

MINUTES

Eugene City Council
McNutt Room--City Hall

March 4, 1996
5:30 p.m.

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

The meeting of March 4, 1996, of the Eugene City Council was called to order by Her Honor Mayor Ruth Bascom.

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

Mr. Laue moved, seconded by Ms. Swanson Gribskov, to approve the order of the agenda. The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

II. CHECKPOINT: GROWTH MANAGEMENT STUDY

Jim Croteau, Planning Division, introduced the topic, noting this was the first follow-up meeting to the joint February 7 City Council/Planning Commission meeting on the Growth Management Study (GMS).

Mr. Hornbuckle arrived at the meeting.

Mr. Croteau presented the scope of the GMS (identified as Scope 1+), which he said was generally adopted by the council at that meeting. The study, he said, will include the following: the rate, timing, location, type, and density of growth; managing the impacts of growth, specifically on certain other issues such as public safety and recreational/cultural services. Mr. Croteau indicated that the Planning Commission was just beginning to outline areas of concern and using the confirmation survey requested by the council. He reviewed the Gantt chart displayed on the wall depicting the commission's meeting schedule, the council's decision points, and the public involvement process, including a public hearing on the draft document after the first of the year. Mr. Croteau said City Council candidates would be invited to attend the deliberation sessions. He asked the council to approve the study process and time line.

Ms. Keller asked for more detail on the study's fall phase and said including potential councilors would be very productive. She expressed concern about the budget and asked for an opportunity to discuss it before a motion is made.

Mr. Boles said the proposed working schedule is the best possible, but some time may be captured in the summer around the alternative strategy construction. As the product definition is narrowed, he said, it may be possible to capture some time.

Ms. Nathanson expressed concern that insufficient time has been allowed for revising and preparing analysis for the tabloid following the public workshops for adding strategy options. She wondered if some time could be taken from the seven weeks allotted for preparing the tabloid itself. Mr. Croteau said the public workshops would be used to solicit alternative strategies as well as provide information. He said that the tabloid production time includes a required three-week print and mail period and a two-to three-week period for people to have time to digest the material before the community forum.

Ms. Swanson Gribskov cited her concern about the budget and asked for more detail on the citywide tabloid mailing and use of a consultant. Mr. Croteau confirmed that staff would contract with consultant Ed Weeks, University of Oregon. He added that the tabloid would be mailed to persons on an interested parties list, with additional tabloids distributed en masse through access points throughout the community.

Mr. Laue moved, seconded by Ms. Swanson Gribskov, to approve the budget request for the Growth Management Study for \$212,000 from FY96 Contingency Funds, as outlined in Attachment C of the March 4, 1996, council packet.

At Ms. Swanson Gribskov's request, Mr. Croteau reviewed Attachment C, adding that the actual expenditure would depend on the scope of work decided upon in the next month or so.

Mr. Hornbuckle left the meeting.

Addressing Ms. Keller's concern regarding the budget, Mr. Boles said this was a budgeted work item in the FY96 budget for the Planning Commission, so much of the money has already been authorized. He explained that the council was being asked to ratify the original authorization, including incremental changes that have occurred. He added that the council had agreed with the Planning Commission about the level of citizen involvement desired, and now balked at the cost associated with that. The council, he said, may have to reduce the other components.

Mr. Torrey suggested tabling the motion to March 6, pending receipt of more details on the budget.

Ms. Nathanson said that what really matters is what has been spent. She recalled that in a two-year period, \$110,000 was expected to be spent on "community planning." The difference between that and this project is the topic of discussion, she added, and the council has to decide if this work, which will impact the entire community, is worth the expense.

Addressing a question from Ms. Nathanson, Mr. Croteau said pre-screening and

pre-training of facilitators, material preparation, pre-testing, and evaluating the process account for the cost of public involvement.

In response to a question from Mr. Farr, Mr. Croteau said the \$110,000 figure was for this particular project, but some of that would likely be spent on other long-range planning projects. Mr. Farr asked for an itemization of the projects being undertaken and their costs to assist the council in ranking its priorities.

