

MINUTES & NOTICE OF BOARD ACTION

APPROVED 7/23/96

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.

January 23, 1996 9:00 a.m.	JOINT LEADERSHIP TEAM AND BUDGET COMMITTEE MEETING	Commissioners' Conference Room
-------------------------------	---	-----------------------------------

PRESENT: Commissioners: Steve Cornacchia, Ellie Dumdi, Bobby Green, Sr., Jerry Rust and Cindy Weeldreyer present. Representing the City of Eugene: Tim Laue and Laurie Swanson-Gribskov present. Representing the City of Springfield: Maureen Maine present. Budget Committee Lay Members: Peter Bartel, Marie Bell Carol Jones, Del Phelps and Bud Stewart present. Department Heads: John Ball, Steve Carmichael, Jim Gangle, John Goodson, Doug Harcleroad, Bob McManus, David Suchart, Bill Van Vactor and Teresa Wilson present. Budget Staff: David Garnick, Tanya Heaton and Rick Schulz present. Recording Secretary: Zoanne Gilstrap.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Green called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and requested that all present introduce themselves.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: November 27, 1995, Leadership Team and Joint Budget Committee Meeting, 8:30 a.m.
December 4, 1995, Leadership Team and Joint Budget Committee Meeting, 8:30 a.m.

MOTION: Approval of the Minutes of November 27 and December 4, 1995. Dumdi MOVED, Harcleroad SECONDED. **VOTE:** Unanimous.

III. BALLOT MEASURE

Van Vactor pointed out that there were differences between this measure and what has been done in the past. He explained that the past tax levies have been lump sums with the amount stated. He noted that this levy was different in that there was not a set amount.

Van Vactor asked Teresa Wilson to explain the consequences noted in the summary of the ballot measure.

Wilson stated her understanding was that the upper limit stated was an upper limit in terms of the ability to budget. She explained that if the rate produced a higher collection rate, the effect would be that additional funds would be a carryover and a resource for the subsequent year.

Van Vactor summarized that more money would not be collected over the three years than the cumulative total.

Wilson responded that in year three, an amount would be set to collect the amount specified in the levy. However, she explained that despite best efforts, there was always a possibility of collecting more money in the last year.

Garnick added that there was also the possibility that if the assessed value was not as high as projected, then less could be collected.

IV. REVIEW PRIOR CATEGORIZATION OF DOLLARS FROM SHERIFF'S CURRENT GENERAL FUND SUPPORT.

Garnick distributed a spreadsheet displaying what the funding levels were and what had been agreed to at the last leadership meeting (see material on file). He explained that everything was exactly the same as where they last ended. Garnick reported that the first two categories were agreed to by the leadership team. However, he stated that there was not consensus on categories III and IV. Garnick stated that the main reason they were here today was to look at the District Attorney's funding level. He said the District Attorney received the funding he requested in category II which was a result of the Sheriff's levy. Garnick noted that under category III, the amount of \$375,000 was considerably less than what the District Attorney had previously requested.

Garnick explained that the handout showed an approximate \$2.5 million deficit. He then passed out a spreadsheet showing the likely reductions for FY 96-97 based upon percentages of the discretionary General Fund use (see material on file). He said this model basically showed that if the \$2.5 million reductions became necessary, where these reductions would be allocated. He explained that about 90% of reductions would go to law enforcement and health and human services with less than 10% going to all other departments.

Van Vactor explained that these were just projections and had not gone through the budget committee and Board of Commissioners' process.

Harclerod requested that Garnick produce a model that spreads the amount of the \$2,496 million identified as a deficit against the departments affected but excluding the Sheriff's department because the Sheriff's department will be off the General Fund if the levy passes.

Cornacchia stated that the value of Harclerod's exercise was to show that the deficit reduction plan is focused primarily on law enforcement and public safety. He said that the question of which departments the deficit reduction plan affect was not broken down anywhere.

Garnick stated that he would provide a new model showing those figures.

V. DISCUSSION: DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S REQUEST TO ADOPT A 6-YEAR DEFICIT REDUCTION PLAN

Garnick distributed the first handout and explained that he plugged some figures into the model that would answer some of the questions regarding the District Attorney's request for additional dollars (see material on file). He said that the figures of \$400,000, \$500,000 and \$600,000 were just the three figures that he started with. He stated that if you plug \$400,000 into the model it will result in a \$1.65 million deficit eight years out. Garnick said there would be no deficit in years six and seven but there would be in year eight and stated that as you go up in amounts, obviously the deficit will increase in year eight. Garnick noted that the leadership team had previously talked about an eight-year deficit reduction plan.

Cornacchia commented that this would be an additional deficit and not the deficit at the end of eight years with this change. He explained that this was what would be added to what the deficit will be without the serial levy.

Garnick reported that right now there was an eight-year deficit reduction plan that shows things are basically kept flat. He explained that there would be a tiny reduction in year eight but it would be essentially just zero. Garnick observed that beyond year eight, there would be deficits because there will no longer be the O&C revenues which would result in additional reductions.

Cornacchia said it should not be anticipated that the deficit would be anything less than what it is currently. He said that after adding eight years of inflation plus an additional reduction of O&C receipts, the deficit will be up around \$11 million to begin with and by giving the District Attorney \$600,000 now, the deficit raises to \$15 million. Cornacchia noted that that was just figuring today's numbers. He questioned whether that was the condition to place the budget in and said the discussion here today was to balance those two interests: the needs of the District Attorney's Office versus the impact to the entire organization.

