

EUGENE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY



Approval of City Council Minutes

Meeting Date: September 27, 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 12, 2010, Work Session and May 19, 2010, Work Session.

ATTACHMENTS

- A. May 12, 2010, Work Session
- B. May 19, 2010, Work Session

FOR MORE INFORMATION

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

MINUTES

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

May 12, 2010
12:00 p.m.

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

Ms. Piercy called the work session of the Eugene City Council to order at 12:00 p.m.

A. WORK SESSION: Eugene Water & Electric Board Water Rights

City Manager Jon Ruiz introduced City Attorney Glenn Klein to present information regarding EWEB's contract with the City of Veneta.

Mr. Klein apologized for the lateness of the work session discussion information that had been provided to the Council members. He provided an overview of the discussion information that had been provided to the council as part of the agenda item summary materials and noted that an article had appeared in the May 10, 2010, edition of the *Register-Guard* regarding EWEB's ongoing negotiations with the City of Veneta for the sale of water rights to Veneta. Mr. Klein noted that the terms of the sale had been finalized and that the contract for the sale had been submitted to the Lane County Circuit Court for validation.

Mr. Klein stated that the Eugene City Charter granted EWEB the authority to operate the water and electric utility "subject to control by the council of extension of water service." He further noted that the council, as part of its legislative powers, had also adopted certain Code provisions (Section 2.212) that provided in part that the "City, including EWEB, shall not provide water, water service or sewer service outside the city limits except as authorized pursuant to the City Charter, this Code, and adopted resolutions."

Mr. Klein reported that EWEB believed that its authority under the Eugene City Charter to operate the water utility included the authority to sell water rights to the City of Veneta.

Mr. Klein stated from the agenda item summary materials that Mr. Ruiz believed that perfecting the City's water rights was a good idea.

Mr. Klein noted the staff recommendation that the council direct the City Manager to hold a public forum to allow members of the community to learn more about EWEB's proposed sale of water to the City of Veneta. He suggested that any such public forums be conducted in conjunction with EWEB staff.

Mr. Klein noted that subsequent to the public forum, staff recommended that the City Council then conduct a public hearing to solicit feedback regarding EWEB's proposed water sale before the council determined a position regarding said sale.

Mr. Klein referenced the timelines involved in the litigation surrounding EWEB's proposed water sale and stated that the City of Eugene, in order to preserve its rights to participate in EWEB's transaction, would need to direct him to take action no later than the end of May 2010.

Mr. Klein noted that his intention, should the staff-recommended motion pass, was to file a motion in the Lane County Circuit Court indicating that the Eugene City Council planned to hold a public forum and hearing.

Mr. Klein noted that Intergovernmental Relations Manager Brenda Wilson was available to provide to the council further information regarding water rights.

Mr. Klein, responding to a question from Mr. Klein, suggested that the Lane County Circuit Court's determination regarding the validity of the EWEB contract with Veneta would be made within the next six to seven months.

Mr. Klein, responding to a question from Ms. Ortiz, noted that the City of Eugene did not receive contributions in lieu of taxes on water.

Mr. Klein, responding to a question from Ms. Ortiz, asked if EWEB had held any public hearings regarding its proposed contract with the City of Veneta.

Ms. Ortiz assumed that some sort of wetlands impact study would be conducted as part of EWEB's proposed water sale to the City of Veneta.

Mr. Klein responded to Ms. Ortiz's comment and briefly noted the various municipal processes that EWEB and the City of Veneta would be required to undergo as part of the water sale. He further noted that the current staff recommendation to the council would not necessarily impact those processes.

Mr. Brown asked if there were any representatives from EWEB present to speak to the staff-recommended motion. Mr. Ruiz suggested that City staff could forward the council's questions regarding the matter to EWEB, and then report back to the council, and would also provide the council with additional information regarding water availability and usage in Veneta.

Mr. Klein suggested that any information regarding EWEB's sale of water to Veneta that staff collected for the council might also be used in any public forums or hearings regarding the matter.

