

EUGENE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY



Approval of Council Minutes

Meeting Date: April 9, 2012
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 December 12, 2011, Regular Meeting, January 11, 2012, Work Session, January 18, 2012, Work Session, January 25, 2012, Work Session, February 11, 2012, Workshop, February 13, 2012, Work Session.

ATTACHMENTS

- A. December 12, 2011, Regular Meeting
- B. January 11, 2012, Work Session
- C. January 18, 2012, Work Session
- D. January 25, 2012, Work Session
- E. February 11, 2012, Workshop
- F. February 13, 2012, 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
Council Chamber—City Hall
777 Pearl Street—Eugene, Oregon

December 12, 2011
7:30 p.m.

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

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the December 12, 2011, regular meeting of the Eugene City Council to order.

1. PUBLIC FORUM

Because of the number of people signed up to speak in the Public Forum, Mayor Piercy limited the forum to one hour to ensure the council had sufficient time to address all the action items on the agenda. Each speaker was given two minutes to speak. Mayor Piercy reviewed the rules of the Public Forum and opened the forum.

Vincent Faini, Ward 1, asked the council to extend the camping ban for Occupy Eugene. He reminded the council that Occupy Eugene was also a protest. He was inspired by what he had seen at the camp and believed that Occupy Eugene had found creative and innovative ways to help the homeless at no cost to the taxpayer.

James A. Rodman, no ward given, called for an end to the Occupy Eugene camp because he believed that matters had gotten out-of-hand and would cost the taxpayers more in the future. Laws had been broken. He felt for the plight of the homeless but believed Occupy Eugene had become a quagmire. He recommended that people who wished to demonstrate follow the law. He asked what services would be reduced so the City could give money to Occupy Eugene. He questioned how wastewater on the site was being addressed.

R. Jamil Jonna, Ward 1, Avenue, spoke to contentions that Occupy Eugene participants did not need to camp. He said Occupy Eugene knew that the homeless would come to the camp and decided to welcome them. Occupy Eugene had not lost sight of the fact it was a protest. He believed the homeless were growing in number because of systemic economic problems and that the country was in a depression. He invited people to visit the camp and experience the collaborative engagement that was occurring.

Gweneth Van Frank, Ward 3, asked the council to consider Option 4.

Lauren Regan, Ward 1, discussed Occupy Eugene's work with the City to ensure the safest possible camp. She asked the council to extend the exemption until a permanent location for the camp was planned and constructed. She offered to provide bi-weekly reports about the camp. She also asked the council to exempt the camp from the City's ban on open fires.

Diane Thurlow, Ward 3, said any additional expenses created by the Occupy Eugene camp cost should be borne by the City Councilors who voted to support the camp. She did not want to pay for the camp. She believed the campers were breaking the law. She said it was the council's job to take care of the homeless and she advised the council to "deal with it."

Becky Lemler, Elmira, suggested the money spent to police the Occupy Eugene camp could have been used to feed the homeless. She objected that Occupy Eugene had been allowed to disregard laws and occupy public property at public expense. She suggested that Occupy Eugene's original message was lost when it allowed illegal activity at the camp and harbored minor runaways, felons, and sex offenders. She understood there were reports that people at the camp were preparing weapons to use to fight the police if asked to disband. Ms. Lemler feared Eugene would become a magnet for protestors from other communities that had closed their Occupy camps and called for the camp to be ended before they converged on the community and caused more problems.

Jonathan Schwartz, Ward 7, said Occupy Eugene wished to be accountable and work with the City toward solutions. He did not think that closing the camp was the right thing to do and suggested that the camp be allowed to continue until the spring. He believed that if the City worked with Occupy Eugene they would find a mutual solution. He referred the council to his written communication.

Ruth Duemler, Ward 3, hoped the council extended the exemption as she did not think winter was the right time to move the camp. She shared her positive experience attending Occupy Eugene rallies, saying they were attended by a diverse group of people, were well-organized, and the results well-communicated to other participants. It had been an amazing experience. She hoped all councilors could visit the site.

David Ivan Piccioni, Ward 1, said Occupy Eugene was a means of expression for the poor and disenfranchised. He believed it would be undemocratic to prevent those populations from exerting political power through protest and organizing.

Jerry Smith, Ward 2, spoke of the work that Occupy Eugene did with the homeless at no cost to the taxpayer. He spoke of the injustices he perceived in the economic system and said Occupy Eugene was trying to bring economic and social justice to the country. He asked the council to allow the camp to continue. He maintained the community supported the camp. Mr. Smith believed it would be tantamount to terrorism to tear down the tents in the middle of winter.

Thomas Price, Ward 8, asked the council to extend the camping ban exemption for Occupy Eugene. He spoke of the economic hardships many residents were experiencing. He had been to the Occupy Eugene camp and knew it was a good thing.

Shaun Haskins, Springfield, shared his view of the origins of Occupy Eugene, which he found in economic inequality, leaving the wealthy the *de facto* policy makers.

Carol Berg Caldwell, Ward 3, suggested that if the Occupy Eugene camp was closed the City would incur costs in other areas. She spoke of the plight and despair of the homeless and suggested that the costs of the camp were "chump change" when compared with the benefits the homeless were receiving from the camp. She asked that the council allow a reasonable extension that gave services time to coalesce around a broader community effort.

Michelle Townsend, homeless, submitted a petition with 1,700 signatures to the mayor and council in support of continuing the Occupy Eugene camp.

Irene Cardenas, General Delivery, Eugene, discussed her preference to live outdoors in harmony with nature.

Jeff Gent, Ward 7, rejected the EPD's reports about the Occupy camp. He acknowledged there were problems but conditions were improving every day. He said kitchen resources could be secured in three days if the City extended the exemption. He said Occupy Eugene was willing to meet the City more than half-way and thanked the City and other agencies for their willingness to work with Occupy. Occupy Eugene did not want to cost the City money. There were many volunteers willing to give resources but time was needed to develop a real plan for a long-term solution.

Ross Howard, Ward 7, likened the Occupy movement to the Arab Spring and asserted the camp was about participants' constitutional rights to camp at Washington Jefferson Park. He maintained that the movement had "done a great job" and had succeeded where others had failed. He did not think it was right to end the camp now and asked the City to work with Occupy. He believed the result would be fewer homeless people

M. V. Lazar, Ward 1, identified himself as a small downtown business owner downtown and supporter of Occupy Eugene.

Gary Cornelius, Springfield, believed that Occupy Eugene allowed the disenfranchised and marginalized to hope change might happen. He advocated for the continuance of the camp while a long-term solution was found. He thought the movement offered people an opportunity for better long-term support not provided by the government.

Ben Rubaker shared remarks authored by **Chuck Gerard**, Ward 1, a White Bird Clinic coordinator, who commended Occupy Eugene for its work with the homeless. Mr. Gerard acknowledged the current situation was not perfect and also acknowledged the increased City costs but suggested they were only incurred because of the additional police presence at protest activities unrelated to the camp. He acknowledged safety concerns but suggested that any death could not be the fault of the council given that many homeless died alone each year in Eugene. He suggested that Major Tom Egan might have been found in time if he had been at such a camp. Mr. Gerard asked the council to continue the exemption while the movement and City worked to develop the park or an alternative site as a long-term solution.

