

# EUGENE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY



---

## Approval of City Council Minutes

---

Meeting Date: July 26, 2010  
Department: City Manager's Office  
*www.eugene-or.gov*

Agenda Item Number: 2A  
Staff Contact: Beth Forrest  
Contact Telephone Number: 541-682-5882

---

### ISSUE STATEMENT

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

### SUGGESTED MOTION

Move to approve the minutes of the May 10, 2010, Council Meeting, May 24, 2010, Council Meeting and June 21, 2010, Public Hearing.

### ATTACHMENTS

- A. May 10, 2010, Council Meeting
- B. May 24, 2010, Council Meeting
- C. June 21, 2010, Public Hearing

### FOR MORE INFORMATION

Staff Contact: Beth Forrest  
Telephone: 541-682-5882  
Staff E-Mail: [beth.l.forrest@ci.eugene.or.us](mailto:beth.l.forrest@ci.eugene.or.us)

## MINUTES

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

May 10, 2010  
7:30 p.m.

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

ABSENT: Andrea Ortiz.

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

## 1. PUBLIC FORUM

Mayor Piercy reviewed the rules of the Public Forum.

**Mary Leighton**, 4046 Normandy Way, Network Charter School, asked the council to direct staff to negotiate a lease agreement between the City and Network Charter School (NCS) for 858 Pearl Street. She said the City's asking price was more than the property was worth. The school had offered to pay for a new appraisal and appraiser Richard Duncan had offered to review the old appraisal at no cost. Ms. Leighton acknowledged it was not the City's job to find the school a home, but suggested that leasing the building to the school was an opportunity to do something that was under the council's control and it could turn what was currently an economic liability into an asset. The school's occupancy would generate funding for the City and provide needed work for the construction community to bring it up to code. Ms. Leighton said the lease was an opportunity to add materially to a vibrant downtown and show support for students who wanted to be downtown.

**Jerry Diethelm**, 2652 Agate Street, asked the council to help keep the NCS downtown and to direct staff to find a mutually acceptable agreement for a lease for the property at 858 Pearl Street. The school would be out of business by the end of June unless it could find a place to occupy. He believed the site could be made to work and emphasized that the school wanted to remain downtown. He suggested the situation called for council direction to create the financial fit to make it work. He believed urban renewal could impact the school in a positive way. He thought the City's investment in NCS would pay off in many ways, including providing more eyes on the street and creating educational partnerships with Lane Community College. It would help the City reduce its carbon footprint.

**Wendy McKenzie**, 290 East 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue, NCS, provided some history about the school's move from the Whiteaker neighborhood to downtown and noted the many places in Lane County that students came from to attend the school. She emphasized the importance of keeping the school downtown to facilitate students' movement to other educational sites, such as Nearby Nature in Alton Baker Park. She suggested that the City could work with the school as it had done with Nearby Nature to facilitate the transaction.

**Daniel Sellers**, 1008 Crocker Lane, a student at NCS, spoke of the importance of the school to students who did not fit into the traditional school system. He thought the school belonged downtown, should stay downtown, and the council could help with that.

**Denise Velasco**, a teacher with the NCS, spoke of the concerns voiced to her by students about the potential loss of the school. Students were worried about large class sizes and about being pulled out of classrooms. They were worried about being lost and unheard in their neighborhood school. Many threatened to drop out if the school was not longer available to them. She noted the homeless students who attended the school and who were very affected by its loss.

**Nicholas Knight-Meigs**, 1587 South Bertelsen Road, spoke in support of NCS. He spoke of his own schooling experience and suggested that it was of the utmost importance that the council assisted the school. He said the school's location downtown was very beneficial to the City. His girlfriend was homeless and had no place to go until she found NCS. She was very happy there while she was able to attend. He wanted every child who attended to enjoy the school and learn from it. He noted the proximity of Lane Transit District and the Eugene Library that benefited the school and were needed for the school to remain functional.

**Zach Bryson**, 1455 Santa Rosa Street, a student at NCS, said he would not have been able to succeed at a public high school and for that reason went to NCS. It had changed his life and he did not know where he would be without it. He was graduating this year and had never thought that would happen.

**Fyona Rose Dahl**, 425 South 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, Cottage Grove, a student at NCS, said many considered the school to be a second home and the students and staff as a family and said they did not know what they would do without it.

**Nathan Spain**, 1270 Hilliard Street, a junior at NCS, characterized NCS as a community and said everyone knew each other and were friends. He agreed that many considered the school a second home and there was no school they would rather attend. He suggested that was quite rare. Now that the school was facing homelessness and its future was uncertain, people such as him were frightened by the potential it would not be available to them in coming years. He wanted to know that the school could continue to thrive and prosper after he had left. He had benefited from the school considerably and the school helped him grow. It helped him gain confidence and learn social skills. He hoped that he could look back and think of the time not as the untimely demise of the school but a difficult time that the school managed to overcome. He asked the council to help the school overcome its current problems.

**Richard Aldrich**, 2225 Salem Avenue, Albany, a senior at NCS, recalled his past experiences at public school, which were not positive. He had then attended NCS and improved his reading, writing, and math skills and was attending school more. He tried to attend another school after trying out NCS without success. Now he participated in class. He thought the school should remain downtown and hoped to attend again next year.

**Brenda Sellers**, 100 A Crocker Lane, a student at NCS, spoke of her positive experience at the school and said if it went away she would have to quit dance, which was her life and one of her communities, as was the school. She asked the council to help NCS stay downtown.

**Gabrielle Legault**, 100 A Crocker Lane, mother of Daniel Sellers, spoke of her involvement as a parent at NCS. She said she appreciated the City's predicament and its desire to dispose of the building. However, she pointed out that in reality, people were not "breaking down the door" to purchase the building from the City. When Ms. Leighton heard the building might be available she had immediately gone to work on partnerships with other nonprofits to fill the building and parents had begun fund raising. However, the school had a short time period and was at risk of not being in place next year if something did not happen soon. She suggested that the school could contribute to a vibrant downtown.

**Don Sellers**, 100 A Crocker Lane, identified himself as the satisfied parent of two NCS students. He asked the

council to do everything it could to help NCS continue to do the wonderful work it did.

**Michelle Rose**, 425 South 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, Cottage Grove, said her two children had gone to NCS but one son had gone back to public school and wished he had stayed at NCS. As a downtown business manager, she thought the students added a great deal to downtown. The school's class room was all of Eugene, and it made sense to keep it downtown given the proximity of resources such as Lane Transit District, the library, and parks. Her daughter loved the school and felt comfortable at a school for the first time. She said if the school was no longer available, she would home school her daughter. She suggested if students did not feel comfortable at their school, they would no longer attend.

