. Thurston was instructed to be prepared to come back with a Board Order on March 3 which could be finalized upon the primary choice of the Advocacy Center or Mapleton and Forbes was asked to speak at Public Comment on that day with his additional information.

Thurston indicated that, with regard to the Oregon Rivers Museum project, he does not believe it is a competitive application as OEDD does not normally fund "planning" projects; and that Lane County has to be the applicant and the Museum could not apply directly to the State.

This meeting recessed at 4:08 p.m. to reconvene at 4:18 p.m.

9. COMMISSIONERS' ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dumdi distributed awards of recognition from the Cascade Pacific RC&D to Lane County, Peter Thurston and herself.

11. OTHER BUSINESS

a. DISCUSSION/1993 Lane County ED Program Scope Goals and Objectives.

Thurston reviewed the packet material with the Board. He noted that there were approximately two FTE represented by the list of 33 activities. Cornacchia stated that it appears that the Coordinator position is unfunded for next year and that there was also a problem of alleged misspent CDBG dollars that may need to be repaid to the state. He expressed concern regarding the expressed possibility that these would be funded by video poker lottery money. The Board reviewed the video poker lottery proceeds thus far which will be approximately \$300,000 by the end of 5 quarters, of which \$161,000 was already committed, leaving (by August of 1993) \$130,000 after grants. Cornacchia indicated that in an upcoming Board packet he was recommending that the Coordinator position and the potential repayment be left to the Finance and Audit Committee and the Budget Committee. Roberts supported Cornacchia's recommendation, noting that the Legislature will be looking to make sure worthwhile projects have been forthcoming from the video poker lottery proceeds. Cornacchia stated that he continues to support the Economic Development program through June 30, 1993, but is not sure he can commit further until looking at it in perspective with all other budget considerations. Roberts concurred. Dumdi noted that the program had grown extensively since 1987, and agreed for the need to take a comprehensive look at video poker lottery proceeds. Frazier concurred that the program needed to be looked at in terms of the entire budget process. She questioned the funding of Thurston's position through June 30, 1993. Thurston confirmed that the position is not fully funded through this fiscal year. Bill Van Vactor,

Acting County Administrator, recommended that a budget analysis needs to be done, in coordination with Finance and Audit, and the item be returned to the Board on the agenda and this was scheduled for March 10. Roberts explained that the Finance and Audit Committee was still trying to negotiate with the state regarding the CDBG dollars and that there were still dollars available in the money set aside for the RCIC position. The Board concurred to roll over further discussion of Item 11.a. with a discussion regarding RCIC some time in April.

There being no further business, this meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.



Sharon Giles
Sharon Giles
Recording Secretary