Mark Callahan, Ward 4, opposed further extension of the exemption to the camping ban granted to Occupy Eugene. He said as a member of the 53 percent who paid taxes, he was concerned about the public funding that had been spent to allow Occupy Eugene to stay in a public park that others could not then use. He did not believe camping could be equated with speech. Mr. Callahan said the council was charged to enforce the law for all citizens. He would be required to secure permits and licenses if he wished to build a structure, cook and serve food, or provide medical care. He had yet to see proof that similar requirements were made of Occupy Eugene. Mr. Callahan suggested that the City should invoice Occupy Eugene for the costs incurred to date.

Claire Syrett, Ward 7, urged the council to allow Occupy Eugene to exist at the current site or move to a new space. She averred that the camp was a protest site, a refuge, and a public meeting space for people to come together and share ideas for moving the country toward greater equality. She said current human services were overwhelmed by demand but had begun to work with the movement to explore ideas for serving people in immediate need and find a permanent solution. She acknowledged the City struggled to address homelessness and recommended that the council let Occupy Eugene "take this on" with the assistance of providers. She believed the least the City could do was provide Occupy Eugene with a small parcel of publicly owned land.

Lotus, Ward 1, said she was living at Washington-Jefferson Park and attested that freedom of speech was very important to participants. She wanted to prioritize people above the rules. She called for long-term solutions that did not marginalize people and services that made them feel welcome.

Teri Ferguson, Creswell, discussed her positive experience at the Occupy Eugene camp. She discounted the police reports because she averred they concerned crimes that had occurred nightly and unreported for years. She suggested the council's decision would not be difficult if "made from the heart." She feared that if the council ended the exemption to the camping ban the movement could not reach its full potential.

Scotty Perey, Ward 1, expressed his disagreement with the general direction of government and society. He suggested that the City was picking on Occupy Eugene even though it was "cleaning up the mess that was killing us all." He maintained the camp made the movement possible and was different than anything that had ever been seen before. He asked the council to "not get in our way" because Occupy Eugene "was already moving on." He envisioned a larger and more built-out camp with educational programs serving all people. He was willing to be arrested if the City ended the camp.

Eugene Wanderer, Ward 7, quoted Section 1 of the Oregon Constitution as rationale for continuing the Occupy Eugene encampment and cited *State v. Henry* as rationale for preferring the State over the federal constitution in this instance.

Mayor Piercy closed the Public Forum.

2. **CONSENT CALENDAR**
 - A. **Approval of City Council Minutes**
 - October 24, 2011, Work Session
 - October 26, 2011, Work Session
 - B. **Approval of Tentative Working Agenda**

The council had approved the Consent Calendar at the 5:30 p.m. work session.

3. **PUBLIC HEARING AND ACTION:**
Adoption of a Resolution Adopting a Supplemental Budget; Making Appropriations for the City of Eugene for the Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2011, and ending June 30, 2012

Mayor Piercy opened the public hearing.

John Barofsky, Ward 3, reviewed the appropriations included in the supplemental budget and endorsed those appropriations as a good use of City funds.

Nancy Woodke, Ward 2, expressed support for the funding proposed for Laurelwood Golf Course and suggested that the long-term future of the golf course was a livability issue.

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to adopt Resolution 5049 adopting a Supplemental Budget; making appropriations for the City of Eugene for the Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 2011, and ending June 30, 2012. Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 8:0

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

**4. PUBLIC HEARING AND POSSIBLE ACTION:
Adoption of a Resolution Adopting a Supplemental Budget; Making Appropriations for the Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Eugene for the Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2011, and ending June 30, 2012**

Mayor Piercy opened the public hearing. There being no requests to speak, Mayor Piercy closed the public hearing.

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to adopt Resolution 1062 adopting a Supplemental Budget; making appropriations for the Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Eugene for the Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 2011, and ending June 30, 2012. Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

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

**5. ACTION:
An Ordinance Concerning State Traffic Laws; Amending Section 5.005 of the Eugene Code, 1971, and Providing an Effective Date**

City Manager Jon Ruiz introduced the item, reporting that the council updated the code annually to ensure consistency with the State Traffic Code. Since the last update in 2010, the State Legislature had made changes to the State code requiring amendments to the City Code.

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to adopt Council Bill 5058, an ordinance concerning State Traffic Laws, amending Section 5.005 of the Eugene Code, 1971, and providing an effective date. Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

**6. ACTION:
Ordinance Vacating a Portion of Moss Street Located Between East 15th Avenue and East 17th Avenue (VRI 10-1)**

City Manager Jon Ruiz asked the council to take action on an ordinance that vacated a portion of Moss Street between East 15th and East 17th avenues. The sole criterion governing the vacation was that the council must find it in the public interest.

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to adopt Council Bill 5052, an ordinance vacating the portion of Moss Street located between East 15th Avenue and East 17th Avenue.

Councilor Poling acknowledged the letter the council received from Greg Rikhoff, Director of Community Relations for the University of Oregon (UO) that outlined the University's extensive community outreach in regard to the vacation. He thanked the UO for its approach to the vacation.

Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

**7. ACTION:
Exemption to Code on Overnight Camping—Occupy Eugene**

Councilor Taylor moved to amend the City Council's November 9 motion exempting Occupy Eugene from the overnight camping prohibition under section 4.815 of the Eugene Code by changing the date from December 15 until May 15, 2012.

The motion died for lack of a second.

Councilor Brown, seconded by Councilor Ortiz, moved to adopt modified Option 3 provided by Councilor Zelenka to extend the camping exemption and provide transition services until the completion of the community task force's work.

- 1) Mayor would immediately form a community task force to report back to the council within 90 days to identify strategies on homelessness for council consideration. The task force could include council members, OE representatives, nonprofit agency representatives, and other community members.
- 2) Hire a nonprofit agency to lead an effort to mobilize and coordinate transitional human services for homeless campers, and consult with OE about the security and management of the OE camp. These transition human services will not replicate the OE camp experience; however, they could provide opportunities for OE homeless campers to continue to receive basic services, such as: a legal place to camp/stay (see 3c and 3d below), food, clothing, and medical services; while the task force develops recommendations for a more sustainable and effective provision of services.
- 3) Temporarily increase the funding for the car camping program, and expand the programs scope to include legal tent camping on sites when appropriate. Currently, three vehicles are allowed under certain conditions in parking lots of religious institutions, business or public entities.
- 4) Create a short-term site, like an Egan warming center, for the rest of the winter specifically for chronic homeless with behavioral and addiction issues; essentially, a secure temporary wet housing pilot program. The facility would be open seven days per week, but with hours restricted to 5 p.m. to 8 a.m. and staffed by nonprofit agencies and trained community volunteers.
- 5) Extend the camping exemption for 45 days to allow full implementation of transition services.
- 6) Occupy Eugene, nonprofit agencies, and City staff are continuing to meet to discuss these possibilities. The cost for transition services, such as these is likely to exceed \$100,000. The City Manager will provide funding options at your Wednesday, December 14, 2011, work session.

Councilor Ortiz suggested that City Manager Ruiz meet with the leadership of Occupy Eugene to determine if it was in agreement with the elements of the motion and report back to the council on December 14.

Councilor Zelenka concurred with Councilor Ortiz. He also wanted to hear Occupy Eugene's response to the proposal.

Councilor Zelenka, seconded by Councilor Taylor, moved to direct the City Manager to bring back a final motion on Wednesday after discussing the modified Option 3 motion with Occupy Eugene representatives.

