

EUGENE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY



Approval of City Council Minutes

Meeting Date: August 9, 2010
Department: City Manager's Office
www.eugene-or.gov

Agenda Item Number: 2A
Staff Contact: Beth Forrest
Contact Telephone Number: 541-682-5882

ISSUE STATEMENT

This is a routine item to approve City Council meeting minutes.

SUGGESTED MOTION

Move to approve the minutes of the June 23, 2010, Work Session, the June 28, 2010, Work Session and the July 26, 2010, Work Session.

ATTACHMENTS

- A. June 23, 2010, Work Session
- B. June 28, 2010, Work Session
- C. July 26, 2010, Work Session

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Staff Contact: Beth Forrest
Telephone: 541-682-5882
Staff E-Mail: beth.l.forrest@ci.eugene.or.us

MINUTES

City Council
McNutt Room—Eugene City Hall
777 Pearl Street—Eugene, Oregon

June 23, 2010
Noon

PRESENT: Alan Zelenka, Mike Clark, Betty Taylor, Jennifer Solomon, George Poling, Chris Pryor, George Brown, members.

ABSENT: Andrea Ortiz.

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the June 23, 2010, work session of the Eugene City Council to order.

**A. WORK SESSION:
West Eugene EmX Update**

The council was joined by Lane Transit District (LTD) Board of Directors Chair Mike Eyster and EmX Project Manager Tom Schwetz. LTD General Manager Mark Pangborn and LTD Board member Gary Gillespie were also present, as were Rob Inerfeld of the City's Transportation Division and City Attorney Kathryn Brotherton.

Mr. Eyster noted the data-driven process LTD was going through to develop its alternatives for an EmX route to serve West Eugene. He said the LTD board would discuss the elimination of some of the alternatives under discussion to this point very soon and he wanted to share that information with the City Council.

Mr. Schwetz provided a PowerPoint presentation on the West Eugene EmX alignment selection process, noting the original 58 options under consideration, which led the Federal Transit Administration to suggest that LTD instead go through an alternatives analysis to narrow the options to a more reasonable number. He said that analysis involved public input opportunities, a technical advisory committee, and a citizen committee that included residents of the potentially affected areas.

Mr. Schwetz characterized the new process as a combination of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and alternatives analysis and said it would lead to a locally preferred alternative. He discussed the advantages of the alternatives analysis approach, emphasizing the local nature of the process, its flexibility, and the opportunities for collaboration it provided.

Mr. Schwetz noted the criteria used to evaluate the options.

Mr. Schwetz reviewed the terminus and alignment options being considered for elimination from further consideration by LTD. Terminus options recommended for elimination included both full-length terminus options at Ed Cone and Ed Cone/Willow Creek and the Seneca terminus option. Alignment alternatives recommended for elimination included both Amazon alignments and West 7th Place. Mr. Schwetz shared a map showing ridership for the West 7th Place option.

Mr. Schwetz discussed options on West 11th Avenue west of Garfield. He emphasized LTD's confidence that it

could make West 11th Avenue work as an EmX route.

Mr. Schwetz reviewed LTD's recommendations for options to retain, which included:

- West 13th Avenue between the Downtown Eugene Station to West 11th Avenue via Chambers Street (this alternative includes two design options, a two-lane transitway or a frontage alley design option on West 13th Avenue between Polk and Taylor streets);
- West 6th/7th avenues between the Downtown Eugene Station to West 11th Avenue via Garfield (this alternative includes four design options: a Lincoln/Charnelton couplet or a two-way bus lane on Charnelton, and either adding or reassigning an existing lane on West 6th and West 7th avenues between Blair and Fillmore streets);
- West 11th Avenue (between Garfield Street and Commerce Street terminus)

Mr. Schwetz reported that LTD had received information from ODOT that indicated reassigning a lane on 6th/7th avenues was problematic. He reminded the council that 6th/7th avenues were ODOT facilities, and ODOT would be looking closely at LTD's impacts on those roads.

Mr. Schwetz reviewed the next steps in the process, which included board approval to narrow the options, the preparation of an Alternatives Analysis Report, followed by release of the report and the start of the locally-preferred alternative decision-making process.

Mayor Piercy believed it was wise to narrow the options at this point given the cost, time, and expense involved in analyzing 58 options. She wanted to learn more about 7th Place as an option. Mayor Piercy suggested that members of the West Eugene Collaborative could host a meeting of business owners in the West 11th Avenue area to facilitate further discussion, and offered her assistance in making that happen. Mr. Eyster endorsed the suggestion.

Mayor Piercy solicited questions and comments from the council.

Mr. Clark also wanted to hear more about the 7th Place alternative. He determined from Mr. Schwetz that the most compelling reason for eliminating its option was its longer travel time; Mr. Schwetz pointed out that the travel time was longer than the no-build option. Mr. Clark expressed concern about the impact of an EmX route on businesses along West 11th Avenue, west of Garfield Street. He appreciated that LTD proposed to mitigate that impact on a case-by-case basis, but he questioned if all impacts could be mitigated. For example, removal of parking could have a detrimental effect on a business. In addition, he perceived issues with the further constriction of West 11th Avenue, pointing out that many buildings had been constructed near the street, and there was no way to widen the street, and adding an EmX route could create a bottleneck. He hoped LTD could study a route that traveled relatively near by and avoided harmful effects. He urged LTD to retain the West 7th Place option, until it could engage more people in discussion.

Ms. Taylor agreed with Mr. Clark's points about West 7th Place, and the need to engage more people. She determined from Mr. Schwetz that the City had jurisdiction over 6th and 7th avenues, east of Jefferson Street. She continued to support a Highway 99 option but acknowledged that option had been eliminated.

Ms. Taylor observed that the locally preferred alternative for residents and businesses adjacent to the proposed EmX route seemed to be the no-build alternative.

Mr. Zelenka shared the concern expressed by Mayor Piercy and Mr. Clark, about removing the West 7th Place

option. However, he agreed with the Mayor it was wise to narrow the options, and there appeared to be a good rationale for removing the options mentioned by Mr. Schwetz.

