

MINUTES

Eugene City Council  
McNutt Room--City Hall

September 27, 1995  
11:30 a.m.

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

**COUNCILORS ABSENT:** Tim Laue.

The adjourned meeting of September 20, 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. Nathanson moved, seconded by Mr. Torrey, to approve the order of the agenda.

Ms. Keller said she hoped the meeting would end early since an item has been dropped.

The motion passed, 6:1, with Ms. Keller opposed.

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

**A. Convention Center Study**

Referring to an article about the Convention Center Study in today's The Register-Guard, Mr. Torrey said he hoped the City of Eugene has not given the impression that it is in conflict with the City of Springfield over the location of a proposed convention center. He asked the press for cooperation.

**B. Council Committee on Environment and Economics (CCEE)**

Ms. Keller updated the council on the CCEE's progress, saying the committee has covered the topics of wastewater, wetlands, storm water, and fire and building codes. She said the committee is making good progress and feeling good about the process. At its next meeting on September 29, the committee will discuss soil and worker safety. Ms. Keller said the committee has also scheduled a meeting for addressing its added charge having to do with Hyundai's two-year extension request, adding that staff can provide the meeting schedule to those interested in attending.

**C. Lane Council of Governments (LCOG)**

Ms. Swanson Gribkov said LCOG's September 28 meeting will include processing transportation issues, which have already been reviewed by the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC). Assuming approval from LCOG, the plan will incorporate part of the council's vision for the Ferry Street Bridge.

**D. Council Liaison to the Lane County Leadership Team**

Ms. Nathanson said that the Council Committee on Public Safety (CCPS) has requested that the council appoint a liaison to the Lane County Leadership Team and she asked to return to this topic at the end of the agenda item, time permitting. The council agreed.

**E. Neighborhood Newsletters**

Mr. Boles shared a news bulletin produced by the Whiteaker Public Safety Station, noting it reports the formation of the Street Crimes Unit. He said he was impressed by the statistics on crimes being provided by the Far West Neighborhood/Jefferson Area Neighborhood newsletters and asked that such statistics be included in newsletters as a matter of course.

**F. Public Safety Issues**

Mr. Boles asked Police Chief Cooke for a report on the initial Street Crimes Unit and an update on how the policies implemented last year on immigration issues are working.

**G. World Wide Web (WWW)**

Mr. Boles offered to assist other councilors in using the World Wide Web network.

**H. Worst Case Scenario**

Mr. Boles said it may be appropriate to look to the private sector as the primary sponsor around the "worst case scenario" video he distributed last week. He asked staff to distribute a copy of the video to the Chamber of Commerce and he would follow up on it.

Both Ms. Keller and Mr. Farr highly recommended the video.

**I. Guide to Sustainable Community Indicators**

Mr. Boles asked staff to add the Guide to Sustainable Community Indicators to the Council Library.

**J. Political WWW Pages of Interest**

Mr. Hornbuckle said that the president of the American Political Science Association has an interesting WWW page. He added that someone in Cambridge,

Massachusetts has a program set-up that enables people to participate in a preference voting election, with tabulated results available on-line. Interested councilors were asked to contact Mr. Hornbuckle.

**K. Lane County Fairgrounds--Power Pole**

Mr. Hornbuckle said a constituent has reported that the County Fair used a power pole behind the fair; he asked staff to investigate.

**L. Staff Accountability**

Mr. Hornbuckle said that Scott Seibert, in a September 15, 1995, letter to him alleges that a staff member gave misleading or dishonest answers to a citizen committee. He asked for an explanation from staff.

**M. Gang Activity Memorandum**

Mr. Farr said he appreciated Ms. Swanson Gribkov's memo on gang activity, adding that he was alarmed and looked forward to working on the problem.

**N. Hope Loop Dedication**

Mr. Farr reported on the Hope Loop dedication, a transitional affordable housing project built by St Vincent de Paul.

**O. Speeding Motorists**

Mr. Farr reported a problem with speeding motorists in his ward, particularly on the new section of Terry Street. He expressed concern that he has not witnessed traffic officers in the area and asked staff to investigate.

**P. Agenda Change**

Mayor Bascom announced a change for the council's October 2 agenda to include a discussion of the Sheriff's levy proposal and its ramifications for community policing and the council's multi-year financial strategy.

**Q. Irkutsk Sister City Picnic**

Mayor Bascom thanked councilors Boles and Laue for attending the Irkutsk Sister City Picnic.