**Tanna Konemann**, 1357 West 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue, an NCS teacher, spoke of the friendly and caring atmosphere at NCS created by relationships between teachers and students. She was disheartened by the idea of no longer caring for the students.

**Kimberly Gladen**, 361 West Broadway, said she saw the students everyday and they were good kids setting a good example that she wanted to see downtown. They were making downtown a better place and learning to be good citizens. She thought the location at 858 Pearl Street was ideal for many reasons. She said there were many negative things happening with children downtown and did not want the good example set by NCS students to go away. As a member of the downtown safety task force, she understood that the school was to be in place and regretted that did not appear to be the case. She believed it would be devastating to downtown and the community if the school were no longer downtown. She asked the council to facilitate the negotiations.

**Eleanor Lang**, 775 West 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue, a teacher at NCS, suggested a livable vibrant downtown included a school such as NCS. She believed keeping NCS downtown gave Eugene a positive presence of youth. It benefited the students from proximity to transportation, the library, and other local businesses who need clients. Downtown also reinforced her classroom lessons about sustainability, civics, and urban planning. She questioned what message the City was sending the students.

**Jared Woods**, 775 West 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue, spoke of the lessons he learned as a result of his involvement to NCS. He said the school meant a lot to its students and teachers and they wanted to stay downtown. NCS networked with other community organizations. NCS students received a constant education as a result of the school's location downtown. He suggested that keeping NCS downtown was key to a vibrant downtown. He said students and staff supported many downtown businesses.

**Susann Bradley**, 84729 McBeth Road, a teacher at Eugene Glass School, a satellite organization of NCS, expressed pride in the school and said she was proud of the NCS students. She said students went to Greenhill for its last community service project and later rallied downtown in support of the school even after all the hard work they had done that day. She asked the council to help keep NCS downtown.

**Kevin Prociw**, 3777 Kendra Street, distributed information for the council regarding the timeline for the renaming of Beltline. He complained that the public did not have sufficient time to weigh in on the subject and the council took only 30 seconds to act. He called for an explanation and asked that the council rescind its approval in favor of a more public process.

**Mark Callahan**, 3621 Mahlon Avenue, wanted to know why the council voted in support of the renaming of Beltline. He termed the renaming an unnecessary expense and objected to the expenditure of tax dollars. He maintained that the council's constituents would rather have potholes filled than have the State rename Beltline. He wanted immediate action by the council to rescind its former approval of the name change.

**David Maloney**, 30612 Butterfly Lane, a staff member at NCS, agreed with previous speakers about NCS and spoke of the caring attitude of teachers toward NCS students, which students responded to positively. He said they became something greater than they were before and did many community service projects that benefited the homeless and hungry.

**Andrea Gillespie**, 3877 North Clary Street, manager of the Cascade Adult Center at the Trude Kaufman Center, was present to answer questions about the lease that would be part of the Consent Calendar. She asked the council to consider renewing the lease for three years to give the center a chance to find another location.

**Joe Canady**, 84825 Territorial Road, thanked the council for its assistance in keeping the Trude Kaufman Center open. He supported the lease renewal request and hoped the council would contract with Cascade Adult Center directly for the building.

**Mark Robinowitz**, no address provided, discussed the City's Climate and Energy Action Plan. He noted the plan's call for a decrease in energy consumption and maintained that people would be forced by nature to reduce their energy consumption and would have to make due with much less. He noted that the City planned to double the fee for a community garden plot and questioned how that implemented the community's goals for increased production of local food. He maintained that when the oil was gone, Eugeneans were going to have to grow all their own food. He also questioned widening Beltline because of his beliefs in peak oil. He also objected to EWEB's proposal to provide water to Veneta.

**Michael Peterson**, no address provided, spoke in support of NCS. He said he had been home schooled for seven years without much success and because of a learning disability had not learned to read until his early teens. He did not know if he would have succeeded at all without NCS. Before he attended the school he had not had friends or community connections. The school helped him build those connections. He did not want to think about what would have happened to him without the school. He had faced homelessness and was offered resources and options by teachers and students that resulted in him securing a low-income apartment.

**LeRoy Parks**, 28295 K. R. Neilson Road, opposed the renaming of Beltline Road as wasteful and arrogant and said it benefited no one but the Papé Corporation. It was divisive. He thought the council had more important things to think about, such as the NCS students.

**Cai Ky**, 618 E Street, Springfield, attended NCS and said without the school he did not know what he would do. He had attended a public school and learned nothing because the teaching styles made no sense and teachers were unable to answer his questions because there were so many other students. He had followed two friends to NCS because of their positive reviews and had passed all his classes and learned a lot. He loved attending NCS and now had lots of friends and considered the teachers and staff to be his friends as well.

**Elliot Glaser-Flynn**, 1690 Wilson Street, a freshman at NCS, said he had a very positive experience at his last school and could not imagine being happy at another. However, he had moved to Eugene and attended NCS and within two months felt accepted, comfortable, and made a lot of friends.

**Steve Wilson**, 4549 Souza Street, questioned why the council did not give the cost of the name change of Beltline more consideration. He criticized the council for its support of the Beltline renaming, saying it was a rubber stamp effort. He suggested more consideration should be given to the Governor's decision because he was a lame duck trying to repay his buddies. He asked the council to support the ballot measure his group was trying to get on the ballot. He found councilors Poling and Solomon's support of the name change offensive.

**Jerry Towers**, 874401 Territorial Road, Veneta, maintained that the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) voted against the constitution when they supported the renaming of Beltline Road. Most of the people attending a meeting in Veneta had been against the name changing.

**Charles Ritalin** objected to the renaming of Beltline Road. He also objected to the closure of bathrooms at Monroe Park. He had been happy to see the re-election of the mayor, however.

**Majeska Seese-Green**, 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Van Buren Street, wanted to see a collaboration between the City and NCS in the Downtown Plan. She said that NCS represented the youth downtown, which was a stakeholders' group that had not been included at all. There was no plans for a collaboration outside public safety and there was more needed to the mix, such as arts and culture and Saturday Market. Ms. Seese-Green then voiced her objections to the Beltline renaming process, including the council's involvement, and hoped it rescinded its decision and had a process in place in the future to prevent such a thing from happening again. She asked the council to support the retention of NCS downtown.

Mayor Piercy closed the Public Forum. She thanked the public for its attendance, in particular those who spoke in support of NCS. She said they did a tremendous job articulating the importance of the school.

Mayor Piercy said that the council would discuss its policy related to such renaming issues on May 19 and would apply it to the I-5 crossing over the Willamette River.

