

Executive Committee Meeting

DATE: Tuesday, March 13th, 2018

TIME: 5:30 p.m.

LOCATION: Lane Council of Governments, Park Place Building, 859 Willamette St., Suite 500, Eugene, OR 97401

CONTACT: Brenda Wilson, 541-682-4395, bwilson@lcog.org

1. Agenda: 3-13-18

Documents:

EC AGENDA MAR.PDF

2. Item 1 Memo: Executive Director Review

Documents:

1. MEMO ED REVIEW.PDF

3. Item 2 Memo: Visioning Update

Documents:

2 MEMO VISIONING UPDATE.PDF

4. Item 2 Attachment A: Summary Of Recommendations

Documents:

2 ATTACH A.PDF

5. Item 3: Draft Board Meeting Agenda, April 26th

Documents:

3 DRAFT BD AGENDA APR.PDF

6. Complete Packet

Documents:

COMPLETE PACKET.PDF



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA FOR MARCH

Date: Tuesday, March 13, 2018
Time: 5:30 p.m.
Location: Lane Council of Governments
Park Place Building, 859 Willamette, Eugene - 5th Floor
Contact: Brenda Wilson, (541) 682-4395

* Denotes Packet Attachment

Policy / Action Items

- 1.* Executive Director Evaluation and Contract

Information Items

- 2.* Update on Visioning Project

Standing Items

- 3.* Draft Board Agenda for April



March 13, 2018

To: Executive Committee
From: Brenda Wilson
Subject: Executive Director Review

Action Recommended: None. Information and Discussion Only

Background:

I have been the LCOG Executive Director since July 2012. LCOG has faced many challenges since I took over the agency and it has been a privilege working with the Board to address those challenges. Stabilizing LCOG and getting the agency's finances in order was a top priority for the Board and is the basis for nearly every decision I make.

I know LCOG is a more relevant, vibrant, and sustainable organization than it was in 2012; but I also know that I have room for improvement. I am always seeking input on how, what, and where I can make those improvements, and how to continue to push LCOG forward and to better serve our region.

Evaluation History:

I have received four annual evaluations since starting with LCOG:

2013 -The first was conducted in 2013 by the Human Resources office at Lane County. This was the standard management evaluation survey used by Lane County at the time.

2014 – A 360-Degree Review was performed in 2014.

2015 – A survey was sent out via Survey Monkey containing questions developed by me and the Executive Committee.

2016 - Because the previous three years of evaluations have been very comprehensive, I recommended, and the Executive Committee and the Board approved, my preparing a self-evaluation.

2017 – A survey, based on EWEB's CEO evaluation, was sent to people selected by the Executive Committee.

Overall, the responses to my annual evaluations have been very positive. Each evaluation has provided me with constructive feedback and I have worked to improve each year. Time is an issue for me but I am looking at ways to address that issue. I have worked on improving my communication with staff to be more transparent and informative. I have worked on reaching out to member agency staff to make sure we are assisting them where needed.

This Year - 2018:

Contract: My current two-year contract comes to the end of the two-year term on June 30, 2019. Accordingly, there will not be a contract negotiation or renewal this year.

Evaluation: Chair Duerst-Higgins, Vice-Chair Walston and I discussed options for my annual evaluation. Chair Duerst-Higgins, Vice-Chair Walston decided that an evaluation survey, based on the same template as last year's, but with questions focused on how LCOG – the agency as a whole – was doing and could better serve the region, with me at the helm.

Suggested questions will be presented at the meeting.



March 13, 2018

To: Executive Committee
From: Brenda Wilson
Subject: Update on Visioning Project

Action Recommended: None. Information Only

Background

In 2015, LCOG's Board directed the Executive Director to evaluate the organization's performance and consider strategies for improvement. This decision followed several years of executive focus on immediate crisis issues that threatened the organization, including financial and structural issues. With the crisis issues satisfactorily resolved, the LCOG Board of Directors shifted their attention to the future.

