

EUGENE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY



Approval of City Council Minutes

Meeting Date: November 9, 2009
Department: City Manager's Office
www.eugene-or.gov

Agenda Item Number: 2A
Staff Contact: Beth Forrest
Contact Telephone Number: 682-5882

ISSUE STATEMENT

This is a routine item to approve City Council meeting minutes.

SUGGESTED MOTION

Move to approve the minutes of the June 22, 2009, City Council Meeting, September 14, 2009, Joint Elected Officials Meeting, September 14, 2009, Work Session, September 16, 2009, Work Session, September 21, 2009, Public Hearing, September 22, 2009, Joint Elected Officials Meeting, and September 23, 2009, Process Session.

ATTACHMENTS

- A. June 22, 2009, City Council Meeting
- B. September 14, 2009, Joint Elected Officials Meeting
- C. September 14, 2009, Work Session
- D. September 16, 2009, Work Session
- E. September 21, 2009, Public Hearing
- F. September 22, 2009, Joint Elected Officials Meeting
- G. September 23, 2009, Process Session

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Staff Contact: Beth Forrest
Telephone: 682-5882
Staff E-Mail: beth.l.forrest@ci.eugene.or.us

M I N U T E S

Eugene City Council
Regular Meeting
Council Chamber—Eugene City Hall
777 Pearl Street—Eugene, Oregon

June 22, 2009
7:30 p.m.

COUNCILORS PRESENT: Chris Pryor, George Brown, Andrea Ortiz, George Poling, Mike Clark, Alan Zelenka, Betty Taylor, Jennifer Solomon.

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the meeting of the Eugene City Council to order. She announced that there would be two public forums for the purpose of garnering input on the possible move of the police facility. She said the first would be at 7:00 p.m. on June 23, in the Atrium Building, and the second would be at 7:00 p.m., on June 25, at the Sheldon Community Center.

1. PUBLIC FORUM

Mayor Piercy reviewed the rules of the public forum. City Attorney Glenn Klein reminded those present that the Local Improvement District (LID) for Crest Drive/Storey Boulevard/Friendly Street could not be a subject of public forum testimony according to the council ground rules because it had been heard by the Hearings Official.

Pauline Hutson, 1025 Taylor Street, read a statement written by Mr. Sikiel-Zdzienicki and her. She averred that the future of the Lane Transit District (LTD) depended on increasing ridership and, given that, the choices of 6th and 7th Avenues and 7th Place would meet the need for more riders and needs created by planned future development along EmX Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) lines on Highway 99 North and River Road. She recalled that the council had passed a resolution that extended the Multiple Unit Property Tax Exemption (MUPTE) into the areas of West 6th and 7th Avenues, including the Trainsong neighborhood. She said this created the possibility for the construction of housing projects with commercial space on the bottom floor and residential housing above, which she believed to be “a perfect opportunity for this kind of activity.” She felt the commercial properties on the avenues needed upgrading. She noted that a survey of the Whiteaker neighborhood had indicated that 21.5 percent of families in that neighborhood were living below poverty level and that 2,326 people with disabilities resided there. She stated that this created a large pool of “transportation disadvantaged persons.” She related that the group Residents for Responsible Rapid Transit (3RT) were promoting the idea that the next BRT line be located on the 6th and 7th Avenue corridor.

Jozef Sikiel-Zdzienicki, 1025 Taylor Street, thanked the council for holding the public forum at its meetings. He asserted that LTD staff had admitted at its previous board meeting that staff had not “communicated enough” with the City and the public, based on a University of Oregon Community Planning Workshop survey. He urged the councilors to initiate and accommodate any sorts of discussion. He asserted that he was trying to bring out facts and LTD was accusing him of inflammatory rhetoric.

Mr. Sikiel-Zdzienicki supported keeping the police facility on the south side of the river. He said one council goal was to revitalize the downtown area. He believed that moving the police force out of the downtown area was counter to that goal.

Randy Stenerson, 159 East 15th Avenue, #9, Ward 3, stated that Lane County was taking steps to open more jail beds. He observed that in light of the ongoing problems in the downtown area, he was “looking forward to the police department making sure the space was well-utilized.” He recalled that one year earlier, the City was discussing what to do with the site on the corner of 10th Avenue and Olive Street. He averred that the City now had, after 16 years and several failed development plans, a million dollar hole in the ground. He had proposed that the site be turned into a Eugene Library park but had since changed his mind. He had talked with several business owners in the City who felt this was a bad idea because they believed it would be a magnet for drug addicted people, alcoholics, and others. He said since then the Downtown Exclusion Ordinance had been put into effect and had changed the downtown area somewhat for the better. He suggested that instead of “moving hundreds of jobs out of the downtown” the council should put the police where they were needed and not “over by a country club that rarely causes problems.” He believed that the placement of the police facility on the site would leave half of the site to be made into a Eugene Library park.

Joe Collins, P.O. Box 24411, continued to be irritated by the group of people who repeatedly attended council meetings to object to the Crest Drive LID. He agreed that they had the right to complain about having to “pay their fair share” for upgrading the road, but he objected to their “dominating City Council meeting after City Council meeting.” He found it “unseemly” that those who lived “in...splendid homes” should band together to “bully” the council. He opined that the wealthy people were trying to browbeat the councilors into submission. He asked that the council not be intimidated by them. He wanted to ensure that the residents there were treated no worse and no better than any other citizen. He also asked that Councilor Taylor recuse herself from the vote if she lived on one of the affected streets.

Majeska Seese-Green, P.O. Box 1214, averred that she and others sent emails to the councilors and never seemed to get any response. She felt it was hard to know whether or not they were being read or whether they were at least “pretending like” they were listening. She had reviewed the Agenda Item Summary (AIS) and some of the minutes of Sustainability Commission meetings while they were working on the work plan. She understood that there was a point regarding neighborhood associations that had been in a draft but it had been removed. She encouraged the council to “somehow put it back in the work plan.” She said it had been deemed redundant to the commission because an earlier point in the work plan included communications and getting information to groups in the public. She opined that getting communications to the public was not the same as developing a relationship with them. She related that the point that had been deleted had to do with strengthening the relationship with neighborhood associations and the Neighborhood Leaders Council in order to help achieve joint sustainability outcomes. She believed that the work of the Sustainability Commission was “hard for a lot of members of the public to relate to,” but neighborhood associations were reporting a lot of interest in sustainability issues, particularly in relation to food production. She noted that there was a citywide committee of the Neighborhood Leaders Council that focused on sustainability. She wanted it added back into the work plan because it would “bridge the gap” between all of the community members who were not relating to the Sustainability Commission’s work and those who had “a lot of energy” for it.

Mayor Piercy closed the public forum.

Councilor Clark thanked those in attendance for coming. He assured Ms. Seese-Green that he read all of the emails that came to him. He apologized for those emails he was unable to respond to, noting that he received quite a few.

Councilor Ortiz also assured her that she read all of her emails. She underscored that the work load for the job of councilor was immense, though that did not mean that people did not deserve a response. She thanked Ms. Seese-Green for bringing up the Sustainability Commission. She said she was in the process of interviewing candidates for her appointment to the Sustainability Commission. She felt it was easy for

people to say that they would give things up and make the carbon footprint smaller, but it was a challenge to see how the Sustainability Commission could connect with a person who was coming from the other end of the socio-economic spectrum. She underscored the difficulty in focusing on what the best practices were when a person was focused on paying the rent and getting food on the table.

Councilor Zelenka reiterated that the volume of emails was too great to respond to them all. He said he read them all. He also wanted to address one of the misconceptions of moving the police patrol facility. He stressed that there were not hundreds of police employees in the downtown area; they were all working different shifts and were out on patrol. He said there were only a few members of the administration and command staff that actually worked in the downtown area.

Mayor Piercy stated that the Sustainability Commission had made an “enormous” effort to reach out to all groups in the community. She said one thing the Climate Masters Program had been doing was to reach out to families and some stimulus dollars were going to help people weatherize their houses.

Councilor Taylor stated that she did not live on the streets in the LID that the council had as an action item on the agenda. She averred that her concern was with justice.

Councilor Zelenka said he was the council liaison to the Sustainability Commission. He reiterated that the Sustainability Commission had a public outreach program and took very seriously the importance of getting the message regarding the work of the commission out to the public. He also noted that each member of the Sustainability Commission served as a liaison to numerous groups in the community in an effort to make the connections.

2. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Approval of City Council Minutes

- **April 13, 2009, Work Session**
- **April 22, 2009, Work Session**
- **April 27, 2009, City Council Meeting**
- **April 29, 2009, Work Session**
- **May 18, 2009, Executive Session**
- **May 18, 2009, Work Session**
- **May 26, 2009, Executive Session**
- **May 26, 2009, Work Session**

B. Approval to Tentative Working Agenda

C. Ratification of Intergovernmental Relations Committee Minutes of May 20, 2009, and May 27, 2009

Councilor Zelenka, seconded by Councilor Clark, moved to approve the Consent Calendar. Roll call vote; the motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

3. ACTION:

Resolution 4980 Electing to Receive State Revenue Sharing Funds Pursuant to Section 221.770 of Oregon Revised Statutes; Resolution 4981 Certifying that the City of Eugene Provides the Municipal Services Required by Oregon Revised Statutes Section 221.760 in Order to Receive State Shared Revenues; and Resolution 4982 Adopting the Budget, Making Appropriations, Determining, Levying and Categorizing the Annual *Ad Valorem* Property Tax Levy for the City of Eugene for the Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2009, and Ending June 30, 2010

Councilor Zelenka, seconded by Councilor Clark, moved to adopt Resolution 4980 electing to receive State Revenue Sharing Funds pursuant to Section 221.770 of Oregon Revised Statutes. Roll call vote; the motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Councilor Zelenka, seconded by Councilor Clark, moved to adopt Resolution 4981 certifying that the City of Eugene provides the municipal services required by Oregon Revised Statutes Section 221.760 in order to receive state shared revenues. Roll call vote; the motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Councilor Zelenka, seconded by Councilor Clark, moved to adopt Resolution 4982 adopting the budget, making appropriations, determining, levying and categorizing the annual *Ad Valorem* Property Tax Levy for the City of Eugene for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2009, and ending June 30, 2010, with the following amendment:

- That it shall reduce the operating appropriation for Public Works in the Road Fund (131) by \$900,000 to \$9,157,594.

City Manager Jon Ruiz explained that the amendment sought to subtract the anticipated garbage hauler surcharge out of the budget as the council motion to institute the surcharge had failed.

Councilor Zelenka asked if there was a list of specific projects that would be postponed. Executive Director of the Public Works Department Kurt Corey responded that they did not have a specific list. He said the amount appropriated from the Facilities Reserve was \$1 million and the Road Fund was approximately \$860,000 out of balance. He stated that the department would not have generated a specific project list until it was known what funding would be made available.

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

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting of the Eugene City Council and convened a meeting of the Eugene Urban Renewal Agency at 7:55 p.m.

4. ACTION:

Resolution 1052 of the Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Eugene Adopting the Budget, Making Appropriations, and Declaring the Amount of Tax to be Received for the Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2009, and Ending June 30, 2010

Councilor Zelenka, seconded by Councilor Clark, moved to adopt Resolution 1052 of the Urban Renewal Agency for the City of Eugene adopting the budget, making appropriations, and declaring the amount of tax to be received for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2009, and ending June 30, 2010. Roll call vote; the motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting of the Eugene Urban Renewal Agency and reconvened the meeting of the Eugene City Council at 7:56 p.m.

5. ACTION:

Resolution 4983 adopting a Supplemental Budget; Making Appropriations for the City of Eugene for the Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2008, and Ending June 30, 2009

Councilor Zelenka, seconded by Councilor Clark, moved to adopt Resolution 4983 adopting a supplemental budget; making appropriations for the City of Eugene for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2008, and ending June 30, 2009. Roll call vote; the motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

City Manager Jon Ruiz expressed appreciation on behalf of City staff for the work of the Mayor, City Council, and Budget Committee. He commended Budget Committee chair John Barofsky, for his

leadership. He also commended Finance Division Director Dee Ann Raile, and Budget Manager Kitty Murdoch and the Finance Division staff who had put months of work in on the budget.

Mayor Piercy echoed Mr. Ruiz's appreciation for the work of City staff, and the work of the Budget Committee.

Councilor Ortiz also thanked all of the City staff. She said it would be a challenging year and it seemed that they were doing a good job of bringing the City through "some rough times." She acknowledged everyone for the cuts they were making.

Councilor Zelenka thanked everyone for the hard work put into the budget. He commended staff for finding almost \$12 million in cuts to the budget. He remarked that the General Fund was "in a world of hurt" and reiterated his appreciation for the sacrifices made.

Mayor Piercy observed that the City was facing a lot of fiscal uncertainty. She felt the budget process had been a demonstration of working together to get through the times.

6. ACTION:

Approval of Minutes, Findings, and Recommendations from the Hearings Official and Adoption of Resolution 4984 Forming a Local Improvement District for Paving, Constructing Curbs, Sidewalks, Medians, Street Lights, Stormwater Drainage and Water Quality Facilities on Crest Drive from Blanton Road to Lincoln Street, Storey Boulevard from Crest Drive to Lorane Highway, and Friendly Street from Lorane Highway to 28th Avenue (Job #4546)

City Engineer, Mark Schoening, stated that he had prepared a memorandum to the council that outlined the three recommendations to help mitigate the impact of assessments on the three LID projects, Chad Drive/Old Coburg Road, Maple Street/Elmira Road, and Crest Drive/Storey Boulevard/Friendly Street. He reviewed the three options:

1. Use the \$500,000 in funds that had already been appropriated but were not needed by the City for the Crest Drive project, because of low bids received, to reduce assessments for all three projects by approximately 13 percent;
2. The City Code stipulates a 10-year payment period for those who finance assessments through the City – but the payment period could be extended to 15 years;
3. The City Manager could revisit the administrative order to possibly amend it to tie the interest rate, currently at eight percent, more closely to the market rate.

Councilor Zelenka asked why it would not be fair to allocate the \$500,000 savings only to the Crest Drive LID. Mr. Schoening replied that for the Maple Street and Chad Drive LIDs, which had also been bid at lower amounts than anticipated, the City's portion of the funding was from SDCs which could not be used to reduce assessments. He underscored that the intent was to be fair and equitable to all three projects.

Councilor Ortiz agreed that the distribution should be fair and equitable. She ascertained from Mr. Schoening that Maple Street and Elmira Road were classified as neighborhood collectors and Chad Drive was classified as a major collector. She said those streets had "taken a hit" in being classified thusly, whereas the Crest Drive area had not.

Mayor Piercy noted that citizens were questioning why the City's portion of the funding was discounted by a larger fraction than the residents' assessment portion. Mr. Schoening reiterated that the funds that would have been used by the City were not fungible and could not be used for other purposes. He explained that the reductions in those particular areas could not be utilized to offset the assessments to the area residents. When the bids came in lower in a number of areas, the assessments to the residents and the costs to the City were reduced by different amounts.

