

February 18, 1997

**REGULAR MEETING
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS**

**Commissioners'
Conference Room**

Cindy Weeldreyer presided with Steve Cornaccia, Ellie Dumdi, Bobby Green, Sr. and Peter Sorenson present. Kim Young, Minutes Recorder.

1. ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA

The commission postponed the executive session (item 3) until February 19.

2. COMMISSIONERS' ANNOUNCEMENTS

This item was postponed until the end of the meeting.

3. EXECUTIVE SESSION as per ORS 192.660

This item was postponed to the following day.

4. COUNTY ADMINISTRATION

a. Announcements

County Administrator Bill Van Vactor reminded the commission that the first Budget Committee meeting would occur later that day. He reviewed the meeting agenda.

5. PUBLIC WORKS

a. DISCUSSION/Establishing Stakeholder Groups for the Jasper Road Extension and Marcola Road Construction Projects. (Ollie Snowden)

Ollie Snowden, Public Works, provided an overview of a staff proposal requesting authorization for the department to form stakeholders group for two road projects, Jasper Road and Marcola Road. He reviewed the anticipated functions of the proposed stakeholders groups. Mr. Snowden referred the board to Exhibits A and B in the meeting packet, a list of candidate groups to solicit for stakeholders. He believed that the stakeholders groups would require more upfront work on the part of the County staff, but would lessen community opposition and animosity to road projects.

Sorenson proposed that the board establish a policy stipulating that the Public works Department form such stakeholder groups when major road projects are proposed. He said that such a policy would mean staff no longer had to seek permission from the board to form stakeholder groups on a case-by-case basis.

Green did not believe that Southern Pacific Railroad would participate in a stakeholder group given his past experience with the railroad's lack of cooperation. Mr. Snowden concurred but said the railroad was included on the list because an at-grade crossing

was contemplated on the Jasper Road extension, which would have operational implications for the railroad.

Regarding the issue of commissioner participation in the stakeholders groups, Green deferred to Cornacchia, the commissioner for the affected area, regarding the level of participation he wished to have in the process. He endorsed the proposal for the stakeholders groups but was not ready to establish a policy. Green commended the mix of potential representatives on the stakeholders groups and highlighted the inclusion of the trucking industry as extremely important.

Dumdi also endorsed the proposal, noting the difficulty the County had in getting residents' acceptance of other road projects and agreeing with Mr. Snowden that more upfront effort with residents and affected interest groups would reduce the staff work load as project design neared completion. She also deferred to Cornacchia regarding the level of participation he wished to have in the process.

Mr. Snowden clarified that the Jasper Road extension involved the districts of both Cornacchia and Weeldreyer.

Cornacchia said that projects affecting many residents, such as the ones involved, were good candidates for the stakeholders process. He did not think the County needed to form a stakeholders group for all road projects and did not support establishing a broad, overall policy. Cornacchia maintained that such policies isolated the commission from its constituency. He said that staff could identify those upcoming high interest projects that might benefit from a stakeholders group for the commission to review. Cornacchia envisioned that the commissioners would act as liaisons rather than as working members of the stakeholders groups. He suggested it was important that commissioners avoid the appearance of having taken a position on a road project before it was considered by the entire board.

Weeldreyer also supported the staff proposal. She said that residents of the Marcola Valley area were aware of the proposal and were eager to participate in such a stakeholders group.

Cornacchia suggested that the stakeholders group list for the Jasper Road project include a Springfield City Councilor and Representative Lee Beyer's Office.

Dumdi concurred with Cornacchia that it was important that the commissioners work closely with their constituents.

Weeldreyer said it appeared the staff had authority to proceed. Responding to a question from Mr. Snowden, the board agreed that the chair could approve the proposed stakeholders.

- b. RESOLUTION AND ORDER 97-2-18-1/In the Matter of Improving Second Street South from Springfield City Limits to Dorris Ranch. (Don Maddox)

Don Maddox, Public Works Department, provided an overview of the resolution and order. He noted the item had been pulled from a previous consent calendar.

Cornacchia indicated he pulled the item in response to a constituent's concern about how the costs of the collector were assessed to abutting residents. He said that the issue was one of benefit. Cornacchia described the road involved in the improvement project and the surrounding topography and said that many properties along the ridge to the west of the road would not have access to Second Street and would not benefit from the sidewalks and gutters to be installed. He said that he had been contacted by Barbara Hassock, owner of property located along Second Street South, about the project, and he had explained the County's policy to her and asked her to attend the meeting. Cornacchia asked the board for further discussion of the issue, noting that several other properties were involved that would not be benefitted by the project.

