



**CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY BOARD**  
 Tillamook Conference Room at Dept of Forestry  
 2600 State Street, Salem, OR 97310

**MEETING MINUTES – June 15, 2007 10:00 a.m. – 11:25 a.m.**

**Board Members Present**

Tom McMullen, Chair	Peter Fernandez, City of Salem Public Works Dept	Bob Stutte, Member
Denny Nielsen, Vice Chair	Alan Maul, Member	

**DAS Staff Present**

Robin Harpster, DAS Facilities Division	Darrin Brightman, DAS Facilities Division
Bill Foster, DAS Facilities Division	Fred Lord, DAS Facilities Division
Robin Kirkpatrick, DAS Facilities Division	Elaine Schacher, DAS Facilities Division

**Others Present**

Bill Neland, former Chair	Linda Gilbert, BAM Analyst for OYA	Michael Beaman, Architect
Rex Emery, OYA	Phil Lemman, OYA	George Dunford, OYA
Iven Findley, OYA		

**Handouts distributed to all members present:**

- Agenda
- Minutes from May 18, 2007 meeting
- Capital Projects Advisory Board Charter
- Public Involvement\Comment Process for CPAB Review of Salem Area Plan Updates
- Public Involvement\Comment Process for CPAB Review of Salem Area \ Capitol Mall Projects
- Area Plan Update Process Status Report with Map of Plan Areas
- Oregon Youth Authority – Oak Creek Facility Space Needs Plan, Construction Project Plan, Building Maintenance Needs Plan

**CALL TO ORDER:**

*Tom McMullen* called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. and noted that there were no entries on the sign in sheet for Public Testimony.

*Bill Foster* introduced Robin Harpster, new Administrator for DAS, Facilities Division. Robin H. started on June 4, 2007. Bill also announced his retirement from state service after 26 years. His last work day will be June 29, 2007.

*Robin Harpster* added that she is from Las Vegas, Nevada and has 14 years of private land development and public sector experience. She came from the Clark County School District in Las Vegas, Nevada which is the 5<sup>th</sup> largest district in the nation with more square footage within the county school buildings than are in all of the state of Oregon. She brings a lot of knowledge of programming for future development to apply to Oregon facilities. She looks forward to working with this Board and with staff and is hoping to make positive changes in the state of Oregon.

**A. BOARD ADMINISTRATION**

**A1. Approval of minutes from May 18, 2007 meeting**

**Motion:**

Denny Nielsen moved to adopt the minutes of the May 18, 2007 meeting.

Second: Peter Fernandez seconded with correction on page 4 from “Visions 20/20” to “Vision 20/20”.

Tom McMullen called for discussion and a vote on the motion as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

**A2. CPAB Charter Final Review and Distribution**

*Robin Kirkpatrick* reported that the final draft of the Charter is provided in the meeting packet. The document was presented to Robin Harpster, DAS Facilities Administrator and Lindsay Ball, DAS Director. However, neither feedback nor approval has been received from the Director’s office. This item will be held over to the next meeting.

**A3. Public Testimony Process - Robin Kirkpatrick**

*Robin Kirkpatrick* presented the Board with two final draft documents outlining a Public Testimony Process for 1) Salem Area Plan Updates and 2) Salem Area Projects and Capitol Mall Projects. The changes requested by the Board at last month's meeting were incorporated into these documents.

*Robin Kirkpatrick* explained that a female board member agreed to compromise on another issue if the documents were made gender neutral so it was a valid compromise.

Salem Area Plan Updates

The Board requested the following corrections:

Item 8 – Line 3. "The Chair at his discretion" should be replaced by "*At the Chair's discretion, testimony time limit may be extended*".

Salem Area Projects and Capitol Mall Projects

Item 5 – Line 3. "The Chair at his discretion" should be replaced by "*At the Chair's discretion, testimony time limit may be extended*".

**Denny Nielsen** moved to adopt the Public Involvement Comment documents as corrected.

Second: **Peter Fernandez** seconded.

