

EUGENE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY



Approval of Council Minutes

Meeting Date: May 23, 2011
Department: City Manager's Office
www.eugene-or.gov

Agenda Item Number: 2A
Staff Contact: Kim Young
Contact Telephone Number: 541-682-5232

ISSUE STATEMENT

This is a routine item to approve City Council minutes.

SUGGESTED MOTION

Move to approve the minutes of the April 18, 2011, Work Session, April 25, 2011, Regular Meeting, April 27, 2011, Work Session, and May 16, 2011, Public Hearing.

ATTACHMENTS

- A. April 18, 2011, Work Session
- B. April 25, 2011, Regular Meeting
- C. April 27, 2011, Work Session
- D. May 16, 2011, Public Hearing

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Staff Contact: Kim Young
Telephone: 541-682-5232
Staff E-Mail: Kim.A.Young@ci.eugene.or.us

MINUTES

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

April 18, 2011
5:30 p.m.

COUNCILORS PRESENT: Betty Taylor, George Brown, Andrea Ortiz, Mike Clark, Alan Zelenka, Pat Farr.

COUNCILORS ABSENT: George Poling, Chris Pryor.

Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the April 18, 2011, City Council workshop to order.

The council was joined by John Barofsky, David Funk, Gerry Gaydos, and Jean Tate of the Meeting the Challenge Task Force. Eugene Area Chamber of Commerce Director David Hauser was also present. Also present were Library, Recreation, and Cultural Services Director Renee Grube, Eugene Police Chief Pete Kerns, Planning and Development Department Director/Assistant City Manager Sarah Medary, Fire and Emergency Services Chief Randy Groves, City Attorney Glenn Klein, Public Works Director Kurt Corey, Central Services Director Kristi Hammitt and Finance Division staff Mia Cariaga, Pavel Gubanikhin, Twyla Miller, and Larry Hill.

**A. COUNCIL WORKSHOP:
Long-Term Financial Stability**

At the request of City Manager Jon Ruiz, those present introduced themselves and discussed their perception about where the City had been in regard to City budgets and finances for the last five years and their feelings about that perception. City Manager Ruiz then provided some context for the discussion by identifying factors affecting the budget. Those factors included the recession, a structural imbalance in the budget, the City Council's policy decision to absorb the library levy inside the General Fund, and increases in the PERS system. He also reviewed the steps the City took the previous year to balance the budget and indicated the goals for the next budget were essentially the same.

City Manager Ruiz solicited comments and questions.

Mayor Piercy advocated for the City to set goals for its job recruitment efforts.

Ms. Ortiz said she continued to receive requests for services from constituents. She asked if it was possible to set a goal for a core level of service, acknowledge the City was "not there" yet, and celebrate when the goal was achieved.

Ms. Cariaga suggested the multi-year financial plan addressed Ms. Ortiz's questions by identifying unfunded needs. Ten of the unfunded needs were highlighted as priorities to inform the council's discussion.

Mr. Farr wanted to be able to clearly articulate to constituents where the City spent its money so he could explain the costs and tradeoffs involved.

Mr. Barofsky believed the City needed to address the condition of non-General Funds such as the Ambulance Transport Fund. He also suggested that political feasibility had led the task force to rule some funding options out, although they might be appropriate for the need. He thought each service had different political and funding strategies attached, and believed the public would be willing to support ambulance transport through a service district or some other creative funding mechanism.

Ms. Tate noted the role that the Multi-Unit Property Tax Exemption played in the construction of housing near and in downtown, and pointed out that after the abatement period, such developments contributed significantly to the tax base. She said that such public investments eventually did get paid back.

City Manager Ruiz then asked meeting participants to list their worst and best outcomes for the discussion on 3" x 5" cards. Those present then shared their best and worst outcomes with the rest of the group. Staff collected the cards at the conclusion of the exercise.

City Manager Ruiz called for a brief break. Ms. Tate left during the break.

Ms. Cariaga provided background on the Meeting the Challenge Task Force, which had been formed in 2009 to discuss a major new revenue source to fund general services. The task force discussed a restaurant tax, a utility fee or monthly fee for service, and a personal income tax. The latter idea was discarded because Ballot Measure 66 was on the ballot at the same time. She asked task force participants to comment on the work of the task force.

Ms. Cariaga noted that other members of the task force included Merle Bottge, Jared Mason-Gere, Gretchen Pierce, Michael Redding, and David Tam.

Mr. Gaydos expressed appreciation for the process and the staff support. He said the task force was concerned about the economy and agreed a strong economy was an important part of any proposal. He referred to the considerations listed on page 1-2 of the task force report and asked the council to review them at a later time.

Mr. Gaydos said that the task force had focused on the restaurant tax. Members recognized the cost of implementing such a tax. The task force had agreed it was important to work closely with the industry on a restaurant tax. Eugene had tourist attractions and sports events that drew people from across the region and they visited restaurants while in Eugene. He thought the recommendation was time-bound to some extent and needed to be considered in the context of the recession. However, Mr. Gaydos believed the task force still stood behind it.

Mr. Funk said the task force was aware a restaurant tax failed before but did not let that affect its thinking. Given time, the task force believed a restaurant tax would be supported if the City offered the restaurants help to implement the tax. He suggested a percentage of a restaurant tax's yield could be dedicated both to providing restaurants with electronic cash registers that helped to collect the tax and to a marketing campaign that encouraged people to go out to eat. The task force believed that because Eugene was a

County seat, many City services such as parks were used by non-residents. The task force wanted to find a way to have non-residents contribute to the cost of such services.

Mr. Barofsky said the task force considered the political implications of different options under discussion and took those considered untenable off the table. The task force took a personal income tax off the table in early in the process. He said the mood of the community had changed to the degree that the council was now proposing an income tax for schools. He interpreted that to mean that some of the other discarded options should be re-examined.

Mr. Hauser acknowledged the Eugene Area Chamber of Commerce was generally not supportive of industry-specific taxes. He believed that political feasibility was a consideration for new revenues, and that could conflict with another value, that of fairness.

Ms. Taylor liked the idea of taxing nonresidents who used City services. She asked if the task force had considered an employment tax. She indicated her opposition to a restaurant tax. She did not think Eugene was like Ashland. She said that Ashland had a stronger entertainment focus and was a smaller city. People who went to Ashland were there on vacation and costs were less significant to people on vacation. Most of Eugene's restaurants served Eugene residents, and a restaurant tax might deter them from going out to eat.

Ms. Taylor said the task force did not recommend a business license tax but it worked in Portland and was a major source of income. She asked why such a tax would not work in Eugene. Mr. Barofsky said staff indicated the business license tax would not yield the desired amount. He believed, however, that such small taxes could add up and have an impact. He noted his own suggestion to double the annual \$10 rental unit fee to raise revenue. Mr. Funk added that different businesses worked at different profit margins and it was challenging to achieve parity in such a tax. He did not know how Portland implemented its business tax.

Ms. Ortiz appreciated the work of the task force and said everything was taxed in California, the state she came from. She expressed support for a restaurant tax because she did not think it would have much of an impact on individuals but would capture revenue from nonresidents.

Mr. Farr asked how much discussion the committee had about the potential of creating an unlevel playing field between restaurants inside and outside the community. Mr. Barofsky recalled it was a concern raised during discussion of the gas tax and he anticipated it would be raised if the council proposed a restaurant tax. He believed any funding source came with tradeoffs, however. He added the committee agreed it was important to identify what the City would pay for with the money, and that it would be useful if there was a nexus between the source of funding and the expenditures it paid for.

Mr. Farr recalled that in 1997 the council proposed a one percent utility tax for low-income housing and it failed by a wide margin.

City Manager Ruiz said the council would not see any of the task force recommendations reflected in the budget and staff was not asking the council to take action now or in the near term. He said he convened the task force because the City had a responsibility to consider all its fiscal options.

City Manager Ruiz asked the group to discuss what sustainability in the budget meant to it from a policy perspective.

Participants offered the following:

- A stable budget balanced revenue with expenditures but did not take into consideration all unfunded or unmet needs, such as backlog of roads maintenance, ambulance fund, parking fund, parks maintenance, building maintenance, planning and development issues—those costs would be addressed in a sustainable budget over a reasonable period of time. Putting the budget onto a path that allowed all those needs to be met would be sustainable. (Zelenka)
- We go about budgeting backwards. Creating a sustainable budget was fundamentally different than creating a stable budget. Need to reorder our thinking about budgeting process to achieve sustainability. We make long-term commitments about services or organization size and then ask how we can afford them. A sustainable budget means we ask first what we can afford, what we can expect in terms of revenues, what are our highest priorities, and what can we achieve with the funding available. (Clark)
- Two ways of thinking about it—what do we want to be and what do we want to have and how do we fund those things, or do we say this is how much money we have and how much can we fund. (Zelenka)
- How you work a business—you envision what you want and figure out how to get it. Would not go the other way (look at what you have and what you can do with it) and expect to run a business that is sustainable. (Funk)
- Perhaps the answer was in the middle—what you want versus what you can get, because you cannot always get what you want. (Farr)
- Need to consider fire services and examine service district concept so users can support. Unsure it would help or hurt bottom line, but think we need to have that conversation to see if that approach was feasible. (Ortiz)
- Believe the budget was a balance of what you can afford versus what you want, which is why we use the Triple Bottom Line (TBL) analysis. Need to do the complete analysis and recognize there are tradeoffs. (Piercy)
- Particularly with finite resources—if you have finite resources and only funded police and fire, not many people would want to live here. The reason we embraced the TBL approach was because it made one think of aspects to issues beyond the dollars and cents aspect. (Zelenka)

City Manager Ruiz then asked the council how it would like to involve the Budget Committee in the discussion for the next several months and beyond.