**R. Eugene Celebration Parade Award**

Mayor Bascom circulated the Third Place Award that the council received for its participation in the Eugene Celebration Parade.

Mr. Hornbuckle said that in years past, he has urged that the people responsible for the Eugene Celebration, the taxpayers, be recognized and it finally was written into policy. He protested that taxpayers were not thanked on advertising for the event.

There being sufficient time, the council returned to item D.

D. Liaison to the Lane County Leadership Team

Ms. Nathanson said the CCPS at its last meeting discussed the ramifications that the Sheriff's levy might have on the City's long-range vision for implementing community policing, adding that the committee was unable to ascertain those.

Ms. Swanson Gribkov added that County representatives attended the CCPS meeting to answer questions and one of the questions posed was how the City might get information to help it understand how the levy might impact the City's community policing effort. County representatives noted that the County's Leadership Team (composed of executive managers, Board of Commissioners members, and County Budget Committee members) have focused its meeting time on deliberation of the Sheriff's levy and invited a council representative to join those discussion. She added that also discussed was the notion of a public safety coordinating council but the County Leadership Team seemed more appropriate.

Ms. Nathanson said that because there was a sense of urgency around the Sheriff's levy, there would not be time to process the issue through the coordinating council, which was looking at long-range issues--including such things as social services and education. She said the only opportunity of coordinating/collaborating with the County, at this time, was through the County's Leadership Team.

Ms. Nathanson moved, seconded by Mr. Boles, to appoint a City Council liaison to the Lane County Leadership Team to participate in discussions regarding the Sheriff's levy proposal; the liaison will report to the CCPS, and the committee will make a recommendation to the council for the council to consider before the December break; and that Tim Laue, CCPS chair, be the liaison, with Ms. Swanson Gribkov as the alternate.

Ms. Keller expressed concern that by appointing a liaison, the council would be underwriting a process it does not agree with. Another concern was that, through one of its members, the council might be underwriting a proposal from the group.

Mr. Boles said he shared Ms. Keller's concerns, adding that it sounds like the process is still too nebulous to be going out in December. He said he did not see how to get the discussion of long-term, non stop-gap, non-emergency, non-ad hoc approaches started. He said he was also concerned with the reaction from the City of Springfield at being left out and said the locus of the issue should be placed with elected officials, e.g., the Coordinating Council or the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC).

Mr. Farr expressed support for the motion, adding he shared Mr. Boles' concern about long-term solutions but he did not believe the liaison approach was counter productive.

Mr. Hornbuckle said he was convinced by Ms. Keller's and Mr. Boles arguments and he was opposed to the motion. He reiterated his concerns with regressive taxation.

Mr. Torrey said the CCPS was concerned that if the City did not get involved in the process in a timely and meaningful way, it would be "left at the station." He expressed confidence in Mr. Laue's ability to represent the City's best interests on the team, adding that the committee hoped the MPC would address the issue of the tax cap.

Ms. Swanson Gribkov said this was an opportunity to have an intergovernmental conversation that garnered information the council could use to enhance its discussion, adding that it was consistent with the council's public safety and good government goals.

Mayor Bascom supported appointing the two councilors, who are particularly interested in public safety issues.

Ms. Nathanson said that as long as the discussions were going to take place, she would rather be a part of them and appreciated the opportunity to do that.

The motion passed, 4:3, with councilors Boles, Hornbuckle, and Keller opposed.

Addressing a question from Mr. Boles, Mr. Gleason said that the liaison would get the answers to the questions of tier distribution and tax compression but the information would not be available for inclusion in the council's September 28 packet.

Ms. Keller asked for a copy of the charge for the CCPS.

### III. CONSENT CALENDAR

#### A. Resolution Concerning Local Improvement District for Sidewalk Projects

Res. No. 4463--A resolution forming a local improvement district (LID) for construction of sidewalks in five various locations in the city. (Job #3344)

#### B. Resolution Concerning Reserve for Capital Projects and Reserve for Encumbrances--City of Eugene

Res. No. 4464--A resolution authorizing the transfer of funds from the Reserve for Encumbrances and Capital Projects.

Ms. Nathanson moved, seconded by Mr. Boles, to approve the City Council Consent Calendar, including resolutions 4463 and 4464.

Ms. Nathanson asked that specific location information on such resolutions as

Resolution 4463 items be included in staff's Item Summary as well as attachments.

Addressing a question from Mr. Torrey, Mr. Gleason said property owners are notified that they can elect to pay assessments over a period of ten years.

