

# EUGENE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY



---

## Approval of City Council Minutes

---

Meeting Date: May 10, 2010  
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 March 8, 2010, Work Session, March 8, 2010, Council Meeting, April 12, 2010, Work Session, April 12, 2010, Council Meeting, and April 19, 2010, Public Hearing.

### ATTACHMENTS

- A. March 8, 2010, Work Session
- B. March 8, 2010, Council Meeting
- C. April 12, 2010, Work Session
- D. April 12, 2010, Council Meeting
- E. April 19, 2010, Public Hearing

### FOR MORE INFORMATION

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

MINUTES

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

March 8, 2010  
5:30 p.m.

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

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the work session of the Eugene City Council to order. She adjourned the Eugene City Council meeting and convened a meeting of the Eugene Urban Renewal Agency.

**A. WORK SESSION:  
Downtown Financing Strategy**

Agency Director Jon Ruiz said the agency was being asked to initiate the process for reviewing changes to the downtown urban renewal district and the agency's action would not be binding. He said the discussion of financing and strategies represented a multi-pronged approach to fostering a vibrant downtown, boosting the local economy and creating jobs.

Finance Director Sue Cutsogeorge reviewed the direction to staff to examine funding options for four projects: Lane Community College (LCC), Veterans' Administration (VA) clinic, Farmers' Market and downtown safety. She said the agenda packet included extensive information on the following funding options:

- Existing resources
- General obligation bond
- Local option levy
- Downtown urban renewal

Ms. Cutsogeorge used a slide presentation to highlight the costs associated with the projects and funding strategies. She noted that in each scenario the City would have to borrow money to pay for some of the projects and interest on that debt was included in project costs. Total administration through FY09 is \$1.2 million. Debt issuance costs are about \$150,000 for each kind of debt issued. The interest amount on new debt varied among the funding packages; legal costs are estimated at \$150,000, and administrative costs were estimated at \$150,000 annually through FY13 when construction is complete, and then would drop.

She identified the one-time funds that would be available to taxing districts if tax increment collections ceased, as well as the ongoing funds. She said that staff was researching whether the funds available to Eugene School District 4J would be an actual increase to revenue or an offset to State school funding. She estimated that the average taxpayer's bill would decrease by \$1.66. She said local schools would receive

about \$31,000 in ongoing funding and other schools throughout the state would receive \$629,000. The impact of Measure 5 on District 4J's local option levy was unknown.

Mr. Ruiz compared the four funding options in each of the following areas:

- Funds all recommended projects
- Creates new jobs
- Improves image of downtown and community
- Subsidized private developers
- Administrative costs
- Public cost
- Maintains downtown/economic development loan program
- General fund impact
- Local schools impact

Mr. Ruiz recommended downtown urban renewal as the funding option for projects because it was responsive to community desires; limited economic impacts to individuals, projects and the General Fund; was immediately available to implement projects; accomplished downtown goals with resources intended for those purposes and allowed for the continuation of the Downtown Revitalization Loan Program. He reminded the agency that the recommendation was limited to the four projects identified at the beginning of the presentation and the urban renewal district would terminate at the conclusion of those projects.

Mr. Clark observed that all funding options included borrowing money and the question for him was the impacts on the City and other jurisdictions of that indebtedness. He asked the Agency Director to explain why tax increment funding was a better approach than the other financing options, including an intended motion by Ms. Taylor, and whether there could be opportunity costs in the future if the agency accepted the Agency Director's recommendation.

Mr. Ruiz noted that Ms. Taylor's intended motion was to fund the LCC project only, not the other three downtown projects, and was not directly comparable to the other funding options. He said the total cost of the urban renewal option was less than other options and it did not ask voters to increase current taxes. He said in terms of an opportunity cost, if the urban renewal district was terminated, some funds would become available, but they would not be sufficient to fund all four projects. He noted that the net amount of funds to be redistributed to the school district was fairly small.

Mr. Clark asked if expanding the boundary of the urban renewal district to include the potential site for a VA clinic required the approval of any other jurisdiction. Mr. Ruiz said it would not require other approvals; the expansion would only occur if the site was selected for a clinic and the VA wanted financial assistance.

Mr. Poling asked how effective the Downtown Revitalization Loan Program had been. Mike Sullivan, Community Development Division, said the loan program had assisted with the Broadway Building, which housed Adam's Restaurant, the building at One East Broadway, redevelopment of Rubenstein's furniture store as office space, Harlequin Beads, Full City Coffee and the Zenon restaurant. He said staff was currently in discussions with the potential developer of the former Taco Time building.

In response to questions from Mr. Poling, Ms. Cutsogeorge clarified that local schools would receive approximately \$31,000 annually in additional ongoing funds if the urban renewal district was terminated. Mr. Ruiz said he envisioned the citizens' review panel being structured and functioning in the same way as the panel overseeing expenditure of funds from the bond for street repairs.

Mr. Brown objected to using the urban renewal district to fund projects and thought it was destructive to Lane County and did hurt the schools. He asserted that the projects could all be accomplished using existing resources and a revenue-backed bond, which did not have to be referred to the voters. He said the council did not know what, if anything, LCC required for its downtown project. He stated that the other projects could be funded from the money the City would receive if tax increment collection ceased, plus liquidation of the loan program and Facility Reserve. He did not understand the reluctance to use Facility Reserve funds on veterans when it was being used to relocate other first responders like police officers.

Ms. Taylor expressed concern about the diversion of funds from schools. She said the VA clinic was not a reality and the focus should be on doing one project at a time; LCC was the urgent project and the City should provide financial assistance if it was required. She was certain that an urban renewal plan amendment would be referred to the ballot and LCC would not have an answer for many months and be unable to move forward with its project. She felt it was possible to fund LCC's needs with existing funds and without continuing urban renewal or raising taxes. She said it was not necessary to move forward with all the projects at once.

Ms. Solomon asked when a decision on the VA site location was expected. Mr. Sullivan replied that the VA had received responses to its request for proposals and would be conducting site visits and due diligence over the next several months. He thought a decision could be made by the end of the year, but it was a federal project and he did not have any more specific information.

In response to a question from Ms. Solomon, Ms. Cutsogeorge confirmed that use of existing resources for the projects would require reprogramming \$450,000 of current General Fund money, which would be permanent cuts in addition to the budget cuts already being made.

Mr. Pryor said, from his perspective, the discussion focused on the two funding options that did not increase taxes: use of existing resources or urban renewal. He said the existing resources option would obligate the City to repay indebtedness until 2032; the urban renewal option would result in termination of tax increment financing in 2019. He stressed that no one was advocating for retaining the urban renewal district past that date. He said the City would pay \$3 million less in interest with the urban renewal option and those were funds that could be used for other purposes. He felt retaining the urban renewal district long enough to fund the projects was the most prudent choice, but wanted definitive information on the impact to schools.

Mr. Zelenka thanked staff for the detailed analysis of funding options. He supported pursuing all four projects as they were catalysts for creating a more vibrant downtown. He said the existing resource funding option was initially appealing, but the need to reprogram \$450,000 in the General Fund was of concern because that could mean cuts to many of the services that were important to downtown, such as the library, parks and recreation, fire and police. He said eliminating urban renewal would save the average homeowner \$1.66 per year, or about the cost of a soft drink.

Ms. Ortiz remarked that the City would not give LCC more than it needed to complete its project. She stressed the importance of having a VA clinic in Eugene and said the City should do everything it could to encourage the selection of the downtown site. She said many in the homeless population were veterans and could benefit from the services a clinic would offer.

Ms. Piercy said there was no perfect funding mechanism for the projects, but the recommendation would address many of the council's priorities. She said supporting a VA clinic as part of the package sent a strong message about the community's interest in helping returning veterans.

Mr. Clark, seconded by Ms. Taylor, moved to forward to the Planning Commission and overlapping taxing districts the proposed amendments to the Downtown Urban Renewal Plan, consistent with the draft plan and report included in Attachments K and L.

Mr. Clark said he was not a fan of tax increment financing, but acknowledged that it was a legitimate tool for increasing property value. He said the tool had been used for some private development, but when it was used for public development it did not increase property values in the downtown area, which could harm other jurisdictions. He did not want to let his ideological opinion stand in the way of a pragmatic approach to making downtown more vibrant. He felt the cost of using existing resources was too high and was willing to move forward with the urban renewal option in order to achieve many benefits to downtown and the community.

Ms. Taylor remarked that urban renewal was never intended to continue forever and the County desperately needed money. She said location of a VA clinic downtown was between the federal government and PeaceHealth. She agreed that assistance should be provided to LCC.

Ms. Taylor, seconded by Mr. Brown, moved to substitute the following motion: "I move that the City Manager prepare and return to the council with a plan to support LCC's 10<sup>th</sup> and Charnelton project in the amount of \$8.2 million (\$8 million plus \$200,000 bond issuance and transaction costs) using the \$2.4 million that would be available after terminating tax increment financing; the \$1.9 million balance in the downtown loan fund; and a \$3.9 million bond paid from the additional \$810,000 in property tax dollars that will come to the City's general fund if tax increment ceases. In addition, the manager shall consider other sources of funds in lieu of part of the \$3.9 million bond."

Ms. Taylor said the option she proposed would not leave LCC in suspense about the City's support.

Mr. Brown pointed out that the funding option in Ms. Taylor's motion did not require reprogramming any General Fund resources. He said there were other viable funding options that did not include continuation of the urban renewal district. He said future councils and staff could decide to extend the district beyond 2019 and it was time to let it go.

The motion to substitute failed, 2:6; Ms. Taylor and Mr. Brown voting yes.

Mr. Zelenka said he did not support the existing resources option because it had impacts on other City services and meant the end of the revitalization loan program, and the general obligation bond and local option levy options asked people to pay more taxes in economically difficult times. He said that left the urban renewal program, which had no net increase in taxes or cuts to the General Fund, maintained the loan program and was the least expensive option for moving all four projects forward. He said the impact to School District 4J was modest and if the motion passed he would ask the City Manager to develop some creative strategies for keeping the school district whole. He liked the concept of a citizen review panel and could not support using the Facility Reserve because it was clear that the current City Hall building could no longer house City functions.

Ms. Taylor commented that the Tualatin School District was rejecting urban renewal. Mr. Ruiz replied that the Tualatin School District had voted to support urban renewal.

Mr. Clark reiterated that he felt urban renewal was the most intelligent and pragmatic approach to accomplishing the goals the community desired. He said the elected officials on the council would make the decision and then, if the issue was referred to the ballot, it was up to the general public to decide if they wanted those four projects to move forward downtown. He said putting the urban renewal plan amendment on the ballot and voting it down was killing the opportunity to make downtown more vibrant. He hoped the community would trust the council's decision.