At the request of Cornacchia, Ms. Hassock, 33530 East Game Farm Road, Springfield, circulated photographs of her property and identified her properties on a map showing estimated assessments as lots 8 and 9. She said that there was no way to reach the properties at the current time unless Springfield extended 3rd Street or constructed an access road along the ridge. Ms. Hassock indicated she favored the proposed road improvements for reasons of safety.

Green asked if the definition of "benefit" was limited to access or if the term encompassed the increase in market value that might result from the improvement. Mr. Maddox believed the term included market value. Green asked about the long-term financial implications of foregoing the assessments to abutting property owners. Mr. Maddox said that the Road Fund would have to bear more of the costs of such projects and would be depleted that much faster. Mr. Snowden noted that in the case of collectors and arterials, the County rarely collected more than five percent of the project cost from abutting property owners because the improvements assessed were limited to curbs, gutters, and sidewalks. He said that, in the case before the board, the County's current policy was to defer the assessment. Mr. Snowden concluded that in the case before the board, the financial implications of waiving the assessments on the Road Fund were probably minimal. If expanded to other projects, the impact would be more significant.

Cornacchia pointed out that the property owner could not take access to the proposed sidewalk off most of the property without repelling down the side of the hill next to the road. He suggested the situation was unique and would set no precedents. Cornacchia said that it made no sense to assess the owner for the improvements when they had no way to access the road from the property.

The board examined the topographical map illustrating the estimates. Mr. Maddox described the proposed improvement and how it would affect each lot on the road. Cornacchia suggested that the current policy was applicable to the majority of property

owners, but proposed that lots 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 3 not be assessed for anything but curbs and gutters to address the impact of residential runoff.

MOTION: That the cost of curbs, gutters, and sidewalks be assessed to abutting properties, with the exception of lots 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 13, which would only be assessed for curbs and gutters. Cornacchia MOVED, Dumdi SECONDED.

Green expressed support for the motion but noted his reluctance to define benefit strictly as access. He indicated his preference to address such situations on a case-by-case basis.

Sorenson expressed support for the motion but concern over the policy implications of the decision and the lack of a broad policy to guide staff in the future. Cornacchia did not believe that there were few such situations for the board to worry about because the County did not do many street improvements that included curbs, gutters, and sidewalks. He anticipated that the street would eventually be turned over to the City of Springfield, and said he would like to see the County reach a point where it built roads suitable for rural areas and cities built roads suitable for urban areas.

Responding to a question from Weeldreyer, Mr. Snowden explained that the definition of access was specific to vehicular, not pedestrian, access from a property.

Responding to a question from Cornacchia, Mr. Van Vector believed that the resolution before the board, with a minor modification, was appropriate.

VOTE: 5-0.

- c. **FIRST READING AND SETTING SECOND READING AND PUBLIC HEARING/Ordinance No. 1-97/In the matter of Amending Chapter 16 of Lane Code to Allow an Exception to the Removal Standards Within the Riparian Setback Area of a Class 1 Stream (LC 16.253(2)(d) (Second Reading and Public Hearing: March 5, 1997, 1:30 p.m., Harris Hall Main Floor). (Bill Sage)**

MOTION: To approve the first reading and set the second reading. **VOTE:** 4-0 (Sorenson out of the room at the time of the vote).

- d. **DISCUSSION/Review of the Public Park Management Consolidation in Rural Lane County Report (Bob Keefer, Sven Andersen, State Parks, and Wade Stampe, Army Corps of Engineers) (NBA & PM 2/14/96)**

Mr. Keefer provided an overview of a proposal to consolidate park management and realize management savings and efficiencies for several parks located in Lane County owned and operated by the County, the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE), and the State Parks Department. He used a map of Lane County to identify the location of the facilities in question for the benefit of the board and described the conceptual realignment. Mr. Keefer explained that the realignment would take advantage of the management strengths and resource of each agency. The questions before the board were

whether the County wished to take on responsibility for more parks facilities, and the anticipated impact of Ballot Measure 47 on the Parks Division and how that impact might affect the transfer.

