

EUGENE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY



Approval of Council Minutes

Meeting Date: February 28, 2011
Department: City Manager's Office
www.eugene-or.gov

Agenda Item Number: 2A
Staff Contact: Kim Young
Contact Telephone Number: 541-682-5232

ISSUE STATEMENT

This is a routine item to approve City Council minutes.

SUGGESTED MOTION

Move to approve the minutes of the May 24, 2010, Work Session, June 28, 2010, Regular Meeting, June 30, 2010, Work Session, July 12, 2010, Work Session, November 22, 2010, Joint Meeting with the Eugene Planning Commission, December 13, 2010, Work Session, December 15, Work Session, January 4, 2011, State of the City, January 11, 2011, Work Session, January 11, 2011, Regular Meeting, January 12, 2011, Work Session, January 19, 2011, Work Session, and January 24, 2011, Work Session.

ATTACHMENTS

- A. May 24, 2010, Work Session
- B. June 28, 2010, Regular Meeting
- C. June 30, 2010, Work Session
- D. July 12, 2010, Work Session
- E. November 22, 2010, Joint Meeting with the Eugene Planning Commission
- F. December 13, 2010, Work Session
- G. December 15, 2010, Work Session
- H. January 4, 2011, State of the City
- I. January 11, 2011, Work Session
- J. January 11, 2011, Regular Meeting
- K. January 12, 2011, Work Session
- L. January 19, 2011, Work Session
- M. January 24, 2011, Work Session

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Staff Contact: Kim Young
Telephone: 541-682-5232
Staff E-Mail: Kim.A.Young@ci.eugene.or.us

MINUTES

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

May 24, 2010
5:30 p.m.

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

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the May 24, 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 expressed appreciation to the Eugene Budget Committee for all its hard work during the recent budget review. She reported that she had spoken on the topic of sustainability to two classes at the University of Oregon (UO) and on the topic of conflict and peace to a class at Lane Community College (LCC). She noted that the next Mayor's One-on-One event would be held the next day at the Market of Choice on Franklin Boulevard at 5 p.m. Mayor Piercy reminded the public that LCC would hold a forum on its proposed downtown campus on May 25 at the Eugene Public Library. She also noted the upcoming open house sponsored by the UO Community Planning Workshop, "Get Plugged In," being held on May 26 at 6 p.m. at the Wheeler Pavilion and the open house at Churchill High School regarding Envision Eugene, also scheduled that night.

Mr. Clark congratulated City Manager Jon Ruiz and his staff for the smooth budget process and said the process was less contentious than previous ones, which he attributed to a well-presented, well-thought out budget.

Mr. Clark noted his attendance at the May 13 Police Commission meeting and reported that he and Ms. Taylor met with Police Auditor Mark Gissiner in their roles as council president and vice president to discuss the Civilian Review Board's June report to the City Council. The auditor also discussed his decision to dismiss the Deputy Auditor. Mr. Clark recalled that the council, by City Charter, could only address directly the work of the City Manager, the Police Auditor, and the Municipal Court Judge. City Attorney Glenn Klein confirmed that fact. He said the council adopted code language that stipulated the auditor made all hiring and firing decisions related to the auditor's staff.

Ms. Ortiz noted that in addition to her service on the Eugene Budget Committee, she also served on the Bethel School District Budget Committee and Lane Regional Air Protection Agency (LRAPA) Budget Committee. She said there were concerns that Cottage Grove would not budget funding for its LRAPA dues, and indicated she had forwarded the council an e-mail on the topic. She reported she attended a town hall at the Songbrook development, where several State legislators were present to hear community concerns, and where the City Manager of Junction City spoke of the new State hospital project planned to be located in Junction City and its anticipated impact on that community.

Ms. Ortiz reported on the recent first annual Latino Education Summit held by Bethel School District, noting that there were more than 600 attendees at the summit from around the State. She briefly noted some of the presentations that were made at that event.

Mr. Pryor reported that he attended that day's memorial service for long-time Eugene resident Adell McMillan, who had made many significant contributions to the community over the years as well as being the long-time director and later Director Emeritus of the Erb Memorial Union on the University of Oregon campus.

Mr. Pryor also commended the work of the Budget Committee and agreed with Mr. Clark it had been a good budget process. He was pleased to see so few changes made to the budget proposed by the manager, which he thought was an acknowledgement of the City's financial condition.

Mr. Pryor reported he attended the recent School District 4J Board of Directors meeting to be available as a resource during the board's discussion of urban renewal funding. The board unanimously concurred with the City's conclusions regarding the financial implications of recent urban renewal funding proposals.

Mr. Brown raised the issue of the dismissal of the Deputy Police Auditor and asked if the council was precluded from speaking to the issue. City Attorney Klein said he would provide a written response to the question in the next council meeting packet.

Ms. Solomon said that the Active Bethel Citizens (ABC) neighborhood organization was meeting on June 26, at 7 p.m., at Petersen Barn, and the annual We Are Bethel Celebration was scheduled to occur on May 29, also at Petersen Barn, from 11 p.m. to 4 p.m. Many great activities were scheduled. She said she had attended the most recent meeting of the Metropolitan Wastewater Management Commission (MWMC), where commissioners had said goodbye to City Public Works Wastewater Manager Peter Ruffier, who was leaving the City's employment. She regretted his departure.

Ms. Solomon noted that she had also attended a meeting of the Public Safety Coordinating Council and a meeting of the Human Services Commission.

Ms. Taylor reported that she attended a Lane County Workforce Executive Committee meeting and commended the work that agency was doing.

Ms. Taylor also commended the community contributions of Adell McMillan and noted Ms. McMillan's two terms on the City's Planning Commission.

Ms. Taylor reported that she had heard from constituents about the new lines on the sidewalk at the Lane Transit District Downtown Station and had visited the station to view the situation herself. The youth she spoke to were not happy about being confined to the edge of the street. She wondered why the delineated space was so wide. City Manager Jon Ruiz believed it was because the lines delineated the sidewalk itself, not a portion of the sidewalk. Ms. Taylor expressed concern that people were not able to stand in the area and talk for a few minutes. She assumed she had broken the law when she visited the area and stood in the marked-off space to talk to people. Ms. Taylor said that some people believed the lines were a way to get people out of downtown. City Manager Ruiz assured Ms. Taylor that the lines were intended to maintain a

clear passage for people to traverse the public right-of-way. People who stood in the area were not breaking the law. Ms. Taylor thought half the space currently delineated would be sufficient for that purpose.

Mayor Piercy recalled that the signage in the area indicated that people should leave space for others to walk though and people were not committing a crime when standing in the area. City Manager Ruiz concurred. The intent of the lines was to facilitate movement on the sidewalk. People had been congregating on the sidewalk, making passage challenging.

City Manager Ruiz also regretted the departure of Mr. Ruffier and said Mr. Ruffier could be proud of the green, sustainable, innovative work he had done at the Wastewater Treatment Plant. He reported that Airport Manager Tim Doll was recently elected to the board of directors for the National Association of Airport Executives. In addition, Eugene's vehicle fleet was named one of the country's 100 best fleets and he commended the work of Fleet Manager Tony Jobanek for that achievement.

City Manager Ruiz announced the upcoming June 4 BRAVO breakfast recognizing the partnerships between businesses and the arts. He also noted that US Bank's annual economic outlook event was scheduled for June 8.

City Manager Ruiz recognized Central Services Director Kristi Hammitt and Central Services staff Sue Cutsogeorge and Mia Carriaga for their work on the 2011 budget.

Mayor Piercy announced that the Oregon Hispanic Commission would meet in Eugene at the Bascom-Tykeson Room at the Eugene Public Library on June 3 to hear from the community.

**B. WORK SESSION:
Overview of City Planning Initiatives**

Assistant City Manager Sarah Medary provided a PowerPoint presentation on City Planning and Decision-Making to clarify the various planning processes currently underway at the City of Eugene and to highlight the different tools staff employed to ensure those processes were integrated.

Mayor Piercy solicited council questions and comments on the presentation.

Ms. Ortiz expressed appreciation for the format employed in the presentation, which made the information easier to understand by more people, and commended the quality of City staff.

Mayor Piercy believed that rail would be significant to the community in the future and should be integrated into the City's planning efforts where appropriate.

Mr. Clark agreed with Ms. Ortiz as to the quality of City staff and commended the quality of staff's work.

Mayor Piercy said she struggled to determine how the City could integrate all of its planning processes and continue to move them forward together in a common direction. Assistant City Manager Medary acknowledged the challenge. She said that City Transportation staff had been present at the first Envision Eugene workshop to share information about the transportation system plan and to identify the connections between the two planning processes. In addition, staff was using the same vocabulary to facilitate an easy

transition between processes. She believed it would be a challenge to staff to identify the areas where the processes came together and should be more carefully interwoven.

Mayor Piercy reiterated her concerns about doing something through one process that was counter to the goals of another process. She acknowledged that it was difficult to anticipate that. Assistant City Manager Medary suggested that the triple bottom line tool was a way to ensure that such issues were considered.

Responding to a request from Mr. Brown, Assistant City Manager Medary indicated she would provide the council with copies of the questions included in the triple bottom line analysis.

Mr. Pryor acknowledged the work that had been done and the work still to come. He suggested that the council needed to also accept that there was conflict ahead. He hoped the council worked through that conflict and came out with something better than it originally considered. He did not think those conflicts would be unique to Eugene and they could be positive, rather than negative. Mr. Pryor anticipated a conflict between reasonable values and suggested that the council owed the community an informed, thoughtful, deliberative discussion when it made its choices, which some people would not support.

Mayor Piercy perceived the Envision Eugene process as an opportunity for the community to have a comprehensive discussion about the future. She said the challenge for participants would be to overcome the initial skepticism that would arise, and while that would not be easy she thought that the council would be pleased with the results of those efforts.

**C. WORK SESSION:
Envision Eugene—Project Approach**

The council was joined by Planning Division Director Lisa Gardner, Metro Community Planning Manager Carolyn Weiss, and City Attorney Emily Jerome for the item. Ms. Gardner provided an update on the process and presented a short video on the project.

Ms. Jerome provided a brief overview of the legal framework for the process. Mr. Zelenka arrived.

Ms. Weiss referred the council to Attachment A in the Agenda Item Summary (AIS) for a listing of issues raised by advisory committees, members of the public, and staff. She recommended that the process address 13 of the 19 listed issues. Items 1-5 were legally required and items 6-13 had a high level of demonstrated community interest.

1. *Transportation findings*
2. *Nodal development*
3. *Housing mix/affordability*
4. *Market trends*
5. *Economic development strategy/site needs*
6. *More integrated land use and transportation*
7. *Underbuild/utilization*
8. *Climate and energy action plan*
9. *Development standards*
10. *District scale modeling*

11. *Seasonally appropriate investments*
12. *Triple bottom line (sustainability)*
13. *Urban form considerations*

Ms. Weiss referred to Attachment B, which included a list of specific work tasks associated with the Envision Eugene project.

Ms. Weiss noted the items not recommended for inclusion:

14. *Parcel-specific plan designations*
15. *Zoning/plan designation consistency*
16. *Dynamic modeling of residential development*
17. *Further natural resource protections*
18. *Further parkland needs*
19. *Adopt Parks Plan as refinement plan*

Ms. Weiss said that if the council chose to expand the scope of work, there would be time line implications. She invited questions.

Mayor Piercy recalled that past planning processes envisioned a population that was not achieved in the planning horizon. She asked if there was a way to trigger various events as population targets were achieved. Ms. Jerome said that staff was working with the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) on the issue. The law does not include a provision to accomplish that; she suggested the way to accomplish it was to build in a shorter time period for check-ins. For example, the council could build in a check-in during the next periodic review. She pointed out that it would require County concurrence to change that number. Staff continued to discuss the issue with DLCD staff.

Mayor Piercy asked if there was a way to switch out land within the urban growth boundary (UGB) with land outside the UGB. Ms. Jerome indicated that she believed that was possible.

Mayor Piercy suggested that the public did not follow the work of the Planning Commission to the degree it did the work of the City Council, and asked how the City could help the community focus on the Planning Commission phase of the process to better engage it. Ms. Gardner said the City was attempting to do that and reported that the commission was seeing more attendance at its meetings. The commission had not received much public comment, but generally 12 to 15 people were present to hear its discussions. Mayor Piercy wanted to see more people in attendance.

Mayor Piercy hoped the City tracked its experience with the triple bottom line tool so it could show other communities how it worked as she considered the tool to be quite innovative and potentially useful to those communities as well.

Speaking to population projections that indicated 34,000 more people would move to Lane County, Mr. Clark suggested the community would grow up, out, or a combination of the two. He believed it would be a combination of growing both up and out.

While he commended the staff work in general, Mr. Clark expressed concern that staff did not plan to include item 17 -Further natural resource protections - which precluded any analysis of natural resources

such as drainageways outside the city limits. He said that appeared to suggest that all the undeveloped land in Santa Clara considered in the Eugene Comprehensive Lands Analysis (ECLA) was developable, and the drainageways would not be protected by the City. He thought that would also concern Santa Clara residents. He wanted to know what the City could do to address his concern without pushing the timeframe out too far.

Mr. Clark asked about the relationship between items 11 and 17 and what the City would be able to address in regard to those items. He also found some of the items on the list less important than the issue of drainageways, and asked staff to discuss the rationale for its recommendations. In response, Ms. Weiss clarified that while staff recommended items 1 through 13 it did not believe it could accomplish them within the current timeline. They would require a timeline extension to accomplish them all. Staff would address the legally required items, 1- 5, to the extent they were legally required within the current time frame. She said in regard to drainageways, staff could develop a timeline for addressing that issue and return to the council.

Ms. Ortiz recommended that Planning Commission meetings be broadcast on Metro Television throughout the Envision Eugene process, and requested the cost of that. City Manager Ruiz commended the suggestion and said that unless the cost proved prohibitive, staff would figure out how to make that happen.

Mr. Zelenka wanted to know the cost of addressing items 1- 5, beyond the minimum legal parameters and also wanted to know the cost of addressing the items that staff did not recommend. He thought it was very important to do the process right and pointed out the council was working under a self-imposed deadline. City Manager Ruiz indicated staff would return with a recommendation on June 14.

Mayor Piercy acknowledged the conflict between the desires of those who wished to do the process right and those who wished to do it quickly and wondered if there was a way to accommodate both interests and give them confidence in the process. Ms. Gardner indicated staff would provide a response to the question on June 14.

Mr. Clark expressed disappointment about further process delay, which he said would serve the ends of some but not all residents. He agreed with Mr. Zelenka it was important to do the process right, and suggested failure to address natural resource protections in Santa Clara would result in a divided community, with people working to stop projects using the regulatory system. He thought the City could have avoided that by preparing intelligently.

Mr. Clark asked if the City had done any analysis to determine if its infrastructure was sufficient to handle a higher level of density. Ms. Jerome said yes, as it was legally required to do so. The City must demonstrate that it could provide the infrastructure needed for more dense development.

Speaking to the triggers mentioned by Ms. Jerome, Mr. Zelenka thought it was bad policy to make irrevocable decisions based on wrong numbers, and he thought the numbers would be wrong. Such triggers would allow the City to make adjustments as time went along. He suggested that the City approach the 2011 Oregon Legislature to seek an exemption that allowed that to occur and to encourage the legislature to modernize the planning rules to recognize that planning had become more complex since the law was written.

Responding to a question from Ms. Taylor about the source of the figure attached to the anticipated demand for housing, Ms. Weiss said the number came from the ECLA project. ECLA suggested that 15,000 homes would be required over the next 20 years; 10,000 of those homes could be accommodated within the UGB. Of the 5,000 that could not be accommodated within the UGB, past trends suggested that 4,000 would be provided in the form of single-family houses and 1,000 would be provided in the form of multi-family housing. She said the City had the ability to reexamine those trends. Ms. Taylor was disturbed by the use of past trends and thought the State requirement that the City project housing demand in 20 years was outmoded because there could be a lot of change in 20 years.

Ms. Taylor did not see any point to rushing the process and did not understand Mr. Clark's comments that delay served some interests because she did not know whose interests those were. She believed the City needed to work on changing the law that required it to do a 20-year plan because things change in 20 years.

Mr. Pryor said he could appreciate Mr. Clark's frustration about the pace of the project and did not want the pace of the project to be a deliberate impediment. He wanted a pace that produced the best product. Mr. Pryor acknowledged that unlike some, he did not see a clear end to the process, and was willing to move at a slower pace while he attempted to figure out what the vision was. His expectation was that people would work together sincerely.

Mr. Clark wanted the process to be done correctly and wanted the City's expenditure of time and money to produce something that was legally defensible and helpful to growing the community in the way it wanted to grow. The choices the council made now were the keys to achieving that goal. Speaking to Mr. Zelenka's remarks about seeking a legislative remedy, he suggested that the City could accomplish the same thing by proposing to the State that Eugene be required to do more frequent periodic reviews.

Responding to a question from Mr. Clark about the State's response to the region's use of performance measures in TransPlan, Ms. Gardner indicated that more discussion would occur with the Land Conservation and Development Commission in July, and staff would report to the council following that meeting. She believed that from past conversations with DLCD staff, the region was on target with its performance measures. Mr. Clark expressed some surprise at that. He said that he had been concerned that the work had been insufficient and that the community was already behind as it started to revise the transportation plan.

Speaking to Ms. Taylor's remarks, Mr. Zelenka said he thought 20-year planning was very good but reiterated his call for triggers throughout the planning process.

Mr. Zelenka wondered if there was a way for staff to identify the most useful work tasks related to items 14-19 and include those in the process.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the work session at 7:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest
City Recorder

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)

MINUTES

City Council
Council Chamber—Eugene City Hall
777 Pearl Street—Eugene, Oregon

June 28, 2010
7:30 p.m.

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

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the regular meeting of the Eugene City Council to order.

1. PUBLIC FORUM

Mayor Piercy reviewed the rules of the Public Forum.

Amy Reid, 1993 Onyx Street, University of Oregon American English Institute, introduced several students sponsored by the United States State Department who were attending a professional development program at the institute. She reported most of the students were from developing countries or countries in transition and they would continue their studies at other universities across the United States after they left Eugene. The students present represented the countries of Chad, Tunisia, Columbia, Morocco, South Korea, Turkmenistan, Costa Rica, and Algeria.

Mayor Piercy welcomed the students and expressed pleasure that they were studying in Eugene.

Pauline Hutson, 1025 Taylor Street, submitted written testimony regarding her concerns about the proposed routing for the west Eugene extension of the EmX system. Ms. Hutson called for more emphasis on alternatives that employed West 6th/7th avenues and West 7th Place. They would provide easy connections to fast growing parts of the community. She believed West 11th and 13th avenues were less desirable due to the many obstacles that currently existed to their use and anticipated that the route would have a lower ridership base. She offered her preferred route, which would avoid West 11th and 13th avenues and instead send the EmX vehicle east down Oak Street and north on 6th Avenue, returning on 7th Avenue and travel down Pearl Street to 10th Avenue, where it would turn north to access the Lane Transit District (LTD) Station. That routing would serve downtown and would pass near the train station.

Zachary Vishanoff, Ward 3, alerted the public to a hearing regarding a zone change for a City-owned parcel near the Riverfront Research Park and University of Oregon urban farm on July 28 at the Sloat Room in The Atrium Building. He wanted the mayor to announce the hearing, its location, and the fact the eventual decision could be appealed. He asked to be informed about any change in the hearing location.

Tom Kamis, 94 West Broadway, thanked the council for the improvements downtown. He commended the work of Officer Terry Fitzpatrick, saying it was having an effect. He believed the boxes near the LTD Station had been effective and they did not affect anyone's constitutional rights. The small fences on the planters were successful in eliminating the large crowds that had congregated on the corners. Downtown

was cleaner. Mr. Kamis continued to be concerned about Josh Kiem's property at 55 West Broadway. He believed Mr. Kiem's heart was in the right place and that he was trying to work things out so he could provide a meaningful service.

Mr. Kamis advocated that the City follow Springfield's example and dedicate meter revenue to help the youth downtown or those such as Mr. Kiem, who hoped to create an outreach center. He believed that in general, people were feeling more comfortable visiting downtown and the food carts were bringing new life into the area.

Erin Ellis, 901 South 37th Street, Springfield, continued to review Ms. Hutson's written testimony, which offered further reasons as to why LTD should avoid West 11th and West 13th avenues in favor of other alternatives, including the greater potential for ridership growth and economic development along 6th and 7th avenues and an enhanced entrance to the community from the airport.

Mayor Piercy closed the Public Forum.

Speaking to Mr. Vishanoff's comments, Mayor Piercy asked City Manager Ruiz to clarify the notice process. City Manager Ruiz said that the City would follow the law as it regarded public notice and he would ask staff to follow up with Mr. Vishanoff.

Mayor Piercy thanked Mr. Kamis for his remarks. She continued to see problems downtown and had asked City Manager for more planning on how to address those problems, because she was not convinced they could all be taken care of by the misdemeanor cleanup crew and a more comprehensive strategy was needed.

Mayor Piercy assured Ms. Hutson that Lane Transit District was still considering 6th and 7th avenues as an option for the West Eugene EmX route.

Councilor Clark thanked the students at the American English Institute for attending the meeting. He introduced his wife Kim and son Bryson and daughter Elizabeth, who were also present.

Councilor Clark thanked all those who offered testimony and said he had not given up on the idea of eliminating the meters downtown.

Councilor Ortiz also thanked those who offered testimony. She said it was nice to see young people from other countries present to view a representative governmental forum. She was happy to hear Mr. Kamis' positive remarks.

Councilor Taylor welcomed the students and hoped they enjoyed their summer in Eugene and that they had time to have fun as well as time to study. She thanked Mr. Kamis for raising the issue of parking. She recalled her long-time interest in eliminating meters downtown. She had recently viewed a series of empty metered parking spaces on Oak Street and spoke of the difficulty of walking back and forth to feed the meters when one was visiting downtown.

Councilor Taylor said she continued to believe the West Eugene EmX extension should go down Highway 99.

Councilor Taylor supported informing the public of hearing locations well ahead of the event.