Councilor Clark requested a cursory estimate of the cost of the modified motion. City Manager Ruiz estimated a cost of \$50,000 to \$150,000 for transition services. He was unsure of the policing costs but believed they would be more than was being spent currently. Councilor Clark suggested the costs could go as high as \$250,000. City Manager Ruiz acknowledged that was possible.

Councilor Clark wanted any transition to be as peaceful as possible and to be conducted in such a manner that allowed people to be heard and treated them with dignity. However, he was concerned that the City was treating Occupy Eugene differently from other citizens when it came to accountability. He wanted to know who spoke for the group and who the City was entering into an agreement with given the nature of Occupy Eugene. City Manager Ruiz anticipated the City would meet for representatives of Occupy Eugene although he expected that they would offer the disclaimer they did not speak for the entire group. He said the City had worked with the group and worked through most of the issues it identified. He expected a similar model.

Councilor Clark asked what the point of the City's action would be if a subset of Occupy Eugene decided to resist.

Councilor Taylor had offered a motion for more time because of the requests the council heard and had believed May 15 would be a good date because the weather would be better and it would give the community time to think about the issues. She wanted to give Occupy Eugene more time to figure out its future and collect donations.

Councilor Farr did not support the motion. He continued to have major concerns regarding sanitation and disease at the camp and those concerns had not been satisfied. The City had worked hard through a variety of initiatives to help the homeless and but only a small percentage of homeless people were staying at the camp. He did not think that wastewater was being handled appropriately and feared the City was creating the conditions for an outbreak of disease.

Councilor Ortiz wanted Occupy Eugene to respond to the City Council's offer to work together. She acknowledged the many homeless people in the community and said that while people learned to survive, they were not living in optimal conditions. She did not expect Occupy Eugene to end homelessness but any step toward that end would make her happy.

Councilor Pryor suggested the question was how much time it would take to move toward a different solution. While he was unsure anyone liked the 45-day deadline, it was a middle point people could agree on. Councilor Pryor supported the motion to postpone action as a way to give Occupy Eugene time to consider the proposal. He also liked the idea of involving the service providers.

Councilor Clark asked staff to prepare an estimate of costs in time for the December 14 discussion. He also wanted an estimate of the number of people who would cooperate with the deadline and how many would not.

Councilor Clark was challenged to support the motion because it gave tacit approval to the camp site. He was interested in hearing further discussion on December 14 but continued to be concerned the City was subsidizing a protest. He defended Occupy Eugene's right to protest but did not want to spend tax dollars to further a protest that was not supported by all residents.

City Manager Ruiz pointed out the motion did not call for the termination of the camp in 45 days.

Councilor Poling indicated tentative support for the motion. He questioned the source of funding and how it affected other services. He recommended the funding come from Council Contingency Funds. Councilor Poling was concerned about extending the exemption for 45 days. He preferred to retain the December 15 date and let staff determine how to close the camp down as soon as practical. He objected to continued extension of the exemption. The camp was not needed to realize the other elements of the motion, which he supported as common sense steps. He anticipated further discussion of that date.

Councilor Zelenka said each Occupy movement was different and in Eugene it had focused on homelessness. He believed that Occupy Eugene captured people's imaginations and at least their attention. He believed that Occupy Eugene represented an opportunity for meaningful change in regarding to homelessness. The intention of his motion was that the camp would close at the end of 45 days. Transition services would be in place to move the campers into more stable conditions with better services. Regarding costs, Councilor Zelenka anticipated the manager would provide the council with funding options at the December 14 meeting and further anticipated the manager would provide ranges of cost.

Councilor Farr was glad for the delay because he hoped it would provide more answers. He continued to be concerned about safety and planned to visit the camp. He had serious concerns about sanitation and questioned where the gray water was going but would keep an open mind and would see if his concerns could be alleviated.

Councilor Brown questioned whether 45 days was sufficient time to transition the event. He suggested the council might need to revisit that decision given the complexity of the tasks that lay ahead. He agreed with the remarks of Councilor Zelenka.

Speaking to the issue of money, Councilor Brown suggested that the revenue from the Moss Street vacation could be one funding source.

Mayor Piercy recalled that the bulk of police-related expenses came from the protests that occurred at the beginning of the camp. She acknowledged that more expenses had been accrued over time. She acknowledged that Occupy Eugene was a political movement that was shining a big light on the problem of the homeless. She thanked the 70 people who signed up to speak and said she tried to treat all fairly whether she agreed or disagreed with their views. She had wanted to ensure the council got to its decision point on the issue. Mayor Piercy believed inequity was a big problem. She thanked those present for caring.

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

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting at 9:23 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, 2012
5:30 p.m.

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

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the January 11, 2012, work session of the Eugene City Council to order.

A. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. Brown had attended the last Civilian Review Board meeting and observed a case review. He commended the thoroughness of the board's review. He had also participated in some recent clean-up parties at Civic Stadium and commended the work of Ed Peara, a long-time volunteer.

Mr. Clark commended the recent State of County event. He reported the Joint Elected Officials Ambulance Transport Task Force continued to work diligently and anticipated it would forward its recommendations to the council in four to five months. He recommended that councilors view the video *Ambulance Service: Matching Resources to Needs* on the City's web site for a better sense of the issues involved.

Mr. Poling said that Travel Lane County's newly formed Issues Committee would discuss the proposed closure of the Gateway Postal Distribution Center. He reported that Harlow Serves, a partnership involving the neighborhood organization, 4J School District, Holt Elementary School parents, Willakenzie Evangelical Church, and North Park Community Church held a successful food drive. He commended Harlow Serves as a great example of what neighborhood partnerships could accomplish. He thanked Trader Joes for providing bags as well as all those who involved in the drive.

Ms. Taylor commended Mr. Peara as a model volunteer. She noted the e-mails the council had received about a tree being cut to protect a sidewalk. She had also been contacted by a constituent regarding the removal of a tree near the Campbell Center and suggested that there should be a process in place that made it more difficult to remove trees because of their multiple values. Ms. Taylor had also been contacted by residents concerned about the intrusion of commercial parking at the development at 17th Avenue and Pearl Street into the street. She believed if the City granted the developer permission to block the sidewalk, the permission should be withdrawn.

Ms. Taylor had attended a meeting of the Board of Directors of the National League of Cities and reported the board agreed to focus on things that affected cities of all sizes, such as unfunded mandates and secure Community Development Block Grant funding. The board also agreed it was important to keep immigration reform in front of Congress.

Mr. Zelenka reported on the recent University Area Neighborhood Livability Summit, saying the impact from the University of Oregon (UO) was a unique issue for the neighborhoods surrounding the UO. He had called together the affected neighborhood organizations to discuss those impacts and possible solutions. He said residents agreed that uniform solutions did not work for all parts of the community and discussed the concept of establishing a UO overlay zone with regulations specific to the area. He said another meeting would occur soon. Mr. Brown asked to be informed of the next meeting date. Mr. Zelenka agreed, and said he would also provide the council with the notes of the meeting.

Mr. Zelenka reported the City's Sustainability Commission had new members and he anticipated they would do very well. He said the commission had been implementing its newly approved and modified work plan, and was focusing on the Envision Eugene process, West Eugene EmX, and the Coordinated Land Use and Transportation Advisory Committee. Mr. Zelenka commended the work of commissioner chair Josh Skov and Sustainability Liaison Babe O'Sullivan.