Mayor Piercy thanked those who spoke in regard to the Trude Kaufman lease.

Mr. Pryor also thanked those who spoke and recalled he had been on the school board when it approved NCS. He acknowledged the work the manager had done in regard to the subject and asked the manager to provide the council with a memorandum outlining the options that existed. He wanted to know if there was a way to look at the issue from a different angle. He acknowledged the tough financial conditions that existed but said if there was a way to move forward, he would like to do so.

Mr. Pryor appreciated those who spoke about Beltline and reminded them it was not a City decision. The City Council was asked if it thought it was a good idea, and he personally believed it was. However, he did not support the expenditure of money on signage and agreed that the process could be improved. He said as a result of the issue, the council would closely at its policies to ensure it was more thoughtful and mindful of the public in the future.

Mr. Zelenka was impressed by the testimony in support of NCS. He supported Mr. Pryor's request and asked the manager to look at the issue more creatively. He agreed about the City's budget situation and said any transaction must make economic sense for the City.

Mr. Zelenka said that neither Eugene nor the State was spending money on new signs. Old signs would be replaced as they wore out. He agreed the State could have used a better process.

Mr. Zelenka indicated support for the Trude Kaufman lease.

Mr. Poling congratulated the students on their efforts, achievements, and successes, and thanked the NCS staff and teachers for guiding them and showing them what could be accomplished. He supported the continuance of the school and said how it was accomplished was the question. He asked if staff had developed a new funding strategy.

City Manager Ruiz was aware of none.

Mr. Poling suggested the City could work with the County to secure additional funding for the school given the fact that students came from all over the County. He joined in the request made by Mr. Pryor and Mr. Zelenka.

Mr. Poling said he first became aware of the OTC action on March 4 through a one-line e-mail notifying him of OTC's action. He had proposed the letter supporting the renaming. He thought that was the right thing because of the work Mr. Papé had done in promoting the transportation system. Beltline Highway had signs stating it was both Beltline Highway and Beltline Road in reflection of its previous road status. He believed that no matter the name, it would still be referred to as the Beltline. He said it was just a name to honor a man who he believed was worthy of the honor. He agreed the State process could be improved on.

Mayor Piercy understood that people were not necessarily satisfied with the council response to the Beltline renaming controversy. She had encouraged the idea that signs be replaced gradually, and that Beltline be retained as part of the name so that people could use the name they pleased.

Mayor Piercy expressed admiration for the students who were speaking in public with little experience for the first time and commended the students graduating from NCS this year. She said the students were very important to the City.

Mr. Zelenka said he had made a personal plea to OTC Chair Gail Atcherman regarding the phase-in of signs, which was the direction the State chose. He said the council was not aware of the cost at the time it took the vote.

## **II. CONSENT CALENDAR**

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

- March 8, 2010, Work Session
- March 8, 2010, Council Meeting
- April 12, 2010, Work Session
- April 12, 2010, Council Meeting
- April 19, 2010, Public Hearing

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

### **C. Approval of Trude Kaufman Center Lease**

Councilor Clark, seconded by Councilor Taylor, moved to approve the Consent Calendar as presented. Roll call vote; the motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

## **III. ACTION:**

### **Ratification of the Metropolitan Wastewater Management Commission (MWMC) FY11 Regional Wastewater Program Budget and Capital Improvements Program**

City Manager Ruiz reported that the MWMC held a public hearing on the budget on April 9 and later approved the budget. The budget must be ratified by the partners in the MWMC.

Councilor Clark, seconded by Councilor Taylor, moved to ratify the Metropolitan Wastewater Management Commission (MWMC) FY11 Regional Wastewater Program Budget and Capital Improvements Program.

Councilor Poling spoke of the process that led to the creation of the master plan for facilities at the MWMC and said

the budget was one of many steps in the process of upgrading the system to respond to changing federal water quality requirements. He was happy to support the motion and pleased to see the progress the facility was making.

Mr. Zelenka was also supportive of the budget. He recognized the upcoming departure of Peter Ruffier, long-time manager of Wastewater Services.

Roll call vote; the motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the regular meeting of the Eugene City Council at 8:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jon Ruiz,  
City Manager

*(Recorded by Kimberly Young)*



**MINUTES**

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

May 24, 2010  
5:30 p.m.

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

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the May 24, 2010, work session of the Eugene City Council to order.

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

Mayor Piercy expressed appreciation to the Budget Committee for all its hard work during the recent budget review. She reported that she had spoken to two classes at the University of Oregon (UO) on sustainability and to a class at Lane Community College (LCC) on the subject of conflict and peace. She noted that the next Mayor's One-on-One event would be held the next day at the Market of Choice on Franklin Boulevard at 5 p.m. Mayor Piercy reminded the public that LCC would hold a forum on its proposed downtown campus on May 25 at the Eugene Public Library. She also noted the upcoming open house sponsored by the UO Community Planning Workshop, "Get Plugged In," being held on May 26 at 6 p.m. at the Wheeler Pavilion and the open house at Churchill High School regarding Envision Eugene, also scheduled that night.

Mr. Clark congratulated City Manager Jon Ruiz and his staff for the smooth budget process and said the process was less contentious than previous ones, which he attributed to a well presented, well thought-out budget.

Mr. Clark noted his attendance at the May 13 Police Commission meeting and reported that he and Ms. Taylor met with Police Auditor Mark Gissiner to discuss the Civilian Review Board's June report to the City Council. The auditor also discussed his decision to dismiss the Deputy Auditor. Mr. Clark recalled that the council, by City Charter, could only address directly the work of the City Manager, the Police Auditor, and the Municipal Court Judge. City Attorney Glenn Klein confirmed that fact. He said the council adopted code language that stipulated the auditor made all hiring and firing decisions related to the auditor's staff.

Ms. Ortiz noted that in addition to her service on the Eugene Budget Committee, she also served on the Bethel School District Budget Committee and Lane Regional Air Protection Agency (LRAPA) Budget Committee. She said there were concerns that Cottage Grove would not budget funding for its LRAPA dues, and indicated she had forwarded the council an e-mail on the topic. She reported she attended a town hall at the Songbrook development, where several State legislators were present to hear community concerns, and where the City Manager of Junction City spoke of the new State hospital project planned to be located in Junction City and its anticipated impact on that community.

Ms. Ortiz reported on the recent first annual Latino Education Summit held by Bethel School District, noting that there were more than 600 attendees at the summit from around the State. She briefly noted some of the presentations that were made at that event.

