

EUGENE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY



Approval of Council Minutes

Meeting Date: July 25, 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 the City Council minutes.

SUGGESTED MOTION

Move to approve the minutes of the June 8, 2011, Work Session, June 13, 2011, Work Session, June 15, 2011, Work Session, June 20, 2011, Public Hearing, and June 27, 2011, Regular Meeting.

ATTACHMENTS

- A. June 8, 2011, Work Session
- B. June 13, 2011, Work Session
- C. June 15, 2011, Work Session
- D. June 20, 2011, Public Hearing
- E. June 27, 2011, Regular Meeting

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

June 8, 2011
Noon

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

COUNCILORS ABSENT: Andrea Ortiz.

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the June 8, 2011, work session of the Eugene City Council to order.

A. ITEMS OF INTEREST AND COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. Brown reported on a presentation made by Stuart Parmenter of the Springfield School District at the May McKenzie Watershed Council meeting. Mr. Parmenter led the Springfield middle school and high school student teams who monitored the water quality of Camp Creek, a tributary of the McKenzie River. The students sampled water chemistry and checked for dissolved oxygen, nitrate, and phosphate levels. In addition, they surveyed macro invertebrates, did habitat assessments for homeowners, and worked with homeowners to monitor well water quality. Mr. Brown said by the time the students graduated they had learned some very technical skills. The program was extremely popular at Thurston High School and attracted more students than the school's sports programs.

Mr. Brown noted that the newly remodeled McKenzie Ranger Station would be dedicated on June 9.

Mr. Pryor said several councilors had attended the recent Arts and Business Alliance BRAVA breakfast. He commended the alignment between the business and arts communities, and believed much could be accomplished through the synergy that alignment created.

Mr. Pryor distributed copies of his committee report on the Housing Policy Board and highlighted the fact the board received three affordable housing proposals for a City-owned land bank site. He also highlighted the board's interest in the results of Envision Eugene as they related to housing.

Mr. Clark reported that he spoke on behalf of Mayor Piercy at the Memorial Day tribute to Veterans and First Responders held at Lane Memorial Gardens. He had also toured the Eugene Water & Electric Board's Carmen Smith power generating facility and viewed amenities designed to facilitate fish passage.

Mr. Clark noted that the Santa Clara Community Organization was meeting on June 9.

Mr. Poling said Lane Transit District (LTD) was still working on the construction of the EmX route near Gateway.

Mr. Poling reported that he and Mr. Clark attended the May 26 meeting of the Harlow Neighbors. He had also attended the May 31 Eugene Police Department awards ceremony along with Mayor Piercy and Mr.

Clark. He congratulated those who received awards and noted the posthumous awards presented to the families of Sergeant Jerry Webber and Officer Chris Kilcullen. He reminded the council of the June 10 EMT graduation ceremony scheduled for 1 p.m. at 2nd Avenue and Chambers Street.

Mr. Poling reminded those watching that Coburg Road was undergoing major repairs. He asked residents to slow down, watch out for the workers, and seek out alternative routes. He was glad to see the safety cross walks installed on the road. Mr. Poling thanked City Engineer Mark Schoening and his staff for working with a citizen who had concerns about the placement of a safety cross walk.

Mr. Farr reported that the “We are Bethel” celebration occurred the past weekend at Petersen Barn and the event was well-attended. He had split his time at the event between the City Council booth and Human Rights Commission booth. Mr. Farr recognized the retirement of Joe Ingram, the long-time Shasta Middle School Jazz Band instructor, and the retirement of long-time member Wayne Markham from the Bethel School Board. He thanked them for their service, saying both would be missed.

Ms. Taylor reported that she recently attended a meeting of the National League of Cities’ Human Development Committee, which she chaired, in Dodge City. The committee discussed the future of Social Security and ways to keep it healthy. Many good ideas were raised. She anticipated that the committee’s recommendations on the topic would be finalized at its fall meeting and forwarded to the full league.

Ms. Taylor said the Lane Workforce Partnership was in danger of losing its federal funding. She reminded the council of the agencies involved in the partnership and the work of the partnership, which included vocational rehabilitation. She commended the work of the partnership, noting it operated a one-stop center where all Lane County residents could receive assistance in looking for work. The partnership also helped businesses find workers and provided job training assistance. Ms. Taylor thought it would be a loss to the community if the partnership lost funding.

Mayor Piercy reported that Human Rights Commissioner Ken Neubeck had represented the City of Eugene at the recent International Human Rights Conference and promised to share his report from the conference with the council.

Mayor Piercy said she addressed the most recent Climate Masters Graduate Class and attended the Pedestrian Safety Summit. She had also attended the University of Oregon’s Research Innovation Awards and heard more about the great work going on at the University and its contributions to the local economy. Mayor Piercy had attended the Business Commute Challenge and noted that the City of Eugene’s Public Works Engineering Division won third place in its category. She also attended the Hope in Action Conference at Alton Baker Park, where students from around the community learned sustainable practices to use in their schools and homes, as well as the First Friday Art Walk on June 3.

Mayor Piercy reported that the University of Oregon had partnered with the Northwest Treeplanters and Farmworkers Union, PCUN, to preserve the union’s historic documents.

Mayor Piercy noted her attendance at that morning’s kick-off for the “Summer in the City” series.

Mayor Piercy concluded by reporting that the City of Eugene had received the Department of Land Conservation and Development Star Award for citizen involvement for the Envision Eugene planning process. The City would receive the award at the next Land Conservation and Development Commission meeting in June.

**B. WORK SESSION:
Envision Eugene**

City Manager Jon Ruiz introduced Sue Prichard and Richard Duncan of the Community Resource Group (CRG).

Ms. Weiss and Ms. O'Donnell provided a PowerPoint presentation entitled *Envision Eugene, City Council Update—June 8, 2011*. The presentation included information on the status of the Envision Eugene planning process, a brief review of the process being used to determine the housing land need, and introduction to a phased implementation concept. The presentation also included an overview of the work being done in regard to the housing mix recommendation that touched on the implications of the mix as well as the demographic factors and trends that affected the mix. The presentation concluded with a summary of the next steps in the process.

Ms. O'Donnell emphasized that staff was not seeking council direction at this time, but wished to provide more context for the housing mix recommendation the council would see soon.

Ms. Prichard reported the CRG formed a Technical Resource Group (TRG) to verify the assumptions in the Eugene Comprehensive Lands Assessment (ECLA). That review was going well. She said the range of opinions among TRG members was broad and meeting attendance had been good. She believed the council could be confident that whatever recommendation came from the TRG would have been thoroughly vetted.

Mr. Duncan concurred with Ms. Prichard. He said that subcommittees had been formed to examine the capacity in partially vacant lands as well as opportunities for residential development inside commercial zones. Another subcommittee was creating a spreadsheet analysis of the ECLA conclusions to share with the community. Those subcommittees would complete their work soon.

Mr. Zelenka joined the meeting via speakerphone.

Mayor Piercy said the planning process was an iterative one that involved a large group of community volunteers who were working to give the council the best advice possible based on their study and expertise. She asked how the City could engage the larger public in the process. Ms. Weiss acknowledged that public involvement in the summer was a challenging thing to accomplish. The City had no major process deadlines scheduled for the summer and had time to hold some community information and input sessions focused on the housing mix in July. There would also be additional opportunities for workshops and open houses in August and September. Those unable to attend a workshop or open house could access a video on the web site (www.envisioneugene.org) to inform them of what they missed. In addition, the Planning Division produced a newsletter to keep people up to date. All major council decisions would be preceded by public hearings that would likely be scheduled in the fall.

