

W. H. B.

**AGENDA COVER MEMO**

---

AGENDA DATE: January 18, 2006

TO: LANE COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

DEPT.: Lane County Sheriff's Office

PRESENTED BY: Russel Burger, Sheriff

AGENDA ITEM TITLE: ORDER NO. /IN THE MATTER OF AMENDING CHAPTERS 16 AND 60 OF THE LANE MANUAL REGARDING USED MERCHANDISE DEALERS REPORTING FEES, DELETE LICENSE REQUIREMENT, AND DELEGATE AUTHORITY (LM 16.600- 16.615 AND LM 60.839)

---

**I. MOTION:**

MOVE APPROVAL OF ORDER NO. \_\_\_\_ IN THE MATTER OF AMENDING CHAPTERS 16 AND 60 OF THE LANE MANUAL REGARDING USED MERCHANDISE DEALERS REPORTING FEES, DELETE LICENSE REQUIREMENT, AND DELEGATE AUTHORITY (LM 16.600- 16.615 AND LM 60.839) .

**ISSUE OR PROBLEM:** A proposal is before the Board of County Commissioners to adopt Ordinance No. 7-05 requiring used merchandise dealers in Lane County to electronically record and report certain regulated property. The ordinance requires the County to establish the reporting fees, which reflect the cost of managing the reporting system. The Board needs to adopt an order amending Lane Manual Chapter 60 in order to establish these fees and remove existing licensing provisions in Lane Manual Chapter 16.

**III. DISCUSSION:**

A. Background. Lane County, the City of Eugene, and the City of Springfield have existing ordinances that regulate used merchandise dealers in their respective jurisdictions. A staff committee from Lane County and the other two metropolitan law enforcement jurisdictions worked together for two years to develop uniform ordinances regulating the used merchandise

C. Alternatives/Options.

1. The Board can choose to adopt the proposed order to add fees to Lane Manual Chapter 60 that would make the administration of Ordinance No. 7-05, if approved, uniform throughout the Cities of Eugene and Springfield and unincorporated Lane County, and help cover the costs of administering the system.

2. The Board can choose not to adopt the proposed order to add fees to Lane Manual Chapter 60. If the Board approves Ordinance No. 7-05, fees could not be collected from used merchandise dealers located in the unincorporated portions of Lane County and there would be disparity among the community's used merchandise dealers. Lack of fees collected in the unincorporated areas reduces the funds needed to cover the cost of administering the system. There would be no automated records of regulated merchandise in the stores not covered.

D. Recommendations. The Sheriff recommends the Board of County Commissioners choose alternative #1 and adopt the order to add fees and eliminate existing provisions by amending Lane Manual Chapters 16 and 60.

IV. IMPLEMENTATION/FOLLOW-UP:

The jurisdictions will sign an intergovernmental agreement to establish a multi-jurisdictional approach to the enforcement of ordinances regulating the purchase of used merchandise.

V. ATTACHMENTS:

Board Order  
Proposed Fee Schedule – Estimate of Annual System Charge  
11/08/05 Finance & Audit Committee Minutes

IN THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF LANE COUNTY, OREGON

ORDER NO.

IN THE MATTER OF AMENDING CHAPTERS 16 AND 60 OF THE LANE MANUAL REGARDING USED MERCHANDISE DEALERS REPORTING FEES, DELETE LICENSE REQUIREMENT, AND DELEGATE AUTHORITY (LM 16.600-16.615 and LM 60.839)

The Board of County Commissioners of Lane County orders as follows:

Lane Manual Chapters 16 and 60 are hereby amended by deleting, substituting, and adding the following section:

**DELETE THIS SECTION**

**INSERT THIS SECTION**

16.600 through 16.615  
as located on pages 16-4 through 16-5  
(a total of 2 pages)

None

60.839  
as located on pages 60-11 through 60-12  
(a total of 2 pages)

60.839  
as located on pages 60-11 through 60-12  
(a total of 2 pages)

Said section is attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference. The purpose of these deletions and substitution is to implement Ordinance No. 7-05 to add used merchandise dealer reporting fees and to delete the license requirement; and it is further

ORDERED that the County Administrator is hereby delegated authority to execute an inter-governmental agreement with the City of Eugene to implement the provisions of Ordinance No. 7-05.

