

# EUGENE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY



---

## Approval of City Council Minutes

---

Meeting Date: December 13, 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 September 14, 2010, Joint Elected Officials Public Hearing, September 29, 2010, Work Session, and October 11, 2010, Work Session.

### ATTACHMENTS

- A. September 14, 2010, Joint Elected Officials Public Hearing
- B. September 29, 2010, Work Session
- C. October 11, 2010, Work Session

### 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

Joint Elected Officials  
Eugene City Council and Lane Board of County Commissioners  
Council Chamber—777 Pearl Street  
Eugene, Oregon

September 14, 2010  
7 p.m.

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

Board of County Commissioners: Rob Handy, Peter Sorenson, Bill Fleenor.

ABSENT: Eugene City Council: Jennifer Solomon.

Board of County Commissioners: Bill Dwyer, Faye Stewart.

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the September 14, 2010, public hearing of the Eugene City Council to order.

Board Vice-Chair Rob Handy convened the September 14, 2010, meeting of the Board of County Commissioners and opened the public hearing. He noted that Commissioner Bill Fleenor was participating via speakerphone, and commissioners Dwyer and Stewart were excused.

**A. PUBLIC HEARING:**

**An Ordinance Adopting an Updated Eugene Airport Master Plan, a Refinement Plan of the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan (Metro Plan); Adopting a Severability Clause; and Providing an Effective Date (City File RA 10-1, Lane County File PA 10-5248)**

Airport Director Tim Doll, Katherine Stevens, and Dan Durazo of the Eugene Airport, Gabe Flock, Steve Nystrom, and Kurt Yeiter of the Planning and Development Department, and City Attorney Emily Jerome were present on behalf of Eugene. Lane County Administrator Jeff Spartz, County Counsel Stephen Vorhes, Planning Division Manager Kent Howe, and Planner Stephanie Schulz of the Land Management Division were present on behalf of Lane County. Project Consultant Damon Smith was also present.

Eugene City Manager Jon Ruiz announced that the joint elected officials of Eugene and Lane County were considering the adoption of an updated Eugene Airport Master Plan as an amendment to the Metro Plan.

Mr. Doll reviewed the request before the joint elected officials, which was more fully described in the agenda item summary and supporting materials provided to the council and board. He briefly noted the public input associated with the plan, which included a stakeholder group that met six times and four general public meetings. Mr. Doll reported that the joint planning commissions of Lane County and Eugene held a hearing on the plan and forwarded it without changes and with a positive recommendation.

Mr. Doll emphasized that the Eugene Airport was a major economic driver for the region. The Oregon Department of Aviation indicated the airport was directly or indirectly responsible for 4,000 jobs and contributed about \$332 million to the economy annually. The airport had recently completed two projects that provided \$13 million in construction work. The fire station project alone had created 56 construction jobs.

Mr. Doll recommended that the plan be adopted prior to the end of the federal fiscal year so the airport could close out its federal grant.

Mayor Piercy noted that the joint adoption process was necessitated by the airport's location, which was within the jurisdiction of both bodies. She called for public testimony.

Commissioner Handy read the title of Lane County's Ordinance PA 12-73 into the record.

There being no requests to speak, Mayor Piercy closed the hearing on behalf of Eugene. Commissioner Handy closed the hearing on behalf of Lane County.

Councilor Poling determined from City Attorney Jerome that he likely had no conflict in regard to the matter due to his employment with the Transportation Security Administration (TSA), but she would research the issue further before the council took final action.

Mayor Piercy asked if the advisory committee had discussed carbon emission reductions. Mr. Smith reported that committee members had general concerns about reducing the airport's carbon footprint. However, the committee was not concerned that the specific projects in the plan would result in carbon emissions of any significant impact. Mr. Doll said that airport projects were built to LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) standards and the airport worked with the airlines to reduce their carbon footprint.

Mayor Piercy acknowledged the new fire station at the airport was a "green" building. She did not raise the subject to suggest there was a fault in the master plan, but to express her hope that staff thought of the issue in general when considering airport management concerns. Mr. Doll said the airport staff was concerned about the environment and kept it in mind in regard to all its improvement projects.

Councilor Brown noted concerns voiced by planning commissioners about the percentage increase in parking projected at a time when the population was not projected to increase by the same percentage. He shared those concerns. Mr. Doll responded that parking demand was determined by passenger projections and were also related to peak travel periods, such as holidays. He did not know when the new parking would be constructed because it would be related to increased demand. Councilor Brown hoped that the new parking would be structured parking.

Councilor Brown determined from Mr. Doll that the airport was required by the federal government to protect airspace for safety reasons and the scope of the protected space was defined by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA).

Councilor Brown expressed concern about the lack of reference in the plan to public transportation. Mr. Doll said staff had talked to Lane Transit District (LTD) and learned that the agency had no plans to serve the airport. He said staff would continue to work with LTD to try to make that happen. Councilor Brown

wanted to have buses serve the airport again and suggested the service should be better advertised to the public.

Councilor Brown recalled that the airport was evaluated for seismic risk shortly after its construction and received a poor rating. He proposed that the City hire a consultant to do a more detailed and current seismic examination of the airport and suggested the City seek grant funds from the federal government to pay for it.

Councilor Zelenka discussed what Alaska Airlines was doing to reduce its carbon footprint, which included reducing the flight path to be more of a glide, which reduced fuel consumption. He asked how such an approach worked within the airport's airspace. He also asked how the use of bio jet fuels affected the airport's fuel farm retrofit capability. Mr. Doll said the new approaches allowed airlines to save fuel and would not affect the airport's approach surfaces because once they reached the approach surface they were in landing configuration. Regarding bio fuels, Mr. Doll said that many airlines were looking at alternative fuels. Eugene was trying to get into a consortium formed by Portland and Seattle to purchase alternative fuels. Councilor Zelenka encouraged the airport to join the consortium.

