



Board of Commissioners

Office: (541) 766-6800

Fax: (541) 766-6893

4500 SW Research Way

Corvallis, OR 97333

co.benton.or.us

MEETING MINUTES

BENTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Goal-setting Work Session

July 11, 2023 – 9:00 AM

Present: Pat Malone, Chair; Xanthippe Augerot, Vice Chair; Nancy Wyse, Commissioner; Jef Van Arsdall, Benton County Sheriff; Vance M. Croney, County Counsel; Suzanne Hoffman, Interim County Administrator

Staff: Darren Nichols, Daniel Redick, Shannon Bush, Inga Williams, Community Development; Cory Grogan, Public Information Officer; Tracy Martineau, Human Resources; Carla Jones, Community Health Centers; Rick Crager, Marilee Hoppner, Shurisa Steed, Financial Services; Damien Sands, Behavioral Health; Sean McGuire, Sustainability; Julie Arena, April Holland; Health Services; Don Rogers, Dawn Dale, Bryan Lee, Sheriff's Office; Maura Kwiatkowski, Amanda Makepeace, Board of Commissioners Office; Gary Stockhoff, Public Works; Tomi Douglas, Natural Areas, Parks, and Events

Guests: Zack Reeves, Ryann Gleason, CFM Advocates; Alex Powers, Mid Valley Media; Liz Irish; Naomi Shadwick

1. Opening

1.1 Call to Order

Chair Malone called the meeting to order at 9:05 AM.

1.2 Introductions

Introductions were made.

1.3 Announcements

There were no announcements.

2. Review and Approve Agenda

The agenda was reviewed. Chair Malone indicated an Executive Session would be held following completion of the regular agenda. The agenda was approved.

3. Discussion Topics

3.1 Board of Commissioners/Community Health Centers Co-applicant Agreement – *Carla Jones, Community Health Centers*

Jones reminded the Board of the Health Services Resources Administration (HRSA) onsite visit audit that occurred May 24 through 26, 2022, which found the Community Health Centers (CHCs) of Benton and Linn Counties were out of compliance with the “Board Authority” section of the agreement.

The Board of Commissioners set a 2022 goal for the County Administrator to clarify and define the roles and responsibilities of the CHC Board and Benton County in the co-applicant agreement. Jones described the 12-month process, which included convening a senior leadership workgroup (CHC Executive Director, County Administrator, Human Resources Director, and Chief Financial Officer). In addition to meeting regularly over the 12-month period, this group completed CHC Board Training.

The agreement before the Board for approval included a legal review by County Counsel and Health Services Compliance Manager. It also included a collaborative review of revisions proposed by the CHC Board.

Key areas of the new agreement include 1) clarification/definition regarding CHC Executive Director selection, termination, and dismissal authorities of the CHC Board and Benton County; 2) an outline of the process for selection and evaluation of the CHC Executive Director; 3) a section on appointment of an Interim CHC Executive Director; and 4) an updated legal section and signing authority.

Jones advised that following Board of Commissioners approval of the new agreement, next steps include requesting CHC Board approval, communication with stakeholders, a review of the CHC Bylaws, and CHC Board work on the Executive Director evaluation process.

Malone asked about the CHC Board qualifications; specifically, that the majority of the Board must be patients. What are the specifics of the patient definition? Jones indicated patient Board members are required to have been enrolled within the last year; but the HRSA would like them to be individuals who are enrolled in

some type of services program. Malone expressed appreciation for the effort required to align the agreement with how the health centers are being operated.

MOTION: Wyse moved to approve the co-applicant agreement.
Augerot seconded the motion, which was **approved 3-0**.

3.2 Update Regarding Adult Drug Treatment Court – *Suzanne Hoffman, Interim County Administrator; Rick Crager, Financial Services*

Hoffman reminded the Board of the previous presentation from Judge Matthew Donohue, District Attorney John Haroldson, Hoffman, and Behavioral Health Director Damien Sands. Hoffman also referenced the Hoffman/Sands memorandum that included background information and a recommendation. The next steps were to come back to the Board if the county took on the role of applying for grant funds and being a grants administrator if grant applications were successful. This item was moved to the August 8 Goal-setting Work Session to align with when Donohue will provide an update to the Board.