**Tom McMullen** called for discussion and a vote on the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**B. Area Plan Update Reviews pursuant to OAR 125-125-0400**

**B1. Status Report on Current Area Plan Update Activity. – Darrin Brightman**

Darrin Brightman presented a status report on the current activity with Area Plan Updates. His job is to manage the update process with the agencies. The following plans were discussed:

**Southeast Salem Area Plan (formerly known as the Correction's Farm) – Currently 1,304 acres**

Final reviews are being conducted with the CPAB sub-committee. A neighborhood presentation is scheduled for July 10, 2007 and Salem City Council will receive a written update on July 9, 2007. DAS is awaiting formal comment from Salem-Keizer Transit District.

**Oregon State Fair and Exposition Center – 185 acres**

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (ODPR) is undergoing a re-development and master planning process which is nearing completion so DAS is starting preparations to update the State Fair Area Plan to enable redevelopment.

*Peter Fernandez* commented that he has seen the Master Plan for the State Fair and they are big plans with some great things being proposed. There is a lot in that proposal that discusses surplussing land, acquiring other lands, re-zoning and a host of other things. At this point, how will that be addressed in the Area Plan?

*Darrin Brightman* responded that those are things that cannot be done within the Area Plan process. What is coming out of the ODPR Master Planning process is not necessarily everything that the consultant is proposing. The consultant's mission was to come in with a proposal for how to maximize the State Fair. Everything that the consultant proposes is not necessarily what will be implemented by ODPR and is not necessarily going to be put into the Area Plan. Anything that addresses perimeter areas outside of state-owned property is not part of the Area Plan process so that will not be addressed. At present, ODPR has no plans whatsoever to surplus any of the property. The Area Plan will reflect what they are actually planning to do in the near future. The Area Plans are scheduled to be updated every five years so only those plans which will occur in the next five years will be included in this Area Plan update.

*Robin Kirkpatrick* added that two individuals from DAS have been attending all of the redevelopment meetings for the State Fair, Darrin Brightman and Bob Karau, the former DAS Area Plan Coordinator. Mr. Karau was the Project Manager who was very involved in getting DPSST on the property where they are currently located so he has a lot of experience and background in dealing with the issues related to Area Plans. ODPR is asking DAS to give the State Fair Area Plan update a little higher priority than it has had in the past as they believe it would be of assistance to them in their process. DAS will begin the involvement of the CPAB Subcommittee fairly soon and begin the same kind of process as with the Southeast Salem Area Plan. There will be a number of sub-committee meetings, a stakeholders list will be created and a schedule will be set. DAS and CPAB will be getting even more involved with it shortly.

**Hillcrest Area Plan – Currently 45 acres**

An internal draft is being worked on to conform to the new format. It will be submitted to Oregon Youth Authority by the end of June for first review. Any lands not required for agency use will be discussed with possible consideration to surplus.

*Peter Fernandez* pointed out that the Fairview Industrial Park and Sustainable Fairview are two separate parcels.

**Airport Road Area Plan – Approximately 145 acres**

The majority of the Area Plan is within the 100-year flood plain of Mill Creek and the Shelton Ditch so there are some challenges in doing any construction there. However, it does provide good opportunity for some ecological restoration work and open space. DAS is currently updating current conditions because the last plan was done in 1986. The site has changed quite a bit in the last 21 years. Some informal discussions have occurred with the City of Salem on the future development. Further discussions will occur with the occupying agencies within the next month.

**Capitol Mall Area Plan – Approximately 93 acres**

Base historical data is being prepared and DAS is awaiting guidance from the legislature.

*Peter Fernandez* asked if there would be any discussion in that Area Plan about what happens when the Capitol Mall is full.

*Darrin Brightman* responded that this would be addressed in the Coordination Plan. One of things being discussed with the City is possibly moving some of the development to the Airport Road Area but that is still in a very informal (just talking) stage.

**Oregon State Hospital and Penitentiary Properties Area Plan – Approximately 383 acres**

The previous plan has actually grown by 20 acres with the recent acquisition of the Corrections Distribution Center (formerly a WinCo warehouse). This Area Plan includes Anderson Readiness Center and ball fields leased to the City of Salem. Right now the Department of Human Services (DHS) is beginning their redevelopment plan for the State Hospital Site. A preliminary site plan is expected from DHS later this year. At that point, DAS can begin moving on the Area Plan.