Mr. Pryor reported on the most recent meeting of the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) Board of Directors, saying the work plan for the Sustainable Cities grant was in place. He commended the work of Stephanie Jennings of the Planning and Development Department for leading that effort and recognized that she was doing two jobs. The search for a new executive director to replace retired LCOG director George Kloepfel was underway and a committee that included City Manager Jon Ruiz had been formed to oversee that process. The board would make the final selection.

Ms. Ortiz reported on a meeting that involved herself, Mayor Piercy, Intergovernmental Relations Director Brenda Wilson, representatives of Beyond Toxics, and representatives of Union Pacific Railroad regarding local concerns about the impact of diesel emissions from idled trains. She learned that the railroad had policies in place governing the practice and did not idle trains when the weather was over 40 degrees because it wasted diesel fuels. She and the representative of Beyond Toxics would contact other railroad companies about their practices. Mayor Piercy added that the railroad reported that 75 percent of its trains were equipped with emissions control devices and that it paid for the devices without government assistance because it helped with fuel costs and because the railroad wanted to do the right thing and respond to community concerns. She said the railroad planned to equip all its trains with the devices.

Ms. Ortiz thanked the Eugene Police Department for arresting the two gang leaders who had been impacting her neighborhood. She reminded the council of the upcoming Martin Luther King, Jr., march and called attention to an immigrant rights meeting scheduled for January 24 at First Methodist Church sponsored by CAUSA.

Ms. Ortiz, seconded by Mr. Zelenka, moved to have staff draft a letter in support of keeping the Gateway Postal Distribution Center open. The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Ms. Ortiz reported the Human Services Commission (HRC) planned to hold a Hate Crimes Conference and a planning group was overseeing that effort.

Mr. Farr noted his son had been married the previous Monday and he and his new wife were going to Brazil for a year so she could study there under a Fulbright scholarship. He congratulated Alicia Hayes of Lane County Health and Human Services for her appointment to oversee the newly reorganized department. Mr. Farr said the HRC appreciated the recognition it received for its Listening Project at the State of the City address. He recognized the time spent on the project by Chair Toni Gyatso and Vice Chair Ken Neubeck and thanked Mayor Piercy for honoring the commission.

Mr. Farr recognized the extensive volunteer work of Mr. Poling and his wife Glenda.

Mayor Piercy thanked City staff for its effort in the State of the City address. She said the event went very smoothly.

Mayor Piercy reported that the Metropolitan Planning Committee passed the Regional Transportation Plan with minor amendments. She acknowledged there was little funding for the projects in the plan but it was important to have such plans in place so the community was prepared when money was available. The MPC continued to work on greenhouse gas planning and on scoping projects for land and transportation scenarios.

Mayor Piercy said she also attended a meeting of the Regional Solutions Committee, which discussed the role of Goshen in satisfying the industrial land needs of Eugene.

Mayor Piercy commended the redevelopment of the Taco Time Building at Broadway and Willamette Street.

City Manager Ruiz announced several upcoming community events, including the Martin Luther King, Jr. Day march, the Martin Luther King, Jr. Community Celebration at the Hult Center, and a presentation by Dr. Joseph White at the UO.

**B. WORK SESSION:
Boards and Commissions**

City Manager's Office Division Manager Keli Osborn and Council Coordinator Beth Forrest joined the council for the item. Ms. Forrest solicited council feedback on the boards and commission selection process.

Mr. Clark, Mr. Farr, Ms. Ortiz, and Mr. Poling expressed specific concern about the geographic diversity of City boards and commissions. Mr. Clark was particularly concerned about geographic diversity as it regarded the Budget Committee and advocated for ways to enhance the recruiting process so the council had a diverse range of opinions on that committee. Mr. Farr believed that wards 4, 5, 6, and 8 in specific were underrepresented on City boards and commissions. Ms. Ortiz acknowledged the challenge of volunteerism for many residents and encouraged the viewing audience to apply. Mr. Poling advocated for better outreach.

Mr. Zelenka believed there were many complicated reasons, including demographics, which resulted in some wards being unrepresented.

Ms. Taylor did not think geographic diversity mattered. Mr. Brown concurred

Ms. Osborn emphasized the challenge of getting people to apply. She suggested councilors think of additional roles they could play in publicizing openings in their wards, such as providing people with applications, and invited suggestions.

Mr. Pryor pointed out that when asked how they heard about a commission opening, the majority of respondents indicated it was word of mouth. He suggested the City would not know why certain wards were more represented than others unless it asked. He believed geographic representation should be a

factor in appointments. He said that he had made random calls to residents of his ward encouraging them to apply with little success. He suggested that people became involved in civic affairs because they were very dissatisfied or very satisfied with City government.

Mr. Brown agreed with Mr. Pryor. He thought it would be useful to know where all applicants came from. He acknowledged that for whatever reason, the City received more applications from residents of wards 1, 2, and 3. He looked for the best applicant when reviewing applications and tried to avoid looking at ward numbers. He did not know how to address the lack of geographic diversity.

Mayor Piercy agreed that geographic diversity was important but so were other types of diversity. She noted growing participation from the Cal Young and Trainsong neighborhoods and said the City should keep working on the issue without getting bogged down.

Mr. Clark pointed out that geographic diversity was mandated by City policy. He wanted the City to do more to effectively achieve such diversity. He said the issue was not a shortage of applicants from other wards but the council's decision-making process. When the council had a chance to choose a qualified applicant from Ward 4 it selected a qualified candidate from Ward 3. Mr. Clark wanted to find new ways to find residents to participate and suggested that the City employ the newsletters of the school districts and local community agencies to announce vacancies. He thought the councilors could do more as individuals. He asked staff to communicate with the council regarding the deadlines for applications.

Mayor Piercy observed that information provided by staff indicated that the lowest levels of participation were in the downtown, Trainsong, Far West, Jefferson-Westside, West University, and Laurel Hill neighborhoods. Ms. Osborn pointed out the discussion was complicated by the fact that neighborhood organizations were different sizes.

Ms. Ortiz expressed general satisfaction with the current process and thanked staff for its work. She suggested that the City could explore the approach used in Salem, where a subcommittee of the council rather than the full council interviewed candidates.

Mr. Zelenka believed the City needed to get more gender diversity on the Planning Commission and noted the lack of younger and older applicants as well as applicants of color. He did not want to "trump" those things for geographic diversity. He did not want to see geographic diversity "quotas."

Mr. Zelenka also supported the current process and recommended that candidates should receive coaching on their opening statements. He did not think the format the City currently used extracted the most relevant information about life experiences.

Mr. Poling pointed out that one-third of applicants did not respond to the question regarding ethnic background, which skewed the numbers. He supported Mr. Zelenka's suggestion that applicants be coached in preparing for their interviews.

Mr. Clark posited the idea of an ordinance change that provided for individual councilors to appoint individual Budget Committee members.

Ms. Taylor did not dislike Mr. Clark's idea. She did not want to limit councilors' appointments to residents of their wards, however. She suggested that after the applicant's opening statement, the councilors ask questions based on the statement.

Ms. Ortiz recommended that the City hold more open houses to inform residents of board and commissions vacancies and share information about the duties and responsibilities of the positions involved. She believed it was the council's role to get people not normally involved in government to apply for such vacancies. She further suggested the City's current process was "too process-oriented" for some as well as a little threatening.

