

## MINUTES

Eugene City Council  
McNutt Room--City Hall

March 8, 1995  
11:30 a.m.

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

The adjourned meeting of March 6, 1995, of the Eugene City Council was called to order by Her Honor Mayor Ruth Bascom.

### I. APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Ms. Bascom reviewed the items postponed from the March 6 council meeting.

Ms. Nathanson moved, seconded by Mr. Laue, that for the March 8 meeting, items flagged for discussion during item II be scheduled for another meeting, any resulting extra time be added to the discussion time of other items, and the issue of scheduling be discussed at an upcoming process session. The motion passed, 5:3, with councilors Boles, Hornbuckle, and Keller opposed.

The motion to approve the order of the agenda was made under item II.

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

#### A. Legislative Update

Mr. Hornbuckle shared that State Representative Cynthia Wooten planned to introduce legislation to eliminate the Lane Regional Air Pollution Authority (LRAPA). He said he would ask the Council Committee on Intergovernmental Relations to recommend that the council oppose the bill. He offered to share a copy of the bill with anyone interested in reading it and/or writing to Ms. Wooten or State Senator Bill Dwyer. Mr. Hornbuckle added that the council may need to discuss an alternative group to enforce the ozone ordinance if LRAPA is eliminated.

#### B. Memorandum Regarding Bike Rack Permits

Referring to a memorandum about bike rack permits, Mr. Boles requested that time be scheduled for the council to discuss why charges for the permits were more than a bike rack cost, especially in light of recommendations in the Central Area Transportation Study and the Transportation Rule Implementation Project, and council's adopted policy encouraging bicycle facilities.

#### C. City Council Policy

Mr. Boles commented on a City Attorney's opinion that neither councilors nor staff may be bound by adopted council policy.

#### D. Abandoned Vehicles

Mr. Boles said the public was receiving mixed signals about who was responsible for abandoned vehicles. He asked for information about how abandoned vehicles were handled, how many there were, if they could be handled by parking control, and what alternatives were available for private sector towing firms to deal with abandoned vehicles.

#### E. Community Development Block Grant Advisory Committee (CDBGAC)

Mr. Boles suggested that the Citizen Involvement Committee (CIC) discuss and make a recommendation to the council regarding the length of terms of CDBGAC members.

#### F. Proposed East Bank Bike Path

Mr. Farr said he met with people opposed to the East Bank Bike Path. He noted that while there were East bank area residents who did not want a bike path, there were Bethel residents who wanted one. Mr. Farr suggested that this be considered during prioritization of where the City extended this service. Mr. Torrey added that there would be an informational meeting on the East Bank Bike Path at Willagillespie School on March 8 between 7 p.m. and 9 p.m.

#### G. Anonymous Correspondence

Speaking to the public audience, Ms. Keller said she did not read unsigned letters.

#### H. Fee Waivers

In response to a question from Ms. Swanson Gribkov about when to discuss a fee waiver for a proposed transitional housing project by St. Vincent dePaul, Ms. Keller said she would flag the item at the appropriate time. The council clarified that fee waivers were not permitted; however, applications for contingency funding may be considered by the council.

#### I. Council Meeting Behavior

Mr. Torrey read a letter written to him regarding a citizen's concern about the inappropriate behavior of a citizen speaking at a public hearing at the March 6 council meeting. Mr. Torrey shared his concern that people may not come to public hearings out of fear of harassment.

**J. "Vision for Downtown"**

Mr. Torrey encouraged councilors to read the "Vision for Downtown" and give the authors feedback as a step toward developing a common community vision.

**K. Approval of the Order of the Agenda**

Mr. Laue moved, seconded by Ms. Nathanson, to approve the order of the agenda. The motion passed, 7:1, with Ms. Keller opposed.

**L. Video Poker Tax**

Mr. Laue reminded councilors of the importance of informing constituents that a vote on the video poker tax was scheduled for March 28.