LCOG contracted with Management Solutions to develop a process to solicit the opinions of individuals with unique familiarity with LCOG programs, history, organizational structure, policies, budget, and staffing. A two-step process was approved. The first step included a series of comprehensive interviews with sixteen individuals selected by the Board of Directors. These interviews were completed in November and December 2015 by Mr. Biles from Management Solutions. The results of these interviews were shared with the Board of Directors at their January meeting. The Board of Directors authorized a second step, a broad electronic survey, to be sent to more than four hundred and eighty-four individuals. Two hundred and sixty-two responses were received and analyzed by Mr. Biles, and a report summarizing the findings of the survey was presented to the Board in April 2016.

Survey Summary

LCOG Employees represented almost 59% of the responders, so the results were grouped into subgroups. The report noted at times the Member Chief Executive Officer (CEO) subgroup data was not consistent with other subgroups.

The report reflected there was widespread agreement on five items that LCOG should look into doing:

1. Expand the existing grant research and application program.
2. Open an additional Senior and Disabled Services branch office.
3. Expand marketing of LCOG services and the organization to several markets.
4. Provide interjurisdictional coordination for development of a regional emergency response plan.
5. Facilitate and provide logistical support to staff training of member organizations.

The attached sheets set forth each item and a summary of where we are with implementing that item.

ATTACHMENT A: SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Expand the existing grant research and application program.

LCOG staff has a history of supporting successful grant applications for public safety, transportation, human services, community planning, water quality, and education to name several. In response to this recommendation, staff developed an array of grant service options to meet the needs of members and other customers. These four services models are described, below:

Service Models:

A. **Managed Services Plan.** The Managed Services Plan is similar to an organization hiring an internal staff person for grant support with a few significant differences. Similar to the internal hire, the cost is a flat amount per year (typically billed quarterly) for the desired FTE level. For example, if an agency purchases 0.25 FTE (520 hours), an employee designated for working on grants will be available just as if she or he was an employee of the agency.

B. **Subscription Plans.** There are two subscription service options:

- The **Annual Survey Subscription** is an annual survey of member/customer project/program priorities for which LCOG will provide referrals of potential funding sources (with no analysis) as we become aware of opportunities.
- The **Funding Landscape Subscription**, where LCOG tracks and shares grant opportunities, develops a grant writing plan for one grant, and edits the final draft of a grant application.

C. **Services Packages.** LCOG has also developed grant application service packages:

- Package 1) a **moderate service grant application** has six basic components. This includes tracking and sharing grant opportunities, developing a grant writing plan for a grant, facilitating a grant writing/project team, drafting a narrative outline, developing a need statement, and editing the final draft of a grant application.

- Package 2) **full service applications**, would include (1) one grant application at the full support level. If a level of service less than full support or if both applications were for the same project, a second application would be feasible at this level. Full support includes the following: tracking and sharing grant opportunities, developing a grant writing work-plan for a grant, facilitating a grant writing/project team, drafting a narrative outline, developing a need statement, developing a logic model, developing an evaluation/data plan, writing other narrative sections, assisting with budget tables, drafting letters of support, editing the final draft of a grant application, and online application submittal.

D. **Hourly.** Another option is contracting with LCOG on an hourly, as needed basis for individual grant requests. One thing to note for all of these options is that typically, LCOG staff is not providing the content knowledge or expertise related to the grant topic - we work with teams of experts from the applicant agency, we facilitate the process and this is what genuinely leads to the high rate of application success.

As is always the case, costs can vary depending on a number of factors; however, this table is the basic rate table for typical service configurations for FY17-18:

Service	Cost	Remarks
Managed Services Plan (Grants)	0.25 FTE - \$35,780.80/Yr 0.4 FTE - \$57,009.28/Yr 0.5 FTE - \$71,161.60/Yr 1.0 FTE - \$141,923.20/Yr	Typically billed quarterly
Subscription: Annual Survey Subscription	(2) Two member hours or (2) two labor hours at standard hourly rate.	
Subscription: Funding Landscape Subscription	\$600	
Service Package: Moderate Service Grant Application	\$3,000	
Service Package: Full Service Grant Application	\$10,000	
Hourly	\$90/hr to \$110/hr	Depending on specific staff assigned

2. Open an additional Senior and Disabled Services branch office.

Support for this recommendation was highest with LCOG staff. Because of the design of the survey, no background information was provided or gathered regarding what this recommendation meant.