2. **CONSENT CALENDAR**
 - A. **Approval of City Council Minutes**
 - April 26, 2010, Council Meeting
 - May 10, 2010, Work Session
 - B. **Approval of Tentative Working Agenda**

Councilor Clark, seconded by Councilor Taylor, moved to approve the Consent Calendar as presented. Roll call vote; the motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

3. **ACTION:**

Resolution 5008 Electing to Receive State Revenue Sharing Funds Pursuant to Section 221.770 of Oregon Revised Statutes;
Resolution 5009 Certifying that the City of Eugene Provides the Municipal Services Required by Oregon Revised Statutes Section 221.760 in Order to Receive State Shared Revenues; and
Resolution 5010 Adopting the Budget, Making Appropriations, Determining, Levying, and Categorizing the Annual Ad Valorem Property Tax Levy for the City of Eugene for the Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2010, and ending June 30, 2011

City Manager Ruiz said adoption of the proposed budget would move the City toward a sustainable future and allow it to provide services while living within its means. He said the Urban Renewal Agency (URA) budget addressed community priorities by moving forward on projects that improved downtown and helped the economy. He commended the council, Mayor Piercy, and the Budget Committee for their hard work on the budget in the face of many challenges. He also recognized the work of the executive team, Sue Cutsogeorge and the budget team, and Alana Holmes and the personnel team. He further acknowledged the work of Budget Chair John Barofsky and Vice Chair Claire Syrett.

Mayor Piercy thanked the manager for his leadership on the budget.

Councilor Clark, seconded by Councilor Taylor, moved to adopt Resolution 5008 electing to receive State revenue sharing funds pursuant to Section 221.770 of Oregon Revised Statutes. Roll call vote; the motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Councilor Clark, seconded by Councilor Taylor, moved to adopt Resolution 5009 certifying that the City of Eugene provides the municipal services required by Oregon Revised Statute Section 221.760 in order to receive State revenue revenues. Roll call vote; the motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Councilor Clark, seconded by Councilor Taylor, moved to include the City Manager's recommended changes to the budget for the Downtown Urban Renewal Plan amendment. Roll call vote; the motion passed, 6:2; councilors Taylor and Brown voting no.

Councilor Clark, seconded by Councilor Taylor, moved to adopt Resolution 5010 adopting the budget, making appropriations, determining, levying, and categorizing the annual ad valorem property tax levy for the City of Eugene for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2010, and ending June 30, 2011. Roll call vote; the motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting of the Eugene City Council and convened the meeting of the Eugene Urban Renewal Agency (URA).

**4. ACTION:
Resolution 1055 of the Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Eugene Adopting the Budget, Making Appropriations, and Declaring the Amount of Tax to be Received for the Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2010, and ending June 30, 2011**

Councilor Clark, seconded by Councilor Taylor, moved to adopt Resolution 1055 of the Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Eugene adopting the budget; making appropriations; and declaring the amount of tax to be received for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2010, and ending June 30, 2011. Roll call vote; the motion passed 6:2; councilors Taylor and Brown voting no.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting of the URA and reconvened the Eugene City Council.

**5. ACTION:
Resolution 5011 Adopting a Supplemental Budget; Making Appropriations for the City of Eugene for the Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2009, and ending June 30, 2010**

Councilor Clark, seconded by Councilor Taylor, moved to adopt Resolution 5011 adopting a Supplemental Budget; making appropriations for the City of Eugene for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2009, and ending June 30, 2010. Roll call vote; the motion passed un-animously, 8:0.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting of the Eugene City Council and reconvened the URA.

**6. ACTION:
Resolution 1056 Adopting a Supplemental Budget; Making Appropriations for the Urban Renewal Agency for the Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2009, and ending June 30, 2010**

Councilor Clark, seconded by Councilor Taylor, moved to adopt Resolution 1056 adopting the FY10 June Supplemental Budget; making appropriations for the Urban Renewal Agency for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2009, and ending June 30, 2010. Roll call vote; the motion passed, 6:2; councilors Taylor and Brown voting no.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting of the Eugene City Council and Urban Renewal Agency at 7:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest,
City Recorder

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)

MINUTES

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

June 30, 2010
Noon

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

COUNCILORS ABSENT: Alan Zelenka.

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the work session meeting of the Eugene City council to order.

City Manager Jon Ruiz noted that Fire/EMS Chief Randy Groves was taking the oath of office as interim chief in Springfield on July 1, 2010, at Springfield Fire Station No. 3. He stated that he would provide additional details of the ceremony as they became available.

A. WORK SESSION - Annual Meeting with the Human Rights Commission

Holly LeMasurier of the Equity and Human Rights Center briefed the council on the most recent meeting of the Eugene Human Rights Commission (HRC). She said many of the most recent work plan accomplishments of the HRC were described in her staff memorandum included in the agenda item summary materials. Ms. LeMasurier reminded the council that it had approved the HRC's two-year work plan in February 2009. She further noted that Equity and Human Rights staff had briefed the council in November 2009 regarding the priorities of both the commission and the City's Equity and Human Rights Program.

Ms. LeMasurier introduced HRC Chair Linda Hamilton.

Ms. Hamilton introduced the commissioners present: Toni Gyatso, Mat Beecher, Iva Boslough and Melissa Mona. She further acknowledged the contributions of the remaining HRC members, support staff, community partners, and council liaison George Brown.

Ms. Hamilton anticipated that the HRC's annual update to the council would involve a reaffirmation of the commission's goals, a discussion of the commission's highlights, and a question and answer period with the City Councilors. She stated that the HRC was a highly motivated and unified group that was fully committed to improving human rights for all persons in the City of Eugene.

Vice Chair Melissa Mona stated that, as part of its goal to increase the effectiveness, efficiency and accountability of the commission, the HRC had been highly proactive in coordinating with various advocacy groups and community members devoted to human rights concerns. Ms. Mona noted that the HRC continued to explore proactive approaches to important emerging human rights issues as part of its Advocacy and Response work plan area.

Ms. Mona commended Eugene Police Department Chief Pete Kerns for his collaborative efforts with the HRC and said he had been very helpful to the work of the commission.

Ms. Mona stated that the HRC continued to work with the Civilian Review Board. The HRC had also conducted a very productive meeting with Police Auditor Mark Gissiner earlier in the year. The HRC continued to explore a variety of other conflict resolution opportunities in the community and continued to investigate ways in which the commission might take advantage of human rights resources in the community.

Mr. Beecher provided information regarding the Community Anti-Hate Crime area of the HRC's work plan. He reported that the commission had had the opportunity to work with the Eugene Police Commission and its Education & Outreach Subcommittee on a collaborative project in December and January in response to a number of issues that had emerged involving hate and bias crimes in the community. He stated that the HRC had participated in several weekend meetings with various community members and human rights group representatives to provide information regarding the prevention and response to such crimes. He further stated that the HRC's Anti-Hate Resolution had been drafted as part of those meetings and subsequent discussions.

Ms. Kerwood provided an overview of the contributions of the HRC's Accessibility Committee. She further noted that the Accessibility Committee had worked in a number of community outreach areas involving accessibility, including elements of the City's Envision Eugene plan. She noted that she served on the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Advisory Committee.

Ms. Kerwood reported that the Accessibility Committee had reviewed service dog issues and the manner in which the various animal control policies of both Lane County and the City of Eugene might be better coordinated.

Ms. Kerwood stated that the Accessibility Committee had fielded a number of helpful suggestions from community members regarding the placement and installation of audible pedestrian signal devices throughout the City.

Ms. Gyatso described how the HRC had supported the creation of the Human Rights Summit event and noted that it had been intended as a collaborative effort with the Community Coalition for the Advancement of Human Rights. She further noted that the planning for the summit event had involved over sixty representatives from various human rights groups. Ms. Gyatso briefly reviewed the goals of the Human Rights summit: 1) to increase awareness of the human rights framework and its local relevance; 2) education efforts describing the City of Eugene and Lane County's efforts to improve human rights in the community; 3) encouragement of discourse regarding ways in which the human rights framework in local government and community groups; and 4) to encourage the City of Eugene to move forward as a "human rights city" while developing a broader human rights community.

Ms. Gyatso noted that the attendance and participation for the Human Rights Summit events had far exceeded the HRC's expectations.

Ms. Hamilton opened the HRC's presentation to questions from the council members and asked how the HRC might improve its communication collaborative efforts with the Eugene City Council.

Ms. Hamilton noted that the HRC members had proposed a council and commission "buddy system" and noted that further details regarding the proposal had been included in the agenda item summary materials.

Mayor Piercy thanked the commissioners for their presentation and said that they had been very helpful in reviewing various human rights issues in the community, including those issues relating to accessibility.

Mayor Piercy looked forward to the discussion regarding the Anti-Hate Resolution that had been developed by the HRC.

Mayor Piercy hoped that the HRC might provide ideas and suggestions on how human rights concerns might be effectively incorporated into various downtown development strategies.

Mr. Poling arrived.

Mr. Pryor appreciated the work of the commission and said that its goals had corresponded well to the council's own visions and goals statement. He believed that the council in its discussions had often relied on the information and experience provided by the members of the HRC.

Mr. Pryor stated he intended to be more diligent about being a "good buddy" to the commission in the future.

Mr. Clark thanked the HRC members and concurred with Mr. Pryor's previous statement.

Ms. Ortiz hoped that the HRC's Accessibility Committee might work to ensure that the City's assisted listening capabilities were adequate for City Council meetings and other City meetings.

Ms. Ortiz noted her concerns regarding recent difficulties the HRC had encountered involving various communications within the group and a member whom the commission had ultimately voted to remove. She further asked how the commission typically worked with members who dissented from the prevailing opinions and perspectives of the group. In response, Ms. Mona said that the commission member to whom she had referred had been removed on the grounds that the individual had not met the commission's reasonable expectations of conduct. She said the individual in question had not respected the working setup of the commission and that his removal from the group had not in any way been based on his opinions or beliefs.

Ms. Hamilton added that the individual's conduct and behavior as co-chair had reflected badly on the HRC. She and other commission members would be willing to discuss the matter in greater detail with the council if it wished.

In response to the comments of Ms. Mona and Ms. Hamilton, Mayor Piercy noted that the council intended to review the uniformity of the City's policies with respect to the manner in which those policies governed the City's various boards and commissions.

Ms. Ortiz appreciated the HRC's accomplishments over the past year but noted that she had often not received sufficient notice of HRC-related events and discussions.

Mayor Piercy agreed with Ms. Ortiz's previous comment and suggested that more sufficient notice from the HRC might allow the council to better understand the benefit of the partnership efforts between the two groups.

Ms. Ortiz hoped that the HRC members would not interpret the council's lack of attendance at HRC meetings and functions as a lack of support for commission and its goals.

Mr. Brown suggested that as the council's liaison to the HRC he had sometimes been remiss in bringing the council's attention to those various areas of concern that might involve the HRC.

Mayor Piercy said that she and the council members planned to be more diligent in their attendance and participation with the HRC but further hoped that the Commission would not hesitate to communicate with the council as the HRC's work plan progressed.

Ms. Hamilton responded to Mayor Piercy's previous comments regarding HRC input on downtown development strategies and stated that Chief Kerns had invited her to participate in various discussions of how the downtown area might be improved.

Mr. Beecher asked what forms of communication the council members wanted the HRC to use as they moved forward. Mr. Pryor suggested that the HRC might use emails, telephone communications and any other regular communications channels so that no important information would be missed by the council.

Mr. Clark left the meeting.

B. WORK SESSION - Hate and Bias Incident Response and Anti-Hate Resolution

Ms. LeMasurier offered a presentation entitled "Responding to Hate" and noted that the council had requested that the City's Equity and Human Rights division provide updates on how hate and bias response protocols enacted by the City had affected human rights concerns in Eugene.

Ms. LeMasurier generally described how the City had applied a number of best practices to its clear and strong leadership commitment to the preservation and improvement of human rights for all citizens of Eugene. She noted that the coordinated Hate and Bias Incident Response plan and the Anti-Hate Resolution would serve that commitment.

Ms. LeMasurier briefly discussed the ways in which the Hate and Bias Incident Response Plan was expected to benefit the City. She believed the plan could easily be adjusted to serve the needs of other local agencies working to preserve and maintain human rights.

Ms. LeMasurier reported that the Hate and Bias Incident Response Plan had been developed as one of the primary action items of the Equity and Human Rights division's Diversity and Equity Strategic Plan. She further noted that the specific action item had been recommended by the City Council's Community Committee on Race.

Ms. LeMasurier briefly discussed the general definitions and characteristics of hate and bias crimes in relation to the guidelines described in the Hate and Bias Incident Response plan. Included in her discussion, Ms. LeMasurier clarified that the Eugene Police Department did not normally respond to complaints of non-criminal hate activity and that such instances were typically left to other forms of community response.

Ms. LeMasurier briefly commented on the roles of community and government responses to instances of hate and bias activity. She maintained that the role of facilitating sensitive responses to such instances could be shared by local leadership and the community. She described several ways in which the role of the City Council and City leaders could be defined in relation to the guidelines described in the plan.

Ms. LeMasurier cited three separate and recent hate and bias incidents in the community as well as the various response methods that had been employed.

Ms. LeMasurier referred to the public outreach that had been conducted during the development of the plan as well as the various community response priorities that had been identified. She described the various hate response plan resources that had been most helpful to her in identifying the best practices for the plan. She commented that the plan had primarily focused on the three areas of notification and coordination, assessment and response, and education and outreach with respect to instances of hate and bias activity in the community. She elaborated on each of the three areas for the benefit of the council.

Ms. LeMasurier identified the key partners that had participated in the April 2010 Anti Hate Public Forum which had contributed to the development of the plan.

Ms. Gyatso discussed the manner in which the Equity and Human Rights staff working in conjunction with the HRC had developed the draft Anti-Hate Resolution. She further noted how similar resolutions had been adopted in a number of other cities.

Ms. LeMasurier described the manner in which the Equity and Human Rights staff had coordinated with EPD staff on the development of both the Hate and Bias Incident Response and the Anti-Hate Resolution.

Chief Pete Kerns described in greater detail the EPD's contributions to the development of the Hate and Bias Incident Response and the Anti-Hate Resolution. He shared statistical data regarding hate and bias crimes in the community and noted that the level of such reported incidents had briefly dropped in 2009 only to rise again later on. He commented on the yearly training that many EPD staff had received regarding bias crime reporting and further noted that representatives from the Southern Poverty Law Center had contributed to the training efforts.

Chief Kerns discussed the priorities of the EPD with respect to the reporting and response procedures involving hate and bias crimes. He further commented on how those priorities had dictated responses to two recent separate hate crime incidents in Eugene.

Ms. LeMasurier stated that the HRC and its support staff recommended that a discussion and more detailed review of the Anti-Hate Resolution be scheduled on a future council meeting agenda and further that the proposed resolution be placed on a subsequent City Council Consent Calendar. She noted that the resolution would still officially be considered a draft until it had been further reviewed by the council.

Chief Kerns, responding to a question from Mayor Piercy, described how graffiti in the city had been typically classified as either a property crime or a hate/bias crime. He further maintained that the EPD's collaborative efforts with Equity and Human Rights staff had helped make the process of such determinations more accurate and effective.

Ms. Ortiz noted that she was glad to see how the resolution had been developed and agreed that it needed to be placed on a future council meeting agenda. She noted her concern that the levels of communication regarding recent incidents of hate crimes in the North Eugene area had not been sufficient.

Mr. Pryor discussed his perceptions of how hate crimes occupied various active and inactive realms of public awareness. He maintained that the inactive realms represented a fertile breeding ground for intolerance in the community.

Mayor Piercy commented on the importance of embracing diversity in the community and suggested that rather than placing the draft Anti-Hate Resolution on a future council Consent Calendar that the council review the resolution openly before the community as part of the regular council meeting agenda.

Ms. Ortiz discussed her perceptions of how levels of intolerance in the community had developed over long periods of time.

Ms. Taylor noted that it was important to preserve the rights of individuals and further noted her disturbance at the HRC's willingness to remove a member on the grounds that he had expressed his beliefs inappropriately. She further noted that in the 1940s she had written an article for a national publication about the dangers of being "intolerant of intolerance."

Ms. Taylor, seconded by Mr. Poling, moved to place the proposed Anti-Hate Resolution on the next City Council meeting agenda. The motion passed unanimously, 6:0.

Mayor Piercy responded to Ms. Taylor's previous comments, saying that civil rights legislation was primarily designed to acknowledge the rights of groups.

Ms. Ortiz maintained that the proposed Anti-Hate resolution represented a positive step toward providing improved law enforcement in the community.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the work session meeting at 1:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest
City Recorder

(Recorded by Wade Hicks)

MINUTES

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

July 12, 2010
5:30 p.m.

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

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the July 12, 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 reported that the council was celebrating the arrival of Ms. Taylor's new golden retriever puppy, Lucy, with chocolate cigars.

Mayor Piercy thanked councilors Taylor, Clark, and Zelenka for being present to welcome the Sister City Delegation from Kakegawa, Japan. She read a letter of greetings and thanks from Kakegawa Mayor Saburo Matsui.

Mayor Piercy reported that the street improvement project at 29th Avenue and Willamette Street had been completed.

Mayor Piercy announced an upcoming statewide swim meet occurring at Amazon Pool in Eugene, which was expected to attract 500 competitors.

Mayor Piercy announced she attended the recent Cascadia Conference in Portland, where discussion focused on different entities working together on high speed rail in the Cascadia corridor.

Mr. Clark expressed appreciation for the opportunity to visit with the Kakegawa delegation.

Mr. Clark reported the Police Commission met on July 8 to finalize its work plan, which would be the subject of council work session on July 21. The commission also reviewed the Use of Force Subcommittee's recommendations regarding Use of Force Policy 300.

Mr. Clark reported that he and Ms. Taylor would meet soon with the Police Auditor Mark Gissiner to discuss the parameters of his evaluation.

Mr. Clark referred to the August Metropolitan Policy Committee meeting and expressed disappointment in the behavior of some of the members of the Board of County Commissioners in regard to the approval of the

Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Plan (MTIP). He hoped Eugene's representatives worked to ensure all projects desired by participating municipalities were included in the plan.

Mr. Clark announced he was asked to witness an effort to break the Guinness Book of World Records for the most people participating in a moonwalk following an Ems game at PK Park.

Mr. Zelenka congratulated Fire Chief Randy Groves for being sworn in as the new chief of the merged Springfield-Eugene fire departments.

Speaking to the comments of Mr. Clark, Mr. Zelenka did not interpret the Board of County Commissioners' actions as an attempt to derail the MTIP, but rather to ensure they had input on a particular project, which he acknowledged held up the entire MTIP. Action on the MTIP had been deferred to August.

Mr. Zelenka noted the high level of road construction occurring in the community and reported he was receiving complaints about it, but pointed to the benefit of such projects and the short time they took to complete.

Mr. Zelenka noted his attendance at a Bobby McFerrin performance as part of the Bach Festival. He commended Mr. McFerrin's performance as well as the performance of the Youth Choir as well, terming it amazing. He also noted the recent Prefontaine Classic, a hallmark event of Eugene summers.

Ms. Ortiz indicated she planned to propose to include improvements to the Highway 99 corridor to the City's United Front lobbying package, with a particular focus on the section between Garfield and Roosevelt streets. That section, with the exception of the stretch including the railroad overpass, would not be included in the State's planned Highway 99 improvements.

Ms. Ortiz thanked staff for providing free swimming at Echo Hollow and Sheldon pools while Amazon Pool was closed to host the 2010 MOST Invitational Swim Meet.

Mr. Pryor also had commended the performance mentioned by Mr. Zelenka, and shared in his congratulations to Fire Chief Randy Groves.

Mr. Pryor recalled that improved street maintenance had been a high priority for him when he joined the council. He was pleased to see progress on road maintenance and did not mind receiving complaints about such projects. He was confident the projects demonstrated to the public the council had been good stewards of its money.

Mr. Pryor reported that the Housing Policy Board met earlier that day to discuss two responses to its recent Request for Proposals for construction of affordable housing of a publicly owned site; both respondents were so good that it was difficult to choose between the two, but after deliberation the board selected a proposal to forward to the council.

Mr. Poling shared Mr. Clark's concerns about the MTIP and said he understood that the State funding for the Coburg interchange project was now in doubt because of the actions of the County commissioners. He said the County was not even paying its share of the project, which the State agreed to assume. He was concerned by how the County's actions would be interpreted by the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the Federal Highway Administration, and urged Mr. Zelenka to attempt to resurrect the

project. In response, Mr. Zelenka indicated the Coburg interchange project was not dead; he understood that ODOT and the County commissioners were continuing to negotiate some of the issues related to the project.

Mr. Poling had learned that City staff had suggested to representatives of Glorybee Foods that rather than relocate to the West Eugene Enterprise Zone, the business remain in its current location. That concerned him a great deal. He said that Glorybee Foods was the type of company the City was seeking to have in the zone. He did not want to see the company's project go away, but noted that the property the company intended for its campus-type development was again on the market. He asked Assistant City Manager Sarah Medary to follow up.

Ms. Taylor said the Lane Workforce Partnership Awards were scheduled for August 27 at the Downtown Athletic Club, and she encouraged the council to attend.

Assistant City Manager Medary said she and Mayor Piercy had attended the groundbreaking of the new University of Oregon east campus residence hall earlier that day. The project represented the second dorm constructed on campus in the last 40 years, and would include a "scholar in residence."

Assistant City Manager Medary noted that July was National Parks and Recreation Month, and she called the council and public's attention to some upcoming recreation and cultural events sponsored by the City.

**B. WORK SESSION:
West 11th Avenue Corridor Study**

The council was joined for the discussion by Transportation Planning Engineer Chris Henry of the City's Public Works Department. Scott Mansur of DKS Associates was also present.

Mr. Henry provided a brief presentation on the City's West 11th Avenue Corridor Study, which commenced in 2008 and focused on short-term improvements to better facilitate movement in the corridor. He reported that the corridor was currently performing well, with some exceptions primarily related to the State system and west end of the corridor. Mr. Henry reviewed examples of improvements that, taken in combination, would improve travel time and efficiency in the corridor for all modes of transportation. The improvements mentioned included improved access management, signal timing changes, and intersection modifications. Mr. Henry provided cost estimates for improvements related to the City system, which totaled about \$1.5 million, and said the costs would have to be weighed against other community transportation priorities.

Mr. Henry spoke to the improvements needed to State facilities and estimated the costs to improve Terry Street at about \$2 million, and the costs to improve Randy Papé Beltline at about \$3 million. He added that those estimates had not yet been vetted with the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT).

Mayor Piercy solicited council comments and questions.

