

MINUTES

**Eugene City Council
McNutt Room--City Hall**

**February 8, 1995
11:30 a.m.**

COUNCILORS PRESENT: Nancy Nathanson, Tim Laue, Shawn Boles, Pat Farr, Kevin Hornbuckle, Barbara Keller, Laurie Swanson Gribskov, Jim Torrey.

COUNCILOR ABSENT: Ruth Bascom

The City Council meeting of February 8, 1995, of the Eugene City Council was called to order by Council President Nancy Nathanson.

I. APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

At Ms. Keller's request, there was consensual agreement to move Item IV, Goals Session Process, to follow Item VI, Parkland Acquisition.

Mr. Boles moved, seconded by Mr. Hornbuckle, to approve the agenda as reordered. The motion passed, 7:0.

II. ITEMS FROM THE MAYOR, COUNCIL, AND CITY MANAGER

A. Neighborhood Groups Funding

Mr. Farr asked that, in the next budget cycle, the Budget Committee (BC) consider additional funding support for the neighborhood groups. Mr. Boles flagged the topic for discussion later in the meeting, time permitting.

B. Spanish Language Interpretation

Ms. Swanson Gribskov asked that the accessibility description on the council's agenda be written in Spanish. Councilor Boles flagged this for further discussion at the end of this agenda item, time permitting.

C. Traffic Calming

Ms. Swanson Gribskov said she receives many calls from citizens concerned about traffic calming and she is glad the BC has identified funding in the City's Capital Improvement Project (CIP) for that purpose.

D. Charnel-Mulligan Park

Mr. Hornbuckle stated that his constituents living in the area of Charnel-Mulligan Park are concerned that people are drinking and relieving themselves in the park. He said he received a call from an area resident requesting that citations be issued for that and other illegal activities at the park.

E. City Vote

Mr. Hornbuckle said the organization, City Vote, wants to get cities to conduct in November a national urban presidential primary that is merely advisory. He said that people will be expressing preferences for candidates so it will have a political impact. He recommended participating and said he would propose that in November.

F. Intergovernmental Relations (IGR) Committee

Mr. Boles said that the IGR Committee's next meeting was scheduled for February 15, following the council meeting. He noted that the discussion will be about a series of bills having to do with land use that are of major concern to the municipality.

G. Willamette Street Funding Open House

Mr. Boles announced an open house on potential funding for opening Willamette Street, from 2-7 p.m. at 990 Willamette Street. He asked staff to make available at the open house former Councilor Paul Nicholson's January 21, 1995, memorandum on funding mechanisms for the project.

Later in the meeting, City Manager Mike Gleason said staff would research information reported in The Register-Guard with regard to the City's ability to assess property owners on Willamette Street for improvements.

H. Mult Center Funding

Mr. Boles referred to a memorandum distributed to the council that indicated the Mult Center had received a pittance in Federal funds while the center generated \$12 million in economic activity in the community. He pointed out that "not one penny of that comes directly back to the municipality that provides the facility."

I. Legal Opinion--Council Policies

Mr. Boles said this was the third time he has asked staff for a legal opinion with respect to the extent to which the council is bound by its adopted policies and the extent to which staff is bound by adopted policies in creating strategies for the municipality. He asked the council officers to follow-up on the request.

J. Willamette Street Design/Funding Committees' Public Hearing

Mr. Torrey announced the Willamette Street Design/Funding Committees' public hearing scheduled for 6 p.m. on February 9 in the council chamber.

K. Ferry Street Corridor North Bank Study

Mr. Torrey announced a joint neighborhood meeting on February 16 on the Ferry Street Corridor North Bank Study.

L. Council Vision/Goals

Ms. Nathanson urged the councilors to establish a short list of goals that are achievable.

M. Lunch Bowl

Ms. Nathanson circulated the council's Lunch Bowl for drawing names for lunch dates.

There being time, the council addressed issues flagged earlier in the meeting.

N. Neighborhood Groups Funding Support. Continued Discussion

Mr. Boles suggested addressing this need from the Contingency Fund. He added that the Department of Public Safety could be asked for support, given its interest in having neighborhoods participate in community policing.

O. Spanish Language Interpretation. Continued Discussion

Mr. Boles noted that the Hispanic population is not the second fastest growing population in the area, and the council should address all language barriers if it chooses to deal with it at all. Ms. Swanson Gribbskov said she made the suggestion because the agenda specifically mentioned Spanish interpretation, adding that the overall issue can be addressed at another time. The council agreed, adding the section should be presented in both English and Spanish.