*Peter Fernandez* asked if the Fire Station was remaining a part of this area plan.

*Darrin Brightman* responded that it was completed and has been removed.

*Tom McMullen* asked what the 20 acre, WinCo warehouse parcel is being used for. As the ownership changes from one agency to another agency, why doesn't it come before CPAB?

*Darrin Brightman* responded that private property was acquired. It was not previously owned by another agency.

*Bill Foster* added that this parcel was acquired some time ago and it went before the Capitol Planning Commission. The issue is that it has not been part of an Area Plan and even though it is not contiguous, it is logical that it could or should be folded into the Area Plan which is closest by and of a related use.

*Peter Fernandez* commented that the word "recent" is misleading if they purchased it five or six years ago or longer.

*Bill Foster* added that it may have been reviewed as a project kind of thing. At the time that it went through, it was reviewed by the Capitol Planning Commission.

**State School for the Deaf – Approximately 50 acres**

Base and historical data is being prepared, awaiting a new site planning process which has not yet begun.

**State School for the Blind - Approximately 8.5 acres adjacent to Bush Pasture Park and Shelton Ditch**

Most of the buildings which were built around 1950 are not meeting the current standards for the use they are serving. There is strong interest to relocate the School for the Blind to the School for the Deaf site. At that time, the Oregon Department of Education will need to assess whether they have a need for the School for the Blind property. If not, it will be evaluated for possible surplus.

*Tom McMullen* asked if the Board members are aware of the process for disposing of surplus lands. The Board indicated they were not familiar with the process and asked if staff could give the Board a brief overview.

*Fred Lord* advised that before offering for sale any real property owned by the state, the agency must declare it surplus and report its intent to sell or transfer to DAS. DAS then notifies other state agencies authorized to own real property of

the intended sale or transfer to determine whether acquisition of the property would be advantageous to another state agency. DAS then sends out an Agency Real Property Notification to all other land-owning state agencies and political subdivisions that have taxing authority within the area where the property is located. Other Agencies, then Political Subdivisions are afforded an opportunity of first right of refusal before it is released to the general public. Under certain circumstances this procedure can be waived by statute. There is a 30-day period when the agencies and political subdivisions can indicate their interest in acquiring the property. After that 30-day period, DAS notifies the selling agency if any agencies or political subdivisions expressed interest. If no interest was expressed, the agency is free to proceed by offering the property for sale to the general public, or however their internal procedures dictate they are to proceed. Another portion of statute pertains to obtaining fair market value as established by market appraisal. Most agencies involved in land transactions have their own internal procedure that they follow but they pretty closely mirror DAS statute.

*Tom McMullen* asked for clarification that other state agencies would have first claim on surplus properties then other governmental jurisdictions, and then it might go to the open market unless somebody decides some other disposal method is more appropriate. Is it the Legislature who directs that?

*Fred Lord* responded that it would be a Legislative decision that would direct the selling agency to sell it a certain way.

*Robin Kirkpatrick* added that at times the Legislature would be working closing with the selling agency and the entity who would be expressing some need for it.

*Bill Foster* added that generally there is no Legislative direction but occasionally there is, and certainly the Mill Creek Industrial Park was an example of a Legislative directive.

*Denny Nielsen* asked if there was a timeline associated with an offer from these other agencies.

*Fred Lord* responded that DAS is required, by statute, to send out a physical 30-day notice to other state agencies. The notice goes to any political subdivision that has taxing authority within the property area. If there are no responses received within that 30 day period of time, the window of opportunity for public expression of interest to buy the property is gone. If they come onto the scene late, Fred assumes they would need to compete with anyone from the general public.

*Denny Nielsen* asked for clarification that the time period could conceivably be as soon as 90 days from public notice to being offered for sale to the general public. *Fred Lord* responded yes.

*Tom McMullen* stated that when the Leslie School site was purchased, the time period was four months from the pursuit to ownership. The process can happen quickly if the property is not encumbered.

