

MINUTES
UMATILLA COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Board of Commissioners' Meeting of January 15, 2014

9:00 a.m., Room 114, County Courthouse

Pendleton, Oregon

*** ** ** ** **

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Bill Elfering, Chair; George Murdock Vice
Chair; Larry Givens, Commissioner

COUNTY COUNSEL: Doug Olsen

MEMBERS & GUESTS PRESENT: Clay Peterson, constituent; Jack L. Esp,
constituent; Pat Hart, Hermiston Fire District Chief; Ric Sherman, Hermiston Fire District Board
President; Bob Heffner, Umatilla County Budget Officer; Jim Littlefield, Umatilla County Under-
Sheriff; Chris Burford, Counsel for Locust Mobile Village; Linda Hall, City of Milton-Freewater
Manager; Orrin Lyon, City of Milton-Freewater Council President; Steve Irving, Milton-Freewater
City Council; Lewis Key, Milton-Freewater Mayor; Sherrie Widmer, Milton-Freewater Valley
Herald; Dan Lonai, Umatilla County Administrative Services Director; Larry Nye, Milton-Freewater
Tea Party Coordinator; Jim Whelan, Stanfield Fire District Chief; Eldon Marcum, Stanfield Fire
District Board Member; Scott Stanton, Hermiston Fire District Assistant Chief; Cliff Bracher,
Constituent; Michael Roxbury, Umatilla Rural Fire Protection District Fire Chief; Kathy Lieuallen,
Umatilla County 911 Manager; Tracie Diehl, Umatilla County GIS Manager; Rachael Reynolds,
Umatilla County Data Analyst; Phil Wright, East Oregonian Reporter; Paul Chalmers, Umatilla
County Assessment and Taxation Director; Greg Bareto, Candidate for 58th District Representative
(Oregon)

*** ** ** ** **

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 9:01 a.m. Chair Elfering reminded all present that the meeting was a public forum and asked all attendees to sign in on the register.

BUSINESS ON AGENDA

Approval of Minutes: None

Additions to the agenda: None

Public Input:

Introduction of Candidate for State Representative – District 58: Clay Peterson

introduced Greg Bareto, a La Grande businessman who was running for the District 58 seat in the State House.

Jack Esp asked if there would be a place for comments in the supplemental budget presentations. Commissioner Elfering responded that the format of the public hearing for those reserved a place for public comment.

Agenda Items:

1. **Hermiston/Stanfield Fire Districts Proposed Reconfiguration Presentation:** Commissioner Elfering introduced Pat Hart and Scott Stanton from the Hermiston Fire District and noted that Pat Hart was to retire soon. Pat Hart responded that he would be retiring on April 30th and that Scott Stanton would be stepping into his position.

Pat Hart reported that Hermiston and Stanfield Fire Districts would like to become one district. That would require that they dissolve both districts and form a new one, which would also take in land not currently covered by any district. The item could be placed on the ballot in one of two ways: via petition that would require that signatures be collected, or by request that the Board of County Commissioners place it on the ballot on behalf of the districts. The effect of placing the item on the ballot would ensure that the voters could decide on the proposal. The intent was to place the proposal on the November 2014 ballot.

Commissioner Givens asked what would happen to the two current districts. Pat Hart replied that the two district boards would be required to pass resolutions dissolving their districts and the two would design a joint plan of liquidation. The current plan was to retain most assets from each district. Then, resolutions were to be crafted to that would require that the new district be approved and providing that if the district did not pass then the resolutions and plan would be null and void.

Commissioner Givens asked if, with the unprotected lands, had the landowners been contacted. Pat Hart responded that so far the two major landowners had been contacted and were working with the fire districts. One of the landowners was looking at balancing of tax cost versus insurance premium reductions to make a decision as to whether they wished to be included in a fire district.

Commissioner Elfering asked about the status of permanent staffing and what locations would be staffed. Pat Hart replied that there would be staff at the main station in Hermiston and on Diagonal Road near Edwards.

Commissioner Elfering asked for information on staffing in Stanfield. Pat Hart responded that the districts were unsure at the time, but would look to the call frequency across the area and place stations in the areas of most need.

He added that with respect to medical services, the re-districting would add a 40 hour per week medic and ambulance driver, one each, for Stanfield. The current Stanfield chief would come to Hermiston and Stanfield would have a division chief.