Ms. Taylor asked Ms. Weiss about the consulting stakeholders for the phased implementation. Ms. Weiss said they included Mia Nelson, Randy Hledik, Ed McMahon, and Kevin Matthews. They were helping staff to brainstorm concepts.

Ms. Taylor asked if the conclusions of Envision Eugene would be subject to change depending on public input. Ms. Weiss said yes. Ms. Taylor asked how the City would implement any housing mix ratio. Ms. Weiss acknowledged that the City did not control all the factors that led to the mix. The City could only

plan to accommodate the housing mix it wished to see through zoning and land use designations. She anticipated that the City would monitor the mix over time.

Ms. Taylor posited that the City could identify a certain amount of acreage for single-family development and “when it’s gone, it’s gone.” Ms. Weiss agreed.

Responding to a request from Ms. Taylor, Ms. Weiss provided an update on planning efforts for the south Willamette area, reporting that the City was in the process of developing a vision for the area. The City applied for State funding to support study and design work along Willamette Street. She noted that a University architecture studio had spent the last term working on planning concepts for the area and studio members had recently presented their ideas to the community.

Ms. Taylor restated her long-standing request for the names of the people involved in developing the reports that came to the council, as well as for minority reports.

Responding to a question from Mr. Farr, Ms. Weiss reviewed the State requirement that the City maintain a 20-year supply of residential land. She emphasized that the City needed to plan for the full 20 years. Staff was trying to determine what the community could do to maintain control over that expansion area so it could be phased in over time if the analysis indicated that the City needed to expand the UGB to accommodate that demand. The City did not know exactly what the market would do in the future, so continued monitoring could allow it to keep pace with the land demand.

Mr. Farr suggested the City was making its “best guess” about the housing land need. Ms. Weiss concurred. Mr. Farr asked about the City’s ability to correct any errors in its estimates. Ms. Weiss referred him to pillar of Envision Eugene that spoke to flexible implementation and suggested continued monitoring for factors such as demand for multi- and single-family homes would allow the City to correct such errors.

Mr. Farr asked for more information about the work of the subcommittee reviewing partially vacant lands. Mr. Duncan reminded the council that ECLA had categorized parcels with improvements costing less than \$1,000 as vacant lands. The subcommittee was looking at parcels with improvements valued above \$1,000. The subcommittee had used aerial photographs to examine the largest parcels and had categorized all parcels of three acres or more in size; below that, the subcommittee had sampled different properties to determine their development potential. The subcommittee had recently completed a review of parcels below one-quarter acre in size to determine if they could be panhandled or further divided with the goal of determining a capacity percentage that could be used to satisfy some of the housing land demand inside the UGB.

Mr. Farr was pleased to hear of the analysis and acknowledged the work involved. He determined from Mr. Duncan that the subcommittee was looking at all lots to better understand their current development and potential capacity.

Mr. Farr said that there were property owners who owned large parcels with single dwellings who were not interested in subdividing their property. He asked if the subcommittee was looking at such parcels. Mr. Duncan said the TRG was looking at all such parcels; however, it not the TRG’s role to determine if such property owners wanted to subdivide.

Mr. Clark thanked Ms. Prichard, Mr. Duncan, and all the members of the TRG for their work. He asked if staff had revisited the subject of non-Goal 5 constraints to development. Ms. O’Donnell said the TRG was looking at that issue. With respect to bioswales and other forms of “green” infrastructure and the

potential such approaches could be more widely used in the future, Ms. O'Donnell reported that Planning Division staff was working with Public Work on information to share with the TRG. She said the City would need to show the State there was a reason that lands affected by such green infrastructure could not be counted toward the inventory. She suggested it made sense to first consider what the impacts might be, followed by further detailed analysis when the City was aware of all the changes staff anticipated would be made to the stormwater standards associated with the City's National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit.

Mr. Clark emphasized the importance of such infrastructure to neighborhood livability. He wanted to ensure the City considered those facilities so it did not create a situation that resulted in overbuilding in those areas.

Mr. Clark recalled that ECLA identified a need for 1,800 acres for residential development, and asked if the City was legally bound to that assumption. City Attorney Emily Jerome said the City was not bound to that assumption. The council had accepted ECLA for purposes of further analysis, and had the ability to adjust the assumption in the future.

Mr. Clark asked for an example of a phase trigger. Ms. Weiss suggested one example was monitoring the construction of single-family houses over a period of time. Mr. Clark asked if the council would decide the decision metrics related to such triggers. Ms. Weiss anticipated staff would work with the consulting stakeholders on those triggers and would return to the council with a recommendation.

Mr. Clark suggested the marketplace, not the City, had control over the housing mix. He asked if the City would monitor the regional effects of its actions, pointing out decisions made by the City of Eugene could affect where growth occurred elsewhere in the region. He believed one could argue the City's actions over the past two decades had increased the percentage level of single-family development in nearby communities. Ms. Weiss believed the City could monitor that impact by providing base information about growth in those communities.

Mr. Zelenka also thanked the TRG members for all their work. He believed the phased implementation process made sense because it did not leave the City with irrevocable 20-year decisions.

Mr. Zelenka reported that he was currently attending the Climate Leadership Academy in Washington, DC, and one of the speakers at the event was a real estate consultant who discussed shifts in the housing marketplace. The consultant averred that the marketplace was shifting away from a drivable, suburban context to a walkable, urban context. That shift was being driven by "The Millennials." The consultant had predicted that over the next 20 years the number of households with children would decrease from 25 percent to 9 percent and the percentage of households with singles and couples would rise from 75 to 84 percent. Mr. Zelenka said the market would respond to those demographics with denser urban environments dominated by multi-family housing.

Continuing, Mr. Zelenka said the consultant suggested the best way to explain the shift was by pointing to the different programs watched by "The Millennials" as opposed to the "Baby Boomers." The "Baby Boomers" grew up watching programs such as "I Love Lucy," "The Dick Van Dyke Show," and "The Brady Bunch" placed in drivable suburban communities, but "The Millennials" grew up watching "Seinfeld," "Friends," and "Sex in the City," programs which were placed in walkable urban contexts. He said that was not an accident but was based on market research done by the programs' producers. Mr. Zelenka said the example helped him to think about "who's driving this train moving forward" in regard to the question of the housing mix. He suggested that "looking in the rear view mirror of where we were"

made no sense but looking forward within the context of “The Millennials” driving the new market made a lot more sense.

Mayor Piercy observed that “I Love Lucy” was initially set in an urban setting before being moved to a more suburban setting.

Mr. Farr suggested that market trends as identified by writers of situation comedies writers did not necessary take Eugene into account.

Mayor Piercy hoped the City planned to do targeted outreach to diverse populations. She also wanted to know how the community was situated in regard to housing for students, and what the University of Oregon was planning in regard to student housing so the City had more sense of whether there was a market for more multi-family housing. Mr. Duncan said his firm recently finished a study that indicated a demand for 2,000 to 2,500 more student housing units. His firm was also seeing more interest in housing near campus, and less demand for parking as students recognized that their cars could be a burden and left them at home.

