

Agenda Item Number 5.

Report of the Executive Committee

Presenter: George Kloeppe

Action Recommended: None. Information Only

Meeting Notes:

The LCOG Executive Committee met on Thursday, February 19, in LCOG's Main Office—Wells Fargo Building, Eugene. Members present for the meeting were LCOG Board Chair Jerry Miller, Commissioners Anna Morrison and Patrick Lanning, Chris Pryor and Mayors Gary Williams and Warren Weathers. Staff members attending included Bob Swank, Ted Stevens, Jamon Kent and George Kloeppe. The Committee discussed the proposed agenda for the February 26 Board meeting, as well as the annual cycle of agenda items that the Board might anticipate. Kloeppe noted the items proposed for inclusion on the Consent Calendar, noting that items B and C had financial implications but were endorsed and recommended by the Senior Services Advisory Council. He indicated that the Board had asked that the Consent Calendar be used for uncontroversial action items, which carried committee recommendations. It was noted that the "special presentation," item 7, would be made by Megan Banks and would describe the downtown visioning/planning that had been done for Creswell, Coburg and Junction City. In addition, the Committee considered the following:

1. Executive Committee Responsibilities, Meeting Schedule

It was noted that this was the first meeting of the 2004 Committee and that last year's Committee had expressed a desire to play a more active role in both setting the Board's agenda and in dealing with minor action items, in lieu of the Board of Directors. Kloeppe outlined the prescribed Executive Committee role for the benefit of new members. It was decided that the Executive Committee should accept greater responsibility for attending to routine business items of the organization and in designing the agenda for

the Board of Directors' meetings. The Committee affirmed the belief that the Board members benefited most from discussions of regional issues. In that vein, it was decided to recommend that the Committee plan on monthly meetings and adjust its schedule to more effectively contribute to the Board of Directors' agenda. Further, it was decided to recommend that the Board consider moving to a bimonthly meeting schedule. The staff was asked to prepare an outline of such a proposed change for the Board's consideration at its February 26 meeting. (A separate memorandum from the Executive Committee to the Board of Directors is attached)

2. Critique of Appreciation Dinner and Orientation Session

Kloeppel sought comments regarding the January 15 Appreciation Dinner and the January 22 Orientation Session that preceded the monthly Board meeting in Creswell. The Committee members expressed the belief that the January Dinner was well designed and conducted. The Committee discussed the issue of awards and generally agreed that recognition of good work and awards were highly important and that the process for soliciting nominees and selecting recipients should be strengthened. The venue at LCC, as well as the service received from staff and students, were deemed excellent. Regarding the January 22 orientation, it was suggested that the most valuable feedback would be obtained from the new Board members who attended the orientation session. It was agreed that a separate room for the session—not the room that the Board was to meet in—would have been desirable. It was acknowledged that, with many new policy makers coming onto the Board, a summer session would be valuable. Kloeppel noted that he needed to conduct more jurisdictional visits to help familiarize councils and boards with LCOG's activities.

3. S&DS and Ballot Measure 30

This topic is scheduled to be addressed under Board agenda item 14.A at the February 26 meeting. Ted Stevens, director of LCOG's Senior and Disabled Services Division, provided a report addressing the impacts that could be anticipated in the aftermath of the vote on Ballot Measure 30 on February 2. He noted that the failure of the tax measure would have effects throughout the State's human services system, as well as for public safety, education and other public services. He acknowledged that more would be known in the coming weeks and months, as legislative and executive decisions are made in Salem. At this point, he asserted, we can expect that the Oregon

Health Plan (OHP) “Standard” program will be lost; but it is not clear how much of the OHP “Plus” program will survive. Services are not likely to be restored for clients in Medicaid long-term care levels 12 and 13. However, Stevens noted that there was considerable uneasiness in Salem about this. He reported that present information suggested that the re-started General Assistance (GA) program would survive, mainly because its eligibility standards are so restrictive that few can qualify. Finally, he reported that the substantially-reduced Oregon Project Independence (OPI) program is not likely to be subjected to further cuts. The Committee discussed the information provided.

4. FY 2004-05 LCOG Dues

Kloeppel referred to a February 13 memo to the Committee which explored Lane County’s announcement that the County Administrator’s budget recommend a nine percent reduction from the County’s FY 2003-04 dues. It was noted that the Dues Schedule for FY 2004-05 had been approved by the LCOG Board of Directors in January. If accepted by the County’s Budget Committee and Board of Commissioners, the appropriation would amount to a cut-back of \$8,727 from the amount included in the Schedule. Kloeppel indicated that the County was confronted with extraordinary fiscal problems and that an “across-the-board” reduction of expenses had been called for by the Commissioners. He indicated that there was precedent for LCOG’s accepting something less than a full dues payment, when a member was experiencing unusual difficulties and requested such consideration. Commissioner Morrison noted that a majority of the Board of Commissioners had opted not to apply the principles of the County’s Strategic Plan to the proposed budget cuts. In her view, an across-the-board approach was not wise. On the other hand, she indicated that a more strategic or surgical process would not necessarily result in a better outcome with respect to the payment of LCOG dues. She felt that the trade-offs which were needed might necessitate even more substantial reductions in the County’s payment of dues to associations. The Committee discussed the situation and acknowledged that it was important that the COG be understanding and flexible. Some members of the Committee also expressed the belief that there needed to be some trade-off in terms of membership status for a member not able to financially support the organization in the manner prescribed in the Dues Schedule. It was suggested that the Chair might correspond with the Board of Commissioners to urge their continued support and to stress the importance of cooperative

efforts between governments, particularly in times of fiscal stress. Members of the Committee asked to review such a letter in draft form with an eye toward possibly signing it as well as the Chair.

5. Bylaw Amendment

An amendment to LCOG’s Bylaws was scheduled to be considered by the Board on February 26 under agenda item 11.A. It was noted that the proposal was in many respects a “housekeeping amendment,” inasmuch as it would bring the Bylaws into conformity with the Resolution on advocacy that had been adopted in May. The Committee reviewed the proposed amendment and concurred that it was appropriate. By consensus the Committee endorsed the proposal and recommended its adoption by the Board.