- Useful to have the input of citizen members, who will be more helpful if they know where council is going. (Piercy)
- Hope citizens members could be brought up to speed. Always appreciate their input. Hope they are aware of this conversation given their influence. Maybe it would be more beneficial to bring the committee in to talk to the council on a more regular basis. (Ortiz)
- The Budget Committee was a thoughtful group of people who give advice but do not make final decisions. The committee's approach varied greatly depending on its membership. The committee gave the council some different perspectives. Think we meet far too much as the Budget Committee already. (Taylor)
- Budget Committee lay members had an opportunity to focus on a relatively narrow aspect of what the City does, similar to Planning Commission, and appreciate that focus. They bring up issues that councilors might not have time to consider. Appreciate the input of Mr. Barofsky and past Budget Committee members such as Mr. Zelenka and Mr. Gaydos. (Farr)
- Value Budget Committee—its added voices enhance the conversation and bring in other points of view the council had not thought about. Plus the lay members could do leg work the council could not do because of its work load, e.g., oversight of service improvement budgeting shift.

Think future budget will be a mix of efficiencies and revenues and perhaps lay members could look into those areas in more depth. Committee adds to a more robust conversation. (Zelenka)

- Agree with Mr. Zelenka about latter point. Structurally speaking, like and value committee, and think it was good to have committee's voices at the table before decisions were made. The committee was a valuable voice of the citizenry. Perceive the lay members' utility as more short-term or medium-term value rather than long-term vision or community direction, which is what this conversation is about. However, acknowledge example of Mr. Barofsky, who advocated for long-term capital needs. Perhaps there was more value in involving the committee lay members in the longer term discussion. (Clark)
- No problem with individuals on committee but I do wish the composition of the committee was more reflective of the entire community. Everyone on the committee lived in south Eugene and I believe it would have more value if its members were more geographically diverse. (Clark)
- Budget Committee lay members can bring public viewpoint to suggestions and recommendations. Creating that kind of opportunity makes sense. Historically committee members have liked being asked to do more regarding long-term strategies. (Piercy)
- When I served on Budget Committee it had a subcommittee focused on how improvements to the Capital Improvement Program. Such tasks were worthwhile for the committee members. (Clark)
- Committee necessary but insufficient in conversation—like urban growth boundary conversation. It was a broader conversation that called for another “Envision Eugene” sort of process. Such a process could serve as a model for how the community made tough decisions. Want to avoid community polarization. (Zelenka)
- Recall that in past each councilor appointed a committee member, leading to more variety of opinions. Could reconsider that approach. Remember, committee members were not elected and were no more out in the community than councilors. (Taylor)

City Manager Ruiz indicated that the workshop was the beginning of a larger conversation. He anticipated that staff would return with additional thoughts and recommendations. He thanked those who participated.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting at 8:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest
City Recorder

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)

MINUTES

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

April 25, 2011
7:30 p.m.

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

COUNCILORS ABSENT: Chris Pryor.

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the April 25, 2011, regular meeting of the Eugene City Council to order.

1. **ACTION:**
Resolution 5030 Honoring Eugene Police Officer Chris Kilcullen, His Service, and His Sacrifice

Mayor Piercy expressed the council's gratitude for the service of Eugene Police Officer Chris Kilcullen, who lost his life in the line of duty on April 22. She also expressed the council's sympathy for his loss to his family, friends, colleagues, and Eugene residents. Mayor Piercy recommended that when residents saw an officer, they express their sympathy for the loss of Officer Kilcullen and thank the officer for his or her service. Such a gesture could mean a lot at such a time.

Mayor Piercy read the following resolution:

The City Council of the City of Eugene finds that:

A. Chris Kilcullen was hired as a Eugene Police Officer in March 1998. Some of his notable achievements include the following:

1. He was a member of the Eugene Police Department Crisis Negotiation Team since 2002. He was a very highly skilled negotiator and is credited with saving many lives.
2. He became a member of the Eugene Police Department Rapid Deployment Unit in 2003, and earned an Advanced Certificate as a Certified Police Officer in 2004.
3. He was awarded Eugene Police Department Employee of the Month in May 2004 for having the highest activity level of any EPD patrol officer, based on the number of investigations, arrests, traffic citations and field interviews completed. He was again awarded Eugene Police Department Employee of the Month in June 2008.
4. He was a member of Special Operations and the Traffic Enforcement Unit since 2005.

5. He helped develop the Crisis Intervention Team and had served on the Team since 2008.

6. He received more than 85 commendations during his 12-year career at the Eugene Police Department. Those commendations repeatedly cited Officer Kilcullen's exemplary professional demeanor and positive interactions with the public, even in the most stressful circumstances. Many people who received traffic citations from Officer Kilcullen would thank him and call the department to comment on his professional and positive approach.

B. Chris Kilcullen was an outstanding Eugene Police officer and exemplary public servant. He was a remarkably and unfailingly kind, cheerful, thoughtful, and giving person, with a smile that brightened the day of anyone he encountered.

C. In addition to his service as a police officer, Chris Kilcullen was a dedicated community volunteer and devoted husband and father. His wife and two daughters were his greatest passion and he adored and cherished the time, however short, he had with them.

D. Officer Kilcullen's tragic death in the line of duty reminds us of the inherent danger that our police officers willingly face to protect the Eugene community. Police officers and other public safety professionals courageously place the safety and welfare of community members above their own every day.

NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EUGENE, a Municipal Corporation of the State of Oregon, as follows:

Section 1. The City of Eugene is deeply saddened and mourns the loss of this fine officer.

Section 2. The City of Eugene expresses its immeasurable gratitude to Officer Chris Kilcullen and his family for his outstanding public service.

Section 3. The City of Eugene hereby declares that Friday, April 29, 2011, is Officer Chris Kilcullen Remembrance Day and encourages the community to share in expressions of support for Officer Kilcullen, his family and the Eugene Police Department.

The foregoing Resolution adopted the 25th day of April, 2011.

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to adopt Resolution 5030 honoring Eugene Police Officer Chris Kilcullen, his service, and his sacrifice.

Mayor Piercy called for a voice vote.

The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

City Manager Jon Ruiz acknowledged it had been a difficult time for the City organization but he was proud of it for coming together. The organization wanted to remember and celebrate Officer Kilcullen's life in a thoughtful way that made his family and the community proud. City Manager Ruiz said police officers grieved like everyone else. He urged residents to continue to express their love and support for the members of the department.

Councilor Poling said over his 30 years in law enforcement he had attended funeral services for several officers, some of who were close friends. He noted he had worked with Officer Kilcullen's father, John, at the Lane County Sheriff's Office. When such an attack occurred, it was a direct assault on the community. The police were the community's thin line of defense against crime. It took a special person to do the work of a police officer and put their life on the line. Councilor Poling commended the officers of the Eugene Police Department (EPD) for their ability to continue to provide excellent service at such a time, and thanked Eugene Police Chief Pete Kerns and the department for their hard work. He also expressed his sympathy to the Kilcullen family for tragic loss of Officer Kilcullen. He suggested people give a wave, a tip of the hat, or a word of thanks to the next officer they saw. It would be appreciated.

Councilor Farr had no words other than words of prayer to offer to the Kilcullen family and the officers of the EPD.

Councilor Zelenka expressed his heartfelt gratitude for Officer Kilcullen's ultimate sacrifice. He expressed his sympathy to the Kilcullen family and thanked the EPD officers who continually put their lives on the line. He said that Officer Kilcullen would be missed.

Councilor Taylor expressed her sympathy and gratitude to the Kilcullen family and to the EPD.

Councilor Brown expressed his sorrow to the Kilcullen family. He had attended the vigil held for Officer Kilcullen on April 24 and believed it demonstrated the community's support for the EPD.

Councilor Clark called the loss of Officer Kilcullen a tragedy for the department, the City organization, and the entire community. He had first met Officer Kilcullen at the Citizens Police Academy and was struck by his unfailing kindness and gentle spirit. He was deeply saddened by his loss and would miss Officer Kilcullen. He had also attended the April 24 vigil and recalled that Ms. Kilcullen had asked those present to remember that all police officers were "just folks" who had families and felt tragedy and pain. He suggested that the community could use the occasion as an opportunity to treat its officers better.

Councilor Clark asked staff to prepare a motion of support for an effort to rename a section of I-126 from Main Street to I-5 in honor of Officer Kilcullen. He said the existing Oregon Department of Transportation process for renaming a facility was lengthy and suggested the possibility that the City could piggyback on a bill currently being considered by the State legislature to accomplish the goal.

Councilor Ortiz believed there was a little Chris Kilcullen in all EPD officers so the suggestion that people be kind to all officers resonated with her. At Councilor Ortiz's request, those present observed a moment of silence in honor of Officer Kilcullen.

Mayor Piercy recognized Eugene Police Chief Kerns, who said it was an absolute privilege to serve the community. He and the department appreciated the honor the council bestowed on Officer Kilcullen.

2. PUBLIC FORUM

Mayor Piercy reviewed the rules of the Public Forum. She opened the forum.