Harclerod said he could accept the \$400,00 and that that would work for the next three years with possibly less in the future. He explained that the District Attorney's Office was just reactors to public safety.

Rust stated that he felt this was a perfect time for the County to have a discussion about where to get the biggest advantage for any additional dollars and said one of the things he was interested in was the juvenile and early intervention component. Rust asked whether the additional \$400,000 should be put entirely into the adult system or whether this leadership team should regroup and put more in the front end of the system for younger people. He stressed that this issue deserved to be debated also. Rust believed the juvenile and prevention angle should be looked at more carefully when decided where the next quarter or half million dollars ought to be directed.

Garnick went on to explain that the current corrections operation serial levy receives \$300,000 from special assessments and, when the existing serial levy goes away and the sheriff goes out on a totally new levy, the department would no longer need to transfer that money over, thus that money would no longer be dedicated for spending and that was where the additional \$300,000 resource came from.

Bell said that she thought what Harclerod was asking for in his request was about a 25% increase over what he had. She stated that she believed that if the Sheriff's department was increased by two times, then she thought what Harclerod was asking for was very reasonable. She stressed the need to go back and look at how much the Sheriff's department has increased or will increase in total before making this decision on Harclerod's request. Bell commented that if the Sheriff's department is doubling their size, it makes no sense not to increase the DA's Office when you are increasing law enforcement.

McManus stated he has 275 employees today and at the end of three years in all categories, police, correction and support, there would be 146 additions.

Bell said that based on the current proposal, as far as FTE, the Sheriff's department would increase 53% and in dollars 73%, and the DA's Office would increase in FTE 31% and in dollars 28%.

Schulz explained that the numbers were very complicated and said the dollars were actually 52% by the third year. He said he came up with 73% first also and after working with Garnick, discovered it was a 52% increase, not 73%.

Bartel stressed that nothing was being done at the prevention level. He stated he does not agree that just because the Sheriff's department gets an increase, the District Attorney's office should get the same percentage.

Weeldreyer asked Harclerod why he needed this additional money.

Harclerod responded that this would get his department up to 1992 levels, ignoring the fact that the caseload has increased significantly with an additional 23% increase in felonies since 1992.

Weeldreyer asked if adding FTE on the front-end of this three year levy would be more beneficial than spreading it out over the next few years. She questioned whether it would be more helpful to have more of this money on the front-end rather than spreading it out as it has been suggested.

Harclerod replied that that would be helpful. He said that cases will start being dismissed if there are not lawyers there to cover the cases.

Rust stated that there is a Public Safety Coordinating Council in place and he believed that was the place for fine tuning between budget years. He said he was ready to go forward with the plan on the table.

Bell said she was concerned about finding more beds for Eugene because criminals were not being prosecuted and property crimes were being ignored. She stated she believed the police force cannot be supported without prosecuting the criminals.

Cornacchia said that he was in support of an additional \$300,000 for the DA based upon the HB 1065 dollars that are available. He explained that, as was pointed out by the budget staff, if the District Attorney was given \$300,000 to adjust each year because that would be all that the District Attorney would get, his budget could be increased by \$300,000 flat for eight years and there would be a zero deficit at the end of the deficit reduction plan.

Rust asked that this issue be taken before the Public Safety Coordinating Council. He remarked that if \$300,000 was going to be allocated, he would rather defer on that action. He reiterated that he liked the plan they have and said they still can fine tune it later.

Bell stated that no plan should be supported if it causes a deficit in eight years. She said this was suppose to be a stabilization plan, which was one of the biggest selling points of the levy and would prevent layoffs or cuts.

Van Vactor clarified that Cornacchia proposed a flat \$300,000 to spend at the option of the DA so that it equals zero at the end. He asked if Harclerod was going to support the levy if they approve the \$300,000.

Cornacchia said there was a strong need for consensus, 100% support in all players and if that could not be achieved, he would like to leave it at status quo. Cornacchia withdrew his proposal due to lack of enthusiasm.

Harclerod said he was agreeable to \$400,000 and that the first he heard of \$300,000 was at this meeting.

Green proposed \$300,000 additional to the DA's Office.

This meeting recessed at 10:55 a.m. to reconvene at 11:05 a.m.

Harclerod agreed to the amount of \$300,000. He said he learned that there was two other locations, the PSCC 1-90 Agreement and also the Budget Committee, as avenues to approach if he sees the need for arguing for additional dollars for the DA's Office in the future.

Phelps said he was aware of the needs of Harclerod's office and of the Sheriff's operation but it was his hope that somehow they could channel more money to prevention in order to stop the revolving door.

Rust said he was going to vote for the levy and support and campaign for it. However, he said he does not support this proposal.

Weeldreyer stated that she shared the same concerns about prevention and moving towards a systems approach and that this \$300,000 is a resource to bring to that discussion. She commented that she was also aware of the critical workload in the DA's Office and said that she believed to a certain degree that having that resource there was a benefit to Lane County. Weeldreyer said that she was supportive of the Motion.

Gangle stated that he was supporting the levy and that he also supported this proposal.

MOTION: To direct staff to determine the mechanism to make the additional funding of \$300,000 of HB 1065 money to support the DA's Office. Dumdi MOVED, Bell SECONDED. VOTE: 23-2, Rust and Bartel dissenting.

There being no further business, this meeting convened at 11:20 a.m.


Zoanne Gilstrap, Recording Secretary



[Back to Board Notices](#)