At Mr. Ruiz' suggestion, Mr. Schoening reviewed the table delineating the funding sources for the City's share of costs contained in the memorandum entitled *Crest Drive/Storey Boulevard/Friendly Street Local Improvement District* dated *June 22, 2009*, and the reductions to them that the lower bidding environment had brought about.

Councilor Taylor indicated her preference to take the entire \$500,000 and apply it to offset the Crest Drive area assessments. She understood that there was not enough council support to do so. She asked if there was not a greater number of people in the Crest Drive/Storey Boulevard area that could only access their residences via those streets but who did not have to pay the assessments. Mr. Schoening responded that this was correct. Councilor Taylor construed that this meant that those residents were paying more for the benefit of other people than residents in the other projects.

Mr. Schoening said if one considered that the people who benefited were the people who traveled the road, one could construe that the Elmira Road/Maple Street area residents were providing this benefit to a greater number of people than the Crest Drive area residents.

Councilor Taylor clarified that she was referring to the number of people who could only access their residences via area streets. She said this was why she thought the Crest Drive LID should receive all of the money to offset assessments.

Councilor Zelenka, seconded by Councilor Clark, moved to approve the Hearings Official's Minutes, Findings, and Recommendations of June 8, 2009. Roll call vote; the motion passed, 7:1; Councilor Clark voting in opposition.

Councilor Zelenka, seconded by Councilor Clark, moved to adopt Resolution 4984 forming a Local Improvement District for paving, constructing curbs, sidewalks, medians, street lights, stormwater drainage and water quality facilities on Crest Drive from Blanton Road to Lincoln Street, Storey Boulevard from Crest Drive to Lorane Highway, and Friendly Street from Lorane Highway to 28th Avenue (Job # 4546).

Councilor Taylor indicated she would vote for the motion despite her concern for the people who had to pay the amount of money they were going to be assessed. She averred that there were some people who could not afford the assessment and there were other people who were strongly supportive of moving the project forward, but were not being assessed. She said it was urgent that the streets get repaired and she understood that it would cost substantially more if the project was delayed a year. She related that if they waited until the council had a chance to change the method of payment, she could not be sure that any substantial changes would take place. She noted that she had been assured by some people who lived in that area that they would be willing to help defray the cost though they were not being directly assessed. She said donations to the project would be tax deductible. She hoped that some people would consider making such donations.

In response to a question from Councilor Taylor, Mr. Schoening stated that the assessments would come due in early 2011, upon completion of the project.

Councilor Pryor ascertained from Mr. Schoening that the payments and the interest would be established at that point. Mr. Schoening said the change in the interim interest rate would be something they would seek to initiate now before the first project came back before the council as an assessment ordinance. He noted that the Maple Street/Elmira Road and Chad Drive projects would come back before the council as assessment ordinances in early 2010.

Councilor Pryor supported moving the LID forward. He hoped they could find ways to be as flexible and to create as few hardships on people as possible.

Councilor Poling said this had been a project that had gone on for a number of years and the people who were affected had been aware of the implications of the LID “from the get-go.” He emphasized that it had been a decision that had come from a great deal of public involvement that had changed the project from a collector to a local street which had, in turn, changed the funding mechanism and raised the assessment. He agreed that the assessment policy needed to be changed, but the current policy had been used before. He related that the current assessments were in the “ball park figure” of most of the other LIDs that had transpired to date. He indicated that he would reluctantly support the motion, adding that he hoped the council could change the assessment policy.

Councilor Zelenka pointed out that the change in interest could be enacted administratively.

Roll call vote; the motion passed, 7:1; Councilor Clark voting in opposition.

Councilor Zelenka, seconded by Councilor Clark, moved to direct the City Manager to reduce the combined assessable costs for the Maple Street/Elmira Road, Chad Drive/Old Coburg Road and Crest Drive/Storey Boulevard/Friendly Street improvement projects by \$500,000 with the intent of reducing the assessments for each of the projects by the same percentage and with the reduced assessments reflected in the assessment ordinances for each project.

Councilor Taylor reiterated her preference to have it allocated only to the Crest Drive area assessments.

Councilor Ortiz asked if the council could move the money “anywhere.” Mr. Schoening responded that a portion of the money had come from County Road Funds and could be used for any transportation purpose. The same was true for the Delayed Assessment Fund. He explained that the Road Fund was restricted to public right-of-way.

Councilor Ortiz remarked that if she had the votes she would move to place the funding into potholes.

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

Councilor Zelenka, seconded by Councilor Clark, moved to include an option for a 15-year payment period in the assessment ordinances. Roll call vote; the motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Zelenka, moved to direct the City Manager to continue to look for additional mechanisms or revenue sources for reducing the assessable cost of the Crest Drive project and to bring back to the council any new mechanisms that he or staff identified.

Councilor Ortiz offered a friendly amendment to include the Maple Street/Elmira Road and Chad Drive/Old Coburg Road projects. Councilor Taylor accepted the friendly amendment, as did the second to her motion.

Councilor Clark understood that the policy could not be altered. He asked where such funds could be found. Mr. Ruiz replied that he would ask staff to see what sources or mechanisms were there.

Councilor Pryor said he would support it because it would not tie anyone’s hands; rather, it would ask staff to “keep [their] eyes open” for other funding mechanisms.

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

Mayor Piercy acknowledged that the project had been a “huge issue” for many people and that some would be satisfied by the council’s approval of the LID and some would not.

The meeting adjourned at 8:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jon Ruiz
City Manager

(Recorded by Ruth Atcherson)

ATTACHMENT B

MINUTES OF THE JOINT ELECTED OFFICIALS OF THE SPRINGFIELD CITY COUNCIL, EUGENE CITY COUNCIL, AND LANE COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2009

A joint elected officials meeting with the City of Springfield, City of Eugene, and Lane County was held in the Library Meeting Room, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon, on Monday, September 14, 2009 at 12:00pm with Mayor Leiken presiding.

ATTENDANCE

Present from Springfield were Mayor Sid Leiken and Councilors Wylie, Leezer, and Simmons. Councilors Lundberg, Ralston and Pishioneri were absent.

Present from Eugene were Mayor Kitty Piercy and Councilors Ortiz, Clark, Brown, Taylor, Solomon, and Pryor. Councilors Poling and Zelenka were absent.

Present from Lane County were Board Chair Pete Sorenson and Commissioners Dwyer, Fleenor, and Handy. Commissioner Stewart was absent.

Mayor Leiken opened the meeting of the Springfield City Council.

Mayor Piercy opened the meeting of the Eugene City Council.

Board Chair Sorenson opened the meeting of the Lane County Board of Commissioners.

1. Economic Development Report.

Eugene City Manager Jon Ruiz presented this item. At the June Joint Elected Officials (JEO) meeting, members approved the framework for a regional economic development plan that would better position our regional economy to take advantage of economic opportunities that aligned with our area's assets and values. The JEO Economic Development sub-committee (ED Task Force) that was formed to oversee the development of this plan worked with the Technical Advisory Group (TAG), a group composed of key stakeholders in our regional economy, to develop economic development strategies that would help define the next economy for our region. The ED Task Force recommended that the JEO approve the economic development strategies outlined below to ensure continued and timely progress on creating a regional economic development plan.

The citizens of the Eugene-Springfield metro area had felt the burden of the financial crisis more so than in other counties and other states. The decline in local jobs, coupled with an increased demand for social services, was putting a strain on city, county and state programs. The Eugene-Springfield metro area unemployment rate in July 2009 was 12.5%, a 6 percentage point increase over the last year, which was slightly higher than the state unemployment rate of 11.9%. The decline in the availability of local jobs has put increased pressure on social services. The number of cases in the federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program for our local district had increased 18.5 percentage points over the past year. The number of applications for low-income housing in Lane County in 2008 increased 13 percentage points compared to the previous year. These programs were indicative that the economic crisis had significantly impacted our local economy and that the need for a regional, long-term plan was present.

At the March Joint Elected Officials (JEO) meeting, members expressed interest in holding a *Regional Economic Summit* to coordinate a collaborative response to the current situation and formed a sub-committee (ED Task Force) for this purpose. At the June JEO meeting, the framework for the development of a regional economic development plan was approved. The framework for designing our next economy included the creation of a Technical Advisory Group (TAG) composed of key stakeholders in our regional economy. (Attachment A was the member list of the TAG). The TAG developed a list of strategies and tactics that they felt the region should strategically focus on to best influence the economic development of our region.

The TAG developed the economic development strategies with the following JEO approved goals and principles as guidance:

Goal: By 2020, create 20,000 net new jobs in the chosen economic opportunity areas; reduce the local area unemployment rate to, or below, the state average; and increase the average annual wage to, or above, the state level.

Mr. Ruiz discussed the principles developed by those subcommittees.

Principles: The principles that will guide the development of our next economy were discussed at length by the ED Task Force.

Healthy Living – Championing businesses and entrepreneurs that promote a healthy, safe, and clean community while enhancing, protecting, and making wise use of our natural resources.

Smart Growth – Encourage a culture of entrepreneurship and re-investment into our local community.

Be Prepared – Develop the region’s physical, social, educational, and workforce infrastructure to meet the needs of tomorrow.

Local Independence – Promote local businesses and entrepreneurs that lead our area to a higher level of economic independence and resilience.

Regional Identity – Create a stronger economic personality that celebrates our region’s attributes and values.

The following strategies developed by the TAG established a vision for how the governments, businesses, and community members could work together to help the Eugene-Springfield metro area achieve economic sustainability. They established a framework for decision-making for community partners within Eugene, Springfield and Lane County. The goal was to focus on several things that could be addressed. This was only one part of three for economic development. Create jobs, support existing businesses (each jurisdiction), and look forward to next few years. Mr. Ruiz discussed each of the strategies.

1. **Business Retention and Expansion**

Support the Growth and Development of Existing Area Businesses to Achieve Quality Job Creation. The ED recognized the crucial role existing area businesses played in sustaining the health of the local economy and in creating job opportunities. Efforts should be directed at supporting the operating needs of local businesses as well as meeting their needs for expansion and growth.

Tactic 1: Coordinate public capital and finance networks within the region to facilitate business access to needed funding for continued operation and growth.

Tactic 2: Develop or strengthen peer-to-peer support networks for businesses of any type (start-up, existing, large, small, etc) for communicating regional information on financing, physical development, locating, hiring, recruiting, training.

Tactic 3: Assist businesses with site development or expansion through coordinated multi-agency review of development permits. Develop methods and policies to streamline the permitting process.

2. **Entrepreneurial Infrastructure**

Accelerate the Development of Entrepreneurial Infrastructure. (Defined as those facilities and services present within our region which encourage the creation of new ventures, and the growth and development of small- and medium- sized enterprises).

Tactic 1: Increase the amount of investment capital in our region by leveraging such groups as the Willamette Angel Conference (WAC), the Southern Willamette Angel Network (formerly Lane Venture Forum), the Oregon Entrepreneurs Network (OEN), and the investor relations programs led by the Eugene Area Chamber of Commerce.

Tactic 2: Expand the partnership with University of Oregon and Oregon State University in bringing new technologies and innovations to market.

Tactic 3: Improve the region's deal flow for investors by accelerating start-ups that are growth-ready, and providing educational opportunities for entrepreneurs to increase their skills.

3. **Workforce Development**

A. **Train, attract and maintain a competitive workforce to meet the region's current and emerging industry needs and stimulate business development.** Foster a dynamic partnership of education, industry, and workforce development to forecast, assess and meet the training needs of existing and developing businesses.

Tactic 1: Partner with local educational systems to enhance and align services to prepare local residents with work readiness skills, including basic math and literacy skills, necessary for success in all occupations.

Tactic 2: Convene industry-interests panels to design and evaluate curricula to ensure that local training programs meet industry needs.

Tactic 3: Continue to build a culture that values learning, an entrepreneurial spirit, acceptance and diversity, and creativity to continue to attract entrepreneurial and innovative talent to our region.

B. Increase the ready workforce in Lane County by expanding access to academic and occupational training for all Lane County residents, particularly lower-skilled and lower-wage workers. The ED recognized the importance of a skilled workforce for the prosperity of the region.

Tactic 1: Connect basic skills training programs (e.g. G.E.D. preparation and English as a Second Language) to post-secondary certificate or degree programs.

Tactic 2: Partner with industry and education to encourage investment in training opportunities for young people, such as internships and work experience opportunities.

Tactic 3: Support the local recognition of Career Readiness Certificates, a state-wide testing and credentialing initiative to enhance workforce readiness.

4. **Land and Physical Infrastructure**

Prepare for the Land and Physical Infrastructure, in a timely fashion, that is necessary to support Business Development and Stimulate Quality Job Creation. Strengthen the coordination between infrastructure, planning and investments, land use, and economic development goals.

Tactic 1: Inventory and evaluate underdeveloped space in an effort to assist business relocations in a timely fashion.

Tactic 2: Integrate opportunistic economic development goals into land use and supply analyses and policies.

Tactic 3: Promote and build on the Region's transportation, distribution and logistics advantages.

Tactic 4: Continue to work with property and business owners to expand, upgrade and construct state-of-the-art facilities.

Tactic 5: Streamline the regulatory processes to assist with site selection and development.

5. **Economic Identity**

Promote Awareness and Advocacy for the Region's economic quality of life that continues to support and attract the investment and innovative and entrepreneurial talent and builds on our dynamic and diverse economic community.

Tactic 1: Partner with local business and economic development organizations to develop and implement an on-going public relations campaign that will promote the Region's economic identity and successes, both internally and externally.

Tactic 2: Promote the Region's strong willingness and ability to mentor and coach entrepreneurs and businesses, and recognize the successes that grow from within this network.

Tactic 3: Promote and Celebrate the Region's creative people who find success elsewhere and find bridges for them to contribute back to our community.

Tactic 4: Promote the region's natural and cultural resources to enhance the cultural tourism within the region.

6. **Targeted Industries**

A. Continue to support the development of our wealth generating sectors that have built a strong economic foundation for our community and have complemented our region's quality of life, such as:

- Transportation/Manufacturing
- Wood Manufacturing
- Health Care
- Construction

B. Support development and growth in successful and emerging opportunity areas within the local economy:

- Health/Wellness
- Advanced Manufacturing (technologically rich, innovative manufacturing)
- Software
- CleanTech/Renewable Energy
- Biomedical
- University of Oregon / Research & Development Institutions

Tactic 1: Identify strategies to address unique site and logistical needs of existing and emerging industries.

Tactic 2: Develop associations or networks among targeted cluster businesses for innovative networking, information-sharing and to provide opportunities for business growth.

Tactic 3: Pursue opportunities to expand and recruit businesses, ideas, and entrepreneurs into our region that can enhance our existing businesses and community.