Mr. Pryor reported that he attended that day's memorial service for long-time Eugene resident Adell McMillan, who had made many significant contributions to the community over the years, as well as being the long-time director and later Director Emeritus of the Erb Memorial Union on the University of Oregon campus.

Mr. Pryor also commended the work of the Budget Committee and agreed with Mr. Clark it had been a good budget process. He was pleased to see so few changes made to the budget proposed by the manager, which he thought was an acknowledgement of the City's financial condition.

Mr. Pryor reported he attended the recent School District 4J Board of Directors meeting to be available as a resource during the board's discussion of urban renewal funding. The board unanimously concurred with the City's conclusions regarding the financial implications of recent urban renewal funding proposals.

Mr. Brown raised the issue of the dismissal of the Deputy Police Auditor and asked if the council was precluded from speaking to the issue. City Attorney Klein said he would provide a written response to the question in the next council meeting packet.

Ms. Solomon said that the Active Bethel Citizens (ABC) neighborhood organization was meeting on June 26, at 7 p.m., at Petersen Barn, and the annual We Are Bethel Celebration was scheduled to occur on May 29, also at Petersen Barn, from 11 p.m. to 4 p.m. Many great activities were scheduled. She said she had attended the most recent meeting of the Metropolitan Wastewater Management Commission (MWMC), where commissioners had said goodbye to City Public Works Wastewater Manager Peter Ruffier, who was leaving the City's employment. She regretted his departure.

Ms. Solomon noted that she had also attended a meeting of the Public Safety Coordinating Council and a meeting of the Human Services Commission.

Ms. Taylor reported that she attended a Lane County Workforce Executive Committee meeting and commended the work that agency was doing.

Ms. Taylor also commended the community contributions of Adele McMillan and noted Ms. McMillan's two terms on the City's Planning Commission.

Ms. Taylor reported that she had heard from constituents about the new lines on the sidewalk at the Lane Transit District Downtown Station and had visited the station to view the situation herself. The youth she spoke to were not happy about being confined to the edge of the street. She wondered why the delineated space was so wide. City Manager Jon Ruiz believed it was because the lines delineated the sidewalk itself, not a portion of the sidewalk. Ms. Taylor expressed concern that people were not able to stand in the area and talk for a few minutes. She assumed she had broken the law when she visited the area and stood in the marked-off space to talk to people. Ms. Taylor said that some people believed the lines were a way to get people out of downtown. City Manager Ruiz assured Ms. Taylor that the lines were intended to maintain a clear passage for people to traverse the public right-of-way. People who stood in the area were not breaking the law. Ms. Taylor thought half the space currently delineated would be sufficient for that purpose.

Mayor Piercy recalled that the signage in the area indicated that people should leave space for others to walk through and people were not committing a crime when standing in the area. City Manager Ruiz concurred. The intent of the lines was to facilitate movement on the sidewalk. People had been congregating on the sidewalk, making passage challenging.

City Manager Ruiz also regretted the departure of Mr. Ruffier and said Mr. Ruffier could be proud of the green, sustainable, innovative work he had done at the Wastewater Treatment Plant. He reported that Airport Manager Tim Doll was recently elected to the board of directors for the National Association of Airport Executives. In addition, Eugene's fleet was named one of the country's 100 best fleets and he commended the work of Fleet Manager Tony Jobanek for that achievement.

City Manager Ruiz announced the upcoming June 4 BRAVO breakfast recognizing the partnerships between businesses and the arts. He also noted that US Bank's annual economic outlook event was scheduled for June 8.

City Manager Ruiz recognized Central Services Director Kristi Hammitt and Central Services staff Sue Cutsogeorge and Mia Carriaga for their work on the 2011 budget.

Mayor Piercy announced that the Oregon Hispanic Commission would meet in Eugene at the Bascom-Tykeson Room at the Eugene Public Library on June 3 to hear from the community.

**B. WORK SESSION:  
Overview of City Planning Initiatives**

Assistant City Manager Sarah Medary provided a PowerPoint presentation on City Planning and Decision-Making to clarify the various planning processes currently underway at the City of Eugene and to highlight the different tools staff employed to ensure those processes were integrated.

Mayor Piercy solicited council questions and comments on the presentation.

Ms. Ortiz expressed appreciation for the format employed in the presentation, which she felt made the information easier to understand by more people, and commended the quality of City staff.

Mayor Piercy believed that rail would be significant to the community in the future and should be integrated into the City's planning efforts where appropriate.

Mr. Clark agreed with Ms. Ortiz as to the quality of City staff and commended the quality of staff's work.

Mayor Piercy said she struggled to determine how the City could integrate all of its planning processes and continue to move them forward together in a common direction. Assistant City Manager Medary acknowledged the challenge. She said that City Transportation staff had been present at the first Envision Eugene workshop to share information about the transportation system plan and to identify the connections between the two planning processes. In addition, staff was using the same vocabulary to facilitate an easy transition between processes. She believed it would be a challenge to staff to identify the areas where the processes came together and should be more carefully interwoven.

Mayor Piercy reiterated her concerns about doing something through one process that was counter to the goals of another process. She acknowledged that it was difficult to anticipate that. Assistant City Manager

Medary suggested that the triple bottom line tool was a way to ensure that such issues were considered.

Responding to a request from Mr. Brown, Assistant City Manager Medary indicated she would provide the council with copies of the questions included in the triple bottom line analysis.

Mr. Pryor acknowledged the work that had been done and the work to come. He suggested that the council needed to also acknowledge there was conflict ahead. He hoped the council worked through that conflict and came out with something better than it originally considered. He did not think those conflicts would be unique to Eugene and they could be positive, rather than negative. Mr. Pryor anticipated a conflict between reasonable values and suggested that the council owed the community an informed, thoughtful, deliberative discussion when it made its choices, which some people would not support.

Mayor Piercy perceived the Envision Eugene process as an opportunity for the community to have a comprehensive discussion about the future. She said the challenge for participants would be to overcome the initial skepticism that would arise, and while that would not be easy, she thought that the council would be pleased with the results of those efforts.

**C. WORK SESSION:  
Envision Eugene—Project Approach**

The council was joined by Planning Division Director Lisa Gardner, Metro Community Planning Manager Carolyn Weiss, and City Attorney Emily Jerome for the item. Ms. Gardner provided an update on the process and presented a short video on the project.

Ms. Jerome provided a brief overview of the legal framework for the process.

Mr. Zelenka arrived.

Ms. Weiss referred the council to Attachment A in the Agenda Item Summary (AIS) for a listing of issues raised by advisory committees, members of the public, and staff. She recommended that the process address 13 of the 19 listed issues. Items 1-5 were legally required and items 6-13 had a high level of demonstrated community interest.