Mr. Brown said he supported the projects, but not the financing option. He hoped the council would refer the plan amendment to the ballot and not require that to be done through a petition.

Ms. Piercy said the recent earthquakes in Haiti and Chile were a reminder of the possibility of a seismic event in the Pacific Northwest and the need to be mindful of the safety and well-being of people in the community. She said the urban renewal option presented the opportunity for a winning result for everyone: the four priority projects could be funded and the urban renewal district would be terminated when they were completed.

The main motion passed, 6:2; Mr. Brown and Ms. Taylor voting no.

Mr. Zelenka, seconded by Mr. Poling, moved to request the City Manager to complete the analysis of the financial impact on Eugene School District 4J and should there be a financial impact, present to the council options for keeping 4J whole either through an exchange of services or financial assistance.

Ms. Ortiz cautioned that school districts were allocated a certain amount of funding per student and in the case of the Bethel School District additional funds had to be returned to the State.

Mr. Clark cautioned that the County was also in need of funds and the City could eliminate its proposed savings if it attempted to assist other taxing districts.

The motion passed, 6:2; Mr. Brown and Ms. Taylor voting no.

Ms. Solomon asked how a plan amendment would address the issue of the VA clinic if the federal government was not scheduled to make a decision until the end of the year. She was concerned about the

potential impacts on funding for the other three projects in the plan amendment. City Attorney Glenn Klein said the plan amendment language would indicate that the urban renewal agency could spend up to a specific amount for each project; if the VA clinic did not materialize, those funds could not be spent for another purpose and the termination of the urban renewal district could conceivably occur earlier.

In response to a question from Mr. Poling, Mr. Klein said if the boundary of the district was expanded to include the potential clinic site, that territory could be relinquished if the VA selected another site.

**B. BRIEFING:**

**Office of the Police Auditor**

Police Auditor Mark Gissner remarked that he met biweekly with council officers and also received feedback from other council members. He said the purpose of his briefing was to describe the subject of the upcoming Civilian Review Board (CRB) meeting. Agenda items included the following:

- Report on the work of the Policies and Procedures Subcommittee, which was almost completed
- Discussion of what constituted a public record – differentiation between public employees and public safety employees
- Police Chief Kerns' response to the Civilian Review Board's request to reopen a closed Taser case
- Monthly case review – an arrest incident involving the interference and subsequent arrest of another person and an attempt by the person arrested to injure himself

Mr. Clark asked for an explanation of the City's current practices with regard to public records requests involving employees.

The meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jon Ruiz  
City Manager

*(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)*

MINUTES

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

March 8, 2010  
7:30 p.m.

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

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

Councilor Poling, seconded by Councilor Solomon, moved to change the order of the agenda so that the Public Forum would occur after the action items.

Councilor Poling stated that it was important that the council get to the action items and he wished to insure that the body did so by reordering the agenda.

Councilor Zelenka could not support the motion because there was a possibility that a member of the public might wish to speak to one of the action items.

Roll call vote; the motion failed, 6:2; councilors Poling and Solomon voting in favor.

1. PUBLIC FORUM

Mayor Piercy reviewed the rules of the Public Forum.

**Diego Hernandez**, 1722 Hilyard Street, stated that he was a senior at the University of Oregon in ethnic studies and political science. He was also a part of the United States Student Association, serving as a first generation student on its board, as well as being a part of student government at the University and Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán (MEChA), which was a Chicano student union. He said there were many people in the Council Chamber who were present in support of the Development Relief and Education of Alien Minors (DREAM) Act. He asked them to stand and show their support. A great number of people stood.

Mr. Hernandez said the week from February 22 to February 27 had been the DREAM Act Week of Action and universities, high schools, and communities all over the country had been engaged in related activities. He said that four young immigrants walked 1,500 miles from Miami, Florida to Washington, D.C., which was one of over 70 actions held across the country. He said the grassroots movement sought to send the message to the Legislature to pass the legislation. He thought it would take a lot of courage and humility to pass the act, given the animosity that some people felt toward immigrants, but it was a priority to give the young people access to higher education.

**Mary Gent**, 2090 Floral Hill Drive, Councilor Zelenka's ward, urged the council to support Resolution 5002, a statement of support for the establishment of marine reserves. She loved the Oregon coast and considered it dear to all Oregonians. She felt that everyone had an interest in environmental health and sustainability. She had been impressed by the marine reserves in California and Washington and wondered why Oregon was "dragging its feet." She was gratified that the state was "finally" addressing this, though she thought the two reserve areas were not enough. She noted that she owned a vacation property in Yachats and related that people from all over the country



came to that area. She believed having marine reserves would create an added attraction. She observed that the ocean off the Oregon coast now contained a dead zone and noted that it seemed that more animal carcasses were washing up on the beach. She thought having the marine reserves would also aid scientists in a better understanding of oceanic health.

**Juan Carlos Valle**, 1040 Horn Lane, introduced himself as Board President for the Centro Latino Americano, Vice Chair of the Police Commission, and an active member of the United Coalition of Color, and indicated he was speaking as an individual in support of the DREAM Act resolution. He considered it to be a part of writing our history. He stated that kids faced a lot of challenges including accountability and expectations. He said the most important expectation was to generate pride in them. He averred that we ask our youth to be mindful of their actions, to be cognizant of the kind of world they want to leave behind, and to give back to the community. He felt that some would not have the opportunity to demonstrate any of that unless the Legislature acted in support of the DREAM Act. He listed the many states that had already resolved to support the act. He believed that the immigrant youth would make the world proud with their accomplishments.

**Eugene Drix**, 307½ High Street, said he was celebrating a goal of becoming a verb. He felt he connected dots for the community by connecting people. He averred that being connected was what made a community. He observed that the rains caused worms to come out and they made “worm parades.” He thought that since worms could not see or hear it helped them to be moved from sidewalks. He related that Eugene was the number one city for the blind, because of the amenities available here. He thought that Eugene was a special city because it accounted for everyone.

**Cynthia Kokis**, 2465 Jefferson Street, spoke on behalf of Women Action for New Directions (WAND), and urged the council to adopt the resolution in support of the DREAM Act. She said WAND endorsed the act. She underscored that youth depended on their support. She averred that if they meant that no child should be left behind, they must support and enable immigrant students to continue their pursuit of education. She commented that she would be proud to be the grandmother of the children she saw at the council meeting.

**Alexandra Harper**, 2422 Willamette Alley, thanked the council for considering the resolution to support Oregon marine reserve policies and the proposed Heceta Head and Cape Perpetua reserve sites. She related that she had grown up in Florida in an area that had engendered appreciation for the ocean and for civic service. She recalled her first visit to Cape Perpetua, at which she had been struck by the “prime real estate” that had not been developed there. She considered this to be evidence of a unique land use ethic. She had also been struck by the “sheer enormity” of the Pacific Ocean, which covered about 59 million square miles of the earth’s surface. She declared that everyone everywhere was connected to and dependent upon the ocean because it drove the weather and absorbed carbon dioxide. She discussed the proposed marine reserves and the protections they would receive. She said it would be part of a network of protected areas, and she believed that they needed a well-designed network of these reserves. She asked the council to support the resolution.

**Chuck Willer**, 1303 Northwest 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Corvallis, Executive Director of the Coast Range Association, noted that he would support Resolution 5001, in support of the DREAM Act, as well as Resolution 5002, in support of the marine reserves. He used to live by the Cape Perpetua area and he knew that quite a few people from Eugene used that area. He said the Coast Range Association had “cut its chops” on forest issues. He commented that forest issues always ended up with a win-lose situation; one entity always lost something. He stated that marine reserves were, in contrast, a win-win situation for everyone. He said the boost in small marine life meant a boost in fisheries and diversity in the ocean.

**José Manuel Ibarra**, 788 Blackfoot Avenue, Chair of the Oregon Commission on Hispanic Affairs and United States Council on Latino Affairs, said one main focus of the Commission on Hispanic Affairs was the advancement of Latinos through education. He cited the following statement issued by the United States Supreme Court in 1992:

“It is difficult to understand precisely what the state hopes to achieve by promoting the creation and perpetuation of a sub-class of illiterates... surely adding to the problems being caused by unemployment, welfare and crime.” On behalf of the Commission on Hispanic Affairs, he urged the council adopt the resolution in support of the DREAM Act.

**Carol Van Houten**, 768 West 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Community Alliance of Lane County (CALC), urged the council to adopt the resolution in support of the DREAM Act. She said CALC favored comprehensive immigration reform and the DREAM Act was a step in this direction. She related that they saw that this was a way for a very talented group of people to come out of the shadows and contribute to their community and their nation.

**Kimberly Gladen**, 361 West Broadway, provided information from Project De Novo, a successful pre-trial diversion program in Minnesota. Her mother worked for the project, which was how the Hennepin County area dealt with property crimes. She said people were required to pay restitution and their records were closed after completion of the program, which addressed first-time offenders by providing counseling and alcohol and drug treatment. She stated that the perpetrators had to take responsibility for their lives through this approach. Her mother thought it would be inexpensive to start such a program as they could do so with a director, a case worker, and two counselors. She thought the latter could be interns from the University. She said if the “movers and shakers” from the City and the University put their heads together she was sure they could work out a program that would aid the City with its property crime problem. She pointed out that such a program would save court money and jail space, while helping people get back on the road to productive lives. She noted the project was a non-profit agency and that it had been so successful that drug and juvenile divisions had been added to the program.

**Jane Waite**, 30415 Le Bleu Road, said hundreds of kids in Lane County would be helped by the DREAM Act. She was the Equity and Diversity Specialist for Lane Educational Service District (Lane ESD) and she ran into many young people in the situation that the act was meant to help. She urged the council to vote in support of those children. She also wished to speak as an indigenous person and asked that they imagine there were no borders.

**Guadalupe Quinn**, 3820 Greenwood Street, wanted to add her voice in support of the DREAM Act. She said she coordinated the Immigrant Rights Advocacy Program for Amigos Multicultural Services Center. She hoped the City of Eugene could join the long list of cities that support the DREAM Act, and then immigrant youth could continue their educations. She asked the council to look out on the room full of people and to understand that in it was the future of the community. She asked the council to think about what it would mean to the community to have young people who were well-prepared to continue running the City.