III. WORK SESSION: EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES/FIRE REDEPLOYMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Lawe introduced the topic, saying that Bill Bass and Vic Martin, City staff, and consultant Curt Wilson would make the presentation. He noted that the council was scheduled to decide the issue on February 15.

A. Staff Presentation

Mr. Bass summarized the information contained in the Item Summary, noting that the Fire/EMS redeployment plan was first adopted by the City Council in 1985. He indicated that the Council Committee on Public Safety had retained architectural consultants for assistance in making recommendations for implementing

the plan.

Consultant Curt Wilson, W.B.B. Architects, referred to what he called "the programming document" and the executive summary. He said his firm had been retained to do three things: 1) work with City Fire/EMS staff to develop program requirements for all the facilities; 2) develop conceptual designs for the proposed sites; and 3) develop preliminary cost estimates. Mr. Wilson identified drive-through apparatus space and survivability of buildings after an earthquake as major department needs.

Mr. Wilson mentioned touring several fire facilities around the State where the same issues are being addressed. He noted that the Tualatin Training site was a regional training center. He said that cost estimates were also compared and the estimated construction costs for the proposed projects are comparable.

Mr. Wilson described the designing process, noting that equipment size determined the facility size, which in turn determined the land site. The City's needs for services was projected over the next 20 years and facilities and sites that met the requirements were chosen as potential locations--the Sheldon Community Center area to replace what is currently Station 6 and the Chambers Connector site. Mr. Wilson described the conceptual facility designs as situated on the potential sites, noting that both sites had easy access to main arterials. He said the Chambers Connector facility was being considered as a master station, including a regional training facility.

Mr. Wilson reviewed the estimated costs, \$4.2 million for Station 6 and \$15 million for the Chambers facility. He noted that the suggested expansions (dashed lines) to meet future demand are not included in the estimates.

At Mr. Laue's request, Mr. Martin described the proposed next step as developing schematic architectural drawings that would determine a more precise layout and add assurances that these were the most practical solutions. This phase would include identifying specific building materials and investigating the land sites. The estimated cost for the next phase is \$77,000.

B. Council Discussion

In response to a question from Ms. Keller, Mr. Bass said the classroom training facility would replace the need for one at the Short Mountain facility, and would be more convenient for on-duty training. Addressing a follow-up question, City Manager Mike Gleason said the Short Mountain facility would still be used for applications more suitable for a remote site, such as bomb disposal and weapons training. Ms. Keller ascertained that the question for the council today is "Are we going to proceed?" She wondered if it were possible to require fire fighters to ride the bus to the stations. Mr. Gleason explained that it was impractical due to the "call back" system, adding that the Sheldon Center parking was currently overutilized.

Mr. Laue moved, seconded by Mr. Torrey, to extend the discussion to 12:30 p.m. There was consensus to do so.

Ms. Swanson Gribkov said she was astounded by costs and she was not convinced of the urgency for a training facility although the four-minute response time must be addressed. She indicated she had contacted Lane Community College (LCC) about providing regional training. She was referred to Lane Council of Government's (LCOG) Regional Public Safety Training document. Ms. Swanson Gribkov favored exploring a "consortium notion" to address the entire metro area's needs with cost sharing by all the jurisdictions.

Mr. Boles posed the following questions: What are operation and maintenance costs over the life of the buildings, and what is the proposed funding mechanisms; What are the systems development charges (SDCs) generated by these facilities, and given the number of water connections, should those be higher; What are the costs associated with using the Tualatin Valley site for training; If part of the necessity for these facilities is driven by development that is occurring and knowing there are no SDCs generated by that community, can the City continue to amortize the cost of growth on the rest of the population; What is the relationship alluded to by the architect between Public Works and the proposed Chambers Connector facility; Why is additional parking being considered at Sheldon (there is ample parking); and Was not Public Works looked at as a back-up for Emergency Operations?

Addressing a question from Mr. Farr, Mr. Bass said that currently the department's four-minute response time is at 73 percent. Mr. Farr said he agreed with Ms. Swanson Gribkov that a central facility was more cost-effective and was beneficial to the broader community.

Mr. Torrey asked staff to analyze parking around Sheldon High School and Sheldon Community Center. He also asked for a time line, including citizen involvement. Mr. Torrey wondered if phase 2 could be scaled down, as a cost savings measure.

Mr. Hornbuckle asked for a written explanation why the district chief should have a separate kitchen and bath. Additionally, he said he favored a November election date.