The next step in the development of the regional economic development plan will be an Economic Summit. The goal for the Economic Summit will be to gather input on the tactics, or action items, for each approved economic development strategy, that will provide a framework for decision-making for our community partners. Following the Economic Summit, elected officials and others will (a) review the input and refine the regional plan or (b) ratify the regional plan and initiate implementation to build our next economy.

JEO OPTIONS

Option 1: Approve the economic development strategies as described in this AIS and have the ED Task Force and Technical Advisory Group hold an Economic Summit in October.

Option 2: Modify the economic development strategies and have the ED Task Force and Technical Advisory Group hold an Economic Summit in October.

Options 3: Decline approving any of the economic development strategies and provide new direction for the ED Task Force.

The ED Task Force recommended option one, which would approve the economic development strategies that created the outline of a regional economic development plan to design our area's next economy and have the ED Task Force and Technical Advisory Group hold an Economic Summit in October.

Mayor Leiken said as a member of the task force, he commended staff for working with a group of people with high opinions and capturing their ideas. The task force included representation from the two cities and the county. He also thanked the members of the task force for working diligently on this. He was supportive of the goals. During his breakfast meetings with Mayor Piercy, they had been on the same page regarding these issues. He also commended Mayor Piercy.

Mayor Piercy said she also appreciated this work and was looking forward to the summit. She referred to Strategy #2, Entrepreneurial Infrastructure, and wanted to make sure some of that focus was on private sector small businesses and local businesses that we were trying to help grow. She would like to add some other places that the City didn't normally network with throughout the community. Some local businesses felt like the cities were looking at larger industry more than small business. She pointed out that much of our economy was built on smaller businesses. She referred to an editorial in the paper regarding health care sectors and the need for employees in that area. We needed to take advantage of that and put our emphasis on that sector. Many businesses also fit into the green category which was the cutting edge. She referred to Strategy #4, Land and Physical Infrastructure. There was some light industrial space in Eugene that was under-utilized and she wanted to look at that opportunity.

Councilor Pryor said he was impressed with the work done; it was very thoughtful. This was just the beginning and being well organized at the beginning was a good way to start. He was impressed with how the task force worked collaboratively as a region. The joint elected body had given a mandate and joint staff had worked on making it happen.

Councilor Brown said he didn't understand Tactic #1 under the Entrepreneurial Infrastructure strategy. He asked if it was something the elected officials could do, as it seemed to be something banks and investment groups would do.

Mr. Ruiz said one of the pieces was that these strategies were not strictly instigated or resolved by elected officials. Part of staff's goal was to have a large enough stakeholders' group from the private, public and non-profit sector that were aligned behind this. It could be any of those stakeholders leveraging that tactic.

Councilor Brown asked about Tactic #2 under the Entrepreneurial Infrastructure strategy.

Mr. Ruiz said the University of Oregon (UofO) community had a lot of opportunities for technological transfer out into the community in fields such as bio-science, nanotechnology and laboratories. The question was how the community and region could work with the universities to find out how to enable more of that to happen and create more spin-offs to start new businesses. It was a good opportunity.

Councilor Brown said it was a worthy goal, but he was not sure how they would do that.

Mr. Ruiz said if Council chose to have a summit on this later in the fall, it could include people that would have ideas on how to make some of these things happen. All of the tactics were in flux and waiting for additional feedback from the summit participants.

Councilor Brown said he had researched the Eugene urban renewal district and had come across a strategic plan from 1982 that included many of these same things. He asked how successful that plan had been for economic development.

Mayor Piercy said she hoped to hold a Willamette Angel Conference in Eugene as was held in Corvallis. Also, the business school at the UofO had expressed interest in working with the cities.

Commissioner Fleenor said good work from staff on this; it was a focused approach. During his community dialogues he had learned that citizens, especially small businesses, felt they were always fighting government. He wanted to take this seriously. As a small businessman, he had also felt it was a fight. The elected officials' role was to remove the obstacles to reduce the burden on small businesses. He didn't see that in this paper. Other than that, he felt they were right on track.

Councilor Clark expressed appreciation for the chance to serve as a representative on the subcommittee. He thanked the staff and task force for their hard work refining their discussions into workable opportunities. The need for elected officials to do their part to stabilize and grow the local economy was very urgent. He was looking forward to the summit. He would vote for option 1 to move things along through the process. He had some specific ideas on how to implement some of the tactics.

Councilor Wylie said she was grateful for the good work and good direction. She noted that when the Springfield Council visited the UofO nano-lab, she found that by sharing information they could discover projects that each was working on. The lab had grants and techniques to help one another and the cities. The key was good relationships and communication.

Commissioner Dwyer thanked staff for their work. He quoted Oregon's motto "She flies by her own wings". He felt it was not government's job to create private sector jobs. If the opportunity and amenities were there, development would come. He referred to partnering with the UofO. Many things were utilized using public money and he was not supportive of public funds for that use. Using public money to develop a product should benefit all of the public. He was around in 1981 when the document referred to by Councilor Brown was drafted which then formed the Lane Metro Partnership. There were other tax benefits that helped at that time. He explained. He asked how far government needed to go to entice businesses to succeed. He wasn't sure it was the government's responsibility. He had been to the Angel Conferences and felt it all lead to who would bring in the money. Banks wanted sure returns as investors. It was good to have these discussions.

Commissioner Handy thanked his colleagues who worked on the committee, as well as staff for working with community members. He was excited about the work force development, and other aspects of this plan. There was enough detail to articulate the values, but also enough flexibility for creativity. He urged the elected officials to modify and go with option 2 in order to hold the economic summit before choosing a plan. Following the input from the summit, modifications could be made if needed. He felt modifications could be made under Strategy #4, Land and Physical Infrastructure and Strategy #6, Targeted Industries. Small business was the backbone of the community, and local businesses, both small and large, needed to be given priority. They couldn't just do business as usual. Strategy #4 was not pointing enough to the role brownfields and density would play when talking about available lands. Many businesses could function on 5-10 acres. He referred to the targeted industries and felt the industry

of Transportation/Manufacturing seemed ambiguous. He asked if that would mean to 'build it and they would come', or to look at integrating land use and transportation through planning. If there was an electric vehicle industry, they would need to determine where the plug-ins would be throughout the community.

Councilor Pryor said he had helped work on the 1982 report, and was one of the original members of the groups that became the Lane Workforce Partnership and Lane Metro Partnership. Those groups went on recruiting trips, which were a waste of time. It was not necessarily what they did, but how they did it. Many reports did have similar things in them. This was the early stage, and he didn't feel the need to go with option 2. The information from the summit would go into the final plan regardless if they approved option 1 tonight or later. A lot had been learned about how to do things and he wanted to make sure this was done the right way. The summit would help move the group in that direction. He would support option 1 with the expectation that it would be adapted, modified and changed.

Councilor Leezer congratulated everyone on their hard work. She agreed with Option 2 and suggested that tourism be added. Tourism was an amazing area and she felt it should be capitalized upon.

Councilor Simmons complimented the group for the work done. This was similar to the document in 1982, but things had changed. The thing that was missing was the need to produce food locally and the need to ensure the food sources and production sources for the needs of the community were met. He agreed with Mayor Piercy that the small to moderate size businesses were extremely important. The fundamental house must be in order, and the fundamental needs met. The listed goals were admirable, but it needed to address the food source component.

Councilor Taylor agreed with the comment regarding food. If we got rid of our land that produced food, we were in trouble. The air and water were the other two basics and protecting natural areas was essential. She asked what was meant by Transportation/Manufacturing.

Mr. Ruiz said that was partly under recognizing industry currently in the area, such as the RV industry. Part of this was to support those that had been successful, could be successful, and also encourage the emerging technology, such as electric vehicles.

Councilor Taylor said while at the National League of Cities convention in Massachusetts, she visited three communities that were cooperating and she commented that cooperation was excellent. She explained how they worked together to determine the most suitable site among the three cities, then shared the tax income. Oregon didn't have tax income, but it was an example of cooperation rather than competition. Industries that were needed should be targeted, rather than those that might bring in big money. She felt the incentives provided to Hynix were an example of a poor choice. She agreed with removing impediments, but not giving incentives unless they were a benefit to the public. She was concerned that if the focus was only on growth, businesses that we wanted here would be turned away. It was important to preserve what made this a good place. She suggested everyone read the book "Better, not Bigger". She agreed with option 2, and holding the summit first.

Councilor Ortiz said she felt this was very comprehensive and she was in support. She agreed mostly with the comments regarding small businesses. She referred to Tactic #2, of Strategy #1 and said she hoped the

task force would look at the Latino business group. It would be a good experience for them to get involved. She appreciated that the task force looked at English as a second language as a barrier.

Commissioner Fleenor said the author of "Better, not Bigger" lived in Eugene. He reminded everyone that Oregon and the 18 O&C counties were going through one of the greatest financial transitions ever due to the reduction of federal timber funding. He noted the decrease thus far and the decreases yet to come. The money that would no longer be coming to Lane County would have serious and significant ramifications. The County was not only suffering from a recession, but also a transition from a resource based economy to the new economy. There were serious challenges ahead in the event the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act was not renewed to its original level. Even cutting timber would not provide nearly enough funds. The funds that were not coming to the counties were not going through to the cities.

Councilor Clark urged his colleagues to support option 1. This was a general outline of how to proceed to the summit without specifics. Passage of option 2 would mean the joint elected officials getting together again to give staff new direction before moving to a summit. He shared Councilor Simmons' concerns regarding food services. He hoped the elected officials would consider option 1.

Commissioner Handy said this was a healthy conversation.

IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER HANDY WITH A SECOND BY COMMISSIONER DWYER, TO TAKE THE LANGUAGE IN OPTION ONE, ADDING THE WORD DRAFT AS THE THIRD WORD TO "APPROVE THE DRAFT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES AS DESCRIBED IN THIS AIS AND HAVE THE ED TASK FORCE AND TECHNICAL ADVISORY GROUP HOLD AN ECONOMIC SUMMIT IN OCTOBER. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Commission Dwyer left the meeting (12:53 p.m.)

2. Metro Plan Work Plan Update.

Assistant City Manager Jeff Towery said the report in the packet was just an update. On June 1, 2009 the Joint Elected Officials (JEO) directed staff from Eugene, Springfield and Lane County to develop a Metro Plan update work program, including timeline, cost estimates and implications for specific changes to the Metro Plan as recommended by a JEO subcommittee and as further supplemented by recommendations from each jurisdiction. The list from the JEO subcommittee included the following subjects:

- a. Overarching policies that identify and address regional issues.
- b. Policies that allow for individual refinement plans for Eugene and Springfield to address jurisdiction-specific issues.
- c. Adjustments to the Metro Plan boundary and text to address jurisdictional specific issues arising in the urbanizable areas and the area outside the urban growth boundary.
- d. A dispute resolution process that reflects the changes described in a-c.

Subsequent to the June 1 JEO meeting, staff from Springfield, Lane County and Eugene met with their respective elected officials to determine if additional issues should be included in the work program. The Springfield City Council had no additional issues to add when this question was discussed during a July 13, 2009 work session; the Lane County Board of Commissioners added no additional issues when the matter was brought forward during an August 26, 2009 regular meeting of the Board; and the Eugene City Council met on September 9, 2009 (too late to be included in this packet).

Based on these final instructions from the elected officials, staff will develop a work program, including identifying the text of the Metro Plan that will be included in the analysis; evaluating if any of this work can be merged into the ongoing HB 3337 or TransPlan update work tasks; and determining what other implications to the Metro Plan may result from the changes brought about by this assignment.

Staff will present the draft work plan to the JEO on December 7, 2009.

Councilor Ortiz said she served on this subcommittee with Councilor Clark and Commissioner Handy. Originally, there was a move to want to throw the Metro Plan out, but they were able to get to a place where they were able to address the issues.

3. Cooperative Services Report Feedback.

Assistant City Manager Jeff Towery said the key question on this item was what information the elected officials needed from staff to make informed decisions on the issue before them. He pointed out that although they were interconnected, at this point, this topic and the Ambulance Transport Summit (ATS) work were not combined. The ATS work would come to the elected officials in December and discussion on how the two related. As needed over next couple of months, each jurisdiction would meet at the policy and staff level as necessary to move this issue forward.

Springfield Fire Chief Dennis Murphy said on July 2, 2007, a landmark decision was made to provide better fire protection with the initiation of the Third Battalion. He explained how emergency crews responded to calls in the fastest response times without regards to the boundary separating the cities. That system resulted in improving the quality and quantity of resource and response without costing the cities. This achievement sparked an interest in joint efforts to make further improvements culminating in a Cooperative Services Study which was distributed at the July 21, 2009 joint elected officials (JEO) meeting. The recommendation of the study was to merge the two departments into a new combined department serving both cities. The purpose of the merger was to save money by eliminating unnecessary duplication in support, administration and management, while continuing to improve service delivery. The fire chiefs of Eugene and Springfield supported this concept as a means to address the financial challenges facing both cities now and in the future. Today's meeting was to determine if the councils of Springfield and Eugene wished to proceed with an implementation plan to merge the departments. If that was the case, a more detailed plan would be developed and delivered to councilors prior to the Thanksgiving holiday. A December 7 JEO meeting had been scheduled to go forward with the plan.

Eugene Fire Chief Randy Groves said the ATS was separate from this, however, they felt it was important to give a brief update on the ATS. Starting tomorrow night for a consecutive three weeks, a series of public forums would be held to receive feedback from the members of the collective communities to

bring back to the ATS. The task force would then bring a recommendation back to the JEO group at a later time. Although the two processes were separate, there were connections, such as the work being done regarding consolidation would help with some of the overhead costs, reducing that from the ambulance transport system. They were interested in hearing the elected officials' feedback. The consultant's study was the why, but they now needed to hear the how.

Councilor Ortiz thanked staff and audience members for coming tonight. She said what she needed from Chief Groves were the outcomes of the various outreach forums in both communities. It was important to hear from everybody in the community. She felt they had been thorough and included representation and participation from all jurisdictions.

Councilor Simmons said he agreed. He was concerned because he didn't have the facts of what it would cost. He gave the example of equipment repair costs each City incurred. He read that there would be initial savings, but wanted to know about savings in years five, six and so on. He discussed deficiencies in the equipment replacement funds in Springfield and asked about the replacement funds in Eugene and how those replacement costs differed. He said it was wonderful that we had already combined training and response, and we needed to share in that responsibility. He trusted both Chiefs, but would be looking over their shoulders.

Board Chair Sorenson asked what percentage of the population served by this unified fire force would be outside of Eugene.

Chief Murphy said about 35%.

Board Chair Sorenson asked if the taxes paid by those people would change as a result of their inclusion into a district or if taxes paid by residents in Springfield and Eugene would be affected by the merger.

Chief Murphy said it would cost less. There would be no effect on service on any other government in Lane County. Springfield and Eugene Fire served 35 jurisdictions in metro central Lane County and throughout the state. Those were user driven fees for contracts and that was self governance by each agency.

Chief Groves said it would depend on the level of governance. If this was some level of modeling a Metro Wastewater Management Commission (MWMC), there wouldn't be any change. If a fire district was formed, it would be a level taxation.