1. *Transportation findings*
2. *Nodal development*
3. *Housing mix/affordability*
4. *Market trends*
5. *Economic development strategy/site needs*
6. *More integrated land use and transportation*
7. *Underbuild/utilization*
8. *Climate and energy action plan*
9. *Development standards*
10. *District scale modeling*
11. *Seasonally appropriate investments*
12. *Triple bottom line (sustainability)*
13. *Urban form considerations*

Ms. Weiss referred to Attachment B, which included a list of specific work tasks associated with the

Envision Eugene project.

Ms. Weiss noted the items not recommended for inclusion:

- 14. Parcel-specific plan designations*
- 15. Zoning/plan designation consistency*
- 16. Dynamic modeling of residential development*
- 17. Further natural resource protections*
- 18. Further parkland needs*
- 19. Adopt Parks Plan as refinement plan*

Ms. Weiss said that if the council chose to expand the scope of work, there would be time line implications. She invited questions.

Mayor Piercy recalled that past planning processes envisioned a population that was not achieved in the planning horizon. She asked if there was a way to trigger various events as population targets were achieved. Ms. Jerome said that staff was working with the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) on the issue. The law does not include a provision to accomplish that; she suggested the way to accomplish it was to build in a shorter time period for check-ins. For example, the council could build in a check-in during the next periodic review. She pointed out that it would require County concurrence to change that number. Staff continued to discuss the issue with DLCD staff.

Mayor Piercy asked if there was a way to switch out land within the urban growth boundary (UGB) with land outside the UGB. Ms. Jerome indicated that she believed that was possible.

Mayor Piercy suggested that the public did not follow the work of the Planning Commission to the degree it did the work of the City Council, and asked how the City could help the community focus on the Planning Commission phase of the process to better engage it. Ms. Gardner said the City was attempting to do that and reported that the commission was seeing more attendance at its meetings. The commission had not received much public comment, but generally 12 to 15 people were present to hear its discussions. Mayor Piercy wanted to see more people in attendance.

Mayor Piercy hoped the City tracked its experience with the triple bottom line tool so it could show other communities how it worked as she considered the tool to be quite innovative and potentially useful to those communities as well.

Speaking to population projections that indicated 34,000 more people would move to Lane County, Mr. Clark suggested the community would grow up, out, or a combination of the two. He believed it would be a combination of growing both up and out.

While he commended the staff work in general, Mr. Clark expressed concern that staff did not plan to include item 17 -Further natural resource protections - which precluded any analysis of natural resources such as drainageways outside the city limits. He said that appeared to suggest that all the undeveloped land in Santa Clara considered in the Eugene Comprehensive Lands Analysis (ECLA) was developable, and the drainageways would not be protected by the City. He thought that would also concern Santa Clara residents. He wanted to know what the City could do to address his concern without pushing the timeframe out too far.

Mr. Clark asked about the relationship between items 11 and 17 and what the City would be able to address in regard to those items. He also found some of the items on the list less important than the issue of drainageways, and asked staff to discuss the rationale for its recommendations. In response, Ms. Weiss clarified that while staff recommended items 1 through 13 it did not believe it could accomplish them within the current timeline. They would require a timeline extension to accomplish them all. Staff would address the legally required items, 1- 5, to the extent they were legally required within the current time frame. She said in regard to drainageways, staff could develop a timeline for addressing that issue and return to the council.

Ms. Ortiz recommended that Planning Commission meetings be broadcast on Metro Television throughout the Envision Eugene process, and requested the cost of that. City Manager Ruiz commended the suggestion and said that unless the cost proved prohibitive, staff would figure out how to make that happen.

Mr. Zelenka wanted to know the cost of addressing items 1- 5, beyond the minimum legal parameters and also wanted to know the cost of addressing the items that staff did not recommend. He thought it was very important to do the process right and pointed out the council was working under a self-imposed deadline. City Manager Ruiz indicated staff would return with a recommendation on June 14.

Mayor Piercy acknowledged the conflict between the desires of those who wished to do the process right and those who wished to do it quickly and wondered if there was a way to accommodate both interests and give them confidence in the process. Ms. Gardner indicated staff would provide a response to the question on June 14.

Mr. Clark expressed disappointment about further process delay, which he said would serve the ends of some but not all residents. He agreed with Mr. Zelenka it was important to do the process right, and suggested failure to address natural resource protections in Santa Clara would result in a divided community, with people working to stop projects using the regulatory system. He thought the City could have avoided that by preparing intelligently.

Mr. Clark asked if the City had done any analysis to determine if its infrastructure was sufficient to handle a higher level of density. Ms. Jerome said yes, as it was legally required to do so. The City must demonstrate that it could provide the infrastructure needed for more dense development.

Speaking to the triggers mentioned by Ms. Jerome, Mr. Zelenka thought it was bad policy to make irrevocable decisions based on wrong numbers, and he thought the numbers would be wrong. Such triggers would allow the City to make adjustments along the way. He suggested that the City approach the 2011 Oregon Legislature to seek an exemption that allowed that to occur and to modernize the planning rules to recognize that planning had become more complex since the law was written.

Responding to a question from Ms. Taylor about the source of the figure attached to the anticipated demand for housing, Ms. Weiss said the number came from the ECLA project. ECLA suggested that 15,000 homes would be required over the next 20 years; 10,000 of those homes could be accommodated within the UGB. Of the 5,000 that could not be accommodated within the UGB, past trends suggested that 4,000 would be provided in the form of single-family houses and 1,000 would be provided in the form of multi-family housing. She said the City had the ability to reexamine those trends. Ms. Taylor was disturbed by the use of past trends and thought the State requirement that the City project housing demand in 20 years was outmoded because there could be a lot of change in 20 years.

Ms. Taylor did not see any point to rushing the process and did not understand Mr. Clark's comments that delay served some interests because she did not know whose interests those were. She believed the City needed to work on changing the law that required it to do a 20-year plan because things change in 20 years.

Mr. Pryor said he could appreciate Mr. Clark's frustration about the pace of the project and said he did not want the pace of the project to be a deliberate impediment. He wanted the project to move at a pace that produced the best product. Mr. Pryor acknowledged that unlike some, he did not see a clear end to the process, and was willing to move at a slower pace while he attempted to figure out what the vision was. His expectation was that people would work together sincerely.

Mr. Clark wanted the process to be done correctly and wanted the City's expenditure of time and money to produce something that was legally defensible and helpful to growing the community in the way it wanted to grow. The choices the council made now were key to achieving that goal. Speaking to Mr. Zelenka's remarks about seeking a legislative remedy, he suggested that the City could accomplish the same thing by proposing to the State that Eugene be required to do more frequent periodic reviews.