Wayne Ford, 85560 Svarverud Road, chair of the Homeless Action Coalition, presented the council with a petition from Virgil, a homeless resident, asking the City to provide more spaces for people to camp legally. The petition was signed by many residents and the request was endorsed by the EPD. Mr. Ford expressed concern about the growing homeless population and his fear that reductions in State aid would

increase the number. He contrasted the cost of enforcement against the lesser cost of providing homeless spaces and asked the council to hold a work session on the request. St. Vincent de Paul could provide 10 more spaces immediately.

Mr. Ford asked councilors to help expand the program at no cost by reminding property owners that the presence of campers near their property reduced theft and vandalism and to ask them to financially support the program. He also asked the council to expand the church program. Mr. Ford suggested a need for greater public awareness that homeowners could allow people to live in a vehicle or tent on their property.

Ruth Duemler, 1745 Fircrest Drive, agreed with the remarks of Mr. Ford. She shared the story of an older resident living in his truck who became homeless because of a heart attack, and emphasized the difficulty such individuals had finding a job in Eugene. Ms. Duemler requested that the City provide portable toilets for the homeless. She also requested recycling be provided. She estimated the cost of portable toilets at \$50 and the cost of a recycling bin at \$10. Ms. Duemler asked the council to contact the State about preserving funding for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF).

Marianne Malott, 1133 Olive Street, #1215, said she received a Ford scholarship to attend the University of Oregon because she had been able to take advantage of a legal camping space. She advocated for expansion of the program, saying it provided people peace of mind. She was able to do her homework in her space and would not have been able to achieve what she had without the space.

Jerry Smith, 5041 Saxon Way, a homeless advocate, spoke of the impact of reductions in TANF funding on local residents, predicting that 2,000 residents now on the program could lose eligibility and some would die. He said that TANF was the only safety net for families with children. Mr. Smith suggested the community was facing an emergency situation.

Bob Macherione, 1994 Brewer Street, discussed his experience with the Code Enforcement staff about a Sign Code violation on his property and suggested the action was in retaliation for a lawsuit he filed against the City. He believed the Sign Code was intended to regulate commercial signage, not free speech. As his sign was on private property and presented no public hazard, he did not think it was subject to the Sign Code. Mr. Macherione interpreted the scope of the code to mean he could use the Sign Code to complain anonymously about people's bumper stickers. He questioned how the complainant in his case could remain anonymous, particularly when the City enforced the code by complaint only.

Mark Robinowitz, no address given, honored the workers in Japan at the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant who sacrificed themselves to minimize nuclear contamination. He recalled the Chernobyl disaster and its lingering effects and suggested the lessons of Chernobyl had not been heeded. Mr. Robinowitz called on the City to ensure its long-term plans were relevant and took into account limited resources and actual demand. He advocated for planning for a future that was physically possible.

Eugene Drix, 307-1/2 East 14th Avenue, thanked the audience for being at the meeting and the people at home for watching. He acknowledged the many issues facing the community and believed that if people worked together they would find a way to solve them. He discussed his experiences with gangs in his neighborhood and said he refused to "buy into" the differences that such gangs encouraged. He attempted to interact with gang members and be positive. He thought ultimately, the presence of such gangs would make his neighbors more alert and connected.

Mark Callahan, 3621 Mahlon Street, appealed to Mayor Piercy and the City Council to ask Hillary Johnson and the organization "Strong Schools Eugene" to drop the lawsuit filed against him as a member

of the Voters' Pamphlet Opponent Committee. He related that he had been one of three volunteers who served on the committee and was the only one sued. Mr. Callahan suggested the lawsuit was directed against him because of his campaign for a school board seat. He said the public needed honor and integrity in its elections, not personal attacks on those with the courage to run for public office.

Mayor Piercy closed the Public Forum and called on the council for questions and comments. There were none.

3. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Approval of Tentative Working Agenda**
- B. Ratification of Intergovernmental Relations Committee Minutes of March 9, 2011, and March 16, 2011**

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to approve the items on the Consent Calendar. Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 7:0

4. ACTION: 2011/12 Funding Allocations for Federal Community Development Block Grant and HOME Investment Partnership Programs

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to approve the One-Year Action Plan for use of Federal Community Development Block Grant and HOME funds in 2011/12.

Councilor Poling determined from Stephanie Jennings of the Planning and Development Department that the funding could be commingled in certain cases with similar funds allocated to other local governments, but none of the projects in questions were supported by comingled funds

Councilor Zelenka determined from Ms. Jennings that the administrative costs listed in Attachment A in the meeting packet represented administrative costs for both the program income and new funding, and also included the costs of the audit.

Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 7:0

5. PUBLIC HEARING: Envision Eugene

City Manager Ruiz introduced the item. He recalled the history of the Envision Eugene process to this point. The hearing was an opportunity to hear the public's reaction to the proposed strategies and tactics intended to guide Eugene's growth over the next 20 years.

Mayor Piercy opened the public hearing.

Bob Cassidy, 2401 East 27th Avenue, recommended that the document be revised to reflect the growth in the percentage of senior citizens who would live in the community in 20 years. He asked the council to consider, as it reviewed the document, what it did to prepare for the community of the future.

Larry Reed, 4251 Scenic Drive, advocated for the designation of more industrially zoned land to support local business growth and quality jobs, particularly traded sector jobs. Traded sector firms competed in regional and international markets and brought new money into the local economy. He favored adding more industrial acres to support such firms and suggested that an expansion of 800 acres would be better than the 400-500 acres proposed by City Manager Ruiz, which he also supported.

Jim Welch, 2139 Centennial Plaza, representing the Eugene Association of Realtors, submitted written testimony on behalf of the association. He recommended that there be less regulation, less paperwork, and fewer delays in the provision of infrastructure in the developing areas. He believed that the community's focus in land development should be on the local economy. He emphasized the importance of industrial land development. Mr. Welch said the association supported City Manager Ruiz's recommendation for industrial acreage, which would provide more large industrial parcels necessary to attract larger employers.

Deborah Smith, 2982 Martinique Street, representing the Eugene Water & Electric Board (EWEB) executive management team, reported that EWEB had delivered a letter of support for the recommendations before the council earlier that day. Ms. Smith emphasized the importance of the planning process to EWEB's ability to deliver services in the future. The focus on flexibility and adaptability, as described in Pillar 7, was critical to EWEB.

Ms. Smith spoke on her own behalf as a member of the Community Resource Group's (CRG) Economic Development Industrial Lands Committee in support of City Manager Ruiz's recommendation to expand the urban growth boundary (UGB) for industrial land. Such expansion would allow the City to assemble a portfolio of sites for various needs. Ms. Smith noted the high priority placed on such land in the Regional Prosperity Plan and suggested an even higher priority was the community's need for new family-wage jobs. She believed the lack of industrial land represented a crisis, and said an adequate supply was a key strategy to attracting employers, for which competition was fierce.

Sue Prichard, 2671 Emerald Street, expressed support for City Manager Ruiz's recommendation to increase the supply of industrial land because of its importance to job creation. She suggested it would take a minimum of 400 industrially designated acres to meet the need and to accommodate the demand for larger parcels. She believed the community should reuse land inside the UGB but that would not be sufficient. She spoke of her work as a commercial real estate broker and offered three examples of companies who looked for land in Eugene unsuccessfully and went elsewhere in Oregon. Ms. Prichard agreed with Ms. Smith that the industrial lands supply represented a crisis, and asked the council to support the manager's recommendation.

Pat Hocken, 338 West 11th Avenue, representing the League of Women Voters, expressed the league's support for the Envision Eugene community outreach process and the conceptual framework represented by the Seven Pillars as a good first step toward improving and maintaining community livability. Ms. Hocken expressed the league's concern that many implementation details were still unknown and some of the goals appeared to be incompatible with one another. She suggested any UGB expansion needed to be accompanied by a realistic assessment of site suitability for new uses and of neighborhoods to ensure the preservation of high-value farmland while also accounting for the draft recommendation to maintain current single-family densities.

Ms. Hocken cautioned that the draft's simultaneous support for 20-minute neighborhoods, transit corridor development/redevelopment, multi-family housing, urban agriculture, and neighborhood support for higher density development created an inherent tension in the draft with a potential for community

controversy. While Opportunity Siting (OS) might help, the league recommended the City consider a pilot project to demonstrate the benefits and potential of the plan's recommendations.

Ms. Hocken noted the league's support for the inclusion of regional strategies related to economic development and natural resources, and the concept of an industrial land trust to facilitate Brownfield redevelopment. She submitted her written testimony.

Paul Conte, 1461 West 10th Avenue, Chair of Westside-Jefferson Neighbors, noted the council's receipt of a letter in support of the Envision Eugene "neighborhood livability" pillar and of revitalizing the Infill Compatibility Standards (ICS) and OS processes. The letter was signed by 65 neighborhood leaders and endorsed by 13 neighborhood organizations. Signees included at least one representative from each neighborhood organization, which Mr. Conte attributed to the importance residents attached to safe, pleasant, livable, and stable neighborhoods. He suggested development pressures in neighborhoods like the West University neighborhood were creating monocultures and such areas were in danger of being future ghettos. Neighborhoods such as River Road and Santa Clara would be threatened by additional development pressure for higher density when the economy improved. Mr. Conte asked the council to consider and implement the recommendations of the ICS Task Team.