*Peter Fernandez* asked if an expression of interest from a Political subdivision requires payment to accompany it.

*Fred Lord* responded: No, it is simply an expression of interest that starts a dialog which is forwarded to the selling agency. In most instances, the political subdivision has already contacted the agency directly, long before the 30-day notice goes out.

*Chair McMullen* closed the discussion and advised the Board to keep in mind, as they review the Area Plans, that there may be certain parcels that are considered surplus within each Area Plan.

*Robin Kirkpatrick* volunteered to put together, with Mr. Lord and the Real Property Sales folks a small document that would describe the process.

*Chair McMullen* stated that it is not a particularly relevant issue until there is an actual area plan to review. It will also give some time for the Legislature to possibly deal with the Blind and Deaf School issue.

#### **Salem Area Coordination Plan – Darren Brightman**

This is a new effort to compile holdings data, long-range multiple agency requirements, and area-wide generic design and development standards. This is intended to help agencies and the city to note and develop relationships between different state uses and the other public and private development within the city. This data will be available so that other state agencies that have needs in the future, have one place to find out what is available and find out if there is some relationships that they can develop. It is currently in a conceptual stage. It will take form as the area plans get updated. It will be completed following final area plan update.

*Chair McMullen* commented that the overall coordination plan is potentially problematic in the sense that each individual area plan will be updated then some overview will be done to look at the relationships between those plans. This approach seems backwards. It would seem to him that a more effective approach would be to lay out some kind of guidelines then it would cast some shadow over all of the individual area plans. There is not a lot of information but this is what he read into what was provided.

*Bill Foster* explained that the whole idea of having a coordination plan is his. It is more about a legacy issue and how these plans were arrived at. These area plans have existed for many years but there has never been any attempt to link them in any way. The goal is to get a better handle on the major holdings on sustainable properties in the city of Salem and how they integrate and whether there are connections between some of the area plans with each other and how those plans fit with the City plans. The goal is to try to see how that links up. In the process of doing the area plan updates, the coordination plan will be a work in progress to look at what maybe should be area plan content and what should be coordination plan. The Area Plans were independent plans and the intent of the Coordination Plan is to show how they are linked.

*Robin Kirkpatrick* added that an additional challenge is that the area plans, as they currently exist, do not exist in a vacuum. As agencies are moving forward through their program time periods, they have needs that need to be met and it is crucial for them to be able to have an updated Area Plan that helps enable them to do what it is they are trying to achieve. We don't have the luxury of being able to just stop and set aside the area plans. The reason we are where we are with the Southeast Salem Area Plan is because the Department of Correction's requested it. They were getting a lot of pressure to be able to address the issues of how they are going to be able to deal with the property they do have. They came to DAS and said it would be of great value to them if DAS could get the Area Plan updated as soon as possible. It is not as straightforward and simple a process as originally expected. DAS will be working hard, once we get all the Area Plans updated, to start looking at it as a whole and see how the pieces fit together. It will evolve but it seems like a valuable tool that has been missing.

*Chair McMullen* agreed that it is a valuable tool. His concern is that the two documents are on a parallel track when they really need to be on the same track. The other thing he is concerned about is that it sounds like there will be more politicians talking to politicians than planners talking to planners and that always concerns him.

*Robin Kirkpatrick* responded that his focus will be to make it a useful tool involving the planning efforts that are required, not so much the politics. The plan is to keep the Board updated.

#### **Recognition of Bill Foster's retirement**

Following a short recess, former CPAB Chair, Bill Neland presented a plaque to Bill Foster in recognition of his service and outstanding contribution to the Capital Projects Advisory Board.

*Bill Neland* commented that he recently retired after chairing the Capital Projects Advisory Board for nine years. Upon hearing the announcement of Bill Foster's retirement he requested to make this presentation. Throughout his 40 years with the University System, he has had the privilege of working with Bill Foster in various arenas concerning state facilities.

