

EUGENE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY



Approval of Council Minutes

Meeting Date: July 11, 2011
Department: City Manager's Office
www.eugene-or.gov

Agenda Item Number: 3A
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 May 25, 2011, Work Session and May 26, 2011, Joint Elected Officials Meeting.

ATTACHMENTS

- A. May 25, 2011, Work Session
- B. May 26, 2011, Joint Elected Officials

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

May 25, 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 May 25, 2011, work session of the Eugene City Council to order. She recognized Mr. Zelenka.

Mr. Zelenka, seconded by Ms. Taylor, moved to reconsider the council’s Monday night [May 23, 2011] vote on the ordinance for the Crest Drive assessments.

Mr. Zelenka explained that without six affirmative votes in support of the ordinance, the City would accrue an additional 30 days of interest expense.

The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

The following motion from May 23 was placed back on the table:

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to adopt Council Bill 5045, an ordinance levying assessments for paving and constructing curbs, sidewalks, medians, street lights, stormwater drainage, and water quality facilities on Crest Drive from Blanton Road to Lincoln Street, Storey Boulevard from Crest Drive to Lorane Highway, and Friendly Street from Lorane Highway to 28th Avenue; and providing an immediate effective date.

Mr. Farr continued to object to the ordinance because of concerns about equitability.

Mr. Zelenka confirmed with City Engineer Mark Schoening that those who qualified for the subsidy met the City’s income test.

The motion passed, 6:2; Mr. Clark and Mr. Farr voting no.

**A. WORK SESSION:
Envision Eugene**

City Manager Jon Ruiz introduced Shawn Boles and Richard Duncan of the Community Resource Group (CRG). Planning Director Lisa Gardner and Metropolitan Community Planning Manager Carolyn Weiss were also present for the item.

Ms. Gardner reviewed revisions recommended to the Seven Pillars of Envision Eugene as a result of input received from the council and public. She asked the council to take action to adopt the revisions. Ms. Gardner solicited questions.

Mr. Clark recalled the Eugene Comprehensive Lands Assessment (ECLA) indicated that 1,800 acres of residential land were needed to ensure a 20-year supply. That meant the City had to expand the UGB, change the Land Use Code so growth could be accommodated within the UGB, or a combination of the two approaches. Ms. Gardner concurred. Ms. Weiss pointed out the number mentioned by Mr. Clark was based on past development patterns. The CRG's Technical Resource Group (TRG) was examining the capacity that existed on partially vacant land existing inside the city as well as some of the assumptions underlying the number, which she believed would reduce the needed acreage.

Mr. Clark said Strategy 1 of the Climate & Energy pillar called for an increasing proportion of residents to live in 20-minute neighborhoods. He recalled discussing with the Sustainability Commission the possibility that development outside the UGB would largely be mixed use, which implied that land for supporting commercial uses would be needed. Strategy 1 of the Economic Opportunities pillar called for meeting all the community's commercial acreage needs inside the UGB. Mr. Clark asked how those strategies could be reconciled. Ms. Weiss said Strategy 1 of the Economic Opportunities pillar included a note stating the strategy did not preclude the designation of small amounts of commercial land within areas that expand to accommodate other uses. "Small" had not yet been defined. Ms. Weiss said the strategy was intended to convey that commercial land would not be the impetus for a UGB expansion; however, if the UGB was expanded for other uses, it made sense to include commercial acreage to serve those uses.

Mr. Clark endorsed the revision to modify the "Protect, repair, and enhance neighborhood livability" pillar to include mention of the River Road-Santa Clara Transition Plan. He recalled that the council accepted, rather than adopted, the plan, and asked how staff interpreted that action. He pointed out that if the council were to accept all the recommendations in the transition plan, an action which he supported, it could potentially increase the amount of land needed outside the UGB. Mr. Clark was unclear about what the word "mention" meant, and pointed out the River Road/Santa Clara residents had expressed their desire for the plan goals to be codified. Ms. Weiss said the neighborhood associations had indicated interest in having two specific goals in the transition plan referenced in the pillars so they could be recognized as a starting point for the area refinement planning effort.

Mr. Brown questioned whether the City had sufficient evidence to warrant expansion of the UGB for industrial use. He suggested there was a natural limitation on industrial growth in Eugene created by a community desire to preserve wetlands and farmlands. He did not think the proposed number of acres to be added was fully vetted. Ms. Gardner indicated the number was recommended by a subgroup of the CRG tasked to work on economic development and was based on the size and diversity of the businesses that the community wished to attract. She also recalled the public testimony in support of the number. Ms. Gardner emphasized that any expansion would occur within the framework of State and local policies.