Mr. Klein, responding to a question from Mr. Brown, stated that EWEB had not sought the validation of the Lane County Circuit Court when it extended its water utility service to the Bethel area.

Mr. Brown noted that he still had several questions regarding how the EWEB water sale to Veneta related to the City of Eugene's Climate and Energy Action Plan and that he would email those questions to staff.

Mr. Zelenka understood from Mr. Klein's comments that the Eugene City Council needed to approve any water sale by EWEB that took place outside the Eugene city limits. Mr. Klein confirmed Mr. Zelenka's understanding but could not confirm whether or not the City of Eugene had approved water sales for the River Road and Santa Clara areas. He did know that the City of Eugene had approved a previous EWEB water sale to the Willamette Water Company. Mr. Klein described how the City's code provisions had been revised in recent years with respect to the sale of water to districts beyond the Eugene city limits.

Mr. Poling arrived to the meeting at 12:10 p.m.

Mr. Klein noted that although the Eugene City Charter was clear that EWEB needed the approval of the Eugene City Council for extraterritorial extensions of “water service” there was a difference of opinion as to whether or not the wholesale purchase of water by a city was actually water service or a sale of water.

Mr. Klein briefly discussed how the staff-recommended motion would relate to the Lane County Circuit Court’s review of the EWEB contract.

Mr. Zelenka expressed his support for the perfection of local water rights but noted his uncertainty regarding EWEB’s proposed water sale to the City of Veneta.

Mr. Klein responded to Mr. Zelenka’s comment and stated that the staff-recommended motion had been intended to ensure that sufficient information regarding the EWEB sale would be provided to the Eugene City Council in order that they might make an informed decision regarding the sale.

Mr. Klein hoped that the City might schedule the public forum during the month of May and that the subsequent public hearing regarding the EWEB water sale could be scheduled for before the end of June.

Mr. Zelenka indicated his understanding that any motions filed by Mr. Klein on behalf of the City would be intended to preserve the right of the City of Eugene to participate as an interested party in EWEB’s water sale to Veneta. Mr. Klein confirmed Mr. Zelenka’s understanding.

Ms. Taylor asked if the only way the City could protect local water rights surrounding the EWEB sale to Veneta was through the legal action which Mr. Klein had described. Mr. Klein responded that the course of action he had described was the only course that did not require direct assistance from EWEB.

Ms. Wilson, responding to a question from Ms. Taylor, briefly described how local water rights might be perfected by demonstrating a real and beneficial use of the water. Ms. Wilson further discussed other ways in which local water rights might be formally perfected for public use.

Ms. Wilson, responding to a question from Ms. Solomon, noted that municipalities were required to provide water management conservation plans to the State that demonstrated a clear plan for the perfection of local water rights. Mr. Wilson further noted that municipal use water laws had changed in the past few years so that municipalities were required to demonstrate beneficial use within a reasonable timeframe.

Ms. Wilson, responding to a question from Ms. Solomon, described how water allocations under established and perfected water rights were usually made. She further maintained that EWEB was concerned that it might lose its water rights for the City of Veneta if it did not act quickly to perfect those water rights.

Mr. Klein suggested that City staff might ask EWEB to help the City develop a plan for perfecting local water rights as part of the upcoming public forums regarding the EWEB water sale to Veneta.

Mr. Klein, responding to a question from Ms. Solomon noted that EWEB sought the Lane County Circuit Court’s validation on the contract for its proposed water sale to Veneta. He further noted that EWEB’s contract might be deemed valid if it was approved by the Eugene City Council.

Mr. Ruiz suspected that EWEB’s contract with the City of Veneta, if deemed valid by the Lane County Circuit Court, might be cited as a precedent for any future water sales beyond the Eugene city limits.

Mr. Pryor agreed with Ms. Wilson's explanation regarding the manner in which the City of Eugene needed to maintain and perfect its local water rights. He further maintained that the staff recommended motion represented a way in which the City might protect its claim for local water rights.