Roll call vote. The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

#### IV. WEST END PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Bob Hibschan, Planning and Development Department, said there were three parts of the presentation: planned preferences, financial analysis, and implementation plan. He introduced Julie Aspinwall-Lamberts, committee chair, to present the first part.

##### Planned Preferences

Ms. Aspinwall-Lamberts prefaced her presentation by saying that the council's charge to the committee was very clear and commended the council for both that and the composition of the committee, adding that the council members on the committee, in particular, gave valuable input and good direction. Ms. Aspinwall-Lamberts also thanked the council for providing the support of consultant John Lawless. She reviewed the process, including review of existing studies and adopted plan for the area, development of design principles to be used as qualitative benchmarks, work with scale models, and computer-generated illustration for the recommendations.

Ms. Aspinwall-Lamberts reviewed the committee's recommendations for a parking structure at Broadway and Charnelton streets, housing at Broadway and Charnelton streets, the downtown Library, disposition of the Sears building, and the plaza area at 10th Avenue and Olive Street. She indicated that the meeting packet contained more detail. Ms. Aspinwall-Lamberts said the committee recognized the need to maintain sensitivity to the surrounding area and, therefore, recommended that both projects be designed simultaneously.

##### Financial Analysis

Scott Luell, Planning and Development Department, said that while the committee did its work, staff looked for ways of paying for the projects, identifying three potential resources: Parking Funds Revenue Bond; Parking Funds Available Working Capital; and Urban Renewal Reserve, for a total of \$7.5 million. He added that a more detailed analysis must be conducted by staff and reviewed by bond consultants to more accurately project the Parking Fund's capacity to support the revenue bond. He said the analysis assumes the current system but, within that, there are options to increase the bonding minimum such as eliminating "free Saturdays" for parking.

##### Implementation

Mr. Hibschan reviewed the committee's recommendation, releasing to parallel

request for proposals (RFPs), one for the public garage and another for a private developer for the proposed housing. He said the committee discussed an alternative that had two different unconnected selection processes, but believed that this would not ensure adequate integration between the two projects. The committee considered an alternative where a single team, including a garage architect and housing developer, would be required to respond. Mr. Hibschan said the committee was willing to work with staff to review and issue parallel RFPs, review the responses, and provide a recommendation to the council. Or, he said, the council could require that the RFPs be brought back to the council for final approval prior to issuance. At the council's request, he added, the committee could also serve to provide citizen input into the process of developing a final site plan for the block and the actual designs of the parking structure and private housing. Mr. Hibschan said that the staff notes did not include the additional role of the committee and the proposed motion authorizes the expense of the architect and that for developing the bond proposal--about \$65,000.

#### Council Discussion

Mr. Farr noted that flat floors were more expensive, but said he recognized their need for maintaining the potential for future conversion to housing. He asked that RFP options include both flat and tilt floors. Ms. Aspinwall-Lamberts said that was discussed by the committee and both will be requested.

Ms. Keller questioned the need to vote now and wondered if it could be postponed to January. Mr. Hibschan said it was beneficial to have the architect begin the work right away, but the council could postpone it if it saw fit to do so. Ms. Keller said she preferred to postpone council action, getting full council buy off before requesting bids.

Mr. Boles said he favored underground parking, but had always understood it to be more costly. Ms. Aspinwall-Lamberts said preliminary examination of the utilities under the street revealed few problems. Mr. Boles thanked Ms. Aspinwall-Lamberts and the committee for their work. He expressed concern with getting into an ad hoc financing situation and wondered about the potential of funding the garages outside the downtown core. He asked staff to report on that potential. He also ascertained that there was money earmarked for the plaza development.

Mr. Hornbuckle said the council needed to consider the economic reality, suggesting that the garage be subsidized by a tax on excess parking on the periphery of the city. He said he preferred to go two levels below grade for parking, based on the assumption that it is affordable.

At Ms. Swanson Gribskov's request, Mr. Hibschan identified the properties owned by the City in the subject area. She questioned the need for having the council review RFPs since four councilors were on the committee. Ms. Swanson Gribskov said she was pleased that the proposal did not call for raising property taxes and that there would be dedicated funding for the projects.

Mr. Torrey supported the proposal, saying that the City could maintain the

right to reject all proposals. He pointed out the potential for private development of the garage, which is then sold back to the City. Mr. Hibschan said the committee discussed that scenario, but realized the timing was such that it would delay the project by approximately a year.