Mayor Piercy said she understood that the University intended to house all freshman and sophomores in campus housing. Mr. Duncan said the University hoped to increase the on-campus population to 25 percent of all students. At this point, the University housed only 21 percent of students on campus now.

Ms. O’Donnell noted that the Portland State University population projections accounted for students. The City also worked with the University on the housing it planned to provide. She recalled that the University planned to keep up with the demand but did not plan on much expansion.

Ms. Prichard suggested that Mr. Duncan’s discussion of the partially vacant lands issue was an example of her statement that the council had the right to feel confident in the information provided by the TRG. Speaking to Mr. Clark’s remarks about the value Santa Clara residents had for the neighborhood’s swales and open drainage ways, Ms. Prichard suggested that was an example of the inherent conflict in the process. Neighborhood livability was “huge” for residents. Removal of the swales and drainage ways in Santa Clara would radically change the complexion of the neighborhood and not for the good. Such things caused the City to consider whether it had to grow out. She said it was important to remember that any discussion of expanding the UGB was not about land grabbing or greed, but about how to maintain a livable community while accommodating everyone’s needs.

Ms. Prichard concluded by reporting that much of the data available to the TRG was not particularly relevant to Eugene. The data was coming from communities such as Atlanta, Los Angeles, and Miami. She suggested it was important to remember that Eugene was Eugene and not Atlanta.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the work session at 1:25 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

June 13, 2011
5:30 p.m.

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 June 13, 2011, work session of the Eugene City Council to order.

**A. WORK SESSION:
Eugene Counts Dashboard**

Service Improvement Manager Terrie Monroe and Jeff Ozvold and Scott Christian of the Information Services Division demonstrated the online “Dashboard” developed for the council’s “Eugene Counts” goal-setting framework. The dashboard provided the community with easily accessible information about the City’s progress and performance in meeting the council’s goals.

Councilors asked questions clarifying the information presented and commended the work that had gone into the dashboard.

Mr. Zelenka arrived during the demonstration.

**B. WORK SESSION:
Homeless Car Camping**

Police Chief Pete Kerns reported that the Homeless Car Camping Program had been operating smoothly for many years and for the most part functioned well. A recent increase in the number of complaints the department had received about homeless camping led to the work session. Chief Kerns introduced Michael Wisth of the Planning and Community Development Department, Sergeant Carl Stubbs of the Eugene Police Department, and William Wise, director of St. Vincent de Paul’s First Place Family Center. Mr. Wisth and Sergeant Stubbs provided an update on the Homeless Car Camping Program.

Mr. Wisth first noted that Eugene Code Sections 4.816 and 4.816 governed camping in Eugene. Section 4.816 allowed for car camping in public and private parking lots in Eugene if certain criteria were met. The City established the Homeless Car Camping Program to oversee the ordinance. He provided a brief description of the program and the City’s management approach to homeless car camping and emphasized the coordination that occurred between the City and St. Vincent de Paul.

Mr. Wisth shared pictures of some managed homeless camping sites, mostly located on public parking lots as well as on private parking lots owned by businesses and churches, and noted the screening process

for applicants. He reported there were currently 31 managed sites serving 63 people, with 83 people on a waiting list. Mr. Wisth reported a committee that included representatives of St. Vincent de Paul and the departments of Planning and Development, Public Works, Police, and Central Services was charged with program oversight and met frequently to discuss strategies to address “hot spot” complaint areas and coordinate signage and enforcement requests.

Mr. Wisth briefly reviewed the elements of Section 4.815, which prohibited camping in the city outside the parameters of the Homeless Camping Program.

Sergeant Stubbs discussed the City’s enforcement approach to violations of the camping ordinance. He reviewed the dispatch protocol for complaints about violations, reporting that initially, St. Vincent de Paul staff responded to such complaints and provided campers in violation with the opportunity to move. Those who failed to move were placed on a local violators list and referred to a team of officers who cited violators and arranged for vehicle tows. Sergeant Stubbs shared statistics demonstrating calls for service about illegal camping that illustrated the increase in complaints over the last few years.

Sergeant Stubbs shared a map showing where enforcement of the homeless camping ordinance had occurred within the community. He also shared data regarding the number of citations issued by the Eugene Police Department for illegal on-street camping.

Mr. Wisth concluded the presentation by highlighting some next steps, which included modifications to enforcement procedures, enhanced coordination, and police dispatch training on the code governing car camping. He provided contact information for himself and EPD staff, and solicited council questions.

Mayor Piercy determined from Mr. Wise that car campers in managed parking spaces were limited to three months in the space although there were exceptions, such as had been recently made for an individual with a chronic and probably fatal illness. Mr. Wise reported that when he assumed responsibility for the program in 2001 he had found there were people who had occupied the same spot for two or three years and considered it their permanent home. He learned that without a deadline to move, such individuals often failed to make efforts to improve their situation.

Continuing, Mr. Wise emphasized the importance of the “cite and tow” aspect of the program. If people were not towed when they behaved poorly other campers emulated their behavior. He acknowledged the process was time-consuming for officers, and estimated that St. Vincent de Paul staff called the police two or three times weekly for enforcement.

Mr. Poling expressed concern about long-term camping that occurred on private property. He cited as an example a noisy camp site located along a fence line in a residential area. Noise and activity from the camp site disturbed the adjacent neighbors. He asked what recourse residents experiencing such problems had. Mr. Wisth believed the City’s nuisance code addressed such situations but the homeless camping ordinance did not speak to them. Sergeant Stubbs said residents could complain about prohibited noise and report suspected crimes.

Mr. Farr observed that homeless people wanted to camp legally in a safe spot without fear of harassment. He suggested the council’s discussion was the start of a longer conversation about how to make more legal and safe camping opportunities available to such individuals so they could avoid citations for illegal camping.

Referring to the map showing the locations where the camping ordinance had been enforced, Ms. Ortiz pointed out that much of the enforcement occurred in the industrial area of west Eugene, which was in her

ward. She expressed sympathy for homeless campers but she also sympathized with business owners and residents adversely affected by homeless camping. Ms. Ortiz wondered if the City had turned away any opportunities for additional camping sites due to a lack of funds. Mr. Wise said there were some additional sites currently under consideration. He noted that each site, some of which could accommodate multiple campers, cost approximately \$1,000 annually; that did not include staff time or the costs of towing.

Ms. Ortiz supported additional funding to support more camping sites. She asked how residents could secure signs prohibiting overnight camping on their streets. Sergeant Stubbs reported that Public Works considered the placement of such signs on a case-by-case basis. City Manager Ruiz invited Ms. Ortiz to send staff suggestions for sign locations. Ms. Ortiz suggested staff develop a matrix that residents could review to determine if their street was suitable for such a sign. She cited location on a dead end street leading to a park as an example criterion for such a sign.

Responding to a question from Mr. Pryor about the proportion of car campers who were situationally homeless as opposed to being chronically homeless, Mr. Wise said almost all the families in the Family Program were situationally homeless and because of that received more intensive assistance and case management. The majority of single campers were chronically homeless, some with mental illness or other disabilities. The majority of those on the street or at the Service Station would never be self-supporting unless there was a major shift in how the country addressed such problems.