Green asked Mr. Keefer to comment on the public perception of realignment in terms of each agency's management styles, particularly in light of the County's goal of improved service. He asked how the public would be educated about the realignment. In response, Mr. Keefer discussed the public involvement process proposed for the consolidation proposal. He said that the County intended to hold up to five public workshops to explain the realignment and how the facilities would be managed. Mr. Keefer believed there would be public concern about the County charging fees that had not been levied before, but he hoped there would be understanding about what the public would receive in return in the form of improved maintenance, upgraded facilities, and increased security.

Cornacchia noted the County's investment in Winberry Park and the fee increase required to pay for that investment. He said that the fee increase caused some concern, but he continued to believe that the fee was a good deal for citizens and the park was still heavily used. Cornacchia said that citizens were also able to see what the increase in their fees purchased in improvements.

Sorenson questioned whether elements of the realignment were likely to be controversial, specifically citing Armitage State Park, and if there was a formal public involvement process planned. Mr. Keefer said that staff intended to hold public workshops in the vicinity of the parks facilities involved in the realignment and would present citizens with information about the proposal and the three agencies' vision of how the facilities would be operated in the future. He envisioned that opposition to the proposal would come from those parks users who did not want to see any kind of change and those who would resist paying fees.

Sorenson asked if it was necessary for the State to transfer title of Armitage State Park to the County or the change could occur incrementally in the form of a lease. Mr. Keefer said that he had initially envisioned a fee title transfer while the State expressed interest in a lease. Both were included as options. He preferred the fee title transfer so the County could capitalize on the resource. He said that it was likely the County would enter into a long-term lease with the State with a mid-point check in.

Green asked Mr. Andersen and Mr. Stampe to comment on the realignment. Mr. Andersen said that the State supported the realignment because it would realize operational efficiencies. He said that the State had envisioned the transfer of Elijah Bristow Park to the County for some time. Regarding Armitage State Park, Mr. Andersen said that there had been controversy for some time about whether the park's proximity to the urban area made it suitable as a State facility.

Mr. Stampe said that ACOE staff believed that operational efficiencies would be realized as a result of centralized maintenance. He also believed that the realignment would lead to better public understanding of what agency was responsible for what

parks in a given area. Mr. Stampe suggested that fee collection would be simplified as a result of the realignment. He added that the realignment gave ACOE the opportunity to manage facilities now in County ownership for wildlife purposes and a chance to enhance access to Lookout Point and ease the burden of use of other waterways.

Addressing the two questions before the board, Cornacchia stated his belief that the concept was desirable regardless of the County's budget condition. The board briefly discussed the funding structure for parks. Mr. Keefer advocated for stable funding in the future for the Parks Division. Sorenson noted a recent conversation he had with Oregon Senator Ron Wyden, who indicated support for the realignment and who had offered additional assistance if the County needed to work with other Federal agencies such as the Bureau of Land Management.

Mr. Van Vactor encouraged Mr. Keefer, Mr. Stampe, and Mr. Andersen to ensure that the realignment contained a process to address any differences that might arise between the three agencies.

The board accepted the realignment concept by consensus.

- e. REPORT BACK/1996 Revenue and Expense Report on Management and Operation of Lane County Campgrounds at Richardson and Harbor Vista Parks (NBA & PM 2/14/96) (Bob Keefer)

Mr. Keefer reviewed the 1996 revenue and expense report for the two park facilities. He briefly noted visitor demographics.

Dumdi noted the decrease in revenues from shower fees at Richardson Park. Mr. Keefer attributed the decline to an increase in self-enclosed vehicles. Green asked if the caretaker at Harbor Vista Park was new. Mr. Keefer said no. He said that he had not provided information about the previous year's activity at Harbor Vista Park because it was difficult to compare the two years given recent changes in the facility.

Weeldreyer commended the changes made to Harbor Vista Park. She encouraged Mr. Keefer to continue to seek grant funding.

6. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Public Works

- 1) ORDER 97-2-18-2/Accepting the Director's Report on Improvements to South 57th Street and Mount Vernon Cemetery Road from Springfield-Creswell Highway (Jasper Road) Including Assessments.
- 2) ORDER 97-2-18-3/In the Matter of Authorizing the Sale of Surplus County-Owned Real Property to Pat Broderick and John Kartye (Map 20-01-04-2101 and 2201), Adjacent to Old Guistina Mill Road.