In 2016, a new survey was sent out to all LCOG employees as well as to S&DS Advisory Committee members to gather additional information, with 121 responding to the survey. Overall, the main concern was parking; it appears the concern comes from employees own experience with parking being too expensive or their perception of consumers' issues with parking. The comments did not indicate an ongoing concern about parking coming from consumers.

Currently, we are in the fourth year of a 10-year lease. The current lease is for all three floors and the basement – a total of about 51,000 sq. ft. – is currently \$40,000 a month. The lease payment adjusts every two years based on the percentage increase in the CPI during the previous two-year period. We estimate the cost of moving the entire office to be about \$50,000, which equals the annual cost of staffing for our Living Well with Chronic Conditions or our Options Counseling programs.

A cursory review of available office spaces around the Eugene/Springfield metro area in 2016 showed a lack of available office space large enough to house the entire downtown Eugene S&DS office. One location, slightly smaller than the Schaefer's building and located in downtown Eugene, was available for about \$61,000 a month, but did not include janitorial services, which are included in our current lease. Smaller office space is available in the metro area, but almost all available space is almost double the sq. ft. than what we are currently paying.

Parking would be a larger issue at any downtown Eugene location. We have been working with the city of Eugene and LTD on parking issues around our building and have had some success with those issues.

Another concern that was indicated was safety downtown. This concern appears to also come from employees' concern for their own safety as well as perceived concern for consumers. To be sure, we conducted a survey of consumers coming into our Eugene office. Overwhelmingly, consumers reported that they felt safe coming to our Eugene office. I believe the efforts of the city of Eugene and downtown businesses have helped with the feeling of safety.

3. Expand marketing of LCOG services and the organization to several markets.

A proposal to increase marketing of LCOG and its services emerged early in the survey process. For some, marketing is a strategy to reduce the operational costs of member organizations by encouraging members to make a broader use of LCOG services. For others, marketing is a way to increase income to LCOG by marketing to non-member organizations on a fee for service basis. For others, marketing is a method to gain public understanding of LCOG. Lastly, for some marketing is a way for LCOG to enhance the lives of more Senior and Disability Services consumers by making sure the public is aware of the existence of S&DS services.

This is an ongoing effort and we are always thinking of ways to increase awareness of the services we provide. We are doing this in a number of ways – job fairs, community events, participating on committees and work groups, coordinating members groups like the Mayor’s Roundtable and Regional Managers meetings, meeting with partner agencies, creating better communications materials. We are seeing our efforts pay off by increased services being provided.

4. Provide interjurisdictional coordination for development of a regional emergency response plan.

This recommendation received high support from LCOG employees, staff of member organizations, and advisory committee members. This idea surfaced during the interviews and the reasoning given was the perception of the lack of coordinated efforts among jurisdictions in Lane County.

Something to note is that member CEOs gave this recommendation no support. I believe that is because they know that interjurisdictional coordination for regional emergency response is already being done by other agencies and organizations. For instance, Lane County Emergency Management is responsible for coordinating emergency response in Lane County. They also operate the Public Alerting System (AlertSense) and the Emergency Alert System (EAS).

But we wanted to be sure we were involved in regional emergency response conversations in case there was a role we could play. We have been involved with the Lane County Community Organizations Active in Disaster (COAD), which brings together a broad array of community organizations to foster an effective response to the people of Lane County in times of disaster, working together to coordinate member organizations' activities in relation to emergency response. On an ongoing basis, the COAD helps with sharing information, resources, and expertise. Being a part of the COAD allows our regional partners to know what resources we have and can provide to COAD members. We also receive updates during events which includes who can help with various needs (example, contact info on organizations that can get wood to hard-to-reach high elevation homes when the electricity is out for long periods of time and roads are covered in ice).

We also have staff attend the Lane Preparedness Coalition meetings. This group aims to enhance each member's ability to educate the community about their efforts to mitigate, respond to, continue critical operations during, and recover from crisis and disaster events. They also host quarterly training opportunities.

Internally, we are also having staff input information into our S&DS service database about a consumer's need when there is a disaster/emergency. Reports can be pulled with this information and would only be shared with emergency personnel if there was an actual event. The information would be tailored to the area impacted (example, Coburg emergency responders would get Coburg info not Springfield info).

