

4/30/19

April 30, 2019

RE: Association of O & C Counties

On December 3, 2012 I attended a meeting of the Association of O&C Counties (AOCC) at Valley River Inn in Eugene, which was also attended by then-Lane County Commissioner Faye Stewart.

After lunch I was asked to leave their meeting due to the private nature of their upcoming discussion.

The newer commissioners may not know that in 2009 Lane County considered dropping its membership in AOCC. A task force was appointed to look into the possibility of leaving the association. Shortly thereafter, then-AOCC president and Douglas County Commissioner Doug Robertson appeared at a Lane County Commissioners meeting to argue for Lane County's continued membership. The county voted to remain a member, with the stipulation that AOCC meetings would be open to the public and conducted under Oregon's open meeting laws. The following excerpt is from Lane County board order 9-10-28-7:

1.) Meetings of the AOCC will be treated as public meetings in accordance with Oregon open meeting laws.

At the December 3rd meeting I attended, after the lunch break, I was cordially asked to leave the room for the "private" part of the meeting. I asked if an executive session was being called, and was told by Commissioner Robertson that while it was not an official executive session, it was an "executive discussion" at which non-members could not be present. I replied that it was my right to be present, due to Lane County's board order. Commissioner Robertson informed me that AOCC had not agreed to any conditions, and did not have to abide by open meeting laws, and that he did not recall any such stipulations. Then-Lane County Commissioner Faye Stewart concurred that as AOCC is not a public body, I was not entitled to remain. When I again stated that I felt I had a right to be present, and would remain unless forcibly removed, Commissioner Robertson decided that he would, after all, call an executive session.

He did call an executive session, in an ad hoc manner contrary to public meeting laws, saying anyone who was not an elected official must leave. Assuming he meant an elected official of AOCC, that is, a board member, I did then remove myself. Imagine my surprise when only three or four of us actually left, with more than 30 people remaining (the board has 11 members). Perhaps he meant "elected official" as in *elected to ANY office*. However, several people who were neither county commissioners nor AOCC board members mysteriously did not leave the room.

I strongly object to the non-adherence to open meeting laws by a body whose members' salaries are paid by public tax dollars. I object to public servants conducting business behind closed doors under the guise of executive sessions which are not such, and, again, I request that Lane County end its membership. AOCC has failed to adhere to the guidelines set out in board order 9-10-28-7 and should no longer receive county support in the form of dues, fees, or allotment of time by our county commissioners.

Sincerely,

Mora Dewey, Lane County resident

34478 Kizer Crk Rd, PO Box 1113, Cottage Grove, OR 97424

morathistle@gmail.com

PASSED

**ATTACHMENT B
THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, LANE COUNTY, OREGON**

ORDER (IN THE MATTER OF ALLOCATING \$37,704
09-10-28-7 (FROM THE LANE COUNTY GENERAL FUND TO
(BE USED FOR THE ASSOCIATION OF O&C
(COUNTIES DUES FOR MEMBER YEAR 2009

WHEREAS, Lane County shares a commonality with 17 other Oregon Counties by having a significant federal ownership presence resulting from revested railroad lands dating back to 1866, and;

WHEREAS, legislative history is rich with state and federal actions to secure management of these lands such that they may contribute to the economic stability of Oregon counties, and;

WHEREAS, the latest iteration of this legislative history is an attempt to replace the reductions in revenues resulting from significant reductions in timber harvests which occurred between 1986 and 2004, and;

WHEREAS, the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 extended the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination and Act until 2012, with little likelihood of any further extensions after 2012, and;

WHEREAS, that Act will provide for almost \$142 million in quality of life benefits to Lane County residents over the four years it is in effect, and;

WHEREAS, Oregon counties currently have limited ability to secure alternative revenue through taxing authority, timber production, or revenue from ecosystem services and/or energy production, and;

WHEREAS, Lane County must develop a highly effective strategy to utilize in securing an authorization of federal funds to permanently decouple the relationship between timberlands and community economic stability, and;

WHEREAS, the Association of O&C Counties (AOCC) is unique in its ability to voice a unanimous statement of need, as well as, develop and manage a political lobbying effort of such magnitude; and

WHEREAS, the Lane County Budget Committee recommended against providing membership dues to the AOCC due to its stance on Bureau of Land Management Plans for future management of the O&C Lands; and

This is the FIRST in a series of three Board Orders that are to be taken up as inter-related

work session

ITEM 10 B

Proposal for a Small Conestoga Camp at 13th and Tyler

**To: Lane County Board of Commissioners
Lane County Administrator**

From: Westside Shelter Search Team

Jay Moseley 1190 W. 12th; tojmosley@gmail.com
Vickie Nelson 942 Van buren St; vnelson42@gmail.com
Phyllis Fisher 1313 Lincoln, Apt. 908; fisherp578@gmail.com
Doug Bovee 2255 Lincoln St.; dboveemd@comcast.net
Wayne Martin 931 Taylor St; waynechaplain@netzero
Cary Thompson 966 Jackson; cdthompson58@gmail.com

PROPOSED: placement of three Conestoga huts on the corner lot at 13th and Tyler (tax lot # 1704364110400)

DETAILS: This lot was formerly the site of a private home but was purchased by Lane County several years ago. It has been largely unused since the then. Even during the annual County Fair, there appears to be enough room for a small camp of the size we propose. A survey of neighbors in the site area taken in summer of 2017 and again in spring of 2018 showed an overwhelming majority of neighbors would welcome use of the lot for some response to help the homeless. In fact, there was only one negative response from approximately 30 immediate neighbors.

SUPPORT: In addition to a welcoming neighborhood, Eric deBuhr of Community Supported Shelters has said he would manage three Conestoga dwellings at the site. His response in an email of March 19, 2018 (and re-confirmed more recently) said:

"We would be happy to place three Conestoga Huts on the property and manage the site in the interim, if this were to become a possibility. We wouldn't charge anyone or any entity for the Huts because if we were managing the site CSS would maintain ownership of them."

SUMMARY: We believe this proposal is a good option for increasing possibilities for the unhoused in the Jefferson Westside Neighborhood area.

Advantages include:

- *It is a small project and temporary
- *It's in a welcoming neighborhood
- *It would be well-managed by CSS
- *It's an interim project with an important impact