

## MINUTES

Eugene City Council  
McNutt Room--City Hall

February 7, 1996  
6:30 p.m.

**COUNCILORS PRESENT:** Tim Laue, Laurie Swanson Gribkov, Shawn Boles, Pat Farr, Kevin Hornbuckle, Barbara Keller (until 8 p.m.), Nancy Nathanson, Jim Torrey.

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Scott Meisner, Art Farley, Adell McMillan, Bob Conrad, Ellen Wojahn, John Van Landingham.

Her Honor Mayor Ruth Bascom called the meeting to order at 6:45 p.m. Mayor Bascom welcomed the Planning Commissioners and introduced Jeff Luke, University of Oregon, to facilitate the meeting. Mr. Luke thanked Jim Creteau, Allen Lowe, and Tony Mounts, Planning and Development staff, for their preparation work for the meeting.

### I. WORK SESSION: GROWTH MANAGEMENT STUDY (GMS)

Mr. Luke reviewed the agenda as outlined in the written materials. He said ground rules could include not monopolizing air time and asked if others had additional ground rules. Mr. Hornbuckle said a decision was needed about whether the meeting would include decision votes. The group agreed to entertain straw polls at key points in the meeting.

Mr. Lowe reviewed the time line of the GMS as represented on a graphic chart. He said the goal of the meeting was to receive enough direction to complete the time line plan.

Mr. Luke introduced the two key variables to be discussed at the meeting: 1) the scope of the GMS, and 2) the public involvement element. He then reviewed the scope options outlined in the handouts.

- Scope Option 1--Growth Management Land Use Issues, limiting the study to land use issues within the purview of the Planning Commission.
- Scope Option 2--City Government Policy Issues, including items outside the authority of the Planning Commission, but within the functional control of the City.
- Scope Option 3--Communitywide Issues, broadening the scope to include topics outside City control, and involving several jurisdictions and agencies.

Mr. Hornbuckle argued that hearing a variety of issues from citizens did not necessitate involving other jurisdictions.

Ms. Keller said she thought the scope had already been decided, and that this meeting was intended to be a check-in. Mr. Boles agreed that the GMS was not intended to be a communitywide visioning process, and that many of the community issues were part of the Metro Plan update process.

The group discussed the difference between discussing the impacts of growth on a variety of areas, as opposed to creating visions for those areas outside the City's jurisdiction. Mr. Farley indicated that the Planning Commission had discussed a potential dividing point as those areas that impact growth versus those which were impacted by growth. Other commissioners agreed, noting that there had been agreement to acknowledge and refer issues outside the range of the study, not to let anything "drop."

Mr. Hornbuckle said the group needed to decide its goals before discussing the scope. He indicated that a survey designed to get a representative response was the most appropriate next step in the process.

A straw poll on scope option 1+ (option 1 plus an examination of the impacts of growth on the identified areas) was supported by all but Mr. Hornbuckle and Mr. Van Landingham.

The group then discussed the concept of a survey. Councilors Torrey and Laue expressed a desire to validate the rankings distilled from the forums and tabloid responses. Mr. Torrey suggested using focus groups or other options as an alternative to a survey. Ms. Wojahn, Ms. Keller, Mr. Van Landingham, and Mr. Farr expressed a desire to conduct a survey later in the process, focusing on strategies. Mr. Laue argued that it was "folly" to begin developing strategies before agreement is reached on desired outcomes. Mr. Laue also clarified that a validation survey with the same questions asked in the forums was important to get a representative sample of citizens. He said that some groups had organized around the forums and could have skewed the data. Mr. Laue also suggested this was an opportunity to incorporate data into trend data being gathered by the City.

Ms. Keller left the meeting at 8 p.m.

Mr. Farley stressed the need for public education prior to the strategy phase.

Mr. Hornbuckle objected to the process, stating that Ms. Keller had left after not being called on. He said the council needed to provide leadership.