This was expected to balance the gain and loss of personnel. Also, adding a medic would make sure that the district would have one on scene in the Stanfield area for advanced life support services.

Jack Esp asked if the new district would be approved individually by residents of both districts. Pat Hart explained that the voters of each district would vote to dissolve their individual district and then also vote to form new district.

Jack Esp asked what would happen if one failed. Pat Hart replied that then the whole proposal would fail.

Commissioner Elfering asked Doug Olsen for the expected process for the request. Doug Olsen explained that the presenters would eventually need to establish boundaries for the district and then a hearing would be set. **Commissioner Murdock moved to direct counsel to move forward with the preparation of the appropriate documents for the creation of a new district to be placed on the ballot for approval. Commissioner Givens seconded. Commissioner Murdock, Commissioner Givens and Commissioner Elfering each voted in favor of the motion which carried 3-0.**

2. **City of Milton-Freewater Annexation Discussion:** Steve Irving from the Milton-Freewater City Council stated that the city had questions about the annexation, noting that the city was not opposed to the action when those requesting it were in the majority and wanted to fund it themselves. He and the council would support that.

Steve Irving went on to report that a second petition was mailed to the county asking it to withdraw the original petition. He went on to state the he did not feel that the infrastructure costs should be on the backs of the current residents as the city was looking at millions of dollars to build that out to the area requesting annexation.

He alleged that the petitioners believed that their petition only addressed water, and noted that annexation included fire and other services, resulting in exorbitant amounts for the infrastructure to the annexed area.

The Milton-Freewater Council was opposed to the annexation and requested that county withdraw the petition. He also asked that the county advise the city of the status of the petition to withdraw.

Commissioner Elfering stated that he had seen nothing that came from petitioners themselves in terms of withdrawing the original petition and noted that any group that is adjacent to the city can request that the county review the water to determine if there was a health hazard. In this case, the

county reviewed it and determined that there was a health hazard and forwarded it to the state. If the petition was withdrawn it would need to be requested by the original petitioners. The county fulfilled its obligation in forwarding the petition to the state after determining that a hazard existed.

Commissioner Givens asked that county counsel outline the process of an annexation petition. He went on to state that once the petition was forwarded, the county had no more authority.

Doug Olsen referred to ORS §222.905, citing the local health board obligation to determine if there is a health hazard. If so, the local health authority was to forward the petition to the state for further action by the state. That meant that the county did not make any further determination and the county had no further obligation regarding the petition.

Linda Hall commented that she did not feel that the petition was vetted as per standards and stated that there was a question as to whether a public health issue existed at the time. She stated that the data used was very, very antiquated and that the state was now re-testing the water.

She continued, stating that she was told that the water in the majority of the petitioners' areas was now determined to be acceptable and that Commissioner Givens was present at the report. The city would want time to remove the gun to their heads and she did not believe that the petitioners had a clear understanding of the effect of the petition.

Commissioner Elfering stated that it was his understanding that when the county determined that there was a hazard, then it was the state's obligation to work out the situation. Therefore, the solution was to be reached between the state, the petitioners and the city.

Linda Hall stated that Commissioner Givens was present when the state volleyed the matter back to the county and that the city was asking if the county would rescind the petition. Commissioner Elfering pointed out that the county received nothing from state to that effect. Linda Hall replied that the statement was verbal.

Commissioner Givens commented that the exact term was that this would go away if the county would just withdraw its request. He was not sure that anyone was clear on the understanding of what the process was and was not sure what the result would be should the state determine there was a problem in the face of a request from the county to desist.

The matter of the petition remained and, granted, that some of the signatures were not very legible, but there were more signatures than required. He would agree with Councilman Irving that not everyone was clear on the effect, but noted that the cost was not a consideration the county could use in determining whether to move the petition forward.

Doug Olsen recited the statute subsection stating that the county board of health could not consider cost as a factor. Commissioner Givens added that that information seemed to go over the parties' heads.

Chris Burford asked who, with the state, stated that the county could request the withdrawal. Commissioner Givens reported that Dave Leland had stated that. Linda Hall added that also Scott Fairley stated it and it was he who was to draft a letter to that effect.

Commissioner Murdock asked Chris Burford if he could speak to the petitioners' position currently. Chris Burford reported that the petitioners were still supportive of the annexation petition and noted that the statute was cited on the petition in its entirety. He also noted that ultimately those residents who were not the landowners would also be paying costs of the infrastructure through their rental costs.