The council agreed to extend the discussion time by a couple of minutes.

Ms. Keller asked what percentage of the River Road population would actually be paying on the General Obligation (GO) Bond, should that be the funding mechanism. Mr. Gleason noted that that particular site was very near the center of the metropolitan area. He summarized the discussion, saying staff would examine phasing and consolidating training; however, the overwhelming cost of training is off-duty versus on-duty training time. He said the analysis will show the need to do the bulk of training for Fire/EMS on-duty, explaining that these people have to be within the dispatch pattern. He indicated that staff would do separate reports on Police and Fire/EMS training requirements.

IV. ACTION: LTD PARKING MITIGATION--OVERPARK/PEARL STREET OPTIONS

Ms. Nathanson adjourned the meeting of the City Council and convened a meeting

of the Urban Renewal Agency (URA).

A. Staff Presentation

Scott Luell, Planning and Development Department (PDD), noted that the meeting packet included the information previously requested by the council, including the time lines of the three projects. Since the last discussion, he said, staff has reviewed the details of the Pearl Street option. Appraisers have confirmed that the value assigned the land (\$400,000) is within the appropriate range, given the value it brings to the Professional Buildings. Mr. Luell indicated that a Portland consultant, very familiar with parking garages in this area, had confirmed that the construction costs were within market. With regard to the question raised at the last meeting on allocation of the Urban Renewal Fund, Mr. Luell pointed out an allocation work sheet from a 1990 council discussion/work session.

Mr. Luell indicated there were four parts to the first proposed "lengthy" motion, but added that briefly the parts were: 1) develop a processed RFP; 2) if the Pearl Street proposal is the only one received, direct staff to accept; 3) if there is more than one qualified proposal received, direct staff to form a citizen involvement group to make recommendations; and 4) direct staff to proceed with seismic and pedestrian access upgrades for the Overpark.

B. Council Discussion

In response to a question from Mr. Torrey, staff indicated there were 25,600 square feet in the proposed quarter block site.

Ms. Swanson Gribkov expressed concern with the costs and wondered if the price was still negotiable. She also asked for the terms of the deal and for more information on the public/private partnership.

Ms. Keller said she was appalled when she received material, which she described as "exaggerations of the pros and cons." Of primary concern to her, she said, was dense development, especially downtown. She said the City was encouraging urban sprawl by supporting the proposal, adding that the council had not analyzed upfront costs and long-term overhead. Ms. Keller compared this to the "Bon/Outlet Factory" proposal. She said the council has already decided what to do about mitigating parking and it should abide by that decision.

Mr. Boles said he did not share Ms. Keller's views with respect to the merits of the Overpark as the solution to parking downtown. He recalled that the council had requested information on the status of the Urban Renewal Authority and the current policies adopted by that body regarding allocation of monies as background material to enable individuals to study it at their leisure. His concern, he said, was comingling it with the Overpark. Mr. Boles noted that the council was aware of having an uneven "playing field" downtown and former Councilor Paul Nicholson's memorandum was the only approach that began

to address that problem. He said the City ought to look at some way of benefiting those who pursue compact urban growth and penalizing those who do not. Addressing Mr. Boles' final question, Mr. Luell said that utilization of \$20,000 tax increment had been considered in the cost comparisons.

Mr. Laue moved, seconded by Boles, to direct staff to facilitate the LTD Transit Station parking mitigation with the construction of a new, free-standing, parking structure. This action would require the following:

- 1) Developing and processing a RFP for a new parking structure, which includes the following criteria: within two blocks of the LTD Transit Station and within the Renewal District, a minimum net gain of 176 public parking spaces on the proposed site, any code required commercial space, developed and constructed as a "turnkey" project, and a maximum of \$3.2 million complete, including land and fees.
- 2) If the Pearl Street garage is the only qualified proposal, the Director of the Urban Renewal Agency is directed to accept the proposal and proceed with final negotiations.
- 3) If more than one qualified proposal is received, a citizen involvement group will be formed to review the proposals and make recommendations to the URA.

Mr. Laue said he understood that the council previously took action to mitigate parking and also understood that LTD hoped to break ground in the summer of 1996. He said he supported the motion but expressed concern that the RFP process was abbreviated and said that care should be taken in making sure it was an equitable one.

Ms. Nathanson expressed support for the motion, saying that a seven story ugly parking structure was worse than a five story parking structure. She noted that the motion was not binding the City into this particular proposal.

Ms. Swanson Gribkov said she had expected a more "hard-nosed" negotiation on costs.