Mr. Brown was not comfortable including the number in the document because the council had not discussed the issue sufficiently. He also expressed concern about expanding the UGB for housing development because it was his understanding there was sufficient residential land inside the UGB to address future demand. Ms. Gardner said staff was not asking the council to make a decision about any of the recommendations now, but was sharing a vision prepared with broad community outreach that appeared to represent a majority position on the CRG. Ms. Weiss said staff would return in July with information about potential expansion areas, which could help inform the council's discussion about the needed amount.

Mayor Piercy pointed out to Mr. Brown that staff was presenting the work of the CRG and the results of community input to the council. The council would make the final decisions about the plan.

Mr. Zelenka shared Mr. Brown's concerns and suggested that the document be revised to reflect that "up to" 400-500 acres would be needed. He agreed that more council discussion was needed before it made such a bold policy statement. Mr. Zelenka also wanted to hear more about the proposed revision related to UGB expansion for housing development. He thought Mr. Clark made a good point about the need for supporting commercial development but questioned the relationship of that expansion to the commercial lands inventory, as he interpreted such an action as creating an immediate surplus of commercial land.

Mr. Zelenka said the reference to "energy price uncertainty" in Strategy 3 of the Climate & Energy pillar was more appropriately phrased as "energy price volatility and variability." In addition, the phrasing of the strategy made it appear that it referred to climate change uncertainty. Mr. Zelenka said climate change was certain and the City had done considerable work on the topic. He asked for the text to be revised and indicated that otherwise he would have a difficult time supporting the other revisions.

Mayor Piercy reiterated her previous point about the fact the council was reviewing the work of the CRG and the public, and until the council reached a decision point she believed the text needed to be sufficiently inclusive to accommodate those points of view. However, she believed that it would be appropriate to use the phrase "up to" as suggested by Mr. Zelenka. Mr. Clark pointed out that the CRG had also discussed a larger number. Mayor Piercy indicated she was attempting to reach a compromise position.

Mr. Farr advocated against revising the document at this point.

Responding to a question from Mr. Farr, Mr. Duncan described the methodology being used by the TRG to determine the capacity that existed in the form of large lots currently developed with a single-family house. That included an examination of all lots over three acres in size using aerial maps. It was possible the TRG would recommend that the City include some of that acreage in the inventory of residential land. Mr. Farr pointed out that many property owners would not develop their land beyond its current status. He wanted assurance that what was identified as available land inside the UGB was really available, and did not just look available. Mr. Duncan indicated that the TRG was also working to determine why lots were partially developed. Mr. Farr pointed out that some people owned large lots because they did not want a close-by neighbor.

Speaking to the concerns voiced by Mr. Brown and Mr. Zelenka, Ms. Gardner recommended that the council postpone action at this time. The staff would continue to dialogue with the community and would return to the council periodically to share that input. She reiterated the mayor's point that the final framework would be established by the council.

Mr. Pryor suggested the discomfort felt by councilors was based on the fact people were trying to gauge their intentions. He agreed that the council did not need to act at this time.

Mr. Clark advised Planning Division staff to ensure that it realistically managed the expectations of River Road/Santa Clara residents. He believed those residents wanted the transition plan to be codified so it had "teeth" to protect neighborhood livability. That was different from including the goals in the plan and hoping they were achieved.

Mr. Clark expressed concern that the percentage shift in the mix of single-family and multi-family would result in leapfrog sprawl. He called for more conversation about that topic.

Mr. Zelenka wanted staff to clarify the text related to industrial lands to highlight that no decision had been made about the needed acreage. He did not think people understood the draft nature of the document and feared that such “bold statements” would take on a life of their own.

Ms. Gardner requested that the council initiate a code amendment process to address infill compatibility standards with an initial focus on multi-family development standards, to establish a flexible review process to facilitate opportunity siting, and to remove barriers to mixed-use development that exist in the current code. She reminded the council that the code amendments represented a long-standing list of proposals supported by the Infill Compatibility Standards and Opportunity Siting task teams and the neighborhood associations.