Mr. Meisner said he had two concerns about a survey: 1) if done now, would it proscribe the path for the study, and 2) how will it be used? Mr. Laue responded that the survey would serve as a check-in, and could be done simultaneously with the next steps.

In response to questions, Mr. Lowe estimated that a survey would take approximately four to eight weeks and cost about \$8,000 to \$10,000.

The straw poll on the survey indicated a majority favored it, with Ms. Wojahn, Ms. McMillan, and Mr. Conrad voting in opposition. Mr. Van Landingham did not vote, but indicated that he hoped this did not result in a smaller budget for other items further along in the process.

Mr. Hornbuckle suggested that each councilor create three strategy statements after interpreting survey results. Mr. Farley stated that the Planning Commission had hoped to ask the public to create strategy statements. Mr. Boles said he had envisioned a different approach, in which commissioners and staff would craft high, medium, and low strategies for each topic. He added that the small response rate to the tabloid indicated the public's desire that the council take the lead on the study. Ms. Swanson Gribbskov agreed with Mr. Boles' approach for the next step. Mr. Torrey expressed concern about the council taking over the leadership of the GMS from the Planning Commission. Mr. Hornbuckle disagreed, arguing that his approach did not take control away, but that it was the City Council's responsibility to develop program design.

Mr. Farr pointed out that the process was already approved and in place, with only the survey added. He said the next step was public input on strategies, followed by high, medium, and low strategies recommended by the Planning Commission to the City Council. Mr. Laue restated the need to agree on outcomes prior to moving forward with strategies. Mr. Laue emphasized the importance of both the commission and the council's involvement, and the need to work together.

Mr. Laue asked to move the discussion on to the public involvement issue. He said the council needed to decide on a level of public involvement for the next phase, indicating that he would favor a high level.

In response to questions from Ms. Swanson Gribbskov, Mr. Croteau described public involvement options as listed in the written materials. He pointed out that it was not possible to have forums at both phase two and three, and still expect to adopt the plan by December. Mr. Croteau explained that the GMS had already exceeded anticipated expenses due to the success of the forums (more information to tabulate and evaluate) and because of contracting out to meet the December deadline.



Mr. Hornbuckle suggested that if the process were limited to information gathering, the responsibility would lie with the people to implement the plan, and the deadline would not be an obstacle.

Mr. Laue suggested adopting option #2, with the inclusion of a random sample survey. Mr. Croteau pointed out the budget figures did not include the cost of services study, which was estimated at \$100,000.

Mr. Boles suggested the cost of services study could be done for less, but argued that the only thing more expensive than doing the Growth Management Study was not doing it. He also suggested moving on to agenda item 5, to give context to the venue for decision-making.

The group then began discussion of how the council and commission could work together to coordinate efforts on the GMS. Mr. Laue suggested a subcommittee be formed, comprised of two commissioners, two councilors, and the Mayor, to meet and report back to their respective bodies. This suggestion became option #1.

Mr. Boles suggested appointing two councilors as liaisons to the commission, although he added that he was willing to honor the commissioners' preference. This suggestion became option #2.

Mayor Bascom pointed out that councilors Boles and Torrey had been assigned to the GMS already. She said she favored option #2, and it could be tried and re-examined.

Ms. Swanson Gribkov suggested another option, that councilors and commissioners could pair up to exchange information. This suggestion became option #3.

Several commissioners expressed a preference for option #2, noting that joint meetings could be scheduled at key points as needed.

The straw poll on the options resulted in a preference for option #2.

Mr. Luke summarized agreements reached during the meeting:

- The agreed upon scope was option 1+.
- The Planning Commission will refine findings from the first forum and develop a random sample survey to review with the council.

- The Planning Commission will review public involvement options and make recommendations to the council, with the goal of staying within the \$250,000 budget.
- The council will appoint two liaisons to the commission as an experiment, adding joint sessions as needed.
- A suggestion to extend the GMS deadline was not agreed on.

The meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Linda H. Norris*

Linda Norris  
City Manager pro tem

(Recorded by Hannah Bradford)

abc03.234