Mr. Klein, responding to a question from Mr. Clark, described the relationship between the City of Eugene and EWEB with particular emphasis on how that relationship affected the utilities provided by EWEB. Mr. Klein further noted that while EWEB was technically a part of the City of Eugene, under the Eugene City Charter, certain City powers were delegated to EWEB.

Mr. Klein specified that the water rights under discussion belonged to the City of Eugene and that EWEB was not an independent legal entity.

Mr. Clark asked if EWEB shared Mr. Klein's understanding of the relationship between itself and the City of Eugene. Mr. Klein responded that he had not asked EWEB if it agreed that it was part of the City of Eugene, but that he had identified legal precedent that demonstrated that it was.

Mr. Clark recognized that the discussion at hand concerned EWEB's authority with respect to local water rights and whether or not EWEB had the authority to sell water outside the Eugene city limits without the approval of the Eugene City Council.

Mr. Poling asked if Mr. Klein's plan to file court pleadings would establish a good faith effort to perfect the City of Eugene's water rights. Ms. Wilson replied that such legal action would not solely perfect the City's water rights but would demonstrate to State officials that the City intended to perfect its water rights. Ms. Wilson restated that the City needed to put water to a beneficial use before the rights concerning the water would be perfected.

Ms. Wilson, responding to a comment from Mr. Poling, stated that she did not believe it was likely that the City of Eugene would lose its water rights as a result of any legal actions relating to EWEB's water sale to Veneta.

Ms. Ortiz indicated her frustration that EWEB staff was not more directly involved in the council's discussion. She hoped that EWEB representatives would be provided the opportunity to present their rationale for their current course of action with respect to the water sale to the City of Veneta.

Ms. Ortiz supported EWEB's efforts to provide water to the citizens of Veneta.

Mr. Zelenka indicated his disappointment with the EWEB Board of Directors for their reluctance to involve the Eugene City Council in their proposed contract with the City of Veneta.

Mr. Zelenka briefly discussed his understanding of the City of Eugene's current water rights and asked for further clarification from Ms. Wilson. Ms. Wilson replied that municipal water rights functioned differently from individual and agricultural water rights in that municipalities normally were tasked to develop a long-term water management conservation plan as part of their water rights that was required to be continually updated.

Mr. Klein, responding to a question from Mr. Zelenka, noted that he had not yet discussed the water sale to Veneta with EWEB's attorneys but generally understood that EWEB intended to sell the water wholesale to the City of Veneta rather than directly to consumers.

Mr. Brown agreed with Mr. Klein's determination that the authority regarding EWEB's proposed sale ultimately rested with the Eugene City Council.

Ms. Wilson, responding to a question from Mr. Brown, noted that partial certification with respect to water rights was intended to show State officials that a municipality was moving forward with its efforts to demonstrate the beneficial use of its entire water allotment.

Mr. Clark, seconded by Ms. Taylor, moved to direct the City Manager to schedule (1) a public forum, with EWEB's involvement if EWEB is willing, in order to provide information to the public about the proposed sale of water; and (2) following that forum, a public hearing on a proposed resolution concerning EWEB's proposed sale of water to Veneta; and (3) a joint meeting with the EWEB Board of Directors before scheduling the matter for council decision.

Mr. Klein agreed that it was critical for the council to have a conversation with the EWEB board regarding the proposed sale of water before the council rendered a decision on the matter.

Ms. Piercy agreed that a full understanding of the water issues for Veneta and other local areas would be helpful to the council and City staff.

Mr. Pryor hoped that any formal discussions with the EWEB board regarding water rights would include a policy component that addressed the wholesale versus retail sale of water.

Ms. Piercy suggested that representatives from the City of Veneta also be involved in the council's water rights discussions.

Ms. Piercy called for a vote on Mr. Clark's previously stated motion. The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

B. WORK SESSION: Eugene Community Climate and Energy Action Plan (CCEAP) Update

Mr. Piercy recognized the volume of work that had gone into the creation of the CCEAP and thanked the staff and community partners who had contributed to that effort.