Adopted this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 2005.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair, Lane County Board of Commissioners

APPROVED AS TO FORM  
Date 11/21/05 Lane County

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
OFFICE OF LEGAL COUNSEL

expertise, then the Department Head and/or Custodian of Records may charge the actual hourly rate, as adjusted to include fringe benefits and indirect costs, of the staff personnel assigned to obtain and furnish the requested information. Charges will be computed on the quarter-hours and the requestor will be provided with the hourly rate to be charged at the initiation of the request. (Revised by Order No. 83-11-30-24, Effective 11.30.83)

**60.839 Department of Public Safety Fees.**

Under the authority of the Lane County Home Rule Charter and consistent with state law, the following fees are established:

(1) Fingerprinting Service Fee. Subject to the availability of personnel, the Department of Public Safety is authorized to offer fingerprinting as a public service on a request basis. The fee of \$10.00 for each initial fingerprint card and \$10.00 for each and every card thereafter so prepared is hereby established to defray expenses in connection with offering such service. The fees shall be waived for fingerprinting necessary in conducting County business.

(2) Personal Property Seizures and Sale. The Sheriff shall collect the following fees per ORS 21.410 and 23.460:

- (a) Levy upon and inventory of seized property (1 hour minimum) ..... \$ 34.00/hr.
- (b) Prepare and mail notices of sale and exemption.. \$ 15.50
- (c) Post notices of sale in three public places..... \$ 34.00
- (d) Conduct sale, collect monies, prepare certificates and return (1 hour minimum)..... \$ 31.00/hr.

(3) Real Property Seizures and Sale. The Sheriff shall collect the following fees per ORS 21.410 and 23.460:

- (a) Prepare and file certificate of levy ..... \$ 15.50
- (b) Prepare, mail and publish notices of sale..... \$ 15.50
- (c) Conduct sale (including postponements), prepare return (1 hour minimum)..... \$ 31.00/hr.
- (d) Prepare and post after-sale notice ..... \$ 32.50

(4) Background Checks for Transfer of Handguns.

The Sheriff shall collect per ORS 166.420..... \$ 15.00

(5) Community Corrections Center (Center) and Electronic Supervision Program (ESP):

(a) The Sheriff is authorized to collect the following offender fees:

	Hourly Wage	Center Fee/Day	ESP Fee/Day
1.	6.50 - 7.00	10.50	9.00
2.	7.01 - 8.50	12.50	11.00
3.	8.51 - 10.00	15.50	14.00
4.	10.01 - 11.50	17.50	16.00
5.	11.51 - 13.00	19.50	18.00
6.	13.01 - 14.50	21.50	20.00
7.	14.51 - 16.00	23.50	22.00
8.	16.01 - 17.50	26.50	25.00
9.	17.51 - 19.00	28.50	27.00
10.	19.01 - 20.50	30.50	29.00
11.	20.51 - 22.00	32.50	31.00
12.	22.01 - 23.50	35.50	34.00
13.	23.51 - 25.00	37.50	36.00
14.	25.01 +	39.50	38.00

Lane Manual

(b) The Sheriff is authorized to collect the following set up fee from those persons eligible and accepted for the Electronic Surveillance Program (ESP) pretrial house arrest ..... \$ 35.00

(c) The Sheriff may approve fee reductions based upon verified financial hardship. .... \$ 15.50

(6) Community Service Fees.

(a) The Sheriff is authorized to collect the following offender fees:

Referral Fee ..... \$ 40.00

Re-Referral Fee..... \$ 15.00

(b) The Sheriff may approve reduction of the referral fee to \$15.00 when an offender presents an Oregon Trail Card.

(7) Used Merchandise Reporting Fees (LC 3.615) – Annual Fee

Number of annual transactions	Fee
(a) 1-199 .....	\$ 200.00
(b) 200-999 .....	\$ 400.00
(c) 1,000-2,999 .....	\$ 550.00
(d) 3,000 up .....	\$ 700.00

*(Revised by Order No. 01-10-17-9, Effective 1.1.02)*

(2) The Board of County Commissioners hereby delegates to the Director its duties and authority as the licensing authority to issue permits. *(Revised by Order 88-1-6-31; Effective 2.27.88)*

**16.420 Application, Investigation, Approval and Appeal.**

(1) Application shall be made to the Director, who may prescribe any forms in addition to those prescribed by the State.