Board Chair Sorenson confirmed that the current proposal was just to combine the departments but not changing the tax structure for any of the jurisdictions.

Chief Groves said that was correct. Staff was looking for support to go ahead and put together the specifics of what it would look like to bring the two organizations together.

Board Chair Sorenson asked if this would involve an amendment to the Metro Plan.

Chief Groves said both cities were already providing those services collectively for eight districts outside the cities. He explained. An amendment to the Metro Plan would be dependent on the level of governance selected for the new entity.

Chief Murphy said it would be a decision making process involving the effective governments if there was to be a change, and there was no presumption of a change.

Councilor Clark appreciated the leadership trying to find better ways to provide service and save money. He needed to know about service delivery. In Eugene, he asked if they would recommend changes to service delivery for Zone 3 or changes outside city limits.

Chief Murphy said the presumption was stabilization of the current delivery system. Beyond that, decision making would be done by the elected bodies. They would make change wherever it made sense, but would have to go to the elected officials. This was just the beginning and the possibilities of further savings were significant. They had a long way to go and would need public forums and decision making by elected officials.

Chief Groves said their objective was to maintain or improve line level service of delivery. This looked at administration and cost savings in that area. He noted the number of command officers that were eligible or near eligible for retirement and that they were trying to capture those savings by doing away with redundancies. He referred to the Zone 3 question, which was an ambulance transport system issue. They would be addressing that issue at the next meeting.

Councilor Clark said he appreciated the work done by both departments.

Commissioner Handy said his work on this committee helped him understand there were short term strategies and long term strategies. Before them today was a short term strategy. He appreciated the work by his colleagues from the Eugene and Springfield City Councils. He noted the work of the other fire districts across the county and their interest, as well as the Florence hospital district. It came to his attention that the County had an immediate piece to deal with regarding deficiencies in Chapter 18 of the Lane County Code that they were in the process of addressing. Long term, they had to address the taxation issue, boundary change issue, special district or a service district issue, and the governance issues involved in those options. Looking at the service effectiveness and ambulance transport were also issues to discuss. In the short term, they were also looking at how to maximize FireMed, and show the public where the shortfalls were. Councilor Ortiz was correct that the feedback from the community was important.

Councilor Ortiz said when they started this conversation, her main question was what the City of Eugene needed to do to stabilize the Ambulance Transport System. She wanted to make sure that hadn't been lost. When she talked about that, she also meant she didn't want the quality of service to get lost. Quality needed to be there. Chief Groves agreed. Councilor Ortiz thanked Councilor Clark for bringing up Zone 3 as it needed to be discussed.

Mayor Piercy said she appreciated the work done on this topic. She said she would like to try this out slowly to see how it worked before getting too far. She would like to think of other small ways to move

forward that included working together as two decision making governing bodies. She wanted to try to find ways to make it work on a smaller scale.

Mayor Leiken said it sounded like the task force thought moving forward with one Metro Plan was the way to go with some autonomy. He asked if this would need voter approval from all three jurisdictions if it went into a discussion regarding a district. Yes.

Mayor Leiken said he had appreciated the third battalion concept and felt it worked well. He said it was important to look at this from a governing standpoint. He had known Chief Murphy for many years and would put a lot of faith in Chief Murphy's judgment. The concept of cooperation had been outstanding. It would be important for him to hear from the leadership of the unions. If there was any issue with the unions, he would be inclined to be unsupportive. He agreed with Councilor Simmons that the elected officials would continue to look over staff's shoulders as that was their job. He also agreed with Councilor Ortiz that we could not lower our service delivery. He needed to know if this would save dollars and cents in the long run. They needed to know they were making decisions that were prudent, while maintaining service deliveries. He said the cooperation between the two fire departments was outstanding. He felt these were the only public agencies that this would work with and it was worth looking into.

Councilor Taylor asked who would be the Fire Chief and which City Manager would be making that decision.

Councilor Taylor asked how difficult would it be to go back if a change was made and they determined it wasn't working.

Chief Groves recalled the consolidation of the Fire and Police Department in Eugene. When they deconsolidated, the most difficult part was building the staffing levels up for each department. It took about ten years to get the resources back to build up those positions. He felt they chose the wrong services to consolidate at that time, but felt these (fire departments) were the right services because they were like services. They were looking at doing more with less.

Chief Murphy said Chief Groves had his support as the Chief if there were a merger. It was important for continuity. He believed that Springfielder's would also support Chief Groves. It would also take a step of faith from Eugene to support our Fire Marshal, as they would most likely be the Fire Marshal for the merged department, as would be our Training Chief. There were three key retirements or turnovers: the Fire Marshal, the Training Chief and the Chief of the department. In those three people would be cost savings and continuity.

ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Leiken adjourned the meeting at 1:25 p.m.

September 14, 2009
Joint Elected Officials Meeting
City of Springfield
City of Eugene
Lane County
Page 14 of 14

Amy Sowa
City Recorder

Sidney W. Leiken
Mayor

Attest:

City Recorder

MINUTES

Eugene City Council
McNutt Room—City Hall—777 Pearl Street
Eugene, Oregon

September 14, 2009
5:30 p.m.

COUNCILORS PRESENT: Alan Zelenka, Mike Clark, Andrea Ortiz, Jennifer Solomon, Chris Pryor, George Poling, George Brown, Betty Taylor.

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the work session of the Eugene City Council to order. She announced that Ms. Solomon would be delayed and Mr. Zelenka was out of town.

A. COMMITTEE REPORTS AND ITEMS OF INTEREST FROM MAYOR, CITY COUNCIL, AND CITY MANAGER

Ms. Piercy invited people to attend the Mayor's Art Show at Jacobs Gallery and the Teen Art Show at Maude Kerns. She attended a Labor Day picnic and a ribbon-cutting ceremony for the new section of Bailey Hill Road. She announced the City had opened its fourth new park and renovated two existing parks. She also attended the 200th birthday celebration for Eugene Skinner. She expressed gratitude for the federal stimulus dollars the City had received, including a grant to reduce carbon emissions. She noted that September 11 had been dedicated to a national day of service and remembrance.

Mr. Clark reported that he and Mr. Zelenka had been meeting regularly with the Police Auditor and a budgetary issue had been discussed. He felt the issue had been resolved, but might come before the council at some point. He attended a Workforce Partnership luncheon and a joint elected officials meeting on the topic of economic development. The Police Commission met and discussed the University of Oregon's (UO) request to expand citation authority and the liaison roles of representatives from the council and the Civilian Review Board (CRB). He invited input from councilors on the economic development work of the Lane Metro Partnership board before he attended the next meeting. He was looking forward to attending an Oregon Transportation Commission meeting and thanked Parks and Open Space Director Johnny Medlin and Public Works Director Kurt Corey for their responses to Bond Lane Park issues.

Mr. Pryor remarked that the United Way's needs assessment of the community revealed that the same issues as had existed in the community last year, still existed, and the annual campaign had begun. He hoped that the community could find ways to meet residents' needs. He commended the work on Bailey Hill Road and said traffic was flowing well with the opening of school. He noted the many road projects that had been constructed throughout the community with bond funds approved by the voters. He attended a Lane Transit District design review meeting for the West 11th Avenue corridor and urged everyone who was interested in the project to participate and provide their input. He was pleased with the attendance at a reception for the new Police Auditor.

Ms. Taylor attended the Eugene Skinner birthday celebration and co-sponsored a health care options forum along with Ms. Piercy and County Commissioner Pete Sorenson. She pointed out that the County was

conducting a series of classes for residents about County services and hoped the City would consider something similar for the purpose of informing the public about City government and encouraging them to become involved. She noted that a former Lane Regional Air Protection Agency employee had started a new business to reduce pollution from idling trucks.

Ms. Ortiz said she staffed the City's booth at the Eugene Celebration and encouraged residents to take the neighborhood survey on the City's website. She indicated that the last meeting of LRAPA had been challenging because of action to direct the agency to become involved in dispute resolution with Seneca. She said the action was determined to be in conflict with LRAPA's charter and hoped there would be an opportunity to revisit the charter, which was 20 years old. She announced publication of a new Latino monthly newsletter and encouraged everyone to attend Fiesta Latina. She was pleased with the City Manager's decision to hire Pete Kerns as police chief.

Mr. Brown commented that he had been researching the history of the urban renewal district and would distill the information into a memorandum for other councilors. He attended a Jefferson-Westside Neighborhood meeting. He also attended a McKenzie Watershed Council meeting.

Mr. Poling congratulated Pete Kerns on his selection as police chief. He also congratulated those who received awards from the Workforce Partnership and Lane Metro Partnership. As the Travel Lane County liaison he attended a ribbon-cutting ceremony for the Diamond Woods Inn near Monroe and said Travel Lane County was developing a new informational website and continuing work on the Gateway visitor's center. He announced that there would be a presentation on a new affordable housing development project during the September 16 Harlow Neighborhood Association meeting. He reminded the public that September 18 was the deadline for boards and commissions applications.

City Manager Jon Ruiz said he would be attending a meeting of the Fairmount Neighbors, and the Citizens Police Academy would begin during the week. He had made several presentations to community organizations about the joint elected officials' economic development activities and planning for an economic development summit in October 2009. He attended a recent concert at Cuthbert Amphitheater and praised the venue.

**B. WORK SESSION:
Interstate 5 Willamette River Bridge – Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)
Project Update**

Mr. Ruiz introduced Dick Upton, project manager for the ODOT Interstate 5 (I-5) bridge project.

Mr. Upton said a crucial element of the project was the partnerships among ODOT, Eugene and Springfield. He used aerial photographs to illustrate the site and aspects of the project, provide an overview of the bridge design and demonstrate alignment of project components and sequence of construction. He anticipated that construction would be completed in 2012. He said the bridge structure would allow for three lanes in each direction, with the expectation that in the future that section of I-5 would be widened. He said the bridge structure was intended to last 100 years. He stressed that ODOT was working closely with several parks organizations to manage and mitigate impacts to the adjacent sections of Alton Baker Park.

Ms. Piercy asked if local contractors were being used for the project and whether a stand of trees that buffered the bike path from I-5 would be preserved. Mr. Upton replied that the two primary contractors on the project for design and construction were local and the use of local subcontractors was being promoted. He said the highway needed to be widened in the section by 12 feet to the west and initial plans indicated that the slope would be cleared; however, during discussions with parks groups the importance of the trees

was emphasized and ODOT had an option to construct a wall at the top of the slope to accommodate the widening, thereby saving most, if not all, of the trees. The challenge was that there were no funds currently available for that option, estimated at \$600-700,000. He said in the interim, while funding was identified, only trees that would be affected by construction of the wall would be removed.

Mr. Poling commented that a wall had also been planned on the east side of the highway on Willamalane Park and Recreation District's property, but Willamalane preferred a slope and perhaps the funds for that wall could be used for the west side of that section. Mr. Upton replied that the wall on the east side would actually be on ODOT property and was mandated by two federal permits. It would be necessary to convince the federal permitting agencies that a slope could be appropriately substituted for a wall and even if that occurred there would not be sufficient funds remaining for a wall on the east side.

Mr. Poling commended ODOT for its public outreach regarding the project and efforts to respond to the interests and concerns of interested parties. He felt it was worth the effort to maintain the area in as natural a condition as possible and the council should indicate its wish to have the stand of trees preserved. Mr. Ruiz said staff would prepare language for a motion if that was the wish of the council. Ms. Piercy determined that councilors were in agreement with Mr. Poling's suggestion.

Ms. Taylor asked if the community had the ability to change the designed width of the bridge. Mr. Upton said that would not be possible at this point in the project, but although the bridge would have the capacity for three lanes in each direction in the future it would only be striped for two lanes when completed.

Ms. Taylor asked if the temporary bridge would be removed. Mr. Upton replied that it would be removed and the beams salvaged for other projects.

Ms. Taylor asked if there was controversy over the bridge design. Mr. Upton said the current configuration was popular.

**C. WORK SESSION:
Downtown Outcomes**

Mr. Ruiz introduced Dr. Gary Manross from Strategy Research Institute to present the results of a recent survey on the level of public interest and support for downtown revitalization. He said the council's collective statements developed in previous work sessions had begun to express expectations for downtown and the next step was to consider what projects and initiatives might help to achieve those expectations and the tools that were necessary, including the urban renewal district. He said the focus of the presentation was expectations, projects and initiatives, to be followed by a discussion of tools at a future work session.

Dr. Manross explained the methodology used to conduct the survey and used a slide presentation to display the results. He said on a list of issues of local concern, economic development (jobs) topped the list and most people agreed that Eugene was a great community and they were happy to live there. He reviewed the results for questions related to the City's budget, adequacy of public parks and open space, the need for urban renewal and more living wage jobs. He said over half of those surveyed were aware of plans to revitalize downtown, almost 90 percent regarded downtown development as important and 75 percent felt it should be made a priority.

Continuing, Dr. Manross said the highest priority elements for downtown revitalization were expansion of Lane Community College's downtown campus and a veterans' medical clinic, followed by funds for commercial building improvements and enhancements, an arts and entertainment district, park improvements and a civic center. Additional elements for downtown revitalization included adequate/free parking, greater

police presence and ease regulations/incentives for businesses to move downtown and shops that sell what people need.

In conclusion, Dr. Manross stated that 70 percent of respondents supported revitalization for economic development and over half supported the investment of public funds, particularly in a partnership with private investment.

Mr. Brown noted that a similar survey last year ranked a subsidy for downtown economic development lowest. Dr. Manross said if the term “subsidy” was not explained, people had a negative reaction, but when they understood its use within the context of a plan for the downtown area they were more favorably inclined.

Mr. Brown said he was pleased that attitudes toward the City’s budget had changed, with more respondents disagreeing there was waste in the budget. He felt that could be a result of the road projects being completed with bond funds.

Mr. Clark asked what would be considered a base level of positive response in a survey for a levy in order to proceed with a levy measure. Dr. Manross said his company used a “go/no-go” model that resulted in accurate predictions of success of the ballot. He said a funding feasibility study would take all of the definite supporters, and half of the probable supporters, to calculate the likelihood of a measure passing.

Mr. Clark felt that 53 percent of respondents supportive of subsidizing economic development was not a high enough percentage to predict success of a funding measure. Dr. Manross agreed and said the City would need to explain to the electorate a specific expenditure plan based on community priorities in order to gain enough support on the ballot.

Mr. Clark said the City had gained credibility with voters by presenting a list of specific road projects to be funded with bond proceeds and would need to take a similar approach with downtown revitalization, although it would be challenging to identify specific projects that had wide support. He felt there would be greater public support for revitalization efforts related to removing regulatory barriers and improving public safety through a greater police presence. Dr. Manross agreed that public safety was very important to voters and he sensed there was also support for easing regulatory restrictions. He encouraged the council to present a package of revitalization strategies and not stop with the two or three top priority elements.