Mr. Ruiz introduced Climate and Energy Action Analyst Matt McRae to provide the update on the CCEAP.

Mr. McRae recognized the CCEAP advisory team members who were present as well as Sustainability Commission members Shawn Boles and Howie Bonnett.

Mr. McRae presented the most recent draft of the CCEAP and reported that a final draft would be presented to the council in the fall of 2010.

Mr. McRae noted that the CCEAP had been generated concurrently with several other planning efforts such as Envision Eugene and the Transplan Update.

Mr. McRae provided background on the CCEAP and noted that in the winter of 2008/2009, the council had directed staff to create the CCEAP for the community with the specific instruction to include a broad range of community partners.

Mr. McRae reviewed the primary goals of the CCEAP for the benefit of the council members.

Mr. McRae stated that staff had been highly conscious in its application of the triple-bottom-line assessment tools to the development of the CCEAP.

Mr. McRae presented information on the CCEAP advisory team members and noted that each of the team members were highly knowledgeable regarding a variety of energy and sustainability areas. Mr. McRae further noted that the advisory team members had been extremely helpful to staff in providing feedback and prioritization regarding the CCEAP.

Mr. McRae described the public engagement process that had been used by staff to develop the CCEAP and briefly noted each of the public outreach events that had been conducted. Mr. McRae also noted the six action areas that had been used to develop the CCEAP during the public engagement process.

Mr. McRae stated that over 500 participants from the community had been involved in the CCEAP public engagement process.

Mr. McRae referred to the copy of the draft CCEAP that had been provided to the council and briefly outlined the contents of the document.

Mr. McRae elaborated upon each of the six main topic areas of the CCEAP and noted how each category related to the overall goals of the plan.

Mr. McRae briefed the council members on the next steps for the CCEAP and noted that those steps involved significant fact-finding efforts, the determination of climate and energy action targets, and further discussion meetings with community partners.

Ms. Piercy appreciated the great breadth of community partners who had been involved in the development of the CCEAP and agreed that the plan needed to be reviewed in relation to other City planning processes.

Mr. McRae, responding to a question from Ms. Piercy, noted that he had conferred with representatives from Lane County and the City's Wastewater division staff to hold discussions on how methane digesters might be of benefit to the region.

Mr. McRae, responding to a question from Ms. Taylor, stated that the appendix of compiled priority action items from the CCEAP was only a different layout of the information contained in the draft CCEAP and did not contain any additional action items.

Ms. Taylor asked if Country Club Drive was in the flood zone. Mr. McRae could not answer the question but stated that the City's flood zones were being reviewed as part of the ECLA process.

Ms. Taylor asked how issues related to airshed and watershed capacity had been incorporated into the development of the CCEAP. Mr. McRae noted that those issues had not been thoroughly discussed during the development of the CCEAP but further mentioned that both the Lane Regional Air Protection Agency and EWEB had each been involved in extensive discussions regarding local air quality and water source issues.

Ms. Taylor hoped that the CCEAP would include references to more direct actions the City could take and further suggested that the council refrain from serving meat during its meetings.

Mr. Ruiz responded to Ms. Taylor's comments and reminded her that there were additional parallel efforts underway to reduce the City's overall carbon footprint and energy consumption levels.

Mr. Clark appreciated the level of detail that had been incorporated into the CCEAP.

Mr. Clark hoped that the CCEAP would incorporate comprehensive and long-term strategies for addressing climate and energy action issues, particularly with respect to various public safety areas of the City's organization.

Mr. Clark planned to closely review the cost and impact elements of the CCEAP and noted that he had a number of questions regarding the long-term economic and environmental impacts of the food security and fossil fuel strategies outlined in the Plan.

Mr. Zelenka noted that he had attended several of the CCEAP advisory team meetings and appreciated the level of input provided by the team members. Mr. Zelenka further commented on several methane digester practices that were already in use throughout the community.