5. Facilitate and provide logistical support to staff training of member organizations.

This proposed recommendation originated in the interviews. The concept was for LCOG to work with member agencies to identify common training needs and to meet those needs with training provided in Lane County. Travel out-of-county or out-of-state for training could be reduced, local jurisdictions could have influence over what was taught, how it was taught, who did the training and at what cost. In some cases trainers located in Lane County could be secured and trainers might come from the ranks of member agencies.

This is an area where we still struggle. We have attempted on several occasions to provide region-wide training without a lot of success. We will continue to work on this area.

Other Visioning and Strategic Initiatives

Another item that came out of this survey was the need to look to the future. There are several areas where we have begun to look to the future, which was not possible several years ago.

Real Estate

In 2012, LCOG had seven loans on three buildings, totaling \$13.854 million. The total expenses for the buildings exceeded the revenue by \$160,000 a fiscal year. Since that time, LCOG has sold two buildings and paid off all but one loan, which was refinanced. A Capital Contingency Account was created and now contains \$445,000 and no funds have been removed from this Contingency Account since its creation with all repairs and maintenance coming out of building revenue funds.

At the end of 2017, the Board approved using up to \$100,000 for maintenance, remodeling, a new key card system, and a building analysis in order to develop a long-term strategy for the preservation and maintenance of the one remaining LCOG building.

Operations

Senior and Disability Services:

- **Space** continues to be an issue, but we have been strategic about the placement of staff.
- While we moved the **Cottage Grove office** to Creswell because of cost, there may not be a need in the future for satellite offices due to the changing service delivery model mandated by the State. Until then, however, we will look at ways to better serve south Lane Communities.
- We have ongoing **staffing** conversations about management, service delivery and span of control. Currently, state law requires all state agencies to have a 1:11 management/staff ratio. As of December 2017, DHS had a 1:10 ratio; our A&DS Division has a 1:14 ratio. While some of our Units have the appropriate ratio, some Units, like APS, need adjustment and we are working to make that happen within our budgetary guidelines.

Governments Services:

- We are currently replacing the shared telephone system that is used by several of our members. We anticipate bringing on new users once the upgrade is completed.
- We are taking a look at our GIS CPA program. LCOG has provided central Geographic Information Systems (GIS) technical services and region-wide GIS coordination to our partner agencies under the Cooperative Project Agreement (CPA) for the past twenty-plus years. We are currently taking a critical look at what we are all doing, reaffirm the degree to which the partners wish to continue their collaboration in the area of GIS systems and the Regional Land Information Database (RLID), and re-work the agreements and directives under which regional GIS initiatives like RLID and the CPA continue into the future.
- We have implemented a Managed Services model for the IS services we provide. This allows our members to subscribe to our IS services without having to worry about unknown costs throughout the fiscal year. It also provides for a more stable budgeting scenario for LCOG and allows us to staff accordingly, with more efficiency and cost savings.
- We are in talks to coordinate legal services with another COG. This will allow the other COG to start a legal services program and allow us to expand our services.
- We have begun to use technology to provide more cost-effective services to members and other agencies where our services were previously not cost-effective.

Administration:

We have fully implemented a new fiscal system, re-written our Policy Manual, restructured our budget documents, improved our Financial Statements document, improved our billing system and strengthened our benefits position. We are also restructuring our Fiscal and Budget Unit, our evaluation system, and our procedures manual.



BOARD MEETING AGENDA

Date: Thursday, April 26, 2018

Time: 6:00 p.m. – LCOG

* denotes packet attachment

6:00 Call to Order

1. Welcome & Introductions
2. Requests for Additions to the Agenda

Public Comment*

3. Comments from the Public

Presentation

- 4.* Fiber Update

Action Items

5. Consent Agenda [*Board members may request an item be removed from the Consent Agenda to discuss separately under Item 6*]
 - a.* February 22, 2018 Minutes – Approve
6. Items removed from the Consent Agenda
- 7.* FY18 Revised Budget - Approve

Information Items

8. a.* Quarterly Financials

Reports

9. a.* Executive Committee Report
- b.* Advisory Council Reports
- c. Report from the Executive Director (will be emailed to you the Tuesday before the meeting)

* Public Comment is limited to 3 minutes. The Board has the right to ask disruptive attendees to leave the meeting. The Board may choose not to respond to comments and lack of response does not indicate support or disagreement. Location is wheelchair accessible. American Sign Language interpretation is available with 48 hours notice.



