

## MINUTES

City Council  
McNutt Room--City Hall

July 29, 1996  
5:30 p.m.

**COUNCILORS PRESENT:** Tim Laue, Laurie Swanson Gribkov (after 5:40 p.m.), Pat Farr, Kevin Hornbuckle, Barbara Keller, Nancy Nathanson, Shawn Boles, Jim Torrey.

The Special Meeting was called to order by Her Honor Mayor Ruth Bascom.

### I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA AND TIME ESTIMATES

Mr. Laue moved, seconded by Ms. Nathanson, approval of the agenda and time estimates. Roll call vote; the motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

### II. STATUS UPDATE: GROWTH MANAGEMENT STUDY

Ms. Swanson Gribkov arrived at the meeting.

#### A. Staff Report

Scott Meisner, Planning Commission Chair, gave the staff presentation noting that the Planning Commission (PC) was working hard to expand and fill out the scenarios for the Growth Management Study (GMS). He stated that currently the commissioners were working to identify the intention of each scenario and added that the next steps were to identify the problems, the gaps, and ultimately the solutions to deal with the gaps and problems. He commented that implicit in that process was the continual revision of the scenarios. He indicated that the PC would hold three public forums wherein qualitative scenarios would be presented to the public.

Mr. Meisner stated that it was important to schedule the next check-in between the PC and the City Council. He added that Jan Childs and Allen Lowe, Planning and Development, were available to answer any questions.

#### B. Questions From Council

Mr. Boles reminded councilors that it was still the council's goal to reach closure as much as possible within the calendar year, and noted that that would most likely take place at a policy and directional level. He suggested that if the PC were to return to the City Council in early or mid-September with material for the council to respond to, those councilors who were interested in more of the detail and

getting into some of the actual change activities in creating the scenarios could meet individually with Mr. Torrey, Mr. Meisner, and staff.

Mr. Torrey expressed interest in obtaining a broad spectrum of information in advance of going out with the survey and the public forums. He said the council would not have the luxury of going back and testing the results of the survey or the forum, so it was important to move into those phases of the project well prepared and well informed.

Mr. Boles said that the council should have available, at the December check-in meeting with the PC, the following items: 1) the first cut of the forum results; 2) the results of the random sample written survey; and 3) the City Council's participation in the forum and those results. He said that he had hoped to be able to follow a two-step process in December: 1) the PC reviews the material and forwards its recommendation; and 2) the City Council holds a work session to create closure on the material. He suggested inviting the councilor-elects to the work session, with the understanding that they could not vote, but could participate in the discussion.

Ms. Keller expressed her appreciation for the work of the PC and Mr. Boles and Mr. Torrey. She asked if there was a policy-level decision that needed to be made in September and suggested that the council's energy could be better used. She advocated for not scheduling a meeting and holding the forum a little earlier.

Mr. Boles expressed his understanding of Ms. Keller's view and added that staff was interested in having the council's approval of the forum before moving forward. He added that it was important for the council to be in alignment before moving forward.

Ms. Norris stated that it was important for the council to look at the information before it went to the public forum. She said that staff would be working to define each scenario so that when the public reviewed them they would have clear understanding.

Ms. Swanson Gribakov expressed her interest in waiting until after the election so that the public could make it through the election and then focus its attention on the public forums.

### III. DISCUSSION/ACTION: EUGENE LOCAL STREET PLAN

CB 4585—An ordinance concerning local streets and public improvements; amending Section 6.300, 6.305, 7.085, 7.140, 7.290, 7.640, 7.650, 9.015, 9.030, 9.033, 9.035, 9.040, 9.045, 9.050, 9.055, 9.060, 9.075, 9.085, 9.510, 9.512, 9.386, 9.574, 9.688, and 9.702 of the Eugene Code, 1971; and adding a new Section 7.280 to that Code.

#### A. Staff Report

Jan Childs gave the staff presentation and referred councilors to their agenda packets. She noted that the packet contained a number of repeats of material they had already received: 1) attachment A, copies of the letters received in testimony; 2) attachment B, a memorandum provided to councilors the evening of the July 8 public hearing providing a preliminary response to questions that staff had

received; 3) attachment C, staff responses to the four letters of testimony; 4) attachment D, a series of staff recommendation corrections to the street plan and items for which staff recommended no changes but was open to the council's direction.