Councilor Zelenka determined from Mr. Doll that the projected passenger increase was based on the airport as a regional airport and was generated using a model developed by the consultant. He noted the growth the airport had been experiencing in recent months.

Councilor Zelenka noted that the plan included a map with areas identified as potential future land acquisitions, and determined from Mr. Doll that the properties in question would be purchased as they became available. He asked the rationale for their acquisition. Mr. Doll said the properties in question were part of the Runway Protection Zone required by the FAA, which recommended the airport purchase and own the lands because it became easier to protect those lands. He said the FAA did not recommend doing anything at this time unless the property owners wished to sell. The property by the cargo expansion area would be used for future development to support aviation services at the airport. Councilor Zelenka asked the potential of the northern parcels being required in the near term. Mr. Doll said there was no potential. As long as the airport was certain that the properties would not be developed inappropriately, there was no need to acquire them.

Councilor Zelenka asked if the terminal expansion extended to the northeast. Mr. Doll said yes, and the airport already owned that land, which currently contained some vacant buildings and one building in use for landscape maintenance. He confirmed terminal expansion would be triggered by an increase in enplanements, and anticipated the expansion could be needed by 2020.

Councilor Zelenka agreed that public transportation was a good idea but also noted the existence of the airport shuttle, which was cheaper for those parking for more than a week.

Councilor Zelenka commended the installation of native plants near the airport walkways and said they looked great. He also noted the picture on page five of the plan showed the new waiting area, and commended the fact that every seat had its own plug and that the area was a nice space. He said the airport seemed well-run and the facility seemed to be well-maintained. He thought the community should be proud of the airport, which was a tremendous regional asset. He thanked Mr. Doll for his work.

Mayor Piercy said she had occasion to travel to other communities and saw their airports and found the Eugene Airport to be a beautifully done "gem" as well as a good experience. She and her guests appreciated the facility.

Commissioner Sorenson referred to the land required for parking and asked if there were alternatives to the parking proposed in the plan. Mr. Doll said the plan showed the need for additional parking on land already owned by the airport. Staff would analyze the parking need and determine the best location. The parking would be phased. Staff would analyze all options for parking, which included a parking structure. He believed the location was ideal for parking.

Commissioner Sorenson asked what efforts were made to minimize parking. He cited the shuttle service as an example of an alternative to parking. He requested data from comparable airports facing similar parking problems to determine if the community should have a dedicated shuttle bus to take people to and from the “hot spots” of usage, such as the University of Oregon. Mr. Doll said that each airport was unique in how they handled parking. Such a service must be profitable to the provider. It would not be an airport-provided shuttle. Commissioner Sorenson asked why not. Mr. Doll said generally such airport-provided shuttles were for on-site transportation and private companies provided off-site shuttles. Commissioner Sorenson wanted to know if such a shuttle would be profitable for LTD, and if not, what the sources of funding were to subsidize a shuttle so the airport did not have to build additional parking. Mr. Doll said he would research the question.

Commissioner Sorenson asked if the master plan would increase or decrease the amount of carbon produced. Mr. Smith said that had not been analyzed. Emissions could increase if one assumed that future cars and planes would generate fewer emissions but more people boarded planes. However, there were plans underway to reduce carbon emissions. Commissioner Sorenson asked how expanding the parking or number of flights leaving and coming to the airport satisfied State Goal 13, Energy Conservation. Mr. Smith said that passengers could choose to fly out of either Eugene or Portland and those going to Portland produced more emissions, while local flights reduced car emissions. Commissioner Sorenson suggested there were greater emissions per mile for planes versus automobiles. Mr. Smith responded that the answer depended on the style of aircraft.

Commissioner Sorenson asked if the City’s Sustainability Commission had reviewed the plan and, if not, could the commission review the plan. Mr. Flock said the review was not required but could be done.

Mayor Piercy said the Sustainability and Planning commissions were beginning to meet jointly and would have an opportunity to review such plans in the future.

Commissioner Sorenson asked if there were any public safety craft projected in the future of the airport. Mr. Doll said the Civil Air Patrol was located at the airport now. The airport would work with any agency that wanted to use the facility. The Lane County Sheriff’s Office and United States National Guard had not approached the airport, and he did not know where they located their planes.

Commissioner Sorenson requested data on the growth projections so the elected officials could see the assumptions behind them. Mr. Smith described how the projections were arrived at and indicated the numbers were reviewed with the FAA and the FAA concurred with the forecast. The percentages applied were clearly documented.

Commissioner Sorenson asked when a 20-year plan started in 2006, had to be approved. Mr. Doll said Eugene needed to close out its FAA grant by the end of the federal fiscal year, September 2010. As far as the FAA was concerned the plan was complete. Commissioner Sorenson asked if the airport had a letter

from the Department of Land Conservation and Development stating that the plan met its criteria. Ms. Jerome said the department had been silent thus far, implying that the plan met its criteria.

Commissioner Handy averred that the world had really changed and people had learned a lot about some of the assumptions behind planning efforts. More was known about issues such as the price of fuel and greenhouse gas reductions. He asked what opportunities the board had to “tweak” the plan to address some of those emerging issues if it had to be approved by the end of the month. Mr. Doll said the master plan was merely a planning document and no project in the plan was guaranteed to be constructed. Staff analyzed each project before it was constructed to ensure it made sense, and any project involving federal funding had to receive federal approval. Airport staff also submitted their capital projects to the Budget Committee each year, which was another arena for review.