Mr. Pryor suggested the chronically homeless required a different and more structural solution. Mr. Wise believed how the problem was managed was a key factor in the program's success. It was not possible to have sufficient legal camping spaces to address all the demand, but the structure of the program fostered cooperation on the part of campers and helped to meet the need. Mr. Wise suggested that overall, the program worked amazingly well, and noted that jurisdictions such as Santa Barbara and Shasta County had adopted elements of Eugene's program and Seattle was considering adoption of a similar model.

Responding to a question from Mr. Pryor about the potential of more consistent enforcement that did not depend on officers having free time, Sergeant Stubbs said that enforcement had been added to the call screen and all patrol officers would address such calls, leading to a more expedited response.

Mr. Clark believed that homeless camping was growing into a more significant problem that required a better response from the City. He suggested that the City could do more to work with private property owners who wished to make their property available for camping. Mr. Clark determined from Sergeant Stubbs that enforcement of illegal camping in the parks was largely complaint-driven, although officers did some proactive enforcement as time allowed. Mr. Clark determined from Mr. Wise that the "safe parks" concept was never funded or implemented.

Mayor Piercy recommended that the council hold another session on related homeless camping issues. She suggested that staff consider changes to the code that might help improve conditions for residents, such as a good neighbor policy that prohibited the behavior mentioned by Mr. Poling. She also suggested that the City actively advertise the need for more camping spots and publicize its assistance with sanitation. Speaking to the potential of more prohibited camping signs, Mayor Piercy suggested that such signs merely pushed the problem to the next block and represented a limited solution. She asked what role mediation played in disputes between campers and neighbors.

Mayor Piercy noted that Corvallis had recently received a donated house for "wet beds" and suggested that Eugene might learn from that experience and attempt something similar, as that approach was more cost-effective than allowing homeless individuals to end up in the emergency room.

Mr. Farr recalled the establishment of the homeless camping program, saying it felt like a quantum leap at the time. He suggested that the City needed to highlight the program to let residents know it existed. He agreed with Mr. Clark that more outreach might produce more camping spots. He was personally aware of a church with interest in providing a camping spot. He asked how the City could facilitate the establishment of more such spaces. He suggested that south Eugene could accommodate some spaces. Mr. Farr believed the City's investment in camping spaces produced a positive return.

Ms. Ortiz said that residents in her ward called 9-1-1 about problems with homeless camping but did not feel they received a response. She asked if they should contact Public Works instead. City Manager Ruiz suggested that residents' concerns be referred to the staff committee.

Ms. Ortiz asked why the City prohibited camping in parks such as Trainsong Park. She suggested a homeless camper could deter graffiti and vandalism in the park. Mr. Wisth said that some City parks do accommodate homeless camping. Staff had discussed expanding that element of the program and was working with the community to find a balanced and workable solution. Ms. Ortiz suggested that there was a different level of tolerance for homelessness in certain parts of the community. She perceived a greater level of tolerance for homeless camping in her ward from both the community and law enforcement.

Speaking to Ms. Ortiz's remarks, Mayor Piercy observed that the City's affordable housing was deliberately disbursed throughout the community and suggested it would require a similar approach to distribute homeless camping more evenly across the community.

Referring to Ms. Ortiz's remarks about the deterrent effect of campers in the parks, Mayor Piercy suggested that a homeless camper in the parking lot at Tiny's Tavern could have a similar deterrent effect on negative behaviors in Scobert Park.

Ms. Taylor suggested that the community actually needed State-supported shelters for the homeless rather than camping spaces.

Responding to a question from Ms. Taylor, Sergeant Stubbs confirmed that homeless campers had to pay a fine to get their impounded vehicle back. Ms. Taylor found that horrible. She said that such fines compounded homeless campers' already existing problems.

At the request of Mayor Piercy, Chief Kerns shared the story of a chronically homeless individual the department assisted with temporary housing who was ultimately able to become sober and secure gainful employment.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting at 7:06 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

June 15, 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 June 15, 2011, work session of the Eugene City Council to order.

**A. WORK SESSION:
 Status Report on Local Gas Tax**

Public Works Director Kurt Corey reviewed the recent history of City Council strategies to fund road improvements, which included adoption of a local gas tax in 2002 and a street preservation bond approved by the voters in 2008. He also noted enacted State legislation, House Bill 2001, which provided additional local transportation funding but precluded new gas taxes until 2014 and then only by voter referral. The legislature's preemption of new local gas taxes led the City Council to repeal the sunset provision included in the 2005 ordinance adopting a two-cent increase in the gas tax, set to expire in 2011, out of concern the increase would be considered a new gas tax.

Mr. Corey estimated the City's average annual investment in preservation at about \$10 million, which was slightly more than half the amount he believed the community should be investing. He called attention to the 2011 Pavement Management Report included in the meeting packet, which identified a street preservation backlog of \$139 million. Attachment A of the Agenda Item Summary, *History of Pavement Preservation Program Projects as of May 2011*, listed the projects funded by the gas tax and bond since the Pavement Preservation Program's inception in 2002.

Speaking to support for operations and maintenance (O&M), Mr. Corey briefly noted the funding sources available to the City and indicated Fund 131 was balanced through the forecast period, including about \$200,000 for the Enhanced Pothole Program. He said the increased funding from House Bill 2001 could be diverted to capital preservation but it would reduce the funding available for operations and maintenance.

Mr. Corey concluded by saying progress had been made but there was much to be done. The local gas tax was a key factor to the success of the City's capital preservation efforts. The City needed to continue to focus on a comprehensive set of solutions to eliminate the preservation backlog entirely.

Mayor Piercy said those with roads still to be repaired continued to contact the council with complaints but she believed progress on the maintenance backlog had been made, which felt good for both the council and community. She thanked the public for its support of the street preservation bond. She called on councilors for comments and questions.

Mr. Poling recalled that he had asked that a work session be scheduled on the local gas tax if the State legislature took action to increase the State gas tax. He wanted to know if the council was interested in referring the gas tax to the public. He acknowledged his constituents were divided on the topic.

At the request of Mr. Farr, Mr. Corey reviewed the actions taken by the council in regard to the gas tax and reiterated that the two-cent increase adopted in 2005 was subject to the sunset. Mr. Farr observed that he had heard from people who expected the two-cent increase to sunset. He did not minimize the progress that had been made with the tax proceeds but was curious about why the council voted to eliminate the sunset.

Mr. Zelenka attributed the council's removal of the sunset to the action taken by the legislature.

Mr. Zelenka determined from Mr. Corey that the \$135 million preservation backlog would not be eliminated by current rates of spending. Mr. Zelenka suggested that even doubling the spending would not eliminate the backlog for improved streets given how long the problem had been neglected. He also noted the backlog of unimproved streets. Mr. Corey estimated it would require \$90 million to address that backlog. Mr. Zelenka preferred to retain the gas tax at its current rate given the need that existed. He continued to support a transportation utility fee as an additional means to address the backlog and make progress on it as opposed to "treading water."

Ms. Taylor agreed with Mr. Zelenka. She wanted to maintain the current gas tax until another funding source was found. Ms. Taylor pointed out that the public did not vote on the sunset; the sunset had been imposed by the council. She believed the money for street preservation should come from the General Fund but she acknowledged that fund was not in any condition to accept the cost. She was pleased Fund 131 was balanced.