### **C. Salem / Capitol Mall Area Project Reviews pursuant to OAR 125-125-0350 & 125-124-0450**

#### **C1. Status Report on Recommended Projects – Robin Kirkpatrick**

*Robin Kirkpatrick* gave a brief status report of projects that have come before this Board as referrals from the Capitol Mall Projects Review Committee. Two projects have been reviewed, the Capitol Mall Restrooms project and the Willson Park West End project. The Board recommended accepting the reports presented on those and recommended approval of both projects to the DAS Director. Director Ball approved both projects and budget considerations are what is going to enable those projects to move forward or not. One other Capitol Mall related project that did not come before this Board was the Wall of Water Fountain project because it was a maintenance issue.

*Bill Foster* stated that there would have been no need for review of the Wall of Water Fountain project by this Board because it was a part of the underground parking structure construction project. The proposed project is really a maintenance issue so it would not have required review. DAS is currently going through a process of prioritizing the

projects that have remaining funding needs for 2005-07 and this is one of those. As soon as the budget issues are developed and there is resolution as to how the funding for each of the projects is going to be dealt with, then further architectural work and construction will begin.

*Robin Kirkpatrick* added that it is his intention to keep status reports coming back to the Board on all projects reviewed so the Board can see the fruits of its actions.

**D. Agency Facility Plan Report pursuant to OAR 125-125-0150**

**D1. Oregon Youth Authority - Oak Creek Youth Correctional Facility Renovation – Phil Lemman, Deputy Director and Rex Emery, Facilities Manager**

Oregon Youth Authority (OYA) requested that the Capital Projects Advisory Board (CPAB) review a proposal for modifications to the Oak Creek Correction Youth Facility in Albany, Oregon.

*Phil Lemman* gave a brief background of the agency to put this project into context and explain the role this facility plays and why OYA is requesting these modifications. OYA is the state juvenile corrections agency. Any juvenile who commits an act which, if committed by an adult, would be called a crime can come to OYA if they commit that act between the ages of 12 and 18. If they are adjudicated by the juvenile court, or convicted in an adult court, OYA can keep them up to age 25. There are about 2,000 youth offenders either in their closed custody system which they call "youth correctional facilities" or in the community under supervision for probation or parole. OYA was carved out of the Department of Human Services (DHS) in 1995 and created as a separate agency following the passage of Measure 11. Measure 11 created lengthy adult sentences including young people ages 15 to 17 who commit the top-tier violent crimes (assaults, homicides, robberies or sex offenses). That law also expanded OYA jurisdiction to age 25. OYA went from what was part of the child welfare system that had 2 training schools, MacLaren in Woodburn and Hillcrest in Salem, to operating youth correctional facilities. These training schools had no fence, they were built in the 1920's and they are very campus-like because they are in fact schools. When OYA became a public agency in 1996, they started to build "youth correctional facilities" which can be called "prisons". Five regional correctional facilities were constructed throughout the state including the Oak Creek facility in Albany. These facilities are secure and fenced, ranging in size from 50 to 100 beds. Some of them have County Juvenile Detention facilities operating within the compound. In prisons, you have adults which are long-term stays, run by the state and jails which are short-term stays, run by the county. In the Juvenile system, there is the same parallel. They have "youth correctional facilities" on the state side and "juvenile detention facilities" on the local side. Because there was a statewide shortage of juvenile detention capacity at the same time, OYA included juvenile detention units as part of their planning and construction in some facilities.

OYA Regional Facilities were designed for short term stays, with two thoughts in mind: 1) The Regional facilities would serve as catchments so the youth offenders could be closer to their communities and families and to OYA services. Youth are paroled out of those facilities into their communities. 2) As youth stayed in the system longer, they would be funneled into the larger facilities like MacLaren and Hillcrest because those are more suited for long-term stays. When the recession hit, OYA closed all but one of those regional facilities. Oak Creek is the last one to be re-opened as part of the progression and improved budget circumstances. If you have 75 young people in a facility (5 girls and 70 boys) it does not create a good dynamic for those young women. OYA learned that lesson fairly quickly and centralized all the services for young women offenders in the Hillcrest facility in Salem. Over time, OYA moved all the young women out of the regional facilities into Hillcrest. The other thing they learned is that access to the same services does not mean equal access to services because girls present very different issues than boys do. A transitional program was opened in Corvallis so once the young women have served the majority of their sentence, they are transitioned back into the community through a half-way house or transition program where they are still in a secure environment. They can go out on supervision either to work or for education in the community and report back.