Mr. McRae, responding to a comment from Mr. Zelenka, briefly discussed the context in which the term "climate uncertainty" had been used in the CCEAP.

Mr. Zelenka hoped that the action items outlined in the CCEAP would be specific, actionable and measurable and suggested areas of the plan where those characteristics might be made more evident.

Mr. Zelenka suggested that the items listed in the compiled priority action items list might be renumbered in order to make the information easier to understand.

Ms. Solomon referenced the land use and transportation areas of the CCEAP and commented that certain traffic congestion and energy consumption issues in those areas might be addressed more thoroughly in the Plan.

Mr. McRae, responding to a question from Ms. Solomon, briefly discussed how the term "climate refugees" had been used in the CCEAP to describe the concept where changing climates in areas might make certain geographic areas less livable than others.

Mr. Brown commended Mr. McRae and his colleagues for their work in drafting the CCEAP and looked forward to reviewing the results of the fact-finding elements to be conducted during the next phase of the plan.

Ms. Ortiz appreciated the depth of analysis and the level of effort that had gone into the development of the CCEAP.

Mr. McRae, responding to a question from Ms. Ortiz, noted that representatives from PeaceHealth and the Lane County Public Health Department had contributed to the draft CCEAP. He further noted that while the CCEAP did not contain any specific actions pertaining to local hospitals and healthcare providers, such agencies would continue to contribute to the various essential services strategies outlined in the plan.

Mr. Pryor noted recent conversations with Mr. Rexius regarding economic volatility and environmental uncertainty and noted the importance of carefully and thoughtfully executing many of the action items outlined in the CCEAP.

Ms. Piercy expressed that the CCEAP would help the City manage its resources with respect to various environmental and economic concerns.

Mr. Ruiz, responding to a comment from Mr. Zelenka, suggested that the specific resource implications of the CCEAP with respect to the City's organizational structure would be discussed in greater detail as the plan moved forward to full implementation.

Mr. Clark encouraged the Council members to conduct the discussions surrounding elements of the CCEAP through the framework of raising the standard of living for the citizens of Eugene. Ms. Piercy agreed with Mr. Clark's statement.

Ms. Piercy adjourned the meeting at 1:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest
City Recorder

(Recorded by Wade Hicks)

MINUTES

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

May 19, 2010
Noon

PRESENT: Alan Zelenka, Mike Clark, Betty Taylor, Andrea Ortiz, Jennifer Solomon, Chris Pryor, George Brown, members. George Poling initially participated by telephone and then arrived later in the meeting.

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the Eugene City Council work session to order. She congratulated councilors Zelenka, Clark, and Poling on their re-election and Councilor-elect Pat Farr on his successful election. She commented that she had not been pleased to observe the mess left over by bar patrons from the night before when walking in the downtown area. She underscored the importance of finding a way to address the mess. She declared that one should not have to walk through "last night's bar activities" at noon on the following day. She believed that the businesses adjoining the sidewalks had a responsibility to step up and do their part.

A. WORK SESSION:

I-5 Willamette River Bridge -- Oregon Department of Transportation Project Update

Assistant City Manager Sarah Medary invited Dick Upton and Chris Henry to the table for their presentation.

Mr. Upton provided a power point presentation entitled *Willamette River Bridge Improvements for Generations*. He underscored the importance of the input they had garnered from the Citizens Advisory Group.

Mr. Upton discussed some of the opportunities the project had presented. He explained that the agreement for the bicycle-pedestrian viaduct on the south bank included that they would put back anything that was damaged or removed. He said the bicycle path on the south bank of the Willamette River looped under Franklin Boulevard and then "petered out" into the street. He related that in early conversations they had found that there were plans to put a bicycle path on the north side of Franklin Blvd. connected into a future bicycle system in Springfield. He stated that they had estimated the cost of the viaduct to be \$2.4 million, not something that could just be added into the project. He had taken the cost they had estimated it would take to restore the path on the south side, approximately \$1.6 million, and had gone to the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and submitted a joint grant application with Springfield for \$4 million for the rest of the funding. He said the project had scored high and they had been awarded the grant.