Ms. Taylor asked about the cost of stolen street signs. Mr. Corey did not have a figure. He acknowledged that such thefts were a growing problem. He said that signs were replaced as staff could get them to them, and confirmed the City had a budget for sign replacement. Ms. Taylor asked what penalties existed for the theft of a street sign. Mr. Poling suggested the theft of a street sign was a misdemeanor unless there was a traffic control situation compounded by the loss of the sign, in which case the penalty would be stiffer.

Mr. Pryor recalled that the condition of the community's streets had been one of his major issues when he joined the council and he was pleased at the progress that had been made. He suggested the council had made commitments it needed to consider when considering the amount of the local gas tax. He contrasted the council's commitment to the sunset of the two-cent increase against its commitment to improve the roads. He believed that if the council maintained its commitment to the sunset that action would jeopardize its ability to maintain its commitment to road preservation.

Mr. Pryor acknowledged the council's lack of alternative revenue sources. He appreciated the concerns of those who objected to the fact the council made the additional two cents permanent. He did not know what would happen if the council referred the increase to the public. However, Mr. Pryor was reluctant to give up the additional funding and, like Mr. Poling, was curious about other councilors' positions.

Ms. Ortiz said she had heard nothing about the gas tax from her constituents and attributed that to the relatively small amount of the tax in contrast with the high price of gasoline. She did not think that residents were leaving her ward to buy gas in other communities.

Ms. Ortiz commended Mr. Corey for the adjustments he made to the City's approach to road improvements, particularly regarding the scale of the improvements that were built. The City was now

allowing unimproved streets to receive slurry seals. The Trainsong neighborhood in her ward lacked sidewalks, curbs, and gutters but its residents deserved good streets and were very happy about the work that had been done in that neighborhood.

Mr. Clark agreed with the remarks of Ms. Ortiz. He also appreciated the good job being done by Public Works. He said he frequently heard compliments about that work as well as complaints from those awaiting their own maintenance overlay. He acknowledged the department was working as hard as the budget allowed. He hoped the City was developing a plan to address the backlog of unimproved streets and encouraged staff to get such a plan before the council as quickly as possible.

Mr. Brown said he had not received any constituent comments about the gas tax. He did hear comments expressing appreciation for the street improvements that had been completed. He suggested the benefit of the gas tax was demonstrated by those improvements. Mr. Brown supported retention of the two-cent increase, suggesting it would become increasingly insignificant as gas prices increased.

Mayor Piercy recalled that council discussion about the removal of the sunset included agreement that the action depended on whether progress was being made on the maintenance backlog. She believed there was considerably more work to be done. She also concurred with Ms. Ortiz about the City's efforts to build the best and most appropriate road improvement and be responsive to what the public wanted, even if that did not include complete urban-scale improvements.

Mr. Zelenka had also heard nothing from his constituents about the gas tax, although he heard constant complaints about the condition of the roads. He recalled he had agreed to eliminate the two-cent increase if the State legislature had provided sufficient transportation funding, but it did not do so. He supported retaining the two-cent increase. He did not think it drove any gas stations out of business and doubted many people drove very far away from the community to avoid the tax.

Mr. Zelenka did not think the current rate of progress on the preservation backlog was sufficient and wanted to see more progress. He reiterated his support for a transportation utility fee to accomplish that goal. Mr. Corey reminded the council of the need for a billing system to collect the fee, and suggested it would require council advocacy to persuade the Eugene Water & Electric Board to administer it.

Mr. Zelenka indicated interest in a council work session poll on a transportation utility fee.

Mr. Farr agreed with much of what had been said, particularly Ms. Ortiz's remarks about the size of the tax relative to the cost of gas. He said he heard less about the actual increase than he did about the erosion of trust created by the council's action to eliminate the sunset, which was a concern to him and which he thought the council should be aware of. He acknowledged he also heard complaints about potholes, and commended the department's responsiveness to those complaints.

Mr. Poling believed the council had heard few complaints about the tax increase because it was using the revenues from the tax as promised. The City was making some gains on the backlog. He suggested that widely varying gas prices throughout the community also made it challenging for people to detect the impact of the local gas tax.

Mayor Piercy believed the council had used the term "sunset" in the case of the added two cents to indicate it would reexamine its action in the future, and suggested that it might consider being more precise about what it meant when it used the term in the future.

**B. WORK SESSION:
Rental Housing Code Program Update**

Assistant City Manager/Planning and Development Director Sarah Medary introduced the item, reminding the council that the Rental Housing Code Program was scheduled to sunset at the end of 2011. She anticipated that at some point in the near future, staff would ask the council for direction on whether to sunset, extend, or modify the program. Rachelle Nicholas of the Planning and Development Department then led the council through a PowerPoint presentation on the Rental Housing Program. The presentation included background on the establishment of the code and its original focus on structural integrity, safe and sanitary plumbing, heating, and weatherproofing and its later expansion to include smoke detectors, security, and mold. The presentation also included a list of other Oregon jurisdictions with similar regulations as well as numeric and geographic information on Eugene rental properties and a map showing the location of complaints received by the City. The complaint, penalty, and appeal processes were illustrated in the presentation. Ms. Nicholas shared slides of violations.

Assistant City Manager Medary shared information about program revenues and acknowledged the large reserve that had been built up. However, she projected that program expenditures would soon catch up with revenues and suggested current revenue levels were appropriate. She emphasized staff time spent on the program was carefully tracked and the expenditures reflected true costs.

Assistant City Manager Medary placed the program in a larger context by reminding the council of the program's relationship to the strategies coming out of Envision Eugene related to compact growth, affordable housing, and neighborhood livability and to the Climate & Energy Action Plan. She anticipated a Triple Bottom Line (TBL) analysis of the program would be done as well as additional public outreach.

Councilors asked questions clarifying the information presented regarding program revenues, staffing levels, and scope. Mr. Clark asked staff to be prepared to identify the distinctions between the State program and local program and any possible duplications of effort at a future work session. Other councilors expressed general support for the program and the current \$10 per unit fee, although Ms. Taylor had reservations about the amount of time it took to remedy a violation and requested records of complaints that did not get remedied in the time provided. Ms. Taylor also asked staff to provide the council with a review of the housing rental program that existed in the 1970s before the council discussed the topic again. Mayor Piercy encouraged staff to share its observations and recommendations for improvements with the council.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the work session at 1:20 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

June 20, 2011
7:30 p.m.

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

COUNCILORS ABSENT: Betty Taylor.

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the June 20, 2011, public hearing of the Eugene City Council to order.

**1. PUBLIC HEARING:
Resolution Adopting a Supplemental Budget; Making Appropriations for the City of Eugene for the Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2010, and Ending June 30, 2011**

Assistant City Manager Sarah Medary reported that the supplemental budget recognized new revenues and authorized other unanticipated changes and legal appropriations. The council was scheduled to take action on the supplemental budget on June 27, 2011.

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

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

**2. PUBLIC HEARING:
Resolution Adopting a Supplemental Budget; Making Appropriations for the Urban Renewal Agency for the Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2010, and Ending June 30, 2011**

Assistant City Manager Medary reported that the supplemental budget for the URA recognized new revenues and authorized other unanticipated changes and legal appropriations. The council, acting as the URA Board of Directors, was scheduled to take action on the supplemental budget on June 27, 2011.