Mr. Brown was generally satisfied with the process. He recommended that staff prepare an informational packet for applicants that included an estimate of the time commitment involved. He welcomed more suggestion of Mr. Clark's idea but pointed out it had been tried before. He believed that all wards were equally represented on the Budget Committee because of the presence of the council. Mr. Brown liked the idea of interviewing from a wide pool and selecting the best candidates.

Speaking to Ms. Taylor's concern, Mr. Pryor believed the council needed consistency in the questions it asked of applicants for the purposes of comparison but suggested the potential of an open question and answer session following the prepared questions. He noted that currently, there were no job descriptions for positions and recommended that the council consider establishing the minimum qualifications for service on City boards and commissions. He thought geography as an element of diversity should be considered. Mr. Pryor wanted to look at mechanisms for engaging ordinary residents who were not motivated by concern about a City decision or position.

Ms. Taylor regretted the demise of the Citizen Involvement Committee, which had fostered citizen involvement through use of a random voter pool for applicants. She suggested something similar to the Citizen Police Academy be established for City boards and commissions.

Mr. Clark said that while residents of a geographic area would not have uniform positions, he believed that geographic diversity ensured that everyone would be heard.

Mr. Zelenka suggested that all interviews be scheduled for one week with follow-up interviews the next week for applicants unable to attend interviews the previous week. Ms. Forrest noted that tentatively, two interview dates were scheduled.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting at 1:28 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 18, 2012
5:30 p.m.

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

In the absence of Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy, Council President George Brown called the January 18, 2012, work session of the Eugene City Council to order.

**A. WORK SESSION:
Envision Eugene—Economic Development**

The council was joined by Community Development Manager Mike Sullivan and Associate Planner Jason Dedrick, who led the council through a PowerPoint presentation regarding the community's land need as it related to the employment growth rate and industrial demand. Councilors asked questions clarifying the details of the presentation.

Mr. Clark suggested that the aspiration goals in the Regional Prosperity Plan (RPP) indicated the region would need to create 25,000 to 26,000 new jobs over ten years and he questioned what growth rate would be required to achieve that given the recent job losses experienced in the community. Mr. Dedrick could not say but reminded Mr. Clark that commercial jobs were also included in the plan forecast. He anticipated the region would grow three times as many commercial as industrial jobs, and a growth rate of 1.6 percent would result in 8,000 industrial jobs and 25,000 commercial jobs. Mr. Clark hoped to see an updated growth rate percentage analysis before the council discussed additional land needs. City Manager Jon Ruiz emphasized the RPP was a regional plan. He also emphasized the goal of increasing the average median income, which often required more industrial type jobs and could cause the City to shift anticipated growth from commercial to industrial jobs, which would increase the overall total percentage of industrial jobs.

Mr. Clark expressed concern that Springfield proposed to add 600 industrial acres to its land base while Eugene was balking at adding that number. He believed the City should be thinking about a much larger number. He said the City wanted to increase jobs in the targeted clusters but it was losing jobs in each of the clusters. He wanted to see wholesale shifts in the numbers.

Mr. Pryor believed the job mix assumptions were a key factor because some jobs paid better than others. He asked if the commercial category included a traded sector component. Mr. Sullivan said the targeted industries were a mix of commercial and traded sector jobs. Mr. Pryor suggested that mix could result in better quality jobs higher wages and wanted to know what traction the City could achieve in the commercial sector toward the creation of such jobs. He believed the issue could be considered from both a property tax standpoint and a payroll standpoint. In terms of payroll, Mr. Pryor wanted as many high

quality jobs as possible for their multiplier effect and suggested that meant it did not matter if the job was in Eugene or Springfield.

Ms. Ortiz agreed with Mr. Pryor, saying she was interested in the overall health of the community. While she wanted to increase the tax base, she also wanted family-wage jobs with benefits. She asked if the business community was considering others approaches to benefits, such as a “tri-share” approach to health insurance.

Mr. Zelenka agreed with Mr. Pryor and Ms. Ortiz. He thought the council should be talking about family-wage jobs and benefits and it mattered less where they were than that they helped to build the regional economy. He suggested that Springfield’s actions had an impact on Eugene that needed to be taken into account and should be considered on a regional basis, such as the development potential that existed in Glenwood.

Mr. Zelenka questioned basing long-term land use decisions on aspirational goals, such as those included in the RPP.

Mr. Zelenka requested a list of the names of the members of the economic development subcommittee.

Mr. Farr said Eugene needed to create incentives to retain local companies and attract new ones. He referred to the information presented by staff regarding parcel sizes associated with large clean tech facility announcements and observed that Eugene had no parcels approaching the sizes listed. He believed Eugene had created disincentives for businesses to remain in, much less come to, Eugene. In recent years, Eugene had lost Grain Millers, Glory Bee Foods, and Rexius Forest Products, and he questioned how they could be replaced.

Speaking to Mr. Pryor’s comments, Mr. Farr was unsure that Springfield residents were going to spend the proceeds from their new jobs in Eugene.

Mr. Farr endorsed the focus on foods as a job cluster and regretted the lack of local food processing facilities.

Ms. Taylor pointed out that Rexius remained in the Eugene-Springfield area. She did not think it mattered where a company located if that location was suitable. She also supported foods and food processing as a job cluster and believed it was important to protect farmland to facilitate food production. She did not think that such lands should be wasted on industrial uses.

Mr. Brown believed it was unrealistic to assume a 1.6 percent growth rate and suggested the lower figure of .9 made more sense.

Mr. Clark did not think that 18 percent of the community’s jobs were industrial given the loss of manufacturing jobs that occurred over the last few years. He wanted the industrial job base to be in Eugene for the sake of jobs and the addition to the tax base that would help stabilize the City’s ability to deliver the services it wanted to and called on Eugene to lead in providing its residents with the best jobs with the best benefits. He believed those were found in the manufacturing, industrial, and traded sectors. Mr. Clark wanted the council to set aside appropriate amounts of land that will help it become a regional leader in the type of jobs that made sense for the community.

Ms. Ortiz pointed out that Eugene incentivized businesses to remain through the West Eugene Enterprise Zone. She believed that Eugene was doing what it could with limited resources.

Ms. Ortiz advocated for a focus on underutilized areas as Four Corners. She said if Eugene put as much effort into that area as it did in downtown it would change the landscape in an area that served as an entry to the community. Mr. Dedrick said that staff would return with a discussion of commercial redevelopment soon, which could address some of Ms. Ortiz's concerns.

Mr. Zelenka agreed with Ms. Taylor's remarks about Rexus. He did not think Eugene was accurately characterized as anti-growth or anti-businesses and recalled that Forbes had ranked Eugene as the fifth best community in the country for businesses to relocate to. He believed the local business environment was very good in spite of Mr. Clark's "rhetoric." He thought the entire council wanted to see more and better family-wage jobs, and he believed that was what the task before the council was all about. Mr. Zelenka anticipated that Eugene would continue to be the job center for the region.

Mr. Farr believed the major disincentive for businesses to remain in Eugene or come to Eugene continued to be a lack of available land.

Mr. Brown said people must realize there were limits to growth. The community could not build on wetlands, steep slopes, or farmland. He did not think Eugene had many suitable factory sites and said that the council could not pretend Springfield did not exist.

Mr. Brown requested a breakdown of the private and public investments for the projects reviewed by staff. He also requested the final report of the Green Jobs Task Force if available.