**Jairo Castañeda**, 1722 Hilyard Street, was present in support of the DREAM Act resolution. He said he was there as a student, a member of Impact, a student body senator, a board member of Oregon Students of Color Coalition, and as a MEChA recruitment and retention director. He had come to the United States as a non-documented individual, at a very young age. He said through many hardships, trials and tribulations, privilege, and hard work he had been able to gain citizenship. He was currently a student studying psychology and ethnic studies. He related that he had been privileged to attend higher education, but over 65,000 young people would not be able to do so. He announced that through MEChA and with the help of a lot of individuals, they were hosting the annual Raza Unida Youth Conference on March 10 at the University of Oregon, which sought to bring over 300 Latino/Latina students from all over the area so they could see what higher education looked like and so they could feel they had the opportunity to pursue it. He urged the council to pass the resolution in support of the DREAM Act.

**Ronald Burley**, 1670 Leatherwood Street, Vice Chair of the Human Rights Commission (HRC), stated that the HRC had voted on February 16 to endorse the proposed City Council resolution on the DREAM Act. He said in supporting the act the City would join other cities. He stated that the DREAM Act proposed to allow undocumented students who had lived in the United States for at least five years and who had graduated from high school or received a graduate equivalency diploma to legalize their immigration status so they could qualify for federal

financial aid and so students would be considered to be state residents in order to get in-state tuition. He felt the adoption of the proposal was a way to think globally and act locally.

**Annie Nelson**, 1750 Alder Street, Apt. 13, stated that she was a senior at the University and the Co-Director of the University of Oregon Multicultural Center. On behalf of the center she asked the council to support the DREAM Act. She declared that the DREAM Act would make higher education more accessible and this was fundamental to equal opportunity and would foster social equity.

**Roscoe Caron**, 840 West 22<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, stated that he was a teacher at Shasta Middle School who worked with a population that was 20 percent Latino. He had been associated with Ganas, a program that linked middle school students with mentors. He remarked that there was a “schizophrenic aspect” to the program, which presented to students the dream of going to college. He said currently the collective grade point average of Ganas students was 3.2 and not one of them lived in a home where English was the primary language spoken. He could not estimate how many of them would never be able to go to college. He related that he had been able to go to college because he qualified for Pell Grants, Student Direct Loans, and the work study program. He said a number of the students he worked with would never be able to do this under the current laws and he considered this to be a great travesty and a great hurt to individuals, the community, and the nation. He considered the resolution an opportunity to right this wrong.

**Carmen X. Urbina**, 788 Blackfoot Avenue, asked the council to please support the DREAM Act. She had been a student whose parents had been undocumented immigrants. She stood before the council because she was fortunate to have a family that was supportive and allowed her to come back and get an education. She said in the spirit of thinking globally and acting locally, she was there on behalf of the Community Coalition for the Advancement of Human Rights. She stated that historically, in 2006, after the City put a goal on race relations and the Human Rights Commission (HRC) had brought to the City the vision and the opportunity for the City of Eugene to become a Human Rights City, the City had charged the HRC and a group of community members to go and educate the community and to engage community stakeholders in creating the vision of becoming a Human Rights City. She said the HRC had held mental health forums, immigration forums, and the International Day of Human Rights. She declared that the DREAM Act was for human rights. She stated that the coalition was comprised of 34 organizations that were coming together to create a Human Rights Community Summit called “Bringing Human Rights Home.” She asked the council to support funding for the summit.

**Ken Neubeck**, 4915 West Hillside Drive, stated that he was a strong supporter of the DREAM Act. He was also a member of the HRC. He had been involved in the evolution of Eugene to become a Human Rights City. He also asked that the council approve \$3,500 to help sponsor the Human Rights Summit. He underscored that they had hundreds of volunteer hours and they had received other financial support; funding from the City could be used to leverage more funding for the summit. He thanked the council for its consideration.

**Samantha Chirillo**, 3930 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, said she was the new Economic Justice Organizer for the Oregon Fair Trade campaign, which had convened a “new and growing alliance” of approximately a dozen Eugene-based groups. She said the group had unanimously endorsed the DREAM Act and they urged the council to pass the resolution in support of it. She averred that the youth that would benefit from the act were an integral component of the community just as advocacy for immigrant rights was a critical component of trade reform. She also wanted to urge the council to support the resolution for marine reserves as she was someone who appreciated Cape Perpetua and as the Co-Director of Eco-System Advocates. She said the group believed the marine reserves were a win-win situation for everyone involved.

**Paula Walker**, P.O. Box 406, Brightwood, member of Our Oregon Oceans Coalition and the Oregon Shores Conservation Coalition wished to applaud the City of Eugene for the resolution in support of the marine reserves. She averred that all Oregon residents had a vested interest in thriving coastal communities and a thriving ocean. She

said studies around the world had proven marine reserves to be a sound investment economically and environmentally. She related that fishers that had been part of the marine reserve efforts had spoken out on the benefits of having marine reserves and environmental studies had proven the high benefits of the restorative process. She urged the City to be the first inland community to adopt such a resolution.

**Emma Kellaway**, Student Body President for the University of Oregon and the Board Chair for the Oregon Student Association, which represented over 100,000 students across the state, conveyed the students' message to the council urging support for the DREAM Act resolution. She said students had spoken through resolutions and letters in support of all students having access to post-secondary education. She stated that the country invested heavily in early education and 65,000 students were undocumented and had the lowest capability for attending the next level of education. She averred that this limited the country's economy from benefiting from a highly educated population. She stated that the DREAM Act would help students who had been traditionally turned away to access higher education. She asked for the council's support to make a very "impactful statement" by approving the resolution in support of the DREAM Act.

**Alejandra Gomez**, 2936 Willamette Street, Apt. 6, represented Juventud Faceta, a youth group that worked to benefit the community. She noted that she was a junior in high school. She said if the country was looking to have less ignorance, the worst thing that could be done would be to deny a group of people the opportunity to be successful. As an undocumented student, she was tired of being told she could not go on to higher education. She said she was a young Latina who was trying to do what her parents could not do. She had moved to the United States with the dream of a better future and for her this had now become the DREAM Act.

**Evelyn McConnaughey** thanked the City Council for considering the resolution to endorse the ocean marine reserves. She underscored that Oregon needed pure and healthy waters. She listed some of the organizations that supported the establishment of the reserves.

**Gary Roth** stated that he had worked in the natural resources field for 30 years. He supported the establishment of marine reserves.

**Phyllis Hockley**, 220 North Adams Street, #2, Co-President of Church Women United of Lane County, spoke on behalf of their board to request that the council pass the resolution in support of the DREAM Act. She said her organization was all-inclusive and supported peace and justice. She stated that the DREAM Act would help Eugene become a better place to live.

Mayor Piercy closed the Public Forum. She thanked everyone for coming and speaking on "two very important issues."

Councilor Ortiz appreciated everyone coming out to speak before the council. She was glad to see their allies of the community coming out in support of the DREAM Act. She believed it was an important education issue. She said she had served on the Bethel School Board and Councilor Pryor had served on the School District 4J Board and the message to students had always been to stay in school and graduate and then they were offered jobs that could not support them in life. She supported comprehensive immigration reform and felt that the system was currently broken. She intended to support both resolutions.

Councilor Zelenka had been impressed by the number of people who took a stand for what they believed in. He said both resolutions were easy to support and he intended to support both because it was the "right thing to do."

Councilor Pryor stated that he had served on the school board because he believed in the power of education. He averred that to deny education weakens people and weakens the fabric of culture. He said the DREAM Act would have a human benefit and an economic benefit, because an educated population would not only benefit itself, it would

create economic well-being and power. He also asked the City Manager to bring options to the Wednesday meeting for how they might be able to fund the request for the Human Rights Summit.

Councilor Brown thanked everyone for coming down. He said he would support both resolutions with pleasure because he believed it was the right thing to do.

Councilor Solomon thanked everyone. She said they all shared important views with the council. She asked if staff could analyze the information on pre-trial diversion that Ms. Gladen had presented and let the council know how it could be implemented in Eugene. City Manager Jon Ruiz responded that staff would take a look at it.

Councilor Taylor said she would be happy to support both resolutions.

Councilor Poling wanted to make sure people understood that the motion he had presented at the beginning of the meeting was not intended to minimize anyone's opinions. He had been impressed by what had been said at the meeting. He said the testimony had not changed his mind; he had intended to support both resolutions. But he emphasized how much the testimony had moved him.

Councilor Clark thanked everyone for coming to speak before the council. He said their passion was obvious and it mattered deeply to him.

## **2. CONSENT CALENDAR**

### **A. Approval of City Council Minutes**

- January 19, 2010, Public Hearing

### **B. Approval of Tentative Working Agenda**

### **C. Adoption of Resolution 5001 Supporting the Passage of the Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors (DREAM) Act, Which Authorizes the Cancellation of Removal and the Adjustment of Status for Certain Immigrant Youths Who are College Bound and Are Long-term United States Residents and Permit States to Determine State Residency for Purposes of Higher Education**

### **D. Adoption of Resolution 5002 Endorsing Ocean-Marine Reserves**

Councilor Clark, seconded by Councilor Taylor, moved to approve the Consent Calendar. Roll call vote; the Consent Calendar was approved by a unanimous vote, 8:0.

## **3. ACTION:**

**An Ordinance to Re-Designate and Re-Zone "South Willamette Properties" for General Office Use by Amending the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan Diagram; Amending the South Willamette Subarea Plan Diagram and Text; and Amending the Eugene Zoning (City Files MA 09-5, RA 09-1 and Z 09-3)**

Councilor Clark, seconded by Councilor Taylor, moved to adopt Council Bill 5023 to re-designate and re-zone "South Willamette Properties" for General Office Use by amending the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan Diagram; amending the South Willamette Subarea Plan Diagram and Text; and amending the Eugene Zoning Map. Roll call vote; the motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Mayor Piercy noted that all of the action items before them had been given a public hearing.

## **4. ACTION:**

**An Ordinance to Re-Designate a Portion of “Lane Memorial Gardens” for Low Density Residential Use by Amending the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan Diagram; and Amending the Willow Creek Special Area Study Diagram (City Files MA 08-1 and Z 09-1)**

Councilor Clark, seconded by Councilor Taylor, moved to adopt Council Bill 5024 to re-designate a portion of “Lane Memorial Gardens” for Low Density Residential use by amending the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan Diagram; and amending the Willow Creek Special Area Study Diagram. Roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

**5. ACTION:**

**Safe and Efficient Streets through Access Management**

**An Ordinance Concerning Access Connection Location Requirements, Special Setbacks and Street Width; Amending Sections 9.0500, 9.5500, 9.6505, 9.6735, 9.6745, 9.6750, 9.6840, 9.6870, 9.8030, 9.8090, 9.8415, 9.8670, 9.8675, 9.8680, and 7.420 of the Eugene Code, 1971; and Adding Sections 9.6703 and 9.6873 of that Code**

Councilor Solomon thanked Peggy Keppler, Development Review Manager for the Public Works Department, for putting together the maps. She ascertained that the proposed amendment was included in the motion for consideration in Agenda Item 6.