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

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

**3. PUBLIC HEARING:
A Resolution Adopting the Budget; Making Appropriations, Determining, Levying and Categorizing the Annual Ad Valorem Property Tax Levy for the City of Eugene for the**

Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2011, and Ending June 30, 2012; A Resolution Electing to Receive State Revenue Sharing Funds Pursuant to Section 221.770 of Oregon Revised Statutes; and a Resolution Certifying that the City of Eugene Provides the Municipal Services Required by Oregon Revised Statutes Section 221.760 in Order to Receive State Shared Revenues

Assistant City Manager Medary reported that the council was scheduled to take action on the proposed fiscal year (FY) 2012 budget on June 27, 2011.

Mayor Piercy opened the public hearing.

Claire Syrett, 363 Adams Street, Chair of the City of Eugene Budget Committee, thanked City Manager Jon Ruiz and City staff for their work preparing the FY 2012 budget and thanked the council for its work with the citizen members of the committee to amend the proposed budget. She acknowledged that the council had the authority to make further amendments to the budget but she asked the council to approve the budget as passed by the committee in May. She believed the committee's efforts should be honored.

Ms. Syrett thanked outgoing Budget Committee member Terry McDonald for his long-time service on the committee.

Gene Obersinner, 2923 Dry Creek Road, an employee of ShelterCare, thanked the council for its past and continued support of human services funding. He expressed ShelterCare's support for the Budget Committee's recommendation to provide an additional \$150,000 to the Human Services Commission. He said the funding would go a long way toward empowering his organization's clients to live more independently.

John Barofsky, 2010 Hubbard Lane, thanked City staff and the City Council for their hard work on the budget. He believed the recent budget review process had been a good one. He thanked Ms. Syrett for her leadership of the committee and concurred with her remarks. Mr. Barofsky asked the council to be clear if it intended to make additional changes to the budget to give the public an opportunity to respond.

Scott Olmos, 3765 Meadowview Street, President of the International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF), Local 851, recalled a past union president's warning to a past Budget Committee of the potential the proposed closing of Fire Station 9 could result in an unfortunate accident, a prediction later proven true by a fatality at Delta Ponds that occurred because it took the nearest fire company more than seven minutes to arrive at the scene. A later analysis attributed that fatality to the response time coverage gap in the area and a system wide drop in reliability and response time performance created by the absence of a staffed fire company in the neighborhood. He emphasized the fact of the system wide drop. Mr. Olmos said that Fire Station 2 was far busier than Fire Station 9, and the closure would have a greater impact on the community. He said since the closure of Fire Station 9, the city's population and number of calls had increased. Mr. Olmos did not think the community needed to relearn a painful lesson. He asked the council to retain the fire company slated for elimination.

There being no other requests to speak, Mayor Piercy closed the public hearing. She thanked those who spoke. She also thanked the Budget Committee, Ms. Syrett, and recognized Mr. McDonald's service.

Councilor Clark thanked Ms. Syrett and recognized Mr. McDonald's long-time service on the Budget Committee.

Councilor Clark indicated he would likely offer the council a motion to restore staffing at Fire Station 2, as well as modify the funding sources for jail beds and gang prevention.

Councilor Zelenka also thanked Ms. Syrett for her work as chair and thanked the other members of the committee, particularly Mr. McDonald.

Councilor Zelenka clarified for the benefit of the public that the City was not proposing to close Fire Station 2. He asked staff to provide information to the council about the percentage of calls the second truck company responded to that were in the Whiteaker neighborhood.

Councilor Zelenka indicated his support for Councilor Clark's intention to change the funding source for additional jail beds.

Councilor Ortiz planned to support any motion that restored funding for the fire truck company eliminated in the proposed FY12 budget. She considered it a one-time fix. While she recognized all the hard work staff did to prepare the budget, she also knew how hard the fire fighters worked and she looked forward to Councilor Clark's motion.

Councilor Clark acknowledged the creative and innovative solutions to the department's financial problems that had been offered to the Budget Committee by Fire Chief Randy Groves and his management team. He was proud of the chief and recognized the challenges he faced. He suggested that people could differ as to the appropriate solution to the department's funding shortfall.

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

4. PUBLIC HEARING:

A Resolution of the Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Eugene Adopting the Budget, Making Appropriations, and Declaring the Amount of Tax to be Certified for the Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2011, and Ending June 30, 2012

Assistant City Manager Medary said the public hearing concerned the FY12 Urban Renewal budget. The URA Board of Directors was scheduled to act on the budget on June 27, 2011.

Mayor Piercy opened the public hearing.

Randy Prince, PO Box 927, Eugene, suggested that a lively urban renewal district should have telecommunications services. However, there was nothing in the URA budget related to telecommunications. He pointed out that the City had established a Telecommunications Fund dedicated to projects of widespread community benefit. He recalled that at the inception of the fund the revenues had been dedicated to public purposes such as wi-fi hot spots at the library. Increasingly, the money was used to benefit City departments.

Mr. Prince said that in 2010 the neighborhood associations were told that \$30,000 from the fund would no longer be available for neighborhood communications but that year the City transferred \$500,000 in Telecommunications Funds to pay for the City's telephone expenses. He maintained the ordinance governing the use of the funding limited the funds to projects such as the library wi fi hot spots and the eliminated neighborhood communications funding.

Mr. Prince noted that the ordinance precluded Telecommunication Funds from being used to replace property tax revenues. However, he believed that was occurring through the General Fund transfer. He maintained that the transfer was clearly illegal and contrary to the desires of Eugene citizens. He asked

the council to review the record of the General Fund transfer. He predicted the City would incur legal bills defending it.

Mayor Piercy closed the public hearing.

Councilor Zelenka asked staff to respond to Mr. Prince's remarks before June 27.

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

**5. PUBLIC HEARING:
An Ordinance Concerning Amendment of Animal Regulations Regarding Service Animals
and Amending Sections 4.330, 4.335, 4.340, 4.395, 4.410, 4.427, 4.435, and 4.440 of the
Eugene Code, 1971**

Assistant City Manager Medary reminded the council it held a work session on changes to the City Code recommended by the Human Rights Commission's Accessibility Committee to provide stronger sanctions for attacks on service animals. She said at the council's request, staff had also talked to Lane County Animal Services about the possibility of providing different tags to licensed service animals to make the distinction between service animals and pet animals clear.

Mayor Piercy opened the public hearing.

Heather Merlin, 77 Red Cedar Street, St. Helens, on behalf of the Willamette Valley Assistance Dog Club, said in her discussion with the owners of assistance animals, she learned they were concerned about interference with their service animal from a pet dog and believed that such incidents were not dealt with appropriately. They believed an attack on the service dog was an attack on the handler and should be viewed as such. Leash laws should be strictly enforced and injuries to a service animal should be addressed in the same way as a car accident.

Ms. Merlin called for publicly funded dog ownership classes to be made available to the general public and required of any pet owner whose animal attacked a service animal. She said that assistance dog owners believed pet dog owners were not informed of appropriate methods of controlling their animals, which were readily available through dog training classes. She advocated for more education about service animals and stricter consequences for pet dog owners who allowed their dogs to interfere with or attack a service animal.

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

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting at 7:56 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

June 27, 2011
7:30 p.m.