**K. Policy Document**

In reviewing the policy document, Ms. Bascom said she noted the following: "Policies established by prior councils remain in effect until changed by subsequent council action but also effect council by its actions and its debate." She also noted that the second council goal directed the council to "act in a thoughtful and deliberative manner." Ms. Bascom said she was concerned when reading the Budget Committee minutes that there was a challenge to the Riverfront Research Park. She said the council had consistently supported that project. Ms. Bascom pointed out that one of the park's businesses, Dynamix, provided high quality educational materials and local jobs.

**III. WORK SESSION: LOW-INCOME HOUSING OPTIONS--LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS--LAND USE AND HOUSING PRESERVATION**

Abe Farkas, Director of Planning, opened part two of a comprehensive discussion about housing.

Speaking about planning and land use issues, Jan Childs, Planning Division Manager, reviewed the highlights of recommendations being presented to the council, especially the following:

1) Under the regulatory side, staff recommended the council approve an update of the City's Housing Dispersal Policy. Ms. Childs referred to a letter from John Van Landingham that outlined concerns about the existing policy, which was originally intended to be interim. She said the Planning Commission agreed it could add the recommended update to its FY95 work program with the council's approval.

2) Ms. Childs noted that three of the four recommendations under enhanced City services were zoning code issues. She said the following changes had the highest potential for making a substantial impact: a) revision in the definition of family; b) adjustment to the code related to accessory rental units; and c) consideration of density bonuses for low-income housing as a matter of right rather than as a conditional use permit. Ms. Childs said that these

changes were recommended to be incorporated into the zoning code review project. Ms. Childs said the fourth recommendation in this category related to potential State legislation regarding reform of the appeals process. She said that the appeals process was sometimes used as a delaying technique against people attempting to develop affordable housing, and a bill was being introduced that would adjust the appeal process for subdivisions and planned unit developments. She said staff would evaluate the bill to ensure that reforms would not be at the expense of the overall land use planning program and bring the issue to the council through the Council Committee on InterGovernmental Relations.

3) Regarding land availability, Ms. Childs said the last update of the residential land inventory determined that Eugene had a shortage of medium- and high-density designated land, i.e., land on which more than ten units of housing per acre were allowed. She said that as part of the periodic review of the Metro Plan, staff was completing a residential land study that would include updating supply and demand information. Ms. Childs said updated data may result in a recommendation to the council that the supply of medium- and high-density land be increased.

Mr. Laue moved, seconded by Ms. Nathanson, to add to the FY95 work plan of the Planning Commission an update of the housing dispersal policy and add enhanced City service questions (items I-D3, I-D4, and I-D7) to the Design Code Review.

In response to a question from Mr. Boles about the Planning Commission being able to add the proposed update to its work plan, Ms. Childs said the number of projects that were in the development phase freed up Planning Commission meeting time.

In response to a question from Ms. Keller about item I-D5, Ms. Childs said the issue of manufactured dwellings, mobile homes, and recreational vehicles would be considered as part of the Zoning Code Review project. Ms. Keller said she supported staff's recommendation.

In response to a question from Mr. Hornbuckle, Ms. Childs defined "density bonus" as the option to develop more than 10 units of housing per acre in a low-density area or 20 units of housing per acre in a medium-density area when certain criteria were met.

The motion pass unanimously, 8:0.

Ms. Keller moved, seconded by Mr. Laue, to include in the staff's work plan lobbying at the State Legislature for legislation that does not weaken the overall land use planning program and to include in the Planning Commission's FY95 work plan a high priority for consideration of increasing the medium-density residential reserve supply. The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Ms. Swanson Gribkov said she had questions about "fast tracking" permits for low-income housing, and what it would take to waive permit fees or System

Development Charges (SDCs) rather than considering them on the current case-by-case basis. Ms. Keller responded that while the idea had merit, there were other problems that she would discuss with Ms. Swanson Gribkov. Mr. Boles added that SDCs were never waived, but the council sometimes approved having the City pay them. He also said he believed that the council's attempt to delay addressing the housing issue for six months was the place to find a long-term funding mechanism for the fee issue.