Hoffman indicated there had been a shift by the Adult Drug Treatment Court (ADTC) Policy Committee led by Donohue. Sands and Chief Financial Officer Rick Crager attend those meetings. At the last committee meeting, Donohue informed of the decision to cease the program effective immediately. Crager indicated the program was stopped for now because the county does not have the resources to operate the program as proposed. The ADTC could potentially resume in 2024 if new resources become available, Crager indicated the committee agreed to stopping the program now and working toward a timeframe during which other resources might be secured. It is now clear to the committee the county does not have the resources to operate the program as proposed, which could include potential federal funding opportunities. Sands indicated the term used was sunseting, which means there may be a potential for a sunrise. It was a difficult meeting and decision. Sands acknowledged the program's excellent work and hoped the pause would provide an opportunity for reset in the post-Measure 110 environment. It is also an opportunity for the Oregon Justice Department (OJD) and Criminal Justice Commission (CJC) to consider doing things differently. Those who are in progress in the program will continue to receive support.

Augerot echoed Sands' comments and pointed out that ADTC staff leads are provided primarily by OJD, and they do not have the authority to receive or apply for grants or enter into contracts directly with behavior health providers. Therefore, this is a responsibility that would fall to the county to provide facilitation and administration, which inherently leads to an awkward relationship between the District Court and the county. It is difficult for the county to recoup

its expenses for doing that work. We all believe in having this diversion opportunity; it has been very valuable. As a result of Measure 110, the census is low, but it is expected to increase. Currently, to be diverted, an individual must have committed multiple property crimes rather than drug crimes. By that point, people are generally in a much worse situation. Augerot is hopeful the county can work with OJD, the legislature, and CJC to better understand the issue. Several other counties have dropped their drug treatment courts because of similar issues.

3.3 Update and Discussion Regarding Governor's Executive Order on Homelessness: Local Planning Group for Balance of State Funding – April Holland, Julie Arena; Health Services

Holland reminded the Board that some of the information in this update was covered in the Health Services Department Meeting on July 6. Arena indicated the goal of the presentation was to provide understanding and updated information, including requirements of House Bill (HB) 5019. The process will be as data driven as possible. Oregon Housing and Community Services (OHCS) expressed a desire for locally-driven programs, which allows the county to continue with its work under HB 4123. Components of community-driven plans would include: 1) community plans are developed by local planning groups and are incorporated into the grant agreements; 2) plans will outline specific strategies a community would employ to reach their goals; and 3) equity plan, which are critical to ensuring groups that have experienced disparities in homelessness within the community are prioritized in the plan.

Arena presented the formula factors used to determine how much funding Benton County would receive. The \$1.4 million funding awarded to the county was based 1) the number of people experiencing homelessness, 2) the rate of unsheltered Homelessness, 3) the number of students experiencing homelessness, 4) the number of of severe rent-burdened households with income below \$35,000, and 5) the number of people in poverty.

Of the \$26 million in available state funding, a remaining \$6 million will be awarded in a competitive process across the 26 counties. The state wants all counties to focus on three subpopulations most likely to fall into homeless and have the most barriers to exiting homelessness, and the community plan due July 21. For the competitive RFP funding process, the community plan's rating will be based on 1) Readiness: demonstrate the ability to create and operate shelter sites or additional shelter beds by June 25, 2025, 2) Operations: demonstrate low barrier operational plan, and 3) Support: demonstrate local support for the project from community leaders and regional partners.

Arena reviewed the activities the county is conducting to collect community input on this topic, which include 1) Collecting Community Input via a survey to collect qualitative feedback on three subpopulations most likely to fall into homelessness and have the most barriers to get out of homelessness; 2) Local Planning Group meetings with community partners; and 3) combining local data and qualitative input from the planning group to create a community plan, which is due July 21.

Arena noted that addressing disparities is difficult, and the team is seeking guidance from Rural Oregon Continuum of Care leadership. In addition, a meeting with OHCS is scheduled for the current week to request resources to support addressing disparities.

Arena reviewed the role of the Coordinated Homeless Response Office, which is to 1) provide leadership, structure, and support for service providers and system improvements; 2) build sustainable resources and additional funding beyond the local level; 3) be a central point of communication; and 4) engage the community.

Augerot expressed appreciation for the rapid coordination and noted that existing partnerships have made a significant difference, but she expressed concern about the program concept of rapidly rehousing 33 people by January 2024. Holland indicated there are various timelines and believes the overall timeframe is longer. The sheltering addendum goes out two years. In response to Augerot's question regarding the status at the end of the biennium, Holland expressed hope this would become sustainable funding; however, that is not certain. A great deal of funding did not materialize in the most recent legislative session, and service providers are concerned about resources for continuing their operations. It remains to be seen if HB 5019 becomes the sustainability solution for rapid rehousing. We are embracing the process in hopes that not only OHSC funding, but framework can be used when pursuing other funding. Augerot expressed hope funding would be pushed out to all corners of the state based on need.