Responding to a question from Mr. Zelenka, Mr. Mansur confirmed that the 11th Avenue and Bailey Hill Road intersection was among the worst citywide, and would also rank high if compared to other dangerous intersections in the state. Mr. Zelenka was glad to see the intersection was a high priority for mediation.

Mr. Zelenka noted the increase in accidents as access points per mile increased, and emphasized the relationship between reducing access and increasing safety. He asked how the City could implement the

access management strategy contemplated in the study. Mr. Mansur briefly described the approach taken by the City of Salem. Mr. Henry said that the strategy could be implemented at the point of development. In addition, the City Code allowed the traffic engineer to modify or close accesses to improve safety. The City could independently implement a safety improvement project in the corridor that allowed it to prioritize accesses for the most benefit. Mr. Henry suggested the West Eugene EmX route could provide another tool to improve the corridor for both movement and the businesses along the route.

Mr. Zelenka emphasized the importance of providing businesses with access, but noted that in many cases accesses were very proximate and he believed that the City could increase safety without hindering access. Mr. Henry clarified the study itself would not lead to changes; he reiterated that any changes would occur through redevelopment, or the City's direct actions.

Mayor Piercy requested information about the approach used in Salem. She wanted to examine the benefits the City could offer to businesses through better access management.

Referring to the intersection at Bailey Hill Road and West 11th Avenue, Mr. Pryor recalled that many of the driveways were in place because businesses were not allowed to connect off-street. If one could get from one place to another off-street, driveways could be eliminated and traffic flow preserved.

Mr. Pryor suggested the study provided the City with an opportunity to do something about the situation in West Eugene before it worsened. He believed that there was an impending transportation infrastructure problem in West Eugene that needed to be addressed. Mr. Henry agreed. He said staff was gathering data to inform its projections. As the community grew, so would travel demand, and that could require a combination of approaches that included enhancements to capacity, improvements to transit, and reductions in driving. He acknowledged that how the needs of the growing community would be solved had yet to be determined.

Mr. Pryor endorsed the approach taken in the study, characterizing the recommendations related to access management and intersection improvements as "low-hanging fruit" that would produce results immediately.

Mr. Brown commended the report. He believed the City should proceed on some of the projects envisioned in the study without tying them to the EmX route, pointing out that one of the options related to EmX was the "no-build" option. Many of the report's recommendations, such as the recommendation for signal timing changes, could be implemented immediately with significant result.

Mr. Brown said he frequently traveled along West 11th Avenue and most times of the day did not find it to be so congested. He asked if staff had traffic counts for Franklin Boulevard and Coburg Road for comparison. Mr. Henry indicated he would provide that information.

Mr. Clark thanked staff for the report. He said his chief concern in regard to access management was its impact on local businesses. Many businesses near intersections had only one access. He wanted to know if Salem's approach to access management had negatively affected that community's businesses.

Responding to a request for clarification from Mr. Clark about the condition of intersections on West 11th Avenue as they related to the standard for volume to capacity ratio, Mr. Henry said that the condition was not bad on the City system relative to City standards; capacity problems existed on the State-owned facilities, including Beltline and the streets west of Beltline.

Mr. Clark noted that many recommendations represented short-term fixes dependent on the construction of the West Eugene EmX route extension, and he questioned whether that extension was a short-term project. He agreed with Mr. Brown that “no build” was an option for EmX, and recommended the creation of a “Plan B” in the case the project did not go forward.

Mr. Poling recommended that staff talk to Steve Korth of the Oakway Mall for his thoughts on access management as it had been instituted on Coburg Road. He expressed interest in seeing comparative information on traffic and accident counts on that stretch of Coburg Road before and after the institution of access management. Mr. Henry agreed to provide that information.

Ms. Taylor questioned if the City could compel property owners to share parking areas and provide for access between adjacent parking lots. Mr. Henry said that the City Code allowed the City to require such access between lots when redevelopment occurred, so it occurred incrementally. Ms. Taylor asked if the code allowed the City to compel the construction of missing sidewalk segments. Mr. Henry said the City lacked a program compelling such improvements, which were generally assessed to the abutting property owner.

Ms. Ortiz determined from Mr. Mansur that the City of Salem worked with private property owners on Lancaster and Market streets to voluntarily reduce access points along those roads. There was considerable give and take in such situations, and Salem had installed new signals and rebuilt intersections to provide better and safer access to businesses.

Ms. Ortiz was also concerned about the businesses on West 11th Avenue. She did not support any changes in policy at this time other than those that could occur through redevelopment. Many of the business on West 11th Avenue were small businesses with single access points owned by people operating in a difficult economy and she did not want to negatively impact them. She supported voluntary efforts to reduce access points.

Mr. Zelenka was also concerned about businesses having access but pointed out that many such businesses would benefit from an increase in safety and the land made available for additional parking when driveways were eliminated. He asked how the City could spur improvements on the part of ODOT. Mr. Henry said that such improvements needed to be identified in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). At this point, the Greenhill Road project was in the STIP, but the Beltline project was not. Transportation Planning Manager Rob Inerfeld noted the limited funding for State transportation projects and suggested additional funding would require a legislative strategy.

Mr. Zelenka was also interested in the subject of completing the sidewalk system. He also noted the other benefits from signal timing improvements, such as a reduction in greenhouse gases and savings in fuel use.

Ms. Ortiz emphasized her priority for improving Highway 99 and said if the City was going to seek more transportation funding, she wanted to ensure it sought funding for improvements along that road. Mayor Piercy suggested the council needed to determine what it wanted to achieve in that area to be prepared when funding opportunities arose.

**B. WORK SESSION:
Endorsement of Willamette River Open Space Vision and Action Plan (A Refinement of the Rivers to Ridges Vision)**

The council was joined by Parks Planning Manager Neil Björklund and Senior Planner Jeff Kroeger of the Lane Council of Governments, who were present to request the council's endorsement of the Willamette River Open Space Vision and Action Plan. They provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding the plan and the partnership behind it.

Mr. Clark applauded the work behind the plan and expressed appreciation for the voluntary nature of property owner participation. However, he was concerned that being overly specific about future property acquisitions might require the City to pay more for land than it might otherwise. He determined from City Attorney Emily Jerome that the City Council's endorsement of the plan did not bias it or bind it in regard to future land use decisions. Mr. Clark asked what value the council's endorsement had. Mr. Björklund suggested the value of the endorsement was that the plan provided a common framework for the participating agencies to work together, and it could be important when those agencies sought funding to realize the vision in the plan.

Mr. Clark supported council endorsement of the plan, but he pointed out the council was considering some competing values. While he thought that such coordinated planning was important and valuable, he believed the City currently fell down in regard to many aspects of its river management, such as in how it managed illegal camping.

Mayor Piercy suggested the plan created a framework for future voluntary property donations and pointed out that past donors had donated land not for profit but for the purpose of creating something good for the community and future generations.

Mr. Poling hoped that the City did not take drastic measures to compel unwilling property owners to sell their properties. He supported the plan with emphasis on the conceptual and voluntary nature of the plan.

Mr. Zelenka commended the report and the staff involved in its development. He said the plan provided an important vision for the future and that vision would be useful when the City sought funding from the federal government and granting agencies. He supported the endorsement.

Mr. Pryor also supported council endorsement of the plan and suggested its implementation would be gradual. He further suggested that the Eugene council's pace of action in that implementation would to some degree dictate how the plan moved forward. He commended the vision in the plan and believed it was already producing benefits.

Mr. Clark noted that the plan was very detailed and complex, and said he would like to see an economic vision and action plan of the same magnitude following completion of the City's joint elected officials committee process.

Mr. Clark asked if mention of a specific private property adversely affected a property owner seeking to develop and finance improvements on that property. Ms. Jerome said not at this time.

Mr. Clark, seconded by Ms. Taylor, moved to endorse the Willamette River Open Space Vision Plan and Action Plan. The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the work session at 7:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest
City Recorder

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)

MINUTES

Joint Meeting of the Eugene City Council and Eugene Planning Commission
McNutt Room—Eugene City Hall
777 Pearl Street—Eugene, Oregon

November 22, 2010
5:30 p.m.

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

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Heidi Bierle, Chair; Jeffrey Mills, Vice Chair; Randy Hledik, Richard Duncan, Jon Belcher, Lisa Warnes, William Randall, Planning Commissioners.

A. WORK SESSION: Joint Meeting with the Planning Commission – Envision Eugene

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the November 22, 2010, work session of the Eugene City Council to order. Planning Commission President Heidi Bierle called the November 22, 2010, meeting of the Eugene Planning Commission to order. City Manager Jon Ruiz, Assistant City Manager Sarah Medary, Planning Director Lisa Gardner, Planners Terri Harding and Carolyn Weiss, City Attorney Glenn Klein were present on behalf of City of Eugene staff. Community Resource Group (CRG) members Don Kahle, Ann Vaughn, and Pat Farr were also present.

The following is a summary of statements collected from Eugene City Council and Eugene Planning Commission members responding to each person’s worst and best outcomes for Envision Eugene. The statements also include those from staff members and the three CRG members who participated in the session. Assistant City Manager Medary facilitated the session.

Worst Outcomes

No decisions are made in February. Envision Eugene cannot find a vision and uses continue to stay in conflict because of the lack of decision. The council will not feel able to provide a clear direction on how/where to accommodate Eugene's population and employment needs. Our plan fails to account for the residue of our unresolved land use issues. We never adjust our unsuccessful existing plans. We'll be stuck, and all the work will have resulted in failure.

Each tactic will require three work sessions to enable decision making. The two planning commission meetings, two council meetings, and one public hearing are insufficient to inform the players as well as provide ample feedback to sufficiently develop a viable plan in February. We go too slowly to accommodate the anxious, and too fast to develop sufficient wisdom and clarity in order to meet the February deadline.

Framework does not meet expectations for information needed to make clear policy choices. Bad on-the-ground assumption data (ECLA) leads to unrealizable strategies. The framework does not have enough information/choices to make specific decisions that we can agree on to move forward in a timely manner.

We squabble about the data being incorrect, not allowing a decision. Too much focus on numbers and assembling a menu that totals xyz—this could take forever.

The options may not be realistic or come with so much opposition down the road. Our tactics are not rich enough in realistic transportation infrastructure (read capacity) planning as to realize our strategies. This process becomes a mechanism to never expand because we plan unrealistic tactics for our strategies (like nodal development, which did not solve transportation). Unrealistic projections of what can be expected (or possible) utilizing the three (or subset of) strategies with insufficient tactics to accomplish the projections, leaving us with insufficient land use choices to meet projected needs (we failed). Recommendations will be too vague to have an impact in guiding growth. We create solutions that are not feasible for economic reasons.

We spiral into perpetual reset of the plan, supplanting other planning needs. We spend too much time and money debating philosophies about growth and end up with a plan that is either rejected by the Land Conservation and Development Commission or remanded by the Land Use Board of Appeals, and by the time we get a plan adopted, it is outdated and we need to start the process all over.

The urban growth boundary (UGB) may end up needing to be expanded further. We expand the UGB to include prime farm and forest lands.

We have a closed process with only ""experts" controlling the outcome. The process chokes off the opportunity of completing/reaching solution to the UGB question.

We reach conclusions and decisions rather than broad consensus. The City Council modifies the critical components of the plan so that the final version barely resembles the collective thinking of the CRG. The process does not generate broadly supported solutions. CRG members do not support group decisions and positions outside the group structure with their peers and the public. People will be angry and disappointed, creating a setback for the entire community, with no shared vision.

Every participant and decision-maker reverts to his or her old way of thinking and speaking so the conversation in the end is not at all a new one. Strong voices overpower, and after all the work to bring new perspectives into the process it is the same (squeaky wheels characterizing) the process. Innovation and agreement in the community is not supported, desired results do not occur.

Eugene fails to fulfill the quality of life that we all expect of Eugene. We will get, or stay, so entrenched in linear thinking that we will miss the opportunity to really achieve some wonderful direction and livability for Eugene.

Best Outcomes

We agree on a new UGB by February 2011 (as a council). Having time frames and trying to speed the process along, we progress as a community to implement the plan at lightning speed. We come up with a strategy to address the UGB issue and shaping Eugene's future that is agreeable to almost everyone's

original deadline. A plan acceptable to the vast majority of Eugene citizens gets adopted and implemented in a timely manner.

We realize that these are tough choices. We understand the council decision is sovereign. We (City Council, Planning Commission, community) take responsibility for the decision we make and own making our collective decision happen.

We have a ready-made implementation plan that has community political support. Everyone is comfortable and able to agree to framework and choose strategies and tactics. Framework will be so brilliant that will result in 8:0 vote in one 45-minute work session. We have broad community support or at least acceptance. All CRG members fully support the outcome/solutions generated by their efforts.

Council collectively and confidently identifies the ways to accommodate Eugene's population and employment needs. We provide data and options that enable us to choose well thought-out ways to meet 34,000 in new population growth that protects what we value, helps create what we need, and gives us direction for our future - and we do it together.

We find the sweet spot of sufficient specificity to define the product that most Eugeneans support while providing enough room to fill in the details as they become clear to us. People understand what tactics we'd be pursuing toward strategies. The plan is specific and comprehensive enough to successfully guide future growth and livability issues in Eugene. The CRG develops a set of real potential solutions. CRG outcomes and recommendations are practical for implementation. We ensure reality based tactics.

We have a new UGB. We create a shopping list of tactics within the strategies that allows filling our basket with acceptable land use choices within the existing UGB and leaves us with a real and well defined amount beyond existing UGB to accommodate the balance. We achieve near consensus agreement about the strategies, and at what level they should be employed so we create a UGB. The planning runs smoothly and UGB expansion is limited to a minimum so Eugene can continue to be a beautiful and livable place to reside.

We make the five-year update a "maximum of five years" to allow flexibility to do updates as needed. We focus on infill and brown field development. We actually focus on things that will truly affect lives - jobs!

Opposites attract. We will realize that everything is connected and that we need to get beyond linear thought and think and dream of the "whole," resulting in an amazingly better Eugene than we have now. This larger framework gives people room to see why and how others view things differently. All intelligent citizens with constructive ideas get a chance to be heard, competing ideas are discussed in a civil and objective manner. People disagree with new respect for one another.

We find a new place to land. We reshape Eugene. Eugene prospers and provides healthy and vibrant living spaces for all of its residents. Decisions reflect human nature in balance with revolutionary ideas. This all works and we live happily ever after. We create community for all. We become the Eugene we all want to be.

Advice

We prepare the City Council for future decisions. We begin listing strategies now.

We have the comfort to trust, share your thoughts, and listen with an open mind. Listen to all sides. Tolerate negative comments.

Let the CRG complete its work, let staff evaluate and synthesize, take it to the general public, and let the City Council make the decision.

Check in with people who obviously have specific needs of remaking good decisions and reaching agreement—make sure they get what they need or show them reasons that they agree with as to why they don't need all the information they thought they did.

Stop talking about how big we're going to be. Talk instead about how we'll be dressing ourselves—Italian tailored good looks or relaxed fit comfort jeans.

Provide high/medium/low levels of tactics (toolbox) that we can use to build up strategies and thus meet the land requirement.

Be aggressive with our strategies and tactics that can be adjusted up/down at the next update (five years). With each adopted strategy, identify which aspect(s), if any, will be checked at five-year check-in.

Don't force assumptions of 34,000 or more people. Consider the possibility of population decrease or stability.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the Eugene City Council meeting at 7:50 p.m.

Mr. Bierle closed the Planning Commission meeting at 7:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest
City Recorder

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)

MINUTES

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

December 13, 2010
5:30 p.m.

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

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the December 13, 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 reported that she attended the recent Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) meeting and presented new Springfield Mayor Christine Lundberg with a bouquet of flowers on behalf of the Eugene City Council. She also reported that the City of Eugene had purchased ten jail beds from the City of Springfield to support the Downtown Public Safety Strategy.

Mayor Piercy thanked City Manager Jon Ruiz and the members of the Community Resource Group (CRG) who presented on the Envision Eugene process at the recent City Club meeting. Two Envision Eugene meetings were scheduled to occur that week.

Mayor Piercy noted the International Human Rights Day event that occurred at the Baker Center on December 10.

Mayor Piercy reported that the State of Oregon had received some additional high-speed rail funding reallocated to states to the federal government following the return of the money by Ohio and Wisconsin.

Mayor Piercy said she was hosting a public forum on December 14 to discuss funding options to support the schools the following day at the Council Chamber.

Mayor Piercy called the council's attention to the anniversary memorial scheduled to honor Thomas Egan and bring attention to homeless veterans scheduled for December 17.

Mayor Piercy hoped councilors got a chance to visit the new Long House at Lane Community College.

Mayor Piercy reported that the Human Services Commission had less money to distribute this year and there was community concern about some of the commission's allocation decisions. She referred those with concerns to the Board of County Commissioners, which had jurisdiction over the final allocations.

Mr. Clark reported that he also congratulated Mayor Lundberg during a recent meeting. He said he attended

the December 9 Police Commission meeting and believed the commission was getting closer to completing its long-term policy reviews. The commission heard a report from Eugene Police Chief Pete Kerns on the implementation of the Downtown Public Safety Zone. Several officers were present to answer questions about the use of the zone as well as about policy issues. Chief Kerns had shared his final version of the taser policy with the commission, which contained only one or two minor revisions of the text he received from the Police Commission.

Mr. Poling reported that the Joint Locally Preferred Alternatives Committee met to discuss options for the West Eugene EmX extension. He hoped the council and community kept in mind that no route had been chosen, and the no-build option was still on the table. Mr. Poling said the Board of Directors of Travel Lane County had met and heard a report that an effort would be made to repeal the law that established how the Transient Room Tax was allocated. New legislative would give authority to the county to make the determination on how those funds would be distributed. That could be devastating to Travel Lane County, which supported tourism in Lane County.

Mr. Poling thanked Ms. Solomon for her service as a City Councilor and said he would miss having her at the council meeting table and the passion and compassion she brought to her work as a councilor. He recalled that four years before they ran for office in 2002 they had talked about running for the council together. It had been an honor to serve beside her. Ms. Solomon thanked Mr. Poling for his remarks and also thanked him for escorting her to her car after late night council meetings.

Ms. Solomon reported that the Public Safety Coordinating Council (PSCC) met at the Springfield Justice Center and members were conducted on a tour of the facility. She commended the partnership demonstrated by the PSCC and said there were many opportunities for the group to do important things around public safety. She also served on the Metropolitan Wastewater Management Commission (MCWC) and termed the commission another model of intergovernmental cooperation. She encouraged other councilors to serve on the MCWC and learn more about that function. Ms. Solomon said she was also a member of the Human Services Commission (HSC), which was working under a new funding model. She hoped the new model was given a chance to work. She concluded by saying it had been a privilege to serve on all three groups, as well as on the Housing Policy Board.

Mr. Brown had also attended the most recent Police Commission meeting as well as the International Human Rights Day event at the Baker Center on December 10. He said that it had been a celebration of progress and admonitions to keep working. It had been a well-attended event.

Ms. Ortiz said she also attended the International Human Rights Day celebration and noted that the City's former Human Rights Program Director, Greg Rikhoff, had been honored for his work.

Ms. Ortiz reported she was on the long-term budget committee for the Bethel School District, which had discussed the potential of a City tax measure as well as its plans for an operating bond for long-term maintenance.

Mr. Zelenka reported that the University of Oregon singing group "On the Rocks" was appearing on the television show "Sing Off" and had made it through the first few competitive rounds. He had attended his last MPC meeting as the body's chair and had presented the MPC's annual report to the Lane Council of Governments Board of Directors. He asked that the report be provided to the council as well.

Mr. Zelenka thanked the mayor for hosting the forum on school funding. He thought it would be an

interesting and important conversation. He noted the Sustainability Commission was meeting the next day. Mr. Zelenka reported that he had met with some of the opponents of the West Eugene EmX extension and received a lot of input that gave him “food for thought.” He also met with Eugene Water & Electric Board (EWEB) General Manager Roger Gray to discuss water master planning and the Veneta water contract.

Mr. Zelenka also thanked Ms. Solomon for her service to the City and said he would miss her.

Mr. Pryor reported that the Lane Council of Governments Board of Directors met the previous week and heard the report mentioned by Mr. Zelenka. He also attended a meeting of the Housing Policy Board and reported the board was seeking new members. He encouraged interested councilors to look into the work of the board, which was working on its next round of affordable housing grants.

Mr. Pryor said he attended the Oregon Business Plan Leadership Summit in Portland. The message he heard was that people could not expect economic development to occur as it did before. A new conversation was necessary. He said the good news was that Eugene was a catalyst and leader in how some of the issues discussed were addressed. He cited budgeting for outcomes as an example, saying Eugene was the only city in Oregon using that approach. He believed there were tremendous opportunities ahead, but the state could not approach issues in the same manner as in the past.

Ms. Taylor reported that she met some neighborhood leaders to discuss the proposed street assessment policies. They were enthusiastic about the proposals. Ms. Taylor reported that she had received a call from a constituent who was facing a street assessment and learned that when applying for low-income status, the City considered last year’s earnings instead of current earnings. She questioned why that was the case. City Manager Jon Ruiz said he would follow up with more information.

Ms. Taylor said she had attended a meeting of the McKenzie Watershed Council, which continued to work on restoration projects. Several property owners who lived along the McKenzie River were in attendance at the last watershed council meeting and they were still upset about Lane County’s riparian and floodplain ordinance proposals. Some planned to join the watershed council. She said that representatives of Lane County and EWEB who were present had offered to meet the property owners to discuss their concerns.

City Manager Ruiz reported that he had also attended the International Human Rights Day event and had been able to recognize several employees for their work.

**B. WORK SESSION:
Adoption of Federal Priorities**

Intergovernmental Relations Director Brenda Wilson was present for the item. She reminded the council that it adopted a priority list on an annual basis to guide the City in its lobbying efforts. She also reminded the council that the Republican Party had assumed control of the United States House of Representatives and had agreed to ban earmarks. The Senate failed to reach a similar agreement but she anticipated that earmarks would be rare.

Ms. Wilson reviewed the projects endorsed by the Council Committee on Intergovernmental Relations. Councilors asked questions to clarify the details of the projects.

Ms. Ortiz expressed interest in adding a project to upgrade the approaches to the Highway 99 bridge to the

list of transportation projects for which the City would seek funding. Ms. Wilson indicated that the City planned to host a tour in the spring for staff of Representative Peter DeFazio.