Mr. Smith said it was common that an airport master plan was updated every eight to ten years even if designed for a 20-year period. It was also common such plans generated additional planning processes specific to the projects proposed. As issues emerged, they could be considered through a focused process and incorporated into the master plan or could stand on their own. Mr. Doll anticipated another master plan revision process would begin in 2016.

Commissioner Handy suggested it was a role of government to incentivize outcomes that elected officials preferred to see society move toward and disincentivize others. He suggested a question to consider was how to “right-size” a project to work for the community and the community’s partners. He cited the Beltline as an example, suggesting that if there was congestion for four hours of a 24-hour day, the answer might be both expanded capacity and other strategies. He suggested that if the challenge in providing parking was in the morning, it would be interesting to know what other communities were doing to address that.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Handy about the source of funding for projects, Mr. Doll said the capital improvement program was funded by a combination of passenger facility charges, FAA grants, and local airport revenues that could only be used for operation and development of the airport. The FAA was fairly specific about what the airport could do; it had to be able to accommodate passengers and plan for peak periods. He said that issue was not specific to just the morning rush, but to holidays as well when airport parking lots were full for weeks at time. He said the airport did not want to have a lot of parking out front and would work to phase it in when needed. The airport was already doing what other airports were doing. It had a shared ride service and taxicabs. Some larger airports have train service, but Eugene was not big enough to support train service. He said that the airport would continue to work with LTD to return bus service to the airport.

Councilor Ortiz recalled that Police Department used an overflow parking lot for training exercises, and determined from Mr. Doll that the airport could continue to accommodate that use during non-peak times, but he anticipated less opportunity over time.

Mayor Piercy observed that the airport was a regional facility that needed to accommodate those who traveled some distance to use the airport, not just local Lane County residents.

Commissioner Fleenor asked what provisions the airport had to promote or restrict private “park and fly” operations between the airport and Eugene, similar to those that surrounded the Oakland International Airport, as a means to prevent sprawl and to encourage entrepreneurs to develop the concept locally. Mr. Doll said the airport would prefer having convenient on-site parking for its customers. Commissioner Fleenor was concerned about the expansion of parking onto Class 1 soils and suggested that it would benefit

residents to encourage park and fly facilities, where people could both park and have their cars serviced. Mr. Doll said that most of the expanded parking area was already paved and no farmland would be affected. He recalled that at one time, the airport offered an oil change and detailing service through Kendall Auto and passengers had not been interested in taking advantage of that service while parked at the airport.

Mr. Doll encouraged the elected officials and residents to share their thoughts and ideas with the Airport Advisory Committee.

Councilor Zelenka suggested that the findings be revised to address some of the things that Mr. Doll mentioned about energy efficient structures, alternative transportation to and from the airport, potential energy-efficient fleet changes, the fuels used by airplanes and automobiles, and the fuels consortium. Mr. Doll indicated staff would also mention the airport's LED lighting.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Handy, Mr. Flock said the main component of the plan that could trigger a future Metro Plan amendment would be the property acquisitions mentioned in the plan. Acquisition of those properties would require that they be designated for "Government and Education" use.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Handy, Mr. Doll said that approval of the plan did not mean the FAA would force the community to do anything in the plan. The FAA would require the City to provide the services and facilities required to meet the demand of the traveling public. The FAA would not direct the City to build any of the projects in the plan, and left it to the local airport to decide how to accommodate demand and meet the requirements that the FAA set out.

Commissioner Handy asked in what other ways the airport could leverage federal money for other things important to the community, such as funding alternative modes to deal with peak travel or beautifying Highway 99. Mr. Doll said that airport revenues and FAA dollars were dedicated to airport operations only. For example, FAA would not pay for parking lots. That required local revenues.

Mayor Piercy determined from City Attorney Jerome that she recommended the record remain open to allow the questions asked by the commissioners to be answered in writing.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the hearing of the Eugene City Council at 8:07 p.m.

Commissioner Handy, seconded by Commissioner Sorenson, moved the third reading and set it for September 28, 2010, at a time to be determined. The motion passed unanimously, 3:0.

Commissioner Handy adjourned the hearing of the Board of County Commissioners at 8:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest  
City Recorder

*(Recorded by Kimberly Young)*

MINUTES

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

September 29, 2010  
Noon

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

ABSENT: Chris Pryor.

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the September 29, 2010, work session of the Eugene City Council to order.

**A. WORK SESSION:  
Triple Bottom Line Framework**

City Manager's Office Division Manager Keli Osborn presented an update on the City's use of the triple bottom line (TBL) framework and TBL analysis tools. She introduced Service Improvement Manager Terri Monroe, Sustainability Liaison Babe O'Sullivan, Recreation Division Manager Craig Smith, Parks Maintenance Manager Kevin Finney, Planner Lydia McKinney, and Library Customer Experience Manager LaVena Nohrenberg.

Ms. Monroe provided a PowerPoint presentation on the development of the City's TBL framework that touched on what the framework was and was not, how it worked, and what staff expected from the tool in the future. She emphasized that the tool was not a decision-making tool but rather a "thinking tool" that helped to supplement one's individual thought process and was designed to identify issues that otherwise might not surface in discussion.

Mr. Smith, Mr. Finney, Ms. McKinney, Ms. Nohrenberg, and Ms. O'Sullivan offered examples of how City staff had used the TBL tool.

Mayor Piercy suggested that in the future, the State of Oregon would be looking more carefully at the true costs of things, and the information provided by the TBL tool would for example help to provide accurate data for the purpose of grant applications.

Mayor Piercy solicited council questions and comments.

Ms. Ortiz thanked staff for the work it had done on the TBL framework and related tools, and suggested the City had something to celebrate. She commended staff's commitment to the TBL framework and looked forward to using the tool herself.

Responding to a question from Mr. Poling about the applicability of the TBL framework to the private sector, Ms. Osborn said the "triple bottom line" has been used in the private sector under different names.