Mr. Zelenka said his experience with the current Eugene route indicated that bus rapid transit seemed to work better with a dedicated lane. He asked how much of the West 11th Avenue corridor route would consist of dedicated lanes. Mr. Schwetz said that LTD proposed to add a lane in each direction. The lane would not impede egress, would allow turning movements, and would improve the flow of traffic. It lacked a hard curb so that motorists could cross it. It moved the buses out of the through-travel lanes, and pulled right-turn traffic out of the flow of traffic. He did not expect that LTD would make traffic conditions on West 11th Avenue, worse than they currently were.

Mr. Zelenka believed that the Eugene-Springfield EmX route had been “a spectacular success.” He rode the route often and found EmX to be a good system. He speculated that as the community grew more dense, such a system would be even more valuable in getting people out of their cars and into transit. The next corridor would be even more important and he thought the option created a “significant alternative.” He did not want to see the recommendation option end up being the “no-build” alternative.

Mr. Schwetz agreed with Mr. Zelenka that exclusive rights-of-way were useful but pointed out that several segments of the first two routes ran in mixed traffic. He said that eventually, LTD might be able to establish exclusive lanes on those routes, but he believed the beauty of the system was its flexibility, and that it could be made to work with the state of the community as it was today as well as tomorrow.

Mr. Zelenka agreed with Mr. Clark that there were places on West 11th Avenue, where the construction of buildings up the street had created a problem.

Mr. Zelenka was willing to look at all of the options but emphasized the importance of dedicated lanes.

As a member of the West Eugene Collaborative, Mr. Pryor agreed that currently, West 7th Place was not viable, due to a lack of ridership. However, he agreed with Mayor Piercy and Mr. Clark that the option should be retained to see if it could be made to work.

Mr. Pryor acknowledged that LTD was being responsive to the community in the number of options that it considered, but he was pleased to see the options narrowed and particularly commended the elimination of the Amazon Creek option.

Mr. Pryor said he kept hearing the question of whether EmX was needed in the first place. He believed that public transit was desirable, but that local corridor service was getting more expensive to offer, and EmX was an affordable option to that existing service that still got people to their destinations quickly and efficiently. He perceived EmX as a replacement for corridor service, rather than an add-on to corridor service.

Mr. Pryor thought that LTD needed to put the routes where people lived and worked now and where they would live and work in the future in a way that did not disrupt what was in place now. Mr. Pryor did not want to see LTD implement EmX in a way that required the condemnation of property, the construction of infrastructure, or street widening.

Mr. Brown was not convinced that the no-build alternative was not the best option. He noted the cost involved in acquiring property to facilitate the route, which would be between \$105 and \$113 million in today’s dollars. He

determined from Mr. Schwetz that the local match would be about 20 to 40 percent of that total, and indicated LTD intended to seek State funding for the match. Mr. Brown observed that the cost involved was a lot of money to save three minutes of travel time.

Mr. Brown agreed with the mayor and other councilors about the West 7th Place option, and suggested that the area might further develop if LTD ran an EmX route through the area. He acknowledged that the businesses and jobs that people were trying to reach now, existed on West 11th Avenue.

Mr. Brown noted the e-mail sent to the council by Ilona Kolezar of the West Eugene EmX Extension Steering Committee proposing that Pearl and Oak streets be added back to the options under consideration, and he supported the suggestion because of the potential loss of parking spaces on Lincoln and Charnelton streets.

Ms. Solomon determined from Mr. Schwetz that the option costs included the costs of property acquisition. She further determined from Mr. Schwetz that even though it did not have an elected board of directors, LTD was allowed to condemn property. Ms. Solomon expressed concern that a non-elected board could initiate condemnation of private property.

Mayor Piercy said while she wanted to retain the West 7th Place option, she thought that West 11th Avenue, was the option that reached the most businesses and jobs, and was closest to the existing neighborhoods. She said the farther a resident was from the route, the less easy it was to use the system. She reminded the council of the MAX system in Portland, which the community had initially resisted, but which she asserted had been “proven to be good to businesses and good for mobility.”

Mayor Piercy hoped that at some future point the community had the capacity to consider the connection between the rail and bus systems. She said that the community needed to prepare for the needs of both today and tomorrow.

Mr. Pryor wanted to avoid an artificial conflict between the benefit to business and the benefit to the public. He urged a balanced approach as LTD moved forward. He encouraged LTD to consider a West 11th Avenue alternative, that did not require a lot of infrastructure. That possibility was creating considerable concern among West 11th Avenue business owners. He wanted to believe that LTD could provide the service along West 11th Avenue, without the need to construct infrastructure that disrupted business, and asked LTD to keep that in mind as it explored that corridor.

Mr. Clark was also interested in hearing more about the no-build option in terms of its impact on people.

Mr. Clark was not convinced that it was wise for LTD to make such a heavy capital investment when the organization was facing operational funding shortfalls. He acknowledged the funding streams involved were different. He welcomed more information about the concept that EmX would lead to smaller operational budgets, as Mr. Pryor’s remarks seemed to suggest.

Mr. Clark asked if LTD had secured funding for the West Eugene EmX extension. Mr. Schwetz said that LTD had yet to begin the actual grant application process. It had to go through the locally preferred alternative process before the Federal Transit Administration would consider a grant application. Mr. Clark asked if LTD would expect the region to fund the system if that funding was not forthcoming. Mr. Eyster assured Mr. Clark that would not happen.

Mr. Zelenka said LTD’s goal was that the system would be completely funded by the State and federal

governments. He asserted that such transit projects were good for businesses; they enhanced businesses along the route. He further asserted that Portland's experience was a great example of that. Mayor Piercy agreed.

Mr. Zelenka said the decision facing the community was a 30-40 year decision, not a decision for tomorrow, and the community needed to consider greenhouse gases and the impact transit could have in reducing greenhouse gases, which he maintained was significant.

Mr. Zelenka said it was not enough to provide alternatives, but those alternatives needed to be convenient and easy for people to use. He believed that EmX was successful for those reasons and would be successful in West Eugene for the same reasons.

Mr. Eyster acknowledged the City's commitment to reducing greenhouse gases, congestion, and reliance on fossil fuels, and said EmX realized those goals and moved people cost-effectively while promoting businesses along the way.

B. WORK SESSION:
Civilian Review Board Annual Report Presentation

The council was joined by Police Auditor Mark Gissiner and Civilian Review Board Chair Kate Wilkinson. Civilian Review Board members Steve McIntyre, Bernadette Conover, and Eric Van Houten were also present.

