

MEETING MINUTES – July 16, 2004 1:30 – 3:35 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Bill Neland, Chair
Ed Galligan, Port of Portland
Doug Spencer, Providence Health Systems
Ron Polvi, Northwest Natural Gas
Denny Nielsen, Salem Hospital
Edith Yang, A.I.A.

MEMBERS NOT IN ATTENDANCE:

Tom McMullen, Vice Chair

OTHERS PRESENT:

Shirley Finanger, DAS Facilities Division
Elaine Schacher, DAS Facilities Division
Donald Quimet, Oregon School for the Blind
Jane Mulholland, Oregon School for the Deaf
Vern Rowan, ODOC
Scott Young, ODOC

Tom Wood, ODFW
Charlie Corrarino, ODFW
Karen Tofte, ODFW

Handouts distributed to all members present:

- Minutes from June 18, 2004 meeting
- Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) Facilities Plan for 2005-2007 biennium w/questions and answers
- Department of Education (Education) Facilities Plan for 2005-2007 biennium w/questions and answers
- Department of Corrections (DOC) Facilities Plan for 2005-2007 biennium w/questions and answers

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS:

Chairman, *Bill Neland* called the meeting to order at 1:30 pm.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR JUNE MEETING:

Bill Neland asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the last meeting.

Ed Galligan made a motion to approve the minutes of the June 18, 2004 meeting. The motion was seconded by *Denny Nielsen* and passed unanimously.

SALEM-KEIZER AREA PLAN REVIEW

None

FACILITY PLAN PRESENTATIONS

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife: Presented by Tom Wood and Charlie Corrarino

Tom Wood introduced *Charlie Corrarino* and *Karen Tofte* and he recognized *Karen's* great work on the update of this CPAB report. This briefing will provide general background information on their agency and specific information relating to Space Needs, Projects and Maintenance Plans.

Mission: To protect and enhance Oregon's fish and wildlife and their habitats for use and enjoyment by present and future generations.

Authority: ORS 496-513.

Department and Program descriptions: The 7 member commission, appointed by the Governor, hires the director, sets policy and adopts administrative rules. The Director oversees agency operations and administration. The two deputy directors oversee the department's day to day activities. The Deputy in charge of operations oversees the activities of the Fish and Wildlife division and the four regions. The Deputy in charge of administration oversees administrative services, human

resources, information, education and information services. Currently the agency staffing level is at 1,108.37 full time employees. ODFW staffs 25 headquarters, district and field offices; operates 34 hatchery facilities; 15 fishery facilities and manages 15 wildlife areas.

Location: ODFW delivers services to four regions that are organized by major watersheds: High Desert Region which incorporates the Deschutes, Klamath and Malheur watersheds; NE Region incorporates Grande Ronde and John Day watersheds, NW Region incorporates the North Coast, North Willamette and South Willamette watersheds; and SW Region incorporates the Rogue and Umpqua watersheds. Fish & Wildlife facilities are strategically located throughout the state to directly support their mission.

Facilities and Improvements: ODFW owns and operates 918 buildings valued under \$1M and 10 buildings valued over \$1M. These buildings total 1.22M square feet of the state's investment and have a replacement value of \$86M. ODFW also owns and operates land improvements valued at \$24.2M, Leasehold improvements valued at \$1.44M, Roads valued at \$8.33M, Tunnels and Bridges valued at \$720,500, Utility Systems valued at \$117.3M, and Docks, Dykes and Dams valued at over \$27.4M. These assets are sited on more than 436,100 acres of agency owned or controlled land. At over \$262M in replacement value, there is a significant state investment in this agency over a significant period of time.

Sustainability Efforts: ODFW recently completed the agency sustainability plan. They are a natural resources agency, as such, sustainability means simultaneously meeting Oregon's economic, environmental and community needs in a way that preserves resources and enhances the quality of life for future generations. The department's core mission is all about sustainability of fish, wildlife and habitats. In carrying out this mission, the department works closely with its constituents to ensure that ODFW's fish and wildlife management activities and decisions consider economic and community needs as well as environmental needs. For example, the department works with commercial and sport fishing interest groups when setting fishing seasons to ensure seasons are both ecologically and economically sustainable. Department staff also works closely with agricultural-based communities to ensure that wildlife-related crop and livestock damage is minimized. They are making great strides in sustainability efforts.

Example: Fall Creek Hatchery Research Center. This project is located in the Alsea River basin between Corvallis and Waldport. They are in the final design/early construction phase of this project. The scope includes the conversion of a production hatchery into a state-of-the-art research facility. The overall concept includes compliance with the Oregon Department of Energy SEED program guidelines and many "low hanging fruit" opportunities.

The provision of on-site residential facilities will decrease the use of automobiles for commuting by research and technical staff. Using land area previously developed as parking, building, and rearing channels minimizes site disturbance. The research building footprint and resulting site disturbance are minimized by the two-story building configuration, which is the highest density allowed for this site by Lincoln County Land Use Code. Potable water will not be used for required landscape irrigation and wastewater will be treated on-site.

The overall building will be designed to reduce energy consumption to 20% less than code requirements, through a combined effort with the Oregon Department of Energy SEED program staff.

Space Needs: No major reorganization plans or unneeded space from downsizing at this moment.

Project Plan – presented by Charlie Corrarino

They are not submitting any future plans at this time and the budget plan submitted for the Fall Creek Hatchery Research Center is currently underway. It is not being submitted for consideration and approval because it was directed by the last Legislative session.

Slides were presented of the state-of-the-art Research Center that is currently being constructed in coordination with Oregon State University. Some background was provided on the OPSW Lifecycle Site located at Bohannon Falls that is being constructed right now.

Bill Neland asked where it is located in relationship to Mary's Peak. Response: Due West. The purpose of the Research Center is to develop an understanding of the mechanisms that may create differences between natural and wild fish and devise ways to manage those differences so that hatcheries can act responsibly in the conservation and use of Oregon's native fish.

That last line is critical “conservation and use of Oregon’s native fish”, because, if a good job is done conserving Oregon’s fish resources, the amount of shortages for commercial fishing and private fishing will be reduced.

Conventional wisdom for a hatchery operation was to maximize the amount of small fish they could pack into a hatchery and then release them, without regard to what happened when they were released. Now the focus is to maximize survival and breeding capabilities while at the same time, minimize the effect on the naturally reproducing fish in the watersheds. Hatcheries today are used for three basic purposes: 1) Support sport fishing 2) Conservation, to increase natural reproduction 3) Genetic reserves. The Hatchery Research Center will examine all aspects of these purposes. A slide was shown of the location of the new hatchery in the Alsea Watershed between Waldport and Corvallis. This Research Center will be working closely with a companion Hatchery in North Fork. This facility was mothballed in the 1990’s and was sitting idle with a skeleton crew. This is an ideal opportunity to take a facility that was sitting idle and turn it into a world class facility with a reasonable investment. The site, as it exists today, includes a stream and some existing natural ponds that are used to raise fish, a work area, a hatch house, and living quarters.