Responding to a question from Mr. Clark about the State's response to the region's use of performance measures in TransPlan, Ms. Gardner indicated that more discussion would occur with the Land Conservation and Development Commission in July, and staff would report to the council following that meeting. She believed that from past conversations with DLCD staff, the region was on target with its performance measures. Mr. Clark expressed some surprise at that. He said that he had been concerned that the work had been insufficient and that the community was already behind as it started to revise the transportation plan.

Speaking to Ms. Taylor's remarks, Mr. Zelenka said he thought 20-year planning was very good but reiterated his call for triggers throughout the planning process.

Mr. Zelenka wondered if there was a way for staff to identify the most useful work tasks related to items 14-19 and include those in the process.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the work session at 7:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jon Ruiz,  
City Manager

*(Recorded by Kimberly Young)*

## MINUTES

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

June 21, 2010  
 7:30 p.m.

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

ABSENT: Jennifer Solomon.

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

**1. PUBLIC HEARING:**

**A Resolution Adopting the Budget, Making Appropriations, Determining, Levying, and Categorizing the Annual Ad Valorem Property Tax Levy for the City of Eugene for the Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2010, and Ending June 30, 2011; a Resolution Electing to Receive State Revenue Sharing Funds Pursuant to Section 221.770 of Oregon Revised Statutes; and a Resolution Certifying that the City of Eugene Provides the Municipal Services Required by Oregon Revised Statutes Section 221.760 in Order to Receive State Shared Revenues**

Mayor Piercy reviewed the rules for the public hearing. She opened the public hearing.

City Manager Jon Ruiz announced the public hearings for the first four items were opportunities for the council to hear from the public in regard to the proposed fiscal year 2011 City of Eugene budget and supplemental budgets. Deliberations would occur on June 28.

**John Barofsky**, 2010 Hubbard Lane, Chair of the Budget Committee, thanked the members of the Budget Committee and City staff for the work involved in the budget before the council. He had been pleased with the openness of the process and level of communication the manager and staff brought to the process. He spoke to areas of concern, including that the manager brought forward proposals related to the reduction of hours at aquatics facilities and parks programs which consumed considerable committee time better devoted to larger issues. He suggested that this took time away from other discussions and was not an efficient use of the committee's time. However, he was glad both programs were able to be funded.

On positive notes, Mr. Barofsky believed the City was on its way to a sustainable budget. He noted that the budget funded a needed neighborhood park in north Eugene, and also included funding for the ongoing maintenance of the park. The committee had also supplemented funding for the Human Services Commission and had dedicated one-time funds to roads. He felt prudent choices were made in regard to animal control. Mr. Barofsky recommended passage of the budget and thanked those who offered input.

Mayor Piercy closed the public hearing and thanked Mr. Barofsky for his service as Budget Committee chair.



Mayor Piercy closed the meeting of the City Council and convened a meeting of the Urban Renewal Agency (URA).

**2. PUBLIC HEARING:  
A Resolution of the Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Eugene Adopting the Budget,  
Making Appropriations, and Declaring the Amount of Tax to be Certified for the Fiscal Year  
Beginning July 1, 2010, and Ending June 30, 2011**

Mayor Piercy opened the public hearing. There being no requests to speak, she closed the public hearing.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting of the URA and convened the City Council.

**3. PUBLIC HEARING:  
Resolution Adopting a Supplemental Budget; Making Appropriations for the City of Eugene  
for the Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2009, and Ending June 30, 2010**

Mayor Piercy opened the public hearing.

**John Barofsky**, 2010 Hubbard Lane, expressed concern about a shift in the Risk and Benefits Fund budget that reduced the balance available in that fund by \$1 million and increased the operating budget appropriation for the Central Services budget by a like amount to pay for a health insurance claim due to an adverse claims experience. He recalled a cost-cutting strategy put forth by staff for the fiscal year 2010 budget that reduced the estimate of risk claims expenses, which saved \$473,000. However, he feared that the City had realized that savings at the cost of \$1 million in higher claims. Mr. Barofsky was also concerned that the downtown Wellness Center, which had been a significant expenditure, did not seem to have reduced claims.

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

Risk and Benefits Manager Myrnie Daut attributed the \$1 million shift from the Balance Available to the Claims line item in the Employee Health Fund to some extraordinarily large claims; the City had the largest single claim it ever experienced, \$600,000, as well as 11 smaller claims that exceeded \$100,000. The City was self-insured for the first \$150,000 for each claim but must pay the full amount of the claim and seek reimbursement from its stop-loss carrier. The City would be reimbursed for most of its large claims, but to ensure there was sufficient funding, staff submitted the supplemental budget request. That occurred before the resolution of the large claims, and did not reflect an overall increase in program costs.

Mayor Piercy asked Ms. Daut to speak to the cost-effectiveness of the Wellness Center. Ms. Daut said more employees were using the fitness center who had not been regular exercisers before, and the center offered them an opportunity to meet their fitness goals.

Mayor Piercy solicited council questions or comments. There were none.

Mayor Piercy closed the meeting of the City Council and convened a meeting of the URA.

**4. PUBLIC HEARING:  
Resolution Adopting a Supplemental Budget; Making Appropriations for the Urban Renewal Agency for the Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2009, and Ending June 30, 2010**

Mayor Piercy opened the public hearing.

**Mary Salinas**, General Delivery, Eugene, shared her concern about the homeless and questioned if the City had given much money to the homeless in the current budget. She advocated for more money to be dedicated to the Egan Warming Center.

Mayor Piercy closed the public hearing. She called for questions or comments. There were none.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting of the URA and reconvened the meeting of the City Council.

**5. PUBLIC HEARING:  
An Ordinance Concerning the Walnut Street Station Mixed-Use Center; Amending the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan Land Use Diagram; Adopting the Walnut Street Station Refinement Plan; Amending the Fairmount/University of Oregon Special Area Study; Amending the Riverfront Park Study; Rezoning Property; Amending Sections 9.1030, 9.2682, 9.5750, 9.6750, 9.7007, 9.7055, 9.7205, 9.7230, 9.7605, 9.7230, 9.7605, 9.8010, 9.8030, 9.8680, 9.8865, and 9.9570 of the Eugene Code, 1971; Renumbering Sections 9.8110 and 9.8113 of that Code to Sections 9.8007 and 9.8009, Respectively; Adding Sections 9.3950, 9.3955, 9.3960, 9.3965, 9.3970, 9.3975, 9.3980, 9.8110, 9.8111, 9.8112, 9.8113, 9.8114, and 9.9655 to that Code; Adopting Special Setbacks for a Segment of Franklin Boulevard; Adopting a Severability Clause; and Providing an Effective Date**

City Manager Ruiz introduced the topic and noted the council was scheduled to deliberate and take action on July 26, 2010.