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA FOR MARCH

Date: Tuesday, March 13, 2018
Time: 5:30 p.m.
Location: Lane Council of Governments
Park Place Building, 859 Willamette, Eugene - 5th Floor
Contact: Brenda Wilson, (541) 682-4395

* Denotes Packet Attachment

Policy / Action Items

- 1.* Executive Director Evaluation and Contract

Information Items

- 2.* Update on Visioning Project

Standing Items

- 3.* Draft Board Agenda for April



March 13, 2018

To: Executive Committee

From: Brenda Wilson

Subject: Executive Director Review

Action Recommended: None. Information and Discussion Only

Background:

I have been the LCOG Executive Director since July 2012. LCOG has faced many challenges since I took over the agency and it has been a privilege working with the Board to address those challenges. Stabilizing LCOG and getting the agency's finances in order was a top priority for the Board and is the basis for nearly every decision I make.

I know LCOG is a more relevant, vibrant, and sustainable organization than it was in 2012; but I also know that I have room for improvement. I am always seeking input on how, what, and where I can make those improvements, and how to continue to push LCOG forward and to better serve our region.

Evaluation History:

I have received four annual evaluations since starting with LCOG:

2013 -The first was conducted in 2013 by the Human Resources office at Lane County. This was the standard management evaluation survey used by Lane County at the time.

2014 – A 360-Degree Review was performed in 2014.

2015 – A survey was sent out via Survey Monkey containing questions developed by me and the Executive Committee.

2016 - Because the previous three years of evaluations have been very comprehensive, I recommended, and the Executive Committee and the Board approved, my preparing a self-evaluation.

2017 – A survey, based on EWEB's CEO evaluation, was sent to people selected by the Executive Committee.

Overall, the responses to my annual evaluations have been very positive. Each evaluation has provided me with constructive feedback and I have worked to improve each year. Time is an issue for me but I am looking at ways to address that issue. I have worked on improving my communication with staff to be more transparent and informative. I have worked on reaching out to member agency staff to make sure we are assisting them where needed.

This Year - 2018:

Contract: My current two-year contract comes to the end of the two-year term on June 30, 2019. Accordingly, there will not be a contract negotiation or renewal this year.

Evaluation: Chair Duerst-Higgins, Vice-Chair Walston and I discussed options for my annual evaluation. Chair Duerst-Higgins, Vice-Chair Walston decided that an evaluation survey, based on the same template as last year's, but with questions focused on how LCOG – the agency as a whole – was doing and could better serve the region, with me at the helm.

Suggested questions will be presented at the meeting.



March 13, 2018

To: Executive Committee
From: Brenda Wilson
Subject: Update on Visioning Project

Action Recommended: None. Information Only

Background

In 2015, LCOG's Board directed the Executive Director to evaluate the organization's performance and consider strategies for improvement. This decision followed several years of executive focus on immediate crisis issues that threatened the organization, including financial and structural issues. With the crisis issues satisfactorily resolved, the LCOG Board of Directors shifted their attention to the future.

LCOG contracted with Management Solutions to develop a process to solicit the opinions of individuals with unique familiarity with LCOG programs, history, organizational structure, policies, budget, and staffing. A two-step process was approved. The first step included a series of comprehensive interviews with sixteen individuals selected by the Board of Directors. These interviews were completed in November and December 2015 by Mr. Biles from Management Solutions. The results of these interviews were shared with the Board of Directors at their January meeting. The Board of Directors authorized a second step, a broad electronic survey, to be sent to more than four hundred and eighty-four individuals. Two hundred and sixty-two responses were received and analyzed by Mr. Biles, and a report summarizing the findings of the survey was presented to the Board in April 2016.

Survey Summary

LCOG Employees represented almost 59% of the responders, so the results were grouped into subgroups. The report noted at times the Member Chief Executive Officer (CEO) subgroup data was not consistent with other subgroups.