Funding - A \$7M funding package was approved during the last legislative session. Legislators approached ODFW and asked them if they would be interested in putting together a conceptual package for a hatchery research center. What brought this to light was the continuous and often heated controversy among people about natural fish and wild fish. It’s in the media all the time. There are a lot of things to learn. A \$10M funding package was put together and the legislators and the governor liked it. Funds came from Measure 66 Capitol Funds, a little over a million from lottery funds and a special fund just for research use and \$1.875M from Other Funds.

Denny Nielsen asked if they could give an example of Other Funds. Response: In this case it was \$1.875M that was a settlement between ODFW and PGE for [some damage to fish in Klamath Falls](#). These funds were made available to ODFW to be used at their discretion to help with hatchery fish management. In July, 2003 a group of people got together and formed four committees: a Steering Committee, Science Committee, Facilities Committee and an Education and Outreach Committee. Staff from both OSU and ODFW are participating on these committees and working together. Most of the committees are meeting once a month and it has been very productive.

The timeline for completion was established in the summer of 2003. The Governor appointed an [Independent Multi-disciplined Science Team](#) (IMST), who hosted a workshop last fall. Forty scientists were invited, from throughout the Northwest, to offer their opinions on the types of questions the research committee should consider to make best use of this facility. That information has been used throughout the project to develop mission, goals and objective statements, research priorities, etc. The schedule calls for completion of the schematic design by midway through the second quarter of 2004 and a similar time frame for project approvals by the design team, which are nearly complete at this time. Construction started a couple weeks ago, right on schedule. They are now beginning to determine staffing needs, seeking funds, and planning experiments. They have drafted mission, goals and objectives statements. They have some off-site sampling plans drafted and ODFW and OSU are putting together a policy options package for the next legislative review. ODFW’s number one priority right now is a \$1M per biennium request from the Legislature for operational costs including staffing the facility, to help pay for the Director and to help fund graduate students. The design is being developed and the intake structure is now under construction. One of the unique features of this facility is the way the hatchery will be set up. There will be four simulated streams each 200 feet long and 25 feet wide. These streams will have the ability to mimic a natural system because they are pulling water directly from the creek into the four channels. It also gives ODFW the ability to control the situation. It’s unusual for something as highly variable as a stream to be controlled for experimentation.

Bill Neland asked if they can slow the flow of water through one or all of the channels. Response: Yes. Slides were presented showing an engineer’s design of the four channels; the Research Center, the 11,000 sq ft research bldg, tank farm (large circular outdoor tanks, 24 big ones and 48 little ones). The tanks and plumbing are designed so they have a lot of flexibility. Flexibility is a key priority in the overall design of the facility. The 2-story research building will contain a wet lab, dry lab, interpretive center, and large meeting room on the main floor. Upstairs will provide living quarters for 24 people as well as rooms for classes, school kids, and whatever. A blend of those will be working and living there at the same time. The second story design will be a typical dormitory layout with 6 rooms.

Relationship with OSU – Not only is the science important but getting people educated and informed about these difficult, challenging natural resource issues is something that they will be able to accomplish with this relationship between the two

agencies. Every new graduate student attending OSU is required to complete an internship and this will provide an excellent opportunity, right down the road from OSU, to fulfill that requirement. It will also provide an opportunity for graduate research at Masters and PHD levels and to professors throughout the world, for example, those on research sabbaticals. This Research Center will provide an opportunity for students and the public to better understand this very complex issue.

Timeline: Construction is scheduled for completion June 30, 2005 and the Center will open July 1, 2005. ODFW is currently implementing a long term vision for the Center, consistent with the goals of the workshop, legislative direction and state and federal policies. They are working to identify secure funding for research projects so that when the Research Center director is hired, some things are in place for the director and there is no need to start from scratch. Funding will be split evenly between OSU and ODFW.

Denny Nielsen asked if they have a hard number for project costs at this point. Response: \$7M. They will have the Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) next Friday.

Denny asked if the contractor was involved in the design process. Response: Yes, it was a collaborative process with significant value received.

Edith Yang commented that ODFW has done a very good job. This year, OSU set a record in obtaining \$117M for research funding due to their leading scientists and graduate students and their well-equipped labs and facilities. OSU is well known for its research on fish. She wishes that ODFW could have located this facility on the OSU campus with access to existing personnel and facilities.

Bill Neland commented that fish don't live in Corvallis so they have to go where the fish live. In certain situations you have to go where the problem is, because you can't bring the problem to the campus. The Newport Science Center was located at the ocean for that same reason.

Charlie Corrarino commented that another factor was that the facility was already in place. ODFW owns the property and it is a perfect location with water rights, while being located close to OSU. ODFW is very excited to participate because obtaining a similar site including acquiring the property and water rights, would have cost at least 45 times as much. They feel it is a good investment, particularly given that the department spends about \$45M per biennium on the operation of hatcheries. They are looking at a cost of \$500,000 per year and it may actually provide an excellent opportunity for cost savings in the future as well as a better quality product. That is why they selected this facility.

Bill Neland asked if there were any further questions. No further questions were presented and ODFW continued their report.

Energy Conservation Efforts – ODFW met, and is currently meeting, the directive included in OAR 330-130-0080 and intends to do so in the future. They have reduced the amount of nonrenewable energy by at least 10% from the amount used in the 2000 calendar year. They have implemented innumerable energy conservation measures as integral components to facility maintenance, repair, renovation or alteration and construction projects. They have a staff of registered professional engineers and project inspectors knowledgeable and very pro-active with respect to renewable energy conservation. Their training and dedication to the agency mission compels them to continually plan and watch for opportunities to promote a wide variety of conservation measures.

Preventive Maintenance Management – ODFW does not have a centralized preventive maintenance system because their facilities are highly decentralized. The Engineering and Facilities Management department works closely with all Hatchery, Watershed and Regional Managers and Hatchery and Statewide Coordinators to seasonally predict and monitor program maintenance requirements. Their first line of action is normally the hatchery staff that manages their preventive and predictive work through O & M manuals and long-term crew experience.

Impacts from E-Board or Legislative Budget Restrictions – They don't expect any material reduction in maintenance funding based on legislative actions.