Councilor Clark, seconded by Councilor Taylor, moved that the City Council adopt Council Bill 5025 concerning access connection location requirements, special setbacks and street widths. Roll call vote; the motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

**6. ACTION:**

**Safe and Efficient Streets through Access Management**

**An Ordinance Concerning Access Connection Design and Construction Requirements, Amending Sections 7.010, 7.085, 7.290, 7.297, 7.308, 7.360, 7.375, 7.385, 7.407, 7.410, 7.430 and 7.445 of the Eugene Code, 1971; Repealing Sections 7.405, 7.415, 7.425 and 7.435 of that Code; and Adding Sections 7.408 and 7.435 of that Code**

Councilor Clark, seconded by Councilor Taylor, moved to adopt Council Bill 5026 concerning access connection design and construction requirements.

Ms. Keppler noted that the change Councilor Solomon had asked about was included in Attachment B and had been incorporated into the ordinance language rather than in an amendment.

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

The meeting adjourned at 8:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jon Ruiz  
City Manager

*(Recorded by Ruth Atcherson)*

## MINUTES

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

April 12, 2010  
 5:30 p.m.

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

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

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

Ms. Piercy thanked all who worked to make Project Homeless Connect a success. She said a delegation from Kakegawa, Japan visited recently. She reported on her participation in Arbor Day activities, the Park Foundation dinner, Human Rights Summit and a climate forum. She announced that a ceremony to recognize those who contributed to neighborhoods would be held on April 20, and she would hold a Mayor's one-on-one community conversation on April 27.

Ms. Taylor commended the Arbor Day and Parks Foundation event. She reported on her meeting with the Police Auditor and attendance at the National League of Cities (NLC) conference. She said the NLC's concerns included improvements to the No Child Left Behind Act and immigration reform. She also participated in lobbying activities with the League of Oregon Cities.

Ms. Solomon expressed her appreciation for the Lane County Prayer Breakfast. She attended a meeting of the Metropolitan Wastewater Management Commission and also testified before the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee about the difficulties residents who lived west of Highway 99 had crossing the railroad tracks and the highway to travel elsewhere in the community.

Mr. Brown commented that the Police Commission had completed its Taser policy review and would be forwarding recommendations to the council and the Police Chief. He attended Project Homeless Connect and the Human Rights Summit. He said homelessness was identified as one of the three top concerns in Lane County and hoped that more resources could be devoted to the problem in the future.

Mr. Poling attended a Travel Lane County board meeting and would be participating in a fund-raising golf tournament to send McCornack Elementary students to Washington D.C. He said the merger of Eugene and Springfield fire departments was discussed at a recent Harlow Neighborhood Association meeting, followed by a presentation from Eugene Water & Electric Board (EWEB) on the riverfront master planning process. He excused himself from the EWEB portion of the meeting as that issue would come before the council in the future.

Mr. Pryor attended the Parks Foundation dinner and was impressed at the extent to which philanthropy was responsible for supporting parks. He toured sites for potential allocation of funds for low-income housing,

as well as some recently opened facilities. He said the West Eugene EmX Extension Corridor Committee meetings were well attended and good information was being provided on possible routes. He attended a Chamber of Commerce news conference on policing and the Lane Metro Partnership dinner. He said Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) was launching an initiative to determine what role LCOG could play in helping to sustain human services, enhance communication and interaction among jurisdictions, and assist with economic development and job creation.

Ms. Ortiz said she attended the Lane Metro Partnership and Parks Foundation dinners. She participated in listening sessions in the Trainsong neighborhood and would attend the April 9 Lane Regional Air Protection Agency (LRAPA) budget work session.

Mr. Zelenka commended those who received awards at the Lane Metro Partnership dinner. He also attended the Birth-to-Three dinner and a meeting of the Save Civic Stadium group. He said there was an interesting plan to preserve the stadium. He toured the new University of Oregon basketball arena and attended the Human Rights Summit. He agreed with Mr. Brown that homelessness in the community was a major concern.

Mr. Clark attended the funeral service for Erin McLyman, a Eugene resident and Sheldon High School graduate killed in action in Iraq, on behalf of the Mayor. He met with Bob Chadwick about conducting listening sessions in North Eugene and testified before the group working on solutions to public safety challenges in Lane County. He felt the group would produce some useful solutions. He also attended the Police Commission meeting at which the Taser policy review was completed, and the Lane County Prayer Breakfast. He was pleased to hear about those who received recognition for their contributions during the Parks Foundation event. He spoke to a Gilham Elementary class about local government and noted that the Cal Young Neighborhood Association would meet on April 22.

City Manager Jon Ruiz noted that it was National Telecommunications Week and National Library Week. He said the budget process was under way and while there would be some changes at the library, it would not involve any reduction in hours. He conducted a listening session with community leaders about the budget and was pleased with the feedback. He said an anti-hate activity forum would be held on April 21, and he would be delivering his budget message to the Budget Committee on April 28. He pointed out that the triple-bottom-line tool had been used to evaluate neighborhood matching grant applications. He thanked a number of City employees for their work with the community.

## **B. WORK SESSION:**

### **Greenhouse Gas Emissions – Legislative Actions Update**

Intergovernmental Relations Manager Brenda Wilson distributed an April 8, 2010, letter from the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) to Gail Achterman, Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) chair and John VanLandingham, Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) chair and a document entitled *Land Use and Transportation Scenario Planning for GHG Reduction*, reflecting the timeline for compliance with legislative mandates. She provided an overview of greenhouse gas (GHG) legislative actions during the 2009 regular session and 2010 special session. She said the primary purpose of HB 2001 that emerged from the 2009 session was to increase transportation revenues; it also included provisions that required Portland Metro and the Eugene/Springfield area to engage in actions to address GHG emissions. She said HB 2186 from the 2009 session, established a Greenhouse Gas Task Force and charged it with determining how the State should address GHG emissions. The task force's report and



recommendations were presented during the 2010 special session and resulted in SB 1059. She reviewed the SB1059 mandates to reduce GHG emissions.

Ms. Wilson said the fiscal impact of SB 1059 was determined to be \$2 million and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) had indicated those funds would come from existing resources: State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and General Fund money. She said there was advocacy for using only new money for the GHG mandates and the MPC letter stressed the need to obtain funding for activities aimed at complying with HB 2001. She reviewed the timeline for GHG-reduction planning activities.

Ms. Piercy commented that the MPC was committed to GHG-reduction and was including appropriate language in all of its work plans.

Mr. Clark noted that the Beltline Facility Plan stakeholders' group had discussed the relationship of alternative transportation modes and new technology to GHG and asked if there would be local input on the modeling ODOT used to determine the impact of VMT on GHG emissions. Ms. Wilson replied that ODOT was developing a statewide strategy to address GHG emissions and targets would be developed for each Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO); how the MPO would meet its target would be determined locally.

Mr. Clark said the nexus between GHG and VMT was not clear and he hoped the State's work would help clarify the issue. He was concerned that the MPO was tasked with developing its strategies after the State had established MPO targets in 2013 or 2014, but decisions regarding Beltline would be made long before that.

Ms. Wilson explained there were two processes under way simultaneously: the local MPO process required under HB 2001 and the process that ODOT and the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) were undergoing as required by SB 1059.

Mr. Clark said it appeared that the Beltline project would be primarily informed by results from the ODOT and Metro processes rather than by local efforts. Ms. Wilson agreed and said that would result in a considerable cost savings.

Ms. Piercy pointed out that prior to the current legislative mandates the MPO still had goals established by ODOT for VMT reductions. The new requirements added to those goals.

Ms. Solomon questioned how the new requirements were different from the TransPlan directive to reduce VMT. She said it appeared that plans were being layered upon plans and that was inefficient and confusing. She felt that the funds could be better spent on transit, which moved people out of their cars, instead of more planning activities. Ms. Wilson said the current mandate was for MPOs to determine local scenarios, implementation strategies and impediments and report back to the legislature.

Mr. Pryor commented that TransPlan dealt with many of the issues 20 years ago, but it was primarily addressing a land use outcome. He said the current mandate took a different approach to addressing the reduction of GHG through a wide range of strategies. He emphasized that there would be a cost to GHG reduction.

Mr. Zelenka remarked that a legislative effort to increase transit dollars, unrelated to the GHG initiative, was defeated. He said the MPO needed to develop two scenarios by the July 2013 deadline, and choose one

to model, but only had to develop the scenarios if funding was provided by the legislature. He said the GHG Task Force recognized that the State needed to establish goals, develop tools and provide funding to assist local planning efforts. TransPlan only addressed VMT reduction; the new mandate also addressed GHG emissions reduction and provided the link between land use and transportation planning. He explained how the toolkit being developed by the State would allow MPOs to determine how best to reduce GHG and VMT.

Mr. Clark urged legislators against using STIP or other funds for planning that might otherwise be allocated to capacity-building and maintenance of the existing transportation system. Mr. Clark remarked that the STIP funds being considered were those already allocated for planning.

Ms. Solomon asked if the new planning mandate would require a TransPlan amendment. Ms. Wilson said the MPO could decide whether to develop another plan or incorporate the GHG/VMT strategies into TransPlan.

Ms. Solomon asked if the July 2013 deadline assumed that MPOs would receive funding immediately and if funding was delayed, would the 2013 deadline be extended accordingly. Ms. Wilson said the assumption was that funding would be provided early in the process, but if funding was delayed then jurisdictions would discuss with the legislature either extending the deadline or combining HB 2001 compliance with SB 1059 requirements.

Mr. Zelenka stated that all MPOs agreed that the work was very important; the problem was lack of tools and funding to complete it. He felt the GHG model would be a part of the TransPlan process rather than a separate plan. He hoped that eventually the State and federal transportation planning processes would be merged into a single plan.