Mayor Piercy expressed appreciation for the remarks of the Civilian Review Board (CRB) regarding the work of the Police Auditor, and said those comments made her feel like the City was making progress. She noted the CRB's request for a review of the ordinance that governed its operations.

Ms. Wilkinson highlighted the recommendations in the Civilian Review Board's report, beginning on page 3 of the Agenda Item Summary.

- *Community impact case designations*—now only the auditor could classify a case as community impact case, which impacted how the board could handle a case; many members of the public had suggested that the board should have a role in that decision or make the decision. Ms. Wilkinson acknowledged there was no consensus on the board in regard to the issue.
- *Information/disclosure*—the board wanted to provide as much information as possible to the public, but members of the public complained about not being able to see things such as the Internal Affairs report. Ms. Wilkinson acknowledged the constraints of State law.
- *CRB authority to order cases reopened*—a CRB majority had voted to order the City to reopen an investigation, which led to a legal opinion from the City Attorney that the board lacked that authority. The ordinance allows the CRB to reopen community impact cases but was silent in regard to closed cases.
- *Exception of good cause exception to six-month filing deadline*—the ordinance allowed the auditor to make an exception without providing a definition of "good cause." The CRB believed such a definition was needed.

Mayor Piercy left the meeting and turned the gavel over to Mr. Clark.

Mr. Clark expressed appreciation for the work of the CRB and noted that he and Ms. Taylor had the opportunity to discuss such issues with Mr. Gissiner frequently. He noted the CRB report was prepared by the chair and vice

chair and asked if it was reviewed and voted on by the CRB. Ms. Wilkinson said that the report was circulated among members, and revisions were suggested and made, and the report was again circulated. There was no formal vote on the report but she believed members were in general agreement.

Mr. Clark noted the CRB's recommendation to form another Police Auditor Ordinance Review Committee (PAORC) and requested Mr. Gissiner's comments on that subject as well as on the remainder of the report.

Mr. Gissiner believed the report represented consensus on the part of the CRB. He suggested that the council keep in mind that several CRB members were relatively new. He was hesitant to ask for major changes in the ordinance until the current CRB had gotten more experience. Speaking to the recommendations, Mr. Gissiner noted that the decision regarding who could designate a community impact case was a council decision. He believed that the Police Auditor's Office provided as much information to the public as was possible in a manner consistent with State law. He had discussed the CRB's concerns with the State Attorney General, who indicated he planned to offer changes to State law regarding personnel records.

Mr. Clark asked what was uncertain about State law as it related to confidentiality. Ms. Wilkinson said that one of the State statutes that discussed personnel records spoke to disclosing the record if it was considered to be in the public interest, but there was no statutory direction as to who decided that or what was in the public interest. She did not think the City Attorney had issued such a definition, and the Attorney General had declined to respond to the CRB's inquiry.

City Attorney Glenn Klein reported that there were no cases that defined what was in the public interest for purposes of the statute in question. He said that the City Code or City Charter guided the City in regard to who made the determination as to what was in the public interest. In regard to the Internal Affairs files, the City Manager or Police Chief made that determination. If someone disagreed, that individual could challenge the determination under State law, and the District Attorney would rule on the subject. That decision could also be appealed to Circuit Court. He had advised the CRB that determination was not within its purview or the purview of the Police Auditor. Mr. Clark said that the issue did not appear to be one of confidentiality, but one of authority over who determined what was in the public interest. Ms. Wilkinson agreed.

Mr. Gissiner said the Attorney General had indicated there was no legislative definition of "public interest" and he believed one was needed. Currently, the Attorney General made that determination on behalf of the State.

Mr. Gissiner noted that many of the CRB's recommendations were related to collective bargaining agreements, and he deferred to the attorneys as to whether one superseded the other. He did not think that Oregon had yet had a court case that stipulated a collective bargaining agreement overrode an ordinance, or vice versa.

Speaking to Mr. Clark's question about reconstituting the PAORC, Mr. Gissiner said he could see a case being made for that. He reiterated his concern about the need for the CRB to gain more experience with the revised ordinance.

Mr. Clark said he thought the PAORC did a thorough job and he was happy with the way the revised ordinance had worked to this point. He believed that it might be premature to form another review committee at this time.

Mr. Zelenka thanked Ms. Wilkinson and the other CRB members and expressed appreciation for the board's work. He believed that eventually the City would want to review the ordinance again, but pointed out that the last review was fairly recent. He suggested that the CRB begin to compile a list of issues for future review.

However, he thought it would be good for the CRB to work with the revised ordinance and get more experience before returning to the ordinance.

Speaking to the Public Records Law, Mr. Zelenka suggested that if the CRB had specific ideas for changes to the law, it should forward them to the Council Committee on Intergovernmental Relations to consider as a legislative priority. He was interested in pursuing a legislative definition of “public interest.”

Mr. Zelenka did not believe that a collective bargaining agreement could trump a municipal ordinance.

Mr. Zelenka said the PAORC purposely created a strong auditor’s position to ensure the authority was vested in the auditor, and the CRB was advisory to the auditor. He was unsure he wanted to change that as he believed it was a still a good thing to have a strong auditor.

Mr. Pryor commended the work of the CRB. He agreed that the CRB would benefit from more experience but he did want to see its concerns addressed in an effective way at some point.

Mr. Pryor was pleased with the direction the Police Auditor’s Office had taken over the past four years. He thought the City had stayed on the right course. It acted thoughtfully, deliberately, and collaboratively. He agreed with the comments he had heard from Mr. Clark and Mr. Zelenka in regard to forming a new PAORC at this time.

Mr. Gissiner suggested that staff could consider how to address the issues related to information disclosure, as opposed to the City being forced into a court situation that took years to resolve.

Ms. Taylor agreed that the council should wait a while before reconsidering the ordinance. She thought the CRB should be a smaller body of three to five and pointed out it took longer for a larger group of people to work together effectively. She suggested that the CRB could serve as the next PAORC. She suggested that it might be that the CRB should be able to overrule the Police Auditor in some instances as well as reopen cases, and recommended the council discuss the issue in more detail with advice from the CRB.

Mr. Clark recognized CRB member Steve McIntyre for comment.