(2) Upon receipt, the Director shall investigate the application for conformance to any State Fire Marshal and Lane County rules and regulations and shall recommend approval or denial of the permit application. The applicant will be responsible for submitting his or her permit to the State Fire Marshal after the Director's review.

(3) If the Director refuses to issue a permit, the applicant may make a written request for a hearing to be held before the Director in accordance with this subsection.

(a) Written notice of the time and place of a hearing shall be served upon the applicant at his or her home or place of business at least 10 days before the date set for the hearing. The notice shall contain a brief statement of the grounds alleged as the basis for the refusal to issue the permit.

(b) At the hearing, the applicant shall be confronted by the evidence on which the action or proposed action of the Director is based and shall be given an opportunity to answer and thereafter be heard. After due deliberation, the Director may approve or disapprove the issuance or renewal of the permit. *(Revised by Order 88-1-6-31; Effective 2.27.88)*

**16.430 Fees.**

An investigative fee for a permit application shall be paid to the Director prior to acceptance of the application, according to the following schedule:

Fireworks Display .....	\$25.00
Fireworks Sale.....	\$25.00
Model Rocket Launching.....	\$ 0.00

*(Revised by Order 88-1-6-31; Effective 2.27.88)*

**SECONDHAND BUSINESS LICENSES**

~~16.600 Definitions.~~

~~As used in this subchapter:~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ Director means Director of the Department of Public Safety.~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ License means a license for the operation of a second hand business under LC 3.600 to 3.630. *(Revised by Order 88-1-6-31; Effective 2.27.88)*~~

~~16.605 Authority.~~

~~Pursuant to LC 3.605, the provisions of this subchapter shall govern the application, approval and revocation of licenses. *(Revised by Order 88-1-6-31; Effective 2.27.88)*~~

~~16.610 Application, Approval, Revocation and Appeal.~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ (1) Application for a license shall be made to the Director, who may prescribe the form of such applications. Applications for renewal of a license shall be made 60 days prior to the expiration date of the license.~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ (2) The Director may revoke a license or refuse to issue a license for the reasons provided in LC 3.625.~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ (3) No license will be approved by the Director without conformance to LC 3.615.~~

~~———— (4) If the Director refuses to issue or renew a license, upon the written request of the applicant, a proceeding shall be held in accordance with this subsection. Such a proceeding shall also be held when the Director proposes to revoke a license. The proceeding shall be conducted as follows:~~

~~———— (a) Written notice of the time and place of a hearing shall be served upon the applicant or licensee at least 10 days before the date set for the hearing. Service may be made by delivering a copy of the notice to the applicant's or licensee's place of business. The notice shall contain a brief statement of the grounds alleged as the basis for the refusal to issue or renew the license or for the revocation of the license.~~

~~———— (b) At the hearing, the applicant or licensee shall be confronted by the evidence on which the action or proposed action of the Director is based and shall be given an opportunity to answer and thereafter be heard. A record shall be made of the hearing, by tape recording or other means. After due deliberation, the Director may, in the case of an application for an initial or renewed license, approve or disapprove the issuance or renewal of the license or, in the case of a proposed revocation, dismiss the complaint against the licensee or revoke the license.~~

~~———— (5) Where a licensee has made timely and proper application for renewal of a license, such license shall not be deemed to expire, despite any stated expiration date thereon, until the Director has approved or disapproved such renewal. (Revised by Order 88-1-6-31; Effective 2-27-88)~~

**16.615 Fees.**

A nonrefundable investigative service fee in connection with the application for original or renewal licenses shall be paid to the Director, prior to acceptance of the application, according to the following schedule:

~~———— Initial application and annual renewals ..... \$ 25.00  
———— (Includes Investigative Fee)~~

~~(Revised by Order 88-1-6-31; Effective 2-27-88)~~

**CONCEALED WEAPONS LICENSES**

**16.800 Definitions.**

As used in this subchapter:

Director means the Director of the Department of Public Safety.