Plans for Reducing Deferred Maintenance – As with all facility/property-owning agencies, they continue to have a backlog of facility maintenance, or deferred maintenance. They completed an exhaustive deferred maintenance field study in 2002 and

updated it in February 2004. Due to the literal thousands of facility and facility-related assets, the field study was accomplished with field staff employees. The results of the update are as follows:

Total Facility Deferred Maintenance Backlog is \$6.3 M. State Funded Hatcheries; \$1.6 M; State and Federal combined Funded Hatcheries - \$876,000; Federally Funded Hatcheries - \$2.4 M; and Other Agency Facilities - \$1.4 M.

At the last legislative session, ODFW presented a deferred maintenance report about 1 ½ inches thick which showed a significant number of deferred maintenance projects. However, ODFW has determined that the majority of those projects should have been capital improvements so the report has been substantially modified to put those projects where they belong. Funds are not presently sufficient to totally reduce the maintenance backlog. They face the challenge to not only retire their hatchery maintenance backlog but also modernize the facilities to meet new management objectives. To date, little funding is available for these purposes. They will be requesting two packages in the 2007-2009 biennium, one for a maintenance management plan and another for the maintenance that will be indicated by the plan to address their deferred maintenance and space allocation problem areas. Their deferred maintenance status has not increased to any significant level over the last biennium due to ongoing project completion. They have, however, experienced a large increase in emergency projects, especially those projects that effect fish health. The plan results should provide them programmatic tools for more effective facilities management and stewardship of state resources.

ODFW sources of funding for current repair and maintenance, and deferred maintenance requirements include Federal Funds, Other Funds, Restoration and Enhancement Act Funding, General Fund, Capitol Improvement Hatchery Funds, and State Hatchery housing Fund. Other Funds being their main source of funding. These sources of funding total approximately \$4.1M with approximately \$565,000 in General and Other Funds available for emergency and deferred maintenance issues.

Bill Neland asked if hatcheries were available for public visit. Response: Yes, all are open in fact they encourage visitors.

Bill Neland thanked ODFW for the report and requested a motion to accept the report.

A motion was made by *Denny Nielsen* to accept the report submitted by the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife without exception. The motion was seconded by *Ed Galligan* and unanimously approved.

Oregon Department of Education: Presented by Jane Mulholland and Don Quimet

Facility plans for the Oregon School for the Deaf (OSD) and the Oregon School for the Blind (OSB) were presented together because the schools share a budget and have a close working relationship. They spoke on behalf of both schools and offered to address specific questions at the end of the presentation.

Mission: The Oregon Schools for the Blind and Deaf have two primary purposes: 1) To provide educational services to children who are blind, visually impaired, deaf, hard of hearing, or deaf and blind 2) Outreach.

Educational Services – It is important for people to understand that each of the campuses is specifically designed for the needs of that particular learning population. For example, at the School for the Blind, the design of the campus, the way sidewalks are oriented, how food is prepared and served, classroom instruction, the playground and track, everything is designed for visually impaired students. At the School for the Deaf, the primary focus is around communication needs of the students so consequently, all of the staff from maintenance staff, cooks, teachers and residential staff are all expected to learn sign language so students can literally go up to anyone on campus to ask for help and get good information. The buildings are designed to support the issues of the students.

Outreach – In a given year they serve approximately 400 to 500 students and adults from around the state of Oregon in various outreach services. They also have a set number of students who are enrolled in their programs in a regular school program. Likewise, upwards of 1,600 outside groups are using the facilities throughout the year.

Denny Nielsen – asked if they go to public schools and serve kids there. Response: No, they do not actually provide an educational program in public schools, but they provide information and resources for people who are in public schools. Services provided are more in the information realm, not in the educational realm. Other agencies provide educational

programs for the public school system. There is a program on their campus which brings in students who are in programs at other schools.

Ed Galligan asked if Oregon is unique from other states, in providing a residential school program for the Deaf and Blind. Response: No. Actually the authority for operating the schools is under the Federal disabilities educational act for special education (IDEBA). There are provisions that every state must provide continuing education options and one of those options is a continuing residential program which is what they have in the School for the Deaf and the School for the Blind. At the School for the Blind, approximately 75% of the students live there during the week. Those students who are there, but are not residential go back and forth every day. At the Oregon School for the Deaf, about half are residential students and the other half come back and forth every day. Every state is required by law to have this option available. All states are not required to have their own school for the deaf and school for the blind. But for those children in that state that require this type of educational setting, the state is responsible for sending them out-of-state with an out-of-state tuition cost. Therefore, most states have one or more schools for the deaf and blind.

Bill Neland asked if they receive students from out-of-state. Response: They have the authority to receive tuition for students from out-of-state. At the School for the Deaf, they have had a number of foreign exchange students. Just this year, both schools received inquiries from out-of-state, so they are in the process of determining what a fair out-of-state tuition would be. Neither school has exercised their authority to accept students from out-of-state.

Edith Yang asked when the law was enacted. Response: The original law was called public law 94-142 enacted in 1976. This was the first comprehensive act for special education and resulted in the emergence of mainstream programs around the country. Prior to that law going into effect, the School for the Deaf served 350 to 400 students per year and that's how it was all across the country. With the enactment of public law 94-142, the mainstream programs developed and many of the students continue to be served in their own school districts. To provide a context, the School for the Deaf serves about one-third of the students in Oregon for whom sign language is their primary mode of instruction. The rest of the 1200 deaf students in Oregon are served in public schools. The vast majority of those students are hard of hearing and not requiring the type of intensive services that are provided at the School for the Deaf.

In the population served at the School for the Blind, all students are visually impaired. However, approximately two thirds have some other disability as well. They have an overall population of approximately 900 students, with ages ranging from birth to age 21. At any one time, they have about 45 or 50 residents, about 6% of the total population.

They have large campuses, relatively speaking, with a number of buildings. Their future plans do not necessarily include acquiring more buildings or space, but rather updating the existing buildings to match the program functions they need. Many of their buildings are quite old. The most recent construction on the OSD campus was in 1975 and the oldest construction is from 1910. Program needs have changed along with technology upgrades and modern living. It is their intention, within the next year, to move forward with a comprehensive facility evaluation study. They plan to develop a master plan for both campuses to identify what the future holds as far as redesign of the buildings and possibly some new construction. They have not wanted to go forward on anything until they have confidence in funding.

Edith Yang asked when ORS 346 was enacted. Response: Unknown. *Jane* offered to look it up and get back to her. The Oregon School for the Deaf has been in existence since 1870. It was about the 5th governmental entity to be established after Oregon became a state. The School for the Blind was established in 1873, so both are very old institutions in this state. The term institution is used advisably and they have a long history in the state of Oregon.