The report reflected there was widespread agreement on five items that LCOG should look into doing:

1. Expand the existing grant research and application program.
2. Open an additional Senior and Disabled Services branch office.
3. Expand marketing of LCOG services and the organization to several markets.
4. Provide interjurisdictional coordination for development of a regional emergency response plan.
5. Facilitate and provide logistical support to staff training of member organizations.

The attached sheets set forth each item and a summary of where we are with implementing that item.

ATTACHMENT A: SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Expand the existing grant research and application program.

LCOG staff has a history of supporting successful grant applications for public safety, transportation, human services, community planning, water quality, and education to name several. In response to this recommendation, staff developed an array of grant service options to meet the needs of members and other customers. These four services models are described, below:

Service Models:

A. **Managed Services Plan.** The Managed Services Plan is similar to an organization hiring an internal staff person for grant support with a few significant differences. Similar to the internal hire, the cost is a flat amount per year (typically billed quarterly) for the desired FTE level. For example, if an agency purchases 0.25 FTE (520 hours), an employee designated for working on grants will be available just as if she or he was an employee of the agency.

B. **Subscription Plans.** There are two subscription service options:

- The **Annual Survey Subscription** is an annual survey of member/customer project/program priorities for which LCOG will provide referrals of potential funding sources (with no analysis) as we become aware of opportunities.
- The **Funding Landscape Subscription**, where LCOG tracks and shares grant opportunities, develops a grant writing plan for one grant, and edits the final draft of a grant application.

C. **Services Packages.** LCOG has also developed grant application service packages:

- Package 1) a **moderate service grant application** has six basic components. This includes tracking and sharing grant opportunities, developing a grant writing plan for a grant, facilitating a grant writing/project team, drafting a narrative outline, developing a need statement, and editing the final draft of a grant application.

- Package 2) **full service applications**, would include (1) one grant application at the full support level. If a level of service less than full support or if both applications were for the same project, a second application would be feasible at this level. Full support includes the following: tracking and sharing grant opportunities, developing a grant writing work-plan for a grant, facilitating a grant writing/project team, drafting a narrative outline, developing a need statement, developing a logic model, developing an evaluation/data plan, writing other narrative sections, assisting with budget tables, drafting letters of support, editing the final draft of a grant application, and online application submittal.

D. **Hourly.** Another option is contracting with LCOG on an hourly, as needed basis for individual grant requests. One thing to note for all of these options is that typically, LCOG staff is not providing the content knowledge or expertise related to the grant topic - we work with teams of experts from the applicant agency, we facilitate the process and this is what genuinely leads to the high rate of application success.

As is always the case, costs can vary depending on a number of factors; however, this table is the basic rate table for typical service configurations for FY17-18:

Service	Cost	Remarks
Managed Services Plan (Grants)	0.25 FTE - \$35,780.80/Yr 0.4 FTE - \$57,009.28/Yr 0.5 FTE - \$71,161.60/Yr 1.0 FTE - \$141,923.20/Yr	Typically billed quarterly
Subscription: Annual Survey Subscription	(2) Two member hours or (2) two labor hours at standard hourly rate.	
Subscription: Funding Landscape Subscription	\$600	
Service Package: Moderate Service Grant Application	\$3,000	
Service Package: Full Service Grant Application	\$10,000	
Hourly	\$90/hr to \$110/hr	Depending on specific staff assigned

2. Open an additional Senior and Disabled Services branch office.

Support for this recommendation was highest with LCOG staff. Because of the design of the survey, no background information was provided or gathered regarding what this recommendation meant.

In 2016, a new survey was sent out to all LCOG employees as well as to S&DS Advisory Committee members to gather additional information, with 121 responding to the survey. Overall, the main concern was parking; it appears the concern comes from employees own experience with parking being too expensive or their perception of consumers' issues with parking. The comments did not indicate an ongoing concern about parking coming from consumers.