Regarding I-E3, Ms. Keller said that the acquisition and banking of new building sites was a high priority. Ms. Childs said staff recommended that if funding was available, it be spent on acquiring new land bank sites.

Marsha Miller, Code Compliance Manager, said that in December 1994, the council requested a scoping report on housing conditions that covered the following:

1) What is the extent of dilapidated housing in Eugene?

Ms. Miller said the last comprehensive survey of housing conditions was done in 1986. In this random sampling sponsored by Eugene, Springfield, and LCOG, 10 percent of Eugene respondents rated their structures as "poor or very poor." In a more recent drive-by survey conducted in conjunction with the update of the Whiteaker Plan, 30 percent of residential structures in the Whiteaker area were considered substandard. Current data was obtained from the Lane County Assessment and Taxation Department's ratings of neighborhoods as "A" (highest quality) through "D" (lowest quality). She referred councilors to a map that represented "D" neighborhoods with approximately 2,200 total units of one- and two-family units. Of those, 19 percent (about 400 units) were ranked "substandard."

2) What tools exist to deal with housing conditions?

Ms. Miller said the most comprehensive tool available was the State Residential Landlord and Tenant Law. She said the only two areas in which the City was currently involved in housing conditions were through 1) Chapter 8 (under the "Unsafe Building" section when a structure was bad enough to be deemed unsafe) or 2) the Rental Rehabilitation Program.

3) What potential action could the City take to ensure a minimum level of maintenance for rental housing?

Ms. Miller said the scoping report outlined the following options:

- a. Proceed with the development of a housing code:  
Code development costs = \$50,900 to \$55,900\*
- Example A: complaint driven; funded by General Fund (\$76,991/year)  
startup costs = \$30,172
- Example B: periodic inspections; funded by fees (\$319,679/year)  
startup costs = \$69,620

Example C: complaint driven; funded by fees (\$119,663/year) startup costs = \$30,172

\*(Does not reflect an estimate of legal costs for challenges)

b. Conduct further study of housing conditions and the potential for a code:

Example A: Conduct a driveby survey for target neighborhoods = \$36,393)

Example B: Conduct a telephone survey = \$26,316

c. Enhance other funding programs such as the Rental Rehabilitation Program. Ms. Miller said the strategies for option c were included in the "Cracking the Housing Crisis" report.

4) What possible protections were available for tenants displaced due to enforcement actions?

Ms. Miller said the City Attorney advised that if the City chose to develop regulations for housing maintenance, new ordinances could include protection for tenants displaced by enforcement actions as long as they were consistent with the State Landlord and Tenant Law.

Ms. Miller concluded by stating that based on the council's direction, staff could proceed with further study of any of the above or alternate options.

Mr. Hornbuckle moved, seconded by Mr. Boles, that the City Council direct staff to develop a housing code for all rental properties that would be financed by a rental licensing fee based on a percentage of the rents and include periodic inspection.

Mr. Hornbuckle said that a housing code was needed to preserve housing, and periodic inspections were needed to protect tenants forced to complain about unsafe conditions.

Ms. Keller moved, seconded by Mr. Laue, to amend the motion as follows (deleted text stricken; added text underlined): "to direct staff to develop a housing code for all rental properties that would be ~~financed by a rental licensing fee based on a percentage of the rents~~ and include periodic inspection and would be brought back for council consideration with mechanisms for enforcement and funding.

Ms. Keller said she offered the amendment because the council lacked sufficient information to determine an enforcement mechanism and funding source. She suggested a possible funding source might be a luxury rental surcharge.