In most cases, they are the only 24-hour comprehensive program in the state for youngsters who are visually and hearing impaired. OSB is more than the students enrolled during the school year. During any given year, OSB serves 900 students and will have some sort of contact with about 450 of those students. Contact is through a regular school year program and a summer program which brings in youngsters who have had public school programs during the regular school year. Some students come in for one, two and four week programs during the summer to develop specific skills. Right now they have a group at the school that is having their very first summer job. They have students who come in for one or two weeks during the regular school year. These short term programs allow the student to learn one specific skill, and return to their regular educational program. They also assess 1,500 students per year in a two to six week, very comprehensive assessment

program. In addition, they are a resource for about 450 youngsters needing motivation assessments to allow pre-schoolers' who are visually impaired to attend pre-school programs around the state.

Denny Nielsen asked if they follow students to determine success factors that exist to be able to see what works best.

Response: They have done and will continue to do follow up studies. What they find is that the services that the students receive are very complicated and it's hard to identify if any one program was the reason why they were successful. In the case for the Blind school, many of the students are going through 12 years of education in the local public schools and coming to them for a transition program from age 18 through 21. They certainly cannot take responsibility for what occurred prior to coming and yet the combination of what was provided in the public school and what was provided for them at OSB is allowing many of them to be very successful. This is something they are continuing to look at and also to look at in conjunction with other programs that provide services around the state. They would really like to know what works best for every youngster and then replicate it. At OSD they have a formal follow-along study that they do with their graduates at one, five and ten years out. This past year they finished an accreditation process through a national accrediting body and as part of the process, conducted studies with all their alumnae and constituents which included the Oregon Association for the Deaf. Hundreds of surveys were sent out. This gave them the opportunity to hear from people who had been products of the school and received the services and learn the value of those services. Follow up is critical.

Denny Nielsen asked if they measure the schools in terms of cost per student or some other basis against other states that have similar models. Response: They actually prepare this information for the Legislature each session and they measure themselves primarily against students here in Oregon, who are in mainstream programs. For example, when OSD took a look at the costs of providing educational services in a residential setting which includes food and the cost for the student's health center to be staffed and so forth, it is actually less costly to educate a child in the OSD setting than it is in the public school program. In the public program, you are looking at a teacher for the deaf, a full time interpreter, plus any additional support services. There is a cost effective measure in having critical mass in one place and bringing the collection of resources there.

Laurie Warner asked what determines residence, whether a student will be in a residential setting or housed in their own school district. Is it based on the severity of the disability they have, or is that a personal choice they make? Response: The decision is made with the child's parents and the Individual Education Program Team (IEPT). What causes a child to be a candidate for the School for the Deaf is if the child is making active progress. There are certainly challenges but they need to be making good progress. If they are not making progress, why not? They then look at things like: Does the child need a smaller class size or does he need to be with someone directly who uses sign language? Is he able to have a conversation without relying on an interpreter to do all his intermediary communications? There are a whole variety of social and educational factors that are actually required in the Disabilities Educational Act to be considered by the team. Then, once the child's needs are determined, it is decided where those needs can best be met. Looking specifically at day school or residential, they look at things like Issues of distance, how far they live from the school. The main issue for OSB is that if the needs are such that the child needs programming in the evening then they would need to be in a residential setting. One of the major areas of instruction for them is activities of daily living. Most people assume that everyone has the ability to dress, eat and cook. These things are much better to learn in a residential environment because it is easier to learn to dress when it's time to dress, learn to eat when it's time to eat. In the public school setting, dressing is typically looked at around PE Class once a week, so they don't get much opportunity to dress. In a residential environment, they dress every morning, they brush their teeth every morning, and they have every opportunity to develop those skills so that's one of the real driving forces for residential placement at OSB.

At OSD two primary factors are communication and academic progress, given communications limitations. As the students get older, naturally they become more interested in the kinds of activities that anyone else can take advantage of in a school setting. At OSD, virtually everything that is there is accessible to them. They can be cheerleaders, they can play on the football team, and they can be in clubs and have student leadership opportunities. Everything is just like a regular school to them, whereas, those opportunities may exist but they may be harder for the kids to access or the students might not feel comfortable in a public school. Many don't make the cut, hearing or deaf, in a public school and having the opportunity to take advantage of the whole school environment is what residential education is about.

Budget Process:

In the fall of 2002, special schools were instructed to identify \$1.2M worth of cuts to be implemented July 1, 2003. Special schools employment budget working group included parents and staff from both schools. All staff and parents from both schools had an opportunity to participate in developing some guiding principals. They went into the process with the idea that

they would try to avoid making decisions that would affect student placements. To make decisions consistent with mission while having a minimal impact on student programs, if at all possible. [Losses included elimination of: Weekend Programs, OSD Dean of Students position, 1 Maintenance Supervisor, 1 Support Services Supervisor, 2 overnight LPN's, 1 OSD Secretary, .5 FTE OSD Teacher, and .75 FTE OSD Custodian and deferred maintenance projects were reduced.](#)

Up until a year ago both schools provided a weekend program every other week so if the youngster lived more than 2 hours away, more than 100 miles from the school, every other weekend they were eligible to spend the weekend at the school. They had to do away with that program. That program was not programmatic for the most part. It was a caretaking program for the youngsters and was fairly expensive so they gave that up. That has had some impact especially for youngsters who live at greater distance. Youngsters in Southern Oregon and the farther reaches of Eastern Oregon have not come to them because of elimination of that program. It just represents too much time in the vehicle, both on Friday afternoon and Sunday evening. It's been a real loss. Some of the positions they did away with included: Two overnight LPN's (Licensed Practical Nurses). They now have an on-call person arrangement in the evening. This was probably a little more traumatic at OSB as opposed to OSD, although both schools have had LPN's overnight for a long period of time. At OSB they have a number of youngsters who have pretty significant health problems. They found that it's been workable during the last year but it was initially a concern.

Bill Neland asked if this is a combined list for both schools. – Response: Yes. They combined the supervision of three departments across the two schools so now the schools share a nursing supervisor, a maintenance supervisor and a nutritional services supervisor. In all cases its working. In some cases they have gone from ten employees to almost 30 so it has been an adjustment. Most of the other positions were at OSD . As they were identifying the reductions they did their best to keep them away from direct services to students. Certainly they were not without impact but that was their goal.

OSB and OSD have a policy option package that is working its way through the budget process. It remains to be seen whether it makes its way to the Governor's office. They are hopeful, it will bring back a couple of things.