License as described in ORS 166.290. (Revised by Order 88-1-6-31; Effective 2.27.88)

**16.810 Authority and Delegation.**

Pursuant to the authority of ORS 166.290 the provisions of this subchapter shall govern the application, investigation, approval, revocation and appeal of licenses. (Revised by Order 88-1-6-31; Effective 2.27.88)

**16.820 Application, Investigation, Approval, Revocation and Appeal.**

(1) Application for a concealed weapons license shall be made to the Director, who may prescribe any forms in addition to those required by the State of Oregon. Applications for renewal of a concealed weapon license shall be processed according to State statute.

(2) Upon receipt of an application and a nonrefundable investigative fee, the Director shall require the applicant to be fingerprinted and provide an acceptable copy of his or her birth certificate or proof of birth.

| At right margin indicates changes  
**Bold** indicates material being added  
~~Strikethrough~~ indicates material being deleted

**LEGISLATIVE  
FORMAT**

60.839 Lane Manual 60.839

expertise, then the Department Head and/or Custodian of Records may charge the actual hourly rate, as adjusted to include fringe benefits and indirect costs, of the staff personnel assigned to obtain and furnish the requested information. Charges will be computed on the quarter-hours and the requestor will be provided with the hourly rate to be charged at the initiation of the request. *(Revised by Order No. 83-11-30-24, Effective 11.30.83)*

**60.839 Department of Public Safety Fees.**

Under the authority of the Lane County Home Rule Charter and consistent with state law, the following fees are established:

(1) **Fingerprinting Service Fee.** Subject to the availability of personnel, the Department of Public Safety is authorized to offer fingerprinting as a public service on a request basis. The fee of \$10.00 for each initial fingerprint card and \$10.00 for each and every card thereafter so prepared is hereby established to defray expenses in connection with offering such service. The fees shall be waived for fingerprinting necessary in conducting County business.

(2) **Personal Property Seizures and Sale.** The Sheriff shall collect the following fees per ORS 21.410 and 23.460:

- (a) Levy upon and inventory of seized property  
(1 hour minimum) ..... \$ 34.00/hr.
- (b) Prepare and mail notices of sale and exemption.. \$ 15.50
- (c) Post notices of sale in three public places..... \$ 34.00
- (d) Conduct sale, collect monies, prepare certificates  
and return (1 hour minimum)..... \$ 31.00/hr.

(3) **Real Property Seizures and Sale.** The Sheriff shall collect the following fees per ORS 21.410 and 23.460:

- (a) Prepare and file certificate of levy ..... \$ 15.50
- (b) Prepare, mail and publish notices of sale..... \$ 15.50
- (c) Conduct sale (including postponements),  
prepare return (1 hour minimum) ..... \$ 31.00/hr.
- (d) Prepare and post after-sale notice ..... \$ 32.50

(4) **Background Checks for Transfer of Handguns.**  
The Sheriff shall collect per ORS 166.420..... \$ 15.00

(5) **Community Corrections Center (Center) and Electronic Supervision Program (ESP):**

(a) The Sheriff is authorized to collect the following offender fees:

	Hourly Wage	Center Fee/Day	ESP Fee/Day
1.	6.50 - 7.00	10.50	9.00
2.	7.01 - 8.50	12.50	11.00
3.	8.51 - 10.00	15.50	14.00
4.	10.01 - 11.50	17.50	16.00
5.	11.51 - 13.00	19.50	18.00
6.	13.01 - 14.50	21.50	20.00
7.	14.51 - 16.00	23.50	22.00
8.	16.01 - 17.50	26.50	25.00
9.	17.51 - 19.00	28.50	27.00
10.	19.01 - 20.50	30.50	29.00
11.	20.51 - 22.00	32.50	31.00
12.	22.01 - 23.50	35.50	34.00



| At right margin indicates changes  
**Bold** indicates material being added  
~~Strikethrough~~ indicates material being deleted

**LEGISLATIVE  
FORMAT**

Lane Manual

	Hourly Wage	Center Fee/Day	ESP Fee/Day
13.	23.51 - 25.00	37.50	36.00
14.	25.01 +	39.50	38.00

(b) The Sheriff is authorized to collect the following set up fee from those persons eligible and accepted for the Electronic Surveillance Program (ESP) pretrial house arrest ..... \$ 35.00

(c) The Sheriff may approve fee reductions based upon verified financial hardship. .... \$ 15.50

(6) Community Service Fees.