Mr. Torrey moved, seconded by Mr. Boles, to postpone the item to March 6, allowing for limited debate.

Mr. Boles said the council has never asked for a detailed budget forecast for every item on any of its studies. He said the information was provided in advance to allow for those councilors with concerns to contact staff.

Mayor Bascom asked staff to distribute budget information by courier on March 5 in preparation for the council's March 6 discussion, adding that additional concerns should be communicated to staff.

Ms. Keller supported the motion and asked for information on what was approved previously.

The motion to postpone passed unanimously, 7:0.

Mr. Laue moved, seconded by Ms. Swanson Gribbskov, to approve the proposed process and time line for the Growth Management Study as outlined on the Gantt chart included in the March 4, 1996, council packet and shown in summary detail on the wall chart.

Ms. Keller reiterated her concern with the budget and said she could not support the motion until her questions are answered: what were the original projections and costs and how is it possible that another \$212,000 is needed.

Ms. Nathanson said she appreciated the commission's and staff's cost reduction effort in limiting the tabloid mailing and encouraged more of the same.

Mr. Boles said that given the level of concern, he advises this be postponed as well.

Mr. Boles moved, seconded by Ms. Keller, to postpone the motion to March 6.

Mr. Laue expressed concern that the delay would disrupt the Planning Commission's meeting schedule.

The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

III. TRANSPLAN UPDATE STATUS REPORT

Jan Childs, Planning Division Manager, introduced the topic, reviewing Attachment A (the Transportation Triangle) and Attachment B (a summary of the alternative plan concepts). The new material for this discussion, she said, is found in Attachments C, D, and E. Ms. Childs introduced Tom Schwetz, Peter Watt, and Lee Shoemaker, Lane Council of Governments (LCOG), to make the presentation.

A. Overview

Mr. Schwetz said the presentation would include the following: an overview of the evaluation process; the public involvement process; an overview of the technical evaluation; the model; and the 1994 household survey. In the next six months, he said, there would be an evaluation of alternative plan concepts that would come back to the council as a Planning Commission recommendation on a direction to take with the draft plan.

Mr. Schwetz said the six resident focus group forums had been completed and they formed the basis for the community survey scheduled for April. The survey will seek feedback from the community on specific strategies. Other public process activities include two public workshops on the alternative concepts and a third stakeholders symposium leading to a set of Planning Commission public hearings. Mr. Schwetz displayed a flow chart outlining how those activities result in a draft plan by fall of 1996.

B. Evaluation

Mr. Schwetz said the evaluation focuses on the value of the alternatives to the community and tries to identify the desirability of one alternative over another, providing the impact of policy proposals, major tradeoffs, areas of uncertainty, and areas for further refinement.

Mr. Schwetz said he thought of TransPlan as a "public investment document," involving multiple objectives and complex interrelated systems. In evaluating regional transportation land use alternatives, he said, staff identified the following key questions to provide the basic framework: 1) is the alternative technically sound; 2) is it environmentally sensitive; 3) is it financially feasible; and 4) is it equitable. He said the following criteria was used to try and answer the questions: can we measure it; is it an effective means to communicate to policy makers the impacts of the various alternatives; is it comprehensive; is it required by State or Federal legislation; and are the measures mutually exclusive,

Addressing a question from Mr. Boles, Mr. Schwetz said public officials will have an opportunity to review, edit, and modify alternative strategies.

C. The Model

Mr. Schwetz defined a travel forecasting model as "taking a forecast of growth and seeing how that manifests itself in the way of travel demand, given

certain assumptions about transportation supply and travel costs, and possible changes in land use as well." He added that modeling is done to be able to predict the effects of travel demand from population/ employment growth, changing land use patterns, transportation system changes, and travel demand management policies. He said the model is able to test variations in those things and provides useful, objective input into the decision-making process. It is one of several tools to the evaluation process.