Mr. Pryor said the survey was a valuable tool for informing decisions. The question of whether there was support for the strategies related to interest versus commitment. He said it was important to determine what the community was committed to doing and the City had done much to restore the public’s trust in a well-functioning government, as demonstrated in the survey. He was intrigued by the level of support for downtown revitalization and economic development and the council needed to spend time identifying the specific components of downtown development for which there would be a commitment. Dr. Manross noted that the survey was of high/moderate propensity voters, not a broad cross-section of the community. He said appropriate uses of the survey results were to help make informed decisions and to inform the public that a scientific survey was used to determine community interests.

Ms. Solomon arrived at 6:55 p.m.

In response to questions from Ms. Taylor, Dr. Manross said a random sample of 400 voters from across all eight wards was surveyed by telephone. He explained the techniques used to assure that people were willing to participate in the survey. He would provide a breakdown of survey results by ward.

Ms. Piercy asked how the public/private partnership with respect to a civic center was defined. Dr. Manross said it was defined as “a civic center, including a campus designed as a public/private partnership where certain City offices would be relocated, combined with a blend of commercial and business entities in the private sector that thrive in a vibrant downtown environment.”

Mr. Brown asked for a copy of the exact questions used in the survey.

Mr. Pryor asked for a full report from the survey with cross-tabulation of results.

Ms. Piercy said the council’s direction with the bond measure was to request a smaller amount for projects that could be completed over a shorter period of time, yet the advice with respect to downtown was to put together a larger package of priority elements. She asked if it made sense to try to complete a few things initially to gain trust. Dr. Manross said the issue was how it was presented to the voters and the council had already done that properly. The next critical step was to ask the public what it wanted based on the list of priorities identified in a scientific survey, rather than simply asking for more suggestions.

Mr. Clark said the question regarding perception of waste in City government could be related to inefficiencies, but he tended to see that as the expenditure of funds not matching someone’s priorities. Dr. Manross said that the public was generally cynical about government and most people did not understand that the City had little discretionary funding and how the municipal budget was constructed. He felt that more work was needed to better educate the voters about those issues.

Mr. Ruiz stated that more detailed results from the survey would be provided and further discussion by the council would be scheduled.

The meeting adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jon Ruiz
City Manager

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)

MINUTES

Eugene City Council
Work Session
McNutt Room – City Hall
777 Pearl Street—Eugene, Oregon

September 16, 2009
12:00 p.m.

COUNCILORS PRESENT: Chris Pryor, Mike Clark, George Poling, George Brown, Andrea Ortiz.

COUNCILORS ABSENT: Alan Zelenka, Betty Taylor, Jennifer Solomon,

Mr. Clark called the work session meeting of the Eugene City Council to order at 12:01 p.m. and noted that Mayor Piercy would be arriving later in the meeting.

**A. WORK SESSION:
Community Climate and Energy Action Plan Informational Update**

Community Climate and Energy Action Plan (CCEAP) Coordinator Matt McRae briefed the council on the history of and most recent developments surrounding the CCEAP. He noted that staff had assembled an advisory team made up of representatives from the City of Springfield, the University of Oregon Climate Leadership Initiative, the Eugene Chamber of Commerce, the Eugene Water and Electric Board, Friends of Eugene, the Eugene City Human Rights Commission, Lane Transit District, Lane County, the Neighborhood Leaders Council, the Eugene City Planning Commission and the Eugene City Sustainability Commission to advise on various aspects of the CCEAP.

Mr. McRae introduced various representatives from the CCEAP advisory team including Jan Wostman from the Neighborhood Leaders Council, and Dave Funk and Howie Bonnet from the City's Sustainability Commission.

Mr. McRae noted that staff and the CCEAP were planning extensive community outreach and discussions and invited the council to attend the CCEAP kickoff event on Saturday, September 26. He further noted a variety of CCEAP community outreach events would be taking place subsequent to the kickoff which were described as part of the agenda item summary materials.

Mr. McRae noted the CCEAP planning process had been designed to be highly participatory particularly with respect to local businesses.

Mr. McRae noted that staff hoped to have a draft of the CCEAP completed by April of 2010 with subsequent community outreach efforts and a final version to be submitted to the council in August of 2010.

Mr. Clark appreciated the scope and volume of work that had gone into the CCEAP planning process so far.

Mr. Brown, referring to staff's background summary from the agenda item summary materials, asked Mr. McRae to elaborate upon the identification of necessary adaptation identified therein. Mr. McRae responded that discussions regarding those adaptations had not yet taken place and that preliminary efforts regarding the CCEAP had focused on making the planning efforts for the CCEAP participatory and effective across a broad range of community interests. He further noted that the Climate Leadership Initiative representatives on the CCEAP had drafted a report on the Upper Willamette Basin released in February of 2009, that outlined a variety of adaptations that might ultimately be incorporated into the CCEAP.

Ms. Ortiz asked for clarification regarding how the CCEAP kickoff and subsequent community outreach events would address the role of area social service providers in relation to the CCEAP work plan. Mr. McRae noted that staff and the advisory team had been coordinating with the City's Human Rights Commission, Lane County Public Health, and other community organizations to ensure that a broad and comprehensive social services strategy would be incorporated into the final version of the CCEAP. Mr. McRae further stated that staff and the advisory team had been setting aside resources in order to conduct a number of smaller, more focused conversations with community and social service groups as the CCEAP was developed.

Mr. Pryor appreciated the level of expertise and experience that had been assembled for the CCEAP advisory team.

Mr. Pryor recognized a number of parallels between the creation of the CCEAP and various elements of the TransPlan process from several years ago and asked if the overall philosophy of staff and the advisory team would be to use either the "carrot or the stick" with respect to any policy recommendations ultimately developed as part of the CCEAP. Mr. McRae was unable to definitively answer which approach the staff and advisory team would choose to take but hoped that whatever policy recommendations were made would "carry some weight" in helping to achieve the goals of the CCEAP.

Mr. Poling asked if staff would be able to distribute to the council in advance, lists of individuals and groups invited to the CCEAP advisory team public outreach meetings so that council members could provide helpful suggestions and feedback.

Mr. Poling asked if staff would provide council with summary minutes of the community event meetings in advance of the April and August presentations to the council. Mr. McRae noted that such materials would be made available to the council members as requested in addition to any other materials from those meetings (i.e. transcriptions, audio recordings, presentation materials, etc.) they might need.

Ms. Medary commented that it was staff's intent to present information regarding the CCEAP process as early as possible so as to keep council members adequately informed about the development of the process as it progressed.

**B. WORK SESSION:
Leaf Program Informational Update**

Ms. Medary stated that numerous emails had recently been circulating regarding the City's leaf collection strategies for the fall of 2009 and introduced Surface Operations Manager Eric Johnson to provide an update to the council.

Mr. Johnson updated the council on the history of, and most recent developments surrounding, the City's leaf collection program with particular emphasis on how the program had related to the adoption of the City's Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan (CSWMP) in 1993.

Mr. Johnson provided a brief overview of the City's leaf collection schedule and noted that enhancements to the program in 2009, would include greater public awareness strategies as well as increased resources for on-street bicycle lane maintenance.

Mr. Johnson commented that the City's leaf program utilized staff and equipment from both the surface and stormwater maintenance teams, as well as certain additional resources from the Public Works Department's Parks and Open Space Division.

Mr. Johnson reported the leaf program divided the City of Eugene into five separate collection areas with two rounds of collection on more than 470 center-line miles of improved streets and one round of collection on approximately 50 miles of unimproved streets. He further reported that the program maintained approximately 80 center-line miles of on-street bike lanes.

Mr. Johnson briefly reported on the City's leaf collection program from the previous year and noted that City crews working under the program had collected more than 16,000 cubic yards of leaves with approximately 54% of that amount being delivered to private properties, 32% being delivered to community gardens and parks and the remaining 14% delivered to commercial recyclers such as Rexius and Lane Forest Products. He noted that no leaves collected under the program had been deposited in local landfills.

Mr. Johnson briefly described how leaf collection programs satisfied the requirements of the City's National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit and further described elements listed in an agenda item summary memorandum related to 1) the public guidelines for leaf collection; 2) the program's public awareness media strategies; and 3) various leaf disposal alternative strategies for members of the community.

Mr. Johnson noted that the total amount of on-street leaves collected in the past decade had remained at a fairly constant level of approximately 16,000 cubic yards per year which he further noted represented roughly 2,000 truckloads of leaves collected each year.

Mr. Johnson briefly described three identified trends that were likely to significantly affect the collection strategies of the leaf program in the near future: 1) an overall increase in leaf volumes due in part to the City's various street tree-planting efforts and the maturation of the urban forest leaf canopy; 2) an increase in the regulatory processes applied to the City's Stormwater infrastructure; and 3) an increase in the number of cyclists and local on-street cycling facilities.

Mayor Kitty Piercy arrived to the meeting at 12:21 p.m.

Mr. Johnson commented that the trend of increased cyclists in the community and the efforts to maintain safety for those persons with respect to the amount of leaves for on-street collection would represent a significant challenge to the City's leaf program.

Mr. Johnson reported on various operational enhancements to the City's leaf program being proposed to improve public safety in the upcoming leaf collection season for cyclists including: 1) maintaining bike lanes during night-shift sweeping operations; 2) the reassignment of a lead maintenance worker to the day shift with a major focus on bike lane maintenance and right-of-way debris management; 3) enhanced prioritization of leaf collection efforts based on input from local bicycle riders/groups; 4) the development of a "leaf season priority bike lane map" designed to identify main corridors on which to concentrate leaf collection efforts; 5) the purchase of an additional leaf vacuum to help concentrate collection efforts on priority routes; 6) increased community outreach efforts designed to help educate the public about the dangers of piling leaves into bike lanes; and 7) improved strategies for allowing members of the public to report bike lanes obstructed by leaves; and 8) the creation of a website to inform citizens of leaf collection along selected bike routes.

Mr. Johnson summarized that the leaf collection program satisfied a number of the City's goals and policies including its Sustainability Initiative, the Eugene Pedestrian and Bicycle Strategic Plan, and the NPDES permit commitment to conduct annual curbside leaf pickup on all City streets.

Ms. Piercy thanked Mr. Johnson for the staff presentation regarding the leaf collection program and felt that the program satisfied the City's clearly stated community goal to pick up leaves and keep bicycle lanes clear. She appreciated that the community goal was positively stated to indicate the City's strong commitment to keeping the streets clear and safe for all users.

Mr. Johnson noted that City staff was looking forward to continuing community education and public outreach efforts to keep people abreast of the City's strategies to make annual leaf collection as safe and efficient as possible.

Ms. Piercy commented she liked the various strategies and enhancements being used by staff to update the public on leaf collection efforts in real-time and believed those strategies would enable users to plan their trips easily. Mr. Johnson responded that the website used to update the public on the specific leaf collection routes would use the automatic vehicle location system used by other Public Works vehicles.

Ms. Piercy asked if the leaf program would include a component whereby members of the public could provide feedback on the City's local leaf collection efforts. Mr. Johnson noted that the City would soon be incorporating an online "leaf reporter" to allow citizens to provide comments and feedback.

Mr. Clark appreciated the information provided regarding the operational enhancements to the leaf program. He noted that leaf collection was a very important issue in the community.

Mr. Clark expressed that while he had recently submitted an ordinance that would make it illegal for citizens to obstruct bike lanes with leaves or similar detritus, the City's leaf program strategies ultimately represented a safer, more reasonable and more efficient approach to the problem.

Mr. Pryor appreciated that the strategies of the City's leaf collection program represented a positive and proactive approach to a potentially serious public safety issue.

Ms. Ortiz was glad to see the City prioritizing the bike lanes with respect to the leaf collection program and was also glad that the strategies of the leaf program incorporated methods to be highly responsive to requests and feedback from the community.

Mr. Brown commented that the City's leaf collection program represented very practical solutions to the concerns of the public.

Mr. Johnson, responding to a question from Mr. Brown, noted that the City's leaf program cost approximately \$400,000 to operate and provided additional information regarding the various funding, revenues and costs associated with the program. Mr. Johnson further noted that, as part of the leaf program's annual budget, the City paid a nominal recycling fee to Rexius and Lane Forest Products for the leaves that the City recycled there.

Mr. Brown noted that the City had at one time operated a compost heap near Skinner Butte Park and suggested that such efforts might be made again. Mr. Johnson responded that the leaf program already distributed on-request leaves for composting purposes directly to local residents, groups and community gardens.

Mr. Johnson, responding to comments made by Mr. Brown, noted that the leaf program remained committed to keeping streets and bike lanes clear particularly at night and on arterial roads where leaves piled up for collection are often spread out into the street and other areas.

Mr. Johnson, responding to comments from Ms. Piercy regarding the level of community involvement provided by groups such as Greater Eugene Area Riders (GEARS), noted that staff working in the leaf program was committed to proactively engaging with the project on the best ways to maintain and improve the program. He noted that staff was actively engaged in discussions with the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) and that Public Works Director Kurt Corey, Maintenance Director Jeff Lankston, and Eric Jones had recently met with the president of GEARS (Greater Eugene Area Riders) to discuss the enhancements to the leaf program.

Ms. Piercy thanked Mr. Johnson for his presentation.

Ms. Piercy was pleased with the recent news that Lane Community College was planning to develop the 10th Avenue and Charnelton Street development site across from the Eugene Public Library and looked forward to further positive developments regarding the matter.

Ms. Piercy adjourned the meeting at 12:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jon Ruiz
City Manager

(Recorded by Wade Hicks)

MINUTES

Eugene City Council
Public Hearing
Council Chamber
777 Pearl Street—Eugene, Oregon

September 21, 2009
7:30 p.m.

COUNCILORS PRESENT: Alan Zelenka, Mike Clark, George Brown, Andrea Ortiz, George Poling, Chris Pryor, Jennifer Solomon, Betty Taylor.

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the meeting of the Eugene City Council to order.

1. PUBLIC HEARING

An Ordinance Concerning Boards, Commissions and Committee; Amending Section 2.013 of the Eugene Code, 1971; and Providing for an Effective Date

Mayor Piercy opened the public hearing and reviewed the procedures for providing testimony.

Zachary Vishanoff, Eugene, stated that the Planning Commission should meet in the Downtown Library and televise its meetings in order to make them accessible to the public. He read the descriptions of public hearing items from the agenda and said the information was inadequate; providing more thorough explanations in plain English would encourage more people to get involved in issues at an earlier point if they understood what was being discussed.

Mayor Piercy closed the hearing and called for comments from councilors.

Councilor Zelenka agreed with Mr. Vishanoff about the need for better explanations of public hearing agenda items. While he agreed with the majority of councilors who supported the current interview process for boards and commissions applicants, he liked the model used by Eugene School District 4J and hoped aspects of it could be incorporated into the council's process.

Councilor Taylor also agreed that agendas could more clearly state the purpose of public hearings. She said it was a good idea to televise Planning Commission meetings.

