

MINUTES & NOTICE OF BOARD ACTION

APPROVED

11/7/98



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.

July 23, 1997
1:30 p.m.

REGULAR MEETING
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Harris Hall
Main Floor

Chair Cindy Weeldreyer presided with Ellie Dumdi, Bobby Green, Sr. and Peter Sorenson present. Steve Cornacchia, excused. Zoe Gilstrap, Recording Secretary.

14. COMMISSIONERS' ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dumdi referred to a letter from John White, chair, Heceta Water District, asking for assistance from the County to meet a State Health mandate to provide minimum treatment facilities. She stated that they are asking that the Board of Commissioners coordinate the various departments in expediting approval of the necessary permits and easements for construction of a filter plant.

Bill Van Vactor, County Administrator, stated that this a long standing problem and that Lane County has wanted Heceta Water District and the City of Florence to work out a comprehensive solution for the entire area. He suggested that this be referred to John Goodson, Director of Public Works, to look at the complete issue.

Green said he would support Van Vactor's suggestion to direct Goodson to work for a comprehensive resolution.

Responding to Sorenson's question regarding the position of Florence, Dumdi affirmed that the City of Florence has been working with Heceta Water District very closely, noting that Florence's drinking water source is in danger of contamination.

There was consensus to have John Goodson work on this issue.

15. OTHER BUSINESS

a. Public Comment

b. DISCUSSION/Public Access Television.

Weeldreyer gave a brief overview of this item (see material on file). She posed the following questions.

1. Should the Board of County Commissioners support expansion of Community Access Television beyond the TCI/Metro Area?

Dumdi reported that she has been in support of expansion for a long time, particularly into the Florence area, but it is an expensive proposition. Robert Lewis reported that the cost to build a microwave link to Florence is approximately \$100,000. Dumdi asked if it would cost an additional \$100,000 to include the east side of the county. Lewis reported that there is no strategy to get the signal to Florence. Dumdi stated that it was important to get the meetings broadcast to those areas as a way of getting the issues to the citizens, and she has been frustrated by not being able to do so. She reported she still has a strong interest in making this happen.

Green reported that he would support expansion, but expressed concern about who would do the work. Weeldreyer stated that one purpose of these questions was to provide guidance to the two commissioners who would be representing the board on the Metropolitan Planning Commission.

Sorenson stated he would support expansion, both governmental and public, into more homes throughout the county. Sorenson urged a long term solution to the issue.

2. Should the Board of County Commissioners appoint two commissioners to the LCOG/MPC planning process?

Green questioned if appointing two commissioners was necessary. Sorenson stated that if the other jurisdictions would include more than one elected official, then the County should also. Green opined that one commissioner (Weeldreyer) was sufficient. Weeldreyer stated she favored having two commissioners in order to assure that the county would be represented. Green recommended appointment of one, with an alternate. Weeldreyer stated support for one commissioner appointee, and volunteered for the position. Sorenson volunteered to be the alternate, and asked Weeldreyer if she had time to be the chair of this planning process. Weeldreyer reported that she did not want to be the chair, just the representative from the county. Dumdi voiced support for Weeldreyer.

3. Should the Board of County Commissioners support efforts to re-engage the City of Springfield in this process in the short term?

Commissioner Green opined that Springfield was about a year away from a commitment, but that it would be prudent to begin discussion. Van Vactor reported that the mayor is interested, but the city council was not, due to funding. Continuing, he stated that the county should move ahead, whether Springfield commits to the process or not. Sorenson indicated support for the foregoing comments.

4. Should the Board of County Commissioners review its current expenditure levels for the PEG system and provide policy direction for future uses of cable franchise fees?

Weeldreyer provided clarification, indicating that this proposed dedicating any growth in franchise fees to the PEG system, rather than elsewhere. Weeldreyer reported that the City Council of Springfield will not redirect any of its franchise fees. In response to a question from Dumdi, Van Vactor reported that cable franchise fees enter the general fund of the county with no stipulation on where the money is to be spent and currently \$54,000 is allocated to the PEG system.