(a) The Sheriff is authorized to collect the following offender fees:

Referral Fee ..... \$ 40.00

Re-Referral Fee..... \$ 15.00

(b) The Sheriff may approve reduction of the referral fee to \$15.00 when an offender presents an Oregon Trail Card.

(7) **Used Merchandise Reporting Fees (LC 3.615) – Annual Fee**

Number of annual transactions	Fee
(a) 1-199 .....	\$ 200.00
(b) 200-999 .....	\$ 400.00
(c) 1,000-2,999 .....	\$ 550.00
(d) 3,000 up.....	\$ 700.00

*(Revised by Order No. 01-10-17-9, Effective 1.1.02)*

Second Hand Resale Businesses  
 Estimate of Annual System Charge  
 FY06

Business #	City	# Transactions		Tier	Estimated Annual Charge	
		2004	2005			
Business 1	Eugene	938	11,256	Tier 1	700	
Business 2	Eugene	678	8,140			
Business 3	Springfield	553	6,636			
Business 4	Lane Co.	359	4,304			
Business 5	Lane Co.	296	3,548			
Business 6	Lane Co.	293	3,516			
Business 7	Springfield	259	3,108			
Business 8	Eugene	239	2,864	Tier 2	550	
Business 9	Eugene	190	2,284			
Business 10	Eugene	162	1,948			
Business 11	Eugene	144	1,724			
Business 12	Springfield	112	1,344			
Business 13	Springfield	110	1,320			
Business 14	Eugene	101	1,216			
Business 15	Springfield	100	1,200	Tier 3	550	
Business 16	Eugene	76	908			
Business 17	Eugene	75	900			
Business 18	Eugene	74	884			
Business 19	Springfield	68	816			
Business 20	Eugene	64	772			
Business 21	Lane Co.	62	744			
Business 22	Eugene	60	716	Tier 3	400	
Business 23	Eugene	59	712			
Business 24	Springfield	53	636			
Business 25	Springfield	45	540			
Business 26	Eugene	44	524			
Business 27	Eugene	34	408			
Business 28	Eugene	26	312			
Business 29	Eugene	26	308	Tier 3	400	
Business 30	Eugene	25	300			
Business 31	Springfield	25	300			
Business 32	Springfield	25	300			
Business 33	Eugene	25	300			
Business 34	Eugene	25	300			
Business 35	Eugene	25	300			
Business 36	Eugene	25	300	Tier 4	400	
Business 37	Springfield	25	300			
Business 38	Springfield	25	300			
Business 39	Eugene	16	196			
Business 40	Springfield	16	192			
Business 41	Eugene	16	192			
Business 42	Eugene	12	148			
Business 43	Eugene	8	96	Tier 4	200	
Business 44	Springfield	8	96			
Business 45	Springfield	4	48			
Business 46	Springfield	3	36			
Business 47	Springfield	3	36			
Business 48	Springfield	3	36			
Business 49	Eugene	3	32			
Business 50	Eugene	2	20	Tier 4	200	
Business 51	Eugene	1	16			
Business 52	Springfield	1	12			
Business 53	Eugene	1	12			
Business 54	Eugene	1	12			
Business 55	Eugene	1	8			
Business 56	Eugene	1	8			
Business 57	Eugene	1	8	Tier 4	200	
Business 58	Eugene	0	4			
Business 59	Eugene	0	4			
Business 60	Eugene	0	0			
Business 61	Eugene	0	0			
Business 62	Eugene	0	0			
Business 63	Eugene	0	0			
Business 64	Eugene	0	0	Tier 4	0	
Business 65	Eugene	0	0			
Business 66	Eugene	0	0			
Business 67	Eugene	0	0			
Business 68	Eugene	0	0			
Business 69	Eugene	0	0			
Business 70	Eugene	0	0			
Business 71	Eugene	0	0	Tier 4	0	
Business 72	Eugene	0	0			
Business 73	Eugene	0	0			
Business 74	Eugene	0	0			
Business 75	Eugene	0	0			
Business 76	Eugene	0	0			
Business 77	Eugene	0	0			
Business 78	Eugene	0	0	Tier 4	0	
Business 79	Eugene	0	0			
Business 80	Eugene	0	0			
Monthly Totals & Average		5825	67,500			22,700