Energy Savings Measures: They have tried to be good stewards of energy. In the last 6 years, both schools have added Utilities Management software, they have gone through delamping. However, at OSB, in programmatic areas, they have not delamped because light is a critical need. The addition of light makes all the difference for them. They have delamped in areas where it's primarily just the staff. Lighting is also a critical issue at the Deaf school as well. The eye strain involved in watching sign language for any length of time is pretty significant so light in classroom areas was not reduced as much as in office areas. They have established guidelines for heating and cooling. It's not quite as cool or warm as people would like but they track this closely and the most recent information showed as having an 11.94% reduction in energy usage although there was no cost reduction.

Deferred Maintenance: The structures on both campuses have been around for a long time. At OSB they have one structure built in 1920. It was used by students up until a couple years ago. The most recent buildings were built in 1958 so everything on the campuses have been around for a long time. One of the things found most critical in the buildings is the supply of electricity and heat. In the older buildings, there was not the forethought as to how many outlets would be needed in each room by the year 2004. Most of their dorm rooms have one outlet. When you consider the technology that is necessary to do adaptive tasks, not even considering radios and boom boxes and TVs, they find themselves sorely lacking in terms of electricity. The same thing is true of heating. They have an antiquated heating plant, which will be part of the study in terms of what needs to be done with utilities.

A facilities evaluation process began in December, 2001. An RFP was developed with DAS, sent out, and they were getting excellent responses, when the budget reductions came about in the 2001-2003 biennium. It was a difficult decision, but they decided to hold off spending any money that was not absolutely critical, so that any budget cuts could be kept as far away from the children as possible. The RFP was terminated although they knew that nothing could be done in the future until this study is completed and it is something they have been hoping to get done for a long time. They are now in a position to go forward with it. About a year ago, both schools were left a significant sum of money from an estate of a woman in Nevada that neither of the schools had any connection with. The administrative teams of both schools decided that they would dedicate a portion of that money for this study so that when the time was right, they could move forward and not be dependent upon state or federal funding to make it happen. The money has been set aside. From a timing perspective, they expect to move forward this fall or

early spring so they are prepared with a master plan as they get into policy development for the 2007-2009 biennium. They will work with DAS to make sure it meets all the provisions of the RFP. The big picture is they would like to have a consultant come in and work with their stakeholders. They have already done quite a bit of preliminary discussion and planning in each of the schools about what the needs are. To have someone come in and facilitate another comprehensive conversation about that and take that back and develop a master plan. Then bring it back for another process of feedback from the stakeholders and hopefully make a decision at that time. Perhaps by the next presentation before this Board, they will have some exciting information to discuss. Handouts of a ten year Deferred Maintenance Plan for each school, was presented to the Board.

Ed Galligan inquired about the handouts titled "Deferred Maintenance Plans". Response: They represent a project calendar of deferred maintenance projects planned for the next ten years. There is a ten year plan for each school.

Ed Galligan asked what the consultant would do. The consultant would take a look at all of the buildings and all of the grounds basically and with an understanding of the program they provide, evaluate what needs to be done to buildings to make them functional from a programmatic perspective. As an example, the Middle and High School Boy's Dorm was built in the 1950's. It is literally the design of a minimum security prison. It has a guard station set up and is a cavernous building with huge open spaces and long hallways. It is difficult to supervise unless you have a guard stationed in the hall, which they don't. They would want the consultant to sit down with the people who work in that dorm, the students and parents and figure out what they need in terms of living space for these students and then a recommendation would be formed around the residential requirements. This consultation is separate from the Maintenance plan.

Ed Galligan asked how they determined priorities on the maintenance plan, for example: 2011-2013 Fire alarm replacement. Response: They are under the provisions and requirements of the State Fire Marshall for things like adding sprinkler systems. Complete replacement of fire alarms is required at OSD because they must now have visual fire alarms in all the buildings. The existing technology needs to be upgraded due to code changes.

Edith Yang commented that she really enjoyed the presentation. She does not know much about the schools and how they are located but she suggested that the mission has evolved. The biggest change occurred in July, 1990 when President Bush signed the Americans with Disabilities Act, Title 1. Title 2 and 3 of the Act has to do with transportation and equal opportunity and full participation in everything for all handicapped people. Since then, many programs have been started in many different buildings. Many volunteer organizations and senior citizen centers, AARP, Housing, Dept of Health and Human Services and especially the one stop for training, jobs and vocational rehabilitation. These buildings they have are centrally located and represent a great variety in size, use and construction and some could be designated historical. She feels that any alterations that are made should be made considering maximum flexibility. Building codes, and earthquake requirements should be demonstrated with different types of buildings and preventive maintenance and energy conservation can be utilized. She feels that these buildings can be used as a model for sustainability codes and goals and she feels that this would be something the board would be interested in because the buildings are centrally located and they could really use them. Any remodeling done should be done with the flexibility so that anybody, in the future, can use the buildings as the program evolves.

Jane invited the Board to come visit the campuses of both schools (OSB and OSD).

A motion was made by *Denny Nielsen* to accept the report submitted by the Department of Education without exception. The motion was seconded by *Ed Galligan* and unanimously approved.

Department of Corrections (DOC): Presented by Scott Young and Vern Rowan

OVERVIEW

The Department of Corrections (DOC) is a statewide agency. They have institutions throughout the state. Their mission is to promote public safety by holding offenders accountable for their actions and reducing the risk of future criminal behavior. They currently own 276 buildings with 4.4M sq ft and they lease three buildings with 83,000 sq ft. Within those buildings they have a little over 3,400 employees and 12,300 inmates. They base the need for institutions on long range forecasts, population forecasts, and correctional forecasts. As they presented in the past, institutions have expanded. They have built Snake River, Ontario, Two Rivers, Umatilla and in 2000 they finished and opened Cotton Creek in Wilsonville. Since then, they have done Powder Correctional Facility expansion which was 100 beds, they also added 50 more beds to South Fork (Tillamook area), Hubbard and Baker City.

Bill Neland asked if they have been accepted in Wilsonville because the busses are gone. Response: Yes, they are doing better without the busses. In March they started breaking ground on a 400 bed minimum security in Lakeview, Oregon which is scheduled to open in another year.

Sustainability –They went through an organizational restructure with a new Director this past year and the sustainability management function has been handed from one person to another. The Business Finance Manager and Administrator had been doing the sustainability function, however, due to retirement, the sustainability duties have now been assigned to the Assistant Director of Finance Services and Scott Young is now handling some of the energy functions along with facility services.