Deborah Healey, 360 East 15th Avenue, advocated for recognition of the differences between multi-family developments. She pointed out that some multi-family developments housed multiple related individuals, or families, while some multi-family developments housed multiple unrelated adults. She believed that to call both types "multi-family" housing misrepresented what the City was trying to achieve in terms of low-income housing and housing affordability. Ms. Healey said that while students might appear to be low-income, they often were not, as demonstrated by the cost of the housing they occupied.

Ms. Healey liked the concept of compact urban development but believed the community could learn from the West University neighborhood. She agreed with Mr. Conte that it was a monoculture in terms of both residents and housing types. She called for measures to protect what was left in the neighborhood, including its historic houses, historic trees, the Millrace, and Amazon Creek. She believed that those measures needed to repair the fabric of the neighborhood and to encourage livability. She asked that Envision Eugene take into account varying neighborhoods and be informed by her neighborhood's experience.

Gary Wildish, 2424 Quince Street, expressed support for the manager's recommendations. He agreed with the remarks of Mr. Reed that the recommendation might be on the low end of the need. He said much of the existing industrial acreage was in small parcels and included constraints that had to be mitigated. He recommended that the City have a portfolio of industrial sites of varying sizes to accommodate business expansion and relocation.

Anne Marie Mehlum, no address given, concurred with City Manager Ruiz's recommendation for increasing the supply of industrial land. She termed it a balanced and moderate approach worthy of the council's support. She said the recommendation provided an opportunity for the local businesses to grow.

Marcia Edwards, 1635 Adkins Road, representing the Eugene Area Chamber of Commerce, expressed support for the manager's recommendation to expand the UGB to accommodate more industrial land. If the redevelopment of existing land was a viable strategy, it would have already happened. Brownfield mitigation was costly and could not compete with land in other markets. She suggested the City financially support the mitigation of such sites to make them available in the future. However, it was not

currently an option for now, or reasonable or practical to expect companies to use Brownfields inside the UGB as a source of industrial land given the alternatives that were available in other communities.

Laura Potter, 1401 Willamette Street, representing the Eugene Area Chamber of Commerce, expressed support for the manager's recommendation to expand the UGB to accommodate additional industrial land. The issue was a high priority for the chamber. She related that the community recently lost more than 500 jobs, including family-wage jobs, due to the loss of large employers. Those losses coincided with the economic downturn. Ms. Potter reported that averages wages in Lane County were on the decline and emphasized the importance of high-wage, family-wage jobs to the health of the community. Such jobs kept young families in the Eugene and kept schools open. They enabled the City to maintain its livability. She concurred that the City should create a portfolio of sites.

Ed McMahon, representing the Home Builders Association of Lane County, agreed that the industrial land supply had reached the crisis point. He expressed support for City Manager Ruiz's recommendation to increase the supply and emphasized that it was based on actual data.

Phil Farrington, 1160 Monroe Street, supported the manager's recommendation to expand the UGB for industrial purposes. He believed that the community's legacy of livability depended on paying attention to fundamentals such as employment opportunities and job creation. Eugene needed to ensure there were opportunities for economic growth. The recommendation would add a modest number of sites of varying sizes to the inventory.

Will Shaver, 2494 Portland Street, believed a long-term solution to homelessness was needed and suggested that increasing the industrial land supply was one such long-term solution. He said it was critical to add employment opportunities to the community. Infill development had not worked for those who had tried to do so locally. He was aware of local employers who had tried to expand their operations and had done so on a piecemeal basis, spreading their businesses across the community, resulting in higher transportation costs and more damaged goods. Mr. Shaver believed the manager's recommendation was reasonable. He advocated for local jobs, which led to local taxes.

Tom Slocum, 1950 Graham Drive, supported the manager's recommendations for the UGB expansion to accommodate industrial uses. He noted the examples offered by others about the challenge of locating a new industrial business in Eugene. He was concerned that Eugene's growth was so slow that it would not have the jobs needed to make the community viable and there would not be sufficient tax revenues to support the community's needs and desires. He was also very concerned about the industrial land supply, and agreed with Mr. Reed that perhaps more acreage was needed.

Brent McClure, 3015 Walnut Street, the chair of the Eugene Area Chamber of Commerce's Economic Development Committee, said the committee supported the manager's recommendation to expand the UGB for industrial uses. The lack of large parcels was an obstacle for many companies seeking to locate in Eugene.

Carolyn Jacobs, 2040 Agate Street, recalled the council's establishment of the ICS Project and reported that since that time 700 young people had moved into 10 new projects in her neighborhood. Lot aggregation had resulted in enormous buildings with minimal setbacks next to single-family houses. Open spaces were nonexistent, and parties spilled into the street. Ms. Jacobs said her neighborhood could not survive development based on the sole guiding principle of the developer's bottom line. Neighbors were being driven out of their walkable neighborhood and were desperate to sustain it.

Ms. Jacobs further reported that the City was currently in the midst of permitting a multi-family project near her home that would occupy a full quarter block, be 42 feet high, and have a five-foot setback on the property line it shared with a single-family house. Ms. Jacobs said without standards, a neighborhood that should be a resource for the University of Oregon and the City would be “thrown away.” She said the current code rewarded developers of such large projects for eliminating amenities such as open space. She believed the City had things backwards in comparison to cities such as Portland. She believed it was crucial that the council take up the recommendations of the ICS Task Team because it was not sustainable to drive out long-term residents invested in the neighborhood and replace them with a young transient population.

Tom Halferty, 4510 Manzanita Street, suggested the Civic Stadium site represented an opportunity for a 20-minute neighborhood. He also advocated for the preservation of farmland if the UGB was expanded.

Kevin Matthews, PO Box 1588, Eugene, president of the organization “Friends of Eugene,” advocated for an increase in the proposed housing mix and opposed the proposal to expand the UGB. He did not think such actions represented sufficient change. Mr. Matthews suggested that the process was being run in such a way that “paid representatives” of the development industry had the last word.

Pamela Miller, 1959 Harris Street, urged the council to provide ongoing staffing to the ICS Task Team so it could continue to work on standards that allowed for infill development to be accommodated in a way that supported neighborhood quality of life. Infill measures should recognize neighborhood differences and ensure that density increases occurred in a visionary way rather than be overlaid on neighborhoods in a “one size fits all” manner. She expressed concern about the high-density development occurring in the South University Neighborhood. The City was doing nothing to encourage diversity of housing to ensure there would be rental and owner-occupied housing for young single and married people.

Ms. Miller also questioned how the City was addressing the needs of retired people. She suggested that the presence of well-designed complexes could persuade older residents to give up their large homes to young families while allowing them to remain in their neighborhoods. She feared otherwise, those residents would leave the neighborhood and their houses would be converted to multi-family developments serving unrelated adults. She feared such unintended consequences from failure to adequately plan for a meaningful, workable, large multi-family zoned area. She hoped such planning occurred in the future.

Louisa Hamachek, 366 Clark Street, Chair of the Whiteaker Community Council, wanted Eugene to prepare for “new times.” She maintained that ecologically and economically, the world was heading toward radical change. She wanted Eugene to prepare for a world without electricity and automobiles. Ms. Hamachek advocated for greater density in neighborhoods and for food production in neighborhoods everywhere possible, including on rooftops. She advocated for the formation of associations with area farmers who could bring their food to market in Eugene via horse and wagon. She wanted to see stables and accommodations for horses. She called for the river to be redeveloped with small local industries that could employ the river for their energy supply using new turbine technology. Ms. Hamachek also supported Brownfield mitigation and reuse.

Mayor Piercy closed the public hearing.

6. PUBLIC HEARING: Civic Stadium

Mayor Piercy opened the public hearing.

Beth Bonamici, 2769 Emerald Street, questioned how the City could acquire Civic Stadium when its budget included fee increases in the library, delays in the opening of Amazon pools, and delayed facility maintenance. All those activities contributed to the well-being of Eugene residents. She supported the YMCA's proposal for the Civic Stadium, which would not require public funding and would provide needed community services at a time when City-funded recreation services were being cut back. She urged the City to spend no money on proposals to renovate Civic Stadium.

Richard Pettigrew, 4147 East Amazon Drive, Executive Director of the Archaeological Legacy Institute, advocated for the preservation of Civic Stadium. He believed the stadium would only become more valued and treasured with time, and people of the future would admire the community for saving it.

W. Scott Bartlett, 1445 East 21st Avenue, reviewed the recent history surrounding Civic Stadium and acknowledged that 4J School District was selling the property because it needed money to educate the community's children. He opposed the Fred Meyer development proposal for the Civic Stadium property and expressed his support for either the YMCA or Save Civic Stadium (SCS) proposals.

Bob Barber, 881 East 38th Avenue, spoke on behalf of his daughter Ramona Barber. He reported that she had written a letter to the Staples Learning Foundation asking it to support SCS in its effort to preserve Civic Stadium, and the foundation subsequently gave SCS \$5,000. He read Ms. Barber's letter to the foundation. He conveyed to the council Ms. Barber's hope that the City could bring the YMCA and SCS proposals together.

Derrick Johnson, 1665 Fairmount Boulevard, urged the City to buy Civic Stadium for a public-private partnership as proposed by SCS. He believed the stadium had the potential to serve the community into the future and spoke of the excitement that professional soccer could engender in the community. He also believed that the partnership would result in the creation of more sports fields, which were currently insufficient in number to meet demand. Mr. Johnson said the Civic Stadium site contained sufficient land for the YMCA as well as a field house. The stadium could be a cornerstone for community activities and an opportunity for economic development and community building.