She suggested the City could partner with the Eugene Area Chamber of Commerce and similar entities to share the TBL framework and tools with the business community and learn from one another.

Mr. Poling encouraged staff to reach out to the private sector to form such partnerships to help obtain the goals the council sought throughout the entire community, and not just the organization. He hoped the City's copyright was not a barrier to expanding the use of the tool.

Mr. Zelenka agreed with Mr. Poling about reaching out to the private sector and noted that such filters were used quite often by the private sector. He commended the examples offered by staff.

Mr. Zelenka acknowledged the many staff members who had worked on the tool and suggested it would lead to better decisions based on more well-rounded thinking. He reported that the Sustainability Commission had looked at several different TBL models and he thought the City's tool was one of the best. It struck a good balance between simplicity and complexity. Speaking to Mr. Poling's comment, Mr. Zelenka suggested the City had copyrighted use of the tool not to limit it, but to protect it and maintain its integrity.

Mr. Zelenka noted staff's application of the TBL tool to the next agenda item and reported that he found the resulting information to be valuable. He wanted to see the TBL tool regularly reflected in future council agenda item summaries.

Mr. Brown thought the TBL tool a good supplement to the analytic tools already in use by the City. He did not find it particularly revolutionary and suggested that depending on the project, half of the questions were unlikely to apply to most situations. He suggested they represented a useful checklist to remind the staff and council of things that they could have forgotten.

Responding to a question from Mr. Brown, Ms. Osborn said the Sustainability and Planning commissions had formed a joint committee that planned to analyze the West Eugene EmX route options using the TBL tool. Mr. Brown was skeptical about that as he did not see how it would be useful but looked forward to seeing the outcome and acknowledged he could be proven wrong.

Mayor Piercy suggested the TBL was a supplemental analysis tool that touched on three factors—environment, economics, and equity—that were associated with everything the City did. The tool was an attempt to keep all three factors at the forefront of the City's thinking all the time. Mayor Piercy believed the tool would help the community become more sustainable. She considered the TBL framework to be important work and hoped the City shared it with some of the national organizations it worked with as she thought they would be very interested.

Mr. Smith reported that he had presented the TBL framework to attendees at the Oregon Recreation and Park Association Conference and he hoped to take it to the national convention. He emphasized the interest of those in attendance, who had evaluated the conference using the TBL tool.

Ms. Taylor suggested the potential of the TBL tool would be ignored in the same way she thought the City's Growth Management Policies had been ignored. She tended to be skeptical of formulaic approaches as it was easy to fit anything into a formula. She hoped that when people talked about social equity they were thinking of long-term social equity rather than short-term social equity. There were things that might be good for the future but could appear to be hurting someone right now.

Ms. Taylor asked if staff considered social equity when the library instituted fees for reshelving reserved books patrons failed to pick up. She pointed out that was harder on poor people than the more affluent. She also asked if social equity was considered when the City closed Amazon Pool for swim meets at the expense of regular users, or when it closed the facility earlier. Ms. Nohrenberg emphasized that access to services was a high priority for the Library. She said that social equity was considered in the decision to increase fees, which was tied to the desire to provide public access to as many services as possible.

Mr. Zelenka believed the tool would receive national attention because it was so well done and because there were so few such tools.

Mr. Zelenka observed the most difficult element of the TBL was the social equity element. He asked those who had used the tool their experience in that regard. Mr. Finney agreed that element was challenging. However, he thought the TBL tool had resulted in much richer conversations and expanded the way that people thought about issues. He cited park lighting as an example, pointing out that such lighting had disparate impact on those with different levels of vulnerability, such as women and children. He anticipated that as staff had more such conversations, the tool would become more institutionalized in its application. Ms. McKinney agreed. She believed that the TBL had spurred more thinking on the part of staff. Ms. Nohrenberg said that some of the questions might not be relevant to an issue but got one thinking about things differently.

Responding to a question from Mr. Zelenka about how the framework would be integrated into City operations, Ms. Osborn discussed some of the steps staff was taking to ensure that would happen, including iterative discussions with the council, roundtable staff discussions, and a “stretch leadership” opportunity involving multiple staff from different departments who could serve as mentors to other staff. She had also presented to department management teams on how the tool could be applied. Mr. Zelenka thought including the TBL analysis in the council’s agenda item summaries would help integrate its use. He suggested that the proof of the tool’s utility would be its continued application.

Ms. Ortiz hoped that staff not only thought about affected groups when using the TBL tool, but also brought them into the conversation. She acknowledged that the social equity element was challenging for those members of the communities of color not involved with the City’s Human Rights Program. They considered it a catchphrase and questioned how it actually affected the work the City did and its hiring and retention of members of the communities of color. She thought the City needed to articulate how the TBL framework affected those individuals.

Ms. Taylor suggested staff make a similar presentation to the neighborhood groups for the purpose of additional review. She also suggested that staff ready a discussion group for the 2011 National League of Cities Convention.

**B. WORK SESSION:  
Food Security Scoping and Resources Plan**

The council was joined by Ethan Nelson of the Waste Prevention and Green Building Program. Permit Review Manager Mike McKerrow, Senior Planner Alyssa Hansen, and Compost/Urban Agriculture Coordinator Anne Donahue were also present to follow up on the council’s direction from February 2009, that staff investigate the development of a food security plan in conjunction with City partners.