Responding to a question from Mr. Clark about the Eugene Depot-Vehicular Loop project identified among the 2011 federal appropriation requests, Ms. Wilson said the funding would pay for a process to look at practical alternatives; no alternative had been decided upon. Mr. Clark supported the project as long as it did not presuppose a solution.

Mr. Clark, seconded by Ms. Taylor, moved to adopt the 2011 Federal Priority Project list recommendations. The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

C. ACTION:

Adoption of Resolution 5018 Authorizing Exception to the Limited Neighborhood Recognition Policy for the River Road and Santa Clara Community Organizations

City Manager Ruiz introduced the item, saying the resolution would allow neighborhood organizations to continue to keep their members informed about issues of importance and allow the River Road and Santa Clara organizations to compete in the Strategic Neighborhood Assessment Process (SNAP) with other neighborhood organizations. Neighborhood Services Manager Michael Kinnison was also present to answer questions.

Mr. Clark supported the resolution. He said residents of River Road and Santa Clara were working closely together and hoped to develop a more detailed neighborhood refinement plan. He said residents of the area wanted a resident-led discussion about transition issues and he thought the proposal was a way to accomplish that. He emphasized the importance of communicating with residents in the area through newsletters.

Ms. Solomon questioned how a new planning effort would differ from the 2006 effort, which resulted in a report that to her knowledge had sat on a shelf because she was unaware of any follow-up. She said that Mr. Clark's reference to transition issues presupposed that such a transition would happen, and she questioned that. She did not think that residents were supportive of transitioning to City jurisdiction. She believed the City's funds were better directed at neighborhood organizations within the city.

Ms. Ortiz supported the resolution because of the considerable history of resistance to the concept of annexation that existed in River Road/Santa Clara and the need to build trust with residents.

Mr. Zelenka determined from Mr. Kinnison that the staff time commitment was likely to be 15-20 hours a week for four to six months. At Mr. Zelenka's request, Mr. Kinnison described the SNAP, terming it an organizing tool for neighborhoods. Mr. Zelenka concurred with Ms. Ortiz's remarks and said he would support the resolution.

Mayor Piercy also supported the resolution but wanted some sort of formal recognition from the two neighborhood associations that the City was stepping forward as a collaborative partner.

Mr. Clark believed it was time to "start a new chapter" with River Road/Santa Clara. In response to Ms. Solomon's remarks, Mr. Clark suggested the resolution provided a route for implementing the 2006 study.

Mr. Pryor believed more conversation was needed to build on the work done in 2006. He supported taking as collaborative an approach as possible to what he considered as the next iteration of a longer process to overcome past bad memories on the part of residents.

Ms. Taylor regretted that the area in question had not incorporated as a city or annexed a long time ago. She found the current checkerboard annexation pattern “crazy.”

Mr. Clark, seconded by Ms. Taylor, moved to adopt Resolution 5018 authorizing exceptions to the limited recognition policies for River Road and Santa Clara community organizations allowing for participation in the SNAP program and continued expenditure of Special Assessment Bond Funds for printing and mailing of neighborhood publications to non-city addresses. The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the work session at 6:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest
City Recorder

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)

MINUTES

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

December 15, 2010
Noon

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

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the December 15, 2010, work session of the Eugene City Council to order. She recognized that the meeting was Ms. Solomon's last as a Eugene City Councilor and on behalf of the council thanked her for her time and service. Those present applauded Ms. Solomon.

**A. ACTION:
An Ordinance Concerning Assessments for Street Improvements**

City Attorney Glenn Klein reviewed an amendment to a motion tabled by the City Council on December 13 related to the street improvement assessment ordinance.

Mr. Clark, seconded by Ms. Taylor, moved to adopt Council Bill 5038 concerning assessments for street improvements included as Ordinance Version C; including also the amendment shown in Attachment D.

Mr. Zelenka: I move to amend the motion to replace subsection (1) of section 7.193 with the following:

The improvement assistance and subsidy programs are available to property owners meeting certain age and income level qualifications. The assessment payment deferral provided in this section is available to all parcels with an owner-occupied single family dwelling or an owner-occupied duplex dwelling assessed for street improvements. After funds have been distributed to all eligible property owners participating in the improvement assistance and subsidy programs, parcels with an owner-occupied single family dwelling or an owner-occupied duplex dwelling assessed for street improvements may elect to defer payment of the assessment until sale or transfer of the parcel. Authorization to defer payment of all or part of the assessment until sale or transfer of the parcel will depend on the availability of funds at the time council adopts the assessment ordinance. Deferring payment of all of the assessment until sale or transfer of the property is authorized only if the City has sufficient funds to ensure the City and affected property owners will incur no initial costs for the construction of the local improvements. If, after funds are distributed under the improvement assistance and subsidy programs, there are insufficient funds to accommodate all property owners requesting to defer assessment payment pursuant to this section, the funds will be distributed among the el-

eligible property owners on a pro rata share. The portion of the assessment not eligible for deferral shall be paid in accordance with section 7.190 of this code.

Mayor Piercy pointed out that not all seniors were low-income, and the amendment could put those who might not have significant need at the head of the line.

Ms. Taylor did not support the motion. She said that people would not take advantage of the assessment deferral unless they needed to, given that both interest and liens were involved. She learned from staff that most people did not take advantage of the senior property tax exemption unless they needed to. She thought it would be complicated to ask people to prove that they needed the deferral. She did not think the deferral should depend on age or income, and did not think many would use the deferral.

At the behest of Ms. Ortiz, City Engineer Mark Schoening described the deferral application process, which required proof of income in the form of income tax returns. That occurred before assessments were levied. The proposed change would affect the process after that point. He did not believe the amendment pit those who chose to defer payment until they sold their house against those opting for a low-income or senior deferral because that decision had been made long before.

Mr. Zelenka indicated his intent was to prioritize the existing limited funding because more people would be subject to assessments in the future and he feared the funds would be depleted more quickly.

Mr. Pryor supported the addition of low-income residents but questioned the addition of senior residents. He thought Ms. Taylor's remarks were well-taken.

Ms. Solomon recalled that low-income residents, including seniors, were already eligible for a subsidy; a citizen could secure a subsidy but not a deferral. Mr. Schoening concurred. Ms. Solomon pointed out that left the deferral pool for everyone else. She wanted to be sensitive to those who might not have a job in the future. She feared that a street assessment could threaten such individuals' ability to keep their homes and wanted them to be able to eligible to apply to the pool for a deferral.

The amendment to the motion failed, 7:1; Mr. Zelenka voting yes.

Speaking to the main motion, Mr. Clark indicated that while he supported the majority of the recommendations of the Council Subcommittee on Street Assessment Policy, he intended to vote no because of his concern that some residents would be assessed twice for road improvements. The assessment was not based on where one's home was, but on who was driving on what street. He felt that basis for the assessment was wrong.

The motion passed, 7:1; Mr. Clark voting no.

B. WORK SESSION: Envision Eugene Update—Economic Prosperity

Community Resource Group members Sue Prichard, Bill Aspegren, Ed McMahon, and Laurel Potter joined the council for the item. Community Development Manager Mike Sullivan and Associate Planner Jason Dedrick provided a PowerPoint presentation on the economic prosperity element of the Envision Eugene planning process. The presentation highlighted local economic trends; current conditions; the economic goals and strategies recommended by a joint committee of elected officials from Springfield, Lane County,

and Eugene; local key industries and wage clusters; and information about the current and projected inventory of industrial and commercial lands in Eugene.

City Manager Ruiz asked the members of the CRG to comment. Mr. Aspegren, chair of the CRG's Economic Development Subcommittee, spoke of the challenge of determining future demand for commercial and industrial land and said the subcommittee continued to discuss the available information.

Ms. Prichard underscored the importance of understanding what the inventory numbers meant and their accuracy. She said a technical advisory committee formed by the CRG would examine the numbers produced through the Eugene Comprehensive Lands Assessment (ECLA).

Ms. Potter emphasized the need for flexibility, particularly for industrial lands, where existing small parcels might not be suitable for industrial use but could be suitable for commercial or residential use.

Mr. McMahon expressed appreciation for the process and had faith it would succeed.

Ms. Taylor referring to the strategies developed by the joint elected officials' committee and emphasized the importance of the education system to strategies 3 (*Invest in tomorrow's talent*) and 5 (*Identify as a place to thrive*). Mayor Piercy said that the issue of education was threaded throughout the committee's discussions.

Mr. Clark referred to the goals of the joint elected officials committee and expressed hope it did not take ten years to increase employment levels. He called for more focus on how to reduce unemployment on an accelerated rate.

Mr. Clark recalled that early in his service as a councilor he had advocated for beginning a process to rezone industrial acres that could not be developed because of wetlands. He wanted to ensure that the impact of wetlands was accounted for so that those acres were not counted as developable when they were not. He suggested the State might be willing to give the community the ability to add larger parcels to the industrial inventory so the City could have more buildable acres in its mix.

Ms. Ortiz agreed with Mr. Clark about the importance of ensuring that land impacted by wetlands was not counted as developable land. She expressed concern that the process did not speak to the importance of encouraging blue collar work. She had talked to railroad executives who expressed their commitment to bringing the railroad back to a higher function. She did not want to lose sight of that because the jobs provided by the railroad were family-wage jobs that could be done by youth who were not college-bound.

Mr. Zelenka suggested the potential of a strategy whereby the City began to rezone some of the smaller industrial parcels to commercial zoning. While he did not want to see the City embark on what he termed the "Golden Ring" of trying to attract large industrial firms, he understood the need for larger industrial parcels of 25 acres or more and asked if the CRG subcommittee had discussed that issue and how many parcels were needed.

In response to Mr. Zelenka's remarks, City Manager Ruiz recalled that Rusty Rexus of Rexus Forest Products had shared with the CRG that his company had sought to relocate its operation from the current location to another site for some time, and he had found there was no land available of the needed size. He said the question was not just one of attracting outside companies but of accommodating the growth of local firms.

Ms. Potter indicated to Mr. Zelenka that the discussion of large industrial parcels in terms of their number, size, and location was occurring.

Mr. Zelenka asked if the subcommittee had discussed the issue of brown fields and possible strategies that could make the development of such sites affordable without government intervention. Mr. Sullivan suggested that the City might be able to take advantage of existing federal programs to inventory and assess brown fields and capitalize a revolving loan fund for their clean-up to keep such lands in private hands.

Mr. McMahon observed that he had heard that when companies came to Eugene to look for large-sized industrial parcels they needed at least three 25 acre locations to look at. Ms. Prichard concurred, saying for the community to be on people's radar, they must have a choice. They wanted the best situation for their employees possible, including access to restaurants and shopping. The same was true for existing employers. They also needed a choice. She believed the community needed 12-15 sites of 24 acres or more, and two 100-acre sites for the purpose of long-term planning. The City's current sites were encumbered by wetlands and had other issue as well.

Mayor Piercy said that access to transit was another amenity of interest to companies seeking land.

Mr. Pryor did not expect the economy to come back as it had before, and for that reason he believed a new conversation about what the future would look like and potential tools was necessary. He did not expect a return to 'business as usual.' He emphasized the importance of partnerships and a model that was designed to compete on the global level. He believed it was the role of government to create the environment in which the private sector could create jobs. That required the community to work smarter with what it had, and he believed it was possible to do so with everyone's commitment.

Mr. Pryor suggested the goal related to job creation was low and Eugene could aim higher.

Mr. Brown questioned the relationship between the presentation and the task of identifying the location for new industrial, commercial, and residential uses. He wanted to look at detailed maps to see where things should go. He suggested that the subject of the Veneta water contact was related to the discussion. It would have huge implications for the outcomes of the Envision Eugene process if the Eugene Water & Electric Board was to become a regional water supplier for other Lane County communities. In addition, growth in Veneta, which he termed a bedroom community of Eugene, also had implications for Eugene. He thought those issues needed to be accounted for. Mr. McMahon asked Mr. Brown to have patience and trust the process. Mayor Piercy concurred.

Mr. Clark emphasized the importance of ensuring the community had an inventory of appropriately sized, unconstrained industrial lands unconstrained. Speaking to Mr. Zelenka's remarks, Mr. Clark suggested the community was moving in the opposite direction to the degree that local businesses had to move to other communities when they wished to expand because of a lack of land inside Eugene.

Mr. Clark suggested the CRG Economic Development Subcommittee consider the economic opportunities related to secondary agriculture products. He also noted the difficulty some employers encountered when attempting to hire employees such as software developers because of a lack of other companies that could hire them.

Mr. Clark agreed with Ms. Ortiz about the importance of maintaining communication with the railroads. He also suggested that the CRG should keep in mind the potential a deep water port could be established in Coos Bay when considering the land supply.

Responding to a question from Mr. Brown about the availability of a map of brown field sites, Mr. Sullivan indicated that such sites were generally privately owned and were not always identified as brown fields.

Mayor Piercy emphasized the redevelopment potential of the vacant Hynix facility.

Speaking to Mr. Zelenka's earlier remarks about the "Golden Ring" approach, Mayor Piercy did not think the City wanted "business as usual" because it had not worked anyway.

Mayor Piercy thanked the members of the CRG for their input.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting at 1:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest
City Recorder

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)

MINUTES

City Council
Eugene Hult Center Lobby
Eugene, Oregon

January 4, 2011
5:30 p.m.

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

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Council President Mike Clark opened the meeting and welcomed those present to the 2011 State of the City event. He introduced other members of the council present and recognized elected and appointed officials from other local government agencies.

II. MUSICAL SELECTIONS

The Willamette High School Jazz Band performed the musical selection “Well Git It” by Cy Oliver.

III. VIDEO PRESENTATION

Those present viewed a video entitled *Building Community, Creating Connection*.

IV. RECOGNITION OF OUTGOING CITY COUNCILOR JENNIFER SOLOMON

Councilor Clark recognized the service of outgoing Councilor Jennifer Solomon. He noted her extensive work on various City committees and commended her as the best kind of city councilor. She had been a guide and support to him, and he believed her passionate work and decision-making made Eugene a better community. He presented her with a plaque in recognition of her service and thanked her on behalf of Eugene residents.

Councilor Solomon said it had been an enormous privilege to serve as the councilor from Ward 6. She had learned much and met many great people. She shared two lessons learned with the audience. The first was that local government worked. It took a while to get things done, but she had grown to appreciate that because the result was a more fruitful and thorough discussion of the issues. The second lesson was that community quality of life did not depend on government. She believed the private sector was the true contributor to the quality of life in Eugene. Councilor Solomon said that as leaders, the council put out a compelling vision and communicated the benefit of certain activities and programs that enhanced the community, but citizens and businesses must accept that vision and chose to make it part of their life and the way they did business. Government should not demand nor regulate such activities. Councilor Solomon

believed that a high quality of life resulted when people chose to live to a higher standard, not when they were forced to. She hoped that the council resisted the urge to tax or regulate the private sector for the cost of attaining the vision it set forth.

Ms. Solomon thanked the employees of the City of Eugene employees and expressed appreciation to her husband Mike and her sons Maxwell and Matthew. She thanked the community, saying it had been a wonderful experience and a privilege to serve.

VI. ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS OF OFFICE

Deputy City Recorder Sandra Stubbs administered the oath of office to Eugene City Councilors Alan Zelenka of Ward 3, George Poling of Ward 4, Mike Clark of Ward 5, and Pat Farr of Ward 6.

VII. ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS OF OFFICE

Ms. Stubbs administered the oath of office to Eugene Water & Electric Board commissioners John Brown of Wards 4 and 5 and John Simpson, at-large.

V. AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

Mayor Piercy recognized the following outstanding volunteers.

Community Awards

- Envision Eugene Community Resource Group—Rob Bennett, Shawn Boles, Kevin Matthews, Lea Nelson, Sue Prichard, and Rusty Rexius were present on behalf of the Community Resource Group to receive the award.
- Courthouse Community Garden—Carmen Ford accepted the award on behalf of Judge Ann Aiken and others involved.

Employee Recognition Awards

Mayor Piercy recognized the following employee teams for their work in 2010.

- Climate and Energy Action Plan Team—Matt McRae accepted the award on behalf of the staff team.
- Youth and Family Recreation Team—Sandy Schaeffer accepted the award on behalf of the staff team.
- Summer in the City Team—Billie Moser accepted on behalf of the staff team.

IV. MUSICAL SELECTION

The Willamette High School Jazz Band performed the musical selection “Amoroso” by Benny Carter.

VII. STATE OF THE CITY ADDRESS

Mayor Piercy delivered the following address:

Good evening.

The State of the City is our traditional salute to the past year and our kick-off to the one just beginning. It gives us the opportunity to talk about what we’ve accomplished and the challenges we face. We’re here tonight to celebrate living and working together in this community.

We know the most important thing about our lives, our jobs and this city we call home is how we care for each other, how we care about the well-being of all who live here, now and in the future, and how we build toward a common good that will enable us to live well together.

It is about how we do this in the best and worst of times.

Let me begin my comments by thanking Jennifer Solomon for her service, Mike Clark and Betty Taylor for their council leadership, and by welcoming Pat Farr back.

Let me ask us to remember with gratitude two former Mayors of Eugene who passed away this year: Ruth Bascom and Gus Keller.

Thank you Willamette Jazz Band for honoring us with your presence tonight. You are a great example of the talent of our city’s young people and the value of our public schools.

Thank you city staff and city manager for your great fortitude, intelligence and leadership in these tough times - managing a slow recovery with continued dedication to providing the very best for the people of Eugene.

Let us give special thanks to our police and fire departments who protect our lives and property at great personal risk every day.

Thank you, City Council, for your hours of meetings, real discussion and difficult decision-making. You have demonstrated how people of diverse opinions can work well together to provide direction for our city.

Thanks to the hundreds of community volunteers who’ve helped our departments, served on committees and advisory bodies, or stepped up for their neighborhoods or non-profits. You make Eugene a great city.

There’s no doubt that in 2010 our economy was our number one issue. Incomes suffered and unemployment stayed high. Our city finances remained tight and regular services were more difficult to provide. We responded by focusing on smart governance, using the triple bottom line of social equity, economic development and protecting our natural resources as a lens, to maximize our dollars and our service while cutting over \$17 million from our General Fund budget over the last two years.

Was this easy? No, but it is something we diligently addressed. We recognized that with crisis comes opportunity and while we must deal with the crisis, we must also seize opportunities. We recognized that while we strain to deal with the lasting effects of the recession, we must also plan for a better and more prosperous future.

Eugene is a great place, full of talented people and resources - capable of strong leadership in our state and in our nation.

What did we accomplish? An amazing amount, given the times.

We have five downtown revitalization projects on the move. Whoopee! You told us that having a successful downtown is a major community priority and after many ups and downs, we are finally seeing our work come to fruition.

There's the Beam's renovation of Centre Court, Bennett's office building filling the Aster pit, Lane Community College's innovative Green Learning Centre and five-story student housing complex in the Sears pit, Masters' apartments on Pearl and former Mayor Brian Obie's Inn at 5th. When you add in Lord Leebrick opening on Broadway, the Jazz Station expansion, opening of OPUS 7, great restaurants and waterholes, there's a lot going on. That's about \$100 million in new investment in the heart of our city.

We've incrementally improved our public safety response and capacity. You told us public safety is key to the livability of our community and a responsive police force is important.

We've added police officers and training, a renovated and efficient police facility, data-based deployment, rental of additional jail beds from Springfield and closer public safety coordination with the University of Oregon. Summer in the City kept the downtown blocks filled with healthy activities.

Our Independent Police Auditor and Civilian Review Board are functioning well. Several high-profile cases were handled and resolved with great sensitivity and transparency. The oversight process we so painstakingly put into place is running more smoothly, building confidence in the integrity of our civilian review system and our Police Department.)

We maximized our resources and our firefighting capacity through the collaborative merging of services with Springfield and single fire chief oversight. This approach has been recognized for its innovation.

Roads, roads, and more roads were repaired. You told us that maintaining our existing infrastructure is a priority. With careful use of your tax dollars, our public works department repaired and rebuilt more roads than ever before in the history of this city. You agreed to support a road bond for fixing a specific list of roads and that is exactly what we have done with a citizen group's oversight.

We provided state leadership in the Oregon rail discussion. Eugene sponsored a state rail summit to initiate work on the Cascadia Rail Corridor from Eugene to Vancouver, British Columbia. Along with Portland business leader John Russell, I've agreed to co-chair a state committee to develop a preferred rail alignment for both passenger and freight between our city and Portland. Millions of dollars have been infused into the corridor, which holds the economic promise of great travel through two states and two countries.

Eugene is a strong voice at the table in state transportation planning to ensure mobility and access, while reducing green house gases and fossil fuel dependence. We serve on several important state-wide committees.

Eugene helped form the regional Area Commission on Transportation to ensure our region can be more competitive for federal dollars. This ACT is a collaborative organization that includes Lane County government and cities.

Eugene moved along our public transit system vision for the future. We know that EmX enables us to achieve a number of council and community goals in terms of accessible transportation, transit-oriented development, green house gas reduction, and reduced reliance on fossil fuels. We're part of the process to determine the preferred way to extend EmX out into west Eugene, and we're working our way through community concerns to find the right solutions.

Eugene continued to be a national leader in bike system improvements with one of the highest percentages of bike usage in the country. With our continued focus on transportation planning that considers bicycle infrastructure improvements; it's only going to get better.

We moved forward our sustainability goals through the completion of our Climate and Energy Action Plan, and used the triple bottom line lens to make city decisions. This year more than ever, sustainability was imbedded in the work of the city using our talent and resources to protect our natural resources, strengthen our economy and ensure social equity for our people.

Sustainability is imbedded in economic development initiatives aimed at reducing the costs of business and positioning us for a carbon-constrained economy. We are managing not only the present, but looking forward to the future in an uncharted world. LCC has taken the lead on a one-stop business assistance center. The Chamber of Commerce has worked to support new investment strategies and to foster entrepreneurs. Eugene has supported local business development through our Business Development Loan Program.

Sustainability is imbedded in our protection of natural resources and provision of cultural services. More people than ever use our parks and trails, visit our libraries and attend our cultural activities. These resources have been hugely important in tough times and we have even been able to add to them with some amazing public contributions.

We helped provide for our most vulnerable population through the Human Services Commission, Court-house Gardens, Project Homeless Connect, the Egan Warming Shelters, and partnering to build our stock of affordable housing options.

We worked to be a Human Rights City through conferences, celebrations and summits and through actions of commitment to equality and justice – through speaking out.