Shirley Widmer stated that Nancy Shaw called her and indicated that the group had withdrawn its petition. Chris Burford noted that he spoke with Ms. Shaw both before and after she spoke with Shirley Widmer and that at both times she was still supportive.

Commissioner Elfering commented that at this point the county had no standing unless there was a clear indication that the petition was to be withdrawn. Commissioner Givens commented that the process put into motion actions, even though the county was not to consider the cost, that had the potential to devastate the entire corridor, that those properties going into the city, should the annexation take place, would need to meet the city's standards. The costs would have to be paid by some other entity than government and undoubtedly that would be borne by the residents. The state would allow the city to recoup the costs that way and that could damage the area.

Commissioner Elfering asked counsel if the understanding was that when petition was filed that a solution would have to be reached between the city, the petitioner and the state. Doug Olsen replied that was correct. Commissioner Elfering noted then the county is not one of them.

Linda Hall stated that the solution via the statute was that the city was required to provide a solution within 90 days and that would be a very onerous statute. She stated the city had no choice but to provide the solution and that there were few landowners.

Commissioner Elfering asked if there was any request to the city relative to bearing the costs or had the city been asked to bear costs directly. Chris Burford commented that he had made overtures to city to discuss a way to resolve the costs. He also noted he had been told he was not allowed to be part of the discussion to reach a resolution.

He stated he heard concerns about the age and quality of the data which was why testing was being conducted. The OHA would do more testing for an accurate determination and the statute specifically provided for alternatives to annexation to resolve any problems.

He went on to state that Ms. Shaw was interested in talking with the city and noted that although the majority claims may not be supportive, a very small number can start a process so that a number of people can make requests to protect the community health. A number of communities had resolved similar situations. Chris Burford stated that Ms. Shaw was looking for a resolution that was better than the current situation.

Commissioner Elfering commented that he believed the board had heard all the views on issue and would close the discussion and would deliberate regarding what action was to be appropriate. Commissioner Givens suggested that the county take no action as he would like to have a chance for the state, city and petitioners to resolve the issue. He asked Chris Burford if he had offered to meet with the city. Chris Burford replied that he offered to do so in August.

Commissioner Murdock commented that he had absolutely no interest in forcing annexation, but would be interested in conveying in writing the county's desire to get updated information since there was some question as to the validity of the data. Commissioner Elfering added perhaps their interpretation of the statute should be requested also because it was hard to understand that the county had the authorization to request the withdrawal of the petition. Commissioner Elfering continued, stating that he felt the county had no interest in forcing something to happen and simply wished to work within the law. He directed county counsel to raise those issues with the state.

3. **Supplemental Budgets - Public Hearing:** Commissioner Elfering opened the public hearing at 9:43 a.m. with the staff report as related below for each supplemental budget.

The chair then opened the floor for public comment at 9:48 a.m.

Larry Nye asked for clarification on CIS versus GIS and Bob Heffner explained that the supplemental budget concerned CIS which was computer information services.

Jack Esp commented that he had made a review of the budget at the request of Commissioner Elfering. The result was his conclusion that there were concerns on three of the supplemental budgets.

First, on Budget Order 2014-31, the software operating system was outdated and that the current software would be moving systems from Windows XP to Windows 7. He understood otherwise that Windows 7 was to no longer be supported. He also questioned the purchase of new computers, stating that private users would ordinarily purchase a new operating system instead of a new computer and asked why the county would not purchase just the operating system. Then the funds for the new equipment could be directed to public safety.

On Budget Order 2014-32 on the CAD system referring to the maintenance, why was maintenance of the system not in original budget? If it was just maintenance where was the money coming from support it?

Jack Esp went on, stating that 35 was another example of reserve funds for future needs that could be directed to public safety.

Commissioner Elfering asked if there were further comments.

Kathy Lieuallen stated that she could answer the question on the CAD system maintenance. She stated that the program believed, at the time of budget preparation, that it would have the new RIMS system up and running by the termination of the contract for the old system, so that the maintenance cost would not be incurred. Those funds are reimbursed by other agencies partnering in the CAD system and those agencies would be billed. The supplemental budget was presented because there was the need is to establish a line item for those reimbursements. She noted that the sheriff's portion of the maintenance cost came out of the City of Pendleton revenue fund.