Ms. Gleason said the council could preface the RFP with an RFQ process, both of which would give useful information on the market. He noted that staff had already done significant analysis, but if the council "picked a number," it was still faced with the deadline problem.

Addressing a question from Mr. Boles, Mr. Luell said there were other sites in private hands comparable to the Pearl Street sites, as well as some underdeveloped sites someone may be willing to demolish and start over. Mr. Boles confirmed that under item 2 of the motion, any proposal would still have to come back to the Urban Renewal Authority before it went forward. He said he wanted to make sure there was some say over the quality of the finished design.

Ms. Keller said the motion, in fact, was a decision to go forward, and she

reiterated her concern with the density downtown.

Mr. Boles said he had just asserted that the URA, as a body, had to approve any proposal before it could go forward, adding there was no commitment to developers at this point. Mr. Gleason explained that the commitment was that if a developer met the City's standards, it would make the deal.

Mr. Torrey moved, seconded by Mr. Hornbuckle, to add five minutes to the discussion, taking the time from the topic of Council Goals. There was consensus to do so.

Mr. Farr expressed support for the motion.

Mr. Torrey said he supported the motion, adding that the council should begin thinking about the area east of Pearl that is part of the downtown area although it falls outside the Urban Renewal District. He noted that the 36 additional parking spaces returned \$360,000 back in terms of an asset. Mr. Torrey said he was not inclined to set a price for the project but would ask that developers assure that the building is designed to accept additional stories.

Mr. Hornbuckle moved, seconded by Ms. Keller, that part 2 of the main motion be amended, indicating that if the Pearl Street option is the only qualified proposal, the Director of the URA is directed to bring the proposal to the Urban Renewal Directors for a work session. The motion passed, 6:1; with Mr. Laue opposed.

Mr. Gleason said staff was asking for the authority to negotiate this specific concept, i.e., he needed to bring back a "deal." Mr. Hornbuckle said that the intent of his amendment was for the directors of the URA to set the parameters of the deal-making.

Ms. Nathanson asked the City Attorney if it was appropriate for the council to move to a vote on the main motion and, over the next few days, if it appears that there is some inconsistency between the amendment's intent and what the City Manager may be able to do, the council can be apprised and the issue flagged for further discussion. City Attorney Glen Klein said it was appropriate to proceed in that manner.

Mr. Torrey confirmed that anyone voting on the prevailing side of the motion could have the issue reconsidered at the next meeting.

The main motion passed, 5:2; ;with Ms. Keller and Mr. Hornbuckle opposed.

Mr. Torrey called for the order of the day. The seconded proposed motion was not considered. Ms. Nathanson asked council officers to address it and recommend a process.

Ms. Nathanson adjourned the meeting of the URA and reconvened a meeting of the City Council.

V. WORK SESSION: PARKLAND ACQUISITION/DEVELOPMENT--CRITERIA FOR ACQUISITION PRIORITY

A. Committee/Staff Presentation

Ms. Nathanson introduced the topic, recalling that three interests intersected in 1994 that led the council to appoint an ad hoc committee to address the City's park and open space needs: 1) the Eugene Decision process resulting in the need to reduce costs for capital projects; 2) her personal interest in developing a policy statement to achieve park equity; and 3) Ms. Keller's consistent strong interest in providing more outdoor facilities.

Ms. Keller said the committee identified areas that were in need of parks and developed criteria by which parks would be selected for acquisition, enlargement, or development. She asked the council to accept the criteria, adding that following acceptance of the criteria staff will be directed to generate a prioritized list for acquisition. Following council review/acceptance of that list, staff will be asked to generate an acquisition plan, including cost estimates and recommendations.

John Etter, Parks Division, gave an overview of maps portraying areas served by parks or school playgrounds, those with natural park-like areas, and the target area--those not served by any of the former. Referring to the second criteria, Mr. Etter said "population" refers to the population in the built-out scenario. "Scenic value" in criteria 5, he added, referred to what one might see from a park site looking out.

B. Council Discussion

Mr. Boles complimented the committee on its work, in particular the development of criteria. He asked for information on the maximum score possible, including the range. He said he was assuming the criteria would be used to rank parkland acquisition sites as identified in the already adopted master plan. That not being the case, he said it would be helpful to integrate that if the committee planned to use SDC funding. Mr. Boles noted the interesting pattern in the targeted area, saying it argued for readdressing the SDC issue. He said he hoped that any funding mechanism suggested covered acquisition, capitalization where needed, and operations and maintenance costs for the life of the asset. He wondered if the Natural Resource Range as suggested by the Friends of Eugene-Springfield Habitat might not be considered as well.