### **C. WORK SESSION: Area Commission on Transportation (ACT) 101**

Ms. Wilson distributed a map showing all ACTS and a document comparing ACTs and MPOs and a listing of the Forum on an ACT for Lane County (FACT-LC) membership. She provided a brief overview of the role and functions of ACTs, which were advisory bodies chartered by the OTC. She said Lane County and Portland Metro were the only areas in the State without an ACT; in Lane County the Board of Commissioners currently functioned as our ACT. She said SB 944, enacted by the 2009 legislature, required Lane County to establish an ACT. She introduced Rob Zako, a consultant hired by the County to facilitate the process of forming an ACT.

Mr. Zako said an ACT was intended to assure more effective communication, coordination and use of transportation resources. He said the FACT-LC membership represented the jurisdictions and agencies that would be part of the ACT. He said the group was developing proposals for the ACT membership structure, bylaws and charter

Ms. Piercy commended Mr. Zako's facilitation of the process and Creswell Mayor Bob Hooker for his leadership during FACT-LC meetings.

Ms. Wilson stated that the FACT-LC would present its proposal to the Board of Commissioners, which would then present it to OTC by September 30, 2010. She drew the council's attention to the proposed membership of up to 27 voting members and ex officio members. She indicated that 1000 Friends of

Oregon had expressed concern with the structure of voting members and responsibility for decisions about the citizen members of the ACT. She said 1000 Friends was recommending that ACT membership be proportional to population and that the Board of Commissioners had authority over the private citizen member appointments.

Ms. Piercy said the goal of the FACT-LC was to achieve a high level of consensus on issues.

In response to a question from Mr. Clark, Ms. Wilson said the council would have an opportunity to vote on the ACT proposal before the Board of Commissioners forwarded its recommendation to the OTC.

Mr. Clark asked how dispute resolution among jurisdictions would be addressed. Mr. Zako replied that one of the elements required by the legislature was a conflict resolution process the ACT would use to produce equitable outcomes. He said that limited resources were available to implement the ACT and the initial goal was to have a functioning ACT that met the spirit of legislative intent. Establishing operational details, including conflict resolution, would be part of the ACT's work plan. He said the ideal for resolving disputes was to make decisions by consensus, but recognized that might not always be possible and the FACT-LC would discuss a resolution process at its next meeting. He said that the Lane County legislative delegation, OTC leadership and neighboring ACTs were being kept informed of the progress with the expectation that the FACT-LC would be informed if its direction was inconsistent with legislative intent.

Mr. Clark stressed the importance of an explicit process that allowed for expeditious conflict resolution.

Ms. Piercy said FACT-LC members were united in their desire to achieve agreement and avoid disputes. Mr. Zako added that the ACT was an advisory body, unlike the MPC, which was a decision-making body.

Ms. Solomon asked for clarification of Highway 126 East membership on the ACT. She also asked why there was no rail representative. Ms. Wilson said the purpose was to provide representation for an unincorporated area that would not have a natural representative, such as a city, on the ACT. She said some members could have rail interests. She said the FACT-LC did not want to limit membership to specific targets or issue areas for ex officio members because interests and issues could shift over time and the ACT's membership should have the flexibility to reflect current conditions. Mr. Zako said the legislature also wanted ACT membership to be primarily elected officials who represented people; the six citizen members were intended to be drawn from different modes and other interests affected by the transportation system. The ACT would decide from among applicants for those positions who would best fill those gaps.

Mr. Brown asked why the ACT would be an improvement over the current process if it was only an advisory body. Mr. Zako said the intent was to establish a process that was more inclusive, particularly of small cities and transportation interest groups. It would not fundamentally change the current process, but rather make it broader. Ms. Wilson said the County competed with other ACTs in the State for funding and an ACT would make Lane County more competitive by reflecting a broad range of interests that determined regional priorities.

In response to a question from Mr. Brown, Mr. Zako said the ACT planning process was being funded by the County and ACT operations would be funded by ODOT.

Ms. Taylor felt that there should be a rail representative on the ACT. She asked who would appoint the citizen members. Ms. Wilson said appointment authority had not yet been determined, although the proposal was likely to be for the ACT to select citizen members.

Ms. Taylor expressed concern with leaving appointment of citizen members to the ACT. She saw one representative from each jurisdiction as a major flaw in the ACT structure.

Mr. Zelenka asked how other ACTs made decisions. Mr. Zako said the process varied among ACTs, with most striving for consensus decision-making and then taking different approaches if consensus was not reached. He said common among ACTs was the concern for making certain all voices were heard and giving voice to minority opinions if there was not agreement.

Mr. Zelenka remarked that a majority of the County's population lived in Eugene and Springfield, but the ACT would give many more votes to the combined small cities.

Ms. Piercy said that most ACTs had a one city/one vote structure. Ms. Wilson said the ACT process was not about jurisdictions competing against each other; it was about the County presenting a united front as it competed with other ACTs for limited State funding. Mr. Zako said the culture of the ACT was as important as its structure and bylaws and he doubted that all of the small cities would unite in a single purpose that excluded the Eugene/Springfield area.

Mr. Pryor was pleased with the caliber of FACT-LC membership and felt they were capable of looking at the broader issues facing the County, not just individual jurisdictional interests. He supported the idea of a consensus approach to decision-making and did not feel that proportional representation was necessary in a collaborative process.

Mr. Poling said the proposed membership structure consisting of elected officials meant that potentially one city could have three representatives on the ACT. He did not think the members should be required to be elected officials.

Ms. Piercy said she would raise that issue with the FACT-LC.

The meeting adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jon Ruiz  
City Manager

*(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)*

MINUTES

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

April 12, 2010  
7:30 p.m.

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

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

1. CEREMONIAL MATTERS

Mayor Piercy announced that the first week of May each year was designated as Public Service Recognition Week honoring the men and women who served America as federal, state, county and local government employees. She read a proclamation recognizing the contributions of public service employees and proclaiming May 4 - 10, 2010, as Public Service Recognition Week.

Ms. Piercy read a statement celebrating National Library Week and recognizing the role that libraries played in the community and the lives of its citizens. She welcomed Jim Olney, executive director of the Eugene Public Library Foundation.

Mr. Olney presented a check in the amount of \$100,000 on behalf of the Eugene Public Library Foundation. He noted that the foundation had raised almost \$7 million over the past 25 years to support the Eugene library system. He commended the partnership between the foundation and the City and stressed the foundation's continuing commitment to the vital role of libraries in Eugene.

Councilor Ortiz expressed her appreciation for public employees and for the Eugene Public Library Foundation's contribution.

2. PUBLIC FORUM

Mayor Piercy reviewed procedures for providing comments.

**Bob Richards**, Timberline, Eugene, director of Buckley Center, spoke to funding concerns for the center's services. He said two years ago funding for sobering and detoxification services was cut by 40 percent. Those services were critical to public safety and without them the police and other referring agencies would have nowhere to take intoxicated individuals, as the jails would not accept them. He said a funding swap agreement between the City and Lane County restored that funding through June 30, 2010, but if the services were to continue additional revenue to replace that funding would need to be found. He said there were discussions under way regarding inclusion of the services in a serial levy, but that would not be timely because revenue from the levy would not be available until 2011 at the earliest. He was approaching all jurisdictions to alert them to the need for funding after June 30 in order to continue sobering services until more permanent funding could be secured.

**Loren Sears**, Loma Linda, Eugene, expressed his appreciation to the council for their service. He resided in the Crest Drive neighborhood and presented a petition signed by other residents of the neighborhood concerning hazards and function inadequacies in the street design that needed correcting before construction continued on neighborhood streets. He said deterioration was occurring from large trucks and School District 4J and Lane Transit District (LTD) had expressed doubts about the safety of the streets for their uses. He said the City was legally liable if it ignored known traffic dangers and those hazards were being called out for the public record. He submitted a list of ten items related to the streets and suggested actions for addressing them.

**Paula Goodbar**, Grant Street, Eugene, Eugene Storefront Art Project member, stated that she lived and worked in Eugene and was concerned with downtown blight. She explained that the project was a group of 400 local and regional artists that came together to explore the concept of using vacant storefronts for revitalization. Spaces made available would allow a local artist to install temporary art in the windows. She said the group was currently applying for nonprofit status and seeking grants and donations to support its efforts. She listed the benefits of storefront art and its impact on creating a vibrant downtown. She said the group was eager to work with property owners to provide them with a marketing and public relations opportunity. She hoped the council could help the project end the creeping urban blight that was taking over downtown.

**David P. Miller**, 10th Alley, Eugene, Eugene Storefront Art Project member, said the project was a group of concerned citizens dedicated to creating temporary art projects to enliven the downtown area. He read the group's mission statement and explained its purpose and goals. He said the storefront art project wanted to add color to the downtown atmosphere and hoped that cultural and financial rewards would follow. He said property owners were being approached with a simple, quick and inexpensive plan to use art as a way to improve the quality of life for downtown residents and improve the environment for downtown development. He hoped that community leaders would support the project.

**Marc Gunther**, Junction City, Eugene Storefront Art Project member, stated that he worked in Eugene and was concerned about the loss of architectural character through urban renewal. He noted that other communities enjoyed the economic benefits of historical architecture. He said the historic Post Office facility at 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Willamette Street was going to be sold and the lack of details about preservation made the future of the structure uncertain. He hoped the public's ability to visit the building would not be restricted by a sale and noted it had been placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1985 because of its unique architecture, lobby and artwork. He said local artist Jerry Ross had formed a citizens' committee seeking to purchase the Post Office for use as a City of Eugene art and historical museum. He urged the council not to let the opportunity for using the building as a hub for downtown revitalization slip away.

**Meisha Linwood**, Van Buren Street, Eugene, Eugene Storefront Art Project member, provided examples of how storefront art had assisted other communities to beautify downtown areas, make vacant properties more desirable and help local businesses.

**Sherry Franzen**, Eugene, Eugene Storefront Art Project member, said she lived and worked in Eugene and was concerned about the many empty storefronts downtown. She said the project had made over a dozen proposals to property owners over the past two months and had successfully placed art in two storefronts and was negotiating for space in two other properties. She said other owners had declined or ignored the group's efforts. She said property owners could select art from local submissions and described the agreements that accompanied installations. She suggested a "carrot and stick" approach that would reward owners that filled empty storefronts and fine those that left properties vacant.

**Duncan Rhodes**, Lewis Avenue, Eugene, Ward 7, said he was a member of Connecting Eugene, a local advocacy group. He had heard that the former Coca-Cola property was to be sold to Oregon Research Institute and asked what the public process for that acquisition would be.

**Drix**, High Street, Eugene, commented on the discarded furniture that appeared in his neighborhood in the spring. He recently met a man who had moved to Eugene from Kentucky and also noted that Conan O'Brien had chosen Eugene to launch his tour. He spoke to the benefits of volunteering in the community and presented a handmade award to the council for its service.