Mr. Brown wanted to see a more specific list of proposed code changes. He supported moving forward with the code amendments related to opportunity siting and the infill compatibility standards but requested more information about the barriers to mixed-use development and flexible review process mentioned by Ms. Gardner. Ms. Gardner envisioned a flexible adjustment process that included neighborhood input and provided for a way to allow good, sustainable projects that might not precisely fit the parameters of the code.

Speaking to Mr. Brown’s question regarding barriers to mixed use, Ms. Gardner acknowledged the City’s past work in removing barriers to mixed use in downtown and said there were other areas of the code where such barriers continued to exist. Ms. Harding cited removal of the requirement for ground floor commercial development in C-2 zones as an example.

Mr. Pryor indicated support for the staff request as a way to “get the ball rolling.”

Ms. Taylor agreed that the requirement for commercial development on ground floors in the C-2 zone was problematic. She agreed with Mr. Zelenka’s remarks about people’s understanding of the nature of the document and emphasized she was not prepared to vote on its contents at this time. She supported moving forward immediately with the code amendments related to infill compatibility.

Ms. Ortiz indicated support for the proposed revisions to the Seven Pillars of Envision Eugene. Speaking to the projected need for industrial land, Ms. Ortiz said her ward needed jobs and it would require a large industrial employer to provide them. The industry did not need to be heavy industrial and she suggested it could be green industry. She also supported the initiation of the code amendments, saying they were a long time coming.

Mr. Poling also supported the revisions to the Seven Pillars. He suggested the last bullet under the pillar “Provide for adaptable, flexible, and collaborative implementation” could be revised to read “Revise language to include phased development approach to making urban growth boundary expansions areas available for housing development, *if needed.*”

Speaking in regard to the proposed recommendation to add industrial acreage, Mr. Poling recalled testimony suggesting that more than 400 acres were needed and recommended that the number be left out entirely to avoid being too limiting or over-reaching.

Ms. Weiss moved on to the subject of the housing mix. She reported that the City anticipated a demand for 15,000 homes in Eugene over the next 20 years, and the question facing the community was how many would be provided in the form of single-family homes and how many would be provided through multi-family development. The TRG had examined the housing need and mix. The TRG did not plan to forward a recommendation on the needed acreage because it believed the decision was ultimately a policy

decision, not a technical decision, but was committed to providing the council with data to inform its decision.

TRG members Mr. Boles and Mr. Duncan then presented a housing mix comparison focused on what the TRG considered the extremes of the range: 60:40 single-family/multi-family and 40:60 single-family/multi-family. Mr. Boles asked the council to consider which end of the range was more compatible with the Seven Pillars and reminded the council that because of the phased implementation approach, it would have an opportunity to revisit its decision.

Ms. Gardner then briefly discussed the proposed phased implementation approach, saying it was meant to address the uncertainty of the future and provide the City with flexibility and adaptability. She anticipated staff would share more information about the proposed approach at a future meeting.

Mr. Clark endorsed the phased implementation approach, saying it allowed the City to see how the plan worked in “real time.” Speaking to housing mix, Mr. Clark recalled that the council received testimony suggesting that the information provided by the consultant EcoNorthwest did not represent the range well. He did not find that the underlying data provided much clarity on the range, and he requested more information about the data and methodology used by EcoNorthwest.

Ms. Taylor, seconded by Mr. Brown, moved to direct the City Manager to initiate code amendments related to infill compatibility standards, opportunity siting, and mixed use development.

Mr. Poling, seconded by Mr. Clark, moved to amend the motion to add the phrase “as recommended by staff.”

Mr. Poling suggested that at this time, staff knew more about the process and what the council needed to see next. He was more comfortable initiating the process using staff’s recommendations, pointing out they could be changed by the council at a later time.

The amendment passed, 7:1; Ms. Taylor voting no.

The amended motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the work session at 1:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest
City Recorder

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)

MINUTES

Joint Elected Officials
Eugene, Springfield, Lane County
Bascom-Tykeson Room—Eugene Public Library
777 Pearl Street—Eugene, Oregon

May 26, 2011
Noon

EUGENE

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

SPRINGFIELD

COUNCILORS PRESENT: Hillary Wylie, Joe Pishioneri, Sheri Moore.

LANE COUNTY

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Faye Stewart, Peter Sorenson, Rob Handy, Jay Bozievich, Sid Leiken.

SPRINGFIELD

COUNCILORS ABSENT: Dave Ralston, Sean Van Gordon, Marilee Woodrow.

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

Her Honor Christine Lundberg called the Springfield City Council to order.