Speaking to Mr. Zelenka's remarks, Mr. Clark suggested that rhetoric was also saying one thing and doing another. He said if the council stated it wanted to increase the community's job base it needed to remove the constraints that kept that from happening. He pointed out that Rexus moved to Springfield because it could not find a suitable site in Eugene. Mr. Clark pointed out the City was facing \$6 million in budget reductions but none of the councilors wanted to cut services. If the council's rhetoric was that it cared about economic growth, wanted to see more jobs, and wanted to fund the desired service levels, it needed to increase the value of land inside the UGB.

Mr. Pryor advocated for the council to depend on actual information to the degree possible and not take things on faith. He believed the community needed to accommodate industrial growth but the issue was to what degree. He said that government could only create an environment for job growth. He suggested that Eugene's anti-business reputation was based on people's perception that it was overly restrictive in its regulations. He believed regulation was necessary but must make sense. Mr. Pryor recommended the council discuss changes in that area to ensure the City was providing a logical, reasonable regulatory environment without "giving away the farm."

Mr. Brown suggested the loss of Rexus was mitigated by the redevelopment that would occur on its former site.

Mr. Brown adjourned the meeting at 1:19 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 25, 2012
Noon

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

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the January 25, 2012, work session of the Eugene City Council to order.

A. WORK SESSION

An Ordinance Concerning Downtown Public Safety Zone; Amending Section 4.74 of the Eugene Code, 1971; and Providing a Sunset Date

Lieutenant Sam Kamkar led the council through a PowerPoint presentation on the Downtown Public Safety Zone (DPSZ) that included a review of all exclusion dispositions from October 2008 through November 2011 and demographic information about people receiving exclusion orders. Police Chief Pete Kerns and Prosecutor Dan Barkovic were also present for the item.

Lt. Kamkar recommended that the word “shall” in Section 4.875 be changed to “may,” and that the sunset in the ordinance be eliminated.

Councilors asked questions clarifying the details of the presentation.

Mr. Clark, seconded by Mr. Farr, moved to have the manager bring back the ordinance appropriately changed to reflect the staff recommendation.

Mr. Clark believed the zone had improved downtown safety conditions. He noted the Police Auditor had received no complaints about the City’s enforcement of the ordinance in the three years of the zone’s existence. He also noted that the Police Commission held a public forum to solicit public input on the zone and subsequently recommended that the council extend the ordinance and remove the sunset.

Ms. Taylor suggested that the City suspend the zone for one year so it could determine how the addition of more downtown officers affected crime rates. She wanted to know where those excluded from downtown went and if they were arrested in some other place. She questioned whether those excluded from downtown had sufficient faith in the system or even enough knowledge of it to pursue their options under the law.

Mr. Poling believed the exclusion zone was working as planned and indicated support for the motion.

Mr. Farr asked for a list of other municipalities with similar zones.

Responding to a question from Mr. Pryor about the increase in crimes after the establishment of the zone, Lt. Kamkar attributed the increase to having more officers available to respond to calls and the fact that downtown businesses were more apt to contact the police and report a crime knowing they would receive a prompt response. Mr. Pryor concluded that reporting rather than crime had gone up and anticipated over time the actual number of citations would decrease if the zone was working. Lt. Kamkar agreed.

Responding to a question from Mr. Pryor, Lt. Kamkar confirmed that the exclusion zone was not being used to target individuals but rather to target criminal behavior.

Mr. Brown did not think the motion was necessary at this time, noting the public process to follow. He questioned the effectiveness of the zone given the data provided by staff and suggested the zone represented an unnecessary layer to the existing policing system. Like Ms. Taylor, Mr. Brown also wanted to know what happened to those who were excluded. He noted that the Mid-Town Merchants Association reported a large spike in incidents in that area, which was immediately adjacent to downtown.

Mr. Brown supported the word change recommended by staff.

Mr. Zelenka believed it was hard to definitely state that zone worked and he continued to have due process concerns. He questioned why one in five challenged exclusions was denied by a judge. Mr. Barkovic said that in some instances cases were dismissed when the court discovered the crime underlying the exclusion was not eligible for a 90-day exclusion order, although the crime might be eligible for one-year exclusions in the event of a conviction. Mr. Zelenka asked for more detail about those cases.

Ms. Ortiz requested additional information about how Latinos were identified in the demographics.

Ms. Ortiz believed downtown crime had leached into nearby neighborhoods as a result of the zone, decreasing those residents' quality of life. She had considered the zone a stopgap measure pending the assignment of more police officers, which she anticipated would have a greater impact than the zone. She agreed the motion was premature and did not support it.

Mayor Piercy believed the intention was that the City would have less need for the zone as other public safety initiatives moved forward. She suggested to Mr. Zelenka that the number of dismissed cases argued that the zone was working. She pointed out the community continued to lack sufficient jail beds and she did not know when that would change. Mayor Piercy acknowledged that focusing on crime in one location frequently shifted it to another location.

Mayor Piercy supported retention of the sunset and a future reexamination; however, she questioned if the time was right to end the zone given the City's goals for downtown.

Mr. Clark agreed with Mayor Piercy. He believed the zone had been effective in removing the worst offenders from downtown and held them accountable at a time the City lacked jail beds to contain them. He recommended those in disagreement contact downtown business owners like Tom Kamis and Betty Snowden to ask them if they thought the zone made a difference.

Mr. Poling agreed with Mr. Clark and Mayor Piercy. He considered the zone a tool to mitigate the loss of County jail beds. He anticipated that Lane County will make even more reductions to public safety. He thanked Sgt. Terry Fitzpatrick and Lt. Kamkar for their administration of the ordinance.

Responding to a question from Mr. Farr, Chief Kerns said studies suggested that focused patrols would disperse concentrations of crime and when they occurred elsewhere they were in smaller concentrations. As the concentration dispersed, the police followed it. The loss of jail beds undermined the police effort. Mr. Farr expressed interest in knowing if the dispersed crime was at the same level as the downtown crime level.

Mr. Zelenka also supported retaining the sunset. He wanted to see more statistics about crime in adjacent areas and wanted more information about the advocacy program. Lt. Kamkar acknowledged the advocacy program had not been used and believed it was because people found the information complicated. He thought changes could be made to make the program clearer and more effective and suggested judges could also remind defendants about the program.

Mr. Zelenka also considered the motion premature.

Mr. Pryor supported the intent behind the motion but wanted to give the manager time to process the concepts raised by the council and the public in a thoughtful way. He was unprepared to address the issue of the sunset without more discussion of its relationship to other public safety tools the City was deploying in downtown.

Ms. Taylor wanted to hear from people who had been excluded. She believed that those who were unable to understand the process or who lacked knowledge about the system would fail to appear and would be unable to fight the exclusion. She also questioned where the City would jail people who violated an exclusion order in the absence of sufficient jail beds.

With the consent of his second, Mr. Farr, Mr. Clark withdrew his motion.

B. WORK SESSION

Envision Eugene: Low-Density Residential Re-Designation

Associate Planner Heather O'Donnell led the council through a PowerPoint presentation regarding the community's low-density residential land need. Planning Director Lisa Gardner and Metropolitan Community Section Manager Carolyn Weiss were also present for the item. The presentation included maps showing the areas proposed for possible resignation. Ms. O'Donnell reported that the Planning Commission supported the staff recommendation for North Eugene and Option C for West Eugene.

Councilors asked questions clarifying the details of the presentation.