Mr. Boles raised the concern that the City, through its growth management strategy, was using one set of projections while TransPlan was using another. Ms. Childs said that the base projections were the same for both.

Mr. Schwetz described how the model worked: identify a land use allocation based on dwelling units and employment following a four-step process of generating, distributing, assigning a transportation mode, and assigning those trips to the system. The model provides information on alternative improvements and identifies alternative plan concepts. Mr. Schwetz said that the model's goal has been to improve the calibration--how well the model reflects reality.

D. 1994 Household Activity Survey

Mr. Schwetz said the 1994 household activity survey results had been shared with the Metropolitan Planning Committee (MPC) and the Joint Planning Commissions Committee (JPCC). He said the survey provides information for land use measures and demand management strategies. He described the survey process, noting it provided detail on over 27,000 trips. Mr. Schwetz reported on the results, noting a trip rate of 9-10 per household, higher than the 6-7 national average. He attributed the higher local rate to the accuracy and high detail of the survey. Mr. Schwetz said the survey provided a rich database and a more comprehensive report is planned.

Ms. Childs reminded the council that there would be a public information meeting presenting the results of the evaluation work and the third stakeholders symposium in May, followed by review and recommendations for a draft plan from the commissions, and adoption by officials in early summer.

In response to a question from Mr. Boles, Mr. Schwetz confirmed that the vast majority of trips are within five miles of home and at relatively slow speeds. Addressing a follow-up question, staff will pursue making the results of the survey available to the public.

Ms. Keller cautioned against disregarding things simply because they do not meet the measurability criteria.

The meeting adjourned at 7:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda H. Norris

Linda H. Norris
City Manager pro tem

(Recorded by Yolanda Paule)
cc113004.036

MINUTES
Eugene City Council
Council Chamber--City Hall

March 4, 1996
7:30 p.m.

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

COUNCILORS ABSENT: Kevin Hornbuckle

Her Honor Mayor Ruth Bascom called the meeting to order.

I. PUBLIC FORUM

Mayor Bascom reviewed the rules of the public forum and opened the forum.

Dave Sweet, 651 East 32nd, accused the Mayor and councilors of breaking State law and asked for an explanation.

Daniel Ernst, no address given, recited a poem about the right to grow cannabis.

David Hinkley, 1308 Jefferson, speaking as a member of the Jefferson Area Neighbors, spoke about the Fair Board proposal to change access routes to the fairgrounds. Mr. Hinkley expressed concern about how the new access road might impact the intersection of 13th Avenue and Jefferson Street. He asked for more details and analysis before the proposal is approved.

There being no other requests to speak, the mayor closed the public forum.

Mr. Boles stated that he had been contacted by the Jefferson Area Neighbors and had asked the interim City Manager for a report detailing what plan is guiding the proposal. Ms. Keller said she had been on a walk with the neighbors and had asked the Fair Manager for a written copy of the proposal.

II. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Approval of the City Council Minutes of January 22, 1996, Dinner Work Session; January 22, 1996, Meeting; January 31, 1996, Lunch Work Session; and February 7, 1996, Joint Meeting with Planning Commission

B. Approval of Intergovernmental Relations Committee Minutes of February 23, 1996

Ms. Keller pulled the minutes of February 7, 1996, Joint Meeting with Planning Commission. Mayor Bascom pulled the Minutes of the Intergovernmental Relations Committee February 23, 1996. These were added to the end of the agenda.

Mr. Laue moved, seconded by Ms. Swanson Gribkov, to approve the remainder of the consent calendar. The motion carried unanimously, 7:0.