**Daniel Lewis Frommherz**, Concord Street, Eugene, Ward 6, asked the council to support repeal of the federal "Don't Ask-Don't Tell" law. He had written each councilor a personal letter explaining the issue. He served as a non-commissioned officer in the U.S. Army for 26 years and found soldiers – both male and female – who were gay to be some of the most competent and forthcoming people with whom he had served. He submitted proposed language for a resolution calling for repeal of the law. He had presented the resolution to the Lane County Board of Commissioners and was encouraged to present it to city councils in the area to gain support.

**Garr Cutler**, Horizon Road, Eugene, spoke to the design problems associated with the reconstruction of Crest Drive. He said the road was very constricted in some areas and had tight corners and was designed as though it was a private drive, even though it was intended to be a collector street serving 26 other streets in South Eugene, some of which had no other access to the rest of the City. He hoped that further road construction in the neighborhood would ameliorate some of the radical designs on a street that in the future would serve many more people than it currently did.

**Mary Salinas**, Eugene, spoke on behalf of homeless people in the community. She said she had been homeless in the past and that had spurred her to speak up on behalf of the homeless population. She wanted the same services in Eugene that other communities provided to the homeless, particularly a safe shelter for women, children and young boys. She said that chronic homelessness should be considered a disability.

**Tom Kamis**, Lincoln Street, Eugene, served on the Downtown Task Force on Public Safety. He expressed disappointment with the recommendations, which he felt reflected small steps when major steps were needed. He commended the Eugene Storefront Art Project as a great approach to downtown beautification and questioned why property owners would not want to participate. He said owners of vacant property should be held accountable. He was pleased with the progress the City had made downtown, but felt less studying and more action was needed.

Mayor Piercy closed the public forum and called for comments from the council.

Councilor Ortiz thanked those who spoke. She hoped that the Human Services Commission could find a way to fund the continuation of Buckley Center services. She liked the Eugene Storefront Art Project concept. She commented that the Crest Drive design was based on a long collaborative process with neighbors and represented an innovative approach to street improvements. She was not certain that the City had a role in the sale of property to Oregon Research Institute and asked the City Manager to provide more information.

Councilor Clark thanked those who spoke. He agreed that it was important to find funding for critical Buckley Center services and hoped that another arrangement with the County could be reached. He asked for a memorandum from the city attorney regarding the City's liability for traffic hazards associated with the

Crest Drive design. He agreed that the downtown public safety recommendations were a good first step and was eager to discuss other suggestions for downtown revitalization.

Councilor Taylor supported the Eugene Storefront Art Project and felt that temporary art in empty spaces would address a number of problems. She suggested that the group work with the Downtown Neighborhood Association. She hoped that the City would explore ways to preserve the Post Office, such as using it for an art museum. She suggested that the council hold a work session on Crest Drive to determine if the design should be modified. She said that a homeless shelter was essential and the State should provide funding.

Councilor Solomon thanked those who spoke. She observed that the only people pleased with the Crest Drive design were part of the small, exclusive group who developed the proposal approved by the council. She hoped that staff could evaluate any deterioration of the completed portions of the project and urged the council to hold a work session to determine if any changes were made before the second phase of construction. She said the City owned storefronts downtown and urged the City Manager to involve the City in the Eugene Storefront Art Project. She would poll the council for a work session on vacant property issues downtown.

City Manager Jon Ruiz indicated that part of the Downtown Task Force on Public Safety's recommendations was a proposed ordinance on including vacant buildings in the Downtown Eugene, Inc. assessment process. He said the ordinance would come before the council for consideration.

Councilor Pryor appreciated the comments offered during the public forum. He agreed that it was critical to find funding for Buckley Center services as they bridged both public safety and human services needs. He felt Crest Drive was reasonable and inclusive, but perhaps the outcome should be re-examined. He was in favor of the Eugene Storefront Art Project and would support the request for a work session on vacant downtown properties.

Councilor Poling echoed earlier requests for additional information on the Oregon Research Institute property acquisition. He agreed with Councilor Pryor's remarks about the Crest Drive design process and said it was a good idea to revisit the outcome. He was reluctant to modify the design without involving the citizens who originally participated in the process.

Councilor Zelenka supported efforts to find funding for Buckley Center services. He commended the Eugene Storefront Art Project and looked forward to hearing about the next steps. He suggested providing the council with copies of relevant ordinances from other communities. He was willing to revisit the Crest Drive issue. He noted that the former Coca Cola property was owned by the University of Oregon and within the Riverfront Research Park. As a public agency the University would need to follow requirements for a public process if the property was sold. He was supportive of a resolution regarding repeal of the "Don't Ask-Don't Tell" law. He agreed that the Post Office was an architectural jewel and hoped it would be preserved as part of the community's heritage.

Mayor Piercy related that the City had expressed concern about preserving the Post Office structure when it learned of the proposed sale.

### **3. CONSENT CALENDAR**

- A. Approval of City Council Minutes of December 16, 2009, Work Session; January 27, 2010, Work Session; February 8, 2010, Regular Meeting; February 10, 2010, Work Session; February 17, 2010, Work Session; February 24, 2010, Work Session; February 26, 2010, Joint Elected Officials Meeting**



- B. Approval of Tentative Working Agenda**
- C. Approval of FY10 Neighborhood Matching Grant Proposals**
- D. Appointments to Lane Workforce Partnership Board**

Councilor Clark, seconded by Councilor Taylor, moved to approve the items on the Consent Calendar.

Mayor Piercy asked that items B, C and D be pulled for discussion.

Item A on the Consent Calendar was unanimously approved, 8:0.

Councilor Ortiz noted that she would be absent April 23 through 29 and there were several items on the tentative working agenda that she might ask to have postponed.

Item B on the Consent Calendar was unanimously approved, 8:0.

Councilor Ortiz was pleased that the neighborhood matching grants were well distributed geographically, reflected innovative ideas and were evaluated using the triple-bottom-line tool.

Councilor Zelenka agreed with Councilor Ortiz's comments and strongly supported the grant awards.

Item C on the Consent Calendar was unanimously approved, 8:0.

Councilor Ortiz asked if the Lane Workforce Partnership Board appointments had taken into account geographic and demographic representation.

Mayor Piercy described the process by which the board submitted a list of appointments to the council for confirmation. Councilor Poling added that the board membership required representation from specific disciplines, unlike the City's board and commission that generally selected candidates from a pool of citizens.

Item D on the Consent Calendar was unanimously approved, 8:0.

**4. ACTION:  
Adoption of Resolution 5003 in Support of United States House of Representatives Bill 4812,  
the Local Jobs for America Act**

Councilor Clark, seconded by Councilor Taylor, moved to adopt Resolution 5003 in support of United States House of Representatives Bill 4812, the Local Jobs for America Act.

Councilor Zelenka stated he would support the resolution. He cited provisions of the bill that would be beneficial to the local economy.

Councilor Solomon stated she was fundamentally opposed to the legislation as it represented another attempt to spend the country's ways out of a recession.

Councilor Clark agreed with the goals set forth in the bill, but concurred with Councilor Solomon about the legislation and could not support the resolution.

Councilor Taylor said she would enthusiastically support the resolution. She said the legislation was timely and was pleased that cities could use up to 50 percent of their funding to retain employees that would otherwise lose their jobs.

Councilor Brown asked what level of funding Oregon anticipated receiving if the legislation passed. Intergovernmental Relations Manager Brenda Wilson explained that funds would be allocated using a formula similar to that used for Community Development Block Grant funds, but factoring in unemployment rates. She estimated that the City of Eugene would receive between \$1-1.5 million.

Councilor Brown felt that little could be done with that amount of money. Ms. Wilson said that was the formula allocation and there were other pots of funding within the bill for which the City could qualify. She said members of Oregon's congressional delegation were co-sponsors of the legislation.

The motion passed, 6:2; Councilor Solomon and Councilor Clark voting no.

The meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jon Ruiz  
City Manager

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)

MINUTES

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

April 19, 2010  
7:30 p.m.

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

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

1. PUBLIC HEARING

**An Ordinance Adopting an Amended Urban Renewal Plan for the Downtown Urban Renewal District**

City Manager Jon Ruiz provided an overview of the proposed Downtown Urban Renewal Plan amendment and four targeted downtown projects. He said the amendment for the four proposed projects only would increase the plan's spending limit by \$16.1 million, expand the boundary if the Veterans' Administration (VA) chose a downtown site for its clinic, impose a sunset provision and establish an annual review panel. He said the council was scheduled to review comments from the public, Planning Commission and taxing districts at its May 10, 2010, work session, with action on the amendment scheduled for May 24. He noted that a frequently raised concern was the impact of the urban renewal district on School District 4J and stated that an analysis by the county assessor, in which the school district concurred, concluded that the school district was better off financially if the downtown urban renewal district continued. Specifically, the school district would lose \$117,000 annually if the district was terminated.

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

**Sue Prichard**, Emerald Street, Eugene, Ward 3, said she was a semi-retired real estate broker and much of her professional activities had focused on the leasing and sales of downtown properties. She thanked the council for its commitment to downtown and developing a sensible, comprehensive plan. She said the past had proved that no one project was the solution for downtown; it was a complex puzzle that required a number of simultaneous activities in the public and private sectors and a continued commitment over time. She strongly supported a favorable vote to amend the urban renewal plan as proposed. It was a timely step forward and without it time would pass and nothing would change. She said tax increment financing was an effective tool and one of the few available to the City for downtown revitalization. She said all of the projects were important and well thought-out, particularly construction of a Lane Community College (LCC) campus downtown. Her life had been changed by the opportunity to attend LCC and there were thousands of similar stories in the community.

**Ben Sappington**, Mecca Avenue, Eugene, Ward 5, stressed the need for a thriving downtown and its importance to the economic well-being of the community and retention of young, talented workers central to

the community's success. He urged the council to focus on the future and take advantage of projects that were ready to move forward now and an immediately available funding source that did not raise taxes or detract from public education. He fully supported the proposed urban renewal plan amendment.

**William Kennedy**, Lincoln Street, Eugene, said he was a member of the Downtown Neighborhood Association and lived, shopped and played in or near downtown Eugene with his family. He urged the council to do whatever was necessary to assure that the LCC project and other proposed projects downtown became a reality, including increasing the spending cap on the urban renewal district. He said little progress had been made in addressing downtown problems without urban renewal. He said opponents of urban renewal wanted the money spent on schools, public safety and public works, but schools were already being built, improvements were being made to the Park Blocks and measures were under way to improve public safety. He said Eugene's least sustainable aspect was the job market for young professionals and families and its struggling downtown. He had seen many peers move away for those reasons, but he chose to stay. He urged support for the four projects as there might not be many more changes to revitalize downtown.