Board Chair Faye Stewart called the Lane Board of County Commissioners to order.

I. Adjustments to the Agenda

There were none.

II. Census/Population Estimates

Risa Proehl of the Population Research Center (PRC) at Portland State University distributed and reviewed a presentation entitled *Oregon's Population Estimates as Developed by the Population Research Center*. Those present were also provided with a document entitled *Population Estimates*, which provided answers to common questions about population numbers, a report entitled *2010 Census Profiles, Oregon and its Counties and Metropolitan Areas*, and a document entitled *The 2010 Census Count Question Resolution (CQR) Program Frequently Asked Questions*.

Ms. Proehl briefly described the work of the PRC, how population estimates were used in Oregon, and the differences between the data sets used by the PRC and the United States Census Bureau. She then provided an overview of the PRC's estimate methods and how its estimates compared to the 2010 census counts. She reported that the Census Bureau used PRC estimates to adjust its population estimates.

Ms. Proehl reviewed the PRC's estimate methods for post-censal estimates. She discussed the differences between PRC's original 2010 estimates and the census counts and the reasons underlying those differences. She reported that the PRC's performance was very good overall, and the center continued to work to improve its methods.

Ms. Proehl reviewed the PRC's methods for the Revised Certified 2010 Population Estimates. She shared findings specific to Lane County about the reasons for the differences between the PRC's estimates and the 2010 Census. Ms. Proehl highlighted steps Lane County and its cities could take if they believed the census counts were wrong.

Ms. Proehl noted inconsistencies between the Census 2010 city boundaries and 2009 boundaries produced by Oregon's GEO in Cottage Grove, Dunes City, Eugene, and Springfield and indicated PRC would do follow-up research with the cities as to reasons for the inconsistencies.

Ms. Proehl encouraged jurisdictions with questions to call the PRC and invited their assistance in making the population estimates more accurate.

Ms. Proehl concluded her presentation by sharing some general Oregon trends, indicating that people were still moving to Oregon despite the current economic climate; smaller rural communities continued to lose population to larger metropolitan areas, although some rural areas with amenities were attracting retirees; senior citizens were increasing in number; the percentage of children in the population was declining in many counties; and the Hispanic population was increasing while the non-Hispanic population was decreasing.

Ms. Proehl invited questions.

Mr. Clark asked if the PRC's participation in the American Community Survey process allowed it to correct errors made by the census. Ms. Proehl said she could try to make such corrections, but it was likely the US Census Bureau would require detailed evidence, such as a sample of housing units and the population.

Responding to a question from Mr. Sorenson, Ms. Proehl indicated the Oregon Legislature employed the enumeration conducted by the US Census Bureau as of April 1, 2010, for redistricting. Those numbers were also used to determine the five Oregon Congressional districts and by other Oregon jurisdictions and special districts. Mr. Sorenson further determined from Ms. Proehl that the US Census Bureau numbers could not be changed and were fixed at a point in time.

Responding to a question from Mr. Leiken, Ms. Proehl said that declines in the numbers of people under age 18 were a national trend and she linked that fact to declining fertility rates.

Mr. Farr noted differences between the PRC and US Census Bureau population data for Eugene's Ward 3 and asked Ms. Proehl to explain the difference. Ms. Proehl suggested that PRC's group quarters population numbers were incomplete. It was also her observation that the number of registered voters in such populations was not as high as in older populations.

Mayor Piercy thanked Ms. Proehl for the presentation.

III. Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Sustainable Communities Grant

Mr. Stewart explained that the Board of County Commissioners had recently heard a presentation about the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Partnership for Sustainable Communities grant. The presentation had raised questions for some commissioners. The meeting was an opportunity for the joint elected officials to discuss the value of the grant and the commitment it represented to Lane County, Springfield, and Eugene as participating agencies.

Andrea Riner of the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) introduced Chris Jones of the University of Oregon (UO) Sustainable Cities Initiative, Greg Mott of the City of Springfield, Stephanie Jennings of the City of Eugene, Tom Schwetz of the Lane Transit District, Bob Parker of the UO Community Planning Workshop, Larry Abel of HACSA, Sarah Majesky from Lane County, and Megan Banks from LCOG. They represented some of the agencies participating in the Lane Livability Consortium.

Ms. Riner provided a PowerPoint presentation entitled *Lane Livability Consortium*. Copies of the presentation as well as a document entitled *Recommended Changes Lane Livability Consortium Memorandum of Understanding* and a brochure entitled *Partnership for Sustainable Communities—A Year of Progress for American Communities* were provided to those present.