Stores using log books (bold font) average based on 2-months and business estimates  
 Sources: AIRS/BWI/log books/hand count  
 The above list represents the 2004 transactions that the Eugene stores reported. Individual store averages from Springfield and all of the Lane County stores are not available, but some of the Lane County stores report to Eugene and are included. It is estimated that there are 5-6 smaller stores in Lane County and other smaller Lane County jurisdictions and 7 additional stores in Springfield that would be required to report secondhand transactions.

i pp 12/6/05-

**Finance and Audit**  
November 8, 2005  
1:30 p.m.  
BCC Conference Room

Members Present: Bill Dwyer, Anna Morrison, Jim Gangle

Staff Present: Karen Artiaco, Bill Van Vactor, Teresa Wilson, and Recording Secretary  
Melissa Zimmer

**1. Approval of Minutes**

September 20, 2005

MOTION: to approve the minutes of September 20, 2005

Morrison MOVED, Gangle SECONDED.

VOTE: 3-0.

**2, Community Health Center Five-Year Budget**

Steve Manela, Human Services Commission, explained that this was the five-year budget for the Federally Qualified Health Center.. He indicated that they need to submit their renewal for next year. He added the budget forecasts would include the revenue and expenses for the next five years. He reported that generally the financial picture is stable but there were some areas of concern.

Elizabeth Midwinter, Human Services Commission, noted that the budget is based on a number of providers, productivity and the payer mix. She indicated that they get different reimbursement depending on whether a patient has insurance or not. She added the grants they are most likely to get are in revenue. She noted the budget was tight and they didn't budget a bottom line. She said that they hope to break even each year. She explained that part of breaking even was a fundraising goal each year to balance the budget.

Manela indicated the federal government requires them to budget as though the money doesn't change over the five years of the budget. He added they are normally given a cost of living increase over that time.

Morrison asked what the challenges would be in the next budget.

Manela responded that they don't know what will happen with Medicaid reform at the state or federal level and that could influence what they do. He said they know that the legislation would keep in place the type of reimbursement that federally qualified health

centers get and the Community Health Center funding for the basic grant continues to support it. He noted another major challenge is the overhead. He said they look at overhead as a percentage of providing medical care. He said they look at around 50% of the cost as overhead and theirs is higher due to some of the historical PERS costs they ended up paying for the employees they hire who are under the new retirement program.

Van Vactor asked when they set up the Community Health Center, if they examined forming a non-profit corporation and changing the public employee status. He also asked if they looked at forming another legal entity that would be the Community Health Center, not Lane County government to try to obtain different rates.

Rob Rockstroh, Health and Human Services, responded that with the Community Health Centers, an alternative was always to possibly go out on its own. He said they don't have the money now to do it.

Morrison asked how they thought they would fundraise to raise the money.

Manela noted to fundraise \$90,000 was not a big problem. He said they want to be good stewards to provide health care and they are doing it in a way that is fair to the people who are doing the work and it is cost effective. He thought they should continue to work with the Community Health Center's advisory council to look at options for the organization for the future. He indicated that there was a potential for the Community Health Center to do more than what it is currently doing. He added they could triple the number of employees over a short period of time. He thought they should come back with long term options to consider. He commented in the short term, they were not concerned that they would be requesting general fund money.

Rockstroh commented that they didn't know how much being tied to the County makes it more difficult to fundraise. He said they could do foundation work that could generate money.

Morrison asked if they had an intergovernmental agreement with the health center.

Manela responded that they have partnerships with Eugene and Springfield and the school districts that were interested in the school-based health centers. He indicated that the hospitals could possibly sign on to give support.

Gangle thought they should review this annually as part of their budget process..

Manela indicated that the federal agency they work with wants the health centers to be successful so they have to submit a five-year business plan that goes along with the budget.

Van Vactor recommended that they obtain a different legal structure than being part of Lane County government.