In 2003, the state passed two laws; an equal access to gender-appropriate services law and Senate Bill 267 which said that all the reformation programs must be based upon research. OYA was charged with making sure that equal opportunity existed for youth offenders of either gender to have the reformation services that they needed to turn their lives around and not commit a future crime. As a result of those two things, OYA appointed a work group of young women's advocates, researchers and juvenile justice stakeholders to look at OYA's services to young women and identify what they needed to do to improve their services and lower recidivism rates and serve that population better. In 2005, a report was issued with a series of comprehensive recommendations. Foremost, and the reason they are here today, is that one of those recommendations was to have a single-gender facility for young women offenders. Instead of

Hillcrest, where there are about 70 young women and more than 100 young men, they will open Oak Creek as a single-gender facility where only female offenders on the OYA side, will be housed. OYA explored options with the legislature. Two options were considered: 1) A young women's facility or 2) An in-take facility where they would bring in everyone and do all the assessments, find out what program is needed then move them throughout the system. There was no funding available to do either at the time and frankly they did not have a good plan to do it at that time.

An interim work group was formed in 2006 to figure out the mechanics and dynamics to make the recommendations a reality. The legislators became very interested in a gender-specific facility and OYA has support from everyone from former Speaker Minnis to Senator Kate Brown, from Wayne Scott to Peter Courtney. Despite the politics and the finance discussion engaged in a little earlier, this is something that has really caught the attention of a broad range of people who are trying to make it happen. OYA submitted a policy option package in their agency request budget that at that time, focused on improving their services at Hillcrest and at Corvallis House. After submitting the agency request, and as they went through the Governor's recommended process, they started to realize that they could achieve a gender-specific adult facility at Oak Creek with a reasonable amount of effort. The Governor's recommended budget contemplated and specifically stated that OYA wanted to re-open Oak Creek as a Young Women's facility but they did not have the project specifics at that time. As they got the Governor's Recommended Budget and began legislative involvement and found support there, they hired a contracted architect to look at the facility and do a detailed recommendation of what it would take to match the programmatic needs with the physical plant. OYA's budget has everything but the certificate of participation element and has passed both sides of the legislature and is on its way to the Governor's desk. OYA is here to ask CPAB to modify their Capital Construction Budget so they can prioritize their COP funding to make these changes a reality.

In terms of specifics, what they would like to do is use the first \$2M in COP authority for the physical plant modifications at Oak Creek. The anticipated opening date for transferring the young women is January, 2008. There is a lot of work to do and they would like to be able to get started.

The general things OYA is looking at doing are:

1. Sight / sound separation of the male offenders in the County Detention Unit away from the young women in the OYA facility. As mentioned earlier, this facility is shared with a short-term stay, county-operated detention unit. The modifications include glazing the windows and installing a small recreation yard on the outside of the walls of the facility.
2. Equal Access to recreation. This means extending the fence outside the facility and building either a softball diamond, soccer field or volleyball courts so the females have the same opportunity for those types of recreational activities as the male offenders in other facilities.
3. Make physical changes to create a program environment that is suitable for females and create a physically and emotionally safe environment. The work group said that an emotionally safe environment is critical to provide the same level of service provided for the young men. This means everything from removing urinals and making them all toilets; removing the welding shop and creating a culinary or other occupational opportunity area that is better suited to young women. There are more program spaces and more privacy areas with screens in some of the showers. Privacy needs are very different for young women than young men. They are trying to create a physical environment that matches that. There will be more social areas where they will do some acoustic softening and some general project work like that.

#### Questions:

*Bob Stutte* asked for clarification that the project is the Oak Creek facility which was previously closed.

*Phil* explained that the County kept operating the detention facility at Oak Creek for the past three years. The state-run operations ceased in that building but the County continued to operate their detention facility during this time. This project would re-open the state portion of the facility.