Wyse expressed appreciation to the team for their hard work. She asked about the definition of rehousing and how long individuals need to be rehoused. Holland indicated staff have been asking these questions, as well as how to categorize and define different types of sheltering and housing. There are US Housing and Urban Development definitions and working definitions. Many conversations are occurring around what the terms actually mean.

Malone expressed appreciation for the thorough update and staff working quickly to meet rapid deadlines.

Arena noted the work would not have been possible without the roles filled by Rebecca Taylor and Libbi Loseke Winters.

3.4 2023-25 Legislative Session Review – *Rick Crager, Financial Services; Zack Reeves, Ryann Gleason, CFM Advocates*

Crager advised that the contractual relationship with CFM Advocates had been in place just under a year. Crager thanked Reeves and Gleason for a positive partnership and indicated the presentation would focus on state issues – an opportunity to recap and look ahead.

Reeves noted the leadership changes of the 2023 state legislative session: a new senate president, a new governor, and a relatively new house speaker. The Democratic majority set two major initiatives: semiconductor legislation relative to the federal CHIPS and Science Act and homelessness. Both initiatives were pared down significantly, and Reeves would have liked to see more funding toward rural counties. The legislature ultimately approved \$200 million in incentives to bring additional semiconductor operations to Oregon, which currently has 15 percent of the industry. A contentious component of the legislation was the land use authority given to the Governor to incentivize semiconductor development.

Senate Republicans, as in previous sessions, denied a two thirds legislative quorum via a walkout, which was the longest in state history. The walkout was spurred by opposition to HB 2002; legislation addressing gender affirming care and women’s healthcare.

A significant number of bills passed at the end of the session. Gleason noted the legislators’ unique position; initial projections indicated the level of money available to spend would be less than in recent past years. When the revenue forecast came in, there was more money to spend than originally anticipated, including a \$5.4 billion kicker to taxpayers. Benton County will receive \$8.8 million in matching funds for the courthouse and \$5.6 million in lottery bond funds for the Emergency Operations Center (EOC). Crager noted the lottery bond funds normally are not placed until the biennium end to avoid debt service costs (approximately March 2025). The legislation, however, has not yet been signed by the Governor, who has line-item veto authority. Gleason does not anticipate these funds would be eliminated. In budget rec bill, a few more allocations that impact the region \$250,000 for Every Child Linn Benton Lincoln, \$780,000 Linn Benton Food Share, \$1.5 million for City of Monroe water infrastructure project upgrade, and \$1.9 million for the Philomath Frolic stand replacement.

Gleason also reported that HB 2296 passed, which extends work after retirement provisions for an additional 10 years, until January 1, 2034. Previously, these provisions, which remove most hourly limits on working after retirement, were scheduled to sunset on January 1, 2024. Reeves gave credit to the Association of Oregon Counties for advocating for this legislation. Crager noted that law enforcement was especially helpful in getting HB 2296 approved.

Augerot expressed appreciation to Representative Gomberg for success in securing funding for small rural communities such as Monroe and Philomath in Benton County. Reeves shared Augerot's sentiment's, indicating Gomberg has a good track record of securing funding for small communities.

Crager reminded the Board the short session is scheduled for February 2024, and Gleason indicated it would be helpful to identify funding priorities as quickly as possible in advance of that session. This allows CFM to coordinate project tours and site visits. Reeves noted that if there are specific policies the county is interested in, it is very important to get those in early due to the limited number of bills that are considered. Augerot wondered if there would be potential legislative opportunities during Legislative Committee Days occurring September 27 through 29, 2023.

Malone reported on preliminary discussions with House Speaker Dan Rayfield regarding remodeling of the Sunset Building for the Children and Family Services program. Given the need and relatively modest funding amount, he believes it is a topic that has some traction within statewide priorities. The county needs to further define the actual need and agreed the sooner, the better in defining priorities is critical.

Crager noted the significant seismic needs of the historic courthouse. It is important to identify federal, state, and local resources that may be available.