Mr. McIntyre did not believe the issues that the CRB raised were related to its lack of experience, but rather to ambiguities in the ordinance. He said that clarity in regard to those ambiguities would make the CRB’s job easier. He suggested the council consider the CRB’s request through that lens. He thought the CRB was working well as a body and encouraged the council to attend its meetings. Ms. Wilkinson agreed. She anticipated that some of the same issues that prompted the recommendations could come up again and the CRB would be in the same position. She said the CRB’s suggestion for a new PAORC was just one idea for how to move forward.

Mr. Clark agreed with Mr. Zelenka that the City Council created the system with a strong auditor in mind and he was happy with that decision. He saw no ambiguity in the current ordinance in regard to the auditor’s ability to determine what is good cause. However, he could appreciate that when there was disagreement between the auditor and the CRB one way to address it was through a new arrangement. He anticipated the council would discuss the issues again in a work session.

Mr. Brown commended the work of the CRB. He agreed with Mr. McIntyre that the recommendations were not

born of inexperience. He thought the CRB was merely requesting clarity on the issues involved. He thought that the issue related to disclosure was somewhat out of the City's hands given that it was governed by State law. He said that Oregon was quite restrictive in what was disclosed. Mr. Brown believed that the council should clarify the other two issues and suggested that the CRB be asked to come up with some recommendations.

Mr. Zelenka distinguished the issues of definitions and clarifications from that of structural authority changes. He believed that issues related to authority and structural changes needed to be reviewed by a new PAORC. He also believed that the lack of a definition of "good cause" was not an issue of structural authority but rather something that the auditor and CRB could work through and bring back to the council. He suggested that the CRB continue to identify such issues and recommend remedies.

Mr. Zelenka expressed appreciation for the CRB's evaluation of the Police Auditor. He agreed with the remarks of Mayor Piercy regarding that assessment and commended the work of Mr. Gissiner.

Mr. Gissiner agreed with Mr. McIntyre about some of the clarity issues raised by the CRB and the agreements that had been written before he arrived; some of them created ambiguities, depending on one's interpretation.

Mr. Gissiner commended the preparation and hard work of the CRB.

Speaking to Mr. Zelenka's earlier remark that a municipal ordinance trumped a collective bargaining agreement, Mr. Klein indicated that the CRB's protocols were part of the City's collective bargaining agreement with the police union, and when that agreement was renegotiated, the City and union could revisit them. The collective bargaining agreement did not override the local ordinance, but if a local ordinance inconsistent with the agreement was passed after the contract was signed by the manager, that ordinance was not consistent with State law and was unenforceable. If management and the union could not reach agreement, the issue went to arbitration, and the arbitrator was not bound by local ordinances.

Mr. Clark adjourned the work session at 1:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jon Ruiz,
City Manager

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)

MINUTES

Eugene City Council
 Work Session Council Chambers – City Hall
 777 Pearl Street—Eugene, Oregon

June 28, 2010
 5:30 p.m.

COUNCILORS PRESENT: George Brown, Mike Clark, Andrea Ortiz, George Poling, Chris Pryor, Betty Taylor, Alan Zelenka.

COUNCILORS ABSENT: Jennifer Solomon.

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy convened the meeting of the Eugene City Council.

A. Committee Reports and Items of Interest from Mayor, City Council, and City Manager

Ms. Piercy reported the *Art and the Vineyard* festival and the *Butte to Butte* were scheduled for the first weekend in July, and she would lead the *First Friday Artwalk* on July 2, 2010. There was an HIV Alliance press conference on June 29, regarding a proclamation in support of National HIV Testing Day. She would attend a One-on-One session at Albertson's, on Coburg Road, with Mr. Poling. She would represent the City at a reception for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) in Salem on June 30. The airport runway opening celebration was scheduled for July 2. Downtown Eugene would host a street parade and opening ceremony for the Pan American Masters Basketball Championships at the Fifth Street Public Market on July 3.

Mr. Clark reported that he and Ms. Taylor continued to meet weekly with Police Auditor Mark Gissiner, with the next meeting occurring on June 29, 2010. He enjoyed the recent Joint Elected Officials meeting and looked forward to the outcome of the meeting.

Mr. Zelenka reported that the *Oregon Bach Festival* was underway. He attended City of Springfield Fire and Life Safety Chief Dennis Murphy's retirement party. He thanked Chief Murphy for 30 years of service to the community, noting he had been instrumental in the creation of FireMed, Life Flight, and many other benefits to the community. He would attend the Wednesday council meeting via telephone.

Ms. Ortiz said the City Council had been invited to the Willamette High School health center open house on June 29, 2010. She recently attended the National Association of Latino Elected Officials (NALEO) in Denver which was attended by over 500 people and featured top notch speakers including U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Secretary Janet Napolitano. She also visited Red Rock Amphitheater.

Mr. Pryor was glad to see a good turnout at the Joint Elected Officials meeting. Lane Council of Governments met in Florence in June, and continued with its efforts to create local initiatives related to human services, communication, and economic development.

Mr. Poling reminded councilors that he and Ms. Piercy would participate in a One-on-One session at Albertson's, on Coburg Road. He was pleased the *Safety First* weekend had again been a successful event. He would be away from City Council meetings for about two weeks beginning July 14. He would participate by telephone.

Mr. Brown attended the Community Alliance of Lane County (CALC) open house on June 25. The organization rededicated the CALC building as the Leslie Brockelbank Peace and Justice Center, and participated in the Whitaker Last Friday Art Walk. He attended the Jefferson Westside Neighbors picnic at Monroe Park.

Ms. Taylor reported the Crest Drive Citizens' Association held a garden party which featured a book of oral histories about the neighborhood. She had read in the newspaper that there were several million dollars remaining in the parks fund. She did not think it was a good idea for the City to help John Musumeci out by spending that money on property he had available, but she did think the City should buy the Amazon headwaters property to protect the water. She was concerned about parking in the Walnut Mixed-Use Center. Jeff Nelson made good points in a communication he had sent to councilors.

Mr. Ruiz said he would join neighborhood leaders from River Road, and Santa Clara, on a tour of the neighborhoods on June 29, 2010. A media event featuring the Beam project downtown was scheduled for June 29, and *Summer in the City* started on June 30. City of Eugene Fire and Emergency Services Chief Randy Groves would begin serving as the Acting Chief for the City of Springfield on July 1. He would attend the Wilamut Natural Area meeting on July 15.

