



BENTON COUNTY HISTORIC COURTHOUSE ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Meeting Minutes Friday January 20, 2022

Members Attending: HCAC Vice Chair: Jill **Van Buren**, Courthouse Preservation Committee representative; HCAC Chair: Chris **Westfall**, Oregon Judicial Department, Trial Court Administrator; Jessica **Hougen**, Benton County Historical Society; Roz **Keeney**, representing Preservation WORKS; Scott **McClure**, representing the Historic Resources Commission; Peter **Betjemann**, OSU, Director of Arts and Education, College of Liberal Arts; Bob **Richardson**, OSU, Senior Land Use Planner

Advisory Staff Attending: Jesse **Ott** Deputy Director of Benton County Natural Areas, Parks & Events; Inga **Williams**, Benton County Community Development Associate Planner;

Others Attending: Lizz Gustin, Benton County Natural Areas, Parks & Events Administrative Assistant II, HCAC Recorder

- I. Meeting called to order 1009
- II. Approval of December 16, 2022 minutes; Hougen motions to approve, Westfall seconds; Approved no opposed
- III. Citizens' call to order; **Westfall** stated none present nor submitted.
- IV. Subcommittee assignments for deeper review of each repurposing type: **Westfall**- Asked about sub committees last meeting however, information has just been gathered so we will break out in the committees this discussion. Three topics we will break out into are as follows: 1. Children/Family 2. Arts and Culinary 3. Government Civic. Discussion on merging two topics was had by all. **Westfall** last meeting we chose the 3 we would go forward with so making another subcommittee isn't intended. **Wyse**- can this not be hashed out in a subcommittee? **Westfall**- yes I do not want this to jump out to be a 4<sup>th</sup> **Keeney**- multiuse this will have them all combined representing more than one thing. **McClure**- if the bldg. remains government county use then no retro fit required but changes to civilian use then this retro fit is mandatory. **Westfall**- yes in a sense we would late make that seismic upgrade vs needing to do so now. **VanBuren**- I feel what scott is saying place into to two categories of government or not government. **McClure**- or yes retro fit; no retro fit. **Kenney**- regardless the report needs to indicate a retro fit. **Wyse**- BOC wants flexibility placing the retro fit but not necessary mandate it within the report. **VanBuren**- yes somewhere down the line it would need this but a positive

omitting it on the report. **Hougen-** yes we decided earlier to put this retro fit to the side as it falls in both the PRO and CON sections of each. **Keeney-** yes we definitely do not lead with this we lead with the fun things to ensure fundings and place the retro fit to the back ground. **Richardson-** there was a focus last time on the topics and then now we can see what is appropriate under each theme. **Westfall-** this is blending into our next topic here I agree seismic will need to be discussed but it is not the charge of the committee to make how the building is treated in support of our decision. **Keeney-** we want to get the tone and citizens behind the reuse of this building. **Betjemann-** I feel your subcommittee will do this deeper dive, what kind of competition will we accidentally trigger, work into 2 sub government and civic – one ties our hands the other does not – within those committees you can divide out to dig deeper. **Westfall-** this AC gilbert analog is a real stretch. **Hougen-** I just want to explain the competition I was referring to is the nonprofit. **Betjemann-** correct we could even spread the donors too thin. **Keeney-** I have people asking what about this and what about that I feel we need to ensure we explain in the report how we go to this conclusion. Making change to culture and arts from culinary arts keeping culinary in the culture parts – all agreed no opposed. **Westfall-** we should agree in general how we will deep dive setting parameters on what needs to return to the whole committee so each meeting we will have a report from the sub committees – let's take a look at our time line. **Keeney-** so draft report is due in Feb. **Westfall-** nothing is chiseled in stone – we should at least show in the report that we are continuing on the deep dives within the 2 sub committees and the final report not due until Sept. **Keeney-** is that what the board will be okay with then Nancy? **Wyse-** yes. **Keeney-** then this is doable. **Westfall-** this will happen after the bond May / June we can look at public engagement – a robust report from the sub committees prior to the public engagement allowing us to pivot after the discussions refining it all. **VanBuren-** so we will take back the public response back to the report. **Westfall-** well I do want to be open to the idea and not spoon feed information out to all – I envision the public engagement may look as our rough draft for the final report. **VanBuren-** so we will present to the commissioners the publics input? **Keeney-** we need to win the public over, need that spark showing a contribution for them. **Wyse-** do we have an artist to represent this? **Westfall-** we do have one for the JCIP maybe we can look into that. **McClure-** is there not a structure on how the public outreach goes? **Wyse-** there is but we are looking to make this more engaging. **Westfall-** there is a public outreach we would make connection with before