Scott McClary, 3366 Agate Street, Board of Directors of the YMCA, asked the council to recognize what the 4J process provided to the community and what a successful response by the YMCA would contribute to the site. He said YMCA was a remarkable place where children could recreate safely and develop social skills. It was an asset to the community at large and to 4J in particular. Mr. McClary said further delay would have a detrimental effect on the YMCA project. He asked the council to allow the 4J process to move forward.

Erik Gunderson, 72 West Broadway, advocated for the YMCA project. He commended the YMCA for its work in the community and for its impact as a family gathering place. The YMCA had touched the lives of thousands of Eugene residents. He said YMCA had not been able to partner successfully with SCS but had been able to partner with the University of Oregon on a proposal that combined student housing and a new YMCA facility. The housing made the project work financially. He said the proposal supported the community's land use goals, would bring new customers to south Eugene businesses, would result in local transportation improvements, and would take advantage of the transit system. The YMCA could continue to provide existing services and would create a community of University students with a focus on fitness as Y membership would be included in the rent.

Kathy Lynn, 2036 Willamette Street, suggested the City should buy or lease the Civic Stadium property and then determine the uses for the site. The City was best positioned to ensure the development achieved its goals for mixed-use development and integrated land use and transportation. The City could also bring in other partners to contribute to the financial viability of the site. That could include the YMCA. She said the site's potential for recreation uses should be explored. She asked that any decisions related to the future of the stadium take into account the planning occurring through Envision Eugene.

Josh Skov, 2036 Willamette Street, said redevelopment of Civic Stadium would follow the pillars and strategies of Envision Eugene only if the City played a key role in the effort, with a central focus on land use and transportation. He believed that role was justified by the size and location of the site in question as well as by its historic significance and proximity to a transportation corridor. He asked the council to consider how the strategies of Envision Eugene related to integrated land use and transportation fit with the site. Those strategies called for transportation options in addition to the car. Mixed-use along transit corridors, 20-minute neighborhoods, compatible infill development, and higher density opportunity sites were strategies intended to foster walking and bicycling as key features of livable, sustainable neighborhoods. Uses that demanded the provision of large amounts of parking were not likely to be consistent with those strategies, ICS, and OS, as well as the community's growth management policies and Climate & Energy Action Plan. Mr. Skov asked the council to do what it could to ensure that the principles of Envision Eugene informed whatever development occurred on the site.

Lauren Doxsee, 2136 McMillan Street, discussed her involvement with SCS and her hope that the stadium could be redeveloped as proposed by SCS to accommodate local youth soccer teams and other sports teams. Currently, teams were backed up waiting for fields. She also hoped to involve the YMCA in the proposal because of the potential of indoor soccer.

Pat Walsh, 941 Oak Street, representing Vox Public Relations, spoke of behalf of Dr. Joe Womack, President of Northwest Christian University (NCU), who was unable to be present. Dr. Womack asked Mr. Walsh to convey NCU's support for the SCS proposal. The proposal would result in the creation of fields that could be employed by college, club, and youth soccer teams. He said that NCU was interested in employing the facility as its athletic home. The location and planned renovations would provide NCU's soccer program with the best facilities of any National Association of Intercollegiate Athlete (NAIA) school in the northwest. NCU supported the proposal not only because of the benefit to NCU students but because of the benefit to the entire community.

Joe Blakely, 4035 Donald Street, Apartment C, supported the SCS proposal. He provided some history of the stadium, which was built through a community effort. He believed that community effort was embodied in the SCS proposal. He asked the council to find a way to save the SCS and maintain it in recreational use.

Dennis Hebert, 850 East 38th Avenue, a member of SCS, advocated for the preservation of the stadium as a community gathering place. He asked the City Council to participate in SCS' effort to preserve the stadium for community use. He described the SCS proposal to turn the stadium into an athletic facility, some of the benefits of the proposal, and noted that many groups had expressed interest in using the facility, including a professional soccer team. He reported that Travel Lane County was reviewing SCS' estimates of the facility's economic impact and he would share its report when available. He anticipated that the proposal would bring jobs to the community both during and after construction. Mr. Hebert did not think the area could support or wanted a mixed-use residential/commercial development. He noted the role the City would play in development approvals and suggested that for that reason it had a financial stake in the school district's decision.

Jonathan Brandt, 57 West 20th Avenue, vice president of SCS, reviewed the funding proposal for the project components. He emphasized that the SCS wished to partner with the YMCA. He believed there were many potential investors and little financial risk to the City.

Carlos Barrera, 2470 Olive Street, expressed concern about the impact of a new Fred Meyer grocery store on the Civic Stadium site, which he feared would threaten already existing businesses in the neighborhood and result in a net loss of jobs. While he liked the YMCA proposal, he believed the loss of the stadium would be a tragedy. He suggested that the YMCA's proposal for four-story buildings would provoke appeals that resulted in years of delay. Perhaps the development would be lost altogether, leaving a big hole. He supported the SCS proposal, particularly its soccer element. He believed it would bring in tourist dollars from outside the community and improve the neighborhood.

Christine Thompson, 2195 Olive Street, a board member of SCS, advocated for the City to play a role in the future of Civic Stadium because of its role in land use approvals and its responsibility for community development and transportation planning. She believed the SCS proposal offered unique opportunities to the community. She noted the many plans and policies that decision makers would have to weigh in making a decision about the site and the considerations that would affect their decision. Ms. Thompson asked the City Council to take the initiative in finding a solution to the future of Civic Stadium.

Pat Skipper, 921 Snell Street, a board member of SCS, encouraged the council to support the SCS proposal. She believed the City had an interest in maintaining Civic Stadium as a recreational facility. She suggested the long-term economic benefits of professional sports, tourism, entertainment events, and recreation outweighed the short-term gains of construction and retail jobs. She said the components of the two organizations' proposal could be merged to provide fitness and family recreation opportunities. Ms. Skipper reiterated NCU's interest in using the facility. She believed other sports leagues would seek to use the facility as well. She suggested the council weigh the cost of participating with the two organizations against the cost and delay associated with private development.

Joyce Berm, 2440 Charnelton Street, advocated for the SCS proposal. She recommended that the City buy or lease the Civic Stadium property for community use. The City could lead in the restoration of Civic Stadium. She believed there was room on the site for the YMCA and SCS as well as other commercial entities, but such proposals took time to realize. She feared that the YMCA proposal would not only result in the demolition of the stadium but would also eliminate desirable open space. She believed there was time for the City to act if the council had the courage to do so.

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved that the council hear the remaining public testimony and postpone the final two items to April 27. Roll call vote: the motion passed unanimously.

Dennis Casady, 1312 Lincoln Street, urged the City to work with SCS to preserve the stadium. He acknowledged the site was not in the list of projects to be funded through the Parks and Open Space Bond but he believed that was because it was not available at that time. He pointed out the Arlie property, recently purchased by the City for a park, was not listed either. Mr. Casady noted the many public historic structures lost to demolition and the fact many of the remaining historic structures were privately owned. He advocated for preservation of the stadium because Eugene lacked historic structures. He believed the SCS proposal represented an opportunity for Eugene to save a publicly owned historic structure.

Scott Landfield, 2425 Willamette Street, commended City Manager Ruiz and his ability to bring different parties together. He wanted to see the YMCA and SCS collaborate on the site. He believed

there were many residents who would like to invest in the proposal. He said the City decision would determine the fate of Civic Stadium. He did not want to give his neighborhood away to out-of-town developers.

Mike Roberts, 1919 Myers Road, discussed how the proposed “Civic Village” concept suggested for the site by Master Development fit within the framework of the Seven Pillars of Envision Eugene. The proposal provided economic opportunities through new jobs; provided affordable housing for all income levels; provided services needed for the neighborhood to become a 20-minute neighborhood; promoted compact urban development and efficient transportation options with a mix of uses in close proximity; protected and enhanced neighborhood livability through the use of transition areas between uses and the existing residential uses; protected and enhanced local resources by precluding the need for UGB expansion; and created a pilot opportunity to test the implementation of Envision Eugene.

Steve Master, 835 East Park Street, said his proposal for the redevelopment of Civic Stadium included the provision of a public space, connectivity, and jobs for the entire community. He suggested if the council wished to hear the voices of the people, it would put the issue out for a vote. He proposed to move Civic Stadium to another nearby location to preserve the structure and provide the community with an economic development opportunity.

David Zupan, 870 West 23rd Avenue, supported the preservation of Civic Stadium, which he termed an endangered legacy from the New Deal. He said the stadium was built by the Works Progress Administration and one of many projects designed to lift the country out of the Great Depression by providing work as well as by reflecting the language that Franklin Roosevelt used to keep the country united. He called on the council to support the project which provided the greatest benefit for most citizens. Mr. Zupan believed that a combined SCS and YMCA project would serve the greatest public good. He also endorsed earlier requests for more homeless camping spaces and portable toilets for the homeless.

Jon Lauch, 715 West 4th Avenue, 4J School District Facilities Director, reviewed the timeline for the school district’s decision regarding Civic Stadium.

Greg Giesy, 42 West 19th Avenue, FAN Board member, urged the City to partner with SCS to preserve Civic Stadium. He believed other proposals for the site, if built, would worsen existing traffic conditions in the neighborhood. Mr. Giesy said if the west wall of Civic Stadium was demolished it would allow noise to travel up College Hill into the neighborhood. In addition, the City would have to manage the water runoff coming off College Hill. He believed City involvement was the only way to get SCS and the YMCA to come together for a good solution.