B. WORK SESSION: Eugene Water Board Sale of Water (EWEB) to Veneta

Mr. Ruiz introduced Brenda Wilson, City of Eugene Intergovernmental Relations Manager. She reviewed the history of the issue, stating the council was presented with background information on May 12, 2010, on the proposed water sale to the City of Veneta by EWEB. EWEB had filed a contract with the Lane County Circuit Court for validation. The council raised many questions about the sale and the certification/perfection of water rights in general. The council directed staff to: schedule a joint meeting with the EWEB Board of Directors before the council made a decision on the issue; schedule a public forum, with EWEB's involvement, to provide information to the public about the proposed sale of water; and to schedule a public hearing on EWEB's proposed sale of water to the City of Veneta. EWEB filed for a 30-day extension of time, which was now June 30, 2010, in order to file an appearance in the validation case in order to provide more time for the process directed by the council. In addition to receiving information at the council-directed sessions, public comment had been received from Jan Wilson of the Western Environmental Law Center, Shawn Boles, Howie Bonnett, and Dave Funk, and EWEB, copies of which were attached to the Agenda Item Summary (AIS). While the Eugene City Manager believed the perfection of the third water right was in the City of Eugene's interest, he also believed that the issue of Charter authority should be resolved first. The City Manager recommended that the City intervene in the pending validation proceeding.

At the request of Ms. Piercy, Mr. Ruiz explained his recommendation was to ask the City Council to direct staff to intervene in the process and resolve the charter authority before the City considered the contract with the City of Veneta. He added the City of Eugene was engaged in the Envision Eugene process that was providing opportunities for discussions around how the community wanted to grow, which may or may not inform the EWEB water sale discussion.

Mr. Brown stated Mr. Ruiz's recommendation was consistent with the basis of EWEB's recommendation, as stated in Attachment D to tonight's agenda, Testimony to Eugene City Council, dated June 28, 2010, in which EWEB requested that any resolution passed was written to facilitate continuation of the validation process through the courts.

Ms. Piercy directed councilors to a memorandum from former City of Eugene Planner Jim Croteau which provided a history of the water rights issue, and EWEB's desire to be able to supply water to the City. She believed the authority issue should be settled, which would give the City of Veneta and the environmental interests, time to meet, and enable the City of Eugene to complete the Envision Eugene process.

Mr. Pryor appreciated the work done on the issue, and Mr. Ruiz's proposal, which he expected would be in the best interests of Eugene. Mr. Pryor identified three fundamental issues: 1) authority to grant the privilege to sell the water; 2) should the water rights be perfected and how they should be perfected, and 3) should whoever had the authority agree to a contract to sell water to the City of Veneta. He asked if one or two of the issues could be resolved and the most important one(s) carried forward. He asked if the City would be blocked from resolving the authority question at a later date if the City Council granted, through a City resolution, the authority to sell the water.

City Attorney Glenn Klein said if the City Council approved the water sale, the contract would be deemed valid by a judge and would resolve the authority question. He opined if the council wanted the charter question decided, it should not approve the water sale at this time. He added that the council could reconsider the issue after a judge had declared whether the City or EWEB had the authority to decide whether the sale should take place. If the council acted tonight, Mr. Klein thought the council would significantly diminish the chance that the court would decide the charter question.

In response to Mr. Pryor, Mr. Klein said the charter question could only be resolved in two ways, by the court or by the voters.

Mr. Poling said, regardless of whether the council approved or disapproved the water sale, the council needed to clarify the issue of who had the authority. He appreciated the proposal set forth by Mr. Ruiz which he would support.

Mr. Clark supported Mr. Ruiz's recommendation. Mr. Clark averred the water rights belonged to the City of Eugene. The City Council should decide how the water rights were addressed in the future and which water rights should be perfected into the future.

Mr. Brown believed Mr. Ruiz's recommendation provided the correct direction for the City of Eugene. He opined there could be other cities that applied for the City's water rights. He said the council would need to determine if the City wanted to become the regional water supplier.

Ms. Ortiz was comfortable with the direction offered by Mr. Ruiz's proposal. She asked if the City of Eugene had the authority to make the decision based on what other cities may or may not want to do.

Mr. Klein said if the City Council had the authority under the charter to authorize or not authorize EWEB to wholesale water, it could authorize or not authorize for any reason. If the City Council did not have the authority, and the EWEB board had the authority, the only say the City Council would have related to how other cities grew would be the same authority any other city had with respect to how Eugene grew. If other cities did not like the

Envision Eugene proposals, they could become interested parties and appeal the Envision Eugene proposals to the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) or other State of Oregon agencies.

Ms. Ortiz had worked hard to improve intergovernmental relationships and did not want the City to be viewed as trying to tell other communities what they could do.

Mr. Zelenka supported Mr. Ruiz's recommendation. While it was clear to him that provision of water outside the urban growth boundary (UGB) required council approval, the issue would be decided by the court.

In response to a question from Mr. Zelenka, Ms. Wilson said the City of Veneta had received a funding package consisting of \$2.6 million in grants and \$13 million in loans. The City of Veneta had to advise the U.S. Department of Agriculture Rural Development of its decision by July 13, 2010.

Mr. Zelenka did not see the proposal before the council as the City of Eugene trying to tell the City of Veneta what do to within its UGB. The question was whether the action taken by the City of Eugene would be based on the principles of how it would make decisions, including the Growth Management Policies (GMP). He believed the sale of water to the City of Veneta violated GMP 1, 2, 5 and 10 and other sustainability issues related to sprawl versus compact urban growth.

Ms. Taylor supported Mr. Ruiz's proposal. She thought the City of Eugene had the right to decide and it would be wrong to take the action of selling water without extremely convincing arguments to support such a decision.

Ms. Piercy asked what role the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) would have over a water line going to Veneta if it was determined that EWEB had the authority.

Mr. Klein said it would depend on whether there were Eugene/Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan (Metro Plan) or Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan (Rural Comp Plan) changes or Lane County permits the City of Veneta would be required to acquire. He did not know what land use issues would apply to building the pipeline. If the Lane County permitting process was an administrative one, it was unlikely that the BCC would be involved in a decision related to the water line.