Addressing a question from Mr. Torrey, Mr. Hibschan said staff agreed with the committee's recommendation.

Ms. Nathanson said she was pleased with the committee's work, calling it a comprehensive planning effort. She said the recommendation identifies a potential development node for the center of the City; with the Library, the plaza area, and development of the Sears building.

Ms. Keller reminded the council that it planned to move ahead with a parking garage on the west end, adding that she hoped the council recognized that this was a better process that responded much better to the community by integrating the other properties in the area. She called it a well thought-out plan that has stirred interest in downtown.

Mr. Boles agreed with Ms. Keller's analysis and urged the council to be clear about the next steps, particularly, funding. He said he hoped that anticipatory work would be done before May, addressing funding for both the garage and housing projects.

Ms. Swanson Gribkov said she was struck with the unanimity around the table. She noted that the original motion did not address the hiring of an architect. She expressed support for the recommendation and its acknowledgment of the potential value of the Sears building as either public or private commercial space, without excluding the Library downtown.

Mr. Hornbuckle said this was another public subsidy for private interests and against the council's goal for reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMTs), adding that private sector representatives on the committee were there to promote their interests. He said he, nonetheless, enjoyed being on the committee and described its members as creative, specifically Ms. Keller. Mr. Hornbuckle said it is premature to say the Library will be anywhere.

Mr. Torrey expressed support for the recommendation and suggested that staff distribute the committee's minutes to the Citizen Involvement Committee (CIC) to demonstrate how well short-term committees can work. He said it was appropriate to have the various interest groups involved in the committee and that that would be the reason for its success.

Ms. Nathanson moved, seconded by Mr. Torrey, to accept the committee's schematic plan for the west end of downtown. The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

Ms. Nathanson moved, seconded by Mr. Torrey, to create a preliminary budget of \$7.5 million for the public parking structure(s).

Mr. Torrey said the motion was consistent with the items as presented.



Ms. Swanson Gribkov supported the motion, saying it set the outside parameter for the projects.

The motion passed, 6:1, with Mr. Boles opposed.

Mr. Boles moved, seconded by Ms. Swanson Gribkov to direct Council Officers to schedule a time for discussion of the financial issues before next May. The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

Ms. Nathanson moved, seconded by Mr. Torrey, to authorize the West End Planning Advisory Committee to work with staff on developing the RFPs, issuing the process details for proceeding with parking structure(s) and housing on the Broadway and Charneilton block, consistent with the time line outlined on the chart. The council would select the developer(s), approve the final design, and authorize funding.

Mr. Hornbuckle offered the following friendly amendment: to add "(s)" after the word "developer" in the last sentence in the motion. The amendment was accepted by both the maker of the motion and the second. The motion passed unanimously, as amended; 7:0.

Ms. Keller thanked Committee Chair Aspinwall-Lamberts, saying she kept the committee on task and made the process enjoyable.

#### V. WORK SESSION: VOTER'S PAMPHLET PROCESS REVIEW

David Biedermann, Administrative Services Department, gave background information, recalling that the council postponed discussion of the voter's pamphlet until after the fall election. The three issues yet to be settled are the question of whether the voter's pamphlet should be mandatory; elimination of the explanatory (neutral) statement and replacement with single supporting and opposing statements with an opportunity for rebuttal; and, should there be additional pro/con arguments, by whatever method.

Mr. Hornbuckle indicated that he was prepared to make motions to set direction from the council. Mayor Bascom recalled that the council had decided not to take action during work sessions. Mr. Hornbuckle asked for clarification of the council's policy.

Ms. Nathanson said it was appropriate to move in some direction during work sessions, but the council should not take final action at this time.

Mr. Hornbuckle moved, seconded by Mr. Boles, that an ordinance be prepared, addressing several possible changes: 1) the voter's pamphlet is mandated by ordinance unless the council decides that one is not needed;

Several councilors pointed out that that was in the current Code and the council did not need to take action.

Mr. Boles said he seconded the motion for purposes of discussion, but it is immaterial.

Ms. Swanson Gribkov said she had questions for staff and wished to have those answered and to hear from other councilors before considering a motion. She said she preferred eliminating the neutral statement in favor of pro/con statements with rebuttals to reduce costs, adding she would go with the council majority on the question of additional pro/con statements. She also supported the current practice with regard to the mandatory question.