#### B. Questions From Council

Mr. Boles asked if his previous questions had been answered. Ms. Childs noted that all policy questions would be addressed by the council's adoption of the ordinance and resolutions before the council.

Ms. Childs, responding to Mayor Bascom's questions, noted that there was no change proposed to the existing grade standards. She added that staff had attempted to, with regard to local residential streets, provide a series of options so that staff could move down to a minimum 20-foot street as opposed to the minimum 28-foot street that was currently acceptable. Ms. Childs commented that, with regard administration of the new code provisions to implement the Urban Forest Plan of 1992, the new ¼ FTE would be a fee-supported position.

Mr. Boles asked if the street design standards included the softer edge lane approach that was present in the retrofit of substandard streets that were inherited from the county. Ms. Childs stated that it did allow for rolled curbs.

Ms. Nathanson, referring to a street tree provision on page 33, noted that there was a possible amendment for the council to consider with regard to areas wherein there was insufficient space to create a street tree easement in the public right-of-way. She noted that in those areas the City could create a street tree easement, which sounded good, but she was concerned about the complexity of the issue of easements. Ms. Childs stated that, in most cases, there would be enough space to plant a street tree in the right-of-way and an easement would be an uncommon occurrence. She noted that an easement would be clearly marked on a plat map.

Mr. Laue moved, seconded by Ms. Swanson Gribkov, to adopt amendments to the Eugene Local Street Plan, as listed in Part A of Attachment D. Roll call vote; the motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Mr. Laue moved, seconded by Ms. Swanson Gribkov, that the bill, with unanimous consent of the council, be read the second time by council bill number only, and that enactment be considered at this time.

Ms. Keller called attention to two sections on pages 14 and 32 of the ordinance. She said the sections concerned stop gap measures for subdivisions exceeding 19 lots and explained that if the sections were deleted it would allow for piece meal development without any connectivity.

Ms. Keller moved, seconded by Mr. Boles, to retain Section 9.035 (4)(g) and Section 9.512 (6)(c)(3).

Ms. Keller explained that the way in which the plan was written now was that as long as developers "stubbed in" a street they could proceed with development even if it never made a connection with



the development. She said that her concern was with the south hills and preventing disconnected development in the area.

Ms. Childs stated that the recommendations in the draft ordinance were intended to replace the 19-lot provision. She said that the sections to which Ms. Keller had referred were intended to be stop gap measures until the PC could create a long-term, comprehensive solution to the problem. She added that the PC believed the new sections more than adequately addressed the problem of connectivity. She referred councilors to page 17 of the ordinance and the section, "Street Connectivity Standards for Local Residential Streets," and said that that section was intended to replace the deleted sections.

Mr. Torrey stated his opposition to the amendment, noting that staff and planning commission had done a thorough job of evaluating this issue and he would be hesitant to implement the change given the amount of public testimony and work and effort that had gone into this issue.

Mr. Boles advocated for the amendment and asked for the council's support for the following reasons: 1) there was a set of egregious actions taken by the development community that took advantage of loop holes in the previous Street Standards Plan and the new plan had not been tested for its loop holes; 2) if the section was merely redundant with another section then why not keep it and allow both protections to work; and 3) leaving the section in would do no harm and it could help by eliminating the possibility of developers utilizing loopholes.

Mr. Laue stated his inclination to support the amendment and agreed that the language was somewhat redundant. Ms. Childs noted that there was no direct conflict between the section in question and the new language and added that the sections were two different approaches to the same problem.

Mr. Farr asked if Ms. Childs believed that the seven to eight pages of new language covered all aspects of phased development. Ms. Childs stated that nothing was foolproof and stated that the PC had worked to develop its recommendation of the best approach to providing connectivity.

Mr. Farr stated his opposition to the amendment because he believed the new language was sufficient to cover all the aspects of phased development.

Ms. Keller stated that, in the case of connectivity, the new language required that an owner provide the plan for development of all of the contiguous properties in their own ownership. She said that it did not require that the owners provide a plan that has anything to do with other contiguous properties though they may be required to provide a stub that would go into the other properties. She said that the new language did not require that the secondary access/the connectivity actually take place.