Mr. Nelson also recognized Shawn Boles and Dan Armstrong, members of the City's Project Advisory Team, and thanked them for their time. He provided a PowerPoint presentation on the City's *Food Security Scoping and Resources Plan*, including near-term and long-term recommendations. Those recommendations included:

*Near-Term*

- Dedicate City resources to increase the level of neighborhood-scale urban agricultural activities
- Completion of a local food market analysis by the University of Oregon (UO) in partnership with Lane County, the City of Eugene, and Eugene Water & Electric Board
- Align the recommendations from the Community Climate and Energy Action Plan with food security, urban agriculture, and related City services and planning efforts

*Long-Term*

- Complete a comprehensive community food security assessment and gap analysis
- Complete a disaster food access and distribution analysis and plan
- Revise the Eugene Code to address urban agriculture and homesteading opportunities

Mr. Nelson said he completed a triple bottom line (TBL) analysis of what it would take to accomplish the recommendations in the plan and found that there were positive effects for environmental and social equity, but neutral effects for economic development. He found that the plan recommendations scored high in terms of social equity if emphasis was placed in implementation on building community access to healthy, affordable, culturally affordable food; if emphasis was placed on boutique products that was not the case. The recommendations scored high in regard to the environment if emphasis was placed on organic and low-carbon farming methods rather than conventional farming methods. Based on the outcomes from the food market assessment, the economic element was marginal.

Mr. Nelson called the council's attention to two draft motions regarding a related topic, the keeping of chickens inside city limits. He recalled the May 24 public hearing and the oral and written testimony received. He said following that, the Building and Permit Services Manager had suspended enforcement of the code if a complaint was based solely on the number of hens. The City continued to enforce other elements of the code related to noise and odor. The first draft motion continued that suspension at no cost to the City; the second motion directed staff to initiate code revisions at a cost of \$10,000 to \$40,000.

Mayor Piercy solicited council questions and comments.

Ms. Taylor was pleased to see the City work with the UO and use student work, suggesting it helped to improve the municipal and university relationship. She noted the close connection between the topic and the City's sustainability goals. She said that eating food produced locally had benefits for health and carbon reduction, which was important.

In regard to chickens, Ms. Taylor questioned if the City would regulate the sale of eggs and if it would allow slaughterhouses on private lots. She also noted the potential of health hazards from eggs produced in unsanitary conditions. She asked if the City had heard from farmers who already produce and sell eggs. She anticipated all kinds of neighbor disputes arising. Ms. Taylor pointed out if there was no enforcement of the number of chickens that could be kept, a resident could have a whole flock of hens, which could be a problem. A constituent had pointed out to her that chicken food could attract rodents and manure both

smelled bad and attracted flies. Ms. Taylor also pointed out that chickens were hard to sex when young, and she asked what happened when a chick turned out to be a rooster.

Mr. Clark thanked staff and the project advisory committee. He acknowledged that a three-day food supply could be a problem in the case of emergency. He had a large garden and said he would like to see more people have gardens. He said that access to the City's community gardens was a high value for many residents, and reported that he had received a number of complaints about the recent fee increase, which he thought was a problem the City needed to address. Mr. Clark wanted to expand access to the community gardens to allow more people to participate.

Mr. Clark noted the lack of information in the presentation in regard to transportation and the storage and processing of food from both a food security standpoint as well as from the economic standpoint. He called for a richer discussion of what the community could do to enhance its infrastructure for food transportation, storage, and processing.

Speaking to the proposed motions, Mr. Clark indicated he would support continuing suspension of the ordinance governing the number of chickens that could be kept inside the city limits to permit further discussion.

Mr. Poling thought the proposed motions related to the keeping of chickens deserved a separate work session. He said the issues raised by Ms. Taylor were also of concern to him. He cited potential safety concerns about home-raised eggs and the fact chicken feed attracted rodents. He also questioned the cost estimate for the code revision process.

Ms. Hansen anticipated that most of the cost would be due to the cost of notice. It was possible notice of the process could be folded into the notice for the Envision Eugene process.

Mr. Poling preferred changing the code to continuing suspension of code enforcement. He asked if staff was monitoring complaints about chickens. Mr. McKerrow reported that the City averaged six to eight complaints each year and all regarded the noise roosters made.

Ms. Solomon agreed with Mr. Poling. She was willing to double the number of chickens allowed and perhaps even raise the number to five because otherwise she feared there would be abuse. She objected to the burden that fell on neighbors to have to be the complainant.

Ms. Solomon did not see the nexus between food security and the issue of how many chickens one could keep. She thought people were supposed to be growing eggs for personal consumption, and was concerned that if people sold eggs there could be cases of salmonella. She expressed disappointment about how the item was presented to the council and said people who were following the issue would not be able to discern from the agenda item title that the discussion was about chickens.

Mr. Brown indicated support for continuing the suspension. He requested a copy of the Lane County Local Food Market Analysis and a copy of the food security assessment. Mr. Nelson indicated he would provide that information to all councilors.

City Manager Ruiz clarified that staff did not intend for the agenda item title to be deceptive and he anticipated additional public conversation. He said the City was not actively enforcing the limit on the chickens a resident could keep, and the proposed motions recognized that and moved onto the next step of

revising the ordinance. He suggested there was a nexus between the issue of chicken keeping and the larger issue of food security.

Ms. Ortiz asked if the food security analysis would include discussion of a standard regarding how close one should live to a fresh food source. She suggested that staff take advantage of the information in the Obesity Prevention Toolkit funded by Health Policy Research Northwest (HPRN).

Mr. Zelenka asked what the City was doing to increase the amount of food available after a disaster. Mr. Nelson said that when staff consulted with emergency managers it found that in most emergency situations, food was readily available from outside sources after three days had passed. The issue was most pertinent in the case of the most prolonged disasters, like a Hurricane Katrina. Mr. Zelenka wanted the City to do more to extend the three days food availability to a longer period.

Mr. Zelenka determined from Mr. Nelson that the City would continue to regulate chickens for noise and odor, and determined from Mr. McKerrow that the City would work with residents keeping chickens above the limit on management options that allowed them to retain the chickens.