Energy Savings Measures: DOC tracks utilities through Utility Manager software, the same software used by DAS. They have also implemented a computerized Maintenance Management System. They track all utilities as well as maintenance and repair activities throughout their institutions. Based on their utility tracking and BTU's per square foot, they are at 25% savings on electricity and about 6% on natural gas so overall they had a 12.8% energy savings. They have done the same thing everyone else has done: de-lamping, lowering temperatures, shutting computers down, they have done everything they can do. They are a 24 hour operation and it is critical to protect the staff, inmate and general public population within their facilities. They have made some great strides and they have really worked hard and are now taking more steps in this biennium to do even more. They have institutions that were built in the late 1800's, early 1900's through 2000's, therefore, some building are barely heated while others are fully conditioned. They have old buildings that are not energy efficient and new buildings that are highly efficient. One of the things they have been doing in their sustainability efforts is capturing the heat from laundry dryers to pre-heat water to wash clothes instead of using electricity or natural gas. They also have a heat recovery system and water re-use system in their laundry. As new buildings are built, they are putting in a lot of the latest technology in order to be cost effective as well as sustainable. In their old institutions they look at control devices, to control the sequence of when a hot water heater or hot water boiler goes on and off and how long it stays off. The devices being tested have a 10% guaranteed decrease in natural gas usage. The test run, at Mill Creek Correctional Institution in Salem, resulted in a 12% natural gas savings. Now they are slowly implementing it in other heating devices throughout the state. Also, some of the older institutions had water-cooled air conditioners which are being changed to air-cooled. They are doing everything they can to save energy, which can be funded fairly reasonable within the tight budget. Another example of energy savings is at Cotton Creek. They built a deep vessel composting operation using food waste, scrap wood, cardboard, and paper. Once these waste materials are put through the device, it processes into a nice, rich mulch that can be applied to flower beds. They are trying to keep everything out of landfills the best they can. At the new Lakeview institution, currently under construction; it was discovered just last week that the area is highly geo-thermic. They plan to completely heat that complex on Geo-thermal. They are putting in some backup boilers for the what-ifs in order to house inmates, but all indications are that they will never need to use them. The water temperature is pushing 200 degrees. All the water used to absorb the heat goes right back into the ground so they are not wasting any water to heat the building.

Deferred Maintenance:

DOC has a total of \$46M deferred maintenance. They did a facility condition study in 1996 and since then, they have been using their in-house experts to update that. They have physical plant managers as well as maintenance and physical plant staff. They have been taking that plan and every couple years they go back and do the tour and adjust for inflation as best they can

Bill Neland asked if they are making improvements and corrections as they go along. Response: Yes. Since they have been low funded on maintenance as well as capital improvement/capital construction projects it's been difficult to keep up with the deferred maintenance. It's going to start causing some problems with operations in the institutions. Due to lack of funding, some of the items on the deferred maintenance list will not get done and the list may even get longer.

Bill Neland asked if the prison on State Street in Salem was the oldest facility. Response: Yes

Institutions will also start suffering from equipment obsolescence. As equipment ages, it becomes more difficult to find parts and pieces to keep that equipment operating. They have some inmates and staff members who have learned how to build parts. In Pendleton, staff and inmates actually take pieces of steel and make parts to fix a piece of equipment for which parts are no longer available. They have been making due with what they have. However, they are also losing experienced staff, through retirements, who had the ability to make parts and keep this older equipment operating. They have been using their

capital improvement budget money of \$2.03M to nickel and dime their deferred list and take care of emergencies as they come up. With the efforts and experience levels of the physical plant maintenance staff and teamwork, a lot of the deferred maintenance has been done in-house. They have maintenance staff that have taken on work loads that are amazing. Reroofing buildings that most people wouldn't want to take on that are not cost effective. In some cases it's a piece of equipment or an electronic device where most people would say call in a contractor or buy a new part. They will replace as much as they can in-house. If they have to contract with someone, they look for the most cost effective solution. Beyond the condition survey of \$46M there's another 23 or so deficiencies that range somewhere between \$13M and \$19M which adds another \$38M. These deficiencies include things such as asbestos, lead, and seismic studies that could bring on a whole range of other issues that they don't know the cost of. The \$46M list is items they know what the problems are and what the value is but without some studies and some other investigations, there is a range of things that they don't know the true value of so they have taken their best estimate. They will need to request funding in the future in order to bring on an expert to look at some of the other problems.

Condition Survey – They have taken a look at the entire list and decided how many bienniums it will take to accomplish and made a ten year plan. If they get funding, consistently over five biennia, they could make the deferred maintenance list non-existent. However, history has shown that they aren't getting the funding and they are doing their best to whittle it down with the funding they have as well as doing things as cost effectively as possible with in-house staff.

Bill Neland asked if they were going backward, if they were finding more problems than they are able to correct in a biennium. Response: No, actually they are starting to whittle it down. Two years ago they reported \$36M for deferred deficiencies. Adjusting for inflation at 4% per annum, this number would be \$49M. Since they are currently reporting \$46M, there is headway. Quite a few of the projects are now off. Sixty to Seventy percent of the projects that were completed where done by in-house staff as cost effectively as possible. Some of the things were technical and involved security issues so they had to be contracted but most of the big structural projects were done by staff. Anything to do with structural design was contracted out.

Slide Presentation was shown to give an overview of prison construction and expansions.

Based on prison and population forecasts, inmate population has been continually growing. Historically, growth projections have been based on Measure 11 however, mandatory sentencing laws have caused the biggest jumps.

Bill Neland asked if inmate growth was in step with population growth or are they growing faster. Response: They are growing faster.

In the fall of 2002, when state revenues were short, they were supposed to start construction at Lakeview and the 100 bed expansion at Shutter Creek near Coos Bay. Those projects were designed and ready to start in the spring of 2003, however, shortage of funding came and those projects stopped so now they are back to restarting those projects. In the meantime, since those beds were delayed almost two years, they have had to put in temporary beds. They have been housing those inmates in various areas within the institutions the best they can.

Edith Yang asked if they were able to double up in cells. Response: Yes, in cells where they had one, they put two inmates. In some cases, the reason they have a single cell is control.

Denny Nielsen asked what happened to the project cost during the two year wait as it would be interesting to know how much it cost to wait two years in terms of construction costs. Response: They didn't have a GMP but were hard-bid. These projects had not gone out to bid. However, they had legislative authority for the projects. The original Architect's estimate for the Warner Creek Correctional facility in Lakeview facility was \$14.1M, it was placed at \$16.2M so 14% is what they lost. If you assume inflation on construction costs of 4% per year, there was another 6% in there somewhere.

Denny Nielsen asked if they always do a traditional design bid as opposed to a modified design bid. Response: Their larger projects are Construction Manager General Contractor (CMGC). The next prison after Lakeview is going to be CMGC. They do both.

Based on population forecasts and the DAS Office of Economic Analysis projection which is done every October and April, it is jumping very fast right now. From April 2003 to April 2004 there was rapid growth. Right now, they are at 12,300 inmates and in five years there will 15,000 inmates.