Mr. Pryor said the reason to sell or not sell water to the City of Veneta was related to intent, which would be an important discussion to have. However, as a Eugene City Councilor, his role was to assess and protect the interests of the City of Eugene and not Lane County. If the sale of water represented a risk to the City of Eugene, that would be a legitimate reason not to sell the water. If the reason was that the City of Eugene did not want the City of Veneta to grow or take other action, he did not have the authority to control what action another community took. He noted local control had been an important issue for the City of Eugene before the state legislature and every city was entitled to local control. It would be important for the City of Eugene to carefully and thoughtfully consider why it would or would not sell water to the City of Veneta.

Mr. Brown asked if other parties involved in the question of selling water to the City of Veneta would pull back.

Mr. Klein asked Jan Wilson, attorney for the Western Environmental Law Center, representing the interveners, to comment on Mr. Brown's question.

Ms. Wilson opined her agency would continue to participate. She observed that EWEB board member Jon Brown was quoted in that day's Register Guard saying this was not an adversarial position and there were not sides. It was a matter of everyone bringing forward their arguments for consideration by the court.

Mr. Clark, referring to the three fundamental issues identified by Mr. Pryor, said he saw the council addressing the issue of authority to grant the privilege to sell the water tonight. Addressing if the water rights should be perfected, how they should be perfected and should water be sold to the City of Veneta should be addressed in the future. As a Eugene City Councilor, he had a duty to protect the largest amount of potential rights for future residents of Eugene. It was unknown how much water future generations would need or how much would be available. He had heard from some parties that selling water to the City of Veneta was in conflict with the City of Eugene's GMP and unsustainable. He suggested if the City of Veneta were allowed to grow it might have an increase in jobs and industry which would mean fewer people would be driving from Veneta to Eugene for employment. He observed if the City of Eugene did not sell water to the City of Veneta, and the City of Veneta acquired water rights by another means, another facility would be required to withdraw the water from the river, which would not be very sustainable. He hoped the council would look at good data to determine the best direction to proceed.

Mr. Zelenka said the council regularly made decisions that impacted other people which were not based on what those other people would do. It was legitimate for the council to assess an action based on the City's principles and policies, to ensure they were consistent. Every action had an economic, environmental and social aspect, referred to as the triple bottom line. Every triple bottom line aspect and the impacts should be assessed to determine the impact on the community.

Ms. Piercy asked if the council understood the triple bottom line impact of the sale of water rather than the City of Veneta taking water from their ground water supply, which would impact nearby rivers. She did not want the council's action to be interpreted that the Eugene City Council disregarded the City of Veneta's authority over its community or disrespect of the community. She asserted all of the local communities had a responsibility for regional planning. She saw the water sale issue as a regional and state responsibility for managing growth.

Mr. Clark, seconded by Ms. Taylor, moved to direct the City Manager to intervene in the validation proceeding and argue that the City Charter grants to the council, rather than EWEB, the authority to decide to sell water outside the City's limits. The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

The meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jon Ruiz
City Manager

(Recorded by Linda Henry)

MINUTES

City Council
McNutt Room—Eugene City Hall
777 Pearl Street—Eugene, Oregon

July 26, 2010
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Alan Zelenka, Mike Clark, Betty Taylor, Jennifer Solomon, George Poling, Andrea Ortiz, Chris Pryor, George Brown, members.

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the July 26, 2010, work session of the Eugene City Council to order.

A. COMMITTEE REPORTS AND ITEMS OF INTEREST FROM MAYOR, CITY COUNCIL, AND CITY MANAGER

Mayor Piercy thanked Mr. Clark for presiding in her stead at the previous week's Wednesday council work session while she participated on a panel at the Oregon Transportation Commission meeting that discussed the roles of various levels of government in local decision-making. She had also attended the quarterly meeting of the Oregon Metropolitan Planning Organization Consortium (OMPOC) in Corvallis.

Mayor Piercy reported that she heard and enjoyed a speech by Robert Kennedy Jr. at the McDonald Theater on the topic "Our Environmental Destiny."

Continuing, Mayor Piercy reported that she had participated in a "thought leaders" breakfast for School District 4J to discuss solutions to the district's looming budget deficit. She had also attended a celebration commemorating the passage of the American with Disabilities Act (ADA) at the Hilyard Center to recognize the difference the act made to Eugene and the work the community had done in regard to supporting those with disabilities.

Mayor Piercy reported that the Track Town Kickoff was scheduled to occur later in the week.

Mayor Piercy announced that Sponsors, Inc. would hold a building dedication for its new facility, Roosevelt Crossing, at 4 p.m. on July 29.

Mayor Piercy reported that she would participate in a town hall in company with Lane County commissioners Rob Handy and Peter Sorenson on the future of the fairgrounds at 6:30 p.m. on July 30 at Harris Hall.

Mayor Piercy noted that the Oregon Mayors Association Summer Conference was being held in Cottage Grove on July 29 - 31.

Mr. Clark reported that he had recently attended one of the Wednesday evening "Summer in the City" events held downtown and thanked Library, Recreation, and Cultural Services staff Billie Moser and Isaac Marquez for their work in facilitating the event. He said they had brought all types of events downtown, including a skateboarding competition that he attended with his son and a dodge ball tournament in which several City employees, including Assistant City Manager Sarah Medary, participated. He had enjoyed

those events as well.

Mr. Clark said he had also attended a recent Ems baseball game as an official witness for a Guinness Book of World Records' attempt for the most people participating in a Moonwalk. He commended City Manager Jon Ruiz for his participation in the event.

Mr. Clark reported that he and Mr. Poling as well as City Manager Ruiz attended the July 23 City Club meeting to hear a report from Jean Tate and David Frohnmayer of the *ad hoc* group Citizen Advocates for Public Safety (CAPS) regarding their findings on regional public safety issues and challenges.

Ms. Ortiz said that the Lane Regional Air Protection Agency (LRAPA) had changed its meeting date to the fourth Monday of each month. She had encouraged members of the board of directors to build relations and anticipated the LRAPA board and staff would hold a potluck as one way to accomplish that. She said the board had issued a Request for Proposals for a consultant to work with the board on internal community building.

Ms. Ortiz reported that she participated in the free medical clinic held July 24-25 sponsored by United Way and the Cascade Medical Team that took place at the Monaco RV Health Clinic Building. The clinic was held for those who lacked medical care. Many people received dental care at the event and were provided with referrals for additional service. Ms. Ortiz thanked the Cascade Medical Team for its work at the event.

Mr. Zelenka arrived.

Ms. Ortiz noted that the organization "Volunteers in Medicine" had moved to Springfield and were no longer located on West 11th Avenue in Eugene.