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 June 27, 2011, regular meeting of the Eugene City Council to order.

1. PUBLIC FORUM

Mayor Piercy reviewed the rules of the Public Forum.

Calling for a point of order, Councilor Farr noted the council's earlier action to include the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance at council meetings closest to Memorial Day, Flag Day, Veterans Day, and the Fourth of July, and asked City Attorney Glenn Klein if the meeting counted as the meeting closest to the Fourth of July. City Attorney Klein did not know. Councilor Clark believed that it did but suggested the council postpone the activity at this time and recite the Pledge of Allegiance at the next meeting instead.

James Baptiste, a California resident of California who spent six months each year in Eugene, questioned why Eugene wanted the money from the wars when councilors did not want to recite the Pledge of Allegiance. He suggested that the country could bring the soldiers home but there were no jobs for them. While he appreciated the mayor's views, he questioned where her allegiance lay. He believed the country was built around the concept of God. He said there was something wrong with the situation and the councilors should examine themselves. He believed the pledge was important and that God was important. He asked the council to think about what it did.

Joseph Newton, PO Box 10334, Eugene, supported Councilor Brown's proposed resolution against the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan because the money being spent on the war was needed at home in Eugene. The police did not have the resources to respond to the small thefts that affected people's lives. He believed the basic elements that made up civilization were crumbling while the nation's resources were going to ill-defined missions that the country should have avoided. He said the United States had stayed in Iraq long after it was not wanted. He believed the wars were affecting the work of the council and the welfare of the residents of Eugene. Mr. Newton said it was within the council's purview to state that it wanted the community's resources to remain in Eugene to help the council create a society that people could feel allegiance to and want to defend.

Kimberly Gladen, 361 West Broadway, #4, discussed the Lane County Courthouse and Wayne Morse Free Speech Plaza. She reported that she frequently met visitors to Eugene who were impressed with downtown and amazed by Saturday Market and the Farmers Market. They often expressed a desire to move to Eugene. Then they visited the Wayne Morse Free Speech Plaza and saw how the community honored Wayne Morse by allowing a chaotic free-for-all that included criminal behavior. The scene drew

transients and runaways from all around the country to downtown and the Board of County Commissioners allowed it to happen. Ms. Gladen asked what she was to say to visitors when asked why the City did nothing about the situation, adding that she heard that question all the time from visitors. She was frustrated, sad, and ashamed when she saw families with children walking by the plaza. She did not think the plaza honored Wayne Morse. She asked what the council was doing about the plaza and asked when councilors last brought their children downtown to demonstrate their pride in the Wayne Morse Free Speech Plaza at the Lane County Courthouse.

Stan Taylor, 1285 McLean Boulevard, represented the Community Alliance for Lane County's Progressive Response Committee, which helped draft the resolution sponsored by Councilor Brown. Mr. Taylor noted his membership on several groups committed to peace and reported that all of them supported the resolution before the council. He further noted that a Pew Research Center poll released recently showed that 56 percent of Americans wanted the United States to withdraw its troops from Afghanistan as soon as possible. He reported that CALC had collected 838 signatures expressing the same sentiment. He presented the council with another 200 signatures of support.

Mr. Taylor recalled that in part thanks to Mayor Piercy, the United States Conference of Mayors recently passed a resolution calling for Congress to redirect the funding spent on the wars to domestic priorities. He believed the cost of the wars in terms of loss of life and actual money was more than the country could afford. He asked the council to support the resolution.

Chelsea Laws, 1435 Polk Street, "We the People" Steering Committee, supported the resolution sponsored by Councilor Brown. She spoke of her volunteer work for the schools and emphasized their need for funding. She also noted the many nonprofits that provided vital community services that were in need of funding. She said the lack of funding threatened the community's social service net. In addition, the Iraq and Afghan civilian communities were being destroyed by the war, and the United States should not support the destruction of communities anywhere. She believed Eugene's priorities should be adequate funding for its own schools, social service structure, job creation, and support of the environment.

Jeff Ewing, 1150 Darlene Lane, #256, represented the Eugene-Springfield Solidarity Network. He expressed support for the resolution. He said human services existed to serve citizens at their time of need and this was a time of need that could get worse. At the same time, there were voices on the national scene calling for austerity and the country was embroiled in two long, expensive, and unnecessary wars. Mr. Ewing said a bipartisan consensus was growing about the need to end those wars and redirect the funds to services needed at home. He urged the council to support the resolution.

Shelley Corteville, 438 C Street, Springfield, represented Veterans for Peace, Chapter 159. She spoke of the many American soldiers killed and wounded in the Iraq and Afghanistan and reported that 18 veterans committed suicide every day. That was the true face of the wars. Ms. Corteville said veterans also come home to another problem, that of a lack of funding to care for them. The Veterans Administration was both underfunded and under-staffed, and the country was making veterans faster than the system could care for them. The cost of making a veteran was high and the cost of caring for one was very high. However, the country continued to have that obligation. She asked the councilors to think of the young people they encountered and consider whether they were willing to put them in harm's way by supporting wars financially.

Alex Payne, 1286 Sunny Drive, said while it was true there had been no draft or rationing required by the war, he had seen much self-sacrifice imposed on citizens because of a lack of money to pay for necessary services. He said that School District 4J was facing a budget crisis. Because of the money dedicated to war he seen teachers' positions be eliminated, programs reduced, and health care clinics restricted in

terms of who they could serve. He supported the resolution sponsored by Councilor Brown as absolutely necessary. Mr. Payne believed that United States cities needed to send a message to the administration that they needed the money being spent on the wars. He did not think the Taliban represented a threat to the United States. Any money that went to support war in Afghanistan was strengthening a regime with no real interest in democracy and was not assisting Afghans.

David Ivan Piccioni, 658 Van Buren Street, supported the resolution sponsored by Councilor Brown. He noted his general opposition to United States intervention in the affairs of other nations. He called for drug decriminalization to stop wars in Latin America. Mr. Piccioni recommended the money saved by stopping United States involvement in the conflicts of other countries be directed to single-payer insurance, environmental programs, support for organized labor, hemp legalization, to stop actions against environmentalists and animal rights activists, to fully fund public education, and to support a state bank.

John Barofsky, 2010 Hubbard Lane, noted that the council would take action on the budget that night and that councilors planned to propose expenditures to be funded by moneys that would otherwise go to marginal beginning working capital. He noted the City's policy governing the use of those funds, which stipulated the first \$900,000 was transferred to capital and the remainder to the Reserve for Revenue Shortfall. He acknowledged the City Manager wanted to see the money go to reserves, but the council felt there were greater needs. Mr. Barofsky recalled the motions passed by the Budget Committee that affected marginal beginning working capital. He asked the council to prioritize those expenditures if the amount of marginal beginning working capital was found to be insufficient.

William Moskel, 1166 Oak Street, acknowledged Councilor Clark's advocacy for the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance at council meetings. He agreed with Ms. Gladen about the status of affairs at Wayne Morse Plaza and urged the council to use its influence to change the situation. Mr. Moskel believed that war was necessary at times. He suggested that ending the wars would not mean that money came back to Eugene. He suggested that the community had a reputation that drew deadbeats to the community and advocated for people to give to those that were good.