Mr. Farr said the focus was rental housing and current building codes did not apply to reinspection after a house was built. Mr. Gleason clarified that a previous housing code related to single-family residential housing and did not

apply to only life-safety issues. In response to a question from Mr. Farr about including owner-occupied units, Mr. Hornbuckle said that while he did not see a problem with that, it may be a separate question.

Ms. Nathanson said she opposed the main motion and the amendment because she was concerned about using time to develop a "huge list of new rules" when there was not adequate staff to investigate and enforce what was currently on the books. She said she preferred more discussion and consideration of options like a rehabilitation program or providing adequate staff at the Permit and Information Center (PIC) to enforce current laws. In response to her question about taking action on unsafe buildings, Ms. Miller said that Chapter 8 of the City Code includes provisions for action if a structure is determined to be unsafe, e.g., when conditions pose an immediate threat to health and safety.

Ms. Swanson Gribkov said she supported the amendment because she agreed that more information was needed about possible funding mechanisms. She expressed concern about how much money was available for the action when the council had just learned that the most important thing it could do was increase land bank sites.

In response to a question from Mr. Torrey about whether there was sufficient staff to fulfill the directive in the motion, Mr. Gleason said the current work plan would have to be looked at and adjusted. In response to another question from Mr. Torrey, Mr. Gleason said the previous housing code was expensive and was cut by a previous council because the code was believed to have more negative than positive impacts. He said resources were then focused on an aggressive rehabilitation program. Mr. Torrey said he would support the motion to amend, but not an amended main motion.

In response to a question from Mr. Hornbuckle, Ms. Keller said that if her amendment did not pass, she would not vote for the main motion until more information was available.

Mr. Hornbuckle said he would support the amendment, but wanted to address the irresponsibility of trying to enforce the current inadequate conditions. He said he proposed a funding source in the main motion, not elimination of the rehabilitation program or periodic inspections. He said landlords may need to be better educated about rehabilitation programs. Mr. Hornbuckle expressed concern that councilors opposed to the main motion and the amendment were "throwing an obfuscation into the gears." He said the staff briefing included technical solutions to a technical problem, and councilors with political problems with the concept should state them.

Mr. Boles said he supported the amendment, but was concerned about misinformation being shared. He clarified that what the council was considering would be revenue-neutral for the General Fund because a new funding source was being sought. Mr. Boles expressed support for the proposed fee as a way of protecting tenants against the danger of substandard structures without putting those people at risk of eviction. He said that with vacancy rates under one

percent, there was no motivation for landlords to change, and the proposed fee was a good idea.

The amendment to the motion passed, 6:2, with councilors Nathanson and Torrey opposed.

Mr. Laue moved the previous question.

The motion to call the question failed, 5:3, with councilors Boles, Hornbuckle, and Laue in favor.

Mr. Laue moved, seconded by Mr. Boles, to extend discussion time on the item by seven minutes. The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Responding to Mr. Hornbuckle, Ms. Nathanson described the council's job as finding the right, not necessarily the fastest, solutions. She said that required discussing many ideas and options, and that name calling was what obfuscated issues, not discussion, and intimidated people from speaking frankly about a number of different ideas. Ms. Nathanson said her intent was to focus on technical solutions, but that she wanted to explore what could be added to the existing code that would enhance adequate investigation and enforcement.

In response to a question from Mr. Farr, it was agreed that the rental housing licensing fee could be included among alternative funding sources. In response to his question, Ms. Keller said the choice for enforcement was periodic- versus complaint-driven.

Speaking to Ms. Nathanson's issue regarding adequate staff, Ms. Keller said that was the idea behind proposing a funding source. Ms. Keller added that the reason for proposing a new code would be to eliminate conflicts presented by the old one. In regard to Ms. Swanson Gribbskov's point about land bank sites, Ms. Keller said that was a different issue, but the payoff per dollar in terms of the number of housing units would be much greater with a new code than with purchasing new housing. She said funds spent to maintain current units of housing stock were well spent. Ms. Keller concluded that the idea for a housing code was not new, and housing had been a major, long-term goal of the council.