Mayor Piercy noted that 23 people had signed up to testify on the next agenda items, related to land use issues, so word was getting out to the community. She agreed the agenda language could be more explicit.

Councilor Clark arrived at 7:35 p.m.

2. PUBLIC HEARING

Minor Code Amendment Project (MiCAP) (Remand)

Alissa Hansen, Planning and Development Department, explained that the purpose of the hearing was to receive testimony on reinstating land use regulations related to building height transition in the South University area and to parking requirements for apartments in the South and West University neighborhoods. Those regulations had been remanded by the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA). She encouraged the council to raise questions following public testimony and said that staff would respond to those in writing prior to council action on the item on October 12.

Mayor Piercy opened the public hearing and reviewed the procedures for providing testimony.

Lauren Hulse, East 20th Avenue, Ward 3, Eugene, thanked the council for enacting Ordinance 20418 establishing building height transition as an interim measure until permanent Infill Compatibility Standards (ICS) were in place. She said appeal of the ordinance and remand back to the City left the neighborhood without any protection against unreasonable building heights and ICS adoption with a new set of protections was likely a year in the future. She asked that the City Council readopt Ordinance 20418 to reinstate the temporary protections related to maximum building heights and minimum parking requirements in the South University neighborhood until the council acted on ICS task team recommendations for permanent changes to building height and parking requirements.

Janet Heinonen, East 21st Avenue, Ward 3, Eugene, spoke on behalf of the South University Neighborhood Association (SUNA) board. She said by unanimous vote the SUNA board respectfully requested the Eugene City Council readopt the MiCAP building height and parking standards for specific portions of the South and West University neighborhoods as previously adopted in Ordinance 20418 on an interim basis until June 30, 2010. She said adopting the standards on an interim basis allowed time for the ICS teams to recommend standards and the council to take those recommendations under advisement. She also asked that the council provide for an immediate effective date for the ordinance.

Jon Mattheisen, Chambers Street, Eugene, spoke in opposition to the MiCAP regulations because property in the South Eugene neighborhood had been under the same zoning for many years. He felt that allowing a neighborhood association to amend that zoning would set a NIMBY (not in my backyard) precedence for the City. He said the area was adjacent to the University of Oregon and high density housing. Student enrollments were increasing and if the City did not build up it would need to build out. He said student housing needs had to be met and urged the council not to regulate zoning and development by neighborhood preference.

Laura Potter, Laura Street, Eugene, speaking for the Homebuilders Association of Lane County, said association members had been working with the ICS task team to develop solutions and compromises to the issues of building height and parking near the University of Oregon. She said ICS was scheduled to go to the Planning Commission on October 20 with the first three proposals, including recommendations on building height and parking. She said the parking proposal was supported by the building community and represented a perfect compromise between current code and MiCAP standards. She hoped for a similar compromise on building height. She urged the council not to reinstate MiCAP as it would undermine the work that had been done and have negative consequences for the local economy. She said the land required to meet MiCAP standards would make many lots unfeasible for development.

Luke Martindale, Stonegate Street, Eugene, a senior at the University of Oregon, stated that students did not need more parking; they needed more housing. The MiCAP parking requirements would encourage more automobile use and students did not require that much parking. He urged the council to uphold its sustainability goals and let the free market decide how much parking students wanted and needed. The MiCAP parking standards would only make it harder and more expensive for students to live where they wanted to and force them to live further from campus.

Richard Keeney, Westleigh Street, Eugene, Essex General Construction project manager, stated without the building projects in the University area he would probably be without a job and strongly recommended leaving the standards as they were.

Marvin Mang, Calumet Way, Eugene, spoke on behalf of the many construction workers in attendance at the hearing. They were there because they needed jobs to feed their families and were employed now because projects were being built in the campus area. Increased parking requirements had already killed a number of projects and were certain to kill more and with so many unemployed construction workers in the area those jobs were badly needed. He said some families had lost their homes and would starve if not for FOOD for Lane County; many ate at public diners alongside people who were homeless. He asked the council to consider those issues when it made its decision about the proposal to dramatically increase parking required for campus area housing, something that would only benefit a small number of wealthy people in the immediate area. He hoped the council would care more for people than for parking.

Jeremy Reynolds, Terra Linda Avenue, Eugene, questioned whether people who purchased homes in the South University neighborhood failed to recognize that the University of Oregon was their neighbor, over 20,000 students got their education there and parking was likely to be an occasional inconvenience. He said that unemployment created worse problems for people than parking concerns. He asked the council to have consideration for those who worked for a living.

Deborah Healy, East 15th Avenue, Ward 3, Eugene, said West University Neighbors supported MiCAP and was supporting the ICS task team parking recommendations. She said that immediate action was important because density was increasing rapidly in the neighborhoods. Despite MiCAP requirements there was no lack of building projects in the West University area that started prior to the remand. She said the neighborhood had a high concentration of bicyclists and pedestrians and parking had always been scarce, but instead of having one parking space for two or three occupants of a unit there were now six-bedroom units being built; one parking space per unit was not adequate. She did not think that more reasonable parking requirements would impact whether people had jobs and it was not sustainable to have people driving around the neighborhood looking for parking.

Jackson Hite, Patterson Street, Ward 3, Eugene, a University of Oregon student, asked the council to consider students' concern. He lived three blocks from campus, shared an apartment with four other people and did not own a car. He did not feel it was sustainable to provide multiple parking spaces and encourage the use of cars but also recognized that business owners and home builders had other perspectives on the matter. He urged the council to take more time to examine the issue from multiple viewpoints.

Stephen Baker, East 15th Avenue, Ward 3, Eugene, encouraged the council to consider the MiCAP code changes in the context of the citizen-driven process that developed them. He had lived in the neighborhood since 1973 and when the residential parking program was originally adopted people often spent 15 to 20 minutes driving around looking for parking. He said there was again insufficient parking in the neighborhood and people were parking illegally, which is why the new parking requirements had been proposed. He was concerned that in the future people would again be driving around looking for parking and wasting fuel.

Gordon Anslow, Paddock Drive, Eugene, urged the council not to readopt the MiCAP measures because it undermined the good faith efforts of those working on ICS. He said an eight-unit, 24-bedroom apartment building currently in design would require six spaces under the current code, nine spaces under the ICS proposal and 12 spaces under MiCAP. He said the ICS standards being proposed represented a compromise and the development community supported. MiCAP parking requirements made development on many lots in the University area out of the question. He asked the council not to put cars ahead of people and adopt standards that would reduce reliance on cars.

Michael Soraci, Kincaid Street, Eugene, said he was affected by both sides of the issue. He was laid off because a project was determined to be too costly under MiCAP requirements and at the same time he had friends and relatives living in the University neighborhoods. He agreed that both sides of the issue had legitimate concerns and the question was how to move forward. A common denominator was expansion of the University of Oregon and its lack of accountability in providing relief for people living near the University. He proposed that the University build a parking structure on campus funded by a percentage of rents in a district around the campus. That would eliminate all of the arguments from neighborhoods and the building community. He encouraged a collaborative effort to approach the University.

Jim Peterson, Eugene, described a housing project with ground floor units accessible and adaptable for those with disabilities that he had planned to construct, but was forced to terminate because the extreme MiCAP parking requirements made it too expensive. He said the project would have encouraged the use of alternative transportation and MiCAP requirements encouraged car use. He asked the council not to readopt MiCAP parking requirements.

Timothy Shinabarger, Agate Street, Eugene, supported readoption of building height limitations. He cited a recent situation where a seven-story apartment building was being proposed, but negotiations between the neighborhood and the developer resulted in a reduction to four stories. He said the need for less permissive building height standards was recognized during the ICS process and asked that MiCAP standards be readopted until the ICS process was completed. He submitted written testimony.

Dan Neal, Pearl Street, Ward 2, Eugene, stated he was involved in the green building initiative and spoke in opposition to readopting MiCAP standards because they conflicted with sustainability. He said that green building required community sacrifices; it was more expensive and involved greater density of housing. He asked the council to be guided by its growth management policies and neighborhood refinement plans related to compact urban growth and reduction of parking.

Malcolm Wilson, East 21st Avenue, Eugene, a SUNA member, agreed that the ICS task team should be allowed to complete its work, but the neighborhood needed interim protection against incompatible development until ICS standards were in place. He asked to have the remanded MiCAP amendments reinstated. He cited examples of neighborhood problems created by greater density of student housing and the neighborhood was working with University administration to deal with student conduct in the near off-campus area. He said zoning that did not take into account the actual social facts destroyed neighborhoods and cities and MiCAP amendments were reasonable and should remain in place until ICS standards could provide a more permanent solution.

Gena Hutton, Hendricks Hill Drive, Eugene, one of the owners of the Hutton Apartment Building at 19th Avenue and Harris Street, spoke to the benefits of the project, including jobs and convenient housing that allowed students to walk or bike to campus. The project would not have been possible under MiCAP requirements. She understood the concerns of SUNA, but the University was growing along with the demand for student housing. The most prudent and sustainable response to that demand was to provide quality housing as close to campus as possible so students did not need to use cars to get to class. She said there were also initiatives under way to provide shared vehicles for students. She asked the council to vote no on the MiCAP amendments.

Mike Russo, Potter Street, Ward 3, Eugene, asked that the MiCAP ordinances on building height limits and parking be reinstated. He said LUBA felt the impact of the amendments had been overstated and there was still a building boom in the neighborhood. He asserted that the neighborhood was not against development around the University. He said planning staff had provided responses to LUBA's concerns and noted that the neighborhood had contributed hundreds of volunteer hours to achieving a favorable outcome for everyone.

Paul Conte, West 10th Avenue, Ward 1, Eugene, remarked that the ordinance was not the problem; there were minor technical deficiencies that resulted in the remand and those could be easily addressed. The remand did not require rethinking the entire issue. He said LUBA determined that building heights would not limit density under MiCAP standards and parking requirements did not increase car usage. He said students used their cars for purposes other than getting to and from campus. He said MiCAP represented the council's best efforts; taking it away would allow more damage to be done and remove incentives for the building community to meet the neighborhoods halfway and get ICS standards adopted.

Carolyn Jacobs, Agate Street, Ward 3, Eugene, stated she was involved in both the MiCAP and ICS processes. Progress was slow and interim measures were necessary to protect the neighborhood from incompatible infill and redevelopment. She urged the council to readopt the MiCAP amendments because the conclusion and results of the ICS process was uncertain and the neighborhood should not be offered up to a handful of developers who were only interested in dollar signs.

Will Shaver, Peppertree Drive, Eugene, said the City and the council had frequently reaffirmed that sustainability was important and growth should be up and not out. An expensive and complicated analysis of buildable land was being done and part of that analysis was density. He said that zoning was factored into the land use equation and transportation plans and the MiCAP proposal was a subtle way to change zoning in certain areas instead of doing it properly by deciding as a community that those areas should be rezoned for lower density. He said the area now had bus rapid transit and a shift to more bike and pedestrian uses, along with a much higher student population. He opposed the readoption of the MiCAP amendments.

Kevin Matthews, Eugene, president of Southeast Neighbors and Friends of Eugene, was tired of the Sustainability Commission chair making anti-neighborhood statements to the council; there was no dichotomy between the quality of traditional neighborhood livability and sustainability. He said there was a way to address density of the community without a debate about how much damage to inflict on neighborhoods. A small amount of growth could be accommodated through residential infill; a large amount of growth could be accommodated through aggressive mixed-use development of core commercial areas. He said the remand from LUBA was on the basis of weak findings from the Planning Department, which continued to encourage appeals. He encouraged the council to adopt the MiCAP amendments on the basis of the improved findings.

Mayor Piercy closed the hearing and called for comments from councilors.

Mayor Piercy commented that there were admirable goals that moved in conflicting directions: jobs, sustainability and neighborhood protection. She said all sides of the issue had valid points to consider and urged those who spoke to have a respectful conversation and not to vilify others when defending their positions. She agreed that the University could have a more active role in meeting the housing needs of students and more work was needed on the parking issue.

Councilor Clark agreed that people should not demonize others in order to make a point as it diminished their credibility. He said many of the concerns revolved around parking and the increasing student population would exacerbate problems. He suggested making 18th and 19th avenues between Alder and Agate streets one-way and adding angled, meter parking to dramatically increase parking.

Councilor Taylor stated it was important to reinstate MiCAP measures while other solutions were being developed. She did not want to lose stable neighborhoods if steps were not taken to protect them. She did not think that building height limitations would pose a large hardship and was convinced the parking requirements were reasonable. She admired neighborhood residents who worked on those issues and urged the council to quickly readopt the MiCAP amendments as an interim measure.

Councilor Solomon thanked Mr. Peterson for his comments on housing for disabled students; it helped to clarify how the ordinance impacted development projects. She was opposed to readopting MiCAP and preferred to wait for the ICS task team recommendations to come forward.

Councilor Brown agreed that the University was not fulfilling its duty to provide for student housing and parking and that forced pressures into the neighborhoods. He asked staff to rework the findings before the ordinance came back to the council for action.

Councilor Zelenka commented that all sides of the issue made good points, but urged everyone to maintain a civil discourse that would lead to solutions. He did not think it was choice between jobs and livability; those did not need to be in opposition. He agreed that the University was not meeting its responsibilities to the increasing student population. He was interested in further discussion of Councilor Clark's suggestion regarding a new parking design. He said the council's job was to see that irreversible actions did not permanently, adversely impact the neighborhood and the ICS task team was working towards that goal. He urged the council to maintain interim protections until ICS recommendations were received.

Councilor Clark said he took seriously testimony that the MiCAP requirements meant loss of jobs. He asked if both of the MiCAP amendments would sunset in June 2010 and when ICS recommendations were scheduled to come to the council. City Attorney Emily Jerome replied that, as drafted, the amendments would sunset in June 2010, but that was something the council could change. ICS recommendations were scheduled to be acted on by the Planning Commission by the end of October and the council's first work session on the recommendations was November 9, followed by a public hearing on November 16 and action on December 14.

Councilor Clark questioned the need to move quickly on MiCAP if the council was going to complete the ICS process in December.

Mayor Piercy pointed out that the ICS timeline could change and take more time than currently intended. She stated that the hearing and the record were closed.

The meeting adjourned at 7:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jon Ruiz
City Manager

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)

MINUTES

Joint Elected Officials
Eugene and Springfield City Councils
Springfield Library Meeting Room—Springfield City Hall
525 5th Street—Springfield, Oregon

September 22, 2009
6:00 p.m.

PRESENT:

Eugene City Council: Mayor Kitty Piercy, Betty Taylor, George Poling, Andrea Ortiz, Chris Pryor, Alan Zelenka, George Brown, members.

Springfield City Council: Mayor Sid Leiken, Hillary Wylie, Dave Ralston, Christine Lundberg, Terri Leezer, Joe Pishioneri, Fred Simmons, members.

Board of County Commissioners: Peter Sorenson, Faye Stewart, Rob Handy.

ABSENT:

Eugene City Council: Jennifer Solomon, Mike Clark, members.