III. PUBLIC HEARING: CITY OF EUGENE SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET #2

Ms. Swanson Gribkov confirmed that a reference to September 1996 on page 97 should be corrected to read September 1995. Ms. Keller asked why the Tugman Park restoration was not a risk management project and in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP). Warren Wong, Administrative Services, responded that the project was not an eligible cost for the risk management fund as the City did not insure for environmental losses, and was not in the adopted CIP because the final mitigation cost was not known when the program was developed. Ms. Keller asked what park sites would be acquired with the \$700,000 revenue increase from Systems Development Charges (SDCs). Chris Andersen, Public Works Director, responded that a memo included in last week's packet outlined the targeted sites. Ms. Keller asked that council officers schedule a work session for discussion of specific sites prior to moving forward with acquisitions. Ms. Keller asked about the appropriation to replace the phone system. Mr. Wong reported that the telephone switch for the City and Lane County had to be replaced due to increased usage and the age of the current equipment.

Ms. Nathanson pointed out that the SDC revenue was for park development as well as acquisition, and agreed that she would like to discuss it further. Ms. Nathanson also asked for details about the \$2 million allocation for energy conservation projects. Mr. Wong agreed to develop a report for the council, adding that the projects are expected to recover costs through energy savings. Ms. Nathanson also asked about expenses related to rebuilding the Public Works Maintenance Administrative Office. She asked whether the planned facility analysis would include this facility prior to rebuilding. Ms. Andersen responded that the need for the building was immediate. Ms. Norris added that staff would be coming back to council with a proposal for a complete facility report at some point.

Mayor Bascom opened the public hearing.

Dave Sweet objected to the allocation for the Riverfront Research Park underpass.

There being no other requests to speak, Mayor Bascom closed the public hearing.

Res. No. 4479—A resolution adopting a Supplemental Budget; making appropriations for the City of Eugene for the Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 1995, and ending June 30, 1996.

Mr. Laue moved, seconded by Ms. Swanson Gribkov, to adopt the resolution.

Ms. Keller asked why the Riverfront Research Park underpass allocation was not part of the Urban Renewal budget. City Attorney Bill Gary explained that it was in the City jurisdiction.

The motion carried 6:1, with Ms. Keller voting in opposition.

Mayor Bascom adjourned the meeting of the City Council and convened a meeting of the Urban Renewal Agency.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING: URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET #2

Mayor Bascom opened the public hearing.

Dave Sweet, 651 East 32nd Avenue, testified that the urban renewal fund should be liquidated and objected to the expense of the Broadway-Willamette Plaza.

There being no other requests to speak, Mayor Bascom closed the public hearing.

Res. No. 984—A resolution adopting a Supplemental Budget; making appropriations for the Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Eugene for the Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 1995, and ending June 30, 1996.

Mr. Laue moved, seconded by Ms. Swanson Gribakov, to adopt the resolution. The motion carried 6:1, with Ms. Keller voting in opposition.

Mayor Bascom adjourned the meeting of the Urban Renewal Agency and reconvened the meeting of the Eugene City Council.

V. AUTHORIZATION FOR PERMIT RELATED POSITIONS

Marsha Miller, Planning and Development, reviewed the memo related to the request. She explained that four of the positions were backfill for Hyundai and funded by permit fees from the company, the remaining positions were needed due to increases in volume and complexity of permit applications, as well as increasing regulations. Ms. Miller said that the department had undergone analyses in the past, but the primary focus had been cost recovery. She said many recommendations from these studies had been implemented, but the need for a comprehensive study of the permit process was now needed to determine how to most effectively deliver services.

Mr. Laue moved, seconded by Ms. Swanson Gribakov, to approve the February 26, 1996, Budget Committee recommendation to hire up to 10 FTE in the Construction Permits Fund in FY96 to respond to increased permit activity, and to bring back long-term solutions for delivering building permit/plan check services at the next City Council trimester planning session.

Ms. Nathanson stated that the dollar value comparisons were not useful to her and asked if another indicator could be developed to assist in an evaluation of needs.

Mr. Boles called this proposal "bad public policy," and said he would not support it because: 1) it would promote pushing applications through which should not be pushed, and 2) it added staff prior to evaluating the system.

Mr. Torrey supported the proposal, calling it a reasonable approach to growth. He said the permit process should not be used to limit growth. Mr. Torrey also suggested bringing the members of the Building Construction Advisory Committee (BCAC) back together to discuss the current problem.