Mayor Piercy reviewed the rules of the public hearing. She opened the public hearing.

**Bruce Mulligan**, 3056 Hendricks Drive, submitted written testimony. He said the process had been in progress for several years, and he noted the collaborative approach to the form-based code that involved the Chamber of Commerce, Fairmount Area Neighbors (FAN), and the University of Oregon. He said the code was not perfect, and compromises were made. He acknowledged that businesses still had some concerns about the multi-way boulevard concept and access restriction that he hoped would be resolved. He supported the form based code as a way to resolve disputes before they arose and streamline development for businesses. He thought the plan was an example of what could happen when people sat down and resolved their differences. He thought the proposed form based code an ideal model for the future and asked the council to recognize the work that had been done.

**Elizabeth Steffensen**, 2435 Skyline Boulevard, a member of FAN, endorsed the Planning Commission's recommendation to the City Council that the form based code be evaluated after 50,000 square feet of development had occurred or three years had passed. The neighborhood could then evaluate the resulting impacts and suggest adaptive management approaches that could take the form of code or plan changes or other supplemental council actions. She said FAN expected any evaluation to be done in collaboration with all stakeholders, including the neighborhood association.

**Rena Cowen**, 1432 Orchard Street, noted the apartment being constructed to the north of her property and plans to build similar structures to the west and south. She had originally favored the node concept, but was also told her business was valuable to the community and neighborhood and no one wanted to impact her business negatively. However, in reality, she anticipated her business would get squeezed out of the neighborhood because she would no longer be able to secure parking for her employees and customers. She had 17 employees and many customers and the coming apartment dwellers would need parking. Ms. Cowen suggested that allowing such high density construction without requiring parking was foolish. She said that it was silly to assume that the people who lived in apartments would not have cars. They would still have cars because people in Eugene needed cars because of the rain and because the bus did not fit their schedules. She liked the idea of a livable and walkable neighborhood, but that did not solve the problem of how clients accessed her business. Most arrived in their cars with their sick animals.

Ms. Cowen believed that the multi-way boulevard concept for Franklin Boulevard was poorly thought-out. It was the major arterial to reach the area for many, and she thought that reducing the number of through lanes and adding a parking lane seemed “crazy.” It would cost a great deal and she doubted it would accomplish what it was intended to do.

**Jeff Nelson**, 2144 East 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, said he lived across the street from properties controlled by the University of Oregon, including the former Romania property. He requested that the record remain open for ten days.

Mr. Nelson asked staff to provide clarification on the differences between the word “abutting” and the word “adjacent.” He wanted the legislative intent to reflect that “adjacent” included property across a right-of-way or easement, and should include mitigation of impacts across the street. The plan expanded the list of outright permitted uses, which he believed shifted mitigation responsibility from developers to the City Council. He wanted the council to keep in mind that the City would be taking more proactive responsibility for mitigation to the neighborhood.

Mr. Nelson asked that surface parking lots be subject to design review.

**Don Philpot**, 1568 Orchard Street, expressed concern about the transition on 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue between the high-density residential (HDR) area and existing residential area. He believed that the transition from north to south was more responsive to the HDR use than to the existing residential use. The setbacks on the north side were not residential in scale. He suggested that the building heights could remain the same but the setback could be widened to be responsive to the neighborhood scale.

Mr. Philpot discussed the lighting standards, which were for a medium ambient light. He said that was a higher standard than a residential standard of lighting. He thought that created too abrupt a transition, and said the transition should be part of the new development and occur from 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue to the north. He asked that the ambient light standard be lowered to be more appropriate to the neighborhood. He also objected to signage that would be potentially allowed, such as reader-boards.

Mr. Philpot believed that parking had been overlooked as something undesirable, but the reality was that there were businesses that needed parking and residents who would also need parking.

**Jared Mason-Gere**, representing the Eugene Chamber of Commerce at 1401 Willamette Street, submitted written testimony. He commended City staff for its work through the process, and particularly noted the work done by the Walnut Station Stakeholders, an effort which brought several groups together to develop a

plan that would benefit the community in the long-term. He commended the form based code as having a number of advantages in that it fostered a walkable, vibrant, diverse, dense neighborhood served by bus rapid transit. It would also facilitate a more streamlined, uniform process for those wishing to build in Eugene.

Mr. Mason-Gere did not support the last minute change related to the body that heard appeals, which had been made by the Planning Commission. He thought there would be more certainty if such appeals went to the Hearings Official as opposed to the Planning Commission, which was a board of political appointees. He was also concerned about negative impacts on business owners on the south side of Franklin Boulevard by the threat of special setbacks on which one could not build. He asked the council to mitigate that, address the appeals process, and adopt the code.

**Susie Smith**, 1659 Orchard Street, a member of the Walnut Mixed-Use Subcommittee of FAN, shared a “no node” sign from 2003 and acknowledged the process leading to the council’s consideration of the Walnut Station MUC was a long one. While she thought the process started on a sour note, she believed the outcome was an incredible product of collaboration. She believed the draft plan was getting better with each review and hoped by July 26 it would be “really good.” Ms. Smith acknowledged the plan was not perfect and there were problems, but she thought the plan went a long way toward addressing the issues that had been mentioned in testimony. She thought it addressed the edges between the MUC and the neighborhood and expressed support for the proposed evaluation process. Ms. Smith said the neighborhood saw much potential in the plan, including the potential that the multi-way boulevard could be a beautiful entrance into the city.

Ms. Smith thanked Project Manager Lydia McKinney and said the project would not have gotten so far without Ms. McKinney’s energy and ability to forge consensus through collaboration.

**Josh Reckord**, 1575 Fairmount Boulevard, spoke to the creation of an expectation of graceful transitions from mixed-use to single-family houses. He noted that the term “graceful transition” was found in the plan, but grace could not be asserted and must be demonstrated. He believed that graceful transitions were necessary to satisfy those who participated in the planning process as well as to demonstrate the viability of such projects to others in the community as the City contemplated additional mixed-use centers.

Mr. Reckord believed the City needed to commit ongoing resources of time and money to the planning process to overcome residents’ resistance to change. He suggested implementation would be key to the success of the MUC. How that occurred would set the stage for moving forward. He suggested that resources be used to assess both the process and the products that resulted.