Mr. Boles said he favored the current mandatory practice; believed the neutral statement should be eliminated, with single support/oppose statements and rebuttal; favored additional pro/con arguments only by signature, with a differential depending on whether the signatures are collected by paid collectors or by citizen volunteers. He added that the council should not close on the issue today, given Mr. Laue's absence; however, the motion will summarize the council's position for him.

Ms. Nathanson said the motion gets to the heart of whether the pamphlet is discretionary or mandatory, adding that the council has not discussed that very much. She said the council has not done a good job of addressing the circumstances outlined in the ordinance, noting that almost anything brought before the council involves one of the three circumstances outlined in the ordinance. Ms. Nathanson agreed that the neutral statement was not very illuminating; favored pro/con arguments with rebuttal, but disliked limiting words. She said the difficulty for her is how to select who writes the pro/con statements.

Ms. Keller said the motion did not serve the council well, adding she could not support it because the council needed to be much clearer about when the council might be able to defer and not have a voter's pamphlet. She favored a neutral statement, saying the information allowed there, such as costs, was disallowed in sections. She said she did not agree with limiting pro/con arguments, adding that that was one of the few avenues for citizens to let other citizens know what the arguments are. Ms. Keller said she felt very comfortable with the current system, if it were only used.

Mr. Farr agreed with Ms. Keller about the neutral statement but added that he was not prepared to vote today. He said he favored single pro/con statements and was undecided on whether additional pro/con statements should be limited.

Mr. Torrey said he supported a mandated publication on every City measure; supported a single pro/con argument, unless a way is found to balance any above those; and supported Mr. Boles' position with regard to collecting signatures. Mr. Torrey said the publication should be made as efficient as possible. He added that he supported elimination of the neutral statement.

Mr. Gleason said that the council needed to question the costs of producing the pamphlet, the time involved in mail-in elections, and whether it is actually used by the voters. He noted that surveys have indicated that the pamphlet is hardly used.

Mayor Bascom said she is opposed to a mandatory pamphlet unless it is improved by eliminating the neutral statement and maintaining pro/con arguments and rebuttal. She said she needed more discussion of additional pro/con arguments before deciding.

Mr. Hornbuckle said the council should allow itself enough time to discuss each of the areas. He mentioned that Mr. Boles had an interesting signature proposal and ought to be able to explicate it. He said he agreed with Ms. Keller about the council being cavalier about not having a pamphlet, adding there should be a mandatory pamphlet.

Ms. Nathanson noted that the motion would provide quite generously for a discretionary pamphlet instead of a mandatory one. She said sharing thoughts had been helpful but it had not moved the council toward closure. She said Mr. Boles had indicated to her that a council ballot might be helpful but suggested disposing of the motion on the table before going further. The suggested ballot might have a matrix of decision-making by posing a series of questions such as: 1) do you want the pamphlet to be mandatory as opposed to discretionary; 2) do you want a neutral statement; 3) do you want single arguments pro and con; 4) do you want additional pro/con arguments; 5) if yes to previous question, how do you qualify for an argument--through signatures, payment of a fee, etc.

Ms. Swanson Gribskov asked staff to share the time line she asked for. Mr. Biedermann said that for a March election, the ballots would be mailed February 27, 1996. The various activities involved almost a three-month process, which meant the process had to begin December 3, 1995.

Addressing a follow-up question from Ms. Swanson Gribskov, Mr. Biedermann said that if the pamphlet was not required, the council would only have to meet the deadline for filing, which is sometime in January.

Mr. Hornbuckle said there was a premise in staff's presentation that had not been accepted by the City Council, rendering it invalid. That premise, he said, was an assumed March election.

Mr. Boles suggested that Mr. Hornbuckle withdraw the motion and a council ballot be created, based on the points made by Ms. Nathanson, and distributed to council to respond to, using preference voting for tabulation of the results. Mayor Bascom suggested that Mr. Boles and Mr. Hornbuckle review the ballot results with Council Officers prior to distribution.

Mr. Hornbuckle agreed, provided that the full council had an opportunity to review and be in agreement with the ballot. He withdrew his motion, and Mr. Boles agreed with the withdrawal.

Mr. Hornbuckle said that the time line that staff displayed assumed that the preference voting initiative would be on the March ballot--something he gathered staff was lobbying for. He said it was up to the council to decide which ballot to put it on. City Attorney Bill Gary clarified that, unless the council chooses an earlier election, it will go on the next primary election.

The meeting adjourned at 1:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael Gleason  
City Manager

(Recorded by Yolanda Paule)  
cc113027.095