Mr. Clark, seconded by Ms. Taylor, moved to direct the City Manager to continue suspension of enforcement on the number of adult female fowl allowed on residential lots under 20,000 square feet, until the soonest time practicable where it may be revised, Eugene Code provision 9.5250(1) can be made.

Ms. Taylor, seconded by Mr. Zelenka, moved to extend the meeting for one minute. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Taylor agreed with Ms. Solomon that it was not fair to place the burden of enforcement on neighbors.

Mayor Piercy pointed out the council had not finished its discussion of the topic.

The motion passed, 4:3: Ms. Taylor, Ms. Solomon, and Mr. Poling voting no.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest  
City Recorder

*(Recorded by Kimberly Young)*

## MINUTES

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

October 11, 2010  
 5:30 p.m.

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

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the October 11, 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 for the turnout for the Susan G. Komen *Race for the Cure*, reporting that about 7,000 people participated in the October 10 event.

Mayor Piercy called residents' attention to Eugene Financial Planning Day, an event sponsored by the City of Eugene and the Financial Planning Association of Mid-Oregon, scheduled for October 23 from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. at Sheldon Community Center. Financial advisors would be present to offer free one-on-one advice to residents on a variety of topics.

Mayor Piercy reported that she would be unable to attend the Metropolitan Policy Committee meeting scheduled on October 14 because she would be at the State of Civil Rights Oregon Forum on the University of Oregon campus as co-chair of the Oregon League of Minority Voters, which was also a co-sponsor of the event.

Mayor Piercy reported that on October 15, she would participate on a City Club panel discussing the topic *Place Making and Parochialism: The Conundrum of Mid-Sized Communities* with Director for the Office of Sustainable Housing and Communities of the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development Shelley Poticha, and Corvallis Mayor Charlie Tomlinson.

Mr. Clark said that the annual Willamette River Clean-Up occurred on October 2, and he thanked Recreation Equipment, Inc., and river advocate John Brown as well as other residents for their work in cleaning up the river.

Mr. Clark said he and Ms. Ortiz attended the Oregon Department of Transportation's (ODOT) October 4 Beltline Steering Committee meeting, at which ODOT presented some high-level policy considerations and the Stakeholder Advisory Committee report. The advisory committee recommended taking some of the existing options off the table and adding the importance of recognizing safety considerations and safety improvements to the policy direction underlying the project. Mr. Clark and Ms. Ortiz had suggested to ODOT that it provide the City Council with another project update. He would poll the council on a work

session date for the update. He noted that the next step in the process was the federal National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) process.

Mr. Poling reported that on September 29 he had met with the consultants working for 4J School District on the replacement of Superintendent George Russell. Later that same day he met with residents of Sandy Drive regarding the potential of future improvements to Sandy Drive. Eric Jones of the Public Works Department had been present at the meeting to answer questions. He thought it was likely that residents would approach the Budget Committee about the possibility of funding the project.

Mr. Poling noted that he had also attended the Emerald Awards put on by Eugene Area Chamber of Commerce and congratulated all the winners.

Mr. Poling reported that he met with new Eugene Water & Electric Board's General Manager Roger Grey, who had some interesting proposals.

Mr. Poling concluded by reporting that the Harlow Neighbors were sponsoring a forum for the candidates running for positions on the Board of County Commissioners on October 13, 2010, at the Garden Way Church.

Ms. Solomon expressed appreciation for the council's monthly receipt of the commendations received by members of the Eugene Police Department. She thanked residents who took the time to write the City about their positive experiences with the department.

Ms. Ortiz hoped the community understood that the Beltline project was a council priority and the project was intended to improve safety conditions in the corridor and address concerns about emergency vehicles reaching PeaceHealth at River Bend. She invited residents to contact her or Mr. Clark with questions about the project.

Ms. Ortiz reported she had attended the Neighborhood Summit and said it was an interesting event with a good turnout.

Ms. Ortiz said Eugene Police Department Officer Randy Ellis was honored at a recent event at City Hall for his 40 years of service to the City. She hoped that the council had the opportunity to honor Officer Ellis as well.

Ms. Ortiz noted the upcoming Prevention Convention at Sheldon High School on October 16.

Mr. Zelenka thanked Officer Ellis for his service.

Mr. Zelenka agreed that the Neighborhood Summit had a great turnout. Good information was traded among leaders. He believed the summit accomplished its purpose in that regard and he thought the City needed to think more about how to encourage such cross-fertilization.

Mr. Zelenka reported he met with PeaceHealth representatives about that organization's plans to rehabilitate its University District property. He looked forward to the construction jobs that resulted from the project and anticipated a nicer facility.

Mr. Zelenka said he had done a town hall event with the mayor to discuss the riot that happened in the West University Neighborhood. He wanted the City to consider the potential of more party patrols, to consider expanding the authority of the University of Oregon Department of Public Safety to address minor offenses outside its boundaries such as MIP, and to embark on a partnership between the City and University of Oregon to provide more activities for students the weekend prior to the start of school. Mr. Zelenka also suggested the amount the University of Oregon had allocated to substance abuse was still “just a drop in the bucket” even though it had recently significantly increased.

Mr. Pryor reported the Housing Policy Board met the previous week to do a status check and had reviewed some of its funding sources and planning documents. He had also attended the Emerald Awards and acknowledged all those who were recognized for their efforts to make Eugene a better place. He said the event was nice and there was a great crowd.

Ms. Taylor said she had attended the Emerald Awards, which she agreed was a nice event, and had also attended the Neighborhood Summit, which she thought was better organized this year than last. She had attended the Toxics Alliance’s Ten-Year Anniversary celebration on October 10 and said it was great to see how successful the organization had been since its founding.