**David Sonnichsen**, 2435 Skyline Boulevard, supported the multi-way boulevard, terming it vital to FAN’s support of the Walnut Station MUC. He said a smooth flow of motorized vehicles using a new Franklin Boulevard friendly to both local and pass-through users, augmented by mass transit, would unite parts of the neighborhood now divided by Franklin Boulevard. Much of the “knitting” would be created by alternative modes. He said that the boulevard would make crossing Franklin more inviting and would promote access to the Millrace riparian corridor and Willamette River because of the stepped down height limits.

**Camilla Bayliss**, 1621 Fairmount Boulevard, spoke to the need for the parking policies recommended by staff and noted the increase in parking problems as the University of Oregon grew and the neighborhood increased in density. The neighborhood succeeded in getting recognition from the UO of the impact of parking spillover problems from UO events. She cited examples of some problems created by those events.

Ms. Bayliss said the Walnut Station MUC Plan included a reduction in the required amount of off-street parking required by new developments without analysis or an attempt to address its impact on the neighborhood outside of committing that the arena parking district remained in place. The arena parking district was not a panacea and parking enforcement did not occur at night. Ms. Bayliss pointed out that the new Courtside Apartments had four floors of apartments and limited parking underneath; she questioned where residents would put their cars. She suggested that the overnight storage of such cars in the neighborhood was unacceptable, and called for a study to determine whether supplemental parking program measures beyond the arena parking district were needed. In addition, she called for a future re-evaluation of the situation. She noted that staff recommended both courses of action, and FAN supported the staff recommendation.

**Mary Ann Holser**, 2626 Cresta de Ruta, submitted her written testimony. She called for careful future evaluation of the plan components, including the developments that resulted, to ensure that it produced the desired outcome. She called on the University of Oregon to define the uses it located on public lands so the parking demand could be evaluated. Such uses could cause problems for adjacent neighbors. Without such definition, there could be negative impacts on the mixed-use vision. She said FAN requested that the evaluation be completed within a year.

**Sue Jakabosky**, 2018 Orchard Street, FAN Board of Directors, commended all those who put effort into the Walnut Station MUC for so many years. She said that the plan might not be perfect but she agreed with Ms. Smith it was getting better and better. She hoped the council honored all that commitment. She spoke to property values and said the neighborhood was still very desirable. With all the things occurring in the neighborhood, many people had expressed concern that it maintain its value and amenities and continue to be a place people loved to live in. She thought the plan would help maintain the neighborhood, which was a prime goal for residents.

**Marion Walter**, 1846 Orchard Street, urged the council to consider the issue of pedestrian safety seriously. She said it was dangerous and unpleasant to cross many area streets, especially Orchard Street and Franklin Boulevard.

**John Barofsky**, 2010 Hubbard Lane, submitted written testimony. He acknowledged the work that led to the MUC Plan. As a business owner and resident, he felt the steps taken had been positive and all had come together on the plan. He acknowledged the critical role played by the development community in the development of the area. He thought the plan fit all stakeholders and the collaboration worked well. The neighborhood association believed the recommendations related to a traffic study and parking were important to the neighborhood livability and he personally saw them important to the city as a whole as the MUC was the first the City Council would adopt and there were others remaining to be planned for. He thought that the current planning process could inform those future processes and would be valuable in assigning impacts and finding ways to mitigate them. Since such studies required resources, he asked the council to direct the City Manager to ensure funding was in place to support them. Mr. Barofsky suggested that one-time funding from the one-time vacation of property in the MUC area be used as a resource. He thanked the stakeholders.

**Al Couper**, 2850 Harris Street, supported the Walnut Station MUC Plan. He said that form-based codes were past the experimental phase, as evidenced by the many in existence. He had never seen a more open and collaborative process than the planning process. All those with an interest had an opportunity to participate. He said the frequent complaint about form based codes was that they emphasized form rather than use and led to a lack of due process; however, the area in question was now zoned C-2, which allowed

most uses, and the process added several uses, so he thought that created a net increase in due process which allowed for the mitigation of impacts.

Mayor Piercy closed the public hearing. She thanked all those involved in the planning process, particularly the FAN. She said the council was deeply concerned about protecting neighborhoods and the lessons from the process would assist the City in other tasks that lay ahead.

Councilor Zelenka thanked those who offered testimony and those who collaborated in the planning process. He also commended the staff work of Ms. McKinney. He said the plan was an experiment in two areas new to Eugene, the fact of the first MUC and the first deployment of a form based code. He suggested it was important to get things right the first time because of the City's hope to have more such MUCs in more areas.

Councilor Brown also thanked those who testified. He referred to page 3 of the plan, which referred to the opportunity to protect the existing Fairmount Neighborhood. He asked how the plan would protect the neighborhood in a way that current codes did not. Ms. McKinney suggested that one major emphasis was the 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue transition edge. The existing zoning was C-2, General Commercial, or PL, Public Lands, for the most part, which allowed 120 feet in height with no setbacks and a broad range of commercial uses. Rather than creating an abrupt edge between the two uses, planners looked at how to mitigate impacts, such as height limits that stepped up and more design standards for buildings along the edge.

Responding to a question from Councilor Brown, Ms. McKinney described the scope of new apartment development in the area.

Councilor Poling thanked all those who were involved in the planning process and the commitment they demonstrated. He thought the plan a good example of collaboration. He asked what the approximate total length of the proposed multi-way boulevard would be. Ms. McKinney noted the extent of the boulevard, which extended from Walnut to Onyx streets. She clarified that the improvements would not go the length of Franklin Boulevard.

Councilor Poling asked the rationale for changing the appeal process. Ms. McKinney said that FAN requested that process, and staff discussed that with the stakeholders group. It came up at the end of the process, and originally staff thought that the process had more support from the other stakeholders. However, they preferred the appeal going to the Hearings Official. The Planning Commission discussed the issue and agreed that because the code was new and it had familiarity with it, it was the correct body to hear such appeals.

Councilor Poling indicated his disagreement with the recommendation of the Planning Commission in regard to the appeals process because the Hearings Official was specially trained to hear such appeals. He would recommend a change in that element of the plan.

Councilor Clark congratulated Ms. McKinney and those involved in the successful completion of the planning process. He believed the plan would help the community grow in a helpful way. He acknowledged the concerns expressed by neighbors in regard to parking.

Councilor Clark questioned if the City had the appropriate processes in place to evaluate parking impacts. He thought that parking was an area that could create conflicts in the future. He called on the City to do a better job up front about being wise about parking impacts.

Councilor Clark, seconded by Councilor Taylor, moved to hold the record open until July 1 at 5 p.m. Roll call vote; the motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jon Ruiz  
City Manager

*(Recorded by Kimberly Young)*