Dan Lonai introduced himself as the Director of Administrative Services and noted that he did research relative to the computer and operating system project. He noted that although Windows 8 was the most current operating system, no information had been received in his program as to Windows 7 no longer being supported. He noted that the county used equipment until it was no longer able to use it, adding that the county had a server in continuous use since 1994. In his research, he considered that for desktop systems having a 2003 version of Office, there would be an upgrade for RAM costing about \$500 per system, not including the software costs and that a portion of those desktop systems would still not be able to support Windows 7 after a RAM upgrade. Many computers were too old to be upgraded.

Jack Esp asked about replacing the CAD system. Kathy Lieuallen explained that the program did not expect to use the CAD system after the first of the year. Jack Esp suggested the money for the new system should be used for the old system. Commissioner Elfering replied that the short answer would be that the system required replacement.

Commissioner Elfering closed the floor to public comment at 9:59 a.m. and the board entered into deliberation and decision.

Commissioner Murdock commented that he fully disagreed with Jack Esp's view, noting that unanticipated reserves were not useable for hiring new deputies because a cash carryover in the budget was not sustainable and therefore no support would be ongoing. He would not support creation of permanent obligations not sustained by a permanent source of revenue and unanticipated reserves were not sustainable.

- a. **Computer Information Services, Budget Order 2014-31**: Bob Heffner reported that the supplemental budget was necessary to support replacing computers whose operating systems were no longer supported. The expenditure was to be supported by a \$578,893 increase from the cash carryover and the foreclosed property fund. **Commissioner Givens, in the matter of a resolution adopting a supplemental budget pursuant to ORS 294.471 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2014, moved approval of Budget Order 2014-31. Commissioner Murdock seconded. Commissioner Givens, Commissioner Murdock and Commissioner Elfering each voted in favor and the motion carried 3-0.**
- b. **911 Dispatch, Budget Order 2014-32**: The order was needed to authorize the maintenance expense of the CAD system and was supported by reimbursement to the county by its partners on the CAD system. **Commissioner Murdock, in the matter of a resolution adopting a supplemental budget pursuant to ORS 294.471 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2014, moved for adoption of Budget Order 2014-32. Commissioner Givens seconded. Commissioner Murdock, Commissioner Givens and Commissioner Elfering all voted in favor the motion. The motion carried 3-0.**
- c. **Foreclosed property, Budget Order 2014-33**: Bob Heffner reported that the supplemental budget was made necessary due to higher than expected activity related to the sale of public lands. The supplemental budget was supported by the increase in revenue. **Commissioner Murdock moved adoption of Budget Order 2014-33. Commissioner Givens seconded. Commissioner Murdock, Commissioner Givens and Commissioner Elfering each voted in favor of the motion, which carried 3-0.**
- d. **School Based Health, Budget Order 2014-34**: The expansion of mental health services required increase which was supported by a new grant for an 18 month period. Commissioner Elfering asked what was anticipated after 18 months. Bob Heffner replied that he had no information on that. Doug Olsen commented that the position was temporary and eliminated after 18 months. Commissioner Murdock commented that all provisions were made for 18 months and no plans were made for afterward. **Commissioner Givens, in the matter of a resolution adopting a supplemental budget pursuant to ORS 294.473 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2014, moved approval of Budget Order 2014-34. Commissioner Murdock seconded. Commissioner Murdock, Commissioner Givens and Commissioner Elfering voted in favor and the motion carried 3-0.**
- e. **Assessor, Budget Order 2014-35**: Bob Heffner reported that the supplemental budget was needed to establish the reserve fund for the future purchase of tablet technology for use in the field, which was supported by the reduction in personnel services as result of the department reorganization. **Commissioner Givens, in the matter of a resolution adopting a supplemental budget pursuant to ORS 294.473 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2014, moved approval of Budget Order 2014-35. Commissioner Murdock seconded. Commissioner Givens, Commissioner Murdock and Commissioner Elfering each voted in**

favor of the motion. The motion carried 3-0. The chairman closed the hearing at 10:05 a.m.

Commissioner Murdock departed for a meeting in Boardman at 10:05 a.m.

4. **Compression Issue:** Undersheriff Jim Littlefield extended the sheriff's apologies for not attending the meeting. He was at the Oregon Sheriffs Association conference and asked the undersheriff to present the proposed reorganization plan.