Ms. Nathanson explained that she generally liked to go along with the PC recommendations because the members had more time to study the details of the language and added that she was interested in providing the maximum degree of protection and closing the loopholes. She noted her concern about keeping both sections because to some degree the sections were contradictory.

Ms. Childs noted that it would be difficult to secure approval of a phase that did not allow for the kind of connectivity that was in question. She added that the City did require, as a condition of approval, the connections to adjacent properties. She reported that the City would receive an application and staff would review the necessity of providing the connectivity on the parcel and into

other adjacent properties. She said that it was a common condition of approval to require the connection to the adjacent piece of property.

Mr. Melaner stated that the PC held an extensive discussion about this topic and members were not interested in creating loopholes. He noted that the PC had done the best job it could and he hoped that the standards would cover all of the situations in question.

Mr. Torrey stated his opinion that the PC was an extremely objective body, and he did not believe it was a good idea to change the decision of the PC and lose the credibility of the people. He added that he would reconsider this item later, but he did not want to change the plan at the current time.

Mr. Laue stated his support for the amendment.

Ms. Swanson Gribakov asked how the council would bring this item back and remove the section if the amendment passed. Ms. Childs stated that the next time the City Council would review a significant portion of the City Code would be when staff brought forth the Land Use Update. She said that staff would then provide an assessment of how well the new language was working.

Roll call vote; the amendment to the main motion passed 6:2, with councilors Torrey and Farr voting in opposition.

Ms. Swanson Gribakov requested that this section be flagged for an update during the review of the Land Use Code Update.

Responding to Ms. Nathanson's question, Ms. Childs stated that information regarding the difference between maintenance of public and private streets would be contained in the appendices.

Roll call vote; the main motion, as amended, passed unanimously, 8:0.

City Attorney Glen Klein stated that he would bring back a report concerning any cross references created by keeping the sections in question. He said he would have an answer the following day.

Mr. Boles called for the previous question. Roll call vote; the motion to call the question failed 5:3, with councilors Hornbuckle, Boles, and Keller voting in favor.

Mr. Laue moved, seconded by Ms. Swanson Gribakov, to postpone the second reading and discussion on this issue until the following week. Roll call vote; the motion passed 5:3, with councilors Hornbuckle, Boles, and Keller voting in opposition.

Res. No. 4500--A resolution amending the June 1993 Design Standards for Eugene Streets, Sidewalks, Bikeways, and Access Ways, as adopted by Resolution No. 4392.

Mr. Laue moved, seconded by Ms. Swanson Gribakov, to adopt the resolution. Roll call vote; the motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

**Res. No. 4501--A resolution amending the June 1993 Design Standards and Guidelines for Transit Facilities, as adopted by Resolution No. 4391.**

**Mr. Laue moved, seconded by Ms. Swanson Gribakov, to adopt the resolution. Roll call vote; the motion passed unanimously, 8:0.**

**Ms. Keller moved, seconded by Mr. Boles, to extend time for 15 minutes. Roll call vote; the motion passed unanimously, 8:0.**

**Ms. Childs noted that there were three separate items included under Section B, and they were items that the PC did not specifically discuss as part of its review, and that staff was requesting council direction if further work was necessary.**

**The additional items were as follows:**

- Private streets/sidewalks-construction standards;
- Private streets/sidewalks-inspection;
- Local commercial/industrial streets.

**Ms. Keller moved, seconded by Mr. Farr, to ask staff to bring back for the council's consideration private streets and sidewalks construction and inspection requirements and standards.**

**Mr. Farr stated that he did not believe the development community was composed of villains and he trusted that in order for developers to remain in business they would develop structures of the highest quality. He said he seconded the motion for purposes of discussion.**

**Ms. Swanson Gribakov said she was worried about the time and staff cost for this issue and said that it could be flagged for future discussion. She said she did not believe this was an issue upon which the council should take action.**

**Ms. Nathanson said that this issue could be considered at the Trimester Work Session.**

**Ms. Childs noted that development activity was relatively constant and added that having something in place that would affect developments during the next construction season would be helpful. She said that the level of effort required in dealing with the construction standards and dealing with the inspection standards was different. She noted that the real costs would be in having the City take over the process of ensuring that those standards were met.**

**Mr. Hornbuckle said that he would be voting for the motion if it included only the construction standards.**

**Mr. Hornbuckle moved, seconded by Mr. Torrey, to divide the motion according to the partition of construction and inspection. Roll call vote; the motion passed 6:2 with councilors Boles and Farr voting in opposition.**



Responding to Mr. Laue's question, Ms. Childs stated that developers submitted a layout if the site was reviewed, but if the street being constructed was to be a private street, the City did not review the construction specifics for that street.