Construction priority: Lakeview, Madras, and Junction City pending all the population forecasts

Expansion projects: Completed: 50 beds at South Fork (Tillamook), 100 beds at Powder River (Baker City) and they just received authority from the June, 2004 E-Board to start on Shutter Creek (Coos Bay), 100 bed expansion.

Lakeview : In December, 2002 contracts were suspended so now these contracts are being amended and re-started. They will get it out to bid in the fall, so they can get to work if weather permits, if not, it will be some time in the Spring.

Coffee Creek Women's Facility : This is an intake center. When inmates come out of the county jail holding facility, they come to Coffee Creek for analysis to determine what institution they best fit. This facility also houses all the women prisoners. The women population growth is booming. Their crime of choice is identity theft which fuels their drug habit. They are expanding to bring in 324 more beds which is what they planned for and have space for. On the minimum security side, there will be one more dorm.

Bill Neland asked if this will fit on the existing campus. Response: Yes, when they originally designed that facility, they promised the neighborhood that they would only get up to 1,600 inmates. With this expansion, they will be there.

Expansions and New Prisons:

Warner Creek Correctional is under construction now, it will be open in September, 2005.

Shutter Creek (re-activating) – 100 beds - Opens December, 2005

Coffee Creek Expansion – Additional Minimum Women's – Opens July, 2006

Coffee Creek Expansion – Additional Medium Women's – Opens February, 2007

Madras Minimum – Opens October, 2006

Madras Medium – Opens November, 2007

Junction City – Minimum Men's – Opens May, 2009

Junction City – Medium Men's – Opens April, 2010

Bill Neland asked how the prisons were named. Response: They open up naming to the general public and the large majority of prisons seem to be located near a creek so that's why they have those names. The Madras and Junction City prisons have not yet been named.

Depending on the October and April forecasts, they may need to reschedule these openings depending on where they need the beds.

Denny Nielsen asked if they already own the property in Junction City. Response: Yes, they have the property for all the anticipated sites. Madras was also started in 2002. They already had some utilities in the ground when this project was stopped.

Additional Projects:

Two Rivers Correctional Institution (TRCI) Emergency Dorm is completed and ready for occupancy July 1, 2004. This 10,000 sq ft area was once designated for workforce to bring industry in and put the inmates to work. Based on the bed needs, they took 10,000 sq ft out of that building and turned it into a dorm. The basic shell of the area existed, all they did was put up a wall to separate it from the rest of the work force area and put in the lighting and ventilation so it is appropriate for human occupancy and living conditions rather than industrial area. Everything done with this remodel was done with staff and inmates.

Oregon State Penitentiary (OSP) Emergency Dorm was deactivated five or six years ago when their construction got a little bit ahead of inmate population. Now this dormitory has been put back in, effective February 1, 2004, and is already occupied.

Both of these were 80 beds.

Completed Expansions

South Fork Forest Camp, Tillamook Dorm 50 beds, they had to expand the dining room, observation building, laundromat, recreation area to watch TV and administration building. The previous building was approximately one-third this size and

housed the administration facilities for the entire camp. That includes both staff from the Department of Forestry and DOC because this is a joint operating facility.

Powder River Correctional Facility – Baker City – New Dormitory was added which doubled and mirrored the existing dormitory. It is a multipurpose building to add additional programming space. This is one of their largest A and B treatment facilities for minimum tested inmates prior to release back into the community and the expansions took the physical plant or maintenance section out of the administration building. They now have a dedicated building outside, have expanded the dining room and modified some of the support services areas so they are all in the same building. Maintenance is outside and the existing vehicle shelter or bus barn is undergoing expansion in order to put on the additional crew needed to take inmates out on work assignments.

Future Expansions:

Shutter Creek Correctional Institution, North Bend - 100 beds New dormitory and updates to 300 buildings, modification and upgrades to the infrastructure, fire alarm system, closed circuit TVs so they can monitor the facility if funding allows pending legislative approval.

Coffee Creek Correctional Facility, Wilsonville – 324 total beds (3 housing units at 108 beds each). The fourth one is in the medium area. All the infrastructure was laid in place with the original construction to support the expansion in these areas.

Current Construction Activity:

Warner Creek Correctional Facility , Lakeview Concept is finished, construction is in progress. They poured slab during seismic activity.

Future Construction

Men's Medium and Minimum, Madras - Concept is finished. It is similar to the Coffee Creek lay out. Medium is in a detached area. They currently have a 400 bed minimum and the current projects calls for that number to be doubled (864 beds). There will be 1,240 beds inside the medium area.

Bill Neland asked if there is a geographic correlation between inmate population and where they live. Response: At the end of their sentence, an inmate can transition into the community, or as close as they can get within DOC facilities, to where they lived. What they are trying to do with the Oregon accountability law and some other planning, is getting the inmates moved towards the end of their sentence so they will be close to home when released.

Existing Institutions:

DOC is charged with providing the support and services on protection of the state's investment in existing correctional institutions by administering a statewide program of maintenance and improvement valuations. In order to accomplish this, they serve as a focal point for agency-wide information gathering and reporting. For putting the report together for this presentation, they did not sit in the office and write a report. The twelve facility managers at the individual institutions were contacted, they each provided an update on their location, and then the report was compiled in the format requested. Before going out to a contractor, they evaluate if a project can be done in-house more cost effectively and if they have the skilled staff to perform it. As far as the prioritization of projects, they use all of the facilities managers as members of a project advisory team. It is welcoming to see that they will sit down and actually look at the needs of the department instead of their own personal needs at an institution and they recognize what project should have the highest priority. In the 3 ½ years since putting the program in place, the team has been right on the money every time. With limited resources they have been forced to start looking at the needs of the whole department instead of the needs of the individual institution. The facility managers all work together as a team now.

Denny Nielsen asked a question regarding maintenance management. He wanted to know if all twelve centers are still using the 1996 assessment and if it is user-friendly enough so it can still be used. Response: Yes, they put it into a database so it can be accessed with excel. They sort by institution and as they go through the biennium, the maintenance managers at each facility will look at how they can do it in-house and they will see ways to do it better.

Denny Nielsen commented that it is hard for 12 groups of eyes to assess criteria. Response: There is some flexibility in the total but this is just for work orders. The list helps track the items on the deferred list that need to get done.

Contract Administration for Capital Improvement and Capital Construction Projects:

The next major function the department performs is the Contract Administration for any of the Capital Improvement and Capital Construction projects. Existing institutions are all over the state. With the building in Lakeview, they will have them on both the North and South borders and in all four corners with a concentration of five in Salem. They range in age from oldest being the Salem Penitentiary, as far as officially recognized and not listed as annexed or farm. South Fork Forest Camp was funded by the 1951 legislature then after the construction in the late 1980's, early 90's realignment taking some of the small buildings assigning to the penitentiary since it was the only prison actually assigning them with a closer facility to better support them.