Malone asked about the 2025 session; had heard transportation will be a key topic. He asked about how that might impact Benton County. Reeves noted it is common to see a large transportation package approximately every 10 years. The last was in 2017; although work on it began in 2015, so the 10-year timeframe is approaching. Gas tax revenues continue to decline, and infrastructure construction costs are increasing. The conversation will be around a fundamental shift in how transportation improvements are funded – from gas taxes to road user fees. High efficiency and alternative fuel vehicles do not pay a fair share of taxes that fund transportation improvements, and this will be a large component of any transportation funding conversation. Some past pilot projects have not really gotten off the ground. The Interstate 5 bridge replacement was funded in a unique

way; a \$1 billion investment comprised of \$250 million in general fund monies over the next four biennia. Legislatures are not technically able to compel future legislatures to spend money in any way, but it is a signal to the federal government that Oregon is committed to funding its fair share of the Interstate 5 bridge replacement. Any 2025 transportation package will include solidifying that investment. There are some deadlines to meet this year to be eligible for federal funds for the \$7.5 billion total bridge cost. If we had not acted this session, those funds would have gone away.

Funding for smaller transportation projects is sprinkled around the state. As 2024 unfolds, the people leading these conversations will begin dialog in preparation for 2025. Malone noted the county benefited from HB 2017 in the form of the new Van Buren bridge project. Augerot mentioned the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) improvement plan for Highway 99W in south Corvallis that is in development. She is hopeful some of that vision will be funded in the next transportation bill. Reeves indicated it is easier to secure funding for these types of projects when they are part of a larger package. Augerot pointed out that transportation funding strategies at the federal level also need to change; she has been talking with Oregon Congressional staff.

Although not directly relevant to Benton County, Malone asked about the tolling issue discussion deferral. Reeves addressed the pause on tolling until 2026, which provides time to consider a more comprehensive Portland metro-wide tolling approach, as well as tolling for Washington drivers entering the Portland metro area. It is a regionwide problem that requires a regionwide solution rather than a single point of tolling. Stakeholders will take a step back and take a broader look beyond Interstate 205 and Interstate 5 to perhaps include roadways. Another concern is diversion; using surface streets to avoid tolling; will need to divert some funds to local governments to pay for the cost of the diversion effect on local infrastructure. Malone highlighted the current concerns with the ODOT budget and its ability to address additional transportation issues.

Malone asked about the Oregon International Port of Coos Bay. Gleason indicated the port received some funding in 2021, and she will check into whether any funding was allocated to the port in the recent session. Malone noted this is another “in the billions” price tag infrastructure project. Reeves believes the current session funding is for some channel work. The port project is a significant one for Senator Wyden at the federal level, and federal monies would be the project’s primary funding source. Gleason indicated House Speaker Dan Rayfield is a major champion of the port project.

Malone thanked CFM Advocates for their efforts on behalf of Benton County.

3.5 Capital Funding Discussion – *Rick Crager, Financial Services; Gary Stockhoff, Public Works*

Crager referred the Commissioners to his summary whitepaper in the meeting packet (Page 32) and expressed a desire to hear from the Board regarding previous decisions, as well as a look ahead. The county suspended \$3 million in Capital Improvements Projects (CIP) funds (approved and adopted in the budget as a resource without specifics) and \$4.2 million in American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funding (set aside with the idea of issuing future community grants). The hold was placed pending the JSIP bond measure result and the results of the state legislative session. The JSIP measure did not pass, but the county did receive \$5 million from the state for an EOC without specifics about how the EOC must be designed. The county also has \$1 million in federal funding for the EOC that expires September 30, 2024 and requires a match of \$300,000. Although the county was fortunate to receive some state resources for the EOC, the cost estimate is \$10.6 million. The project is now a different model, so it will need to be reviewed again. Approximately \$4.3 million is needed to complete the EOC project. HB 5506 resources can be used for an EOC, and there is some flexibility to consider other alternatives (sites, etc.).

Crager indicated now is the time to make decisions about the \$7.2 million that has been held. As the Board directed, the CIP application process was conducted, but no decisions were made. A total of \$4.46 million in requests were submitted compared to \$3 million in available resources. Hoffman reminded of the \$1.5 million needed for Behavioral Health facilities. Of the \$4.2 million of available ARPA resources, approximately \$1.1 million is considered revenue replacement and is flexible for all government uses. The remaining \$3.1 million of resources must be expended in ways that respond to COVID-19 impacts including assistance to households, small businesses, nonprofits, and impacts to industries including hospitality, tourism, and travel. Funding may also be used for investments in water, sewer, or broadband infrastructure.