Lonnie McCullough, 1350 Charnelton Street, #6, emphasized the importance that the City partner with SCS to preserve Civic Stadium and continue to make it available to the community. He said the proposal would result in a community recreation center in the heart of community. He suggested that the City could use the proposal as an opportunity to expand the Amazon Community Center. Mr. McCullough believed the design could be refined to meet the needs of the City’s Library, Recreation, and Cultural Services Department as well as the uses already identified. He asked that the council authorize City Manager Ruiz to move forward with the acquisition using funds from the Parks and Open Space bond.

Becki Hawk, 2030 McLean Boulevard, supported the acquisition of the Civic Stadium site using money from the Parks and Open Space bond. She believed preservation of the stadium was in the best interest of the neighborhood. She found the Fred Meyer proposal the least appropriate and believed the apartments included in the project would add to local traffic problems. The area was already well-served with

grocery stores and apartment complexes. She supported the YMCA and was disappointed it was unwilling to work with SCS because she thought there was room for both uses on the site. She thought the City's partnership with SCS could trigger other sources of financial support. The end result could be preservation of the stadium and a new home for the YMCA. She suggested Fred Meyer could consider the current YMCA location for a store and apartments.

Tom Halferty, 4510 Manzanita Street, discussed how the SCS proposal meshed with the Seven Pillars of Envision Eugene with emphasis on the pillar related to economic opportunities for all community members. He tied increased tourism opportunities to the "pod" of fields that would be created by the SCS proposal.

Tom Brandt, 37056 Boiler Creek Road, Springfield, discussed his success with past efforts that were at first opposed but later turned out to be successful, such as Saturday Market. He expressed support for the SCS proposal as a life apprenticeship learning center.

Earl Erb, 981 West 8th Avenue, spoke on behalf of the Professional Developmental Football League, which hoped to expand to Oregon and wanted to play games at a redeveloped Civic Stadium. He described the scope of the league, which planned an expansion team in Eugene next year. He said the stadium would provide affordable opportunities for families to view football games as well as job opportunities for local college football players who had not been drafted by other pro leagues.

Yodin Bocahaliv, 4989 Hunters View Drive, was present to represent the local soccer community, particularly youth. He emphasized the need for sports fields to accommodate soccer teams and spoke of the difficulty of finding fields. He believed that Civic Stadium could fill some of that demand. He said his club and Kidsports would love to rent the facility and he believed it could accommodate tournaments and high school sports events.

Kevin Matthews, PO Box 1588, Eugene, advocated for the City to partner with SCS to preserve Civic Stadium. He feared that the Fred Meyer proposal would damage the small businesses in south Eugene. He believed the site could accommodate both the stadium and the YMCA.

Carlis Nixon, 1556 Wilson Court, expressed support for the SCS proposal because it would make the facility available to all citizens for recreational activities. She opposed the Fred Meyer proposal because the area had sufficient shopping and "we don't need or want" a business indistinguishable from others. She believed whatever occurred on the site should have a "unique Eugene" flavor. Ms. Nixon found the area "charmingly authentic" and called on the council to assist in its preservation.

Sheryl Engerbert-Scott, 1065 East 22nd Avenue, did not want to lose Civic Stadium in order to get a new YMCA. Eugene needed recreational facilities. She believed the City had neglected recreational sports. Her children struggled for playing fields. Eugene had doubled in size since she was a child but had not kept up with the demand for organized sports. Ms. Engerbert-Scott said the stadium had the potential for other uses. She suggested it could be place for young people to meet safely; for example, the stadium could house an outdoor evening theater where children could go.

Beverly Smith, 2150 Onyx Street, executive director of Kidsports, said there were many local children looking for places to practice and play safely. She asked the council to help preserve open space for recreational use, particularly given the budget cuts facing the school districts and limiting their ability to provide after-school activities for youth. A centrally located indoor sports facility would do wonders to help her organization meet the needs of local youth and their families.

Brandon Spencer-Hartle, 795 Willamette Street, #203, representing the Historic Preservation League of Oregon, noted that the stadium was nominated for recognition on his organization's "Most Endangered Places List." He expected an announcement in May. He asked the council to keep in mind that "this place matters."

Phil Carroll, 1054 Van Buren Street, urged the council to work toward the preservation of Civic Stadium. He suggested that history was less about places and objects and more about the stories that were told. He suggested the process was about binding the past to the future and capitalizing on a community investment and continuing the "wonderful story." Mr. Carroll acknowledged that the future of Civic Stadium was not a council decision, but he believed that was true only in the narrowest administrative sense. He wanted the council to take on an educational role and "teach by example" and "do the right thing."

Mark Callahan, 3621 Mahlon Avenue, advocated for the SCS proposal. He spoke of his history with the stadium, where he spent many hours with his late grandfather watching the Eugene Emeralds play baseball. All he had of that time was his memories. He believed Civic Stadium was part of the local culture and suggested the intangible benefits of keeping the stadium intact outweighed other short-term financial considerations. Mr. Callahan said residents wanted to share the history and mystique of the stadium with their children in the future.

Mayor Piercy closed the public hearing.

**7. ACTION:
Adoption of an Ordinance Concerning a Four-Year Income Tax for Schools; Adding Sections 2.2000 to 2.2038 to the Eugene Code, 1971**

This item was postponed to April 27, 2011.

**8. ACTION:
Adoption of Resolution 5029 Amending Resolution No. 4281 Providing an Additional Way for Property Owners Subject to a Crest Drive Area Street Improvement Project Assessment to Qualify for the Street Subsidy Program**

This item was postponed to April 27, 2011.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting at 10:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest
City Recorder

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)

MINUTES

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

April 27, 2011
Noon

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

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the April 27, 2011, work session of the Eugene City Council to order.

A. ACTION:

Adoption of an Ordinance Concerning a Four-Year Income Tax for Schools; Adding Sections 2.2000 to 2.2038 to the Eugene Code, 1971; and Providing a Sunset Date

Ms. Taylor, seconded by Mr. Brown, moved to adopt Council Bill 5046 regarding a four-year income tax for schools, adding sections 2.2000 to 2.2038 to the Eugene Code, 1971; and providing a sunset date.

Mr. Clark, seconded by Mr. Poling, moved to amend Section 2.0026 by adding the following sentence: “However, nothing in the rules may require an employer to withhold wages for this income tax.”

Mr. Clark indicated his intent in offering the motion was to ensure that an employer could, but was not required, to withhold wages for the income tax.

Ms. Ortiz determined from Finance Director Sue Cutsogeorge that staff was in discussions with the City of Portland about the potential that agency would administer the tax.

Mr. Zelenka noted criticism that the City did not know the cost of administering the tax, which he did not think was true. He asked Ms. Cutsogeorge if she was aware of anything that made her question the City’s original cost estimates. Ms. Cutsogeorge said no.

Mayor Piercy indicated the proponents of the tax were informed by the City of Portland the cost to administer the tax could be five percent of the amount collected. Ms. Cutsogeorge said that figure was based on the experience of Multnomah County, and Eugene’s experience may be different. She added that in addition to those costs, there would be other activities Eugene staff would undertake to administer the tax.

Responding to a question from Mr. Brown about whether Multnomah County required employer withholding, Ms. Cutsogeorge said Multnomah County, the City of Portland, and the benefitting schools had to withhold, and other withholding was optional. There were few Multnomah County employers who chose to withhold the tax. Mr. Brown did not think withholding would be a burden for most employers given the function was routine and computerized.

Mr. Brown observed some of the cost of the tax was presented as avoidance and evasion, and he questioned whether those represented true costs. He believed the council, through adjustments to the rates, had eliminated most of the evasion and avoidance potential in the tax.

Mr. Farr said at level of five percent, the cost of administering the tax through Multnomah County was \$1.2 million. He determined from Ms. Cutsogeorge that those administrative costs were included in the estimate of gross revenues that would not go to the schools (\$7 million) because of tax evasion, avoidance, or exemption. The net amount that would go to schools was \$16.8 million.

Ms. Taylor asked what difference the amendment made. Mr. Klein said the amendment guaranteed that the City Manager could not authorize rules to require employers to withhold. Ms. Taylor asked who benefited from the amendment. Mr. Klein suggested that both employers and City staff benefited. He noted that the ordinance still allowed for voluntary withholding.

Mr. Clark suggested that because addresses could be located inside the Eugene city limits but the residents living at them were not subject to the tax, it would be burdensome to require employers to withhold.

Responding to a question from Mr. Zelenka, City Manager Ruiz confirmed that it was not his intent to require employer withholding.

The amendment to the motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Mr. Zelenka, seconded by Mr. Poling, moved to amend Section 3 by adding the following sentence: "It is the intent of the City Council that the sunset shall not be extended or repealed unless approved by the voters."

Mr. Zelenka believed the addition of the sentence created an additional political hurdle for a future City Council when it contemplated the extension of the tax. Mayor Piercy supported Mr. Zelenka's intent.

Mr. Farr determined from City Attorney Glenn Klein that the added sentence would not legally bind future councils.

Mr. Brown concurred with Mr. Zelenka. He said people were spreading false fears that a future council would decide to extend the tax indefinitely without referring it to the ballot. He pointed out the council could have done that already but had chosen not to do so. He had a difficult time believing that a future council would extend the tax without referring it to the voters. Mr. Brown suggested that voters could ask those campaigning for council office if they would extend the tax unilaterally or refer it to the ballot. He speculated the answer would be that they would refer it to the ballot.