Project Plans 2005-2007

Cell Door Switches - Currently, they open and close doors in a cell block at EOCl with switches that are a manual operation at \$115 a piece. Their life expectancy is based on the number of times operated. It is a wiring nightmare to troubleshoot. They have the same problems at OSCl where the box is very similar. They are going to a computer control from master control touch screen or mouse control so they will be able to open and close the cells or individual housing units from remote locations.

Bill Neland asked if they have this in place now . Response: Yes, in Snake River and Two Rivers, Coffee Creek, and a modified version of this at OSP. The fire alarm upgrade they did in 1993 at the Penitentiary put all the core doors and gates on this type of system.

Bill Neland asked if the maintenance had gone down. Response: This just opens and closes the doors. The maintenance issue regarding the doors is still the same. They didn't change the method of operating the doors. They are still electric. They only changed the control device.

Heating Unit Replacement at OSP. C Block at OSCl. The heating unit has been maintained and repaired and patched by in-house staff for in excess of ten years and it's still in need of replacement and repair.

OSP's Electrical Upgrade— This system has been in place since prior to 1958. It is fairly obsolete. When they try to buy a transformer, they need to have the transformer designs drawn by an engineer, they then need to sign that this will do what they need it to do and it takes 16 weeks to get a transformer. Cost is fairly high because of the labor involved. This also puts the institution at risk because they have had a transformer fail and they had to jury rig the unit with band aids. What the reconstruction will do is get rid of the 2300 volt unit and go to the industry standard 4160 with parts readily available off the shelf. Very similar to the electrical upgrade accomplished at OSCl.

Underground storage tank removal - The largest remaining underground storage tank they have is the fueling island over at the Waremart building that they purchased and turned into a distribution center. It's on the project list to request funding to get that tank out so they can decrease their liability.

Edith Yang commented that perhaps some of the inmates could be trained to do preventive maintenance such as going up on the roof twice a year and do minor patching. This would save a lot of money and perhaps delay replacement of a roof. Response: Most of these roofs have gone a 12 to 15 year life and DOC has been training inmates to do everything they can do including learning to do preventive maintenance on everything operated in an institution, including roofs. In some of the older institutions, the life of the roof has passed and they are starting to leak and cause damage to other structural integrities of the building such as walls and other fixtures.

Ed Galligan asked if they have a past and current fully loaded cost per inmate. He wanted to know if there was a number that could be compared to other locations throughout the states. Response: Yes, they do that all the time. At the latest update, they were looking at \$58 to \$62, maybe a little higher, per day per inmate.

Ed Galligan asked if this figure was high, low, or medium compared to other locations throughout the United States. Response: There are some Government-run institutions that get down to a low of \$35 to a high of \$65 per day.

Ed also asked if the private-run institutions have proven economically superior to governmental run. Response: It is difficult to compare because the private-run institutions don't do education and they don't try to train for skill sets. They just house inmates. DOC's recidivism rate is very low, around 30%. Those other states who have higher re-cidivism rates, are not training inmates, they are just housing them. Once the sentence is complete, the inmates are put out on the street; so it's very tough to try to compare DOC to other states. There are some states that do very similar programs and DOC is neck and neck

with them in cost comparison. There is a vast difference between states that house vs states trying to educate, train and get them transitioned back into the communities. DOC is trying to make inmates good, honest citizens when they come out of the system so an inmate is able to get a job and hold a job and be able to be productive so they don't go back into the system. At least some of the state's who have gone to the privatized correctional facilities, are still providing the facilities. The private agency only provides the staffing and at the end of the contract, the state has a bill to pay in order to get the facility brought back up to where they can use it again because maintenance is not always included in the cost of the operation.

Inmates are used in every field and every trade. Everything they can do, they perform right along with the staff. Every member of their staff is just as much a teacher and supervisor of those inmates, as they are workers. They have the skill sets, they roll up their sleeves and do it, but they also teach the inmates to do as much as they can. They try to use the existing skills of inmates in order to keep those skills current. For example, if an inmate is a licensed electrician; he can use that license to do electrical repairs. The system will keep him educated and keep up code compliance so those inmates come out with that licensing in tact.

Denny Nielsen asked the reason for closing the gift shop at the Penitentiary as he once purchased fishing flies from the shop. Response: The shop was closed when State Street was widened. Because of the flood in 1996, they had to put in a four foot tall levy across that area and in order to put the curio shop back in, they would have had to elevate it 74 inches and have all the utilities re-constructed. The public can contact the Superintendent's office at the Penitentiary in order to purchase items from the curio shop. The hobby shop is still in operation. The inmates are still making the items for sale. They also do laundry, have a metal shop, make furniture, and have call centers. They do everything they can possibly do to educate and train inmates.

Ed Galligan asked how much of a rub the curio shop is with the private sector. Response: It depends on the industry. They have to watch what they do and they promised that they wouldn't cause damage or harm to any business in Oregon. They get into fields where they won't cause harm to any other business or sometimes they become a regular competitor and it really doesn't matter. Sometimes they partner with local businesses and both grow as a result of the partnership. All the bunk beds and tables in the emergency dorms were made by inmate labor. When the inmates are focused and it's a repetitive task and they learn a skill set, they do some very good quality work.

A motion was made by *Denny Nielsen* to accept the report submitted by Department of Corrections without exception. The motion was seconded by *Ron Polvi* and unanimously approved.

Shirley Finanger commented on two items:

- 1) OLCC Update – They exercised the declaration for emergency request recommended by the Board, and contacted BAM about using current funds to get an architectural evaluation of the 1977 portion of the warehouse. The evaluation determined that immediate measures must be taken to reinforce the building. However, the best solution has not yet been identified. The plan is to have the repairs completed before the winter weather begins.
- 2) Reporting schedule change. The following agencies will present plans on August 20, 2004: Fair, Veterans, and PERS. Military will return with a concise report on new projects and DAS will return with an update on the Computer Center Consolidation. The September meeting will have presentations by State Lands and Human Services and there will be Salem-Keizer Area reviews for DAS and Military.

Denny Nielsen commented that he would encourage everyone to drive by the Military Department Emergency Coordination Center and look at the 4/10 of a mile of fence which cost \$1,025 per linear foot to construct. *Shirley* commented that Military will explain the need for that fence at the next meeting.

NEXT MEETING DATE: August 20, 2004 from 1:30 pm to 4:00 pm at the Forestry Building.

Meeting adjourned at 3:35 pm.