We built strong partnerships with our schools, universities and community college, EWEB and LTD, and our government partners throughout the area and state - and we have done it successfully while holding true to our values.

We had healthy and substantive community discussions about important city issues such as growth and development. People of all perspectives gave time and talent to more productive community deliberations.

We've led an enormous community planning effort encompassing land use, transportation, social equity, economic development and environmental stewardship. This is Envision Eugene and you're all invited to be part of it.

This city commitment to people, planet and profits has grown and strengthened over the last few years with careful and smart work by many people. It has not always been easy nor do I suspect it will be in the future. The life of a city is complex. We are moving forward with steady hands at the wheel.

Our efforts have been noticed. ICLEI, a national coalition of local governments for sustainability, recognized our leadership in sustainability initiatives and innovation. We were named among the top bike cities in the country by Bike Magazine. We were named one of the 100 best cities for business by Forbes; a best place to retire; a great place for people with pets; home of a great university that is a member of the prestigious Association of American Universities; a best small city for families; a smarter city; and a best place to live.

"Eugene is a breath of fresh air, unlike other places which duplicate each other across this land," and "considered Paradise" are just a couple of the quotes about our city I've found.

We've also recently been noted as one of the nation's most progressive communities and that is only possible because of all the work, cooperation, and vision coming from our citizens, council, staff and leadership, working in a new era of collaboration to make Eugene a great city and place in the 21st century.

And if that is not enough to launch you into 2011, let's not forget our Ducks, the University of Oregon Debate Team and the On the Rocks an a cappella group, all competing nationally to accolades and honor.

We live in the sweet spot.

In 2011 we will continue to move our economic plan. People must have jobs - jobs that pay well and keep our community unique, healthy, clean and strong. We have a lot to build on. We'll measure our progress and make adjustments as we go.

We'll take some specific additional steps to further address homelessness and the needs of our young people. In particular, we'll take a look at how we might locally support our public schools during this time of state funding crisis.

We'll see all our downtown projects come to fruition and work on adding more. We'll work on creating a safer community. We'll work with the U of O and our neighborhood associations on a wide range of safety and livability issues.

We'll focus city efforts on an arts and culture district. Although we've lost some ground in the visual arts due to the recession, we remain committed to supporting the wealth of talent we are so fortunate to have in this community.

We'll decide the future of our city hall and plan accordingly. This is called "getting our own house in order."

We'll implement our ambitious climate and energy plan to ensure that we are as prepared as we can be for an uncertain future, and we'll maintain our huge commitments as a Human Rights City.

We'll finish Envision Eugene and integrate it into all our other planning processes.

We'll have inclusive and respectful policy discussions at all levels.

We'll evaluate the proposed third segment of EmX in order to continue to build our world-class transit system.

We'll support strengthening our state's passenger and freight rail system, ensuring that Eugene benefits economically.

We'll move up to platinum status in bike friendliness through implementation of our bike and pedestrian plan.

And we will care for each other and take pride in our city where so much is done and so much is possible.

Desmond Morris – “Clearly the city is not a concrete jungle, it is a human zoo.”

Margaret Mead – “A city is a place where there is no need to wait for next week to get the answer to a question, to taste the food of another country, to find new voices to listen to and familiar ones to listen to again.”

William Shakespeare – “What is the city, but the people?”

Eugene is ours and we are it and another year begins.

VIII. Adjourn

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest
City Recorder

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)

MINUTES

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

January 11, 2011
5:30 p.m.

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

COUNCILORS ABSENT: Chris Pryor.

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the January 11, 2011, work session of the Eugene City Council to order. She noted that Mr. Pryor was out of town, and welcomed Mr. Farr to the council.

A. ITEMS AND COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mayor Piercy reported that she attended Eugene Police Captain Chuck Tilby's retirement party. She recognized Captain Tilby's 33 years of service to Eugene and thanked him on behalf of the council.

Mayor Piercy noted the Matthew Knight Arena was opening on January 13 and the Gateway EmX dedication was scheduled for January 14. She also noted that January 17 was Martin Luther King, Jr. Day and a march in honor of Dr. King would be held that day, followed by an evening event at the Hult Center.

Mayor Piercy thanked the Oregon Ducks for their 2010 season and for giving the community the opportunity to share in the journey to the national championship game. She said a parade in honor of community champions was planned for January 22 to honor the accomplishments of the Ducks as well as other community and University groups.

Ms. Taylor reported that she had attended both the State of the City and State of the County events and commended the mayor for her remarks at the State of the City event. She congratulated Mayor Piercy for her recognition by The Nation as the most progressive mayor in the United States

Ms. Taylor reported she had been appointed chair of the National League of Cities Human Development Policy and Advocacy Committee.

Ms. Taylor said she was receiving complaints from constituents about a change in the hours when parking tickets were issued.

Ms. Taylor reported that the Lane Workforce Partnership had moved to its new headquarters and the organization was happy in its new surroundings.

Mr. Zelenka commended the State of the City event and also commended the national recognition received by Ms. Taylor and Mayor Piercy. He said the Oregon Ducks were also recognized by being chosen for the national championship game, which put Eugene on the map. He said it was a special thing to be able to attend the game, and the Ducks were winners to him. He reported on the pep rally held before the game, saying it was attended by 20,000 people.

Ms. Ortiz was also proud of the Ducks and thought they did a fabulous job. She reported she had attended a meeting of the Trainsong Neighbors the previous week and would attend the Whiteaker Community Council meeting the next day at which the EmX extension alternatives were discussed.

Ms. Ortiz regretted she had been unaware of Captain Tilby's retirement. She said he was an awesome person and would be missed.

Ms. Ortiz noted that the Eugene Police Department received 22 commendations December 2010. She reviewed a commendation from a person whose car failed at a busy intersection. The officer pushed the car out of the intersection and waited with the driver until he was sure a tow truck was on the way. She believed it spoke to the good job the police were doing in the community.

Mr. Brown had attended the State of the City and State of the County. He also met with an ad hoc group concerned about the school funding situation. Mr. Brown reported that he attended the orientation for his new committee assignment as the council's representation to the Metropolitan Wastewater Management Commission as well as a meeting of the McKenzie Watershed Council.

Mr. Farr announced that the Active Bethel Citizens had received a Strategic Neighborhood Action Plan (SNAP) grant to fund community gardens. He anticipated the gardens would be operated in conjunction with the Bethel School District on district property. The ground-breaking would occur the following week.

Mr. Farr observed that he was wearing a unit insignia for the second battalion of the 166th Infantry. When he received his commission, he was posted to Bravo Company of the Second Battalion. The executive officer was Thomas Egan. He had served with Mr. Egan in the National Guard for several years. He had thought of Mr. Egan when he heard the news that Bravo Company received a Presidential Unit Citation for bravery in Iraq. He congratulated the men and women of the 166th Infantry, who were now home, and hoped that all those serving came home safely.

Mr. Poling welcomed Mr. Farr back to the council. He remarked that the honor mentioned by Mr. Farr was the first Presidential Unit Citation received by a reserve unit since World War II. He also thanked and congratulated the men and women of the 166th Infantry.

Mr. Poling announced the Harlow Neighborhood Association meet at the North Park Community Church at 3484 Harlow Road on January 13 at 6 p.m. He announced the Cal Young Neighborhood Association would meet on January 20 at the Sheldon Community Center to discuss the possibility of reorganization.

Mr. Poling acknowledged the recent shootings in Arizona and the six victims of that incident as well as those wounded. He urged people to consider their actions and be part of the solution.

Mr. Clark welcomed Mr. Farr to the council.

Mr. Clark said it had been an honor to serve as the council president.

Mr. Clark thanked Captain Tilby for his service to the City and congratulated him on his retirement. He congratulated the Ducks for their conduct during the national championship game.

Mr. Clark had also attended the State of the City and State of the County events and commended both events. He reported that the Santa Clara Community Organization met on January 6. He conveyed to the council the thanks of the Santa Clara and River Road community organizations for the variance that allowed those organizations to be considered for a SNAP grant. He noted the Springfield State of the City event was on January 13 at 11 a.m.

Mr. Clark asked those with an interest in taking a leadership role in a reorganized Cal Young Neighborhood Association to contact himself, Mr. Poling, or Neighborhood Services.

Mr. Clark reported that the Eugene Area Chamber of Commerce would recognize Rob Bennett as Eugene's First Citizens at its Celebration of Business event on January 26.

City Manager Jon Ruiz said construction continued to go on downtown. Speaking to Ms. Taylor's remarks about parking, City Manager Ruiz said that there had been no change in the enforcement hours for parking limits.

City Manager Ruiz congratulated Captain Tilby on his retirement, saying he was a wonderful person who gave great service to the community.

Councilors then offered committee reports. Mayor Piercy noted that the council had been provided with a written report on the Public Safety Coordinating Council.

Mr. Brown reported on the work of the Human Rights Commission, saying that the commission worked with the Gender Center on Transgender Awareness Week and the Day of Remembrance, forwarded a letter to the council on the Arizona law regarding illegal immigrants, hosted a community forum on veterans, sent a letter of support to the United Nations in support of the Declaration of Rights of Indigenous People, provided financial support to Pride Day, CALC Cornucopia, Transgendered Awareness Week, and the upcoming Martin Luther King, Jr. Day event, and held an International Human Rights Day event at the Baker Center. Several commissioners attended best practices training for boards and commissions.

Mr. Brown anticipated that the Human Rights Commission would ask the council to approve a resolution reaffirming the City's commitment to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Human Rights Framework; a three-hour training on the framework was planned, and the commission hoped that councilors attended. A subgroup of the commission was examining its Human Rights Support System and would make recommendations to the full commission on how to proceed. Mr. Brown noted that there were vacancies on the commission to be filled in the next recruitment cycle.

Mr. Farr looked forward to the challenge and opportunity of serving on the Human Rights Commission. He asked the council to calendar the date for Project Homeless Connect, which was March 17.

Ms. Ortiz hoped that the City could provide more training in the future to those appointed to City boards and commissions about their charges and the legal parameters that bound them.

Mr. Zelenka discussed the work of the Sustainability Commission, saying it had reached out to the Human Rights Commission about framing the social equity element of the Triple Bottom Line (TBL).

Mr. Poling reported that the Board of Directors of Travel Lane County heard a report that the State legislature would attempt to revise the way Transient Room Tax funds were allocated. The proposed legislation would allow counties to make the decision about how those funds were allocated, which could have a serious impact on Travel Lane County's ability to market Lane County and the county's tourism industry. He planned to ask the Council Committee on Intergovernmental Relations to take a position in opposition to such legislation. Travel Lane County staff was also concerned about proposed modifications at the federal level that would change how room taxes were collected for internet bookings.

Mr. Poling reported that the West Eugene EmX Extension Steering Committee was asked to make a recommendation for the West 11th EmX alternative to the Lane Transit District (LTD) Board of Directors. While he believed the West 11th Avenue option the best route of those proposed, he also believed he could not support the motion placed before the committee without more input from the City Council. He had asked that the "no build" and transportation system management (TSM) options be forwarded as well, and was told the "no build" would be forwarded but TSM would not. Because TSM was not included, he voted against the motion to forward the recommendation to the LTD board. Five members voted in support of the option, four abstained, and there was one "no" vote.

Mayor Piercy asked Mr. Poling to ask the Travel Lane County board to consider how the region could take better advantage of rail travel opportunities between Washington and Oregon and the United States and Canada. Mr. Poling agreed to raise the issue at the next board meeting.

Mayor Piercy reported that the Human Services Commission had less money to allocate this year so had gone through a program evaluation process that resulted in recommendations for funding to the Board of County Commissioners. One of the agencies that had not been funded objected to the recommendation package, so the board returned the decision to the commission for further discussion.

Mr. Pryor was not present to report on the Lane Council of Governments Board of Directors.

Mr. Zelenka reported that the Metropolitan Policy Committee had elected a new chair, Hillary Wylie of the Springfield City Council. The committee continued to work on local transportation system plans that would eventually be integrated into the Regional Transportation System Plan.

At the request of Mr. Clark, Ms. Wilson briefly discussed the relationship between the Lane Area Commission on Transportation and the Metropolitan Policy Committee and their respective statutory responsibilities.

Mr. Zelenka reported that the Sustainability Commission had discussed his report to the council. Members had commented on the work being done by the Sustainability and Planning commissions on land use and transportation. The Sustainability Commission wanted the council to take a long-term view of those issues with sustainability in mind and to mitigate the negative impacts "at the intersection" of land use and transportation. The commission had believed the social equity element of the TBL was important and should not be forgotten. The commission had also asked for more responsibility. It requested it be giving a role in framing the TBL analysis associated with the Envision Eugene process and reviewing the analysis before the council saw it on February 28. The commission also requested that it be allowed to give staff input on large complex projects, policy issues, and ordinances before they went to the City.

Mayor Piercy supported the commission's requests. Mr. Clark expressed interest in hearing the Sustainability Commission's analysis of the economic impact of some of the decisions it was discussing. He asked if a TBL analysis was being done of the route options for West Eugene EmX. City Manager

Ruiz anticipated a TBL analysis would be done as the council moved toward a final decision in August/September 2011. Mr. Clark assumed that analysis included a complete analysis of the route's impact on local businesses and the LTD operating budget. Mr. Zelenka said he would share that with the commission. He clarified that the commission would actually review the analysis done by staff to ensure the three elements were adequately addressed.

City Manager Ruiz reminded the council that the analysis occurred in the context of sustainability, not in the context of the local economy. However, economics was an important part of the analysis.

Mr. Zelenka concluded his report by saying that the Sustainability Commission wanted to be able to add "low-hanging fruit" to its work program. He commended the work of Sustainability Coordinator Babe O'Sullivan.

Mr. Farr determined from Mr. Zelenka that the commission would both identify "low-hanging fruit" and would accept suggestions from others.

B. Appointment of Representative to Lane Area Commission on Transportation (LACT)

Intergovernmental Relations Manager Brenda Wilson joined the council for the item. She reported that the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) had approved the Lane County Area Commission on Transportation (LACT) bylaws on November 9, 2010. The other Lane County communities that would be represented on the LACT were in the process of selecting their representatives. Ms. Wilson said that the bylaws stipulated that the City's primary representative be an elected official. It was recommended but not required that the representative also serve on the Metropolitan Policy Committee. She reported that the County would select its LACT and Highway 126 representatives the following day.

Mr. Clark suggested that Mayor Piercy was the logical appointee to the LACT. He recommended that her alternative also be an elected official to ensure accountability to the taxpayers. City Manager Ruiz concurred with the recommendation.

Mr. Clark said while he had never objected to any action taken by the City representatives to the Metropolitan Policy Committee, he wished there was more diversity in the views of its representatives.

Mr. Clark, seconded by Ms. Taylor, moved to appoint Mayor Piercy as the City's representative to the Lane Area Commission on Transportation (LACT). The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

Mr. Clark, seconded by Ms. Taylor, moved that the City alternative to the LACT be the City's other representative to the Metropolitan Policy Committee. The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

C. WORK SESSION: Eugene Water & Electric Board Sale of Water to Veneta

Ms. Wilson introduced the item. City Attorney Glenn Klein was also present for the discussion. Ms. Wilson reminded the council that it had discussed the sale of surplus water to Veneta several times, and the courts ruled in 2010 that the Eugene Water & Electric Board, not the City of Eugene, had the authority to enter into a contract with and sell surplus water to Veneta. The City of Eugene was appealing that decision. In the meantime, the City of Veneta was requesting the City of Eugene show support for

the sale so it could move forward with a federal funding package and begin work. She said that support could be reflected in a resolution, and a resolution would be presented to the council later in the month. The resolution would reflect a specific amount of water and could include a provision that ended the resolution should the City be unsuccessful in its appeal or a regional water supplier come into existence. It could also include a provision that no one could tap into the pipe line without council approval.

Veneta City Administrator Ric Ingram discussed the terms of a contract between EWEB and the City of Veneta as it regarded the amount. The contract currently called for 4 million gallons per day; that amount was based on a 20-year horizon. However, 3 million gallons per day was acceptable for the immediate future. Veneta would maintain a redundant system and have its own capacity.

Councilors asked questions clarifying the details of the proposed contract.

Mr. Clark asked the average daily flow of the McKenzie River. Jeannine Parisi of EWEB indicated that the utility took about 3-1/2 percent of the flow from the river at the Hayden Bridge intake on an August day of highest usage, and adding Veneta to the flow was .02 percent more.

Mr. Clark said the purpose of the contract was to perfect more water rights for Eugene and to help Veneta find a solution to its water supply problem, and the question was whether it was a good idea. If it was a good idea, he questioned why the City would limit the amount of water that EWEB could sell to Veneta since it did not appear to significantly impact the supply. It would also generate more revenue for EWEB.

Speaking to whether the contract should be for more water, Ms. Wilson pointed out that to perfect its water rights, EWEB must demonstrate beneficial use of the water and it would not help to sell Veneta more water than it needed. The amount could be more if Veneta could show the need for more water. City Attorney Klein added the City could increase that amount in the future if the pending litigation was settled in its favor.

Mayor Piercy suggested the quandary before the council was the precedent being set for infrastructure expansion and growth without a broader discussion of regional water needs. She acknowledged that Veneta had a grant and a time line to address. Mayor Piercy also acknowledged concerns about the community's claim on additional water rights in the McKenzie River.

Mayor Piercy asked if the contract should also include conservation agreements and stipulations about water reuse in the future. Ms. Wilson pointed out that the contract included requirements about water conservation, including water reuse.

Mr. Zelenka agreed with Mayor Piercy's summary of the issues. He asked City Attorney Klein if the resolution threatened the City's appeal, given that the amount of water included seemed arbitrary to him. City Attorney Klein said there needed to be a significant difference between what the council and EWEB authorized. He believed that the courts would accept 3 million gallons a day as a sign of significant differences in position, keeping the lawsuit alive.

Mr. Zelenka recalled he had asked for staff input about how the contract affected the City's growth management policies and its relationship to State land use planning laws. He acknowledged that for him the issue was not about Veneta, which had its own urban growth boundary (UGB) and was responsible for growth inside that. Instead, it was about Eugene's role as regional provider of water and how it related to the City's growth management policies and State land use planning goals. After discussion with Ms. Wilson, Mr. Zelenka came to the conclusion that the growth management policies and State planning rules did not apply because the pipeline would run between the two communities. He

considered that a bit of a disconnect, but acknowledged the issue did not come up often. He believed that the council needed to consider the spirit of those policies and laws as opposed to the letter of the law.

Mr. Zelenka pointed out that Eugene would need multiple Venetas to perfect its water rights for the first 25 percent, which suggested to him that the region needed a planning context for that to occur. He suggested there were benefits from a regional water master planning approach, including cost savings and the mitigation of environmental impacts.

Responding to a question from Mr. Brown, Ms. Wilson indicated that the courts had ruled in the past that municipalities have five years to perfect their water rights. Because of the difficulty of doing so, the legislature was trying to modify the law. One of the League of Oregon Cities' top three legislative priorities was clarifying and protecting the amount of time municipalities have to perfect their water rights. She said no one knew precisely when EWEB had to perfect its rights, but it had to be soon. EWEB had asked for an extension to provide more information to the State proving it was moving toward the next 25 percent. She did not know if the State would grant the extension.

Mr. Brown pointed out that even if the City approved a resolution of support, the contract did not get EWEB closer to the next 25 percent. He said EWEB would need more customers and he questioned if they were out there. He said that when EWEB first applied for water rights in the 1960s the community was going through a growth period and many believed that its population would reach San Francisco levels, but that had not occurred. He asked how long EWEB projected it would take to perfect the third water right. Ms. Wilson said that it was not likely to happen in 5 or 20 years, but the community just needed to meet the first 25 percent. She said that EWEB General Manager Roger Gray had noted out that beneficial use was not just the use of water, but also the mitigation of the risk of having a single source of water. In the case of an emergency, the community could lose water for weeks. EWEB hoped to demonstrate to the State that it had a plan to mitigate that risk by showing part of the water right could be used as a back-up source.

Mr. Brown believed it would take more than 100 years for EWEB to fully perfect the third water right. He thought the water right was too big and added to a false sense of pressure, making the issues difficult to sort out. Mr. Brown suggested that Veneta and EWEB could change the contract at any time without consultation with Eugene to increase the amount of water.

Mr. Clark suggested a well-done regional water master plan would include the voices of people from around the region and would not be filtered through the City's growth management policies. He said Eugene was not the ultimate arbiter of the discussion and he anticipated the State would have a say in many of the issues.

Ms. Taylor did not want to confuse the subject of the Veneta contract with the subject of a second source of water. She thought they were separate topics. She believed that EWEB should talk to the Springfield Utility Board about sharing sources of water.

Mr. Zelenka thought it important to protect EWEB's water rights, particularly the first 25 percent because it gave the community a reservation on the next 25 percent. He suggested a regional water plan could help answer the questions before the council, would create benefits through regional cooperation, and would address the risk of infrastructure costs. He reviewed his proposal for a regional water planning process, included with the council's meeting materials.

Mr. Farr determined from Ms. Wilson that Veneta could not sell excess water or allow other cities to tap into the pipeline.

Responding to a question from Mr. Brown, Ms. Wilson said the State had denied cities water rights in the past. It was becoming more difficult for municipalities to perfect their water right permits. The courts ruled that perfection must occur on a faster time table because of the many entities waiting for water. It was highly unlikely that EWEB would be able to get back in the queue and apply for the same amount without any restrictions was highly unlikely. Portland was buying water from other entities because it was unable to secure additional water rights. Other municipalities had lost their rights because of failure to perfect their rights. She did not envision that the State would allow exemption after exemption if a community made no attempts to perfect its rights. Water was held in trust for the people of Oregon by the State and hoarding was not allowed. Mr. Brown asked about the potential of negotiating with the State to reduce the third right to a more realistic level. If the community gave up too much and found it needed the water in 100 years, he doubted the State would deny Eugene the water. Ms. Wilson said the law of prior appropriation would not allow that.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the work session at 7:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest
City Recorder

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)

M I N U T E S

Eugene City Council
Council Chamber—City Hall
777 Pearl Street—Eugene, Oregon

January 11, 2011
7:30 p.m.

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

COUNCILORS ABSENT: Chris Pryor.

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the January 11, 2011, regular meeting of the Eugene City Council to order.

1. ACTION: Election of City Council Officers for 2011

Councilor Clark, seconded by Councilor Taylor, moved to elect Betty Taylor as the council president and George Brown as the council vice president. Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

2. PUBLIC FORUM

Mayor Piercy requested a moment of silence for the victims of the Tucson, Arizona shooting.