Crager reminded the Board of the obstacles to collocation of the District Attorney's Office with the new courthouse, including with the state. The county also continues to have space challenges related to the Children and Family Services program, and resources are currently dedicated to this need. In addition, the homeless navigation center was not funded due to the bond measure failure. The county does have some assets, including the former Board of Commissioners building and the historic courthouse, so there are potential opportunities for leveraging. The historic courthouse, of course, would come with a more significant cost to make it a usable space.

Stockhoff mentioned one other asset – the seven-acre parcel at the north site for which the county currently does not have plans. Augerot noted this discussion is more difficult because the county does not have a facilities master plan. There are vacant offices at Avery, but the site will be getting squeezed at some point. We need to be thinking long-term about Sheriff's storage and long-term facilities needs at Avery. Capital preservation is very critical, and we need to protect the county's resources. Also, what are the county's matching funds obligations? Augerot expressed the desire to complete the Children and Family Services program build out due to the urgent need. Another Augerot priority would be to direct funding to the navigation center to secure property and get to shovel ready status.

Regarding the EOC, Augerot expressed concern the cost estimate was based on a significant mobilization of construction at the site. How is that cost impacted by the bond failure and the lack of shared mobilization? Stockhoff indicated a need to review the cost per square foot and the soft costs and would defer to Van Arsdall regarding need. Van Arsdall reported that EOC staff and Search and Rescue were being transitioned to the former Board of Commissioners Office, and he will be working with Crager and others to identify options, making do with what is available. Search and Rescue and Marine functions are squeezed at Avery. Malone asked about flexibility in reducing the EOC square footage to align with available resources. Van Arsdall indicated such would require review; sufficient square footage is necessary to ensure the space is useful for the EOC and the community.

Wyse asked developing options for the \$6.3 million. For example, could the EOC be constructed at the new courthouse site? Stockhoff has a drawing that shows the EOC standing on its own and this should be considered, but whether it could be expanded in the future is undetermined.

Crager indicated he was not requesting Board decisions in the current meeting. He will be meeting with affected parties, at which time staff would be positioned to present options to the Board. The greatest challenge is not knowing what the needs look like. Once needs and costs are known, the county may be required to call upon other resources, which is where the \$7.2 million would come into play. One question is whether the county should wait longer to spend CIP resources until the EOC need is determined. Augerot would like to also see firm cost estimates for what is needed at the Sunset Building to accommodate the Children and Family Resources program. Stockhoff will request this information from Facilities Manager Paul Wallsinger. Will also be meeting with Bryan Lee and others regarding the EOC.

Crager indicated the CIP Committee is being convened; not to make decisions but to discuss priorities. One significant consideration for projects is readiness to

proceed and criteria development. Malone would like to prioritize resources toward what is urgent and necessary. The Monroe Health Clinic is one example. Stockhoff noted there would be requirements associated with the federal money, and purchasing power tends to decrease when federal funds are part of the equation. Crager was fairly confident the \$1 million in federal funding for the EOC could be used for planning purposes. The use of the federal money is more urgent because the county must do so by September 30, 2024. Augerot expressed the need for a corrections facility.

Wyse indicated it would be helpful to know how many agencies use the ARPA money; are there any organizations that will need to return funds? Her preference is still to use these funds for their original purpose. Crager can provide more information about current grants. He has not found any agency that had not used the money. One project has been delayed – the business loans through the Economic Development Office – but that initiative is now gaining momentum. Another agency had vehicle purchases delayed due to supply chain issues. The \$3.1 million must be used in the categorical areas of the ARPA guidelines; however, there is a great deal of flexibility. The mental health facilities need would be a fit for these funds. The navigation center would also fit due to the homelessness connection. Financial Services staff is receiving a good number of contacts from organizations inquiring about the next round of funding. Crager also noted the spend time for the ARPA funds is December 31, 2024.

Augerot noted the evacuation route on the ARPA list; is there a deadline for that project? Crager responded there is a project moving forward, and unused funds can be used for evacuation route analysis. The county has dedicated \$1.6 million in ARPA funds for water and sewer infrastructure. Malone identified priorities of moving forward on the EOC and the remodel of the Sunset Building for the Children and Family Services program. Regarding CIP and ARPA, there was a reason the county delayed moving forward with disbursement, which was waiting for the result of the bond measure election. The Board now needs to carefully evaluate priorities and balance those priorities with available resources.

