M I N U T E S

Eugene City Council
McNutt Room--City Hall

October 30, 1995
8 p.m.

COUNCILORS PRESENT: Nancy Nathanson, Tim Laue, Shawn Boles, Kevin Hornbuckle, Barbara Keller, Jim Torrey.

COUNCILORS ABSENT: Pat Farr, Laurie Swanson Gribskov.

The Special meeting of October 30, 1995, of the Eugene City Council was called to order by Council President Nancy Nathanson.

I. ANNUAL COMMUNITY SURVEY

Ms. Nathanson referred the council to the ballot containing the proposed special survey questions and associated council rankings and to Mr. Hornbuckle's proposed revisions. She reminded the council that it had been polled by staff on its interest in adding questions regarding the Ferry Street corridor, Internet use, bicycle facilities downtown, and the jurisdiction of Glenwood.

Ms. Keller said that balloting was no substitution for discussion. Mr. Torrey agreed. Mr. Boles said that balloting would continue to be a problem if the council did not reach agreement on how the ballots should be completed. Mr. Hornbuckle concurred. Ms. Nathanson said that ballots can be used successfully and effectively with the proper background information. Mr. Laue said that ballots can inform the council discussion but not take the place of a council decision.

Referring to the Ferry Street Bridge corridor questions, Mr. Hornbuckle advocated for a special survey including questions 1 and 2. Regarding City use of the Internet, Mr. Hornbuckle said that a separate survey may be appropriate. He did not support any survey questions regarding bicycles downtown or Glenwood.

Ms. Keller said that the Ferry Street corridor questions were too global and required information generally beyond the scope of the typical citizen. She questioned whether the council would receive thoughtful responses to its questions. Ms. Keller supported the generic nature of the survey questions related to the Internet. She noted that she had raised the issue of including survey questions regarding bicycle facilities downtown. Ms. Keller did not support inclusion of survey questions regarding Glenwood.

Mr. Laue agreed with Mr. Hornbuckle and Ms. Keller about the Ferry Street corridor questions. He agreed that the questions were quite specific and required considerable knowledge to answer. Regarding City use of the Internet, Mr. Laue said that he could support examination of that issue. He was neither in support of or against the questions regarding bicycle facilities. Mr. Laue did not support the inclusion of questions regarding Glenwood.

Responding to a question from Mr. Laue, Ms. Keller said that a survey including a question gauging support for a one-percent utility tax would, in essence, be conducted in the spring with an election.

Mr. Boles supported inclusion of the corridor questions. He also supported the inclusion of questions regarding the Internet, pointing out that if question 3 was to be useful then questions 1, 2, 4, and 5 must be answered by the respondents. He said that it would also be useful to know the penetration of computers in the community, and the relationship of personal computer usage to income level and education.

Mr. Torrey did not support inclusion of the Ferry Street corridor questions, agreeing with Ms. Keller's comments. He supported inclusion of questions 2 and 5 regarding the Internet. Mr. Torrey did not think questions regarding bicycle facilities or Glenwood were needed. He was interested in knowing whether the community supported the Centennial Car Camp.

Ms. Nathanson said that she perceived the value of gauging the community's reactions to features of the Ferry Street corridor; however, she said, the questions contained too much planning jargon. Ms. Nathanson supported the Internet questions. She said that if the survey contains questions regarding bicycle facilities, the council should add a question about locked bicycle parking facilities as well as attended lots. Ms. Nathanson did not favor including the Glenwood question in the survey.

Mr. Laue supported all the questions regarding the Internet except question 3.

Mr. Hornbuckle recommended that Mr. Boles be asked to work on the survey questions regarding the Internet. Mr. Boles endorsed the questions as framed, with the deletion of question 3.

The council agreed to drop the Ferry Street corridor questions, the Glenwood question, and to include questions 2 and 5 on the Internet. The council, with the exception of Mr. Boles, supported the inclusion of question 1 on the topic of bicycles if reworded (bold italicized text added) "If an attended ***or locked*** bicycle parking facility. . ."

Ms. Nathanson suggested that question 1 regarding the Internet be modified to read (bold italicized text added) ". . .events and services ***such as***. . ." Mr. Boles asked that it be reworded to let the respondent know that the reference was to computerized services. The council accepted the modifications.

Responding to a question from Ms. Keller, Barb Bellamy, Administrative Services Department, said that past surveys had contained up to four or five single-response questions. The survey was already quite long, which made it difficult to keep respondents on the telephone. The survey contained both continuing questions to enable the City to measure trends over time, and special questions that varied in length and number.

The committee considered Mr. Hornbuckle's suggestions for changes to the continuing questions. Mr. Hornbuckle distributed a handout containing his proposed revisions.

Ms. Keller said that Mr. Hornbuckle's revisions to question 5 would be interpreted by respondents as eliciting a response to the question "are you satisfied with the City Council." She said that the citizens answer that question through the election process.

Mr. Boles cautioned the council against changing the continuing questions because of the difficulty of interpreting trends over time. Mr. Torrey concurred. Mr. Laue also agreed, saying that he preferred to retain the existing questions so trend data was easier to interpret.

Ms. Keller indicated her support for Mr. Boles' remarks. She said that Mr. Hornbuckle's revisions, particularly to question 9, were good and she wished the council had the opportunity to consider them earlier. Ms. Keller suggested that the council could include the questions on later surveys.

Mr. Hornbuckle said that a badly worded question did not have to be retained.

Ms. Keller left the meeting at 8:35 p.m.

Mr. Torrey said that questions related to growth should be submitted to the Planning Commission so it can address them in the growth management study. He was not opposed to the addition of more questions, but wished to retain the existing questions.

Mr. Boles said he was willing to drop another of the special questions to ask Mr. Hornbuckle's revised question 5. The council could choose to ask the question again in the future to examine the response pattern.

Ms. Nathanson preferred to retain the existing questions.

Mr. Hornbuckle asked that the council revise question 5 as recommended in his handout. A straw vote indicated that a lack of majority support (four opposed) for the revision.

Mr. Laue argued for the retention of the original version of question 7 on the basis that it was one of the measures the council selected for its Government goal. Mr. Hornbuckle accepted Mr. Laue's reasoning.

Responding to a request for a show of support from Ms. Nathanson, the majority of the council indicated opposition to Mr. Hornbuckle's suggested revisions to questions 7 and 9.

Mr. Boles said that he preferred that the survey resemble past surveys to the degree possible. He supported revising question 5 and adding the two questions on which the council had reached consensus.

Mr. Hornbuckle objected to the council's unwillingness to revise the survey as he suggested. Ms. Nathanson suggested that Mr. Hornbuckle's questions would be addressed through the Growth Management Study and the recommendations of the Council Committee on Environment and Economics.

Mr. Hornbuckle left the meeting at 8:49 p.m.

The councilors remaining acknowledged that there was no quorum. Responding to a question from Ms. Nathanson, Mr. Boles noted that the survey was an ongoing part of the work program and did not require a formal vote.

The meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Micheal Gleason
City Manager

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)
cc80030.105