Undersheriff Littlefield reported that the proposal would not require any increases in the budget. The increases proposed for the sergeants would be absorbed by the criminal division with the intent to increase the patrol. Currently, the department had added a patrol sergeant to the criminal division. A lieutenant's and a sergeant's position were both left vacant through retirements. The department brought a detective into an interim sergeant position to temporarily fill the vacant sergeant's position but the department still had a lieutenant position vacant.

Sergeant Gregory was transferred from Milton-Freewater to Hermiston. The department's view was that it was not fair to have one sergeant to address staff. With one supervisor and one sergeant, the team could potentially supervise 20 personnel. With the addition of a sergeant to the opposite end of county to provide relief and allow the use of sergeants for more call for service responses, the result was expected to create more effective policing. That would put 4 regular deputies on each end of the county plus sergeants.

It was proposed that the department promote Dave Williamson to Lieutenant, as he was already doing those duties for the most part. He was well qualified and had his knowledge and 25 years of experience.

The department would then leave one detective position open. If another detective was needed the sheriff and undersheriff would fill in as necessary in the detective division.

With that reorganization, the sheriff proposed to increase the patrol sergeants from a Range 29 to a Range 32 in the pay scale to provide separation between the line staff and the management. Currently, some staff was making more than the management due to overtime and longevity pay.

The proposal would create no increase in the budget. The department was anticipating about \$4000 in savings through end of fiscal year by not filling the second detective's position. It was hoped that the changes could encourage retention and recruitment.

The department was also having difficulty attracting experienced officers into the sergeant's positions due to the compression and due to the differential in lateral transfers from other agencies. The goal was to put more people on road, increase efficiency, encourage investigative practices among line staff and encourage efficiency by training field deputies in investigative work.

Commissioner Elfering commented that the sheriff did bring the proposal to him as the liaison and indicated that he intended to address the budget as well as efficiency.

Commissioner Givens added that he was pleased with the realignment of the sheriff's office as well as throughout the rest of the county. The commissioner commented that he had heard that the officers' increased presence was noted and the comments from constituents were positive. Jim Littlefield replied that the department now had ten patrol deputies, which was up from seven and those changes were also the result of the efficiencies.

Larry Nye commented that he had a varied career as a mayor, councilman, budget officer, supervisor of law enforcement in Athena and corrections officer for EOCI. He reported that the support of sheriff was common throughout the agencies and that there was also a common understanding at EOCI that the sheriff and local law enforcement agencies were a common recruiting pool for the state and viewed as a training ground. To that end, he would endorse a decent wage for the sergeants so as to encourage quality personnel to remain in the area.

Larry Nye felt that the undersheriff's explanation was very valid and commended the leadership in the current reorganization and follow through of the promises made by sheriff. Doug Olsen recommended that the proposal be addressed in two separate motions with the first adding the position and the second addressing the change of range.

Commissioner Givens moved to create a new sergeant position. Commissioner Elfering seconded.

Commissioner Givens asked if Bob Heffner had signed off on the proposal. Bob Heffner and Undersheriff Littlefield both confirmed that the proposal had been discussed with the budget officer. **Commissioner Givens and Commissioner Elfering each voted in favor of the motion, which carried 2-0.**

Commissioner Givens moved to grant the request to change the sergeants' pay range from 29 to 32. Commissioner Elfering seconded. Commissioner Givens and Commissioner Elfering voted in favor. The motion carried 2-0.

5. **Purchase of Additional GIS Software for Assessment & Taxation Department:** Paul Chalmers, Tracie Diehl and Rachel Reynolds were present for the presentation. Paul Chalmers reported that he had discussed the purchase with the liaison commissioner before bringing the request to the meeting.

The department, in its move toward automation, tested the software for free. That software was currently being used by GIS Manager Tracie Diehl. The testing period was ending and the department was also aware that the test copy was non-transferrable meaning that to ensure that the

department's data analyst could use the program with GIS, the department would need to purchase the full program.

The advantage to the software was that the program would allow users to look at various layers of mapping and maintain more than 42,000 maps needed in the county's database. It would allow staff to track sales activity necessary to support the annual ratio study.

The program was also why the department had not gone forward with looking for staff to replace those leaving through attrition. The technology advances would support the decrease in staff.

He proposed to use the savings generated from the most recently vacated position for the initial cost of \$3,000 which included a maintenance agreement valued at \$600 for first two years.