Crager confirmed his assignments from the Board: 1) work with Van Arsdall and Stockhoff to develop options and costs for the EOC; 2) work with Wallsinger, Sands, and others to identify the true cost of the Sunset Building remodel to accommodate the Children and Family Services program; and 3) regarding ARPA resources, a) prepare an update on the progress of existing projects, and b) identify potential demand for ARPA funding.

Augerot indicated that if the county is considering another round of ARPA grants, it is important to emphasize it is one-time funding. Organizations will need to

think strategically – infrastructure, for example, rather than ongoing services. Augerot and Wyse reminded that the first round of ARPA grants emphasized there were no guarantees around future funding. Given the funding stream is not sustainable; if a request would require an ongoing funding stream, how will the agency address that? Crager pointed out the county also communicated that future grant criteria would be different. Malone reminded that the purpose of ARPA funding was to get communities through the pandemic, not to guarantee ongoing agency operations.

Regarding CIP projects, Crager would work with Stockhoff and the CIP Committee to identify what projects are ready, what deferred maintenance needs to be addressed, etc. Crager indicated the need to make some decisions relatively soon (no later than mid-August) regarding direction.

Crager asked if there was any work the Board would like to have done relative to the navigation center. Augerot indicated the City of Corvallis pledged \$500,000, and she would like the county to at least match that amount. If a property can be secured for the navigation center, she believes the legislature would provide some funding. Crager will research the present status of the navigation center; he believes the cost is \$5 million.

Crager noted the county will be receiving \$1 million from the agricultural appropriations bill for a modular building for Monroe Health Center. This federal money expires September 30, 2024, so the work needs to be put together pretty quickly. Malone asked about the total cost of the clinic; Crager indicated the county has approximately \$800,000 of existing federal funds that can be used for this health clinic. Stockhoff noted an August 2022 cost estimate was \$1.2 million. He indicated he would meet soon with CHC Executive Director Carla Jones and the Monroe School District. Crager noted there is money from the Health Resources and Service Administration, which is a new source for the county. He did not know the requirements yet, but the county would likely not see an award of those funds until March 2024. Some work needs to begin now before the funds are awarded to determine the requirements. Stockhoff indicated the funding the county has can be used to keep moving the project forward.

3.6 Solid Waste Workgroup Final Report and Recommendations: Next Steps Discussion, Continued – *Darren Nichols, Daniel Redick; Community Development*

Nichols presented the staff memorandum and the updated draft Request for Proposals (RFP); the memorandum outlines a draft process recommendation. Nichols requested the Board direct the establishment of a temporary taskforce to

advise staff and the Board regarding the content of the RFP. Staff recommended it be a regionally representative group because solid waste and sustainable materials are complex, regional issues that should be addressed with a regional perspective. The proposal is to appoint specific members to the temporary taskforce as soon as July 18; within one or two weeks following those appointments, convene that taskforce to refine the RFP to a final draft to be presented for Board approval. Target RFP publication would be early September.

The BCTT Workgroup report also called for the creation of a regionally representative sustainable materials management advisory committee to advise the Board. The process should be open, inclusive, and transparent to the public. Nichols indicated Attachment A to the memorandum represents an extensive list of potential taskforce members. To fully leverage the benefits of a Sustainable Materials Management Plan (SMMP), advisory committee membership should include other counties, other jurisdictions, and other agencies, including from outside Benton County, and ideally includes most of western Oregon to make a difference in waste streams. The goal is to determine how Benton County can do its work in a way that leverages support, partnerships, and ultimately compliance from a wider group of jurisdictions. Who should be included is the question that should be asked at every step in the process. Inclusion would be a four-tiered approach that considers: 1) those that must be at the table for any solutions to move forward; 2) technical resources that have specific expertise, experience, or insights that could be valuable to the process; 3) participants who need to stay informed as conversations move forward; and 4) continuous open engagement for anyone who wishes to participate.

Wyse asked about the word participate; would these stakeholders have an opportunity to provide testimony and comments at meetings? Nichols said yes; the goal is for the process to be a two-way dialog from start to finish, including frequent opportunities and a variety of tools for public engagement.

Nichols indicated he was struggling somewhat about how to manage the work. How do we approach it in a systematic and strategic way? Also, the concept of monitoring the landfill versus planning for the bigger picture. This is an opportunity to be intentional about who performs this work and how it is accomplished.