Mr. Laue said that he approved of the criteria.

Ms. Nathanson said at some point the criteria would have to have descriptions added, including guidelines, to reduce the chance for applying it differently. She noted that the committee had discussed with staff about the need to update the master park plan, deciding that was a more long-term project. She said

that one of the problems with SDCs was that there were already developed areas without access to parks, and there are also developing areas where SDCs are being collected. There still remains to be seen how many situations present themselves and how those are resolved, she added.

Mr. Farr pointed out the dearth of parks in the Bethel area, adding that calling something a park does not necessarily make it a park. He also pointed out the contradiction in getting to an unsafe park safely, e.g., Golden Garden Park.

Mr. Torrey asked for clarification of SDCs at a future discussion. He noted there were no parks above the Sheldon area.

Mr. Hornbuckle asked for the rationale for a development-related criteria: revenue-generating potential. He said that poor people needed places to go "that don't charge them." Mr. Hornbuckle added that availability of volunteer energy and donations could cause the effective privatization of park development, with the City subsidizing them.

Ms. Keller noted that the list is not fixed, lending itself to slight modifications, depending on circumstances.

VI. WORK SESSION: GOALS SESSION PROCESS

Mr. Laue noted that six homework assignments have been turned in for the goals session. He said the assignment was designed to bring back for discussion all of the outcomes identified at the mission session, which had not been included on the priority list. He indicated that the assignment was optional but council members should bring ideas and be prepared to make goal statements at the end of the session. Mr. Laue said the council would try to "key into" the Oregon benchmarks, which provide a good objective measure outside that informs the council on how the organization is doing in high level measures toward its goals. He added that Eugene was large enough that the Council Committee on Working Relationships believes it may be able to impact materially some of the benchmarks with its actions. He said he hoped draft statements would be available by February 20 for adoption by the council. Mr. Laue said a consensus process for the discussion would be used and voting would include a one through five ranking. He noted there may be more than one outcome per goal.

Addressing a question from Mr. Boles, staff said polling results for a date for a follow-up goals session were unavailable.

Mr. Boles asked council officers to poll members on how useful the goals session background documents were.

Ms. Keller left the meeting.

VII. ACTION: RATIFICATION OF COUNCIL OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Laue moved, seconded by Mr. Boles, to ratify the Council Officers' Recommendations of January 17, 1995. The motion passed unanimously, 6:0.

VIII. CLARIFICATION

A. LTD Parking Mitigation Options

With regard to the LTD parking mitigation item, Mr. Gleason said the RFQ would not "pretty much what we have here" from either this company or some other. If only one proposal is received, he asked, does the council authorize staff to move forward with the deal or does it wish to have the proposal come before it a second time?

Mr. Boles said that the spirit of Mr. Hornbuckle's amendment was to enable the council to put some boundaries around that negotiation, adding that he personally wanted to give input on the design. The only way he knew of to do that was in a work session, he said.

Mr. Torrey said it was his impression that staff would bring back a proposal for the council to "adjust, amend, do with as we wished."

In response to a question from Mr. Hornbuckle, Mr. Gleason said it would not be a problem to "package the proposal" for the council, adding that it meant negotiating details sufficient to give a good estimate of costs. Mr. Hornbuckle said that if the council was dissatisfied with what came back, the RFQ could be reissued.

Mr. Boles said staff needed council "collectivity" around the issue, that was why a work session was needed.

Ms. Nathanson said it sounded like the council needed more discussion time around the issue and asked council officers to schedule the item.

Mr. Laue said the most effective way of processing the issue was to let staff work with developers who would "give it their best shot," bring it back to URA and "move forward."

Mr. Torrey said if Mr. Gleason was uncomfortable with the council's direction, he would move to reconsider at the next meeting. Mr. Gleason said that was why he posed the question about the level of details, because otherwise, what would be presented was much like what the council had before it.

Ms. Nathanson recalled that the Downtown Commission developed "downtown development design guidelines," and asked staff to distribute those to the council. Mr. Boles asked that the guidelines be made a part of the RFQ.

B. Fire/EMS Redeployment

Mr. Laue said it was not possible for staff to respond to the issues raised regarding Fire/EMS Redeployment in the meeting packet tomorrow for the February 15 meeting, and asked if members were willing to have the information sent via electronic mail. The council agreed.

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael Gleason
City Manager
(Recorded by Yolanda Paule)
cc115008.025