**Dan Herbert**, Potter Street, Eugene, supported the ordinance amending the downtown urban renewal plan to provide funding for four projects and then sunsetting the district. He said opponents' plans to refer the issue to the ballot and end the district in 2010 was a bad idea. He said opponents' chief complaint was the diversion of funds from the City's General Fund, the schools and the County, but that was a weak argument because the City's General Fund could fare even worse if urban renewal funds could not be used to support the projects. He noted that the 4J School District had confirmed that it would not suffer financially from urban renewal as the State made up any shortfall in funds. He said the four projects would serve the entire County, not just Eugene. He said if a referral to the ballot succeeded in rejecting urban renewal, alternative means for funding the projects would cost an estimated \$3 million more and an election would cost the City \$25,000 and the County \$75,000. He said a referral would also cause delays in the LCC project, risking increased costs or scuttling the entire project. He was concerned that an election would also result in a worsening of opponents' harsh rhetoric, with the effect of shutting down serious discussion of important issues.

**Charles Biggs**, Antelope Way, Eugene, did not support the plan amendment as currently written. He liked the LCC project, but it was not contingent on construction of housing. He said LCC already had a facility in downtown the same size as the proposed project and the amendment should be modified to require housing as part of the project. He did not see why the City should provide a "bailout" of \$2.5 million in tax money to persuade the VA to locate a clinic downtown when the current owner of the facility—PeaceHealth—was a very wealthy organization. He said that information provided to the Planning Commission indicated there would be a \$650,000 loss to schools and questioned the source of the new figures cited by the City Manager.

**Alexis Garrett**, West 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene, Ward 1, had served as chair of the Eugene Redevelopment Advisory Committee (ERAC) since 2004 and the committee had been given the task and privilege of reviewing every viable project proposed to support downtown. She said the ERAC understood the unique costs and construction and staging challenges of building in the downtown area and the importance of creating funding to insure realistic projects moved from concept to completion. She said ERAC had sponsored and heard community input on every level and had previously supported and recommended other projects it felt would provide the foundation for desired development, living wage jobs, subsidized and market rate housing and inviting venues for the arts. She said it would not have been possible to predict the current economic challenges and perhaps in another time and economic cycle the plan amendment would have been a different proposal. She said after a thorough evaluation of the proposed downtown plan amendment, the ERAC

unanimously supported it as a positive step forward and supported urban renewal as a viable, valuable and proven funding option.

**Dennis Carr**, Bent Tree Lane, Eugene, spoke on behalf of LCC about its vision for a new downtown center campus. He said it represented a tremendous opportunity for LCC, the City and the community. LCC was fully committed to the project and the new campus would embody its mission of accessible education and training and supported its core value of sustainability. He said the proposed site was consistent with the City's redevelopment needs and sustainability goals and would provide a return on investment. The campus would house a variety of college programs, including energy management and renewable energy programs. He said the facility would also include meeting spaces available for business, community organizations and residents and housing constructed at the site would attract up to 200 new residents to downtown. He said the facility would create economic opportunity through a state-of-the-art training facility and immediate construction jobs. He thanked the Mayor and council for their leadership and willingness to invest in the project, which would provide decades of services to students and impact generations to come. He said the project could be shovel-ready by September 2010, with potential completion by fall 2012.

**Scott Sanders**, Susan Street, Eugene, commented that there was no "silver bullet" to revitalize downtown and believed that it was private investment that would eventually bring about the desired change, although improvements were needed now to attract more private investment over time. Those improvements included increasing viability, safety and activity in downtown and the proposed plan amendment would accomplish those things through the four targeted projects. He supported the plan amendment.

**Chris Boone**, Centennial Loop, Eugene, Ward 7, said he was a young professional who had lived in Eugene most of his life, leaving only to complete his education. He said for him and his peers it was imperative that progress be made on filling the empty spaces and increasing activity in downtown. He said a good base of young professionals was essential to a vital economy and one of the key elements of attracting and retaining that demographic was an attractive and vibrant downtown. He said the currently proposed projects were a major step in the right direction and would bring positive energy and activity downtown. He urged the council to avoid delay and use the funding tool that was currently available to support the projects.

**Maylian Pak**, Whitbeck Boulevard, Eugene, Ward 2, spoke in support of the downtown urban renewal district. She said a thriving downtown was essential to economic growth and an engaged community. She said it was critical for the council to support revitalization of the Park Blocks and augment public safety to attract businesses and individuals who would be engaged and active in helping to stimulate the local economy. She supported the proposed projects and without the council's support it was likely that there would be more vacancies and empty storefronts downtown. The plan amendment could re-energize efforts to reposition downtown as the heart and soul of Eugene.

**Oliver Thornton**, West 10<sup>th</sup> Alley, Eugene, stated that he supported the plan amendment, but with the condition that it was a ballot measure. He thought the public had the right to determine how public funds were spent in the downtown urban renewal district. He said the projects had broad appeal, but was concerned with the diversion of funds from the schools, the City and the County. He said the public should be able to prioritize the needs and determine which projects should be funded.

**Craig Willis**, Queens Way, Eugene, Ward 4, Lord Leebrick Theater artistic direction, said the theater was currently in the process of renovating its property downtown and joined other speakers in urging the strongest

support possible for amending the urban renewal plan, which was vital to the success of current and planned redevelopment downtown. Regarding concerns about nonprofit organizations and the payment of property taxes, he stated that Lord Leebrick Theater Company will have paid over \$20,000 in property taxes and would continue to do so in the future. He said that was possible because the theater's redevelopment plan called for retail space as part of its project and that was not exempt from property tax. He pointed out that the theater provided employment to many people who were also Eugene home owners and spent their salaries at businesses that employed Eugene residents who paid property taxes.

**John Brown**, Ward 5, Eugene, speaking as a private citizen, commended the council for the diversity of projects included in the urban renewal plan amendment. He fully supported all of the projects and had personally been involved in efforts to locate a VA clinic in downtown for several years. He thanked the council for its work on downtown issues.

**Jim Olney**, Eugene, Ward 5, executive director of the Eugene Public Library Foundation, said the new library stood alone in its pursuit of literacy and community and he anticipated an outstanding partnership with LCC when its campus was constructed across the street from the library, following approval of the urban renewal plan amendment. He said the lively environment with more people downtown would also help to address public safety issues. He said the foundation supported the urban renewal funding and hoped it was approved by the council.

**Mary Salinas**, General Delivery, Eugene, spoke on behalf of the homeless community. She said homeless people were the same as other residents, but faced many challenges. She said public safety meant the homeless, particularly the young people in the downtown area. She listed many services that were needed to assist the homeless: a soup kitchen, legal parking for camping and a compassionate homeless shelter. She said homeless people were not transients; they represented a community and many had grown up in Eugene. She urged the council to help the homeless.

**Tamara Underwood**, Olive Street, Eugene, owner of Bagel Sphere and Novella Café in downtown Eugene, urged the council to support the urban renewal plan amendment as presented. She said it was targeted to projects that citizens had said were important to them and clearly stated the proposed funding for each. She said downtown needed critical mass and the projects would help to achieve that. She felt the proposal was a good start on downtown revitalization and urged the council to support it.

**R. Joseph Newton**, Cross Place, Eugene, Ward 7, stated that he was opposed to the previous urban renewal measure because he felt it was a subsidy to development interests and overrode the natural development of downtown. He now wished to speak just as strongly in favor of the current proposal. He said the urban renewal plan was about vital public services and institutions. He hoped the City did not stop striving for an indoor Farmers' Market and hoped that LCC would consider including a theater in its facility. He said he supported all of the projects and felt it was the right direction for urban renewal to take. He urged the council's support for the plan amendment.

**Kit Kesey**, West 34<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene, owner of the McDonald Theater building downtown, spoke in support of the urban renewal plan. He said it was what he had hoped would occur downtown when he purchased his property and the public safety aspect was especially important to downtown businesses. He fully supported the plan.

**Jim Welsh**, Centennial Plaza, Eugene, speaking for the Eugene Association of Realtors, said realtors were supportive of efforts to revitalize downtown and expressed their gratitude to the council for its continued interest in and attention to downtown. He said there had been disappointments, but the City could not give up. He said worthy projects had been proposed and tax increment financing would help them move forward and pave the way for future growth, including growth that would increase tax payments. He was pleased that public safety was a part of the proposal and urged the council to approve the plan.

**Richard York**, University Street, Eugene, Ward 2, spoke in favor of the urban renewal plan amendment, which he felt was very carefully designed. The four projects were well thought out and provided vital public services that would improve the quality of life in the community, particularly the LCC campus that would make it much easier for people to access educational opportunities. He urged the council to support the amendment.

**Kappy Eaton**, Covey Lane, Eugene, speaking on behalf of the League of Women Voters of Lane County, said the league supported the proposed amendments to the downtown urban renewal plan and favored increasing the spending limit and expanding the boundary. She said the four projects included in the amendment would contribute to the plan goals of strengthening economic conditions in the plan area, as well as enhancing downtown's role as a center for public and private development and investment. She said tax increment financing was a reasonable method to raise revenue for such activities, which would support other activities planned or underway downtown. She spoke to the benefits of each of the four projects and urged the council to support the plan amendment. She said the league was not advocating for a referral of the plan amendment to voters, it would not be inappropriate given the expansion of maximum indebtedness and geographic boundary of the district.

**Phil Farrington**, East 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene, Ward 1, representing PeaceHealth as its director of land use planning and development, said that PeaceHealth had been actively working with the VA to bring a new outpatient clinic of approximately 120,000 square feet into the area. He said the project would bring hundreds of family-wage jobs and provide services to thousands of veterans in the community and surrounding areas. He said the Willamette Street site was a strong candidate for the facility based on a number of factors and the City's ability to exercise its available tools to assist redevelopment on the site increased its viability. He said that while the VA had not yet made a decision, the financing tool gave the downtown site an advantage that could prove decisive. He urged the council to support the proposal.