Mr. Farr asked for clarification on Mr. Boles' statement that this proposal would be the third or fourth study for the PIC. Ms. Norris responded that a study had been done during development of the PIC to determine the feasibility of a "one-stop" permit center. In addition, the BCAC had been formed to review the process and funding and to work on cost-recovery issues. Ms. Norris said one issue for review was whether the concept of a one-stop center still works. Mr. Farr supported the proposal, stating that the permit process was currently taking two to three times longer than what the City had promised, and that the costs of delays were being passed along to buyers.

Mr. Laue supported the proposal, noting that the last two building seasons had been the strongest in history. He disagreed with Ms. Nathanson that the dollar value indicator was not helpful.

Mr. Laue moved, seconded by Ms. Swanson Gribskov, to extend the time on this item by seven minutes. The motion carried 6:1, with Mr. Farr voting in opposition.

Ms. Keller expressed concern about the background information, indicating that the 20 percent administrative fee is connected to the City's cost, and is not "free and clear." She said there was a need to examine the 20 percent general fund allotment, stating "growth should pay for itself." Ms. Keller noted that statistics from 1985 were not good comparisons, since it was a recession year. She also expressed concern about the statement that staff reductions would occur if volume decreases. Ms. Keller suggested these issues be reviewed prior to considering the proposal.

The motion carried 5:2, with Mr. Boles and Ms. Keller voting in opposition.

VI. PACIFIC RESEARCH INSTITUTE'S CONFLICT RESOLUTION CENTER: APPLICATION OF ITS *A NEW COMMUNITY MEETING* (ANCM) CONFLICT RESOLUTION MODEL TO THE ISSUE OF GROWTH

Mr. Boles recused himself, declaring a conflict of interest due to income from Pacific Research Institute (PRI).

Greg Rikhoff, Human Rights Analyst, introduced the item, reviewing the memo information. He noted that Gayle Landt, from PRI was also available to answer questions.

Mr. Laue moved, seconded by Ms. Swanson Gribskov, to approve \$5,000 in in-kind

services in the form of meeting space and 20 hours of planning staff time over 20 months, to the Pacific Research Institute for meetings related to implementation of this program model.

Ms. Keller expressed support for the proposal, but cautioned Ms. Landt that the public could misunderstand the intentions of the process. Ms. Swanson Gribekov also expressed support, remarking that several community leaders had been impressed with the model.

The motion carried unanimously, 6:0.

Mr. Boles rejoined the council.

VII. APPROVAL OF MINUTES, FINDINGS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM HEARINGS OFFICIAL AND PASSAGE OF AN ORDINANCE LEVYING ASSESSMENTS ON LAMBERT STREET

Mr. Laue moved, seconded by Ms. Swanson Gribekov, to approve the Hearings Official's Minutes, findings, and recommendations of February 22, 1996. The motion carried unanimously, 7:0.

CB 4567—An ordinance levying assessments for paving, curbs, gutters, sanitary and storm sewers on Lambert Street from Broadview Street to 350 feet west and 250 feet north; and declaring an emergency.

Mr. Laue moved, seconded by Ms. Swanson Gribekov, that the bill, with unanimous consent of the council, be read the second time by council bill number only, and that enactment be considered at this time. The motion carried unanimously, 7:0.

Mr. Laue moved, seconded, by Ms. Swanson Gribekov, that the bill be approved and given final passage.

Ms. Nathanson thanked the staff for their work and resolution of issues concerning the cemetery.

The motion carried unanimously, 7:0, and became Ordinance 20040.