Nichols confirmed his understanding of the Board and BCTT subcommittees' positions on education and outreach. Public engagement should not just be another deliverable; it must be specific and intentional to be successful. Other steps and considerations that have been articulated include the need for the Board to identify a single coordinated group structure (Page 4 of the memorandum). In

addition, the Board is being asked to continue to take an active role in solid waste management; this can be done without being overwhelming. Lastly, it is important to provide an open opportunity for public feedback to the Board, which needs to be constructive and solutions focused.

Nichols reminded that the Board had asked about whether and when to re-evaluate the disposal site franchise agreement. Many changes have occurred since the agreement was signed in 2020, and the future of solid waste management will be greatly informed by the SMMP. The county will have a much better sense of the level of willingness, support, and partnership among other counties, the state, and perhaps other organizations that would be helpful if the franchise agreement were reopened. Nichols indicated shared interests may emerge; those should inform how and where the county moves forward in partnership.

Nichols reported the Planning Commission discussed a two-pronged approach: 1) revise the RFP as described, and 2) potentially update the Benton County Code in accordance with recommendations in the BCTT Workgroup's final report. The Planning Commission will next meet on July 18, and Nichols will report back to the Board after that meeting.

Nichols confirmed the selected SMMP consultant would be required to review the entire BCTT Workgroup report, not just the SMMP section.

Malone asked about the advisory committee; how many members should be part of this committee to assure it is functional? Nichols indicated membership should be large enough to represent the diverse interests, but not so large it cannot accomplish its work. Nichols expressed hesitation to attach a number to membership until the structure and capacity of the group is known.

Augerot suggested a smaller group complete the work of issuing the RFP. Nichols believed the county could rely heavily on the public BCTT Workgroup members. Augerot suggested the small taskforce created to put together the RFP would be the same group that conducts the RFP evaluation process, and they may also be the nucleus of the eventual advisory committee.

In order for the community to accept a process guided by a sustainable materials management advisory committee, that group needs to be more weighted toward the local community members; but for the whole project to be successful, there must also be representation from the industry sectors where behavioral change is desired. How would the structure interweave these stakeholders? Nichols indicated the first step could be a stakeholder analysis to begin to identify the representative voices. Augerot indicated there were some groups on the list that

would be great to have, but whether the county could get them to our relatively small table is questionable; need to make room for them as they can participate. Nichols noted there will be different roles for different stakeholders. Nichols recommended one representative from each tribal government, with participation being developed based on interest and availability. The state legislature would also participate, but at a different level. It is important to understand what participation is appropriate for each of the groups listed.

Malone asked whether there was an existing template for the process. Nichols indicated the recommended approach has been used successfully nationally and internationally. It was developed in the early 1970's in the Pacific Northwest to build consensus – using collaboration – on a variety of issues, including salmon restoration, healthcare, housing, and others. There are some Oregon firms that are very good at structuring these types of processes. Nichols described a circumstance where he and others successfully used a similar process in the Columbia River Gorge and the Great Lakes Basin.

Augerot indicated she was pleased with the plan and timeline and hopes it is not too ambitious. She believes the BCTT Workgroup community members are very invested in the process. Redick believes people will want to participate on the RFP taskforce, especially given the short timeline and defined completion of the RFP development process. Malone expressed support for the approach. Staff and community members have a great deal invested in the process, and the county should embrace people's willingness to participate. Augerot recommended a preproposal conference for questions and answers, and an FAQ (Frequently Asked Questions) document could then be posted on the county website for all prospective bidders to review. Augerot also indicated the RFP should include the work product or a deliverable. Also, pictorial/graphical presentation of information would be very helpful because the county needs to communicate to a wide and diverse audience.

Nichols indicated he would be happy to have the Community Development Department lead the sustainable materials management plan process; however, it should be a countywide effort. He plans to have conversations around where people are interested and their availability to participate. Augerot cited internal partners Public Health and Environmental Health, and Malone cited Public Works. Malone believed that if this is viewed as a countywide effort, more departments would be engaged.

Nichols' last question was about governance and structure; what is the structure for long-term success? The county currently has a SWAC, DSAC, Planning Commission, Environmental and Natural Resources Advisory Committee, Board

of Commissioners, and staff. It is important to ensure the right voices are included using the right method. Should the county consider bylaws for any organized committees or groups? Augerot pointed out that DSAC is a statutory committee and is focused on Coffin Butte Landfill and the Pacific Region Compost as a whole. SWAC is a Board of Commissioners committee. This process is addressing solid waste issues in a more regional and comprehensive way. It could potentially be helpful to expand DSAC and not have a SWAC until the process is completed.