Mr. Clark supported the amendment as clarifying the intent of the council. He acknowledged future councilors were not bound by the action. Speaking to Mr. Brown's remarks, Mr. Clark said he did not think it was a false fear that a future council would not allow the sunset to expire. He pointed to the example of the City's gas tax, which was intended to expire but which had been extended by a council majority.

Mr. Zelenka recalled that the council had included a sunset clause in the gas tax in the event the State fixed the transportation funding problem, and when the State did not do so the City was forced to make the tax permanent.

Mayor Piercy observed that the proposed tax was modeled on the Multnomah County tax, which had sunsetted after four years.

The amendment to the motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Mayor Piercy solicited comments on the main motion.

Mr. Clark said while the quality of schools meant a great deal to him, he opposed the motion. He recalled his preference for taking action to assist the schools in the fall following the completion of the legislative session. He did not think the measure was an effective way to help the schools and thought the tax could potentially harm the schools. He said it could harm the economy and families.

Mr. Farr emphasized the fact that despite the amendment just passed, the council could not stop a future council from extending the tax. He said residents had fears that the council would change things that past councils had done and even things that voters had voted upon. He had concerns about the lack of firm information about the costs of administration of the tax. Mr. Farr had also preferred taking action in November, which would have given staff more time to clarify the details of the tax. He questioned adding to the income tax burden of residents when they already paid some of the highest income tax rates in the country.

Mr. Poling agreed with Mr. Farr about the timing of the issue. He continued to have questions about the mechanics of the tax that staff had been too burdened with work to determine. He also continued to believe the tax was unfair because of the fact that many students lived outside the city limits and their families would not be subject to the tax. In addition, some Eugene residents were inside the Junction City School District and it made no sense to tax those residents for Eugene schools. The tax would not fix the problem, would be a temporary stop-gap, and it was possible passage of the tax would make it easier for the State to avoid addressing the problem. He also questioned the emergency nature of the problem given how long it had been in existence.

Mr. Zelenka averred Oregon had high income taxes because it lacked a sales tax. He said no tax was perfect. However, he believed the proposed tax was workable and it accomplished what the council was trying to accomplish. He concurred that education funding was a State responsibility but the State had failed to solve the problem and did not appear to have a plan to do so. Mr. Zelenka declared “enough is enough.” He did not want to see shorter school years or larger class sizes. He believed the structure of the tax was fair and equitable. It was not fair to require those below the poverty line to pay more, and the ordinance removed the burden from those residents and placed it on those who could afford it.

Speaking to the gas tax mentioned by Mr. Clark, Mr. Brown pointed out the council agreed to extend it unanimously. He believed the most unfair thing would be to not pass the ordinance because it would increase classroom sizes and shorten the school years. He believed the system was reaching a crisis point, as evidenced by the loss of 100 teachers and 10 school days and increased class sizes. Mr. Brown emphasized the difference that smaller class sizes made to education.

Mr. Clark agreed with Mr. Zelenka and Mr. Brown about the importance of quality schools and about the consequences of fewer school days and larger classes. However, the council was only considering one side of the balance sheet. He believed the solution was cost control, and that was a legislative function. He said if local school districts could do more to control their costs, such as the cost of PERS and employee compensation, he believed Eugene would have world class schools. However, that was not the case. Because of that, he did not think the council should try to solve the schools’ funding problem. It

might have good intentions, but it could do something that harmed the schools by continuing the existing governance and funding structure.

Mr. Pryor did not think anyone was comfortable with the proposed tax. He said it would be great if the school funding problem could be fixed in a different way, but that was not going to happen. The legislature had failed to act for 20 years. He did not necessarily like the proposed tax but supported it because he did not want to harm kids. He said the school districts needed to reinvent themselves in significant ways. The tax was a way to buy time for that process. He would have preferred to wait for the November ballot, but the proponents wanted the measure on the May ballot and he was willing to accommodate them. Mr. Pryor supported the motion but did not see the tax as the ultimate fix.

Ms. Taylor said the temporary tax was all the community had. She said teachers could not do their jobs in the conditions they faced. She also emphasized the importance of a healthy, well-funded education system to the economy. She believed the community was facing an emergency and while it was not ideal, the tax was a partial temporary solution.

Mayor Piercy said the tax was designed to preclude some of the damage from proposed reductions. She pointed out that there an oversight committee to ensure that the funds were spent appropriately. There was transparency and accountability built into the tax.

The motion passed, 5:3; Mr. Poling, Mr. Clark, and Mr. Farr voting no.

B. WORK SESSION:

Adoption of Resolution 5029 Amending Resolution 4281 Providing an Additional Way for Property Owners Subject to a Crest Drive Area Street Improvement Project Assessment to Qualify for the Street Subsidy Program

Ms. Taylor, seconded by Mr. Brown, moved to adopt Resolution 5029 amending Resolution 4281 providing an additional way for property owners subject to the Crest Drive Area street improvement project assessment to qualify for the Street Subsidy Program.

Responding to a question from Ms. Ortiz, Mr. Klein explained that resolution allowed those affected by the Crest Drive Area street improvement project and who had experienced a change in economic status to apply for the program. The council would be changing the rules of the program for residents subject to the Crest Drive assessment.

Ms. Ortiz indicated her opposition to the motion because it changed the program rules for a targeted group and the benefits had not been available to residents of her ward similarly impacted by road improvement projects.

Responding to a question from Mr. Poling, City Engineer Mark Schoening explained that the resolution would not change the allocation of project costs but would reduce the assessment for those who qualified, which increased the City's share. The funding to reduce the assessment came from the Low-Income Subsidy Fund. Mr. Poling asked if the money in that fund could be directed to other projects. Mr. Schoening did not know. He noted that the fund was established in 1991 for the purpose of subsidizing assessment projects and now contained about \$35,000. Responding to a follow-up question from Mr. Poling, Mr. Schoening did not recall that any money being added to the fund since its establishment. Mr. Poling asked if the amount of money in the fund would be increased after the Crest Drive project was

paid off. Mr. Schoening acknowledged that staff had not discussed that question. Mr. Poling was concerned about that as he expected other projects would require such subsidies.

Mr. Poling agreed with Ms. Ortiz about changing the program rules and indicated his opposition to the motion.

Mr. Clark shared the concerns expressed by Ms. Ortiz and Mr. Poling but he also acknowledged greater job volatility in the community. He was generally in favor of adjusting the criteria to account for a person's current economic status. However, he was challenged by the fact the resolution appeared to address one area of the community and a single project. Mr. Clark indicated he could support the motion if changed to read ". . . *for property owners subject to any future street improvement project assessment to qualify for the Street Subsidy Program.*" Mr. Klein indicated that would require another resolution because there were no other street assessment projects where income as of April 11, 2011, was an important factor. If the council chose that approach, it needed to direct staff to produce another resolution, which would result in further delay to the Crest Drive assessments. He indicated the council would act on the actual assessments once applications for the subsidy had been approved.

Mr. Clark said he was unsure about his position on the motion given his concern about changing the rules as proposed and his concern about the affected residents.

Mr. Zelenka suggested the council could adjust the dates for future street assessment projects to accomplish what Mr. Clark wanted to see happen. Mr. Schoening indicated that City policy would have to be changed to accomplish that. Mr. Zelenka recalled that the council had recently changed the code to increase the categories of those who could defer street assessments, which he suggested was also changing the rules in midstream. He did not see much difference between that action and what the council was considering now.

Mr. Zelenka thanked Ms. Taylor for bringing the issue up because it was a real issue for many residents who had lost their jobs.

Mr. Farr determined from Mr. Schoening that 24 people affected by the Crest Drive project had qualified for the subsidy for a total of \$171,000. Mr. Farr determined from Mr. Schoening that there was no difference between the project in question and the Elmira Street project in terms of the project assessment structure. Some residents on Elmira qualified for the low-income subsidy while others financed the improvement through the City. Mr. Schoening acknowledged those residents' financial situations could have changed in the meantime.

Mr. Pryor thought the City's basic policy was a good one. He agreed that it was not usually a good thing to change the rules in mid-stream because it created an appearance of inconsistency, but believed that extraordinary economic circumstances justified the resolution in this instance. He would want more discussion if additional changes were to occur.

Ms. Taylor said the proposal merely required the City to consider current, not past income. She advocated for additional discussion of the subject.

The vote on the motion was a 4:4 tie; Ms. Taylor, Mr. Zelenka, Mr. Pryor, and Mr. Brown voting yes; Ms. Ortiz, Mr. Clark, Mr. Farr, and Mr. Poling voting no. Mayor Piercy cast a vote of support and the motion passed a final vote of 5:4.

**C. WORK SESSION:
Ward Redistricting**

Mr. Clark stated his company worked closely with a company that created what he termed the “national gold standard” for redistricting software. He had not been involved in any conversations about the City’s redistricting process and would not profit if the City chose to employ that software.

City Manager’s Office Division Manager Keli Osborn joined the council for the item. She sought direction from the council regarding oversight of the ward redistricting process and feedback on the timeline, which was included in the meeting packet as Attachment D, *2011 Ward Redistricting--Timeline*. She referred the council to Attachment E, *2011 Ward Redistricting—Criteria for Drawing Eugene Ward Boundaries*. She recommended that the criteria be discussed further by the council and tested with the community in May 2011 through an interested parties list, a Web survey, and a drop-in forum. Following that, staff would return to the council in June with draft criteria to guide drawing of the boundaries.