Ms. Ortiz reported that she attended the recent Envision Eugene workshop at St. Catherine's Hall and the consensus shown by participants made her feel hopeful about the possibility the outcome of the process would have broad community support.

Mr. Pryor said he represented the City as both a member of the Housing Policy Board and the City Council at a recent meeting with representatives of the State about the State's implementation of a new process to fund low-income housing projects. He said that meeting participants discussed the Willakenzie low-income housing project and the State representatives were positive about the project.

Mr. Brown reported he attended the most recent meeting of the Human Rights Commission. He had also attended a presentation by Alexander Cousteau at the Eugene Public Library, which was very well-attended. He said Ms. Cousteau's organization helped small communities around the world to secure their water sources, as well as funding for water purification.

Mr. Brown had also attended the City Club meeting mentioned by Mr. Clark and said while he had not learned much new information at the presentation he was looking forward to CAPS' final report.

Mr. Poling said he planned to attend the local kickoff for the "National Night Out" event being held on July 27.

Mr. Poling noted that the council had received copies of a letter being sent to residents living adjacent to pavement preservation projects advising them to park somewhere other than the street during the duration of

the project and suggested to the City Manager that he arrange for extra patrols to ensure the safety of vehicles and add to residents' sense of comfort.

Mr. Poling expressed appreciation to the City Manager for the staff response to his inquiries about the Glory Bee project, adding he was glad to hear the project was moving forward.

Mr. Poling noted recent letters-to-the-editor as well as comments he heard about the increased noise levels at PK Park during Ems games and asked the Manager what the City could do to work with the Ems organization and University of Oregon to mitigate the noise levels. City Manager Ruiz said he would follow up.

Ms. Solomon said she would also attend the Sponsors, Inc. facility dedication, as well as the National Night Out event scheduled in her ward at Candlelight Park.

Ms. Taylor said she recently returned from a meeting of the Human Development Committee of the National League of Cities, which was working on the National Workforce Reinvestment Act and also discussed dental care. She reported that other committee members had been impressed when she shared what Eugene was doing in regard to training people for the jobs of the future. She said the committee toured a facility in Hampton, Virginia, that was a one-stop shopping center for employment and also provided college classes that could lead to a PhD.

Ms. Taylor reported that she heard from many constituents in favor of naming the new Willamette River/I-5 Bridge the "Whilamut Passage Bridge." She had also heard several complaints and fears expressed about any relaxation of the City rules governing the keeping of chickens. One constituent shared that her neighbor had rushed out to buy more chickens before the council suspended enforcement, and had further pointed out that chicken food could attract mice and chicken manure attracted flies. Others had objected to the noise from chickens.

Ms. Taylor also reported that her constituents were concerned that Amazon Pool closed at 5 p.m. during the week when it was most hot and that the pool was closed on weekends. While they were aware they could go to other pools, south Eugene residents had voted to install the pool and paid taxes to support it and were very unhappy.

Ms. Solomon noted that a Washington State community planned to hold a tour of chicken coops in an urban environment.

Mr. Zelenka said he had attended a symphony in the park and commended the event, which had sold out in hours. He had also attended the most recent meeting of the Sustainability Commission, which reviewed its work program in preparation for discussion with the council.

Mr. Zelenka reported that he also heard constituent complaints about the noise created by chickens.

City Manager Ruiz noted that the council would discuss the subject of chickens and goats on September 8.

City Manager Ruiz reported that the community's use of the Library continued to be high. The Eugene Police Department was conducting two sessions of safety camps for kids. He further reported that Mobility International USA was bringing 30 women to Eugene from around the world to participate in its Women's Institute on Leadership and Disability (WILD) and they would be supported by the City's Adaptive

Recreation staff at the Hilyard Center.

City Manager Ruiz concluded by reporting that he had visited the Fleet crew recently and thanked the crew for its hard work. He invited interested councilors to contact him if they wished to tour the Fleet Shop.

Ms. Ortiz noted the passing of former Lane County Commissioner Chuck Ivey.

B. EXECUTIVE SESSION (Pursuant to Oregon Revised Statute 192.660(2)(i))

The council entered into executive session in accordance with Oregon Revised Statute 192.660(2)(i).

Mayor Piercy adjourned the executive session and convened the council in regular session.

C. WORK SESSION: City Manager Annual Performance Review

City Manager Ruiz said the City had a good year in 2009. The organization had succeeded in correcting some long-standing structural imbalances, had stabilized its core funding, and was now living within its means while continuing to invest in the future. City Manager Ruiz noted the many good discussions the Budget Committee and council had in regard to the latter topic, particularly in areas such as downtown public safety and climate and energy planning.

City Manager Ruiz thanked the City's executive team and acknowledged that it was a relatively young team but he believed it was doing outstanding work individually and collectively. He also commended the work of the organization's division Managers, a talented group charged with carrying out the policies developed by the executive team. City Manager Ruiz also commended the many employees throughout the organization who stepped up to the City's financial challenges and sought new and innovative ways to balance the budget.

City Manager Ruiz deferred councilors to his self-evaluation, included in the materials provided to the council.

City Manager Ruiz thanked the council for its hard work during the previous year and said it provided good guidance to him and the staff, and that was appreciated. He thought the organization was moving the community in the ways the council wanted.

Mayor Piercy thanked the Manager for his leadership of City staff and his work with and for the council. She thought he had been very successful in the past year. Mayor Piercy appreciated that City Manager Ruiz had set his own goals as Manager. She also appreciated that he had worked with the council on setting and achieving its goals, which made the council feel more successful in doing what it needed to do. She thanked the Manager for his focus on economic development and the triple bottom line. She wanted the organization to hone in on that work and establish specific benchmarks and partners so the council felt the community was making progress.

Mayor Piercy expressed appreciation for the Manager's value of bringing people with different points of view to find a way forward to a solution, which was a value she shared and which she thought critical for the community. Mayor Piercy believed the values that went into the budget process were important and

reflective of the community's values. They spoke to the importance the organization placed on its employees and its commitment to providing the community with services even in difficult economic times.

Mayor Piercy expressed appreciation for the Manager's efforts on behalf of downtown, the arts, and culture. She appreciated that the Manager did not get defensive when criticized or when the council made suggestions. The Manager did not appear to mind taking the heat for his decisions.