Ms. Taylor thought it was rather sad to see the balcony closed at the Farmers’ Market and pointed out that meant people could not get out of the rain. She said youth downtown needed a place to gather out of the weather, such as a youth center.

Ms. Taylor noted two recent letters to the editor about pedestrians being hit downtown. She was aware of similar incidents and expressed concern about unsafe pedestrian conditions downtown. She hoped that the City could do something about that.

City Manager Jon Ruiz thanked Neighborhood Services Program Manager Michael Kinnison and his team for putting together the Neighborhood Summit. He thought a lot of value came out of the event.

Speaking to Ms. Taylor’s remarks about the closure of the balcony at Saturday Market, Mayor Piercy said the closure of the area in question was done at the request of the Saturday Market and was done because of the level of drug dealing going on in the area. The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) was brought into the discussion and did not seem to think the closure infringed on the Free Speech Plaza.

Mayor Piercy said she believed the community faced a growing problem with homelessness and reported she had been talking to the City Manager about the status of the City’s current intervention activities and possible options for the future. She thought the problem would continue to be bad given current economic conditions.

**B. WORK SESSION:  
Funding Gap for Maintaining Current and Future Parks and Recreation Facilities**

The council was joined for the item by Parks and Open Space Division Director Johnny Medlin, Recreation Director Craig Smith, Facilities Division Director Mary Beth Perkins, and Design and Construction Manager Mike Penwell of the Facilities Division.

Mr. Medlin presented a PowerPoint presentation on the subject of the funding gap for parks and recreation facilities. He provided information on new City parks and recreation facilities built in the last 12 years and



briefly overviewed budget data that indicated current operation and maintenance (O&M) funding was at 1998 levels, leaving a \$1 million funding obligation that the City was unable to meet. Even though many new facilities had been brought online recently, many facilities, including some of the relatively new ones, were in need of repair. Increasingly, staff was having trouble keeping up with maintenance, and the entire system was in decline. Mr. Medlin shared examples of unanticipated maintenance demand, which included vandalism, graffiti, clean up of homeless camps, and trail damage.

Mr. Medlin reported the division's park condition rating system was in its infancy but was producing important information that indicated that most of the community's developed parks and natural areas were in good condition.

Mr. Medlin estimated that the General Fund required \$5.5 million to address the costs of O&M for developed parks, with \$4.2 million available now, and \$800,000 annually to address O&M for natural areas, with about \$300,000 available now. He suggested there was an approximate \$1.5 million funding gap.

Mr. Smith provided information on Recreation facilities owned or contracted by the City and Mr. Penwell reviewed data regarding the condition of existing facilities.

Mr. Smith provided a brief overview on the recreation facilities shared by the 4J School District and City of Eugene. He reviewed the Recreation budget for fiscal year 2011. He said that the "Eugene Counts" process demonstrated high levels of support for recreation services, and that was confirmed by rising program participation. He anticipated that senior services would be an area of increased need and that the division would need to be equipped to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse population.

Mr. Medlin shared information showing future development costs for Parks, Recreation, and Open Space (PROS) projects by priority ranking. Mr. Smith then shared a series of maps showing the location of City community centers and the geographic distribution of program registrants.

Mr. Medlin called attention to Attachment D of the meeting packet, which reflected page 5 of the PROS Comprehensive Plan and listed 18 different funding sources. He emphasized the high value placed on parks and recreation services by residents, as well as the community value for the equitable provision of services. Mr. Medlin said the question before the council was how the City could continue to meet community expectations.

Mayor Piercy suggested that the need for parks and recreation services was increasing as the community became more stressed. She agreed the issue was how to continue to meet expectations.

Mayor Piercy asked for information about the impact of vandalism and people living in the parks. She acknowledged the public safety aspects of the issue and invited suggestions on how to address them. Mr. Medlin indicated staff would return with a response. Mayor Piercy also requested more information about the park condition rating system mentioned earlier by Mr. Medlin.

Responding to a question from Ms. Ortiz about volunteerism in the department, Mr. Medlin noted the number of volunteer hours and fact the department had three full-time volunteer coordinators as well as a Parks Development Coordinator working with the Parks Foundation and other fund-raising organizations. He emphasized the amount of coordination that effort required. Mr. Medlin said some organizations wishing to volunteer had a clear idea about what they wanted to do. He said the department worked with

those volunteers to get their projects done in a way that did not increase maintenance costs for the City. There was considerable give and take involved. Mr. Medlin said that sometimes the division had to decline projects, but volunteers in general were a great resource. He suggested that beyond the monetary contribution, the value of volunteers was in neighborhood building, the ownership such projects gave residents, and the extra “eyes and ears” on the parks that volunteers provided.

Ms. Ortiz questioned if there was a way to allow residents to adopt a park and do minor maintenance of the facility. Mr. Medlin said the City had an “adopt the park” program and was open to volunteer maintenance as long as the City was notified and could coordinate the effort and ensure it met applicable regulations and practices.

Mr. Pryor expressed appreciation for the presentation. He recalled that in 2006, Mr. Medlin proposed a bond measure to the council for maintenance and acquisition. The council declined to place such a measure before the voters, and instead decided the proceeds of the bond would be completely dedicated to acquisition. He regretted the council’s failure to accept Mr. Medlin’s proposal. He said the existing situation was not due to staff, which had been diligent in bringing forward its best recommendations. Mr. Pryor acknowledged the budgetary constraints facing the City and the difficulty of funding parks maintenance given other needs.

Responding to a question from Mr. Brown, Mr. Medlin clarified that the 2006 bond did not include any funds for renovation. He reviewed the projects that would be funded with the remaining money. Mr. Brown asked if there were barriers to using some of that funding to acquire Civic Stadium. Mr. Medlin suggested that was a legal question and the answer was dependent on whether one could define Civic Stadium as a community park. Mr. Brown observed that the council had been scheduled to discuss the issue of Civic Stadium in September but that discussion had not occurred. He suggested the possibility of a land exchange to free up money from the bond to buy Civic Stadium.