*Bob* further clarified that there would be 67 staff people and 75 youth offenders occupying this facility.

*Phil* responded that there are between 60 and 70 females at Hillcrest.

*Denny Nielsen* asked if that is a typical ratio of staff to inmates (nearly 1 to 1).

*Phil* responded that the facility runs 24 hours per day 7 days per week. One of the major differences between an adult correctional facility and a youth correctional facility with regard to staff ratio is the fact that youth correctional facilities are much more treatment and reformation oriented environments versus a supervision and control environment. OYA has a

statutory obligation to provide youth with schooling. Each offender must be sent through high school to get their GED or diploma so it is a more staff-intensive process.

*Bob Stutte* asked if half of the facility would be run by the County and half by OYA.

*Phil* responded that the ratio will be about 3 to 1. Right now there is an existing capacity for 75 state beds and about 20 county detention beds. There is room at the site to add another 25-bed unit for OYA but that would require additional capital construction.

*Bob Stutte* asked if it is efficient to have two different agencies operating in one facility and whether there is any cross-over.

*Phil* responded that it is a good partnership. The dollars and cents efficiencies are unknown. There is cross-over and the main reasons that the County is interested in having OYA back is because they would get the economies of scale for food service and a lot of the administrative management so it will be relieving the County of a burden that they have had to bear for the last three years.

*Bob Stutte* asked if there will be different eating facilities for the young men and young women.

*Phil* responded that meals will be served in the units. One of the differences between Oak Creek and Hillcrest is that they only have one school and one dining area so to have that completely walled off and separated is a much different thing. At Oak Creek there is a smaller, more contained population in one part of the facility so there is more room to work around things.

*Chair McMullen* inquired about deferred maintenance that was reported in a previous presentation and how will that become addressed.

*Phil* responded that this presentation doesn't speak to the deferred maintenance other than an update of the building maintenance plan is it relates to this project.

*Robin Kirkpatrick* informed the Board that the documents that were distributed for this meeting today are an update of the Space Needs Plan, the specific Construction Project Plan for this project and an update on the Building Maintenance Needs Plan. The Space Needs Plan and Building Maintenance Needs Plan were documents that OYA presented to the Board in February, 2006. The Board has not seen the updated versions before but the deferred maintenance information was simply re-stated as it was previously.

*Rex Emery* confirmed Robin's statement and added that there have been some things that have been accomplished on that list. For example, the tents (temporary structures) were removed. Only portions of the Space Needs and Maintenance Plans were revised that was pertinent to the Oak Creek renovation and the purposes of this meeting.

*Chair McMullen* stated that rarely will this Board pass up the opportunity to remind agencies of deferred maintenance and taking care of the facilities they already have, as new facilities are built. He then called for a motion to accept the report.

**Denny Nielsen** moved to accept the Oregon Youth Authority Construction Project Plan for the Oak Creek Youth Correctional Facility Renovation as submitted.

Second: **Peter Fernandez**

Denny Nielsen added that this was a very informative presentation and very well done.

**Tom McMullen** called for a vote on the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

## **E. Other Business**

### **E1. Update on requests from previous meeting – Robin Kirkpatrick**

Robin reported that all the requests have been taken care of. The Board's latest request was the public testimony process which was reviewed earlier in this meeting.

*Chair McMullen* noted that Bob Stutte was unable to attend last month's meeting where his concern regarding potential liability exposure for CPAB members was dealt with.

*Bob Stutte* confirmed that the opinion of the Assistant AG satisfied his question.

## E2. Central Facilities Planning Committee meeting participation by CPAB

*Robin Kirkpatrick* reminded the Board of the Central Facilities Planning Committee (CFPC) meeting on June 25<sup>th</sup>. In addition to the CFPC members, a number of the Agency Land Managers have also been invited. Approximately half of the Agency Land Managers are also the Facilities Managers. There are several items on the agenda more specifically related to land issues than facilities issues but this was a good opportunity to cover all issues while this group was together. Tom McMullen, Denny Nielsen, Vickie Harden Woods and Alan Maul will be attending the meeting. Other Board members were invited to attend if they choose. There will be an early part of the meeting in which an introduction of Robin Harpster will occur and one of the primary objects of this meeting will be to get feedback on how the review process has gone for the agencies during this last review cycle. The land issues will be addressed in the second hour of the meeting following a short recess to allow Board members to leave the meeting at that time. The location of the meeting is this room, Tillamook Room at the Department of Forestry.