Mr. Gleason clarified that the council's direction was to add a separate chapter. He also clarified that the current Chapter 8 was a health/safety code, and the reason a previous council withdrew the housing code as a separate chapter was that the safety issues were in Chapter 8. Mr. Gleason said the following were issues to consider: 1) tenant laws that could be strengthened to parallel State laws and that affected the tenants' relationship to safety in the City's code enforcement program; and 2) the capital life and ability of housing stock to sustain itself. Mr. Gleason recommended that the City needed to be in a position to intervene and fund maintenance of the housing stock, and the two issues needed to be deliberated distinctly.



Mr. Torrey noted that the council was in the third month of its two-year cycle, the issue was not part of the council's recent goals-setting session, and the council seemed to be "fast tracking" it. Mr. Torrey said he hoped there would be a study that would outline the impact on tenants caused by landlords passing on the licensing fee in the form of higher rents. He said that creating a hardship on property owners might also result in housing being torn down. Mr. Torrey said he supported scheduling a work session to discuss the issue, but not spending \$55,000 for staff time when there was no council consensus to support the end document. He said he would vote against the amended motion.

Mr. Hornbuckle moved, seconded by Ms. Keller, to extend discussion by ten minutes, taking time from item VII. The motion passed, 6:2, with councilors Farr and Laue opposed.

Mr. Hornbuckle shared that the City of Salem had a rental licensing fee of \$7 per unit per year, and he did not understand why a landlord would destroy their investment because of that small a fee. Mr. Hornbuckle said there were many people living in inadequate housing, and he encouraged other councilors to accept his invitation to inspect real conditions.

Acknowledging the emotion, opinion, and possible misinformation around the table, Ms. Swanson Gribskov suggested the council discuss the motion at another work session.

Ms. Swanson Gribskov moved, seconded by Mr. Torrey, to table the motion to a work session on a date certain as soon as possible following spring break. The motion passed, 6:2, with councilors Boles and Hornbuckle opposed.

Mr. Boles clarified that a work session would be scheduled and at the end of that work session, the council would vote on the amended motion.

Richie Weinman, Housing and Community Development Section Manager, reported that citizen members recommended for the Council Committee on Affordable Housing Financing included John VanLandingham, Bret Hughes, Jay Carlson, Penny Anderson, Bob Conrad, Jack Roberts, Kent Hunsaker, Terry MacDonald, and John Woodward. In response to a suggestion by Mr. Boles about consideration to representatives from low-income housing groups or CDBG, Mr. Weinman said the focus of the committee was funding versus need. The council concurred.

**IV. ACTION: ADOPTION OF FINDINGS CONCERNING APPEAL OF THE HISTORIC REVIEW BOARD (HRB) APPROVAL OF THE AMAZON FAMILY HOUSING DEMOLITION APPLICATION**

Councilors Boles and Nathanson recused themselves and left the meeting because of conflicts of interest based on their employment by the University of Oregon (UO) as stated at the March 6 council meeting.

Mr. Laue moved, seconded by Mr. Torrey, to adopt the "Findings and Conclusions of the Eugene City Council" concerning the Amazon Family Housing Demolition Application.

Mr. Laue said he was uncomfortable making the motion because he believed that the HRB erred in its findings to the extent that it said that there was no evidence available in the record for action that would result in preservation of the Amazon Housing units. He said there was evidence, and whether it was sufficient was another question.

Ms. Keller said that although she voted in favor of preparing the findings because she did not believe the HRB erred, she could not vote to support the findings because it was stated at the March 6 council meeting that the HRB was precluded from reviewing the completeness of the application. Ms. Keller said that would become part of the record for any future appeal.

Mr. Torrey said he supported the findings and believed that while the last page of the record indicated that there were no considerations or potential options, the fact was that the record stated a number of times that there were options, and the last page included a misstatement.