Mayor Piercy thought there was more work to do. She wanted the Manager to strengthen his relationships with labor. She also called for continued work on public safety and youth issues. Mayor Piercy advocated for more work on the City's relationship with the County and hoped that the two organizations could be better partners. Mayor Piercy said she generally found the Manager good to work with.

Mr. Clark agreed with much of what Mayor Piercy said. He thought the Manager did an outstanding job leading the organization over the past year. He said there were frequent opportunities for contentious situations to arise, and he appreciated that the Manager kept the council and community focused on a "best outcomes" point of view. He thought that helped the council to move forward positively. He hoped the Manager could maintain that positive attitude while modeling a service mentality for the organization. He recalled the Manager saying during his interview that he saw himself as a coach with the goal of creating a high-functioning team and Mr. Clark thought that had been accomplished. He thought many of the Manager's hires had been "just right" and helped create a supportive organization.

Mr. Clark believed the fact that few amendments had been proposed to the last budget was a testament to the Manager's excellent preparation.

Mr. Clark indicated acceptance of the Manager's compensation recommendations. He commended the concept of compensation packages tied to specific performance measures that took the politics out of the process. He did not think a subcommittee was needed.

Mr. Zelenka also thanked the Manager and commended the job he had done over the past year, particularly in regard to the budget. He thought the principles used in the preparation of the budget were well thought-out. Mr. Zelenka liked the links the Manager had created between the council's goals and policies and the work plan as he had long thought that such linkages were necessary.

Mr. Zelenka said he frequently heard from residents that the Manager was doing a good job and he appreciated the Manager's outreach to the community and thought he had built up community trust. He thought that the Manager had made some great hires at the executive team level and particularly commended the hiring of Assistant Manager Medary, Central Services Director Kristi Hammitt, and Police Chief Pete Kerns. Mr. Zelenka commended the Manager for employing the triple bottom line tool and hoped that further work was done with the tool.

Mr. Zelenka expressed particular appreciation for the Manager's communication with the council.

Mr. Zelenka recommended that the Manager work on his relationship with the City's unions and the University of Oregon. He appreciated the economic development plan but did not think it adequately captured the shift to the "green economy" and hoped more work was done on that.

Mr. Zelenka also indicated acceptance of the Manager's compensation recommendations.

Ms. Ortiz agreed with much of what was said by the other councilors. She expressed appreciation for the access the Manager provided to the staff. She said the council had an open door relationship with the Manager and she did not recall a time when Mr. Ruiz had not been responsive to her concerns. She appreciated having City Manager Ruiz in the community and liked hearing that community members enjoyed their interactions with the Manager as well. She said it was evident he cared about the whole community.

Mr. Pryor believed that the Manager had responsibility for creating a work place environment and culture that supported the council. He suggested the evaluation was a credit to the culture the Manager had helped to create. He praised the Manager's evaluation as one of the best he had seen in some time and commended it as thorough, thoughtful, and deliberate. He said the comments in the evaluation were well-directed and effective.

Mr. Pryor also indicated acceptance of the Manager's compensation recommendations and commended the Manager for the recommendations, which indicated to him a desire on the part of the Manager to be a part of the larger "City family," which also included the council.

Mr. Poling said that City Manager Ruiz had become one of the faces of the community in a short period of time. People look to the Manager for his leadership and guidance and appreciated his ability to move the organization forward in incremental steps. Mr. Poling expressed appreciation for the Manager's sense of humor and his ability to laugh at himself. He found the Manager approachable and open about what he did. He thought that people could trust the Manager. He also appreciated the Manager's hard work and hoped he continued to bring the same work ethic to his job.

Mr. Poling commended the manger's compensation proposal and said it demonstrated that the manger was realistic about the tough financial times the City was in. He liked the Manager's suggestion for compensation in coming years because it meant the council knew what to expect. Mr. Poling wanted the Manager to remain with the organization as long as possible.

Mr. Brown appreciated the way the Manager and staff had managed the fiscal year 2011 budget. He also appreciated the way the Manager went out in the community and connected to various community organizations. He appreciated and supported the Manager's compensation recommendations.

Ms. Solomon agreed with Mr. Pryor's praise of City Manager Ruiz and said the Manager was the right person at the right time. She said the community members she heard from indicated the Manager was approachable and listened to them. She liked the Manager's focus on best outcomes and believed it helped the council achieve its goals. Ms. Solomon suggested that Mr. Ruiz had captured what it took to run Eugene. She thanked Mr. Ruiz for his service.

Ms. Taylor said she had little to add to her written comments. Speaking to the comments of other councilors about City Manager Ruiz being out in the community, Ms. Taylor said that she heard from people who wondered why the Manager was not at the City Club more often. She said the Manager had a thick skin and was able to deal with criticism calmly. Ms. Taylor appreciated the Manager's support of the arts. However, she frequently felt that the council was not offered enough choices.

Mayor Piercy felt the community was making progress, which was important to her and gave the council energy to do the work that needed to be done. She appreciated the staff sense of "can-do-ness" and thought it served Eugene well.

Mayor Piercy said she liked that Mr. Ruiz appeared to like Eugene. She wanted to feel that the person in charge of the City organization appreciated, respected, and liked the community.

Mayor Piercy also appreciated that the Manager provided the council with more open access to staff. She liked that staff seemed to enjoy the challenges that faced it and perceived those challenges as problems to be solved. She suggested that residents experiencing economic difficulties were given confidence when they believed the City was working to make life better for them and improve their opportunities, and that made her feel the organization was doing the right thing.

Mr. Clark, seconded by Ms. Taylor, moved to complete goal-setting for the next year with the City Manager by October 1, 2010, and to approve the suggested compensation adjustment package and process beginning in fiscal year 2012

There was brief discussion of how the motion was most appropriately worded as it regarded the staff and council follow-up to occur. Mr. Clark amended his motion as follows:

Mr. Clark, seconded by Ms. Taylor, moved to complete goal-setting for the next year with the City Manager by October 1, 2010, to approve the suggested compensation adjustment package and process beginning in fiscal year 2012, and to bring back to the council for a future work session an agreement based on the e-mail put forward by the Manager.

Mr. Zelenka did not believe the compensation incentives for the Manager to stay on the job were high enough, and thought that subject deserved further council conversation.

The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting at 6:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jon Ruiz,
City Manager

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)