Ms. Riner's presentation included information about the HUD Partnership for Sustainable Communities Program and its goals. The program targeted resources through grants and other programs to help states and communities create jobs and strong economies by developing more sustainably; removed regulatory and policy barriers at the federal level to make it easier for states and local governments to access federal services and resources; and aligned agencies priorities and embedded Livability Principles in each agency's actions so that transportation, housing, and environmental protection efforts were coordinated. The program included several new grant opportunities, including the HUD Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grants.

Ms. Riner reported that the region applied for and received a Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant in the amount of \$1,450,000 to better integrate regional transportation, economic development, and affordable housing, to prepare the region to compete strongly within a new federal funding network, and to fund regional projects that provided jobs, transportation choices, and affordable housing.

Ms. Riner noted the consortium of agencies and organizations formed in Lane County to participate in the grant, which included the City of Eugene, City of Springfield, Lane County, University of Oregon Sustainable Cities Initiative, University of Oregon Community Planning Workshop, Lane Transit District, St. Vincent DePaul Society of Lane County, Eugene Water & Electric Board, Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization, Oregon Department of Transportation, and LCOG.

Ms. Riner identified core objectives of the grant, which were to advance interagency collaboration to successfully address complex regional issues; to build capacity for efficient and effective collaboration; to develop more effective strategies for affordable housing, economic development, and transportation; and to help the region identify, promote, and fund priority infrastructure investment strategies. She anticipated that three regional plans would be impacted by the process: 1) Regional Transportation Plan, 2) Eugene-Springfield Consolidated Plan 2010, and 3) Regional Prosperity Economic Development Plan.

Ms. Riner noted some of the concerns that had been raised about the grant. Those included concerns about responsibility for decision-making and regional policy setting; concerns about accountability to elected bodies; concerns about added bureaucracy, slowed processes, reduced efficiencies, restrictions, and constraints; concerns about the addition of future new parties; and concerns about the impact on staffing.

In regard to the first concern, Ms. Riner pointed out decision-making remained with each jurisdiction and recommendations would reflect existing policy direction and local values. She described how the consortium would work and anticipated that each jurisdiction's staff would pursue implementation at their respective agencies.

In regard to the second concern, Ms. Riner outlined steps to help ensure accountability to elected bodies, which included development of a communication plan that would ensure monthly updates.

In regard to the third concern, Ms. Riner emphasized that the process was intended to fill in the gaps between some of the existing plans with technical assistance. All the work contemplated was focused on increasing efficiencies.

In regard to the fourth concern, Ms. Riner said new members would only be added if all consortium members agreed.

In regard to the final concern, Ms. Riner emphasized that staff work outside of currently programmed activities would be funded with grant funds, and the funding would allow staff to better leverage the work they were already funded and required to do.

Ms. Riner acknowledged that some questioned the need for additional planning. In addition, there had been questions about how the process in question differed from the Region 2050 process. She pointed out the different funding source and group of participants involved in that effort, and suggested that lessons had been learned from the Region 2050 process that could be applied to the consortium.

Ms. Riner reviewed next steps in the process, which included revisions to the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between participating agencies.

Mr. Clark asked about the scope of Eugene's three-year commitment. Eugene City Manager Jon Ruiz anticipated it would largely be an in-kind match. Mr. Clark suggested the potential the federal funding approach changed again; what was the value of the work? Ms. Riner pointed to the reauthorization of federal transportation funding as one example of an area where the results of the consortium could be employed.

Mr. Poling did not believe the Eugene council had received sufficient information about the consortium and suggested the council schedule a work session on the topic. He had received the meeting materials too late for adequate review and did not feel able to discuss them. He questioned if Eugene would be looked to disproportionately as a source of funding.

Ms. Wylie supported the proposal. She spoke of Springfield's TEAM Springfield effort, a consortium of all Springfield public agencies, and said that effort had accomplished a great deal. She emphasized the important role that consortiums played in forming the relationships that were necessary to local problem solving.

Ms. Ortiz pointed out to Mr. Poling that there were many grant opportunities the council did not hear about. She supported the consortium and said it sounded exciting. She suggested the elected officials needed to have faith in the judgment of staff.

Mayor Piercy recalled that the council had been invited to an event celebrating the kick-off of the consortium. She suggested that much of what was contemplated through the consortium was embedded in the City's Envision Eugene planning effort and fit into the work the City was already doing.