In response to a question from Ms. Swanson Gribskov about the possibility of adjusting the document to remove the section Ms. Keller identified, Mr. Gleason said the council could alter the findings, but any alteration should be done under the advice of counsel because it would affect an appeal.

Ms. Keller said she was not willing to rewrite the findings "on the fly." In response to a request for clarification by Ms. Swanson Gribskov, Ms. Keller said the findings in question were on pages 3 and 4 where it stated "Under the Eugene Code, it is the responsibility of the planning director to determine whether . . . ." Ms. Keller said she did not believe the wording was in the code, and she did not want, through the record of the decision, to put the wording back into the code. She said that by adopting the findings, the council was in essence putting the wording in the code.

In response to a request from Ms. Swanson Gribskov, Mr. Klein clarified that the City Attorney's opinion was that the wording was in the code. Unless the council changed the findings and conclusions, the council would adopt that interpretation for purposes of appeal. He added that the council could change the relevant language in Chapter 9 of the code by sending a directive to the Planning Commission and then adopting an ordinance. Ms. Keller said the council's action to approve the findings created precedent.

Ms. Bascom said she had studied the findings and conclusions and believed there was substantial evidence in the record to show that further delay of the demolition application would not likely result in the preservation of the historic property. She stated that in the case of a tie vote, she would vote in favor of the motion.

The motion passed, 4:3, with councilors Hornbuckle, Keller, and Laue opposed, councilors Farr, Swanson Gribkov, and Torrey voting in favor, and Mayor Bascom voting in favor.

**V. ACTION: HIGH STREET APARTMENTS PROJECT (RELOCATION OF AMAZON BUILDINGS)**

Ms. Nathanson moved, seconded by Mr. Laue, to donate the 19th Avenue and High Street landbank site to St. Vincent dePaul Society of Lane County, pursuant to Section 2.872 of the Eugene Code. The .94-acre parcel is located between Pearl Street and High Street on the southern third of the block facing 19th Avenue.

Mike Sullivan, Planning and Development Financial Services Manager, explained that the proposal was to move four units from the Amazon Housing complex to a site held in the landbank since 1992. He said the property would be conveyed to St. Vincent dePaul, which would take possession of the property, relocate the structures, and rehabilitate the buildings. Mr. Sullivan said the City would also loan funds from the Housing Rehabilitation Loan Program to St. Vincent dePaul. He said conveyance of the site was contingent on that agency's securing other financing for the project and availability of the buildings. Mr. Sullivan said St. Vincent dePaul hoped to have 30 apartments that would rent for \$250 per month available for occupancy by December 1995. He said the speedy turnaround was possible because the site was available and development-ready, and because rehabilitation funds were available.

Ms. Keller said she supported the motion because it translated part of the council's previous decision into something positive and also would help alleviate problems with loitering on the site. She expressed amazement that St. Vincent dePaul figured out how to use the site in a way that fit the lot and neighborhood. Ms. Keller complimented St. Vincent dePaul on its excellent record for developing and overseeing beneficial projects.

In response to a question from Mr. Torrey about whether the project was viable in light of the appeal of the Amazon Housing decision, Mr. Sullivan said there were things that could interfere with moving forward with the project, including a suit that the City Attorney was working on. Mr. Sullivan said the UD was willing to work with the City as long as the Amazon Housing units could be moved by May 15, but he noted that it took four to six weeks to move the units because they had to be cut in half and moved in pieces.

Mr. Boles said he supported the motion, but encouraged the council not to assume that the project solved the problem of inadequate housing.