Mayor Piercy reviewed the rules of the Public Forum.

Pauline Hutson, 1025 Taylor Street, asked the council to consider the human factor and the large business tax base affected by the proposed West Eugene EmX extension. She suggested that to this point, they had been out of the sight and minds of the policy makers. She objected to the fact that no West 11th Avenue business owners were represented on Lane Transit District or City advisory committees discussing the route. She suggested that past City planning processes affecting 29th Avenue and Willamette Street and West Broadway had negatively affected adjacent businesses. Ms. Hutson believed Eugene was unique and charming as it was and would be more successful without such redevelopment. She said the council seemed intent on destroying Eugene with rezoning, overlays, and mixed-use development, with LTD compounding the problem through tree removal and bus lane construction that disrupted neighborhoods and took away valuable parking from businesses. Ms. Hutson supported public transportation in the right location. She did not think LTD's plan for West Eugene, which she called wrong and unnecessary, was sustainable.

Robert Rubin, 2836 West 11th Avenue, believed the issue of school funding was beyond the City's charge and suggested a new City tax for schools would not be popular.

Speaking to the proposed West Eugene EmX extension, Mr. Rubin objected that LTD was making service reductions while planning to increase its budget by \$1 million to underwrite the costs of West Eugene EmX service. He did not consider the project sustainable because of that and suggested that the City ask LTD to identify the source of funding for future West Eugene EmX operations now. He did not think the payroll tax increase would be sufficient to operate the route in the future. He also believed LTD should identify now the areas it was contemplating for future reductions.

Mr. Rubin did not accept LTD's contention that EmX represented increased service in West Eugene, pointing out it would have fewer stops a greater distance apart than the current system. He objected to the fact that LTD had never tried an express service on West 11th Avenue although it clearly had the advertising budget to promote such an express, as evidenced by its advertising in support of the West 11th Avenue EmX project. He believed LTD had lost sight of its real mission in its desire to secure Federal Transit Agency (FTA) funds. He did not think congestion would be solved by a giant bus, and pointed out that existing park and rides on along West 11th Avenue were not used to capacity. He said that forecasts can be wrong, and planners can issue rosy but wrong projections.

Keith Edding, 1970 Columbia Street, called for open and honest discussion of the status of school funding as the reductions being contemplated by Eugene School District 4J would damage the schools, erode public confidence, and erode Eugene's positive reputation as a place to live and do business. He moved to Eugene in part because of the solid reputation of the public schools. His daughter was getting a reasonable education but had large classes and was losing time to furlough days. He believed conditions would worsen as a result of the draconian reductions he anticipated the district would adopt and as a result the district's schools would not meet State requirements. He called on the council to exercise its leadership and refer a City income tax devoted to K-12 to the voters.

Pete Mandrapa, 4120 West Amazon Street, a retired teacher, said he moved to Eugene because of the reputation of its schools. He said in the 1970s and 1980s he worked in an exemplary school system where teachers and students were well-supported. Things had changed with the passage of Ballot Measure 5 when funding responsibility for the schools was shifted to State government. The State income tax was a more volatile source of funding than the property tax. During the 1990s the school system started going downhill and class sizes began increasing. He supported a City income tax because the community needed to do something about the funding shortfall in the short-term while the State worked toward a long-term solution.

Josef Siekiel-Zdzienicki, 1025 Taylor Street, indicated support for an income tax dedicated to K-12 education. Speaking to the proposed West Eugene EmX route, Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki said that LTD wanted a 15-foot easement in much of the 61-mile route that it planned. That added up to a lot of easements, and he thought the public should be alerted to that. He called for synchronization of Envision Eugene and the EmX route planning effort. He said that every property owner living along all the transportation corridors being discussed should be notified of the potential impact of the Envision Eugene process and he promised that many people would show up to share their concerns. He believed that having the policy discussion now would avoid the need to have the same discussion later for the other corridors.

Jeff Morton, 93103 Powerline Road, said he owned the Boulevard Grill and also had children in the local schools. While he appreciated the cause, Mr. Morton did not support a sales tax on restaurants because people would either spend less or opt out of dining in restaurants altogether. As a result, unemployment could rise in the food service industry. He pointed out that the community was already seeing a trend toward limited menus and food carts due to the lower costs of those businesses. Restaurant profit margins were thin, particularly for non-franchise restaurant owners.

Mr. Morton suggested a second unintended consequence to such a tax was that Springfield restaurants would have a competitive advantage over Eugene restaurants. He also asked the council to consider the timing of such a tax. Businesses were struggling through the recession and were beginning to crawl back. He asked why the City would want to kick business when it was down and chose one industry to bear the load. Mr. Morton offered to share his bottom line with the council.

Joel Pomerantz, 1171 Risdén Place, represented the Oregon Restaurant Lobbying Association. He did not minimize the education budget shortfall but suggested that it was an issue that belonged to the entire community. He believed a City tax on prepared foods would be unfair. Most tax revenues would be collected by lower price restaurants visited by low-income families with multiple jobs and no time to cook, and such a tax would be regressive in nature. Meal taxes had to be collected in both traditional restaurants, grocery stores, convenience stores, food carts, and where ever food was sold. Such a tax would unfairly target the food sales industry. It should not be the only community industry at risk. Mr. Pomerantz said that restaurants have small profit margins and losing a percentage of sales would put business at risk. Most restaurants owners were just hanging on.

Kimberly Gladen, 361 West Broadway, #4, suggested a restaurant tax or flat income tax would hurt low-wage earners. She asked the council to consider who it was taxing. She said that such taxes took homeless families further away from being in a home. Her neighbors dreamed about having more space for their children, but taxing their incomes and their restaurant meals took them farther away from that dream as well. Such taxes also hurt the mentally ill and the disabled, who often held jobs. Ms. Gladen suggested the only fair tax would be on higher income earners who had enjoyed large federal tax breaks and advantages that the low-income did not have. She considered cell phones, computers, and cars one did not live in to be luxury items for the rich. Taxing her income would be unfair and taxing those poorer than her would be even more unfair. She said the City should consider who such a tax might hurt.

Jack Radey, 2230 Garfield Street, questioned LTD's use of public funds to conduct a radio campaign in support of the West Eugene EmX extension. Mr. Brady's review of the information related to the extension and the response to his questions of LTD staff about the project led him to conclude that a "sell job" was occurring. Mr. Radey said that the facts cited by LTD did not stand up well to close examination. LTD seemed to have selected the projections that best supported its argument of need. He questioned how LTD could maintain such a system given the status of its budget and objected to the lesser service that he perceived would be delivered on West 11th Avenue as a result.

Wendy Butler Boyson, 1265 City View Street, expressed her support for the proposed West Eugene EmX extension. She described her own use of the first phase of EmX system in support of her remarks. She believed the ridership on the existing EmX system spoke for itself. She said the buses were frequently full. Ms. Butler Boyson went on to aver that once the community provided fast and easy transportation in the form of the EmX system, people with cars would use the system to get to the places they wanted to go. She did not think that concerns about construction concerns should be an issue for the businesses along West 11th Avenue because of LTD's mitigation plans.

Charles Hibberd, a West 11th Avenue business owner, suggested that EmX between Eugene and Springfield was successful because it ran between two hubs. He questioned the sustainability of the proposed extension because he did not think LTD would be able to maintain it or support it into the future without causing damage or depletion of a resource. In this instance, the resource was the businesses on West 11th Avenue. None of them were supportive of bus travel. People did not travel to Home Depot on the bus to buy wood. He located his business in the corridor because it was a busy street and people came to do businesses in their automobiles. He suggested that the businesses on West 11th Avenue represented

an interdependent ecosystem that relied on easy automobile businesses. Mr. Hibberd said that traffic on the street was heavy but it moved without problem.

Ian McNeely, 2288 Potter Street, supported a modest temporary tax dedicated to education. He maintained that the economy of the city and its identity depended on education. He could no longer use the local education system as a tool to recruit new faculty to the University of Oregon. He said his neighborhood association had expressed support for higher taxes to support education even though most members did not have children in the schools. Mr. McNeely said citizens who earned a paycheck had received a “windfall” as a result of President Obama’s tax cuts, and he wanted the council to ask the citizens to impose a progressive tax on incomes over \$50,000 to “ earmark that windfall” to add back school days and reduce class sizes. He encouraged the council to “use the City’s leverage” to ensure the money was spent on raising academic quality to ensure students were prepared to attend Oregon universities.

Bob Macherione, 1994 Bronson Street, represented Our Money Our Transit. He distributed copies of a working paper that addressed issues related to the proposed West Eugene EmX route. His organization’s concerns included the lack of proven need for West Eugene EmX. Mr. Macherione suggested the City had conflicting goals and it frequently lost sight of its primary goals. For example, he questioned how the 63-foot buses operated by LTD fit with the goal of reduced greenhouse gas emissions, and how 105-foot wide streets for mixed-use residential development accommodated the needs of pedestrians. He suggested the City “pick a goal and stick with it.” He wanted the City to ask the question of whether LTD was meeting its mission and goal. He considered LTD’s primary task was to provide basic bus service. He pointed out that West 11th Avenue had not been LTD’s first choice for a third route.

Mr. Macherione objected that LTD was stating there were two successful EmX routes when the second route had just started operations days before. He reported that the Eugene Area Chamber of Commerce had rewritten its letter of support to be less supportive.

Joy Marshall, 5166 Alpine Loop, represented Stand for Children. She distributed and reviewed her testimony in support of a new tax to support local school districts. She also distributed a letter from University of Oregon President Richard Lariviere in support of the tax.

Brian Weaver, 1365 Grant Street, believed that LTD’s alternative analysis for the West Eugene EmX route was based on assumptions and expectations that might not be realized. He recalled that LTD had installed 40 park and ride spaces at the Fred Meyer parking lot that were little used. He asked how the community could respect LTD’s projections. He did not think that the West Eugene EmX route could be compared with the Franklin EmX route, which passed the University of Oregon and traveled on to Springfield. There was more ridership on that route and it did not infringe on property owners to the degree that the West 11th Avenue extension would. Mr. Weaver believed that LTD’s credibility was at issue.

Mr. Weaver said that Mayor Piercy had written an op-ed that discussed how the EmX system was based on a system in Bogota, Columbia, which was a community of 7 million people in South America. He did not think the communities were comparable. He asked the council not to rubber stamp LTD’s plans.

Christy Monson, 1616 East 27th Avenue, asked the council to support a dedicated revenue source for Eugene schools and cited examples of other communities that had passed municipal taxes to support the schools and some of the programs that were supported. She maintained that the community would stand behind the council if it referred a tax dedicated to education to the ballot.

Tom Kamis, 94 West Broadway, a restaurant owner, said he had enough struggles paying his employees and his taxes. He read a letter from Ibrahim Hamide, owner of three local restaurants, in opposition to the tax because of its impact on the local restaurant business. Mr. Hamide recommended that the schools be supported by a tax on all people, not just on restaurant patrons. Mr. Kamis recalled that he had been before the council before to speak of the difficulty he had running a restaurant in downtown Eugene. All restaurant owners were feeling the pinch of the recession. He agreed the schools needed more support and acknowledged the school funding picture had changed but he believed it needed to be addressed on a statewide level. He suggested if the council wanted to raise revenues, it try to attract more business to the community. Eugene needed sustainable growth and he did not think continued taxation of the remaining businesses got it anywhere.

Oscar Hernandez, PO Box 26142, Eugene, owned Officina Restaurant. He expressed sympathy for all those affected by the school funding situation. However, small business owners such as restaurant owners had a difficult time competing with major chains, and they were feeling the pinch of the recession but still had to make their payroll every two weeks. He understood that people wanted the best for their children. He opposed applying a tax to one segment of the community. People had to work together and share the burden. He pointed out that many once-successful Eugene restaurants had closed their doors because of the recession.

Mayor Piercy closed the Public Forum. She thanked those who spoke for their comments.

3. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Approval of City Council Minutes**
 - July 28, 2010, Work Session
 - August 11, 2010, Work Session
 - September 8, 2010, Work Session
 - September 15, 2010, Work Session
 - September 22, 2010, Work Session
 - September 27, 2010, Work Session
 - September 29, 2010, Regular Meeting
 - October 11, 2010, Work Session
 - October 13, 2010, Work Session
 - October 20, 2010, Work Session
 - October 25, 2010, Regular Meeting
 - October 27, 2010, Work Session
- B. Approval of Tentative Working Agenda**
- C. Adoption of Resolution 5021 Acknowledging Receipt of the City of Eugene, Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2010**

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to approve the items on the Consent Calendar.

Councilor Poling noted he had submitted corrections to the minutes of the work session of September 8, 2010.

Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting of the Eugene City Council and convened a meeting of the Eugene Urban Renewal Agency.

4. ACTION: Adoption of Resolution 1058 Acknowledging Receipt of the Annual Financial Report of the Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Eugene, Oregon, for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2010

City Manager Jon Ruiz reported that the resolution acknowledged receipt of the Annual Financial Report for the agency and demonstrated the City's compliance with State law.

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to adopt Resolution 1058 acknowledging receipt of the Annual Financial Report for the Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Eugene for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2010. Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting of the Eugene Urban Renewal Agency and reconvened a meeting of the Eugene City Council.

5. WORK SESSION: 4J and Bethel Budget Shortfall

City Manager Ruiz introduced the item. He acknowledged the financial shortfalls that the 4J and Bethel school districts faced and the community interest that had been expressed in finding funding solutions. Many had suggested the City could assist the districts by placing a new revenue measure for schools on the May 2011 ballot. He said that for such a measure to be placed on the ballot, staff would need council direction on February 14, 2011

Twylla Miller of the Central Services Department provided the staff report. She noted the suggestions for a restaurant or personal income tax to be placed on the May ballot, and said other taxing options were also analyzed in the agenda item summary provided to the council. She cautioned that the revenue estimates were based on older data and staff would work with an economist to refine the estimates if the council chose to move forward with one.

Ms. Miller recommended that the council consider the current economic environment, Eugene funding priorities, and the plans of other jurisdictions when making its decision. County and State government faced shortfalls at a time of increased demand, and the City had unfunded priorities that included the General Fund shortfall, ambulance transport funding, and parks operation and maintenance funding. The stability of the revenue source and its ease of administration also needed to be considered. Ms. Miller said the City lacked a collection mechanism but it was possible it could piggyback on the State income tax collection mechanism. There were also timing issues to consider. She called attention to an election sequencing timeline included in the meeting packet and noted that the deadline for the May ballot was February 15.

Ms. Miller reviewed a series of council decision points, including:

1. *Should Eugene pursue a new revenue source at this time?*
2. *If so, which revenue source should be pursued?*
3. *What is the target amount of revenue generation from that source?*
4. *Should any City services be included in the revenue package?*
5. *Should the measure be placed on the ballot, or implemented under the City's home rule authority?*

6. *Should there be a public opinion survey prior to placing a measure on the ballot?*

Mayor Piercy called on the council for questions and comments, noting the first question before the council was whether to pursue such a revenue measure at this time.

Ms. Ortiz said she wanted to first know if such a measure would make a difference to the schools. In response, 4J School District Superintendent George Russell indicated that an annual \$10 million would assist the district through the next few years. Bethel Superintendent Colt Gill said Bethel's shortfall was estimated to be \$4 to \$7.5 million annually, and any revenue coming to the district would be helpful.

Ms. Ortiz understood the districts were considering operating levies and asked if the superintendents believed they would also be able to pass those levies if the City placed a measure on the ballot. Superintendent Russell indicated that the 4J School District Board of Directors would have to discuss that. He had recommended the 4J board refer a \$130 million bond measure to the voters in May 2011. Superintendent Gill said that he had also recommended a general obligation bond measure of between \$10 million and \$12 million to his board. Preliminary polling had been positive, but it had occurred before discussion of a City tax measure.

Mayor Piercy said those advocating for the measure wanted to help the schools and alleviate reductions that would increase class size and furlough days. She asked if the superintendents perceived the proposal the council was being asked to consider as helpful or a problem in terms of what the districts were trying to accomplish. Superintendent Gill suggested the Bethel board needed to discuss that question. He said the issue was complicated by a lack of information about the revenue to be received and the reductions that had already been implemented, which included negotiated concessions from employee groups. He did not know how the revenues would be used, but believed that those who supported such a measure anticipated it would reduce class sizes and restoring contract agreements.

Superintendent Russell agreed with Superintendent Gill. He said the 4J board would have to discuss the issue. If such a measure were to pass, the revenues would have to be targeted to address certain community concerns, such as class size and the length of the instructional year.

Mayor Piercy asked when the districts would need to know the details of any revenue proposal in order to have a board discussion. Superintendent Russell said he would make some final recommendations to the school board the following day about the reductions it needed to make in the next school year. Any potential revenue source could affect the decisions made over the next three to four months.

4J School District Board of Directors Chair Craig Smith suggested that depending on the device chosen, the money might not be available until much later in the year.

Mr. Clark said he had two small children in grade school in the 4J district and high-quality schools were important to him. He also wanted to see the community lead the state in quality of schools. However, he had concerns about the conversation as it regarded timing. There were many elements to the discussion and the council could be acting quickly to stem a problem that it might not be able to have an impact on until next year. For that reason, he wanted to ensure that anything the City did was smart and well thought-out.

Mr. Clark observed that Governor John Kitzhaber said in his "State of the State" speech that the funding crisis gave the State an opportunity to rebuild its house for the 21st century. He believed the council must consider what the State legislature would do in regard to education funding. He recommended that the City take more time rather than move quickly toward a May measure. He questioned whether adding a

new tax immediately would solve the long-term problem given the recessionary conditions that continued to exist. He advocated for creating a stronger economy and a better school system. He said the governor had directed the legislature not to send him short-term tax increases because they were not the long-term solution the state needed. Mr. Clark agreed and thought the direction appropriate in this situation.

Mr. Zelenka said that schools and education were very important to the community and to the community's economic health. He believed that Ballot Measure 47/50 had many little understood consequences, including the elimination of local control. He also agreed with Mr. Clark that the City did not know what the legislature or governor would do yet. Mr. Zelenka liked what the governor had to say at the Eugene City Club regarding his education policy and plans for reform, and he thought the council needed to hear more about that and incorporate it into its thinking.

Mr. Zelenka was concerned about the potential of competing education revenue measures. He asked about the impact of the proposed school measures on the average homeowner. Superintendent Russell said the board was considering a May 2011 measure because its current bond was expiring and a new bond would not raise property taxes. Superintendent Gill indicated there would be no increase as a result of the Bethel bond for the same reason.

Ms. Taylor thought the council should do what it could for the schools. However, she did not support imposing a tax without a vote of the people. She did not favor a tax on restaurants. She supported asking people if they wanted to pay a surcharge on their income tax, but she did not support taxing the low-income. She asked if Eugene could tax people who did not live in Eugene. City Attorney Glenn Klein indicated that Eugene could place a "work privilege tax" on nonresidents who worked in Eugene. Ms. Taylor thought such a tax sounded like a good idea. She further determined from City Attorney Klein that the City could tax incomes above \$100,000, and indicated it was her preference to tax such residents.

Mr. Brown believed the City should pursue a new revenue source for the schools. He said every economic development meeting he attended included an emphasis on the importance of a healthy school system to attract businesses. The City could not attract technology companies without a good school system. Eugene's system was slipping. Class sizes were growing and the districts had lost instructional days. He thought it was important to address those problems. New revenue would not improve the situation but would just "stop the bleeding."

Mr. Brown favored a surcharge on the State income tax, and advocated for the council to direct the manager to explore that option. He also favored a graduated straight income tax. He opposed a business or restaurant tax as he thought it unfair to target one segment of the community. The tax needed to be a shared burden. Mr. Brown believed that Eugene residents would be happy to pay such a tax.

Mr. Poling said he had grandchildren in the Eugene system and was supportive of the school districts. He would be willing to pay some sort of tax but he represented other people as well. He did not think the City needed to act as quickly. He suggested that a good public relations firm could be engaged to do a public opinion survey that asked people the type of tax they favored. He said that depending on the outcome of the survey, he might or might not support a measure.

Mr. Poling said he would oppose a restaurant or business tax. He was particularly opposed to a restaurant tax because the restaurant industry was one of the hardest hit industries in the current economy. He suggested any measure the City Council referred to the voters should be very specific about what would be funded with the revenues that were realized and should include an accountability element similar to what the council did with the road preservation bond. Mr. Poling was concerned about putting too many measures before the voters at one time.

Mayor Piercy said a council decision for a ballot measure in May 2011 would have an immediate effect as the new revenues would be a bridge to the future. She emphasized the temporary nature of the tax being discussed.

Mayor Piercy reported that some polling was underway to answer the questions raised by Mr. Poling. The results of that polling would be available soon.

Mr. Farr said that there was clearly a chronic problem with education funding. He had served on the Bethel School Board during the Measure 5 reductions and it seemed that the City was still trying to fix those problems. Mr. Farr had not yet decided on the merits of a City measure but was willing to consider one only if the legislature developed a long-term funding solution for the schools. He emphasized the importance of a long-term statewide solution that avoided the need for *ad hoc* community solutions. He said that income taxes were unreliable and unpredictable at best. He supported further research into revenue mechanisms but wanted the council to have the ability to stop any taxing mechanism if the State found a funding solution before the sunset date.

Mr. Clark did not want a short-term temporary solution to school funding. He wanted a long-term permanent solution. He did not want a new tax that hurt local businesses and did not solve the problem. He believed the governor meant what he said in regard to statewide changes in education. Mr. Clark thought that Eugene had the opportunity to create the best outcome in combination with the work the State did to create the best educational environment for the long-term.

Mr. Clark said the council did not know what the funding shortage was or what the legislature would do, so he considered that it would be acting in haste if it placed a measure on the May ballot at this time.

Ms. Ortiz indicated she did not support a restaurant tax.

Ms. Ortiz, seconded by Mr. Zelenka, moved to create an Education Subcommittee that would include representatives of the City of Eugene, the Bethel and 4J districts, and Stand for Children to return to the council with recommendations.

Ms. Ortiz indicated she would prefer the district representatives be board members.

