

Parks Funding Task Force

January 21, 2021

Meeting Summary

**This written indexed summary of minutes is provided as a courtesy to the reader.
The recorded minutes created pursuant to ORS 192.650(1) are the official minutes of this body under Oregon law.**

The recorded minutes are available on the Lane County Parks website:

http://lcpubw05.lanecounty.org/Information/PW_Parks/PAC_012121.MP4

Members Present: Janelle McCoy (Chair) , John Clark (Vice Chair), Dale Weigandt, Brad van Appel, James Houghton, Randy Dersham, Art Farley, Scott Coleman, Andy Vobora, Jim Mayo, Don Mathes, Bob Warren, Ericka Thessen

Members Absent: Renee Jones, Kevin Shanley, Randy Dersham

Staff Present: Brett Henry, Ed Alverson, Cynthia Schlegel

Meeting Facilitator: Bob Keefer - SDAO

Elected Officials Present: None

Guests Present: Christine Moody, Joseph Szelesta, Dave Metz, Dan Hurley

McCoy called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

00:02:00 **Introductions** – Introduction of attendees

00:06:00 **Public Comment** - None

00:06:14 **Approval of November 19, 2020 Minutes**

- Clark motioned to approve the November minutes, and Brad van Appel seconded, motion passed unanimously.

00:07:02 **Community Survey Questionnaire and Discussion**

- Dave Metz from FM3 gave a presentation on performing community polling for Parks on various funding mechanisms. Metz recommends an initial survey to assess aggressiveness before deciding to put something on the ballot. The initial survey will assess public opinions and perceptions, priorities and general public confidence in Parks management to use funds responsibly. After the survey, FM3 will provide an analysis on priorities, funding mechanisms, and public confidence.
- Metz suggests performing a tracking survey before putting something on the ballot to define exactly what would go on the ballot and make sure nothing has changed in public opinion that might affect the measure put on the ballot.
- FM3 uses a mix of survey methods; cell phones, land lines, emails, and online surveys and will target potential registered voters and emails are sent out to reach those who have not responded. Polling interviews take about 15 minutes to complete and the sample size recommended is 400.

00:38:15 Lane County Finance & Discretionary Revenue Sources

- Christine Moody gave a presentation on where the County's general fund revenue comes from and where discretionary funds are sourced and where they get distributed. Lane County has 35 funds, but general funds provide the most income for the County.
- General funds are distributed to Public Safety, Assessment & Taxation, Elections, Public Health, Animal Services, Property Management, Finance, Facilities, Board of Commissioners, budget, County Administration, and County Counsel. Moody presented a pie chart to show all 35 funds and a visual of size in each.
- Discretionary fund sources are comprised of property taxes, other taxes & assessments, licenses & permits, fines, foreclosures & penalties, federal revenue, state revenue, administrative charges, and interest earnings.

01:09:14 Deferred Maintenance Study Update

- Henry provided an update on Parks' Facility Conditions Assessment (FCA). Faithful & Gould has been working on the assessment and has accomplished quite a bit since November's meeting. They are in the process of assessing four parks; Orchard Point, Richardson, Armitage, and Baker Bay. Above ground assessment has been completed and the subcontractor is in the process of assessing underground infrastructure. Henry expects a preliminary report in late February, but the full assessment won't be completed until mid-March at the latest.

01:17:48 Potential Revenue Sources Discussion

- Keefer led a discussion on potential funding sources for Parks and asked each member what they feel are the best avenues to explore. The categories are operations and maintenance, deferred maintenance, conservation & education, and revenue generation, with operations and maintenance being the highest priority. Keefer asked members what funding mechanisms make the most sense.
- McCoy ~ preference is conservation and areas where the most opportunities are. Look for funding sources from those that can best accommodate the cost.
- Clark ~ local option levy is number one because it's most sustainable. Concerned about the utility fee and believes it would be too hard to do because of the many utility companies that would have to collect. The solid waste fee would be too limited to specific groups. Would like to include conservation and education with regular maintenance. Local option is number one choice with a second choice of bonds for deferred maintenance. Clark later restated first choice would be a County Service District with local option levy being the second choice because the levy would only be in place for five years.
- Warren ~ County Service District is first choice because it doesn't expire in five years. Would also like to see Parks expand campsites. TRT worries him if there would be opposition from the lodging industry.
- Mathis ~ wants to find revenue sources from the most amount of people so it is not expensive for any individual but could be available in perpetuity, such as the utility tax which could be an ongoing revenue source. The goal being to create long revenue streams from the greatest population while being affordable to each individual and not universally applicable.
- van Appel ~ County Service District would be first choice because it could be a long-term solution, and local option levy would be second choice.
- Farley ~ Do whichever is easiest and will pass. Local Option Levy easiest to do, but hard to get passed and has to be re-done when it ends, but may be the way to get to a County Service District. Important to conduct a survey to see what the level of confidence is with the public.

- Vabora ~ TRT is in high demand by other entities and taking huge hits, but still likes the funding source. Likes the local levy option, but worries about homeowner's costs. Also likes the utility fee and likes the County Service District in the long-term, but initially thinks a local option levy is best.
- Coleman ~ thinks the local option levy would be best.
- Houghton ~ if tourism is back, would like to see Parks getting more TRT funds. Agrees local option levy would be good in the short-term and interested in a County Service District and utilizing public partnerships.
- Weigandt ~ County Service District is the best idea, but most difficult to do. Would opt for local option levy with a very detailed agenda of what Parks wants to accomplish within five years, and then work towards a County Service District.
- Thessen ~ likes local option levy, second choice is a utility fee, and third choice is a County Service District.
- Mayo ~ County Service District is interesting but polling might show how hard that may be to get approved so may be more of a long term idea. Start with local option levy to work within timeframe as first choice. Also likes utility fee and would be second choice. Solid waste fee might be possible. Would like to work on a County Service District over the long term as third choice.
- Keefer ~ local option levy, utility fee, and County Service District seem to be main funding source opportunities as well as what Parks can do with fees and campground expansions to increase revenue.
- Keefer wants the Task Force to look at the strategies the group had defined as examples of a mix of revenues Parks could use.

01:46:58 Meeting Wrap-up/Assignments

- Next meeting schedule for February 25, 2021.
- Determine in February if the next meeting will be in March or April.
- Henry will present FCA results at the next meeting.
- Henry is working on question for a public survey.

McCoy called for Adjournment of meeting – van Appel motioned to adjourn, Mayo seconded. Meeting ended at 7:52 p.m.