Ms. Keller moved, seconded by Mr. Boles, to extend time by 10 minutes. Roll call vote; the motion passed 5:3 with councilors Farr, Hornbuckle, and Torrey voting in opposition.

Ms. Keller stated that the motions were designed to level the playing field so that all developers had to meet the same standards. She said that the City was attempting to move toward public streets and away from private streets.

Ms. Nathanson stated that some of the constituents in the southwest hills were very troubled by the condition of their streets. She said that the streets needed repairs. She said that this would be a step of a preventative nature.

Roll call vote; the motion concerning construction standards passed unanimously, 8:0.

Ms. Keller moved to call the previous question. Roll call vote; the motion passed 7:1 with Mr. Laue voting in opposition.

Roll call vote; the motion concerning inspection failed 4:4 with Mayor Bascom breaking the tie and voting in opposition and councilors Keller, Hornbuckle, Boles, and Laue voting in favor.

Ms. Nathanson requested that reconsideration of the issue be included in a council Trimester Session. Mayor Bascom stated that little additional information would be available for its reconsideration at the July 31, 1996, Trimester Session, but that the topic would be added to a list of items to be considered for inclusion in the session scheduled for fall 1996.

#### IV. WORK SESSION: LANE REGIONAL AIR POLLUTION AUTHORITY

Ms. Keller moved, seconded by Mr. Boles, to extend the meeting time by 15 minutes. Roll call vote; the motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

##### A. Staff Report

Mary Walston, Council and Intergovernmental Services Division, stated that this was a follow up discussion of the council's previous consideration of the Lane Regional Air Pollution Authority (LRAPA). She reminded the councilors that both the LRAPA Board and the Metropolitan Planning Committee (MPC) requested some indication of the City's support of LRAPA, given the transition that LRAPA was facing. She referred members to a letter from Lane County Commissioner Steve Cornacchia and a response from Don Arkell, Executive Director of LRAPA, that had been placed before them. She introduced LRAPA Board member Steve Dodrill, one of two Eugene citizen representatives on the Board.

Mr. Dodrill reminded councilors of Mr. Torrey's previous comments that there had been numerous complaints about LRAPA, from both the business community and the environmental community, which indicated to him that LRAPA was doing a balanced job. He said he agreed with Mr. Torrey and if the agency was disbanded and control was handed back to the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), he would not feel as comfortable about the air he breathes. He said that DEQ, over time, would not do as good a job as LRAPA.

#### B. Questions From Council

Ms. Nathanson thanked Mr. Dodrill and the other Eugene representatives. She noted that all of the specifics raised in the letter from Commissioner Cornacchia to Mr. Arkell had to do with the regulatory and enforcement end of LRAPA, and added that LRAPA also performed outreach and educational programs concerning the impact of everyday actions.

In response to a question regarding a time deadline, Ms. Walston indicated that the MPC wanted direction in a timely fashion.

Mr. Boles said that it was imperative that Lane County maintain some local control of monitoring air quality. He noted there were some areas in which LRAPA was more restrictive than DEQ. He stated his concern that if control was relinquished to DEQ then Lane County would lose some amount of service.

Ms. Keller thanked LRAPA for its service and noted that she appreciated the local control of air quality.

Ms. Swanson Gribakov expressed her interest in maintaining LRAPA. She said LRAPA tended to hold industry to higher standards in some areas, and there were some areas which did not fall under the jurisdiction of DEQ, such as backyard burning.

Mayor Bascom commented that Lane County was the only county that had local control of air quality. She noted that the southern end of the Willamette Valley was the end of a "shoe box" where winds blew in from the north and "pooled" polluted air in the valley. She thanked Mr. Arkell for his terrific job.

Mr. Torrey stated that local control allowed for making adjustments at a more specific level and stressed his support for LRAPA.