Ms. Osborn called the council’s attention to Attachment C, *2011 Ward Redistricting—Process Alternatives*, which outlined the oversight and public process options.

Ms. Osborn noted that Jason Dedrick, Sarah Zaleski, and Laura Hammond of the Planning and Development Department would assist in the process, and the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) could serve a consultative role. She reported as part of the public outreach process, Pat Hocken of the League of Women Voters as well as a representative of the Eugene Water & Electric Board (EWEB) were present, and the City had also reached out to many other organizations.

Ms. Osborn called the council’s attention to Attachment B, a ward map showing the locations of the residences of current councilors and Eugene Water & Electric Board commissioners. She also called attention to Attachment A, which provided demographic information about each ward.

In regard to the first request for direction, the council unanimously concurred that that it would oversee the ward redistricting process rather than establish a separate committee. Councilors also concurred with the timeline, with some objection from Ms. Taylor because of her belief the process should be completed in August so potential candidates would know what ward they were in and what council seats they should run for before September 8. Mr. Poling wanted to have the process completed by the time the council went on its summer recess if that was possible.

Mr. Farr expressed interest in knowing why Portland State University’s population figures were different from the population figures provided for this work session. For example, he recalled that PSU had projected a lower population for Ward 3 while the 2010 US Census data for Eugene showed an increase compared to some wards. Ms. Osborn reminded the council that staff had cautioned in February that the PSU figures were preliminary and that Ward 3 included group housing situations that were not fully reflected in those numbers. She said for the purpose of the US Census, college students who lived in Eugene were counted as Eugene residents though they may not always be registered as Eugene voters, which might also add to the discrepancy. Mr. Farr expressed concern that Ward 3 as currently established could have a lower percentage of voters than other wards, for example Ward 6. Ms. Osborn reminded the council that redistricting also was intended to provide equal protection under the law to residents, and that included persons of all ages and non-voters.

Ms. Ortiz asked staff to assist the councilors with their outreach to the community.

Mayor Piercy recommended that groups with interest in the process contact Ms. Osborn. Ms. Osborn noted that interested residents could also consult the City's Web site, which included a link to information about the redistricting process.

Mr. Clark wanted the outcome of the council's efforts to be put out for public comment.

Speaking to Mr. Farr's remarks, Mr. Clark believed the City was legally obligated to use US Census Bureau figures. He noted that the bureau would adjust census numbers for only three reasons. Following the 2000 census, the bureau granted only 39 appeals for adjustments in the entire country.

Also speaking to Mr. Farr's remarks, Mr. Zelenka added that as many as 3,500 people in Ward 3 had perhaps not been counted in PSU figures, which added to the discrepancy between counts that Mr. Farr had mentioned.

The council briefly discussed the timeframes for the State and County processes. Ms. Osborn pledged that staff would work as quickly as possible to get as much done as possible by the August recess, but she cautioned that it can be difficult to get on the council agenda, summer could be a challenging time for public involvement, and coordination with the State and County may be desirable, so she was reluctant to offer guarantees. She would continue to seek council feedback when possible.

Ms. Taylor, seconded by Mr. Brown, moved to designate the Eugene City Council as the review and decision-making body for ward redistricting criteria, scenarios, and process. The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the work session at 1:24 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest
City Recorder

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)

MINUTES

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

May 16, 2011
7:30 p.m.

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

COUNCILORS ABSENT: Pat Farr.

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the May 16, 2011, public hearing of the Eugene City Council to order.

**1. PUBLIC HEARING:
An Ordinance Establishing the S-HBS Historic Brunner-Schmitz House Special Area Zone and Amending the Eugene Zoning Map**

City Manager Jon Ruiz introduced the topic, stating that the public hearing concerned a zone change establishing a Historic Special Area Zone for the Brunner-Schmitz House and property on a .44 acre parcel at 1410 River Road. The zone would allow limited commercial and residential uses on the property. He reported that the Eugene Planning Commission had unanimously recommended approval of the application.

Associate Planner Steven Ochs explained that the application concerned a house recently designated as a Historic Landmark. The property owner subsequently applied for a Special Area Zone, which allowed uses that contributed to the historic preservation of the property. The proposed uses for the property were limited to residential and commercial uses, including general office and restaurant uses.

Mayor Piercy called on the council for conflicts of interest or *ex parte* contacts. There were none.

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

Councilor Brown determined from Mr. Ochs that the existing zone and current historic designation limited the property to residential uses, including R-2, Medium-Density Residential. Mr. Ochs said that the development under the R-2 zoning could be in conflict with the historic designation. He further clarified that the property owner sought the zone; the City was not requiring it. Councilor Brown asked what the property owner intended to do with the property. Mr. Ochs believed an accounting office was planned in the short term but it was possible a restaurant could eventually be located on the site.

Councilor Brown asked if the property's zoning could be changed to commercial. Mr. Ochs said no, as the property was designated medium-density residential in the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan General

Area Plan (Metro Plan). It would require a Metro Plan amendment or a planned unit development application and approval to permit commercial uses similar to those the property owner was requesting.

Councilor Brown noted that the ordinance spoke to the provision of special treatment and protection for the property so that the uses permitted and the restrictions imposed would preserve the landmark's defining historic features and allow for their rehabilitation. He asked if that could occur without the ordinance. Mr. Ochs said yes. The owner could retain the current zoning but would need to retain the building in its existing state or could build a multi-family development on the site.

Councilor Brown suggested the ordinance was necessary for the property to be used commercially. Mr. Ochs indicated there were other options, but the option in question required the retention of the house's historic features.

Responding to a question from Councilor Ortiz, Mr. Ochs confirmed that the house would have to stay intact to retain its historic designation. The property owner must go through an approval process for any alterations to be made. Councilor Ortiz asked if the site could accommodate additional businesses or multi-family development. Mr. Ochs said yes, but the new zone would restrict additional new development to a duplex, which would also need to go through the alterations approval process.

Councilor Ortiz was pleased to see the owner take advantage of the zone, which she hoped would keep the historic house intact for a long time.

Mayor Piercy determined no councilor objected to closing the public record. She closed the public record for the application.

2. PUBLIC HEARING:

A Special Ordinance Granting an Exemption to the Application of Section 6.200 of the Eugene Code, 1971 (Ordinances to Renew Five-Year Exception to Application for Controlled Ecological Burning)

City Manager Ruiz introduced the item, reporting that the West Eugene Wetlands Program had a long history of using controlled burns to manage and restore wetland habitat. The City had employed controlled burns in west Eugene since 1986. The program had sought a series of five-year exemptions to the City's ban on open burning to accomplish the burns; the most recent exemption expired in December 2010 and staff was seeking another exemption through the proposed ordinance. City Manager Ruiz said such burns allowed the City and its partners in the program to control non-native plant species and protect and restore native plant habitats. In addition, it provided the Eugene Fire & EMS Department with practice in fire training.

Mayor Piercy opened the public hearing. There being no requests to speak, she closed the public hearing and called on the council for questions and comments.

Responding to a question from Councilor Zelenka, Natural Areas Restoration Supervisor Trevor Taylor described the ecological benefits of fire to the wetlands habitat that the City was trying to protect and restore. Councilor Zelenka asked how many acres were proposed to be burned. Mr. Taylor responded that the program proposed a maximum of 250 acres per year within the city limits and 75 acres outside the city limits and inside UGB; historically, however, the program had never succeeded in burning that many acres. Under the last exemption, the most acreage burned in single year was about 125 acres because of weather restrictions on burns.

Councilor Zelenka asked how the program controlled the risk of such a burn getting out of control. Mr. Taylor said all prescribed burns were done in partnership with other agencies, including all the land managers in west Eugene, including The Nature Conservancy, City of Eugene, Army Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of Land Management. They combined their resources to accomplish the burns. The Oregon Department of Forestry was also involved. There was a detailed plan for each burn identifying all resources required, including people and equipment. There were also extensive backup plans.

Councilor Zelenka asked how the acres burned by the program compared to the acres burned for grass seed production. Mr. Taylor said the program's burns were much smaller and the methods used were different to reduce the impact of the burn. He did not know how the acreage compared.

Councilor Zelenka indicated support for the ordinance.

Responding to a question from Mayor Piercy about the air monitoring that occurred during controlled burns and what citizens could do if they felt a negative effect from a controlled burn, Mr. Taylor noted that the Lane Regional Air Protection Agency (LRAPA) regulated such burns. The program worked closely with LRAPA staff on the day of the burn to ensure weather conditions were appropriate. Staff took weather readings every 15 minutes throughout the burn to monitor conditions, and tracked the direction of the smoke plume. Mr. Taylor further reported that the City provided notice to residents living within a half-mile of the burn. Citizens could contact the City for more information or to let City staff know of smoke incursions near them.

Councilor Brown determined from Mr. Taylor that the burning that occurred was staggered and did not occur all at once, and that the City attempted to burn each parcel once every five years.

Councilor Ortiz confirmed with Mr. Taylor that the City used the City Fire & EMS Department to oversee its burns. Responding to a follow-up question from Councilor Ortiz, Mr. Taylor also confirmed that controlled burns were a multi-jurisdictional effort. The Nature Conservancy contracted with private fire suppression entities while the public agencies in the partnership had their own fire fighting resources and backup.

There being no further questions, Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting at 7:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest
City Recorder

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)