Currently, we are in the fourth year of a 10-year lease. The current lease is for all three floors and the basement – a total of about 51,000 sq. ft. – is currently \$40,000 a month. The lease payment adjusts every two years based on the percentage increase in the CPI during the previous two-year period. We estimate the cost of moving the entire office to be about \$50,000, which equals the annual cost of staffing for our Living Well with Chronic Conditions or our Options Counseling programs.

A cursory review of available office spaces around the Eugene/Springfield metro area in 2016 showed a lack of available office space large enough to house the entire downtown Eugene S&DS office. One location, slightly smaller than the Schaefer's building and located in downtown Eugene, was available for about \$61,000 a month, but did not include janitorial services, which are included in our current lease. Smaller office space is available in the metro area, but almost all available space is almost double the sq. ft. than what we are currently paying.

Parking would be a larger issue at any downtown Eugene location. We have been working with the city of Eugene and LTD on parking issues around our building and have had some success with those issues.

Another concern that was indicated was safety downtown. This concern appears to also come from employees' concern for their own safety as well as perceived concern for consumers. To be sure, we conducted a survey of consumers coming into our Eugene office. Overwhelmingly, consumers reported that they felt safe coming to our Eugene office. I believe the efforts of the city of Eugene and downtown businesses have helped with the feeling of safety.

3. Expand marketing of LCOG services and the organization to several markets.

A proposal to increase marketing of LCOG and its services emerged early in the survey process. For some, marketing is a strategy to reduce the operational costs of member organizations by encouraging members to make a broader use of LCOG services. For others, marketing is a way to increase income to LCOG by marketing to non-member organizations on a fee for service basis. For others, marketing is a method to gain public understanding of LCOG. Lastly, for some marketing is a way for LCOG to enhance the lives of more Senior and Disability Services consumers by making sure the public is aware of the existence of S&DS services.

This is an ongoing effort and we are always thinking of ways to increase awareness of the services we provide. We are doing this in a number of ways – job fairs, community events, participating on committees and work groups, coordinating members groups like the Mayor’s Roundtable and Regional Managers meetings, meeting with partner agencies, creating better communications materials. We are seeing our efforts pay off by increased services being provided.

4. Provide interjurisdictional coordination for development of a regional emergency response plan.

This recommendation received high support from LCOG employees, staff of member organizations, and advisory committee members. This idea surfaced during the interviews and the reasoning given was the perception of the lack of coordinated efforts among jurisdictions in Lane County.

Something to note is that member CEOs gave this recommendation no support. I believe that is because they know that interjurisdictional coordination for regional emergency response is already being done by other agencies and organizations. For instance, Lane County Emergency Management is responsible for coordinating emergency response in Lane County. They also operate the Public Alerting System (AlertSense) and the Emergency Alert System (EAS).

But we wanted to be sure we were involved in regional emergency response conversations in case there was a role we could play. We have been involved with the Lane County Community Organizations Active in Disaster (COAD), which brings together a broad array of community organizations to foster an effective response to the people of Lane County in times of disaster, working together to coordinate member organizations' activities in relation to emergency response. On an ongoing basis, the COAD helps with sharing information, resources, and expertise. Being a part of the COAD allows our regional partners to know what resources we have and can provide to COAD members. We also receive updates during events which includes who can help with various needs (example, contact info on organizations that can get wood to hard-to-reach high elevation homes when the electricity is out for long periods of time and roads are covered in ice).

We also have staff attend the Lane Preparedness Coalition meetings. This group aims to enhance each member's ability to educate the community about their efforts to mitigate, respond to, continue critical operations during, and recover from crisis and disaster events. They also host quarterly training opportunities.

Internally, we are also having staff input information into our S&DS service database about a consumer's need when there is a disaster/emergency. Reports can be pulled with this information and would only be shared with emergency personnel if there was an actual event. The information would be tailored to the area impacted (example, Coburg emergency responders would get Coburg info not Springfield info).

5. Facilitate and provide logistical support to staff training of member organizations.

This proposed recommendation originated in the interviews. The concept was for LCOG to work with member agencies to identify common training needs and to meet those needs with training provided in Lane County. Travel out-of-county or out-of-state for training could be reduced, local jurisdictions could have influence over what was taught, how it was taught, who did the training and at what cost. In some cases trainers located in Lane County could be secured and trainers might come from the ranks of member agencies.