Mr. Hornbuckle said that he wished the pronouncements of environmentalism were around and as abundant when the council ushered in Hyundai with its tons of annual pollutants. He said that he was glad the council supported LRAPA. He responded to Commissioner Cornacchia's point about solicitation of support and noted that Commissioner Cornacchia solicited support from regulated entities so if it was wrong for LRAPA it should be wrong for Commissioner Cornacchia. He suggested making a resolution to the local state legislators urging their defense of the State statute that allowed for local air quality control.

Mr. Boles moved, seconded by Mr. Laue, that the City of Eugene recommend that LRAPA be retained in its current form and funding structure.



Mr. Hornbuckle stated that the duties of an LRAPA Board member were very demanding and technical. He said that it was difficult to understand all of the information. He suggested that the agency would be stronger if it could afford the board appointees time to study the issues and have more frequent board meetings. He suggested creating a stipend for board members.

Mr. Boles emphasized his agreement with many of Mr. Hornbuckle's comments, and noted that he left the motion as simple as possible because he believed it was important to work through this issue before dealing with other issues involved. He stated that change would have to happen in conjunction with the hiring of a director.

Ms. Keller stated her support for the motion and noted that modifying the funding structure would be something to look at over time. She said that the council needed to send a strong message to MPC that it supported LRAPA in its current form.

Mayor Bascom asked for clarification as to why Mr. Boles made no suggestions as to how to change the funding structure. Mr. Boles stated that had he not seen Commissioner Cornacchia's letter, he probably would have made a different motion, but he was afraid that there would be an indirect attempt to eliminate the agency by reducing its funding.

Roll call vote; the motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

The council took at 15 minute break at 7:30 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 7:45 p.m.

#### V. POST PUBLIC HEARING DISCUSSION: TAX BASE INCREASE TO FUND COMMUNITY POLICING

Lane County Commissioner Cindy Weeldreyer dispersed copies of a letter from Commissioner Bobby Green. She stated that the board's position was that there was very little room under the cap and if the City of Eugene went for a tax base increase then it would severely impact Lane County. She noted that the board had "put all of its eggs in the Public Safety Coordinating Council's (PSCC) basket" and it would like for the City of Eugene to join it in attempting to find county-wide solutions to the problems.

Ms. Norris stated that Chief Cooke and Captain Hill were available to answer questions.

Responding to Mr. Farr's question about the City moving ahead independently to solve some of its criminal-justice problems, Chief Cooke stated that the Department of Public Safety (DPS) staff had scaled the proposal down significantly in order to allow space to both solve some problems and work interdependently with other Lane County partners to create an integrated solution.

Answering Mr. Farr's question about a serial levy, Chief Cooke stated that a serial levy would not provide sustainable funding and the DPS might have to lay people off in the event that the levy did not pass in the future. Ms. Norris added that with a two-year levy, by the time recruiting and training had been completed, the general population would see little impact from the improvements.

before it was time to vote for the levy again. Chief Cooke added that a serial levy would set the public up for expectation of service and if the levy did not pass, the level of service would not be possible.

Mr. Hornbuckle stated his opposition to the serial levy for the reasons mentioned. He added that Richard Green, during the public hearing, made an unfair accusation, noting that the councilors did not recognize the problem. He stated that all the councilors had agreed that there was indeed a problem and the discussion was around how to solve the problem and not whether or not a problem existed. He commented that the woman who spoke about Sacred Heart employees rousting transients from the hospital doorways, needed to realize that the transients were in need of urgent care; they urgently needed a place to live. He said that these comments were demoralizing and demeaning to homeless people.

Ms. Nathanson stated that the council had recognized the community need and had begun acting. She stated that it was inaccurate to make such statements and noted that the questions to be answered were 1) what is the appropriate way to meet the need; 2) what is the appropriate funding mechanism; and 3) what is the appropriate level of funding. She asked what kind of assurances would the City have from the County that the \$150,000 would be money in addition to what was already in place. She asked if the amount of training and recruitment time had been acknowledged in the funding package.

Ms. Norris stated that there were no guarantees as to how the County would allocate the resources to the District Attorney. Chief Cooke answered the second question by stating that DPS would be able to recruit the numbers of people proposed.

Ms. Keller stated that she would support the tax base increase because it would allow the City to transition into an integrated solution. She stated that there was plenty of time to have further discussion with the County about any effects the proposal would have on Lane County. She said that she had become very aware of how important it was to transition to community policing and stressed the importance of permanent funding.