Commissioner Elfering commented that in reviewing the issue he noted that normally a \$3,000 purchase could be made but it involved a contract which was why it came before the board. Paul Chalmers added that the goal was also to convey transparency in the department's process.

Commissioner Givens asked for an explanation of the advantages for staff. Paul Chalmers gave a baseline example where, in days gone by, sales information was written on the mylar maps. A realtor would need to review the original mylar for the comparisons and history of various properties which was time consuming for staff. That time would be better spent in the field on new construction.

The new format would allow for addition of information in real time as well as more efficient use of the data for information resources. Commissioner Givens noted that when the reclassification of the county's forest areas was done, it would have been much more efficient had this been in place.

Commissioner Elfering asked if it would reduce the need of outside services when compression was addressed. Paul Chalmers replied that it would not, for an outside query, but would manage data from day to day in house.

Commissioner Elfering asked how the proposal would fit in the budget. Paul Chalmers explained that it would be funded from the reserve account that was set up for new technology from the savings from the unfilled vacated position and that the purchase would include the maintenance for two years.

Commissioner Givens noted that Larry Nye had asked for a question. Larry Nye commented that he was curious about the \$9,900 contingency for GIS and taxation and asked if Paul Chalmers would please show where the contingency fund would be used and when and how the county would decide to use contingency. Paul Chalmers replied that it stemmed from a previous discussion where the department created savings from not replacing a person in a position.

Larry Nye asked how the county would decide to use contingency. Paul Chalmers replied that the county used to maintain a contingency in each specific budget, but that when things got lean and then leaner, that individual contingency was eliminated. About 8 to 10 years ago contingency had been centralized.

Commissioner Givens added that there were sideboards as to what the county can use for contingency. Bob Heffner explained that contingency was retained for unexpected items that the county was not able to foresee at budget preparation.

Commissioner Elfering added that those could be for unexpected medical expenses at jail, boiler repairs, breakdowns in equipment, drastic changes in PERS or the cost of prosecution in the district attorney's cases as had occurred in the past.

Commissioner Givens moved that the Board approve the request for the tax and assessment in the amount of \$3000 for the purchase of software from Intergraph Corporation. Commissioner Elfering seconded. Commissioner Givens and Commissioner Elfering voted in favor of the motion, which carried 2-0.

6. Planning Commission Temporary Appointment: Commissioner Elfering noted that Planning Commissioner John Standley had completed two full terms and was, thus, termed out. The county had initiated recruitment and staff requested a temporary reappointment until he was replaced.

Commissioner Givens noted that several years ago, terms for the planning commissioners were for long periods and that the term limit program was trying to bring its appointment terms in line with state practices. **Commissioner Givens** stated that the requested action was to continue to have John Standley in his position until his replacement was selected and **moved to approve the temporary appointment. Commissioner Elfering seconded. Commissioner Givens and Commissioner Elfering each voted in favor of the motion, which carried 2-0.**

7. Eastern Oregon County Association Intergovernmental Agreement - Public Hearing: Commissioner Elfering opened the public hearing at 10:38 a.m.

Doug Olsen began the staff report by explaining that the organization was originally formed by six other counties to address federal policies, regulations and managed lands. The board was asked to approve membership, which would require approval of an IGA and an ordinance.

Commissioner Givens commented that the organization was not part of the Sagebrush Revolution group and that it was now about 12 counties including all the eastern counties and a couple counties from southern Oregon.

It was primarily the rural counties that addressed distinct separate issues related to eastern Oregon as opposed to the more urban counties. The biggest issues being fire and law enforcement response

where the distance covered areas sometimes of 100 or more miles, the ownership on land in those areas were often federal agencies, which presented issues with financial crises related to mining, logging and roads.

The organization was started by commissioners in Union County and Steve McClure promoted it from the start. The advantage was that it gave a block of counties with similar interests and needed a vehicle so that they could go as a group to seek help and involve smaller western counties.

Commissioner Elfering noted that one of the issues addressed now would be the forest bill with the goal to carry the message forward. The two largest counties in the organization were Umatilla and Deschutes. The dues for the association were to be paid as 1.5% of the PILT payments received.

Commissioner Elfering opened the floor to public comment at 10:43 a.m.

Jack Esp asked if the county received its PILT payment this year. Commissioner Elfering responded no.