Mr. Zelenka supported the motion. He was concerned about the timeline for the process. Measures 5 and 50 created problems for the education system that needed to be bridged with a local solution. He said the road preservation bond taught him that such a measure should be targeted, modest, and temporary. There needed to be a professional audit so people felt comfortable about it. He did not support a business or restaurant tax but supported a graduated income tax or charge on nonresidents that would yield \$10 million to \$15 million annually. He agreed that the City needed some polling on voters' responses.

Mr. Brown did not expect any quick solutions from the State. He thought the council needed to refer something to the ballot. It could not impose such a tax by fiat. He hoped any referral was unanimous, and that the measure was on the next ballot. The measure could include a clause that canceled the ballot results if the State acted. He thought such a measure should be for \$30 or \$40 million for four years with a sunset clause. He thought that the committee proposed by Ms. Ortiz needed direction about the nature of the tax and its duration.

Mr. Poling thanked Ms. Ortiz for her motion. He thought it was a great idea. He asked if the parents of students attending district schools who lived outside the city limits could be required to pay any tax that

was adopted. City Attorney Klein recalled that the last time the City supported the school districts with a property tax levy the dollars were allocated to the 4J and Bethel districts based on the number of students they had residing inside the city limits. He said that the City was unable to limit the use of any resulting tax revenues to those students residing within the city. He said the council would have to make a similar policy choice for any new revenue. City Attorney Klein said the City Council had no power to tax parents living outside the district.

Mr. Poling said many people had made references to short-term taxes, which reminded him of the council's conversation about the City's gas tax. He recalled that he suggested if the State increased the State gas tax the City should reduce its gas tax, and he intended to request a work session on that topic. He wanted any new tax to have a better built-in sunset mechanism than the City's gas tax had.

Mr. Farr believed there were many questions needing to be resolved before the council acted. He said those speaking to the schools' needs were very passionate and if the State did not do something on a broader basis those arguments would be repeated by different parents in the future. He believed the situation made it more important to act now to pressure the State for a solution. He said the current taxing structure was not serving Oregon and needed to be fixed.

Ms. Taylor was concerned about the idea of a committee as she feared it would delay action until it was too late to place something on the May ballot.

Responding to a question from City Attorney Klein, Ms. Ortiz did not know if her motion presupposed a May ballot measure. She would need more discussion. She was not prepared to support anything at this time. She preferred to miss the May ballot rather than refer a measure to the voters that she could not support.

Ms. Taylor agreed a long-term solution was needed, but a short-term solution was also necessary. She would not vote for a tax right now, but she would vote to let citizens vote. For that reason, it was difficult for her to support the motion.

Mr. Clark thought the council needed more details before moving forward. He said new taxes often do not work out as they were intended to. He cited measures 66 and 67 as an example. He suggested that that a representative of the business community, such as a member of the Eugene Area Chamber of Commerce could participate in unintended consequences. Ms. Ortiz concurred.

Mr. Zelenka pointed out that ballot measures 66 and 67 passed in Eugene. He had faith in the governor and thought he would come up with a good plan but questioned whether the legislature would act given that it had failed to solve the problem in many years. He thought it was prudent to come up with a local solution. If the State solved the problem, the tax could be ended.

City Attorney Klein asked questions clarifying the nature of the committee to be formed and its membership. City Manager Ruiz indicated it would be difficult for staff to support the committee if all options were on the table, given the lack of time remaining before a decision must be made for a May ballot measure.

Ms. Ortiz did not anticipate a long-drawn out process. She pointed out that four councilors had already indicated they would not support a restaurant tax. She suggested that only two meetings would be required given the work that had already been done.

Mayor Piercy observed that she had only heard council support for an income tax.

Mr. Brown wanted to serve on the committee. He said was a business operator and supported an income tax to support schools. He said that the quality of the education system affected businesses and it was a real issue for many businesses.

Mr. Poling hoped the issue of what revenue source would be answered by polling. He said if the committee did not have its recommendations in place by February 14, he was okay with that. There would be another ballot opportunity.

Mr. Clark said when he suggested representation from the business community, he was not suggesting someone who was opposed to or supportive of such a measure, but someone who could provide the committee with realistic impact assessments about what a proposed revenue source would do to the local economy. He was happy to leave the question of who that was to staff.

Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting at 9:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest
City Recorder

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)

MINUTES

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

January 12, 2011
 Noon

COUNCILORS PRESENT: Betty Taylor, George Brown, Andrea Ortiz, Mike Clark, Alan Zelenka, Pat Farr.

COUNCILORS ABSENT: George Poling, Chris Pryor.

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the January 12, 2011, work session of the Eugene City Council to order. She noted that Mr. Poling and Mr. Pryor could not be present. Mr. Farr participated via speaker phone.

A. WORK SESSION: Envision Eugene Update – Social Equity

City Manager Jon Ruiz introduced the topic, reminding the council that the City was evaluating the Envision Eugene process through the Triple Bottom Line (TBL) framework. He recalled that the council had held a work session on the economic element of the TBL and staff was now present to discuss the social equity element. A work session on the environment element of the TBL was scheduled. City Manager Ruiz acknowledged that the question of the location of the urban growth boundary (UGB) was the catalyst for the Envision Eugene process, but he believed the process encompassed a much broader conversation about where the community wanted to be in the future and how it could move toward that vision.

City Manager Ruiz reviewed the Seven Pillars of Envision Eugene:

- *Support a sustainable family wage economy.*
- *Provide affordable housing for all income levels.*
- *Plan for climate and energy uncertainty.*
- *Promote compact urban development and efficient transportation.*
- *Protect, repair, and enhance neighborhood livability.*
- *Protect and restore natural resources.*
- *Provide for adaptable and flexible implementation.*

Human Rights Program Manager Raquel Wells and Senior Planner Terri Harding led the council through a PowerPoint presentation on the topic, copies of which were provided to the council and audience. Planning Director Lisa Gardner, Community Development Manager Stephanie Jennings, and Community Group Members Bill Slattery and Julie Grossman were also present for the item. The presentation framed the concept of social equity as it related to access to employment opportunities; housing opportunities; services, transportation, and educational opportunities; and making Eugene livable for all. The presentation highlighted community issues and trends in the areas of employment and wages, poverty and

financial hardship, housing affordability and transportation costs, access to services, and community safety. The presentation also highlighted the best and worst outcomes for each area developed by the Community Resource Group (CRG) after its meetings with various stakeholder groups in listening sessions, as well as strategies for achieving the best outcomes.

Mayor Piercy solicited comment from the members of the CRG.

Mr. Slattery said it was his personal opinion as a builder that the community needed more land for new housing. He thought it would be a mistake if the community was not prepared to expand when the need existed. That required long-term planning. He believed the community needed to identify where it was going in that regard and then address the issues highlighted in the presentation. He had great hope because he believed the process had opened doors and given residents like him a voice in an environment where they often considered the “bad guys.” He said he was not the enemy and wanted to do his job in cooperation with others. Mr. Slattery expressed appreciation for the work of the council and for the opportunity to participate in the CRG process. He commended the work of City Manager Ruiz.

Ms. Grossman said while the process had been cumbersome and frustrating at times it was always rewarding. She felt hopeful about the outcome of the process. In regard to the presentation, Ms. Grossman said the YMCA saw about 100 potential members monthly who sought financial assistance to join, and when the agency inquired about their extenuating circumstances it often heard that mortgage and rent were the extenuating circumstances. That put a very personal face on the issue.

In regard to the process, Ms. Grossman acknowledged that when such a large conversation occurred it could be circular, with many themes rising to the top. The themes that continued to resonate with her were the challenge of planning when one could not predict the future and the need for flexibility given that fact. She said that many people wanted to invest their time, energy, and money in improving the community but it was often a challenge to get through local processes. She thought that was unfortunate. Ms. Grossman suggested that no one disagreed with the concepts highlighted in the presentation, but the “devil was in the details.” She reiterated the importance of flexibility and of responding quickly to those who wished to make the community a better place to live.

Mayor Piercy observed that the new downtown projects had not been easy to put in place and they took much determination on the part of the City and developers to bring them to fruition. Even if one wanted to do the right thing it was not easy, particularly in this economy.

Mayor Piercy thanked Mr. Slattery and Ms. Grossman for their work on the CRG.

Mayor Piercy solicited council comments and questions.

Mr. Clark also thanked Mr. Slattery and Ms. Grossman. He acknowledged that the social equity element of the TBL was the most challenging to him in terms of knowing the wisest choices to be made. He questioned the use of words like “access,” which had different connotations to people depended on how it was used. He said “access” as used in the presentation seemed to imply affordability. Ms. Wells said that was part of it. Mr. Clark asked if access to health care implied affordability. Ms. Wells said that access meant both physical access and economic access. There were many access barriers that were not economic in nature. Ms. Gardner added that increasingly, access to Web-based programming and services was an issue.

Ms. Jennings suggested the issue of access was related to creating an environment that facilitated access to affordable housing, health care, etc., and was also related to the line between the role of government

versus the role of the private sector and the individual seeking access. The CRG had extensive discussions of how to create such an environment.

Mr. Clark determined from Ms. Wells that the City had data that indicated where under-served populations lived.

Speaking to the issue of access to transportation, Mr. Clark suggested that the Lane Transit District's plans for EmX would make transit less accessible to residents and suggested it might be better if bus service was more integrated into neighborhoods. Ms. Gardner indicated that accessibility in the transit industry was based on industry standards and was related to the level of service provided.

Ms. Ortiz suggested that the City's role could be considered one of facilitating residents' access to various services in collaboration with those who provided the services.

Ms. Ortiz questioned how the City would integrate Attachment A, which was a memorandum from a group of neighborhood leaders to the CRG entitled *Envision Eugene "Neighborhood Livability" Theme* into the process. She asked how the process would address the conflict between those who wanted to grow out and those who wanted to grow up. Ms. Harding said that a lot of community work had been done to identify opportunity sites where more people could be accommodated without destroying neighborhoods. That was the goal of the infill compatibility and opportunity siting work that had been done, and she thought there was much in that work that could be carried forward into the strategies that implemented Envision Eugene.

Ms. Ortiz observed that she was challenged when she heard phrases such as "holding sacred the character of communities" because it brought to mind sundown laws and racial redlining, although she understood that was not the intent of the phrase. She pointed out that she lived in a neighborhood dominated by industrial uses. Residents were working to improve their neighborhood, and the phrase did not resonate with her in the same way it might with others.

Mr. Zelenka thanked staff and the members of the CRG and commended the work that had gone into the process.

Mr. Zelenka emphasized the importance of access to multi-modal transportation systems. He commended the definition of community safety for its mention of economic security, safe transportation, and safety from discrimination.

Mr. Zelenka suggested that protecting neighborhoods meant protecting the things that people liked and adding the things they did not have. Speaking to the issue of affordable housing, Mr. Zelenka acknowledged that it was a complicated issue that encompassed questions of the land supply, the housing mix, and the incentives needed to achieve the mix.

Mr. Brown thanked the CRG members for their comments. He emphasized the importance of neighborhood livability and said it was one of the pillars the City could have an effect on. He asked City Manager Ruiz to remind the CRG of its importance and ensure it was integrated into his recommendations.

Mayor Piercy asked the CRG members to comment on the group's discussion of livability.

In response to Ms. Ortiz's question about addressing the conflict between those with different growth approaches, Ms. Grossman believed there was a consensus among the CRG that if and when the

community grew up, or out, or both, it had to be growth based on rationale discussion, real data, and research. She did not get the impression there was a strong camp in opposition to one approach over another, although she acknowledged there was a perception that was the case at the beginning of the process. She thought the CRG had worked hard to overcome that perception.

Mr. Slattery acknowledged he entered the process with bias because of the economic challenge of doing density infill development in neighborhoods that opposed it and because he did not consider such infill a reasonable offset to UGB expansion. Neighborhood groups opposed density infill because much of what had been constructed was ugly. He suggested the City had been aggressive in encouraging infill because of the potential it would offset the need for UGB expansion. He believed the approach had gotten somewhat out of control because he did not think anyone anticipated what had resulted. It provoked a community reaction, as expressed through the CRG membership, of “don’t mess with our neighborhood.” He cited the University area as an example of a neighborhood where residents were dissatisfied with the nature of the infill development that was affecting the neighborhood.

Mr. Slattery said that people he thought would oppose any discussion of the UGB had been very open to the discussion. He believed the CRG members had been open to each other’s input. He predicted the process was not going to end in February because so much remained to be done.

Mayor Piercy said she saw many discussions at the CRG about the best way to accommodate anticipated growth in a way that best preserved existing neighborhoods.

Ms. Taylor emphasized the importance of design standards to avoid inappropriate or incompatible development that impinged on existing housing. She cited housing built too near existing housing or multi-story housing in a neighborhood of single-family housing as examples of incompatible development. She commended good examples of development such as Cascade Manor and suggested there was more room for such development.

Ms. Taylor believed that accessibility depended on a living wage and advocated for council passage of a living wage ordinance that affected the City of Eugene and its contractors to serve as an example for the community. She said any company that received subsidies to relocate to Eugene should have to pay its employees a living wage.

Mr. Zelenka suggested a future benefit of the Envision Eugene process would be the community education about planning that occurred. He believed such education was essential to residents’ understanding of planning, which had a big impact on residents’ lives. He suggested a lack of planning for the West University Neighborhood led to the fact it was largely dominated by rental housing with its associated problems.

Mr. Zelenka agreed with Ms. Taylor’s remarks about the importance of a living wage to social equity and hoped the City did something about that as well. He said the City could only set an example.

Mr. Zelenka believed that some of the objections to infill development was based on the fact neighbors did not feel heard. He recalled that the City Council had amended the code to require developers to talk to neighborhood associations about their projects with the hope that communication would result in better, more compatible projects. He believed the change had resulted in more acceptable and compatible projects.

Mr. Clark determined from City Manager Ruiz that the Seven Pillars were intended to guide the Envision Eugene process. Mr. Clark suggested that he might not agree with those as the most overriding process

values and asked how they were developed. City Manager Ruiz said staff had developed the pillars as one way to provide the community with a “snapshot” of what the process was trying to accomplish. They were not all encompassing for everything that occurred in the community.

Mr. Clark suggested that a pillar that stated support for compact urban development suggested a predisposition for one approach over another. City Manager Ruiz did not think so. He offered the concept of ‘phantom capacity’ as an example. He said the CRG had acknowledged the City could not plan for something it had no chance of achieving. For example, the City could not direct that all new growth go into a two-block area of downtown. However, the principle recognized that compact growth was what the community generally wanted to accomplish, and it did not preclude other choices that allowed other values to be satisfied.

Mr. Clark hoped to have council discussion of the pillars given that they could be the lens through which the council was offered choices. City Manager Ruiz anticipated that would occur.

Mayor Piercy also anticipated more council conversation about the Seven Pillars. She did not think support for compact urban development precluded other approaches or the flexibility the community needed to move forward with different solutions. City Manager Ruiz concurred, and emphasized the importance of future check-ins that gave the community the opportunity to make changes in direction.

Mayor Piercy also emphasized the importance of being prepared to respond to State initiatives and mandates.

City Manager Ruiz said that whatever strategies the council adopted, staff intended to implement them, and he anticipated discussion of the resources that would require.

Mr. Slattery anticipated that the City Code would need to be amended to implement the mixed-use vision that was emerging from Envision Eugene. He also believed that affordability and financing had to be considered. He agreed with the mayor about the importance of flexibility, but believed there were some very difficult questions to be asked and answered driving some of the outcomes that had not yet been discussed. He emphasized the importance of keeping supply and demand in mind, because when the supply of land was restricted, its price went up, which added to the cost of housing. Mr. Slattery commended the manager for creating an open process where people could express themselves freely. He thought the process would have an impact beyond the question of the UGB’s location.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the work session at 1:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest
City Recorder

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)

MINUTES

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

January 19, 2011
Noon

COUNCILORS PRESENT: George Brown, George Poling, Mike Clark, George Brown, Pat Farr.

COUNCILORS ABSENT: Betty Taylor, Andrea Ortiz, Alan Zelenka.

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the January 19, 2011, work session of the Eugene City Council to order. She noted that councilors Taylor, Ortiz, and Zelenka were unable to be present.

**A. WORK SESSION:
Review of 2010 Implementation of Bond Measure to Fix Streets**

Public Works Director Kurt Corey joined the council for the item. He reminded the council of the criteria established in regard to the 2008 bond measure: 1) a specific project list was identified for funding; 2) an outside auditor was contracted with to verify the bond proceeds were used appropriately; and 3) a street repair review panel was formed to document the use of the bond proceeds and determine if they were used in accordance with the terms of the resolution that placed the measure on the ballot.

Mr. Corey provided an update on the implementation of the bond. He first reviewed the list of completed projects and then called attention to the findings of the independent auditor, Isler CPA, which were included in the meeting packet. He noted the findings' conclusion that the City complied with the limits of Resolution 4953. No exceptions were identified.

Mr. Corey introduced members of the street repair review panel present: Janet Calvert, Howard Bonnett, and John Barofsky. He reported that the panel had confirmed the auditor's findings. The panel also acknowledged the City's leadership in sustainable construction practices, the number of jobs created by the projects, and the fact the City had taken its advice and accelerated the construction schedule to take advantage of the favorable bidding climate. The panel expressed interest in developing an expanded project list and in taking an advocacy role for transportation funding in general.

Mr. Corey reviewed the bond-funded street projects to be constructed in 2011 as well as several street projects that were being funded from other sources and anticipated a busy construction season.

Mr. Corey acknowledged that while the City was making progress and the bond was doing what it was intended to do, the current rate of investment was not sufficient to keep the backlog from growing. He suggested the City needed to think to the future because of the pending expiration of the bond measure.

In regard to operations and maintenance, Mr. Corey reported that the Road Fund was balanced through the six-year forecast period, although it would still be below the reserve target. There was still a considerable backlog of deferred maintenance projects to address.

Mayor Piercy solicited comments from members of the panel. Mr. Bonnett, Mr. Barofsky, and Ms. Calvert commended the work of staff and the panel. Mr. Barofsky said the panel members were all advocates for better roads and he recommended the council keep the panel in place to identify projects for a future bond. He said the backlog of projects was down this year for the first time in ten years but would go back up next year. That needed to be addressed, and Mr. Barofsky thought it important to keep in mind that there was still work to be done. He said the panel was also open to other charges.

Ms. Calvert thought the emphasis on alternative modes in the measure was also important and hoped that focus and modal split was maintained in future bonds.

Mayor Piercy expressed appreciation for the work of the panel. She asked that a letter of appreciation be sent to the panel on behalf of the council. She said it was heartening to hear about the jobs that resulted from the bond measure and the fact projects were reducing the community's environmental impact while saving money. She heard continual positive feedback about the projects from the public. Mayor Piercy acknowledged there was still work to be done.

Mr. Clark congratulated Mr. Corey and thanked him and his staff for a job well-done. He also thanked the panel members. He thought the council should consider other ways the panel could serve as the council contemplated future bond measures.

Mr. Clark asked Mr. Corey when he believed another bond would be needed. Mr. Corey suggested the City first needed to consider the status of the budget after the first 32 projects were completed. He did not know what other competing needs might exist following expiration of the bond in 2013. He said the council would need to discuss the ramifications of another bond and the potential of other funding sources, such as a transportation maintenance system fee and fees assessed to garbage haulers.

Mr. Clark asked about the department's capacity to address the condition of unimproved roads. He noted the department's use of thin overlays, which many in his ward were satisfied with and others wanted. Mr. Corey acknowledged the City received many inquiries about the overlays. A considerable amount of such work had occurred through transfers from the General Fund. He said through full implementation of House Bill 2001, the City anticipated a continuation of such work through the Road Fund over the six-year forecast period at a cost of \$200,000 annually.

Mr. Clark wanted the City to have a long-term plan of action to deal with its unimproved streets, which were not included in the maintenance backlog. He asked if that required a council work session. Mr. Corey thought the City was heading in that direction as a result of previous council discussions. He anticipated that staff would return with ideas about how to address those streets.

Mr. Pryor expressed appreciation for all the work that had been done by everyone. He had joined the council because of the poor condition of City streets, and at that time there seemed to be no resolution in sight. There had been considerable need but little money. He said the bond moved the community forward and helped stabilize the situation, but he agreed with Mr. Corey that more work was needed. He believed that the projects that had been accomplished represented a significant victory for the community. He was pleased the council kept the promises it made to voters.

Mr. Poling agreed with the remarks of Mr. Clark and Mr. Pryor. He reported that he had also received inquiries about the overlays mentioned by Mr. Clark and hoped to see more such overlays done.

Mr. Poling thanked Public Works and EWEB staff for coordinating the Coburg Road water main replacement project, which would start the following month. He thought such coordination was a good idea and anticipated it would result in cost savings.

Mr. Poling recalled that the council had agreed to revisit the local gas tax if the State gas tax was increased, and indicated he would poll the council for its willingness to hold a work session on that topic.

Mr. Poling thanked Mr. Corey for his efforts.

Mr. Farr also congratulated Mr. Corey for the success of the bond. He said the change in tone of the discussion was remarkable compared to past years. He noted that Ward 6 had only two projects in 2010, less than any other ward, although he acknowledged there had been more projects the year before. He suggested that made a new bond a difficult sell for residents living on the streets around Willamette High School. He also thanked the panel.

Mayor Piercy recalled that the council had discussed extensively how to reestablish faith with the community and with that goal in mind had adopted the lower cost, shorter term, and more accountable approach reflected in the bond measure. She suggested the bond was a model for other funding proposals. She applauded the community's value of having residents and staff work together on behalf of Eugene.

Mayor Piercy suggested that portions of 5th Avenue needed work.

Mr. Brown thanked Public Works staff and the advisory panel. He believed the measure had worked as intended. He was frequently thanked by residents for the road improvements.

Mr. Corey said when the City embarked on the bond it had not been difficult to find projects throughout the community, meaning there was something for everyone. Responding to Mr. Farr's remarks, Mr. Corey recalled that the City had assembled other funding sources to repair Roosevelt, Royal, Barger, and Elmira roads in Ward 8.

Mr. Corey emphasized the fact the City had only the local gas tax and the 2008 bond measure as dedicated sources to maintain its streets. He said the City had developed a complicated funding approach over time, and adjustments to one funding source would require adjustments to the entire approach.

Mayor Piercy thanked Mr. Corey and adjourned the work session at 12:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest
City Recorder

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)

MINUTES

Eugene City Council
Joint Work Session with Lane Transit District Board of Directors
McNutt Room—City Hall
777 Pearl Street—Eugene, Oregon

January 24, 2011
5:30 p.m.