Mr. Boles asked if the proposal adequately met the need of the projected costs and load on the District Attorney's Office and the Sheriff's Office. Ms. Swanson Gribakov said that Doug Harclerod and Steve Carmichael both agreed that the proposal was entirely inadequate.

Mr. Laue stated that it was imperative that the council moved forward with the proposal. He reminded the councilors that 40 percent of Lane County's tax base came from the City of Eugene.

Ms. Swanson Gribakov stated that she had asked staff to come up with lesser amounts for the tax base proposal. She said that she could not support a \$4.7 million because it made the margin under the cap too narrow.

Mr. Farr stressed his commitment to community policing. He stated that the testimony received on Monday, July 22, indicated to him that there was huge momentum behind community policing, but he was concerned what would happen to that momentum if a tax base measure failed on the November ballot. He added that he was concerned with regard to the District Attorney's Office because he believed there would be a greater load on that office given the upgraded community policing. Chief

Cooks noted that the proposal was modest and DPS staff believed that problems would be mitigated with the District Attorney's Office.

Mr. Hornbuckle stated that the need for additional police services was only half of a two-part question. He said that the questions were 1) should Eugene have additional police services; and 2) should Eugene fund the additional police services through a property tax. He said there was not support for the second question and noted that this was where the liberals were separated from the Marxists. He said that political liberals create situations wherein conservatives step in and create things like property tax limitations. He urged the councilors to simply implement a funding source without a vote of the people and asked them to review a system that absolves elected officials from doing what is right.

Ms. Nathanson said that she, along with Mr. Farr, was looking for a plan that had the best chance of success at the polls. She said that she wanted to show that the City had confidence in the local program and in the local plan, while also maintaining flexibility to assure that the PSCC work reaches a positive conclusion.

Mr. Boles noted that it was important for the council to support the PSCC if it wanted to create any effective long-term solution.

Ms. Keller moved, seconded by Mr. Laue, to direct the City Manager to prepare a ballot measure approving a tax base of \$53.3 million, an increase of \$4.6 million for community policing, to be submitted to the voters at the November 5, 1996, General Election.

Mr. Torrey noted that he hoped the motion being on the floor would not preclude amendments. He said that the council needed to find a quality compromise before it attempted to ask the public to support the proposal. He said that two concerns he had were that 25 percent of the crimes in the community were youth crimes and the number of beds was capped at 36.

Ms. Swanson Gribakov moved, seconded by Ms. Nathanson, to amend the amount from \$4.6 million to \$2.5 million.

Ms. Swanson Gribakov said that it was her major concern that the Eugene live within the cap. She said that in 1996 all the jurisdictions were at \$8.28 per 1000. She said that \$2 million would cost \$.28 per 1000 and every \$500,000 thereafter cost another \$.07. She said that was where the \$2.5 million originated.

Mr. Hornbuckle spoke to the method of taxation by stating his opposition to property taxes. He added that he was sympathetic to the argument that the City might set a model for each jurisdiction attempting to solve the problem on its own. He said that a tax base measure would put off the City's ability to access other economic resource requirements. He urged the majority to consider the consequences of a tax base measure not passing.

Ms. Nathanson said she wanted to be assured that the \$2.5 million would be in addition to and not a replacement of money that the council had already authorized in the last two years. She said that she wanted to be sure that there would be enough money to put more officers on the street and that



support would exist for patrol and investigation activities and noted that there needed to be a short-term solution while the City worked for a long-term fix.

Ms. Norris stated that the \$712,000 was one-time money, so any measure supported by the council would be funding that on a sustainable basis. She noted staff had compiled a list of the pieces of the proposal that were most important and stated that the Rapid Deployment Unit (RDU) topped the list, followed by the safer schools positions, and then the police officers it would take to achieve the level recommended in the Hobson Report.

Ms. Swanson Gribakov stated that she was attempting to negotiate an answer and added that she was not "married" to the numbers in her proposal. She said she was willing to work with the council to find some middle ground. She noted that it was important to maintain the RDU and the safer schools program. She added that she had suggested taking 2/3 of the patrol numbers and added in a station in Bethel.

Ms. Keller stated that community policing was missing from Ms. Swanson Gribakov's proposal and said that it was not the way to solve the problem.