Mr. Upton said another opportunity had arisen from recognition that they would need to widen Interstate 5 to the west, and this would have taken a grove of trees out. He explained that the trees served as a great barrier between the interstate and the park. He related that a member of the citizen group had asked how they could save the trees. They had been required to put in a retaining wall on the east side in the Willamalane Park to keep the fill out. He said Willamalane was concerned that a retaining wall would become a graffiti magnet so it had been proposed that they do some contouring there, providing a "landscape that was more fitting," and then the trees would be saved in the process.

Continuing, Mr. Upton discussed the public input they had gotten on the design enhancements from the citizens group and art teams. Through that process they had come up with a number of ideas of which enhancements they would pursue. He invited the Mayor and council to visit the site.

Mr. Henry stated that the design enhancement process had begun with the Eugene City Council.

Mayor Piercy thanked them for the presentation. She thanked everyone who had been involved in the project. She averred that it was an improved way of going about a project of this type. She also expressed appreciation for the bicycle system enhancements.

Mr. Zelenka said it was a great job "so far." He ascertained from Mr. Upton that their intent was to do the work on the southbound bridge first and then the northbound bridge. He thanked all of the community members who had participated.

In response to a question from Mr. Zelenka, Mr. Upton discussed the planned stream enhancements. He said all of the regulatory requirements that were italicized on the slide entitled *Opportunities* would be completed above and beyond required levels. He stressed that their goal was to naturalize the area.

Mr. Zelenka asked what they were doing with the Millrace "ruins." Mr. Upton responded that they had worked out an agreement with the State Historical Preservation Office (SHPO) for a design that would minimally impact the Millrace. He said they had also agreed to provide some level of signage and they had engaged the art and design team for the south bank to do so.

Mr. Zelenka asked what "hydro-acoustic monitoring" meant. Mr. Upton replied that excessive construction noise had been an issue that caused problems on a construction project in Portland. He explained that it involved the impacts that pile driving could have on juvenile fish. He related that they had looked at the historic experience and had decided on building a steel encasement that fit around the two pile placements with foam coating on the inside and that would include small tubes blowing air bubbles inside the casing to further break up the sound. He said they had tested a number of different things and determined this would work best.

Continuing, Mr. Zelenka asked about canoe canal enhancements. Mr. Upton discussed the changes that they planned to make on the bridge and how they would open the path up. He said they had renditions of what they intended to build. Mr. Henry added that they were working from the Citizens Planning Committee (CPC) for the Whilamut Natural Area of East Alton Baker Park plan for naturalization of the slough.

Mr. Pryor thanked them for the presentation. He recalled the preliminary discussion of the project three years earlier. He felt they had made the process a "nice interactive partnership." He asked about the naming process. Mr. Upton replied that ODOT had a process to nominate names. He noted that CPC member David Sonnichsen was "deeply engaged" in the naming process.

In response to a question from Mr. Brown, Mr. Upton explained that the loud noise from the pile drivers could hurt or kill fish by bursting the air bladder and this was why they were seeking to reduce the noise impact.

Mayor Piercy thanked them for a great presentation. She had felt more like they were partners in this project. She believed the end result would be a "signature bridge."

**B. WORK SESSION:
City of Eugene Naming Policy**

City Manager Jon Ruiz invited Mayor and Council Support Manager Beth Forrest to the table to present the item.

Using PowerPoint Ms. Forrest provided a brief overview of the policy. Copies of the code regarding naming were included in the agenda item summary (AIS). She stated that there were three elements to naming: transparency, fiscal responsibility, and public engagement. She said in the proposed policy, staff had outlined several specifications for notifying the public and the different methods available for "getting the word out." She noted that the council last discussed the naming policy in 2004. She reviewed the steps proposed for the naming process, from the proposed naming through an appointed committee and its process to a recommendation to the council for approval.