Mr. Hornbuckle said he objected to the motion because there was no notice sent to interested parties, specifically the Save Amazon Coalition, no public notice published in The Register-Guard, and no public hearing on the concept of splitting up the historic property. In response to a question from Mr. Hornbuckle about the allegations that were the basis of a lawsuit, Mr. Klein said nothing that the City Attorney's Office had learned so far indicated

unlawful activity by the City. In response to another question from Mr. Hornbuckle, Mr. Sullivan clarified that the City was being sued, not pursuing a lawsuit. He said the action was complicated and had been referred to the City Attorney. Commenting on notice, Mr. Sullivan said the following groups met to discuss the issue: the Friendly Area Neighbors, West University Neighbors, Housing Policy Board (HPB), and the Community Development Block Grant Advisory Committee (formerly the Community Development Commission). He said that was in addition to the statutory notice that was required to comply with Housing and Urban Development (HUD) regulations.

The motion passed, 7:1, with Mr. Hornbuckle opposed.

**VI. ACTION: COUNCIL CONTINGENCY FUNDING REQUEST-LOW-INCOME HOUSING**

Ms. Nathanson moved, seconded by Mr. Laue, to direct the City Manager to enter into a contract for services needed to facilitate providing ten units of very-low-income family housing for households involving a person with a developmental disability, and authorizing the expenditure of up to \$40,000 from the Contingency Fund to cover the cost of the contract.

Mr. Weinman explained that the request was from the ARC of Lane County to support development of a project to be funded by a HUD 811 Grant for people with disabilities. He said the property in question was currently owned by the Housing Authority, and the project had the full support of the Housing Policy Board. Mr. Weinman said funds would not be spent in FY95, but as part of the grant, ARC needed to know if the funds would be allotted in FY96. He clarified that federal funds could not be spent to support developmental costs because that amount would be deducted from the grant from HUD. Mr. Weinman acknowledged a member of the audience, John Wagner, who represented the project.

Mr. Farr clarified that the project included ten units in five duplexes for a total cost of \$863,000 or \$170,000 per duplex. Mr. Weinman said the higher cost was due to the specialized needs of units for the disabled. In response to a question from Mr. Farr about the design of the units, Mr. Wagner said there would be two floor plans for the duplexes, one that combined a two- and three-bedroom unit and one with two two-bedroom units.

Ms. Keller pointed out that while the council did not "waive" fees for low-income housing projects, one outcome of Eugene Decisions was to identify costs and consider taking them out of the Contingency Fund. She said nearly all costs of constructing units for the disabled needed to be subsidized to ensure affordable rents for people who were virtually incomeless. Ms. Keller said she was impressed with the unique, specialized design and applauded the excellent job by ARC.

The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Ms. Keller moved, seconded by Mr. Laue, to move item VII to the end of the agenda or, if there was insufficient discussion time, to transfer it to another meeting, so the council had time for adequate discussion of items VIII, IX, and X.

Mr. Gleason said it was imperative, given the council's adopted time line, that before the council's break it give staff direction on how to proceed with council goals. He said he would prefer items VIII, IX, and X were delayed if necessary.

Mr. Boles said if councilors supported acceptance of the goals document that the Council Committee on Working Relationships (CCWR) developed consistent with the process and believed that document was sufficient to "drive staff's work," they should vote in favor of the motion.

The motion failed, 6:2, with councilors Farr and Keller voting in favor.

#### VII. WORK SESSION: COUNCIL GOALS SESSION FOLLOW-UP

Barb Bellamy, Strategic Issues Manager, said clarification was needed on some of the draft 1995-96 council goals in order to develop a Council Goals Work Plan. She said that at the end of 90 days, the council will adopt final goals, and a work plan that includes measures and provides direction regarding adjusting resources, as needed to balance work load. Ms. Bellamy distributed copies of an initial outline of the goals work plan and asked that councilors review it over their break. She explained that Oregon Benchmarks which might be used to measure progress toward the goals were listed. In the next few weeks, staff will review the benchmarks and identify other measures to evaluate progress toward outcomes as well as two-year objectives for each goal. In mid-April, staff will return with a first draft work plan and ask council to select measures and provide direction regarding strategies and gaps.