**Westfall-** two groups now, I would like each group to vote a member to be lead. **VanBuren-** we will need to keep them going so we have no wanders. **Keeney-** I am retired I will need structure to show up. **Westfall-** each committee to get together however you want encouraging sooner than later and will need to provide a monthly report to the full committee in goal that Robust report to the committee I need to get a sense of what do we need from the subs as a whole – a written report? We just superficially touched on pros and cons as a group we will need further sense of these pros and cons. **Wyse-** this would be dependent on how you get the public to participate – I think we should next month have the subs come back with what topics they will deep dive. **Betjemann-** potentially the first stage each of the chairs will have 20 minutes of floor time to present. **Westfall-** yes nicely played as this will place the writing to Lizz ☺

**Hougen-** how many days do you need to give the public for a notice of public meeting?

**Westfall-** I think 10 days but will look into this -when we come back next meeting we will have a better sense – I would still keep track in the sub committees similar to what we have done here

**Wyse-** refer back to the study

Need a DLR study in print – Jesse

**Hougen-** will take on the initial meeting for their sub committee

**Westfall-** will take on his

V. Preparations and planning for drafting preliminary report to Board of Commissioners.

**Westfall-** we have touched on this – envisions a 2 page over view. **Keeney-** who is writing this?

**Westfall-** I need to get with Jesse to see his capacity. **Keeney-** yes Jesse would be logical

**Richardson-** key thing to get to the report we looked broadly and chiseled it down to these two – will we get a nod or a no from the commissioners then we will feel comfortable moving forward

**Westfall-** yes we will check back in with the BOC vs waiting till September to return with the report. **Wyse-** yes we will nod and speak up on a report presented **Westfall-** our last meeting the only option off the table is demolition looking for good 2-3 topics

VI. Next Steps – What are we missing?

**Keeney-** what kind of support are we getting for presentations? **Westfall-** I want to find these people to bring to the meetings. **Keeney-** can't ask PR to make it look great if they are not part of this. **Richardson-** next couple of months what are we to gain from it? do we focus on the one or 2 concepts or do we just open everything and retain the publics opinion. **Westfall-** I agree in getting a public sense. **Keeney-** yes that is why we need a PR person. **Richardson-** we need to be clear to the public whatever it is vs them telling us. **Westfall-** get with Jesse on capacity of the county drafting this report preliminary report – good space moving forward. **Keeney-** with Porsche gone are we not missing a critical role we need that grounding of money. **Hougen-** I do not feel Kate's position has been fulfilled.

Discussion on replacement people for this committee had by all with names flying out. **Westfall-** will get with Jesse to look into a county employee to cover the empty spaces

VII. Other:

**Keeney-** thinking out loud what if there is an overwhelming thing they want nothing to do with this – they do not support the Justice center anyhow why are you moving out anyway- so demolishing not being a thing is our final line. **Westfall-** yes we will need thick skin presenting to the public there will be push back but majority in this room are prepared for this with past customer feedback meetings 500+ accumulative within the room. **Keeney-** working with other groups it is nice to know Chambers, County or Museum are backing it – Having the tour people is a blessing as they know what we need to get them to come. **Hougen-** I think Roz is on the right track need to be transparent to the public the "WHO" was on the committee at least which group they actually come from. **McClure-** the historic preservation group feels that the diversity on this committee is well represented. **Keeney-** I have not presented back to the group I represent as things are too busy for me. **Wyse-** so maybe all will need to bring this draft report to their respective groups then we come back and engage. **Richardson-** we could set up booths at the

farmers market – get the public engaged. Keeney- can we go back to the architect report as they did the report and compared across the country. **Westfall-** DLR is now contracted with the county for JSCIP. **Richardson-** how far do we go on a deep dive – we spend our time to come up with ideas seems like no matter at the end we will have great ideas – a feasibility will need to still be done – if that is true then we need to communicate this **Westfall-** Paul could help and clarify on some feasibility for the building itself. **Betjemann-** we talk a lot of the process and cannot wait to get in the sub committees to allow us to get more in depth of needs.

**VIII.** Adjournment 1130