Ms. Weiss reviewed the project timeline, indicating staff would return with a draft recommendation in March, which would be followed by community forums, a public hearing, and council action in May.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting at 1:19 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest
City Recorder

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)

MINUTES

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

February 11, 2012
9 a.m.

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

COUNCILORS ABSENT: Mike Clark.

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the February 11, 2012, annual workshop and meeting with the Eugene Budget Committee to order. The council was joined by Budget Committee lay members John Barofsky, Ken Beeson, Chelsea Clinton, Shanda Miller, Mark Rust, Doug Smith, and Claire Syrett. City Manager Jon Ruiz and members of the City’s Executive Team, Assistant City Manager/Planning and Development Director Sarah Medary, Fire and Emergency Medical Services Chief Randy Groves, Police Chief Pete Kerns, Library, Recreation, and Cultural Services Director Renee Grube, and Public Works Director Kent Corey.

The council first considered a motion related to the location of the proposed Veterans Administration (VA) hospital.

Mr. Brown, seconded by Mr. Farr, moved that because the City Council strongly supported veterans and locating the new Veterans Administration (VA) Clinic in Eugene, and because the council was committed to ensuring that Eugene sites were competitive and was working proactively with the VA, land owner, and developer of the project to ensure its success, the council directed the city manager to bring back to the council as quickly as feasible a range of options for facilitating the development of a VA Clinic in Eugene as well as possible mechanisms for funding those options. The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

A. WORKSHOP

Ms. Miller and Ms. Cutsogeorge then led the council and lay committee members through a PowerPoint presentation entitled *City of Eugene General Fund Forecast*, which highlighted General Fund trends, described causes of the structural budget imbalance, and underscored recent budget accomplishments. The presentation included both a General Fund forecast and reserve review that included trend data about property tax revenues, Eugene Water & Electric Board’s Contribution-in-Lieu of Taxes (CILT), and inflation, and highlighted the impact of additional PERS costs over the forecast period.

Councilors and lay committee members asked questions clarifying the details of the presentation.

Mayor Piercy called for a brief break.

City Manager Ruiz then discussed the strategy he proposed for reducing the City's anticipated \$7 million budget shortfall over two years by reducing the organizational footprint through position eliminations and recapturing recession revenues through the City's investments in the Joint Elected Officials Regional Prosperity Plan, business assistance loans, and downtown development efforts. He acknowledged staff had proposed little by way of new revenue increases and attributed that to recognition of the fact that taxpayers were facing a similar gap. City Manager Ruiz anticipated that some employees would be laid off. He indicated he would present his full recommendation to the committee on February 22.

Councilors and lay committee members asked questions clarifying the details of the manager's strategy.

Mr. Poling suggested the City would be deeper in the hole after two years if the projections were not realized and the gap grew even more. City Manager Ruiz believed the two-year period gave the City time to make course corrections without creating financial instability. He pointed out that the more revenue the City captured in the first years, the less it would have to capture in the out years; if the City was able to capture more than half of the shortfall in the first year it would reduce the risk in out-years.

Ms. Taylor requested information about the ten-year tax exemptions granted by the City.

Responding to a question from Mayor Piercy about steps the organization had taken to reduce health care expenses, Ms. Hammitt said that Risk Services Manager Myrnie Daut had evaluated an on-site clinic but it did not appear to be a cost-saving strategy when investigated. Ms. Daut focused on prevention and wellness to lower the City's overall health expenditures. Ms. Hammitt promised to provide additional information. Ms. Ortiz suggested the City could direct staff to the County's community health centers for regular care and buy catastrophic insurance for other issues. Ms. Hammitt said the City continued to look for opportunities to reduce costs through cooperation with other regional agencies. She reminded the committee that employee benefits were bargained for through the contract process.

Ms. Hammitt led the council and lay committee members through a PowerPoint presentation entitled *Sustainable Funding for City Services* that highlighted the City's progress toward achieving a stable budget. Councilors and committee lay members asked questions clarifying the details of the presentation.

Ms. Ortiz determined from City Manager Ruiz that when he talked about employee layoffs he was also talking about service reductions. Ms. Ortiz acknowledged that several employees were doing several jobs. She hoped that the organization moved forward in a way that was true to the council's goals and the community's values.

Mr. Poling asked if Eugene was aware of service reductions contemplated by the other local jurisdictions that involved services delivered through intergovernmental agreements. If that was the case and if Eugene could no longer fill the funding gap, he questioned whether those functions could continue and if it was worth it to go forward on such a diminished basis. City Manager Ruiz noted his frequent meetings with the chief executive officers of those jurisdictions and said they attempted to keep those issues in mind while also being aware that the elected officials had their own priorities. He said it was a balancing act.

The council and committee lay members discussed the proposed process. Concerns included the truncated process associated with the official budget message scheduled on April 18, uncertainty surrounding the budgets of other jurisdictions, inadequate time for the committee to provide the input necessary to achieve a service mix that was in accord with community goals and available funding, and a desire to do more than meet the minimum legal requirements. Those supporting the process found it more

strategic than past budget reviews, believed there was adequate time for public input built into the process, and thought it accommodated potential changes resulting from other jurisdictions' budget decisions.

City Manager Ruiz previewed the February 22 meeting, reminding the council and lay committee members they would receive his recommended reductions on that date and all Budget Committee meetings scheduled in February and March would include public input opportunities. There would be time for members to provide input and offer motions prior to the official budget presentation.

Responding to a question from Mr. Poling, Ms. Hammitt confirmed that the committee could meet if any of its partner jurisdictions took an unexpected budget action that affected the City's budget. She assured the committee that staff continued to track the discussions that were occurring around the involved services.

Mr. Zelenka expressed interest in a document showing what had changed in the non-General Fund portion of the budget from the previous year. He also advocated for a "big picture" discussion of revenues that included information about initiatives planned by other local jurisdictions. Ms. Miller and Mr. Barofsky shared Mr. Zelenka's interest in a "big picture" discussion. City Manager Ruiz welcomed such a conversation.

The committee agreed to move forward with the process proposed by City Manager Ruiz.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting at 11:52 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest
City Recorder

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)

MINUTES

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

February 13, 2012
5:30 p.m.

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

COUNCILORS ABSENT: Alan Zelenka.

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the February 13, 2012, work session of the Eugene City Council to order.

**A. ACTION:
Motion to Accept New Evidence (Upcoming Joint Elected Officials Hearing on Springfield Metro Plan Boundary)**

Planner Alissa Hansen joined the council and requested council action on a motion to accept new evidence for a Springfield proposal to expand the Springfield Metropolitan Plan Boundary. She reported that Lane Board of County Commissioners approved a similar motion the previous week and the Springfield City Council would consider such a motion the following week.

Mr. Brown, seconded by Mr. Farr, moved that, in accordance with Eugene Code 9.7750(1), the March 13 public hearing of the Joint Elected Officials regarding the boundary changes of the Metro Plan allow new testimony and not be limited to the record of the Planning Commission. The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

B. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Ms. Ortiz said she had asked City Manager Jon Ruiz to schedule a work session to discuss the Lane Regional Air Protection Agency (LRAPA) budget because Lane County and Springfield had again notified LRAPA they would not be able to pay their dues for fiscal year 2013. She hoped the council could discuss that issue before the City's own budget review. She noted that LRAPA's budget review began in March. She had appointed Tom Musselwhite to LRAPA's Budget Committee and anticipated he would be a good fit. Ms. Ortiz also reported that LRAPA's home wood heating and wood stove change-out programs were going well in Oakridge and Cottage Grove, that LRAPA would host a week-long motor vehicle testing project in Eugene as part of Earth Month, that LRAPA staff sent informational packages about asbestos abatement to Lane County residents who received building permits for remodeling projects, and that LRAPA had formed a Revenue Resource Committee and a Personnel Policy Committee.