Malone was glad to see several universities listed. Nichols provided the specific reasons the four universities were listed: 1) Oregon State University (OSU) is a community partner and waste generator; Portland State University has a sustainability program that could be helpful and insightful; 3) the University of Oregon has a public policy and management program that could help inform; and 4) Willamette University has a legislative liaison program where interns are connected with the Capitol.

Next steps are for staff to present a list of proposed temporary taskforce members to the Board at its July 18 meeting. Once the members are appointed, taskforce meetings will be convened to develop a final draft RFP to be presented to the Board for approval. The final draft RFP will include a stakeholder analysis component. Following issuance of an approved RFP, a bidders meeting will be scheduled for mid-September. The public meeting will focus on how we are moving forward. Wyse would also like to have a public input component. Whether we do both is to be determined; the question will remain open for now. Wyse's thinking was for an opportunity for public comment at a regular Board meeting; Chair Malone will identify a potential date.

3.7 Strategic Communications Update – Cory Grogan, Public Information Officer

Grogan provided a strategic communications update. Activities included Podcast Episode 3 on wildfire preparedness, promotion of the County Administrator candidate public reception, and feedback collection on JSIP. Recent county advertising activities have targeted fentanyl awareness, Benton County committee volunteer recruitment, and the Fair. Grogan indicated he was exploring advertising opportunities with OSU, although they are expensive. Hoffman asked whether OSU would partner at reduced rates or at no cost given the public health partnership. Public service announcements, particularly surrounding fentanyl awareness, are very relevant to the OSU student population. Augerot suggested asking Health Director Holland to broach the topic of an advertising partnership with the OSU Health Director.

Grogan also reported on community outreach activities, which included a presence at the recent Philomath Frolic, the August Fair/Rodeo, and the Fall Festival in September. Grogan also briefed the Board on external communications and social media. Malone asked Grogan to check whether there were fireworks-related fires or injuries surrounding July 4; Grogan will contact Emergency Operations Manager Bryan Lee for that information. Grogan noted that county reader boards with fire safety messaging are out in the community and additional messaging will be posted on social media. Next year, Grogan would like to have a panel event to share information on fire safety. Lastly, Grogan updated the Board on county informational publications that were either being created or updated.

3.8 County Administrator Recruitment– *Tracy Martineau, Human Resources*

This item was heard in Executive Session.

3.9 County Administrator Updates

There were no County Administrator updates.

3.10 Commissioner Updates

Augerot

- Attended Steve Clark’s retirement party; it was a nice celebration of Clark’s time at OSU.
- Participated in planning activities for the Association of Oregon Counties (AOC) District 5 meeting, which is being hosted by Lane County in September.
- Will be attending the NACo national conference in Austin.
- Serving on the hiring committee for the new Corvallis Chamber Executive Director.
- Will participate on the Government Corner panel at the downtown Corvallis library the first weekend in August.
- Will speak at the Oregon Community Foundation’s Willamette region meeting; participating on a panel about philanthropy and rural Benton County.

Wyse

- Will be on vacation the week of July 17.
- Attended the Philomath Frolic; event was very well attended; is looking forward to their remodeled and expanded seating.

Malone

- Noted the Good Samaritan 75th anniversary celebration on August 26; it is appropriate to have a Board presence at this event.
- All Commissioners met individually with AOC Executive Director Gina Nikkels on July 10. Nikkels mentioned the September 22 Board retreat in Klamath Falls.
- Had a good conversation on Saturday with House Speaker Rayfield.

Malone expressed a desire for additional coordination on Board attendance at community events. The Commissioners Updates portion of Goal-setting Work Sessions was originally intended to ensure event attendance coordination among the Commissioners.

Augerot asked Grogan to send the Benton County Fair volunteer signup sheet to the Commissioners. Malone suggested inviting legislators to attend the Fair as guests at the county booth.

4. Other

ORS 192.640(1)" . . . notice shall include a list of the principal subjects anticipated to be considered at the meeting, but this requirement shall not limit the ability of a governing body to consider additional subjects."

No other business came before the Board.

Chair Malone recessed the Goal-setting Work Session at 2:23 PM.

5. Executive Session ORS 192.660[2][a] – Employment of a Public Officer, Staff, or Agent

The Board entered Executive Session at 2:23 PM and exited Executive Session at 3:19 PM.

Chair Malone adjourned the Goal-setting Work Session at 3:20 PM.



Pat Malone, Chair



Maura Kwiatkowski, Recorder