

(Agenda of meeting was posted in the Courthouse Administration Lobby at 9:05 a.m. on Wednesday, February 18, 1998)

MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE
February 19, 1998

The Board of County Commissioners of Tulsa County met at 9:30 a.m., with the following members present: John Selph, Chairman, Robert N. Dick, Lewis Harris. Members absent: none. Others present: Sheriff Stanley Glanz, William LaFortune, Joan Hastings, Wayne Carr, Buck Rudd, Linda Johnston, Claudette Selph, Fred Morgan, Dick Blakeley, Janelle Steltzlen, Fred Emmer, Paul Coury, Marshall Stewart, John Harris, Clayton Edwards, and Melody Bishop.

Chairman called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m., and the following business was transacted:

Glanz announced that the Justice Department will be here March 10 and 11, 1998. Chairman, Glanz, and Morgan will walk through the jail in the next couple of weeks. The jail population today is 916 inmates. There is a Jail Overcrowding Committee meeting scheduled for this afternoon and they will be reviewing booking and court flow which sometimes creates a problem for the jail population.

Claudette Selph, Executive Director of The Parent/Child Center of Tulsa was present to give a status report on the Child Abuse Prevention/Family Support Services Grant that was funded through the City of Tulsas Community Development Block Grant, effective October 1, 1997 for one year. This program provides group activities for families to help relieve the stress involved with being temporarily without a home while residing at the Tulsa Community Emergency Shelter. Since inception The Parent/Child Center counselors have served 135 adults, and 222 children. Volunteers are also being recruited to help work with the children at the shelter.

Emmer, from the City of Tulsas Urban Development Department, requested the Boards approval of an agreement granting a five year ad valorem tax abatement (as authorized in 62 O.S. 1997, Section 850, et seq. for renovation of the Ambassador Hotel located at 13th and Main Street, to create a dining room and 53 rooms for lodging. Motion made by Dick, seconded by Harris, to approve the agreement and authorize execution of the agreement by the Chairman, subject to approval by the District Attorneys office. Upon roll call: Harris, yes; Dick, yes; Selph, yes. Motion carried. (CMF #167114)

LaFortune was present to discuss his letter to the Board dated 2-17-98, regarding a shortage of office space in the District Attorneys (D.A.s) office and to propose a partial solution for consideration. Blakeley and Morgan have looked at commercial property near the courthouse and found that space is available at \$9.00/square foot in the Denver Building, located at 7th Street and Denver Avenue. Following discussion regarding the rental costs in general, a \$15,780 one-time expense to equip the facility for mainframe access, and a \$270 monthly charge for a required T-1 telephone system connection, the Board directed Edwards and Rudd to (1) work with the D.A.s office to find space suitable for the D.A.s needs and (2) at the same time, explore the possibility of moving another department (which would not require such a one-time expense for mainframe access) into rented quarters and then make the exiting departments space available to the D.A.s office. Edwards will report back to the Board at the March Management Conference.

Motion made by Selph, seconded by Dick, that the Board enter into Executive Session for the purpose of discussing the case of Stanley Glanz, Sheriff of Tulsa County v. Board of County Commissioners of Tulsa County and Tulsa County Criminal Justice Authority; Case No. CJ-97-6125. Upon roll call: Harris, yes; Dick, yes; Selph, yes. Motion carried.

Executive Session began at 10:22 a.m.

Motion made by Dick, seconded by Selph, that this Executive Session be closed. Upon roll call, Harris, yes; Dick, yes; Selph, yes. Motion carried.

Executive Session ended at 10:54 a.m.

Chairman deferred to LaFortune for comment regarding Case No. CJ-97-6125. LaFortune responded that Blakeley had corresponded on February 10, with a follow-up letter on clarification on February 18, 1998, regarding the District Attorneys (D.A.s) offices disqualification in the subject Case; that pursuant to Rule 1.7 of the Supreme Courts Rules of Professional Conduct, the D.A.s office believed that it would have to disqualify itself from representing the Board of County Commissioners (Board) in said Case by reason of a conflict of interest due to its multiple representation of multiple clients; and that what was not discussed in the letters and what the D.A.s office is going to pursue is the exception to that Rule that exception being when two of his clients are on opposing sides in a matter to be litigated, the lawyer must have the consent of one client before he can represent the other client in the same dispute. LaFortune stated they will advise Glanz in writing of the conflict and the Rule and if Glanz consents to the D.A.s representation, then the D.A.s office would be able to go forward with representation of the Board. The D.A.s office will advise the Board of Glanzs response. Chairman noted that if Glanz will consent, then the D.A.s office will continue to represent the Board and the Board will not be required to hire private counsel, which the Board prefers not to do.