Manela said that would be evaluated with other options. He said as they develop the agreements and partnerships with other entities they would look at containing their costs.

**3. Report Bank on Parks Fee Collection and Enforcement Overview  
2002- Present**

Todd Winter, Parks, reported that in Spring 2005, they changed from a manual collection system to an automated system. He indicated that 10% of the park visitors entering the parks chose not to pay the fee. He noted that three years ago they were half-self pay and compliance was impossible. He said in 2004 they looked at putting fee collectors in the fee booths at the parks. He added when the fee season was extended, it extended the collection window from May 1 to September 20. He said the booths were manned by extra help people and they couldn't work the whole season. He said they looked at labor costs involved with manual collections. He said it was determined that the manual and self-pay methods were problematic and not cost effective. He noted for the Fiscal Year 03 /04, \$123,000 was spent collecting \$162,000 in revenue.. He noted that the automated machines reduced collection labor from 283 hours to 54 hours. He said in 2004 they spent \$120,000 collecting fees and this year in July, August and September, they spent \$33,000, including checking for compliance with the park rangers. He added that they only spent \$13,000 in labor.

Dwyer recalled that people didn't like the amount of the fines and thought there wasn't enough notice of the signs. He said the people felt they were entrapped.

Winter said they have been collecting fees at six locations for about 15 years. He added that three years ago by request of the Board, they started collecting at Mt. Pisgah. He thought they over signed in a number of the areas. He recalled in 2000/2001, when people came in and didn't pay the fee the rationale was they should have paid. He added in 2001 they experienced people coming into the campgrounds and taking off. He said they came to the Board to ask for non-payment of fees. He noted at the time that Lane Code 6.5080 was added, the Lane Code minimum fine amount was set by the legislature at \$109. He said that typically the courts would lower it to \$35. He added in 2003 the legislature passed an increase. He said what was once initially \$109 went up to a \$141 minimum. He indicated that 43,170 vehicles paid from May 1 to September 30. He noted from 8/26 to 9/25 they began capturing data when they went into a park, how many total vehicles were in the park and how many were non-compliant. He indicated that Armitage was the worst with 15% non-compliance. He added that Mt. Pisgah had the greatest amount of compliance.

Winter noted that with court statistics as of 10/26, the number of citations dismissed was 120. He said if someone came into their office to discuss their ticket, they dismissed it. He commented that voluntary compliance was their goal. He noted the number of violators who plead guilty were 467. He added that 182 failed to appear in court. He noted that only five went to trial. He indicated that there could be alternatives for the citation. He said they could also amend Chapter 6 of the Lane Code to identify parking

fees to an infraction with a fine amount to be set by the Board. He explained that the court would get half and Parks would get the other half.

Wilson suggested leaving it a flat fee or reducing it down to a Class C or Class D so it is similar to other non-payments of parking.

Dwyer agreed to leave it alone or bring it to a Class C offense.

There was consensus to move this to the Board

Ollie Snowden, Public Works, indicated that a non-payment of camping fees would stay at \$141.00.

**.4. In the Matter of Amending Chapter 18 of the Lane Manual to Accommodate the Lane County Parks Online Reservation System**

Winter said the current language in Chapter 18 with reservations needed to be amended as follows: under group picnic reservations, it should have been struck the last time the fees were increased for picnic sites.

Winter noted that under campsite reservation fees, the fee is \$14.00. He noted that was split between the concessionaire and Parks. He noted with online reservations, the customer would do the brunt of the work. He indicated that campsite reservation fees industry wide is \$10 and Parks will receive the entire \$10 fee to offset the E-commerce reservation system. He added that there would be a campsite reservation fee of \$6. He stated that those are the only proposed changes.

MOTION: to move this to the full Board.

Gangle MOVED, Dwyer SECONDED.

VOTE: 2-0. (Morrison out of room).