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

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
BOARD MEMBERS

PRESENT: Mike Eyster, Chair; Mike Dubick, Greg Evans, Gary Gillespie, Dean Kortge, Doris Towery.

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the January 24, 2011, work session of the Eugene City Council to order.

Lane Transit District Board of Directors Chair Mike Eyster convened the board meeting. Board member Ed Necker was not present.

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

Mayor Piercy expressed appreciation for the opportunity she had to read to students at Prairie Mountain School the previous week. She reported that she attended a meeting that included representatives of Lane County and the Lane Historic Museum regarding potential uses for the United States Post Office building on Willamette Street. Mayor Piercy also attended two meetings held by the Oregon Congressional delegation. She had participated in the Martin Luther King Jr. Day walk as well as the Martin Luther King, Jr. Celebration that occurred later that evening with the theme *Voices of our Youth: Tomorrow's Leaders*. She commended both events and appreciated being able to participate.

Mayor Piercy reported she had awarded the “Bold Steps” award to Café Yumm for its use of the triple bottom line approach. She also attended the combined Eugene-Springfield firefighter and EMS awards ceremony in Springfield.

Mayor Piercy announced the January 2011 Mayor’s One-on-One event on January 25 at the Grocery Outlet Store on River Road. Ms. Ortiz would also be present.

Mayor Piercy concluded by commending the Champions Parade held on January 22. She thanked Assistant Manager Sarah Medary and Billie Moser of the Library, Recreation, and Cultural Services Department for their hard work in facilitating the event. She also thanked City Manager John Ruiz and Community Relations Manager Jan Bohman as well as all City staff who contributed to the success of the event.

Ms. Taylor concurred with the mayor's remarks about the parade and her thanks to staff. She thought the parade had been a good example of cooperation between the City and University of Oregon.

Ms. Taylor discussed the plight of a constituent who was having difficulty paying for a street assessment because of lost income. She shared a communication from David Cole of the Crest Drive Neighbors that recalled the City's promises that no one would be forced to move or go bankrupt because of the Crest Drive improvement project assessments and suggested that the remedies in place did not envision long-term unemployment or the mortgage crisis. She hoped something could be done for the individual in question.

Ms. Taylor expressed concern that the recent court decision aimed at members of the Lane Board of County Commissioners could cause others to be reluctant to run for public office. She considered the decision an injustice.

Mr. Clark reported that he had attended the Springfield State of the City event and Police Commission meeting on January 13. He had also attended the opening night for Matthew Knight Arena, and he commended the arena.

Mr. Clark reported on a Board of County Commissioners discussion about the 190 agreements between the County and its special districts, saying it appeared there was a renewed spirit of cooperation on the part of the board to address some of the issues that residents living in the urbanizing areas have raised. He thought future discussions would be fruitful, and expressed his appreciation to the board.

Mr. Clark had also attended the combined Eugene-Springfield firefighter and EMS awards ceremony and said the community could be proud of its fire department.

Mr. Clark reported he had Mr. Poling continued to work with the Cal Young Neighbors as its members discussed reconfiguring the organization. They had also met with staff to discuss the issues involved with such a process. He asked residents of the area in question to contact him or Mr. Poling if they were interested in a leadership position in a smaller association.

Mr. Clark also commended the City staff for its work on Champions Parade and said staff did an amazing job in very little time. He reminded the council of the upcoming Eugene Area Chamber of Commerce Celebration of Business, which would include presentation of the First Citizen Award to Rob Bennett.

Ms. Ortiz said she had also attended the Martin Luther King, Jr. Day March, the Springfield State of the City event, and the opening of the Matthew Knight Arena. She reported she attended the Whiteaker Community Council meeting and heard a discussion about the proposed west Eugene EmX route. She asked City Manager Ruiz to discover why the toilet was removed from the Whiteaker Station.

Ms. Ortiz reported that she attended the Leadership Breakfast at PeaceHealth-University District and heard a presentation on the hospital's University District redevelopment plans.

Ms. Ortiz said she attended a meeting of the board of directors of the Lane Regional Air Protection Agency earlier that day and believed that the board's communications had improved as a result of the team building work the group had done. She had agreed to sit in with other board members on employee listening sessions in early February.

Ms. Ortiz said she would be in Washington, DC, in early February to attend a training session on redistricting.

Mr. Pryor reported he had been in Washington, DC, to attend a training session on community engagement. He had many ideas to share with the council from the training. He had attended the local meeting held by Senator Jeff Merkley regarding foreclosure relief and mortgage assistance and learned that there was not enough money to address all the relief funding applications. He anticipated some legislation would be drafted to help address the problem.

Mr. Pryor reported he had attended the Springfield Chamber of Commerce dinner the previous week and it was an enjoyable event. He also commended the Champions Parade and thanked all those who worked on it.

Mr. Zelenka said he had attended the opening of the Matthew Knight Arena and believed that the residents' hard work on the Arena Parking District had paid off.

Mr. Zelenka reported he had attended the Metropolitan Policy Committee meeting on January 13 and the committee had appointed Lane Council of Governments Director George Kloepfel as its representative to the Lane Area Commission on Transportation. The committee also reviewed the Regional Transportation Plan project list to determine if projects that had been on the list for some time were still relevant and had approved a letter of support for Eugene's "Safe Routes to School" Program.

Mr. Poling reported he had attended the most recent meeting of the Harlow Neighborhood Association, which had been held at the North Park Community Church. He thanked the church for allowing use of its facility. He said that all the elected officials who represented the Harlow area were present. Those in attendance heard a briefing from the Eugene Water & Electric Board (EWEB) on a project that would affect traffic on Coburg Road. He had also attended the combined Fire and EMS awards.

Mr. Poling expanded on Mr. Clark's earlier report about the Cal Young Neighbors, saying that he and Mr. Clark also met with staff and representatives of the Neighborhood Leaders Council to discuss possible changes in the makeup of the organization. He noted that the neighborhood association had also discussed the possible location of a cell tower on the Oakway Golf Course.

Mr. Farr reported on the recent meeting of the Human Rights Commission, saying the commission heard testimony from residents opposed to a commission motion that called for the commission to draft a letter to Israel critical of its actions in response to the "Freedom Flotilla." He clarified that the commission had not, in fact, drafted such a letter, and passed a subsequent motion to place any action on the letter on hold.

Mr. Farr said the Community Resource Group continued to meet and had another meeting scheduled the following day.

Mr. Farr reported that the Bethel School District, in conjunction with the Active Bethel Citizens and City of Eugene, would soon break ground on organic gardens for education and public use.

Mr. Farr said he had attended a January 18 town hall conducted by commissioners Peter Sorenson and Rob Handy on plastic bags in grocery stores. It had been an interesting event and he planned to send more information to the council on what the legislature planned to do regarding plastic bags.

Mr. Brown reported that he had also attended the Martin Luther King, Jr., Day March as well the evening celebration. He had attended his first meeting of the Metropolitan Wastewater Management Commission. Mr. Brown said he had attended a meeting of the McKenzie Watershed Council, which heard a

presentation on habitat improvement. The EWEB representative to the council discussed the utility's revised approach to protecting water quality in the watershed.

Mr. Clark asked City Manager Ruiz to find out whether community gardens could be established directly next to Bond Park on undeveloped land owned by the City.

City Manager Ruiz recognized Mark Loigman of the Hult Center and Sergeant Darrell Schultz and the Police Traffic Team for their work in making the Champions Parade possible. He also thanked Lane Transit District for rerouting its buses to accommodate the parade. He thanked Building Official Stuart Ramsing and his team in Building and Permit Services for their work in ensuring that the Matthew Knight Arena was ready to open.

B. WORK SESSION: West Eugene EmX Update

The council was joined by members of the Lane Transit District (LTD) Board of Directors and LTD General Manager Mark Pangborn, LTD Planning and Development Manager Tom Schwetz, and West Eugene EmX Project Manager John Evans, who were present to provide information about the project and answer council questions.

Mr. Schwetz and Mr. Evans shared a PowerPoint presentation entitled *West Eugene EmX Extension Update*. The presentation highlighted the policy direction that drove the project, the recommendations of LTD advisory committees and community organizations, mitigation concepts being considered for the route, key performance measures, anticipated capital and operating costs, travel time comparisons, ridership projections, and the local preferred alternative selection process.

Speaking to the recommendations of the advisory committees and community groups, Mr. Poling, a member of the LTD EmX Steering Committee, reported that he supported forwarding the West 11th/West 13th alternative as well as the Transportation System Management (TSM) alternative. He was unable to support the committee's final action since the committee did not forward TSM as well.

Mr. Pangborn highlighted the information in the presentation that indicated that because of \$8.3 million in federal funding for bus replacements, LTD should be able to maintain its current service level and add EmX without incurring deficits or requiring service reductions.

Mayor Piercy suggested that the presentation lacked mention of State and local goals related to carbon emission reductions. She anticipated that carbon levels would "move dramatically" with the institution of EmX. Mr. Schwetz responded that LTD had done some analysis of that issue and more would occur through the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) of that. He acknowledged that current methodologies to determine corridor-level greenhouse gas emission savings were not well-developed, but LTD had research that suggested that transit was a strategy to reduce greenhouse gas emissions both at the corridor and regional level. He cited reductions in vehicle miles traveled and transit passenger loads as indicators of savings.

Mr. Kortge emphasized Mr. Pangborn's point about the extra money that LTD received for buses. That funding removed some operating costs and affected the estimates for EmX. He said that the estimates had changed because of such factors.

Mr. Dubick emphasized that reducing VMT, congestion, and greenhouse gas emissions were of importance to the board, and the board perceived EmX as a way to achieve those goals.

Mayor Piercy acknowledged that LTD was working to decrease the negative impacts of the route on businesses and residents, but she did not want LTD's efforts in that regard to work against the goal of achieving a viable public transit system. She was pleased to see that even with mitigation, the buses would run on dedicated lanes 75 percent of the route, which was an improvement over both the Franklin and Gateway EmX routes.

Ms. Taylor determined from Mr. Pangborn that the information generated by LTD was corridor-specific and he did not know for how long the data would still be valid.

Referring to the committee and community recommendations, Mr. Clark noted the West Eugene Collaborative (WEC) position that it was not an option to maintain West 11th Avenue as it was currently configured. The WEC envisioned that the road would be rebuilt as a different sort of thoroughfare and that land uses in the corridor would fundamentally change. Currently, businesses along the corridor were auto-dependent and thus dependent on the current road configuration. Mr. Clark also noted that the Eugene Area Chamber of Commerce had pledged to work to ensure West 11th Avenue businesses and property owners were not adversely affected by the route. That raised the question of the larger vision for West 11th Avenue and what would happen to those businesses. He acknowledged the issue was one for the council to resolve.

Mr. Gillespie pointed out to Mr. Clark that the WEC had stated it was not an option to maintain the road as a "congested" retail avenue. He said there was no intent to eliminate retail uses in the corridor. In response, Mr. Clark pointed out that through the Envision Eugene process the City had looking at the future of the corridor and there was discussion of multi-story businesses close to outside edges of the core, which he interpreted as meaning that existing businesses along West 11th Avenue would change.

Responding to Mr. Clark, Ms. Ortiz said that was not what she heard "at all." She believed that LTD was "definitely listening" to the affected businesses and attempting to address their concerns through mitigation. She never heard anyone say that they were trying to eliminate those businesses, "change the face," or replace the existing businesses with multi-story buildings. She believed that people understood there was value in the businesses in place, although they were not thriving as they once were due to the economy. She thought the EmX route would augment those businesses. Ms. Ortiz shared what she had learned in Cleveland, saying that Cleveland had established kiosks in association with routes where businesses could deliver products for pick-up by riders.

Mr. Eyster reported that several board members participated in a listening session facilitated by Bob Chadwick to hear the concerns of the opponents to the West 11th Avenue route. He acknowledged the risks that business owners faced from such projects and reported that a representative of "Our Money Our Transit" had recently spoken about the extent to which LTD staff had gone to mitigate potential damage to businesses. Staff had met individually more than 150 times with owners along the corridor. Mr. Clark expressed appreciation for that.

Mr. Clark asked if the City's vision for West 11th Avenue was one of a denser transit corridor with different businesses than were in place now, or was it protect and maintain what was there. Mr. Zelenka asked Mr. Clark what his vision was. Mr. Clark indicated he was inclined to the no build option at the moment because of concerns that the system was too costly at this time and that the process was being rushed through. He also felt it was important to consider how decisions from the Envision Eugene process affected the question. Mr. Clark pointed out the council was talking about large-scale community changes and he wanted to ensure that those change occurred in the context of a larger vision. He believed

that the plan LTD developed was the plan it was asked to develop, but he was unsure that the council and community had the appropriate conversation about what West 11th Avenue should be.

Mr. Pryor acknowledged that people felt the impacts of such a project now while the benefits were realized in the future. It was challenging to have a conversation about the future when living in today, particularly when one was still trying to quantify the benefits of the project. He suggested that the City Council could help by discussing the future of West Eugene and transit's role in that future and believed the work that LTD had done in regard to EmX was essential to that conversation. He pointed out the vision of the WEC was not the only vision for the area. Mr. Pryor anticipated that the land use conversation would happen next.

Mr. Eyster agreed with the remarks of Mr. Pryor and said that was the reason the board had approached the mayor and manager about the potential of changing the order that approvals were done. He believed that the issues mentioned by Mr. Clark and Mr. Pryor were under the purview of the council.

Mr. Zelenka commended the first phase of the EmX system, terming it a resounding success. He found it convenient and useful and said its ridership was "off the charts," and said that was why other communities were looking to Eugene-Springfield as an example. He believed that the Gateway route would "be that or better." He was impressed with the many public meetings that LTD had held and its receptiveness to changes.

Mr. Zelenka emphasized the importance of articulating the benefits of and need for the system, which he maintained was "all about the future." He thought it was particularly important to acquire right-of-way for a future light rail system. He maintained that the benefits of the system were clear. He said the population and jobs in the corridor as well as the transformation he envisioned would occur along West 11th Avenue were all factors supporting the EmX route.

Mr. Zelenka maintained that over time, the entire community, particularly its transportation corridors, would grow denser. He envisioned the EmX system would realize travel time decreases that made it an attractive alternative to the automobile and that further it would result both in reductions in green house gas emissions and in lower operating costs.

Mr. Zelenka went on to state that the system would result in no reduction in transit services, no financial deficits would be created by the system, and that EmX was the most cost-effective of the options examined. He commended the mitigation that LTD had done and said it had listened to the community, no matter what anyone said. He asked how many trees LTD would plant along the new route. Mr. Schwetz indicated that LTD would plant more trees than it removed. Mr. Zelenka spoke enthusiastically about the physical changes that EmX had produced on Franklin Boulevard and along the Gateway route. He considered the Gateway route much more attractive than it had been before. Mr. Zelenka pointed out that in spite of the "dramatic" reduction in property acquisition, the proposed route would still run in dedicated rights-of-way 75 percent of the time. He also commended LTD's plans to stage construction.

Mr. Zelenka agreed that the current businesses along West 11th Avenue were important and should be taken into consideration. He suggested there were mitigation mechanisms and funding that could deal with their concerns. He pointed out construction would not occur until 2014-15, and he envisioned that the economy would have improved by then.

Mr. Zelenka did not believe any businesses along the other routes had failed because of construction. He determined from Mr. Pangborn that LTD did not have to resort to eminent domain on the other system phases.

Mr. Zelenka suggested that businesses along West 11th Avenue could make eminent domain a self-fulfilling prophecy, or they could negotiate with LTD.

Mr. Poling recalled that a previous City Council had viewed schematics of the corridor that included several mixed-use centers identified along the route, none of which had come to fruition. He observed that in his eight years on the council, only one of the identified mixed-use centers had been built.

Mr. Poling endorsed the recommendation made by resident Josef Siekiel-Zdzienicki that the decision about the west Eugene EmX route be incorporated into the Envision Eugene process.

Mr. Farr suggested that LTD's ridership statistics did not take into account the volunteers that used the bus to reach Food for Lane County.

Mr. Farr suggested to Mr. Clark that the WEC vision for West 11th Avenue was a long-term picture, and EmX was a long-term solution for travel on the road.

Mr. Farr suggested that more people in Bethel would be able to access a system that turned around at Winco. He asked what process LTD went through to select West 11th Avenue, as opposed to Highway 99, which had more residential neighborhoods. Mr. Pangborn said the City Council selected West 11th Avenue as the next corridor for LTD to pursue.

Mr. Farr referred to the fact that West 11th Avenue was also State Highway 126, and recalled that Highway 126 was to have been relocated to the West Eugene Parkway, a project the council terminated. That meant Highway 126 would continue to be on West 11th Avenue. He understood that the EmX system was intended to be complementary to the parkway, and asked how Eugene could change the vision for EmX on West 11th Avenue now that Highway 126 would not be relocated. He asked LTD staff to respond to that at a future meeting.

Mr. Farr observed he heard many business owners along West 11th Avenue complain that they had not been able to provide input earlier in the process.

Mr. Brown asked questions clarifying the location of dedicated lanes along the route. Mr. Pangborn indicated that current maps of the route could be found on LTD's Web page and LTD staff would provide paper copies of those maps to the council. Mr. Eyster characterized the route as a moving picture because staff continued to work on revisions with input from the businesses.

Mr. Clark posited the route would better serve neighborhoods and manufacturing and employment centers that were less retail-oriented than a corridor dominated by retail uses. He asked if a Highway 99 alignment that reached into Bethel would serve more neighborhoods and employment centers. Mr. Dubick suggested that the council needed to factor in that retail establishments had employees that needed an economical way to reach their employment. Mr. Pangborn did not think that people realized how many people lived in high-density housing within a short distance of West 11th Avenue. He believed that LTD needed to serve both employment centers and residents where they lived, and that such routes needed to have good connections to other parts of the community.

Ms. Towery suggested that discussion of the transit-dependent population was missing from the conversation. She said much of the high-density housing mentioned by Mr. Pangborn was low-income housing, and she believed that an EmX route made it possible for those people to be connected to the community more effectively and efficiently, which added to their quality of life. She said that LTD had

worked to connect to those individuals, who lacked the money to pay signs and four-page advertisements in newspaper. She maintained the route was an important corridor for those reasons. Mr. Clark agreed. He emphasized his question was on the merits of the routes relative to one another. He wanted to ensure that the community was receiving the appropriate service with the appropriate tools.

Mr. Gillespie emphasized that LTD was building a system, and each route deserved a systematic approach. As a transit-dependent person, he found EmX important because he did not have to know the schedule, and the most time he would have to wait for a bus during the day was ten minutes. He emphasized the importance of such frequent headways to those shoppers who sought to visit West 11th Avenue on their lunch hours and other short periods of time.

Mr. Evans believed that community growth in west Eugene over the last 20 years changed travel and development patterns and placed pressure on existing arterials. He believed that transit planning had lagged other types of planning, with consequences for LTD travel times on corridors such as River Road. He maintained that West 11th Avenue had changed dramatically over the past few years and would continue to change, and if LTD did not act now, congestion would increase in the corridor because of planned growth in the west and north. He predicted “deep trouble in the future.” Mr. Evans believed a previous council was wise to select West 11th Avenue as the next EmX route. He averred that “people are avoiding West 11th Avenue if they can” but sometime they would not be able to avoid such routes to get back and forth. Mr. Evans concluded by stating in the final analysis, the “only real solution” was a transit solution.

Ms. Ortiz emphasized the importance of transit to a healthy viable community.

Mr. Poling referred to the summary of operating costs provided to the council and LTD’s assertion that it was able to offset the operating costs of EmX by delaying the purchase of buses and equipment. Mr. Pangborn clarified the amount involved was \$500,000. Mr. Poling asked how LTD proposed to fund operating costs in the future. Mr. Pangborn said LTD projected out to eight years and anticipated that its budget would be balanced and the agency would not have to cut services even adding the west Eugene service.

Mr. Brown determined from Mr. Pangborn that the ridership projections were derived from a computer model used nationwide for all transit enhancements. The model employed local data.

Responding to a question from Mr. Farr, Mr. Pangborn clarified that that LTD had not selected a “no build” option for Coburg Road; Coburg Road was still a critical link in the EmX system. He said at the time that Coburg Road had been under discussion, LTD was considering both the Gateway route and the Coburg Road route. As the process went on, more controversy about Coburg Road was raised and the Springfield City Council had indicated it was ready to go forward with Gateway. Subsequently, LTD built the Gateway route and put the Coburg route on hold because it could only build one route at a time.

Mr. Poling recalled that at the time of the decision to postpone Coburg Road, the Eugene City Council had required that 80 percent of the route be in dedicated lanes, and it had been impossible to physically achieve that level of dedication. The council had then decided to drop the route.

Mr. Zelenka contrasted the jobs that existed in the West 11th Avenue corridor as opposed to the Highway 99 corridor and suggested that the numbers were not even close. He was puzzled by discussion of the Highway 99 route. He did not think it was a matter of which route; he said both were needed, as was the Coburg route. Mr. Zelenka averred that the decision on those routes was made long ago. He hoped that the Highway 99 corridor was constructed next. He did not want to start all over again given the time it

took to reach this point. He feared further delay would delay construction a decade. Mr. Zelenka questioned if the Highway 99 extension would be constructed at all if the council killed the West 11th Avenue option.

Mr. Kortge suggested that as residents aged, they would increasingly want to ride the bus and people would not want them driving.

Mr. Eyster recalled that TransPlan had called for a regional transportation system and all the EmX corridors were identified in TransPlan. He maintained that it was a question of when EmX, not if EmX, and in what order. He did not want to hear further discussion of reordering the routes. He said the City Council had come to the LTD Board in 2006 to request that it proceed with the West Eugene route. It was now 2011, and he did not think now was the time to rethink the corridor selected. Mr. Eyster concluded by stating that the system was based on community values.

Mayor Piercy stressed the importance of the local elected and appointed officials acting with one voice to secure the needed federal funding to construct the west Eugene EmX extension. She recalled discussion of LTD proceeding with EmX on both Highway 99 and River Road to ramp up construction of the system. She acknowledged the challenge of that. Mayor Piercy suggested the Gateway phase represented a step forward because EmX began to look more like a system. She believed the West 11th Avenue extension would really help the system function as such.

Mr. Poling did not interpret the council's questions as suggesting a need to stop what was occurring now, but rather as seeking clarification of why the system was moving forward in the order it was.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the work session at 7:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest
City Recorder

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)