- 3) ORDER 97-2-18-4/In the Matter of Awarding a Contract to Pape Brothers, Inc., in the Amount of \$249,453, with Trade-in, for the Purchase of One (1) New Crawler Tractor, Contract FY96/97 FS-04.
- 4) ORDER 97-2-18-5/In the Matter of Accepting a Deed of Land to be Used as a Public Road Easement for County Road No. 728 (Thornton Lane) (20-03-27).
- 5) ORDER 97-2-18-6/In the Matter of Vacating Lot Lines Between Lots 3 and 6 and Lots 6 and 7, All in Block 2 of the Plat of Goshen as Platted and Recorded in Volume W, Page 349, Lane County, Oregon Plat Records, Without a Public Hearing, and Adopting Findings of Fact (18-03-23).
- 6) ORDER 97-2-18-7/In the Matter of Accepting a Deed of Land to be Used as a Public Road Easement for County Road No. 582 (Worth Road) (17-02-24).
- 7) ORDER 97-2-18-8/In the Matter of Releasing, Dedicating, and Accepting a Parcel of County-Owned Real Estate as a Public Road (16-03-33) (West Thomas Street).
- 8) ORDER 97-2-18-9/In the Matter of Releasing and Dedicating a Parcel of County-Owned Real Estate as a Public Road (16-03-33) (West Thomas Street).
- 9) ORDER 97-2-18-10/In the Matter of Accepting a Deed of Land to be Used as a Public Road Easement for Vintage Way (16-03-33)

MOTION: Approval of the Consent Calendar. Green MOVED, Dumdi SECONDED.
VOTE: 5-0.

7. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There was no one present wishing to offer public comment.

2. COMMISSIONERS' ANNOUNCEMENTS

Sorenson reported that he had attended the briefing held by the Association of Oregon Counties the previous day with commissioners Green and Dumdi, and said that it did not appear the State Legislature would be of much help to the counties in addressing the budget ramifications of Ballot Measure 47. He had attended a dinner later with representatives from Lane County and a reception with several other lawmakers and termed the experiences helpful in gauging what was occurring at the capitol.

Sorenson reported on the United Front lobbying trip to Washington, DC. He noted the Federal government's interest in locating a new Federal courthouse in Eugene. He said that the City of Eugene was advancing the possibility of collocation of facilities. Sorenson said that he had also visited the National Guard Readiness Center and met with staff who were in charge of identifying sites and monitoring construction of new National Guard facilities; that individual indicated that the Eugene National Guard facility was a low priority. He anticipated that it would take more work on the part of Oregon's congressional delegation to

secure funding for the facility. Weeldreyer noted that one-third of all National Guard members train at the Eugene facility.

Green concurred with Sorenson's remarks regarding the State Legislature's interest in helping the counties and said that it was important that the County work strategically and coordinate with other jurisdictions to get its message across to the legislature. He suggested that the County's Legislative Committee take up the subject. Green said that the reception was not a satisfactory setting to discuss the issues involved.

Weeldreyer suggested that the County's citizen volunteers should be encouraged to carry the County's message to the State.

Dumdi concurred with the remarks regarding the legislature made by Green and Sorenson and said that local governments must develop an aggressive campaign to carry their message to the State. She added that the legislature did not seem to perceive that its constituency was the same as the counties' constituencies. Weeldreyer agreed, pointing out that counties were an extension of the State government. Sorenson believed there was interest in county issues on the part of the legislature, but little understanding of the impact of the measure on county government. He suggested that the County make a presentation on the impact to the County's delegation.

Mr. Van Vactor reported that he had been working on a memorandum outlining possible legislative strategies that he would copy to all board members.

Responding to Sorenson's suggestion for a presentation to the County's legislative delegation, Cornacchia noted the relative lack of impact of the Lane County delegation in the legislature. He suggested that the County focus on legislators who would have an impact on the outcome of the Ballot Measure 47 discussion.

Dumdi indicated willingness to pursue Sorenson's idea.

Weeldreyer discussed her role in the United Front visit, reporting that she had visited the Environmental Protection Agency to discuss with EPA staff the McKenzie Watershed Council's need for plan implementation funding and the need to establish other watershed councils. She anticipated further discussion with the agency after the council had completed its transition to a new organizational structure.

8. REVIEW ASSIGNMENTS

Van Vactor reviewed the assignments, noting a follow-up assignment related to the resolution for assessments and associated director's report and the Parks Division's follow-up regarding the conceptual realignment proposal.

There being no further business, this meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

(Recorded by Kim Young, City of Eugene Minutes Recorder)

r:197lanecolbcc18.027