Mayor Lundberg said the hope was that the proposed MOU took advantage of the efforts now in place. While she acknowledged concerns about additional bureaucracy, she echoed Mayor Piercy's remarks about the intent of the consortium. She wanted the consortium to put the region in a better position to compete for project dollars. Mayor Lundberg envisioned those projects would include projects already in existing planning documents as well as new projects with a regional benefit. She recalled the Region 2050 process, which had "taken on a life of its own" and had been halted because of concerns the decision making process was working against community autonomy. She wanted the MOU to recognize community autonomy while helping the region move forward with projects of regional interest. She was also concerned about how the new dollars were shared.

Mr. Zelenka felt that \$1.4 million over three years was modest, which caused him to puzzle over the discussion. He asked if Mr. Poling wanted to see every grant the City applied for or if he was concerned about this particular grant. Mr. Zelenka also recalled that the council was notified when the community received the award and he had attended the kick-off at which HUD Assistant Secretary Shelley Poticha had announced the grant. He suggested the grant was about doing things "smarter, better, and cheaper." The grant spoke to many subjects and attempted to integrate them to a greater degree. He agreed with Mayor Lundberg's remarks about the importance of recognizing community autonomy.

Mr. Bozievich found it ironic that the grant arose from a program focused on the removal of regulatory policy barriers, but the participating jurisdictions were being asked to sign a 23-page MOU that referenced an 18-page contract with HUD, and buried inside that contract were references to 600 pages of federal regulations. He questioned how that reduced barriers. He noted the HUD contract prohibited the use of planning efforts to recruit businesses to the community if that might be to the detriment of another community. He asked what other policy decisions were included in those 600 pages of regulations. Mr. Bozievich believed that the elected officials should understand any contract they signed, and he had yet to receive a clear explanation of the policy decisions he was making by signing the contract. He called for clarity about what the community was agreeing to.

Speaking to Mr. Zelenka's assertion that \$1.4 million was a "modest" amount of money, Mr. Bozievich pointed out that amount would fund the four FTE Lane County was cutting from the District Attorney's Office budget over the next three years. He felt \$1.4 million was a lot of money.

Mr. Bozievich said he was more concerned about the reauthorization of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act than he was about the grant. He pointed out the County was being asked for offsets to the Secure Rural Schools money, and said he would gladly give up the grant to secure those unrestricted funds. He challenged the other elected officials to say the intended use was how they would spend the money if it was not restricted. It was not how he would spend the money.

Mr. Pryor suggested there were two issues, the grant itself and the consistency of the information being provided to members of the partnership. He said such significant grants required more consistent information sharing. He interpreted Mr. Poling's remarks not as opposition to the grant but as discomfort that he lacked information. He appreciated Ms. Wylie's remarks about TEAM Springfield, saying that approach was built on the notion of equal information for equal partners at all times. He believed the partnership in question would work if based on that model.

Mr. Farr also shared Mr. Poling's concern that Eugene might be viewed as a source of funding for other jurisdictions. He did not think that was the case, however, and was excited about the possibilities the grant funding presented.

Mr. Poling clarified he was not saying the grant was a bad idea; he did not know. He agreed with Ms. Ortiz there were many grants the council was probably unaware of, but pointed out the majority were reviewed by the Council Committee on Intergovernmental Relations. He said that not all councilors were able to attend all events, and the information shared at the kick-off was not shared with those unable to attend.

Like Mr. Bozievich, Mr. Poling found the money involved to be significant, particularly in the current economy. He did not know how much the City of Eugene would be asked to contribute to the partnership, and wanted a clearer picture of what was expected of Eugene. Mr. Poling objected to the fact that he had to obtain the meeting materials on his own. He reiterated he did not know his position on the grant. He waited until he secured all possible information before making a decision.

Mr. Leiken hoped the three chief executive officers of the three jurisdictions would meet to discuss the parameters of the MOU with the concerns they had heard today in mind. He had also been at the kick-off, but found the information shared at that time to be more conceptual than detailed in nature.

IV. Fire Department Merger Update

Due to a lack of time, this item was deferred.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting of the Eugene City Council at 1:35 p.m.

Mayor Lundberg adjourned the meeting of the Springfield City Council at 1:35 p.m.

Chair Stewart adjourned the meeting of the Lane Board of County Commissioners at 1:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest
City Recorder

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)