This is an area where we still struggle. We have attempted on several occasions to provide region-wide training without a lot of success. We will continue to work on this area.

Other Visioning and Strategic Initiatives

Another item that came out of this survey was the need to look to the future. There are several areas where we have begun to look to the future, which was not possible several years ago.

Real Estate

In 2012, LCOG had seven loans on three buildings, totaling \$13.854 million. The total expenses for the buildings exceeded the revenue by \$160,000 a fiscal year. Since that time, LCOG has sold two buildings and paid off all but one loan, which was refinanced. A Capital Contingency Account was created and now contains \$445,000 and no funds have been removed from this Contingency Account since its creation with all repairs and maintenance coming out of building revenue funds.

At the end of 2017, the Board approved using up to \$100,000 for maintenance, remodeling, a new key card system, and a building analysis in order to develop a long-term strategy for the preservation and maintenance of the one remaining LCOG building.

Operations

Senior and Disability Services:

- **Space** continues to be an issue, but we have been strategic about the placement of staff.
- While we moved the **Cottage Grove office** to Creswell because of cost, there may not be a need in the future for satellite offices due to the changing service delivery model mandated by the State. Until then, however, we will look at ways to better serve south Lane Communities.
- We have ongoing **staffing** conversations about management, service delivery and span of control. Currently, state law requires all state agencies to have a 1:11 management/staff ratio. As of December 2017, DHS had a 1:10 ratio; our A&DS Division has a 1:14 ratio. While some of our Units have the appropriate ratio, some Units, like APS, need adjustment and we are working to make that happen within our budgetary guidelines.

Governments Services:

- We are currently replacing the shared telephone system that is used by several of our members. We anticipate bringing on new users once the upgrade is completed.
- We are taking a look at our GIS CPA program. LCOG has provided central Geographic Information Systems (GIS) technical services and region-wide GIS coordination to our partner agencies under the Cooperative Project Agreement (CPA) for the past twenty-plus years. We are currently taking a critical look at what we are all doing, reaffirm the degree to which the partners wish to continue their collaboration in the area of GIS systems and the Regional Land Information Database (RLID), and re-work the agreements and directives under which regional GIS initiatives like RLID and the CPA continue into the future.
- We have implemented a Managed Services model for the IS services we provide. This allows our members to subscribe to our IS services without having to worry about unknown costs throughout the fiscal year. It also provides for a more stable budgeting scenario for LCOG and allows us to staff accordingly, with more efficiency and cost savings.
- We are in talks to coordinate legal services with another COG. This will allow the other COG to start a legal services program and allow us to expand our services.
- We have begun to use technology to provide more cost-effective services to members and other agencies where our services were previously not cost-effective.

Administration:

We have fully implemented a new fiscal system, re-written our Policy Manual, restructured our budget documents, improved our Financial Statements document, improved our billing system and strengthened our benefits position. We are also restructuring our Fiscal and Budget Unit, our evaluation system, and our procedures manual.



BOARD MEETING AGENDA

Date: Thursday, April 26, 2018

Time: 6:00 p.m. – LCOG

* denotes packet attachment

6:00 Call to Order

1. Welcome & Introductions
2. Requests for Additions to the Agenda

Public Comment*

3. Comments from the Public

Presentation

- 4.* Fiber Update

Action Items

5. Consent Agenda [*Board members may request an item be removed from the Consent Agenda to discuss separately under Item 6*]
 - a.* February 22, 2018 Minutes – Approve
6. Items removed from the Consent Agenda
- 7.* FY18 Revised Budget - Approve

Information Items

8. a.* Quarterly Financials

Reports

9. a.* Executive Committee Report
- b.* Advisory Council Reports
- c. Report from the Executive Director (will be emailed to you the Tuesday before the meeting)

* Public Comment is limited to 3 minutes. The Board has the right to ask disruptive attendees to leave the meeting. The Board may choose not to respond to comments and lack of response does not indicate support or disagreement. Location is wheelchair accessible. American Sign Language interpretation is available with 48 hours notice.

859 Willamette Street, Suite 500, Eugene, OR 97401 Phone (541) 682-4283. TTY (541) 682-4567. Fax (541) 682-4099