Responding to a question from Mr. Brown, Mr. Penwell clarified that \$3.2 million was the current replacement value for the buildings at Laurelwood Golf Course. Mr. Medlin estimated the land itself was valued at approximately \$250,000/acre, and there were approximately 80 acres in question.

Mr. Clark asked how much money was set aside from the bond for acquiring land for Santa Clara Community Park. Mr. Medlin estimated \$1 million was available. He said staff continued to negotiate for the last 16 acre parcel. At this time, the City had acquired less than 24 acres for the park. Mr. Clark asked if the City had enough money to acquire the entire acreage desired for the park. Mr. Medlin said yes; at this time, the barrier to completing the park acquisition was the lack of a willing seller.

Mr. Clark said that during a recent Santa Clara Community Organization meeting, attendees had discussed vandalism in neighborhood parks and many had volunteered to clean up and had asked how they could become involved. He thought many residents would volunteer for graffiti clean-up in their neighborhood parks, which would increase their sense of ownership of such facilities and perhaps decrease City costs.

Mr. Clark agreed that parks and recreation were important to citizens’ quality of life but the City would face many budgetary challenges in the next few years. He said the council needed to consider both how to bridge the funding gap while reducing the cost of providing the same level of services. Mr. Clark was also interested in examining under-used park assets, such as the back nine at Laurelwood Golf Course, for possible disposition.

Mr. Zelenka reminded the council that he had proposed the work session and said it was due to his concern about the status of funding for parks O&M. He contrasted the higher cost of rehabilitation to the lower cost of regular maintenance and suggested the council was being short-sighted in not adequately funding O&M.

Mr. Zelenka suggested the City was “semi-rich in lands” and had money for acquiring more land, but lacked a plan to get funding to develop those lands. He wanted the council to recognize the magnitude of the problem that existed and the danger it would worsen if nothing was done. He suggested the danger was that the City would cut costs by closing facilities or letting them deteriorate. He wanted to avoid that and called on the council to develop a plan to address both park funding and development.

Ms. Taylor did not think all parks needed to be developed parks, although she agreed the City needed to maintain its developed assets. She was happy the bond had focused on land acquisition due to the scarcity of land. She hoped the remainder of the bond proceeds were used to acquire crucial lands, especially those that affected the water supply.

Ms. Taylor asked if the O&M backlog was divided into things that should be done now and things that could be put off. Mr. Medlin said staff had looked at different reduction scenarios and different approaches to keeping service levels as high as possible while still cutting costs. He cited mowing as an example, saying that the City cut the mowing of sports fields in half. There were limits to what the City could do in regard to reduced maintenance without seeing consequences. Mr. Medlin said staff discussed how to change maintenance frequencies while maintaining customer satisfaction, and he suggested that determining the appropriate and acceptable level of maintenance would be an iterative process.

Ms. Taylor thought the City needed new sources of revenue and called for a work session on additional taxing mechanisms. She suggested a levy might be possible given residents’ value for parks, and thought the “adopt-a-park” concept mentioned by Mr. Clark might appeal to many people.

Mayor Piercy did not believe the City could provide basic services using only charitable contributions or volunteer labor. She suggested the council needed to talk to the community about concepts such as “adopt-a-park.”

Mayor Piercy invited suggestions to share with the new dean of the University of Oregon’s School of Business, Dennis Howard, who wished to do a big annual signature event with students that left a lasting mark on the community.

Mr. Zelenka agreed with Ms. Taylor that not all parks needed to be developed parks.

Mr. Zelenka believed the staff-suggested motion was adequate for the discussion, but it only addressed half the problem. He called for the development of a plan that included funding options to meet the City’s capital and recreation facilities renovation backlog, which was approximately \$23 million.

Mr. Clark suggested that the issue was not just how to get more money, but how the City could do business differently. He suggested that new and innovative ideas were needed. He said the staff-suggested motion did not cover that concern. Mr. Clark thought the City could look to examples of how services had been delivered differently and innovatively, and cited the Neighborhood Matching Grants Program as an example.

Ms. Ortiz could not support putting out a bond measure this year or next year. She suggested the council consider turning over responsibility for facilities such as the Kaufmann Center to a private party and sell the

back nine at Laurelwood Golf Course to cover the costs of fixing the buildings. She pointed out that the council had yet to fulfill its promises of a community center to residents of Santa Clara.

Mr. Zelenka believed that residents considered the back nine at Laurelwood to be a natural area because it had never been developed. He said if the council was to look at natural areas to sell to make money, he wanted to look at all the natural areas the City had purchased to see what made the most sense.

Mr. Zelenka agreed with the Mayor that the City could not provide services using volunteers. He did not want the City to find itself in a situation similar to the one it had faced in regard to street maintenance funding.

Mr. Zelenka questioned how the City could afford to maintain Civic Stadium given its current budgetary challenges. He was unsure he wanted to take on more maintenance problems, particularly the scope of issues that the stadium represented.

Speaking to the concept of selling City-owned park assets, Mayor Piercy believed that it did not make sense to sell most assets because of their value to the community, but it might make sense to sell some of them. She suggested if the City did so, the council should discuss how to reinvest the funding and grow that money for use in the future.

Mr. Clark, seconded by Ms. Taylor, moved to request the City Manager to develop funding options and innovative methods for City Council consideration for the FY12 budget to sustainably maintain and renovate current Parks, Recreation, and Open Space facilities. The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the work session at 7:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest  
City Recorder

*(Recorded by Kimberly Young)*