**5. Discussion and Recommendation/Proposed Fee Schedule land Inspection Process for Implementation of Fire Safety Standards for New Development Within the Wildland-Urban Interface of Rural Lane County**

Jeff Towery, Land Management, said they were asking as part of the implementation plan to extend their requirements for fuel breaks from RR2 forest zones to all zones that allow residential development. He noted it was consistent with the implementation of the Community Wildfire Protection Plan and it provides an even application of regulation across all of their zones. He said from a customer's perspective, they are looking at a timing issue. He said they only have one person in the department that works on this one day a week. He added that fuel breaks are a condition of a planning application prior to the issuance of a building permit. He said it could take three to four years before a dwelling is built. He commented that the fuel break should take place when development

occurs. He indicated that because one person was working on it the unit cost was high. He said it is about \$490 for a fuel break inspection and they do about 50 to 75 per year. He said this proposal would make this an inspection that happens as part of a building permit implementation as opposed to a planning action. He said because they are going to be doing it in 13 zones instead of 2 zones, it would increase the volume. He noted a big part of the staff cost is due to one person performing this duty. He said their proposal is to require an inspection for a fuel break in conjunction with one of the other scheduled inspections on the project. He said the costs would be either \$75 or \$150, depending on the scope of the inspection. He indicated that would lower the unit cost from \$490 to \$150 for the applicant. He explained that would bring a gross revenue receipt of \$85,000 under the proposal. He said that was money they proposed to fill a staff position in the building program that would allow them to provide a more efficient and effective way of building permits. He added that it resulted in a net decrease to the planning program of about \$38,000, but they are currently using three people in the planning program to supplement the review of building permits. He added that the planning department would be receiving three days of work back or about \$45,000.

Towery indicated that this was the first formal step of the process beyond the project being authorized. He noted that this was one of the projects approved by the Board for implementation of the Community Wildfire Protection Plan. He noted that this was scheduled to go to the Planning Commission in December and would be back to the Board for action in January. He said they presented the same information to the Homebuilders Association.

Dwyer recommended that this go through the Planning Commission and then come back to Finance and Audit.

Towery indicated that the Planning Commission was going to be making a specific recommendation on the regulations and they are not expecting them to weigh in on the fees.

Wilson recommended that this go forward to the Board without a recommendation from Finance and Audit.

#### **6. In the Matter of Amending Chapter 60 of Lane Manual to Add Used Merchandise Reporting Fees**

Russ Burger, Sheriff, reported that he met with the used merchandise dealers who opposed what was proposed previously and they worked out a resolution that everyone was happy with. He recalled that some of the dealers had opposition to the proposal of using BWI as a vendor for an automated reporting system. He met with the dealers to discuss the issues. He noted that one of the issues they were concerned with was that they would have to utilize new software to make the system work. They asked if they could make the software compatible with what the vendor is offering. He said they don't like to see the information or dollars going from Oregon to Canada. He suggested that they should develop their own system to handle the used merchandise database through a

statewide system. He said the vendors were happy with the proposition that they develop a statewide system for used merchandise. He spoke with someone in the insurance industry and they were interested in exploring a public private partnership statewide.

Burger said his ultimate goal would be for the insurance industry to pay for this so there is no pass through costs. He added that he wanted to make sure that additional premiums not be added to the program, but that they use some of the profits they earn to support the program. He noted that the used merchandise dealers who were in opposition have agreed that they would be willing to allow the initial five-year contract to occur while they develop a statewide system.

Burger noted they brought the proposed fee schedule. He said the initial plan was to charge \$1 per transaction for those who were using the automated system and \$3 for those who weren't. He said what the dealers came up with was a schedule of annual fees that would be based on the volume of the sales by each store.

Dwyer's concern was not with the dealer but the costs levied upon the person bringing in items.

Morrison thought this was a good tool.

Burger reported that he met with the used merchandise dealers who were opposed because the point of sale was not compatible. He said they didn't want to implement new software. He indicated they figured out a way to use existing software instead of paying for software in Canada.

Morrison commented that they could arbitrarily after a three or four-year period of time do a small audit to see if there is enough reason to believe that there are violations. She asked if they had to wait to do a local implementation before they did the state implementation.

Burger indicated that in the interim they would work on a five-year contract.

Morrison thought \$20,000 per year was a cost effective way to build up credibility.

Dwyer commented that insurance companies should be paying for this. He didn't support this.

Morrison and Gangle were supportive of bringing this forward to the Board.

Adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Melissa Zimmer  
Recording Secretary