Board of County Commissioners: Bill Dwyer, Bill Fleenor, members.

Also present were County Administrator Jeff Spartz, Eugene City Manager Jon Ruiz, and Springfield City Manager Gino Grimaldi; Greg Mott, Mark Metzger, City Attorney Bill Van Vactor, City of Springfield; Kent Howe, Stephanie Schulz, County Counsel Steve Vorhees, Lane County; Kurt Yeiter, Heather O'Donnell, Carolyn Weiss, Chris Henry, City Attorney Emily Jerome, City of Eugene.

Mayor Sid Leiken called the public hearing of the Springfield City Council to order.

Mayor Kitty Piercy called the public hearing of the Board of County Commissioners to order.

Board Chair Peter Sorenson reconvened the September 22, 2009, Board of County Commissioners meeting and reviewed the Lane County file numbers for the items under consideration: Second Reading and Public Hearing on Ordinance PA 1262.

1. PUBLIC HEARING: An Ordinance Amending the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan Text, Chapter III, Section D, Policy #11; Adopting an Exception to Statewide Planning Goal 15 Willamette River Greenway; Adopting a Severability Clause; and Providing an Effective Date

Mayor Leiken determined there were no conflicts of interest or *ex parte* contacts on the part of the Springfield council.

Mayor Piercy called for conflicts of interest or *ex parte* contacts on the part of the Eugene council. There were none.

Chair Sorenson determined that neither Mr. Stewart nor Mr. Handy had conflicts of interest or *ex parte* contacts related to the item.

Mr. Zelenka arrived, and indicated in response to query from Mayor Piercy that he had no conflicts of interest or *ex parte* contacts to declare.

Mr. Metzger provided the staff report. Ms. O'Donnell and Ms. Schulz were also present for the item. Mr. Metzger called the elected officials' attention to the relevant criteria of approval for an amendment to the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan General Area Plan (Metro Plan) and asked those wishing to speak to address their testimony to the criteria. He said the amendment must be consistent with statewide planning goals, and must not cause the Metro Plan to be internally inconsistent. Mr. Metzger said the elected officials were also addressing an exception to State Goal 15, Willamette River Greenway, and the criteria for that were mounted on the meeting room wall.

Mr. Metzger recalled the joint planning commissions' public hearing on September 1, during which one individual testified. That individual, Jan Wostmann, testified in support of the amendment and suggested that text be added to the amendment that called for a connection between the Laurelwood neighborhood and the bicycle path. The commissions had agreed it was a good idea but outside the scope of the request before it, and each commission unanimously recommended approval of the amendment to the elected officials.

Speaking to the issue of the amendment's consistency with statewide Planning Goal 15, which spoke to the purpose of the Willamette River Greenway, Mr. Metzger said the greenway goal was intended to preserve the aesthetic values of the river, protect its environmental functions and values, and bring people close to the river for recreational use in a sensitive way. Allowing access and encouraging access for recreational purposes were at the heart of the goal. He believed the proposal met the goal of allowing people more access to the river. Currently, physical obstructions forced the multi-use path away from the river when it entered Glenwood, and Springfield would like to change that to improve the aesthetics of the path experience. The proposed viaduct would allow the path to continue through Glenwood in the future. Staff believed the proposal was consistent with the intent of statewide Goal 15.

Speaking to the issue of the amendment's consistency with the Metro Plan, Mr. Metzger reminded the elected officials that TransPlan was an element of the Metro Plan and it included maps that showed current and proposed multi-use paths. The proposed multi-use path was a key element in the community's bicycle system and was shown in TransPlan and appeared in other planning documents, such as the Willamalane Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan, which was also a refinement of the Metro Plan.

Mr. Metzger referred the elected officials to the findings prepared for the amendment and said he believed they supported a decision in favor of the amendment.

Mayor Leiken opened the public hearing for testimony and determined that there was no one present who wished to address the elected officials. He solicited questions from the elected officials.

Mayor Piercy determined from Mr. Metzger that no one had testified against the amendment before the commissions.

Speaking to Mr. Wostmann's suggestion, Mr. Zelenka thought such a connection was a good idea but pointed out the railroad created an obstacle to making it at the current time. He suggested that adjustments to the I-5 ramp alignments might make such a connection possible in the future.

Ms. Leezer determined from Mr. Metzger that there was sufficient funding to support the project. He indicated that the main issue before the elected officials was the land use permissions necessary to allow the viaduct structure to be

built. He referred to Policy D-11 in the Metro Plan, which stated that any transportation-related facility within the greenway setback that required fill must go through the Metro Plan amendment and goal exception process. He said the actions being contemplated by the elected officials did not pre-empt environmental review. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process would occur to ensure environmental protection was assured.

Mr. Handy determined from Ms. Schulz that there had been two previous local exceptions to statewide Goal 15, both associated with the I-5 bridge construction project. One was for the temporary bridge carrying traffic now, and one was for the upcoming construction of the permanent bridge. Both were approved. The proposed exception would be the third exception in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Handy asked staff to speak to a sentence in the reasons analysis for Finding 63 that had been included in a memorandum provided to the board that indicated there was no single statement of greenway values in the State statute or administrative rules. He also asked staff to speak to the nature of the Willamette Greenway Plan, specifically, if the plan was a compendium of plan amendments. Mr. Handy wondered how the State articulated its greenway plan and values. Mr. Metzger said he had reviewed the statute and rules extensively in attempting to set out the criteria for the exception, and while they contained considerable description about the greenway and its purpose he had been unable to find a single statement that spoke to the greenway's functions and values. Ms. Schulz added the goal encompassed many different values. Speaking to the nature of the plan, she clarified that it was not a specific refinement plan for the greenway, which was a mapping overlay.

Mr. Handy determined from Mr. Metzger that State law spoke to a boundary of approximately 150 feet away from the river. In Eugene-Springfield the boundary frequently expanded to encompass publicly- owned land that was past that distance. He believed that a distance of 150 feet from the river was the general boundary but could not guarantee that was the case in every situation.

Mr. Pishioneri asked what the viaduct would look like. Mr. Metzger said two basic design approaches were being considered but the design was not yet finalized. For the most part, the viaduct would be within the Oregon Department of Transportation right-of-way. He described the two approaches being discussed.

Ms. Lundberg thought a bicycle path was much needed in the area and its location next to the river would provide bicycle riders with a more enjoyable aesthetic experience. She supported the amendment and wanted to see the elected officials move the project on to the next stage.

Ms. Taylor advocated for leaving the public record open.

Ms. Taylor, seconded by Mr. Zelenka, moved to leave the public record open for seven days. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Handy, seconded by Mr. Stewart, moved to hold a third reading and deliberations on October 21, and to hold the record open for seven days. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Ralston, seconded by Ms. Pishioneri, moved to leave the public record open for seven days and hold a public hearing on October 10. The motion passed unanimously.

2. PUBLIC HEARING: An Ordinance Amending Chapter I, Introduction and Purpose Section of the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan by Adding Separate Population Forecasts for the Cities of Springfield and Eugene for the Period 2010-2030 and Including the Period 2030-2035, and Adopting a Severability Clause

Springfield Planning Manager Greg Mott was present for the item and identified a discrepancy in the materials

adopted by the three planning commissions and the language adopted by the board for the Lane County projections in June 2009. The text adopted by the board was not carried forward into the text considered by the commissions. He reviewed the discrepancies involved and apologized for the oversight.

Responding to a question from Mr. Ralston, Mr. Mott described the process staff used to extrapolate the population projections from the data prepared for Lane County by Portland State University.

Responding to a question from Mayor Piercy about whether the discrepancies represented a barrier to moving forward, City Attorney Emily Jerome indicated the elected officials could proceed with acknowledgement of the errors.

Responding to a question from Mr. Handy about the impact of the discrepancy on the action taken by Lane County, Mr. Spartz did not perceive that anything that had been done affected that action, and referred the question to Mr. Vorhees, who concurred. He indicated that Lane County would have to revise its ordinance if the board accepted the intervening years and text mentioned by Mr. Mott. Mr. Handy indicated he did not object to having the matter before the board again.

Mr. Mott indicated that metropolitan staff had also notified all the mayors and city managers of Lane County's ten small cities, as well as those on the various jurisdictions' interested parties' lists, of the proposed breakout of the years. Ed Moore from the Department of Land Conservation and Development had indicated support but he had heard from no one else.

Mr. Brown observed that he had reviewed a 1968 document prepared by the Eugene Renewal Agency that predicted that the urban population of the Willamette Valley would equal that of the San Francisco Bay area by 1985. He acknowledged that the community must make such predictions but suggested that they be taken with a "grain of salt."

Mayor Leiken noted that the document mentioned by Mr. Brown was written prior to the adoption of Senate Bill 100, and suggested it would be interesting to know what would have happened in the absence of that legislation.

Mr. Handy requested a one-page document summarizing the elected officials' next steps.

Mayor Leiken opened the public hearing, acknowledging that no one had signed up to speak.

Mayor Leiken thanked the planning commissioners for their recommendation.

Mr. Stewart, seconded by Mr. Handy, moved to hold the third reading for the item on September 30, and leave the record open for seven days. The motion passed unanimously, 3:0.

The Springfield and Eugene councils agreed to hold the record open for seven days.

3. ACTION: Consideration of Alternative Public Hearing Process Regarding TransPlan Planning

Eugene Senior Planner Kurt Yeiter introduced the item, reporting that the current version of TransPlan projected that the community would reach a population of 296,000 in 2015. The community had not grown that rapidly. The cities had initiated amendments to TransPlan and the Metro Plan to reflect the lower, slower growth rates at the time the two cities were pursuing the safe harbor approach. He recommended that to avoid restarting the process, staff recommend the elected officials to adopt a motion that established a process that allowed them to consider new evidence, including evidence related to that issue, when a joint public hearing was scheduled.

Mr. Ralston, seconded by Mr. Pishioneri, moved to establish a process for proposed transportation

planning horizon amendments that allows new evidence at the governing body joint hearing and allows the governing bodies' decision to be based on the new evidence as well as the evidentiary record created before the planning commissions. The motion passed unanimously, 6:0

Mr. Zelenka, seconded by Mr. Poling, moved to establish a process for proposed transportation planning horizon amendments that allows new evidence at the governing body joint hearing and allows the governing bodies' decision to be based on the new evidence as well as the evidentiary record created before the planning commissions. The motion passed unanimously, 6:0.

Responding to a question from Mr. Handy, Mr. Yeiter said the work plan approved by the Land Conservation and Development Commission established a multi-year schedule of tasks that would result in the update of TransPlan (regional transportation system plan) and the Metro Plan. The work plan was scheduled to be completed by 2013.

Mr. Handy noted that the elected officials had discussed whether the next regional transportation plan update would be a major or minor update. It appeared that the work plan might help reconcile some of the different planning horizons for local planning documents, which he thought would be helpful. He asked how else the work plan would impact policy choices related to the integration of land use and transportation. Speaking to the question of integration, Mr. Yeiter noted the existing disconnect between the update schedules for federal and local planning documents. He did not think that the next update would result in all plans being aligned for 20 years, but he anticipated that would occur with the next update. He said the slower actual population growth rate bought the local area some time to achieve that integration. He anticipated that the two planning processes would inform each other, and noted that locally, staff was working with ODOT to integrate local processes with ODOT's federal planning obligations.

Mr. Stewart, seconded by Mr. Handy, moved to establish a process for proposed transportation planning horizon amendments that allows new evidence at the governing body joint hearing and allows the governing bodies' decision to be based on the new evidence as well as the evidentiary record created before the planning commissions. The motion passed unanimously, 3:0.

Mayor Leiken adjourned the meeting of the Springfield City Council at 7:15 p.m.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting of the Eugene City Council at 7:15 p.m.

Mr. Sorenson adjourned the meeting of the Lane Board of County Commissioners at 7:15 p.m.

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)

MINUTES

City Council
McNutt Room—Eugene City Hall
777 Pearl Street—Eugene, Oregon

September 23, 2009
Noon

PRESENT: Alan Zelenka, Betty Taylor, Chris Pryor, George Poling, Jennifer Solomon, Andrea Ortiz, Mike Clark, George Brown, members.

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy convened the process session of the Eugene City Council. She reviewed and revised the order of the agenda.

**A. WORK SESSION:
City Council Process Session**

Topic: Council Officer Succession

Mr. Pryor observed that the current officer succession process worked one way if there was frequent turnover in councilors and another way if there were councilors who served more than one term. He wanted to ensure that there was a policy for officer succession that would not create any acrimony. He believed the current practice for rotation was unclear for councilors who had longevity on the council.

Mayor Piercy thought the officers were elected on a rotation basis, with the exception of councilors who had served for less than two years.

Mr. Pryor stressed that his desire was to establish a formula and avoid a “popularity contest.”

Ms. Ortiz commented that she did not want to base a policy change on a situation that happened prior to her tenure on the council.

City Attorney Glenn Klein stated that the council could structure the code so that it was formulaic and then if a future council did not like it, they could change it.

Mayor Piercy ascertained that there was general consensus to retain the current formula.

Mr. Pryor added that he also would prefer for officers not to be elected based on their political orientation. He thought it would be better to maintain a strictly formulaic approach to officer elections.

Topic: Attending Council Meetings Via Conference Phone

Ms. Solomon stated that there had been times when various members had attended meetings via telephone. She said it had been hard to hear and sometimes councilors did not mute their phones when not talking. She related that since then Mayor and Council Support Manager Beth Forrest had found a bridge line that worked better. She considered it to be very important to be present and to be selective about one's absences. She did not want to set a limit as to how many times a councilor could participate by phone per quarter, but she wanted to strongly encourage councilors to be in attendance.

Mr. Clark echoed that sentiment.

Topic: Citizen Involvement Committee

Mr. Zelenka recalled that when the Citizen Involvement Committee (CIC) had been disbanded by council order, the function had been delegated to the Planning Commission. He was wondering if furthering citizen input opportunities was an important enough topic to reinstate the committee. He suggested that it should meet perhaps once per quarter to discuss how to garner input from more than the people who most frequently provided public testimony.

Ms. Solomon believed that the councilors did reach out to the community. She considered the council to serve as the CIC. She said if the council was going to discuss ways to reach out, then the council should engage in that conversation. She did not think the work should be passed off to another committee because that would cause more staff work, more minutes, more meeting organization, and "more cookies." She thought technology had changed a lot since the CIC work had been delegated to the Planning Commission. There were a lot of surveys in the community and there was tremendous online access for citizens. Additionally, she pointed out that each of the councilors were out in the wards encouraging people to participate. She was not interested in reconstituting the CIC.

Ms. Ortiz wondered how they would measure, if there were another CIC, whether there was more input from the community. She remembered that the CIC had not resonated in the west side; she could not recall anyone bringing it up prior to her tenure on the council. She believed that the City did a lot to garner community involvement. She agreed that it was part of the councilors' charge to be a conduit to the community.