Commissioner Givens commented that Congressman Walden's office called requesting some help because, for the state, the PILT payments were significant. For the rest of the nation the complete authorization was \$490 million. When the congressman called, the PILT had been pulled out of the appropriations in the budget discussion on Monday as a trade-off for another line item. Under situations like this, the organization would help to fight for support to pass bills.

Jack Esp asked if he could assume if the percentage of PILT didn't come in, could the association continue. Commissioner Givens replied that they would need to adjust the dues.

Larry Nye offered a brief strategic comment, describing Congressional District 2, and the overlay of Congressman Walden's support, that he felt it would give more weight in negotiating and that the organization would have more advantage in terms of backing.

Commissioner Givens added that the relationship built between the organization, Congressman Walden and Kathy McMorris-Rogers built a stronger coalition. He understood that the speaker agreed to look again at the PILT appropriations. Commissioner Elfering closed the floor to public comment at 10:48 a.m.

Commissioner Givens read the ordinance, by title and moved approval of Ordinance Number 2014-01. Commissioner Elfering seconded. Commissioner Givens and Commissioner Elfering both voted in favor and the motion carried 2-0.

8. Amend Fiscal Policy for Fleet Management Plan for Non-Law Enforcement Vehicle Purchases: Commissioner Elfering noted that the primary change to the policy was to change the point of contact for purchase requests. Doug Olsen noted that it would also include updated

language to make sure that any requests must be made by February 1 with recommendations on the requests to be provided by March 1. The policy revision would switch the budget officer from the committee to the budget liaison commissioner.

Commissioner Elfering commented that it was a continuation of the policy that was formed in the previous year to address the continuity of the vehicle replacement.

Commissioner Givens moved to adopt the amended fiscal policy for the Fleet Management Plan (Non-Law Enforcement and Public Works), F-11.0. Commissioner Elfering seconded. Commissioner Givens and Commissioner Elfering voted in favor. The motion carried 2-0.

New Business: None.

Commissioners' Reports:

Larry Givens: Commissioner Givens reported that he just came back from the AOC legislative meeting. With the legislature opening on February 3rd, a number of things were on the agenda that could impact counties. The commissioner noted that he was not assuming the group's positions on any initiatives.

One of the big issues was the RPS (renewable portfolio standards), which created a heated discussion. The topic was that a petitioned initiative supported by UEC and some of the local legislators to change the standards. The introduction brought up opposition including a group with AOC which was trying to circulate a referendum opposing placing the proposal on the ballot. The initiative would include hydro power in the RPS.

The governor put together a task force to work with the petitioners and industry to try to develop a resolution so that the initiative did not land on the ballot. Some in the county wanted to see the initiative move forward.

Commissioner Givens reported that he moved to table the resolution to oppose the initiative to wait for the governor's task force to report on it. Had it not been tabled, it would have gone forward to legislative committee for opposition. Tabling it placed a hold on the position on the initiative until the governor weighed in.

The other contentious issue was the marijuana legislation, since the OSSA and DAs had come out in opposition of recreational legalization. A position to support legalization was hotly contested but AOC passed a resolution to oppose legalization.

The state was considering having the counties assume DEQ duties in each of their own counties without funding. The effect could be devastating since there were no monies accompanying the mandate. The current local DEQ office currently served Umatilla County and 11 other counties in

EO and Josephine and Jackson and then Clatsop County. Because the program was understaffed they had to send the DEQ staff in Pendleton to Clatsop once a month to serve that area. DEQ was now looking at Coos County providing DEQ support to Clatsop. AOC took a position opposed to taking the DEQ program without funding because the result would be the counties would be forced to raise administrative fees and the state would take the fees.

Bill Elfering: Commissioner Elfering announced that the two committees assigned to him met at the same time and he attended the water committee. The water committee decided to continue as before, related to the renegotiation of the Columbia River Treaty, ensuring continuing water, continuation of the CRUST effort to try to reach a consensus on water use.

Commissioner Elfering commended Tamra Mabbott on securing a \$25,000 grant on planning on the 395 corridor north of Hermiston.

Commissioner Elfering announced that he had expanded his office hours on Thursdays in Hermiston and noted that he was in the midst of preparing the agenda for the NACo legislative conference in DC at the end of February.

Other Discussion: None.

Scheduling of Next Meeting: The next meeting will be held February 5, 2014.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:03 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Headley
Executive Secretary
Umatilla County
Board of Commissioners