Mr. Laue agreed with Ms. Keller's comments and noted that the proposal was reactive policing.

Mr. Boles stated his opposition to a tax base measure, and said he would be willing to look at an income tax surcharge on high incomes or a serial levy that would pay for services until the PSCC had completed its job.

Mayor Bascom stated that while the council could simply implement a tax, it would most likely be referred by the citizens.

Ms. Norris noted that there was agreement that more money was needed, that community policing was a good idea, that the City should work with the PSCC, and that it was important to leave some money under the cap. She said the question was what size and type of measure should be supported. She said that it was important to have community policing components in the measure and it would be important to at least go for a tax base or at least a five-year serial levy.

Mr. Torrey moved, seconded by Ms. Nathanson, to have a 10 minute recess. Roll call vote; the motion passed 6:2, with councilors Keller and Hornbuckle voting in opposition.

Following a recess, Mayor Bascom reconvened the council.

Mr. Farr moved the previous question. Roll call vote; the motion failed 5:3, with councilors Farr, Keller, and Torrey voting in favor.

Mr. Hornbuckle said that he had warned against naming certain aspects of DPS as community policing and now the majority council was not supporting a smaller scale proposal because it was allegedly reactive. He added that there was no evidence that the community would not support another funding source for this proposal.

Ms. Nathanson said that the net increase in Ms. Swanson Gribkov's proposal was \$1.62 million and per year, which she did not feel was adequate. She said that she did not agree that this was just reactive policing because much of the proposal was money that had already been allocated to start community policing. She said that if the amendment did not pass she wanted to consider a proposal with a higher amount.

Mr. Torrey said he would like to see the council deal with the amendment and then vote on the main motion. He stressed that he did not want to simply walk away from the meeting saying, "well that is the end of that," because there was still time to create a new proposal.

Ms. Keller said that there was money under the cap if the council went with the original proposal. She stated that the council could still work with the PSCC with the original amount of money proposed. She asked Chief Cooke to discuss the amendment and whether it was an adequate amount to fund greater transition to community policing.

Chief Cooke stated that the environment was changing and becoming more violent. He said that the City needed a balanced approach to the problems and staff had worked hard to create a modest proposal.

Ms. Swanson Gribkov said there was nothing sacred about her proposal but wanted to point out that the safer schools program was community policing as was the Bethel station and the RDU. She added that she thought there were possibilities for different kinds of funding for policing in the future, but it needed to be accomplished on a regional basis.

Mr. Boles reiterated his interest in the method and not the amount. He said that he had asked staff to give him a rough-cut of what sort of surcharge would have to be imposed on incomes over \$100,000 in order to fund the proposal. He said that he would not support the tax base method.

Ms. Nathanson stated that she wanted to fund the whole proposal, but her concern was the partnership with the PSCC and adopting a permanent solution before the work was completed. She agreed that a balanced approach was needed.

Ms. Keller moved the previous question. Roll call vote; the motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Roll call vote; the amendment failed 6:2, with councilors Swanson Gribkov and Nathanson voting in favor.

Ms. Keller said that the council needed to simply decide how it was going to support funding for community policing.

Ms. Keller moved the previous question. Roll call vote; the motion passed 6:2, with councilors Laue and Nathanson voting in opposition.

Roll call vote; the main motion failed 5:3, with councilors Keller, Torrey, and Laue voting in favor.

Ms. Keller suggested that the council table discussion until the next meeting.

Mr. Boles offered his support for that suggestion if the council would take the time to generate alternatives to the tax base funding mechanism.

Mr. Laine said that if the issue was not going to be on the November ballot then the council did not need to rush to a decision.

Mr. Boles stated that he felt some pressure to act and he welcomed a set of options to be considered.

The councilors generated the following list of proposed funding mechanisms:

- Five-year serial levy;
- Surcharge on income tax over \$100,000 for whatever amount required;
- Business license tax required to create \$4.6 million;
- Consider a figure below the \$4.6 million;
- Separating the questions on the ballot by utilizing the approval voting method.

Ms. Norris said that she would supply councilors with a list of the programs in order of importance.

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Linda H. Norris*

Linda H. Norris  
City Manager pro tem

(Recorded by Jennifer Self  
cc53029.076