**Joy Marshall**, Eugene, Ward 2, spoke in favor of the proposal for use of urban renewal funds, particularly the LCC project. She had been a strong advocate for school funding for the past decade and was distressed with use of the school funding argument to oppose the urban renewal plan amendment. She agreed there was a small amount of property tax funds diverted from the school district by urban renewal, but the State compensated for most of that loss. She noted that property tax funds were also used for many City functions such as fire, police and administration. She said the real question was whether the proposal was a reasonable, moderate and carefully designed proposal that was important to the community, and she felt it was. She urged people not to use a misguided argument against the urban renewal plan amendment because it would provide far more benefit to the community than harm. She said waiting for a better funding mechanism could result in loss of opportunity and public trust. She urged the council to support the amendment.

**Zachary Vishanoff**, Eugene, Ward 3, commented that the public had trust problems with urban renewal and LCC could inherit those problems if it used urban renewal funds. He recommended separating LCC from the

urban renewal proposal package, which was trying to accomplish too many things at once. He assumed that the public hearing was also about relocating the police station outside of downtown because the plan amendment included a public safety component that would deflect outrage over that move. He felt the public would refer the plan to the ballot because of the lack of detail. He also questioned what organizations would be meeting in the space LCC would be providing and wondered if LCC students had been allowed to vote on that decision.

**Misha Seymour**, Lincoln Street, Eugene, opposed the downtown urban renewal plan. He said the stated intent to make downtown more welcoming for everyone was not true. He saw mean-spiritedness that was psychologically damaging the poor on a daily basis. He said that people were not allowed to gather on the sidewalk outside of the library. He said an urban renewal plan amendment should be used to provide low-income housing. He said chairs and tables had been removed from Ken Kesey Square and people were not allowed to sleep in the library. He said the community should be for everyone and that was not currently happening. He said the plan amendment should be placed on the ballot for a public vote.

**David McLean**, Beacon Drive, Eugene, Ward 5, said the urban renewal plan represented an opportunity to take steps to address issues in Eugene that had thwarted the community for decades and an opportunity to say “yes” instead of “no.” He said the LCC project would spur the local economy and bring hundreds of students downtown, supporting local businesses and bring positive activities to the City’s core. He said the public safety improvements would make downtown feel safe and welcoming, the Farmers’ Market would continue to bring people downtown and the VA clinic would support area veterans and fill vacant space. He said the projects were ready to move forward and the funding mechanism did not require raising taxes or harm other services. He asked for the entire community to take advantage of the opportunity and support the projects, which would help the City move forward to create a downtown everyone deserved.

**Thomas Kamis**, Lincoln Street, Eugene, a downtown resident and business owner, said the plan amendment would not solve all of downtown’s problems, but it was a good start. He said the other funding mechanisms available to support the projects were complicated and would take more time. He spoke to the benefits each of the projects would provide to the community and downtown area and urged the council to support the proposed amendment.

**William Ivanoff**, North Grand Street, Eugene, Ward 7, spoke in favor of the LCC and VA clinic projects downtown. He questioned whether the urban renewal district had increased the livability and vibrancy of downtown since 1967. He was not certain that urban renewal had caused many of the issues downtown today and felt there were other City policies that drove businesses from downtown. He said urban renewal would not solve all of the problems in downtown; it was a more complex issue. All of the City’s policies that contributed to the current situation should be examined.

**Duncan Rhodes**, Lewis Avenue, Eugene, Ward 7, thought the projects were good, but the urban renewal district had been in existence for a long time and he wanted to see a financial accounting of its history, including the revenue generated and how it was spent. He said that information should be compiled and submitted to a referendum before any of the projects were approved.

**Jared Mason-Gere**, Willamette Street, Eugene, speaking on behalf of the Eugene Area Chamber of Commerce, said that often the City had ignored opportunities, but in this instance he was confident that would not happen. He commended the council’s thoughtful deliberations and the well thought-out projects that were



being proposed, which had wide support throughout the community. He said the projects would spur growth downtown, create many jobs, fill vacant space, attract a large number of people to downtown, address public safety issues and provide necessary services. He said the Chamber would prefer to see more private projects in the proposal that would generate taxes and the sunset provision eliminated, but those were the tradeoffs that were necessary in order to move forward as a community. He said it was a balanced plan and hoped everyone would support it.

**Dave Hauser**, Elkhorn Drive, Eugene, Ward 5, spoke on behalf of Downtown Eugene, Inc. (DEI). He said DEI was the voice of downtown business, promoting responsible development and improving public safety. He said downtown property owners voluntarily assessed themselves an additional tax that they invested in the downtown area in the amount of \$4 million over the last 16 years. He said DEI stakeholders wanted to promote a vibrant, safe and diverse downtown. He said the plan addressed the future and its projects, and the LCC facility, especially, would create momentum downtown. DEI was opposed to sunsetting the urban renewal district earlier than planned as it was an important tool for enabling future projects, but now was the time to act and DEI was willing to accept that condition in order to move forward with the proposed projects, particularly the public safety improvements. He urged the council to approve the plan amendment and create positive momentum for downtown.

Mayor Piercy closed the public hearing and thanked those who spoke. She recognized that the proposal would not fix all of the problems downtown, but it was a good start and would provide momentum to the other efforts that were already under way.

Councilor Taylor thanked those who spoke. She was opposed to expanding and extending urban renewal. She pointed out that urban renewal opened the streets, but it also closed the streets and destroyed many historic buildings. She noted that many speakers were concerned about LCC, but felt its project could be accomplished without urban renewal. She said any extension of urban renewal should be by a vote of the people. She was willing to vote immediately to support LCC to remove any uncertainty about the project.

Councilor Clark thanked those who spoke. He was pleased to see so many people in the community support the proposed plan amendment, which was different from previous urban renewal plan amendments. He was enthusiastic and optimistic about the proposal.

Councilor Solomon left the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

Councilor Ortiz appreciated the comments from a wide range of constituents. She agreed there was no single solution to downtown's problems. She pointed out that there were other neighborhoods in the community that faced challenges and hoped future conversations could address those issues, but the current focus was on downtown and she supported the proposed urban plan amendment as the right thing to do.

Councilor Brown also thanked those who spoke. He said councilors supported each of the projects, but in a different way. He felt they could be accomplished without urban renewal. He said urban renewal had destroyed downtown and wiped out the community's architectural heritage and it was time to let it go. He said if the plan amendment was approved the City would lose \$10 million from the General Fund in nine years. He preferred to explore the option of a revenue bond as a financing tool. He felt each of the projects had flaws, although they looked good from a distance, and could not support them in their current forms. He felt the City

had adequate finances to move all of the projects forward and taxpayers should be able to vote on the expenditure of urban renewal funds.

Councilor Zelenka stressed that the urban renewal plan amendment was not the same proposal presented two years ago. He asked the City Manager to restate the information about financial impacts on the school district.

Mr. Ruiz said based on information provided by the Lane County Assessor, and City staff, and confirmed by School District 4J, the district would lose \$117,000 annually if the urban renewal district was not continued. From a financial standpoint it was to the district's advantage to continue the district.

Councilor Zelenka commented that he had requested the analysis because of misperceptions about the fiscal impact of urban renewal on schools. He urged the public not to believe the rhetoric and support the proposal. Failing to support the urban renewal plan amendment would likely eliminate the Willamette Street site's potential for a VA clinic and could jeopardize the LCC project. He said all four projects could be accomplished with urban renewal funds without raising taxes, while the opponents' plan would actually raise taxes and cause financial harm to the school district. He urged support for the plan amendment.

Councilor Pryor stated he had served on the school board for 11 years and concurred with the analysis of the financial impact of urban renewal on the school district. He pointed out that the school district had confirmed the results of the analysis. He said the plan amendment was a viable means of moving forward immediately with the projects, then sunsetting the district when they were completed.

Councilor Poling remarked that there was nothing in the proposed plan amendment that would destroy any part of downtown; the projects would add to its beauty and vibrancy and the district would sunset when they were completed. He said opponents objected to the expenditure of funds on public and nonprofit projects that would not pay taxes, but objections to the previous urban renewal plan were based on expenditure of funds on private development instead of public services. He emphasized that expansion of the district was specific to the VA clinic site and would occur only if that site was actually selected for the clinic. He was concerned that if the council approved the plan and it was then referred to the ballot, the delay would jeopardize the projects and perhaps cause the City to miss a golden opportunity.

Councilor Taylor felt that the council should find another mechanism to assist LCC to avoid any delay in the event the plan was referred to the voters. She asserted that urban renewal did not create money, it came from taxes and if the funds continued to be diverted from the County, the County had a greater need to raise taxes to support public safety. She preferred to use the City's current resources to support the LCC project without putting it to a vote of the people.

Mayor Piercy expressed her appreciation for the community's outpouring of support for the projects. She stated that there had been a request to keep the record open until May 17 and typically the council allowed an additional 7 to 14 days when such a request was made. She said the City had agreed to keep the record open until April 30 for the overlapping taxing districts and asked that a motion to that effect be put forward.

Councilor Clark, seconded by Councilor Taylor, moved to leave the record open until April 30.

Councilor Brown, seconded by Councilor Taylor, moved to substitute that the City Council, acting as the Urban Renewal Agency, keep the public record on the Downtown Urban Renewal District plan amendment open until May 17.

Councilor Ortiz inquired about the timing of council actions and efforts to gather signatures for a ballot referral if the record remained open until May 17 instead of April 30. Mr. Ruiz said the council was scheduled to take formal action on the amendment at its May 24 meeting. He was concerned that extending the record beyond April 30 would make it difficult for staff to provide the council with a compilation and evaluation of any additional testimony by its May 10 work session on the amendment. He said that could be accomplished if the record remained open until April 30. The operational date for signature gathering was the May 24 action by the council.

Councilor Poling said he could not support the substitute motion based on the timeline for council consideration of the amendment and formal action. He said if the substitute motion did pass, the May 10 work session and council action on May 24 should be postponed to allow staff adequate time to process additional information and the council time to review it.

Councilor Zelenka commented that the council typically granted a two-week extension if requested, which would extend the record to May 3. He suggested that as a compromise it would still allow staff time to prepare materials for the council. Mr. Ruiz said staff could provide responses in time for the May 10 work session if the record remained open until May 3.

Councilor Brown preferred to extend the record for a longer period of time because each of the projects was rich with problems and potentially legal problems associated with some of the proposed uses of tax increment financing. He felt that the process was moving too quickly and had not allowed sufficient time for discussion.

Councilor Clark indicated he was willing to extend the record to May 3.

Councilor Brown withdrew his substitute motion. Councilor Taylor agreed.

Councilor Clark amended his motion as follows: Move to leave the record open until May 3. Councilor Taylor concurred with the amendment. The motion passed, 7:0.

The meeting adjourned at 9:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jon Ruiz  
City Manager

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)