*Bob Stutte* asked if any portion of this meeting will include a discussion of deferred maintenance.

*Robin* responded that there is an agenda item to discuss deferred maintenance and trying to establish consistency in dealing with it. It will be a follow-up discussion to the efforts the agencies went through earlier on with the Board to try to establish what the agencies deferred maintenance figures were. The conclusion of that process was that a number was accumulated that represented critical deferred maintenance for the agencies. The challenge with that process remains bringing consistency to the numbers that the agencies are reporting. Hopefully there will be some discussion amongst all of these facilities folks about the disparity and how deferred maintenance was looked at in that process. If it looks like it would be beneficial to have another meeting focused on deferred maintenance as a primary issue then it will be set up.

*Bob Stutte* commented that he did not understand the age of the deferred maintenance list that Oregon Youth Authority provided to the Board today.

*Robin Kirkpatrick* responded that this list is what OYA presented to CPAB in February, 2006.

*Bob* further stated that he understands OYA's agenda was to discuss only the Oak Creek Facility today. However, it would be more efficient if they were to come before CPAB and be able to discuss all of the issues in the Agency Facility Plan including the deferred maintenance.

*Robin Kirkpatrick* thanked Mr. Stutte for bringing that up. He would like to give the Board a little context to the presentation today. It was basically a result of a BAM Analyst working with the LFO Analyst and realizing when looking at the financing package that had been included in the OYA budget that there was a project that had not been reviewed by CPAB. OYA was requesting that a change be made to the capital construction bill for the 2007-09 budget that is going to be reviewed by the legislature any day. It is anticipated that it will be reviewed and approved by the end of June when this Legislative Session closes. The question was; could they include the funding request for the Oak Creek project in the capital budget bill? LFO's direction was that they were not to include any budget request for a project that has not been reviewed by CPAB. LFO was trying very diligently to stick to that requirement. So, in working with the BAM and LFO analysts, Robin indicated there was a CPAB meeting coming up so Robin worked with OYA to put a project presentation together in a manner in which it could be reviewed. Robin apologized for not having the full review that the Board would really like to have but there were circumstances requiring that the process be expedited in this case. OYA was very appreciative of that effort.

*Chair McMullen* advised that Robin reviewed this with him and he agreed the project should be brought to this meeting and the Board should, as best as they can, facilitate the Agencies getting through the processes set up. The Board has always done that and is strongly committed to making this process as accommodating as possible.

*Robin Kirkpatrick* advised that OYA does have another project that was included within this funding package in which there was planning funding included. Since that project impacts their 2009-11 budget and not the current budget, it was decided to wait until OYA returns with their 2009-11 presentation in the normal review cycle.

*Rex Emery* advised that a number of OYA staff and representatives (George Dunford, Phil Lemman, Rex Emery, Linda Gilbert, BAM Analyst for OYA, and Mr. Beaman, Architect) attended this meeting to be available to answer any questions the Board may present as they did not want to get stalled in this process. Also, he advised that OYA has just completed a six month deferred maintenance assessment of all their facilities. He would be pleased to show that to the Board earlier than the scheduled February meeting if necessary.

*Chair McMullen* responded that there was no need to move it up. The Board wants to make sure they are working on it and thinking about it.

*Chair McMullen* advised the Board members who are attending the CFPC meeting that they are there to listen and perhaps gain some insight as to how CPAB can do its job better or make other people's job easier or more understandable. After that meeting, the Board will receive a report and it will be discussed.

**E3. Next Meeting**

July 20, 2007 from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon at the Department of Forestry, Tillamook Conference Room.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:25 a.m.

*Prepared by Elaine G. Schacher, DAS Facilities*