In response to a question from Sorenson, Van Vactor stated that apportionment of the collected fee has changed depending upon the need of various groups as determined by the Board of County Commissioners. Van Vactor reported the average for the last ten years is roughly \$50,000. Lewis added that although the amount collected has grown substantially, the funding applied to PEG has remained static. Green stated opposition to review, and spoke in favor of letting the process continue in order to account for future unforeseen developments. Weeldreyer voiced support for Green's statement, as did Sorenson.

5. Should the Board of County Commissioners support exploration of ways to engage in a broader use of CATV within the larger community?

Weeldreyer cited participation by Kidsports and other programs as an example. Green voiced approval. Dumdi agreed. Van Vactor asked if this would include using county staff, to which Weeldreyer responded negatively. Weeldreyer declared that this issue is a means to create a public and private partnership which will sustain PEG into the future.

6. Should the Board of County Commissioners support public access becoming a nonprofit independent operation using government dollars for seed money only?

Green voiced agreement, with the reservation that a careful analysis of the tradeoffs should be undertaken. Dumdi agreed with Green. Sorenson voiced interest in exploring how other communities operate, including the use of a nonprofit to administer the public access portion of the PEG triad. Dumdi suggested an exploration, rather than a commitment. Weeldreyer agreed.

Sorenson declared that public access should not take the full brunt of reduction in funding and that allocation of the reduction should be equal between governmental and public access. He reported the perception that government reduces public access and not governmental access. He stated that this sends a bad message. He declared that the county should be vigilant about protecting public access. He voiced concern about reducing hours at the public facility while not doing the same at the governmental channel, stating, "I don't think that's fair." Voicing support for involving other organizations, Sorenson said there is a large group of people who would get involved in this activity. He voiced hope that ultimately this would improve service.

Weeldreyer stated that one of the defining issues was creating an outlet so that children can express themselves. She voiced favor for creating a strategy around prevention and linking it to an expanded PEG system in Lane County. She reported that many rural children are isolated and bored, and this would be a way to engage them in positive activities. Dundi agreed with Weeldreyer, and spoke favorably of a children's program that had been produced in the Portland area. She added that her constituents are opposed to spending public funds on programs that offend their sensibilities; but government programming on public functions is very important to them. Green voiced agreement with Sorenson that public access should not take the brunt of reductions, but he wants to see measurements of how that will take place. He advocated for a balance of funding between government and public access, with delivery of the best possible product. In response to Green's statement, Van Vactor reported that public access has been reduced by 50% while government broadcast remains at the same level until this process is completed in September or October. Van Vactor stated that the county has no control over the City of Eugene's apportionment; but the county could reallocate resources from the government portion to public access. Van Vactor requested that the Board identify which Board meetings it would not want covered. Sorenson reported that his constituents are extremely concerned about the cost benefit analysis; and proposed less coverage of budget committee meetings instead of Board of County Commissioners meetings. Green stated he was reluctant to cut back coverage of budget committee meetings because employees view them to learn how their department will be impacted. Green suggested discussion with the City of Eugene to see if coverage could be shared.

Van Vactor asked if three commissioners wanted a memorandum reporting on possible savings by reducing budget committee or Board of County Commissioners meetings. Weeldreyer stated it would be valuable for Lewis to prepare such a report. She added that a report on using volunteers in the production center would be valuable. Lewis agreed to produce a report.

Weeldreyer thanked Lewis and others in attendance for their valuable contribution to the discussion of item 15 b.

- c. DISCUSSION/Six-Month Work Plan Review and Update for Community and Economic Development and the Rural Community Improvement Council.

Stephanie Schulz, Rural Program Services Coordinator, and Peter Thurston, Community and Economic Development Coordinator, gave a brief overview of the changes in their work plans due to reduced FTE (see material on file).

Dumdi recognized their commitment, noting that they now only have half-time to achieve very ambitious work plans.

Weeldreyer encouraged them to continue to look for grant proposals to provide additional revenue to add FTE.

Tanya Heaton, Management Analyst, stated that because these work plans are very full, she is requesting recognition of the 15-minute rule by the Commissioners.

Dumdi requested that periodic projects reports be made to the Board.

There being no further business, this meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.



Zoe Gilstrap, Recording Secretary