Mr. Pryor said the Housing Policy Board (HPB) held special meetings to discuss anticipated reductions in federal HOME and Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding, which were used locally for construction, operation, and administration construction of low-income housing. The reductions would have an impact on the City's budget. The HPB also discussed coordination between the jurisdictions and how they used those moneys; in Eugene HOME money was used to build multi-family low-income housing and Springfield used much of the funding it received to assist first-time home buyers. He believed the two programs complimented each other. Mr. Pryor said the HPB recognized that its work was related to Envision Eugene and members were interested in the outcome of that process. He noted that the HPB would debrief the Bascom Village Request for Proposals experience at its next meeting. Mr. Pryor observed that the City had one remaining landbank site and it was important to develop it correctly.

Ms. Taylor reported that the Lane Workforce Partnership had received a grant from the American Association for Retired People to fund job training for residents older than 50.

Mr. Poling reported the Harlow Neighbors would meet on February 16 at the North Park Community Church. He had attended the first meeting of the newly formed Northeast Neighbors and presented information about the City's draft Bicycle Pedestrian Master Plan and the Bascom Village project process.

Mr. Brown reported that the Metropolitan Wastewater Management Commission (MWMC) had reviewed the projects completed in 2011, all of which were built under budget, allowing funding to be carried over. The MWMC previewed the upcoming budget, which the council would be asked to approve in May. Mr. Brown reported on MWMC's contract with Fresh Water Trout for riparian restoration that would generate shading credits for lowering the river temperature, saying MWMC encountered a road block because the federal Department of Environmental Quality determined only the project's capital costs, not monitoring costs, could be reimbursed. The MWMC was working on how to pay the costs of monitoring.

Mr. Brown reported that in spite of the excessive rain that fell in the last few days of December, the wastewater plant performed well under capacity and met all regulatory requirements.

Mayor Piercy suggested that the council talk about what LRAPA meant to the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality.

Responding to a question from Mayor Piercy, Mr. Pryor said he would find out if the remaining landbank site could be used for community gardens.

Mayor Piercy reviewed some of the Sustainability Commission's recommendations regarding the draft Bicycle Pedestrian Master Plan, highlighting the commission's recommendation that any proposed street repair bond include funding for bicycle and pedestrian facilities and a sidewalk infill program.

**B. WORK SESSION:
West Eugene EmX Extension Update**

The council was joined by Transportation Planner Kurt Yeiter and Lane Transit District (LTD) General Manager Ron Kilcoyne, LTD Director of Planning and Development Tom Schwetz, and LTD Director of Service Planning, Accessibility, and Marketing Andy Vobora. Rick Duncan of the appraisal firm Duncan Brown was also present. Mr. Yeiter introduced the item, an update on the West Eugene EmX extension, and recalled that nearly a year previous the council and LTD board had narrowed nearly 50 alternatives to

a single locally preferred alternative (LPA) along West 6th/7th avenues and West 11th Avenue. LTD staff had been studying the impacts of the alternative and would present its findings. No action was requested of the council.

General Manager Kilcoyne reported that LTD submitted a draft environmental analysis for the LPA to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in September 2011. He anticipated the FTA would determine whether to certify the analysis in March, which would trigger a 45-day public comment period. After the FTA reviewed the comments General Manager Kilcoyne anticipated the agency would issue a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI); otherwise, LTD would have to return the federal funds it received for planning to the FTA. He said Mr. Duncan would present his real estate analysis, which was part of the environmental analysis.

General Manager Kilcoyne noted that President Barack Obama's budget, released earlier that day, included \$19 million for project development.

Mr. Duncan led the council through a PowerPoint presentation entitled *LTD EmX Property Impacts Analysis Proposed West Eugene EmX Extension*. The presentation included a series of maps showing the impact of the LPA on properties along the LPA route and potential acquisitions. Mr. Duncan offered the caveat that no actual appraisals had yet occurred. He noted his assigned scope of work, which was to provide a general property description of each affected property; review acquisition maps; identify potential land use or code issues, existing property constraints, or potential direct property effects resulting from the project; identify any direct or indirect potential business/property effects; and recommend mitigation strategies to minimize those effects where possible.

Mr. Duncan noted the most potentially impacted properties (Adult Shop and King's Asian Market). He described the impact of the project on parking along the route and shared examples of possible parking mitigation approaches. He shared an example of a building impact on 6th Avenue. Mr. Duncan noted potential land use and code compliance issues as they related to legal non-conforming uses and legal non-conforming situations. He noted the possibility that sidewalks might require narrowing in some areas along the route.

Mr. Duncan reported that 118 properties, or 24.3 percent of the properties along the route, would be impacted by the project; of those properties, less than 2 percent of the total site area of those properties was proposed for acquisition. He noted the percentage range of impact on the affected properties. Mr. Duncan provided a general summary of the proposed acquisition areas, reporting that 14 percent of affected properties required no acquisition; LTD proposed to acquire less than 100 square feet on 13 properties, proposed to acquire between 100 and 1,000 square feet on 55 properties, and proposed to acquire over 1,000 square feet on 36 properties; 6 of those properties required more than 3,000 square feet.

Mr. Duncan shared a property impact summary of the major property impacts and the number of impacted properties.

Councilors asked questions clarifying the information presented.

Mr. Brown requested information about the number of on-street metered parking spaces that would be lost along downtown streets as a result of the project. He also requested that LTD provide the council with copies of Mr. Duncan's complete analysis once it was available.

The council then considered the Consent Calendar, scheduled for action at the regular meeting scheduled at 7:30 p.m.

2. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Approval of City Council Minutes**
 - November 21, 2011, Regular Meeting
 - November 23, 2011, Work Session
 - November 28, 2011, Regular Meeting
 - January 30, 2012, Boards and Commissions Interviews
- B. Approval of Tentative Working Agenda**
- C. Ratification of Intergovernmental Relations Committee Minutes of February 1, 2012**
- D. Interim Appointment to Toxics Board**

Mr. Brown, seconded by Mr. Farr, moved to approve the items on the Consent Calendar.

Ms. Taylor pulled item C.

Roll call vote: The Consent Calendar, with the exception of item B, passed unanimously, 7:0.

Ms. Taylor said she pulled the item because she had made a motion at the Council Committee on Intergovernmental Relations to change the City's position on the bill from Support to Oppose but failed to receive a second to the motion. She recommended that the City Council oppose the bill.

Ms. Taylor, seconded by Mr. Brown, moved to change the City's position on House Bill 4017 to Oppose.

Ms. Taylor believed a person who was convicted of driving under the influence was already punished enough through embarrassment and remorse and did not need an interlock device in their automobiles for further punishment.

Councilors expressed an interest in receiving more information about the bill.

Mr. Pryor, seconded by Ms. Ortiz, moved to table the motion until the regular meeting. The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

Ms. Ortiz congratulated Richard Nichol for his appointment to the Toxics Board and thanked Mr. Nichol for applying.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting at 6:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest
City Recorder

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)