VIII. AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE INSTITUTION OF PROCEEDINGS IN EMINENT DOMAIN FOR THE ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY INTEREST ON AND ADJACENT TO WILLOW CREEK ROAD

Ms. Keller referred to the request for signalization from residents of Morley Loop, asking about the neighbors' concerns. She asked staff about potential truck traffic increases on Danebo due to the proposed realignment, particularly referring to substantial construction traffic over the next two years. Jeff Lanston, Acting City Engineer, responded that it was anticipated that truck traffic would use West 11th Avenue or Beltline Road. Ms. Keller disagreed, noting that the realignment would move

truck traffic directly onto Danebo, and suggested delaying action on this item until a later date.

Ms. Nathanson emphasized the safety hazards at the intersection, stating that citizens and local businesses had been requesting signalization for several years. She noted that many options for truck traffic were possible, and she urged the council to move forward on the proposal. Mr. Farr agreed, adding that the traffic speed exacerbated the problems. Mr. Boles asked how this intersection compared with other areas in the need for signals. Ms. Andersen responded that the 1994 list identified this intersection as the highest priority.

CB 4568—An ordinance authorizing the institution of proceedings in eminent domain for the acquisition of property interests on and adjacent to Willow Creek Road from West 11th Avenue to West 18th Avenue and on West 11th Avenue from Willow Creek Road to 400 feet east of Beltline Road.

Mr. Laue moved, seconded by Ms. Swanson Gribakov, that the bill, with unanimous consent of the council, be read the second time by council bill number only, and that enactment be considered at this time. The motion carried unanimously, 7:0.

Mr. Laue moved, seconded by Ms. Swanson Gribakov, that the bill be approved and given final passage.

Ms. Keller pointed out the ordinance was an authorization for property acquisition for the realignment, not for signalization. She said it was a mistake for the neighborhood.

Ms. Keller moved, seconded by Mr. Boles, to table the motion. The motion failed, 5:2, with Ms. Keller and Mr. Boles voting in favor.

Ms. Nathanson asked staff for a memo outlining what had been done to mitigate impacts on the neighborhood.

The motion carried 5:2, with Ms. Keller and Mr. Boles voting in opposition, and became Ordinance 20041.

IX.. ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE INSTITUTION OF PROCEEDINGS IN EMINENT DOMAIN FOR THE ACQUISITION OF EASEMENT IN THE SANTA CLARA AREA FOR BASINS "S" AND "U"

CB 4569—An ordinance authorizing the institution of proceedings in eminent domain for the acquisition of easement interests for sanitary sewers in the Santa Clara Area for Basins "S" and "U."

Mr. Laue moved, seconded by Ms. Swanson Gribakov, that the bill, with unanimous consent of the council, be read the second time by council bill number only, and that enactment be considered at this time. The motion carried unanimously, 7:0.

Mr. Laue moved, seconded by Ms. Swanson Gribakov, that the bill be approved and given final passage. The motion carried unanimously, 7:0, and became Ordinance 20042.

X. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Keller referred to a statement in the minutes of the February 7, 1996, Joint Meeting with Planning Commission in which Mr. Hornbuckle had stated that Ms. Keller left the meeting because she had not been called on. Ms. Keller said this statement was unfortunate because it was not the reason she left the meeting. She asked for that part of Mr. Hornbuckle's statement to be stricken from the minutes.

Mr. Laue moved, seconded by Ms. Swanson Gribakov, to approve the minutes of February 7, 1996, Joint Meeting with Planning Commission, as amended. The motion carried 6:1, with Mr. Farr voting in opposition.

XI. APPROVAL OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 23, 1996

Mayor Bascom noted that the issue of bus rapid transit had been of interest on her recent trip to Washington, D.C. She said the concept was considered "visionary" and that legislators were interested in the progress. Ms. Nathanson added that this issue had been raised by Lane Transit District (LTD) Board members in a recent joint meeting. She said she still hoped this concept would be evaluated in the context of TransPlan.

Mr. Laue moved, seconded by Ms. Swanson Gribakov, to approve the minutes of the Intergovernmental Relations Committee of February 23, 1996. The motion carried unanimously, 7:0.

The meeting adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda H. Norris

Linda H. Norris
City Manager pro tem

(Recorded by Hannah Bradford
cc73004.036