Ms. Taylor agreed that naming something after a person should only happen if the person was dead or retired. She opposed placing a naming item on the Consent Calendar. She was also opposed to renaming anything that already had a name.

Mr. Clark commended Ms. Forrest for her work. He agreed that a naming item should not be on the consent calendar. He said naming something for someone sought to honor that person and placing such an item on the consent calendar would defeat that purpose. He understood that renaming streets was in the code specifically and asked why there was a reason not to put their naming policy into code. Ms. Forrest did not know. She explained that in looking at the policies and codes of other jurisdictions regarding naming, it was done both ways.

Mr. Clark observed that street naming was handled by an *ad hoc* committee of the Planning Commission. He wondered if any thought had been given to putting place or facility names to the Planning Commission and, if not, whether there was any reason not to do so. Mr. Ruiz thought it would not impact the Planning Commission work plan as place or facility naming was an infrequent occurrence.

Mr. Pryor expressed his appreciation for the work Ms. Forrest had done. He thought it was very thoughtful and that it would serve the City well. He did not think the policy needed to be changed. He was concerned about disagreement among committee members on a name. He also would not want to close the door on renaming places, as circumstances could change, though he would only want to rename a place under extraordinary circumstances.

Ms. Ortiz thanked Ms. Forrest for her work. She supported having an appointed committee. She would want to have some councilor say-so in the makeup of the committee so that it was geographically and demographically representative. She was amenable to restricting naming to commemorating people who had retired or passed on. She added that one of the reasons she had decided to run for City Council was because of the issues that the renaming of a street to Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard had raised for people. She felt there seemed to be a lack of understanding as to why the naming was so important. She said it was a changing world, the demographics were changing, and young people would want to put their footprint on the City.

Mr. Zelenka echoed appreciation for Ms. Forrest's work. He wondered if any jurisdictions just used existing committees to work on naming as opposed to forming an *ad hoc* committee. Ms. Forrest responded that she was not certain of the answer but she did know that one jurisdiction had a standing naming committee.

Mr. Zelenka noted that the subsection of the policy regarding staff naming requests referred to renaming subsections of city facilities. That seemed vague to him. Mr. Ruiz replied that he would consider a library shelf or a chair in the Hult Center for the Performing Arts a subsection of a facility.

Mr. Zelenka asked if it was common for jurisdictions to require a little more than a simple majority to rename something. Ms. Forrest replied that she did not remember seeing this clause, but given the controversial nature that some proposals could have, this could be prudent.

Mr. Poling did not see why a simple majority would not be adequate. He suggested that the policy regarding the *ad hoc* committee indicate that the committee should include representatives of the people who proposed the naming and people who lived in the area where the changes were to occur.

Mayor Piercy suggested that the portion of the naming policy that recommended that names incorporate geographic, historic, and geologic features also include demographic features.

Ms. Taylor did not think it would be appropriate to use the Planning Commission. She said public hearings and actions of the City Council were more watched and monitored by the public than those of the Planning Commission. She did not think a special committee was needed either; the council could serve in that capacity.

Mr. Clark thought that financial impacts needed to be a specific part of the policy. He pointed out that the name change to Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard had external financial impacts to area businesses and the council needed to be aware of these impacts during consideration of a name change.

Mr. Zelenka liked the idea of requiring more than a simple majority of councilors to approve naming. He echoed councilor opposition to placing a naming item on the consent calendar.

Ms. Solomon thanked Ms. Forrest. She noted that it had been mentioned that there might be an upcoming naming opportunity. She asked if the new bicycle bridge over Delta Highway was a federal or local project. Mr. Ruiz said he would have to look into it.

Mayor Piercy commented that the last thing one would want if something was being named in their honor would be a lot of fighting over it. She said the closer they could come to consensus on naming items, the better it would be for the process.

Ms. Taylor agreed that at least six councilors should vote in favor of a naming proposal for it to pass.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the work session at 1:19 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest
City Recorder

(Recorded by Ruth Atcherson)