Ms. Taylor had served as the council representative on the CIC before it had disbanded. She noted that the committee had not met every month. She related that "one good thing" about the committee was that its membership included two people from the voter pool. She averred that those people learned things about the City that they would not have learned otherwise and some of them had gone on to become involved in other things. She had thought the CIC was a good thing. She recalled that the CIC had to approve the departmental advisory committees (DAC). She said if it looked like a DAC was weighted too much in one direction or if it had left out an important segment of representation, the CIC could change it.

Mr. Pryor commented that he could see both sides. He was interested in how the council made good decisions and to what degree the public involvement portion could work. He shared the concern that the council did not have the best information to make informed decisions in every case. He believed that much

of this had to do with which way the flow of information went. He questioned whether the public should be involved in helping councilors make decisions or involved in informing them on decisions and how this would work. He observed that there was a group of people that, for one reason or another, was the group of people they most often saw participating in the public process. He averred that this was to their credit, but it did not represent the entire community. He did not want to confuse people into thinking that they were participating in the decision-making process; they were in an advisory position only. He did not know that it would take a committee to engineer more public input, but he agreed that it would take a larger process than the one that was currently in place.

Mr. Clark observed that process sessions were meetings on how to have better meetings. He felt that a CIC was a committee on how to have better committees. He agreed that the council needed a broader measure of the community values. He thought it was staff's job to measure the community sentiment, community involvement, and community values when it was a part of what the council needed to make better decisions. He said it was their job to engage the community in the process. He was not sure they should create a committee to do so.

Mr. Poling believed that they were doing a better job of getting information to the community, but the problem lay in that a lot of people would not get involved until an action would affect them specifically. He recalled complaints that the Metropolitan Wastewater Management Commission (MWMC) had received when he had served on it regarding the early morning meeting time. He related that the MWMC had responded by holding a meeting at a later time and had publicized it but only one member of the public had shown up. He also noted that the Harlow Neighborhood Association was experiencing difficulty in recruiting officers. He believed that people would not get involved "until the very last minute." He was not in favor of adding another committee to the roster.

Mr. Brown believed it was a worthy idea, but he agreed with Ms. Solomon that the councilors could attend neighborhood association meetings and work to "get the word out." He had also witnessed that participation was low unless something specifically important was happening. He suggested that when people showed up at meetings, it presented an opportunity to encourage them to participate on boards, committees, etc. He had observed that there was a high percentage of representation from Wards 1, 2, and 3 on them.

Mr. Zelenka agreed with Mr. Pryor. He said the goal would be to get more and broader input into City Council decisions. He did not think the Planning Commission was the right place to assign the work of the CIC as their workload was already great and they did not really have "ownership" of it. He commented that the department advisory committees seemed very distant from the council processes. He rarely knew what they were doing and did not see how they should impact the council decision-making process. He thought one way to address it would be to form a task force to increase citizen involvement in the short term.

Ms. Taylor pointed out that not everyone had a computer or intended to purchase a computer. She said information that was available on the Web was not available to them. She opined that giving the work of the CIC to the Planning Commission was akin to eliminating it, because the Planning Commission had enough to do. She noted that the County was holding classes for people to educate them about County services. She thought the City should also hold classes about each of its departments over the course of eight or ten weeks. She averred that the more people knew about government, the less likely they were to be afraid of it.

Assistant City Manager Sarah Medary related that a City employee was enrolled in the County's classes. She said they had come up with an idea for a "City College" to provide this type of education for area residents.

Mayor Piercy perceived that there had been a huge change in the way the City tried to garner public input and to educate the community. She cited the most recent meeting, at which a relatively broad group of people had provided testimony. She thought they should reach out for public input in "every place." She was pleased at the work that City staff and its elected officials had been doing to increase it.

Topic: Use of Council Office Space (Guidelines, Courtesies)

Mr. Pryor understood that City staff could use more space. He wondered if the City Council really needed the amount of space it was allocated. He did not need a desk, though he acknowledged that some needed one. He thought this might present an opportunity to consolidate. He added that the meeting room had been invaluable to him.

Mr. Brown and Ms. Ortiz indicated that they used the office and preferred to retain their desks.

City Manager Jon Ruiz said no decision was warranted at this point as the need for more office space was not great at present.

Mr. Zelenka stated that he used the space and he especially liked the conference room. He observed that as new councilors were elected, the use of the space would fluctuate and they could not predict who would use the City Hall office and who would use a home office.

Ms. Ortiz suggested they strike the topic from the list. There were no objections to it.

Topic: Meeting Safety

Ms. Ortiz said she was concerned about a possible safety issue. She recalled a shooting in a council chamber in California that had happened several years earlier. While she did not believe that this would actually happen in Eugene, she wanted to be aware of this possibility. She preferred not to have a police officer present, however, and wondered if the Council Chamber was equipped with a panic button.

Ms. Medary stated that some staff members present had the number for the Eugene Police Department (EPD) watch commander programmed in their cell phones. She felt that this was like having a panic button. She said when she had spoken to councilors about this concern, most indicated they did not want an officer to be tied up sitting in the room. She thought that in a situation in which they had an individual come to several council meetings who was "kind of scary," it might be wise to increase security measures.

Ms. Ortiz still felt that it would be a good idea to install a panic button that was directly linked to the 911 call center.

Mr. Zelenka had not been very concerned about this issue until he had watched some of the recent town hall meetings and seen some of the behavior exhibited by people on “both sides of the fence.” He was not certain a panic button would work, given that the watch commander was only a short distance away. He noted that the proximity of watch command could change if the police facility moved to the Country Club Road location. He did not think they needed to have an officer present.

Mr. Clark remarked that how one defined outrageous behavior might be an interesting conversation. He believed the council had seen quite a bit of outrageous behavior that matched or exceeded what they had seen on television nationally. He agreed that they needed some mechanism to address the concern, though he would not want to take police resources from active patrol. He was not concerned so much for the council as for the situation in which someone with a disorder and/or a grievance who would come into a public setting with 50 people present. He said a means to address this quickly and effectively was important.

Mr. Pryor commented that everything would be fine until it was not. He recalled the school shooting that had happened in Springfield and how shocking that had been. He said the issue lay in how they should treat this “everything is fine until it is not” situation. He stated that having the watch commander a short distance away was not much different from having that person be a long way off because once someone pulled out a gun it only took seconds to cause harm. He observed that even having an officer in the room was no guarantee of a level of security. He noted that some places had installed metal detectors. He said he was not necessarily advocating for the installation of metal detectors. He thought a panic button would help to create a false sense of security, but would not actually make things more secure. He said there had been times he had felt concerned and he had been discouraged by the lack of civility he had witnessed. But he was not certain what to do about it that was reasonable, there would be no simple solution.

Mr. Poling observed that a watch commander alone would not be able to mitigate an extreme situation. He shared Mr. Clark’s concern for the safety of everyone that would be attending a meeting. He was not advocating for metal detectors or uniformed officers, but he thought they needed some kind of planning. As for dangerous behavior, he had witnessed some people working themselves into a frenzy in the back of the room before they came up to speak. He believed there was only a short distance between outrageous behavior and dangerous behavior. He did not want to scare people away from the meetings or to exclude anyone, but he thought the staff needed to be aware of what was going on around them, as did the councilors. He said if one of the executive staff members saw something that did not feel right they should have the authority and responsibility to send a note up to Mr. Ruiz or to suggest that a recess be called.

Ms. Taylor thought having a recess was a good idea. She added that she did not believe things had become worse.

Ms. Medary suggested, as an interim step, that they invite Crime Prevention Specialist Tod Schneider to a work session and an evening meeting to assess the situation.

Mayor Piercy approved of that idea and of the proposal to call a recess if a potential threat was perceived to be in the room. She related that she had experienced the first unnerving situation in her political life in the past year and she felt the response had been a little slow.

Kristie Hammitt, Executive Director of the Central Services Department, stated that the Municipal Court had worked through a lot of these issues and had some systems in place. She said they had conducted training for the judges that could be beneficial to the councilors.

Mayor Piercy said it would be good to be reminded of basic things such as getting down on the floor if a situation looked threatening.

Mr. Poling remembered that the council used to always take a break during its Monday evening meetings. He did not think it would be unusual to call for a break.

Topic: Consulting with Council before Authorizing a Public Opinion Poll

Mr. Brown stated that they served as City Councilors and as the Urban Renewal Agency and had fiduciary responsibilities associated with this. He felt the council should have been consulted about the survey that the Urban Renewal Agency had authorized. He noted that the survey had cost \$25,000. He was not concerned so much about the cost as he was that the council had not been informed. He had learned of it from a co-worker.

Ms. Ortiz disagreed. She said there had been approximately a dozen polls conducted since she had begun her tenure on the City Council. She believed it was an effective way to conduct outreach. She did not want to become involved with the process at that level of detail. She had not seen the executives stray very greatly from the direction they were given.

Mr. Pryor considered this to be about the interface between policy and operations. He believed that conducting a poll was a part of operations and the council was a policy body. He agreed that the council should be informed if the City or the Urban Renewal Agency had an interaction with the public, but he did not want to be involved in the design of it.

Mr. Clark agreed with Mr. Pryor. He would want to know about a poll before it was administered. He recalled that he had learned from the local newspaper about one. He added his observation that sometimes subtleties drove questions in a survey. He believed it was important to clearly understand what outcome was desired before engaging in this type of outreach.

Mr. Zelenka thought it was good to conduct polls. He was not in favor of requiring the council to approve of surveys, but he wanted to be able to discuss the policy.

Mr. Brown did not want to micromanage the process. He believed that there had been policy implications in the Urban Renewal Agency poll and that policy implications should require council discussion. He thought the questions might have been a little different had a couple of the councilors participated in it.

Ms. Taylor agreed that the council should be aware of such a survey before it happened. She expressed skepticism about polls. She said most people had answering machines and caller identification and would not take a call from someone they did not know. Because this would restrict who would take the call, she

questioned the validity of polls.

Ms. Ortiz commended Mr. Ruiz and staff for doing a good job of getting information to the council ahead of the newspapers.

Mr. Ruiz said the City conducted a lot of polls and used the information “constantly.” He had thought the policy direction staff had received was to have a public process and public input. He related that, as part of following this directive, staff had engaged a company to conduct a poll. He felt that it could cause concern if the council started wordsmithing a survey because it could make the survey more political. He had no qualms about informing the council that staff would be conducting a poll.

Mr. Zelenka did not think anyone was interested in wordsmithing. He added that he did not believe a poll could be unbiased because they were “always trying to get at something.” He averred that where this intersected with policy would be where it became part of the council’s purview. He thought determining what they were trying to “get at” through a survey would be a legitimate conversation to have.

Topic: Process to Honor Staff and Community Members

Mr. Zelenka related that he had wanted to honor some of the people from his neighborhood but he had not known how to undertake such an activity. He observed that there were a lot of “cool” things happening. He thought they should have a formal process to celebrate what the community did well.

Mayor Piercy related that a lot of people requested proclamations. She said they needed to be careful not to grant this to too many people, though it would be good to find a way to honor them nonetheless.

Mr. Clark agreed. He thought a process for honoring the good things would be an appropriate way to celebrate them. He noted that he kept a stack of stationery and cards in order to send people in his ward notes of congratulations, etc.

Ms. Taylor observed that such things could be brought up during the ‘Items’ portion of the work sessions.

Topic: Maximizing Use of Council Work Session Time

Ms. Medary stated that this item had arisen from comments made during work sessions regarding the different levels of need for information different councilors had before starting a discussion on an item. She said staff also wanted feedback on the amounts of time allotted to various items and the materials provided to councilors.

Mayor Piercy commented that even if she had read information and was familiar with it, there was an aspect of presentations that sought to educate the public.

Ms. Ortiz wanted to address this topic and the next two, meeting minutes and use of new tools and technology, at the same time. She had liked that one previous meeting had been broken into a 20-minute item and a longer item for discussion. She related that a very large packet of information had been provided

to councilors related to the Joint Elected Officials meeting of the previous night. She appreciated receiving smaller updates on issues to remain current. She noted that information related to planning was dense and detail-oriented and sometimes hard to digest, but was very relevant to the community. She liked the public record and the way the minutes were being processed and provided to the councilors. Regarding an email distribution list, she wondered if the City Council could create a council newsletter. She thought this would be one way to call out the contributions of members of the community as well.

Mr. Zelenka also liked having shorter items mixed into the agenda. He agreed with Ms. Ortiz about receiving smaller updates. He said he would like more short meetings with the various commissions and committees that worked on City issues. He pointed out that the councilors all served on committees and commissions as well. He thought it would be beneficial if the councilors could provide some sort of report or update from them at work sessions.

Mayor Piercy suggested that this could be integrated into the regular council meeting. She observed that the committees often worked on things having to do with big policy issues in the community. She thought a portion of the regular meeting could be set aside for such updates.

Mr. Brown had been frustrated by the lengthy Powerpoint presentations that had been made regarding urban renewal and the police facility. He felt that not enough time had been left for discussion. He believed that all of the councilors came prepared and that by the time an item was brought back for the second time another Powerpoint presentation would not be necessary. He agreed that it was good to bring the public up to speed on the background information, but he thought that unless a Powerpoint presentation was significantly different from its first iteration they should curtail them.

Mr. Ruiz commented that one reason for giving a Powerpoint presentation that had been basically provided at a previous meeting was to review information.

Mayor Piercy remarked that it was a difficult balance.

Ms. Solomon cited the transportation issues they had been working through and observed that every presentation had been similar but the councilors were still “asking the same questions.” She had no problem with seeing a Powerpoint presentation more than once.

Mayor Piercy said the challenge lay in allowing enough time for the council to have a real conversation about an issue in addition to the information portion of the meeting.

Mr. Brown remarked that he wished they could engage in more process sessions. He said when a meeting was 90 minutes long and the Powerpoint took 20 minutes of it, and councilors were only allowed to speak in three-minute bites, it impacted the time for discussion.

Ms. Ortiz wondered how much time other city councils spent on running their cities. She asked if the council had ever re-evaluated how much time they spent on the City’s business. She averred that the Eugene public deserved as much background information as possible.

Ms. Taylor recalled that work sessions used to be two hours long and agendas never included action items. Regarding Powerpoint presentations, she commented that they meant the council was reading on a screen what it would be reading in the packets. She added that she also felt hampered by the three-minute time limit.

Mayor Piercy surmised that some of these issues deserved more discussion. She thanked the councilors for the good conversation and asked them to give feedback on how they would like to continue it.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the Council Process Session at 1:32 p.m.

The following topics were deferred for lack of time:

- *City Council Meeting Minutes (Detailed vs. Summary vs. Video)*
- *New Tools/Technology for Agenda Materials, Meeting Records and Minutes, Goals and Issues Tracking*
- *Mayor/City Council Email Distribution List*
- *Inclusion of Ordinances showing Legislative/Grammatical Changes in Agenda Packets*

Respectfully submitted,

Jon Ruiz,
City Manager

(Recorded by Ruth Atcherson)