Ms. Bellamy said "strategies" were part of the current work program and "gaps" were barriers to reaching the goal or areas where resources or new strategies were needed.

When reviewing the strategies and gaps, Ms. Bellamy said staff needed to know if there were other things that councilors had in mind when they worked on a particular goal.

Specific areas of clarification requested of the council along with the CCWR's recommendation for each area included:

- Housing: Staff assumes that "support community resources. . ." is limited to the housing strategies. CCWR recommendation = yes;
- Public Safety: Does "optimal response time" include police services? CCWR recommendation = no;

- **Public Safety:** Within this goal, it is staff's assumption that "support social services" is focused on those activities that support the overall mission of the Department of Public Safety and the policies outlined in the Long-Range Public Safety Plan. CCWR recommendation = yes; and
- **Government:** Is emphasis of "provide information to the community" getting information "out" versus improving citizen involvement/input into the organization? CCWR recommendation = no; intent is for improved two-way communication.

Using the housing goal as an example, Ms. Bellamy said the draft goal was stated, and then depicted in a conceptual map. Strategies will be built around these separate elements within the goal. Additional examples of goals were for public safety, transportation, land use, and government. Mr. Farr noted that part of the goal statement on public safety was missing.

Ms. Nathanson shared that she believed the ultimate goal of communication was to connect people to government and help people participate, but also to enhance the involvement of citizens through neighborhood organizations. In response to a question from Ms. Nathanson about the phrasing of the goal, Mr. Boles clarified that the expectation was that a set of possible activities that could augment communication in both directions would be included with the strategies presented for council consideration. The strategies were an expansion on the original wording. Mr. Laue said the reason for asking the council to review, edit, and modify the work plan was to achieve clarity around what the words mean.

Referring to "support community resources limited to housing strategies," Ms. Nathanson said she needed more information about what might be excluded.

In response to a question from Mr. Torrey about feedback to staff before the council's break, Mr. Laue said more specifics were needed about what councilors wanted to discuss on April 19.

Ms. Keller said she understood the purpose of goals was to focus on what could be done. She said the goals seemed "extremely broad" and suggested that definitions be limited so as to be realistic about what could be accomplished.

Ms. Keller left the meeting at 1:29 p.m.

**VIII. APPROVAL OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF HEARINGS OFFICIAL AND PASSAGE OF AN ORDINANCE LEVYING ASSESSMENTS FOR PERSHING STREET FROM LASSEN STREET TO FOCH STREET**

Mr. Gleason introduced the item.

Ms. Nathanson moved, seconded by Mr. Laue, to approve the Hearings Official's findings and recommendations of February 17, 1995. The motion passed unanimously, 6:0. (Mr. Farr was out of the room during the vote.)

CB4530--An ordinance levying assessments for paving, curbs, gutters, and storm sewers on Pershing Street from Lassen Street to Foch Street; and declaring an emergency. (Contract 94-22) Job #3163

Ms. Nathanson moved, seconded by Mr. Laue, that the bill, with the unanimous consent of the council, be read the second time by council bill number only, and that enactment be considered at this time. The motion passed unanimously, 6:0. (Mr. Farr was out of the room during the vote.)

Ms. Nathanson moved, seconded by Mr. Laue, that the bill be approved and given final passage. The motion passed unanimously, 7:0, and became Ordinance No. 20003.

**IX. APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MINUTES**

Discussion of the item was delayed until Ms. Keller was present.

**X. RATIFICATION OF COUNCIL OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATIONS**

Mr. Hornbuckle said his question about the Council Officers' recommendations had been resolved, and he had withdrawn his request for discussion.

Ms. Nathanson moved, seconded by Mr. Laue, to ratify Council Officers' recommendations of February 24, 1995. The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

The meeting adjourned at 1:32 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

  
Micheal Gleason  
City Manager

(Recorded by Fran Curtis)  
CC113008.035