Mayor Piercy closed the Public Forum. She thanked those who spoke in regard to the resolution. She thanked councilors Brown and Poling for their work on the resolution.

Councilor Ortiz also thanked those who testified. She asked City Manager Jon Ruiz the status of enforcement activities on Wayne Morse Plaza. City Manager Ruiz agreed to provide an update.

Mayor Piercy observed that the City had been working to improve conditions at Wayne Morse Free Speech Plaza for some time.

3. ACTION:

Adoption of Resolution 5040 Expressing the City Council's Desire that Funds to Continue the Iraq and Afghanistan Wars be Directed to Domestic Priorities, Including Pressing Needs in the City of Eugene

Councilor Brown, seconded by Councilor Taylor, moved to approve Resolution 5040 expressing the City Council's desire that funds to continue the Iraq and Afghanistan wars be directed to domestic priorities, including the pressing needs in the city of Eugene.

Councilor Brown explained that CALC had proposed the resolution and asked him to place it before the council. He reported that Councilor Poling had offered some revisions that he had subsequently accepted after consultation with CALC. He reviewed the accepted revisions offered by Councilor Poling. He said

he had declined to accept Councilor Poling's suggested revisions to Section 3 of the resolution, which related to how the funds freed by stopping the wars would be used, because he found it overly specific. Section 3 of the proposed resolution currently read as follows:

Section 3. The financial resources used to prosecute the war be redirected, as they become available, to address the urgent needs of the most vulnerable portions of Eugene's population, including education, health, and full benefits for returning veterans, as well as to fund the creation of jobs, full functioning of schools, rebuilding of our infrastructure, and development of non-carbon-producing alternatives for our energy needs.

City Attorney Glenn Klein noted the four versions of the resolution being considered by the council: 1) Resolution—Bring War Funds Home—with Poling's amendments—CLEAN; 2) Resolution—Bring War Funds Home—Brown's Version with amendments—TRACK CHANGES; 3) Resolution—Bring War Funds Home—Brown's with amendments—CLEAN; and 4) Councilor Poling's proposed changes to Councilor Brown's resolution.

Councilor Brown clarified that his motion was specific to the resolution labeled *Resolution—Bring War Funds Home—Brown's with amendments—TRACK CHANGES*.

Councilor Poling did not object to Section 1 if revised to read "The Council of the City of Eugene, on behalf of the people of Eugene, urge President Obama to speed up the ending of these wars by beginning withdrawal of forces in a safe, rapid, and orderly fashion that fully protects American troops from harm and to support efforts led by international organizations to rebuild both countries." He objected to the use of the word "occupation" in Section 2, suggesting "war" was a more accurate description.

While he doubted any additional money would come to Eugene if the wars ended, Councilor Poling said his revisions to Section 3 spoke to his funding priorities. His revised section read as follows:

Section 3. The financial resources used to finance the war be redirected, if they become available to the City of Eugene, to the following priority list: 1) Full benefits for returning veterans and veterans of all wars, 2) Increase and maintain personnel of the Eugene Police Department and the Eugene Fire and Emergency Services Department to meet national staffing standards, 3) Increase workforce development and job creation, 4) Rebuilding of our infrastructure, and 5) Public health and social safety net., which included full benefits for veterans, sufficient funding for police and fire services to meet national standards, workforce development, infrastructure reconstruction, and the public health and safety net.

Councilor Poling shared the national standards for fire personnel, reporting the national average was 1.72 firefighters per 1,000 residents; Eugene had 1.07 firefighters per 1,000 residents. The national average for sworn police officers was 2.3 officers per 1,000 residents; Eugene had 1.2 officers per 1,000 residents.

Councilor Poling move to substitute the resolution labeled *Councilor Poling's proposed changes to Councilor Brown's resolution* for the resolution before the council. The motion died for lack of a second.

Councilor Zelenka expressed appreciation to CALC for the resolution. He noted the number of soldier deaths, injuries, and suicides, as well as the extensive loss of civilian life in Iraq. He said it was long past time to end the country's involvement in Iraq. The war had cost the community \$345 million and that money could have been spent on education, job creation, public safety, human services, and veterans care. He believed it was time to redirect the money being spent on the war to domestic priorities. He supported

the resolution offered by Councilor Brown. He thought it addressed most of Councilor Poling's concerns and he found it more inclusive in terms of the services it identified for funding. Councilor Clark distributed the resolution proposed by Mayor Piercy to the US Conference of Mayors. He said he found the language in the CALC resolution somewhat incendiary but agreed entirely with its sentiments. He suggested Mayor Piercy's resolution was a middle ground the council could support. Councilor Clark read the resolution.

Councilor Clark, seconded by Councilor Poling, moved to substitute the text of Resolution 5040 with the resolution adopted by the US Conference of Mayors with the phrase "City of Eugene" inserted where the "US Conference of Mayors" appeared in the resolution.

Councilor Brown did not support the motion because he believed the CALC resolution was more complete. It addressed a broader range of services without being overly specific. He suggested if the council wanted to be "super-specific" it would call out specific actions, such as ending homelessness and opening the Egan Warming Center. His resolution urged the Congressional delegation to bring home the troops and to return funding to the cities in the broad categories mentioned in the resolution.

Councilor Farr believed the findings in the resolution were difficult to refute but he opposed the use of the phrase "on behalf of the people of Eugene" because he considered it divisive. He preferred the text in the mayor's resolution.

Councilor Farr held out little hope that the federal government would send any money not spent on war to Eugene.

Councilor Pryor pointed out all the resolutions wanted the same thing, which was to bring the troops home safely and to redirect the money to a common purpose at home. He agreed with that fully. He suggested the "sticking point" was how to say that and what to do with any money realized by ending the wars. He suggested the council focus on the first question, that of the wars and whether they should be ended. He believed there was strength in numbers, and if the council signed on to the resolution adopted by the US Council of Mayors it might have more of an impact than if it adopted a resolution of its own. He supported Councilor Clark's proposal.

Councilor Taylor said Councilor Brown's resolution was a local resolution drafted by local people that represented local voices. She thought the resolution reinforced the message contained in the mayor's resolution. Speaking to Councilor Farr's concerns about the use of the phrase "on behalf of the people of Eugene," Councilor Taylor did not think that implied agreement on the part of all residents, but rather that it was in the interests of the people of Eugene. She supported Councilor Brown's resolution.

Councilor Zelenka was impressed with the mayor's resolution and proud that the mayor had sponsored it. He anticipated he would offer the council a motion to support that resolution as well.

Councilor Brown believed the mayor's resolution was appropriately addressed through the forum of the US Conference of Mayors and it was time for a local resolution. He suggested that councilors interested in passing the mayor's resolution should have raised the concept when CALC asked him to present the resolution to the council. He thought last-minute substitutions subverted the purity of the original resolution.

Councilor Poling objected to how Councilor Brown had characterized amendments to the resolution as last-minute given that he had given the council ample notice of his intention to offer revisions. He

intended to support Councilor Clark's motion and said if that failed he would not be able to support the proposed resolution because of his stated objections to the text.

Councilor Brown clarified his remarks about last-minute amendments were in regard to Councilor Clark's substitute motion.

Roll call vote: The vote on the motion was a 4:4 tie; councilors Pryor, Clark, Poling, and Farr voting yes, and councilors Taylor, Ortiz, Zelenka, and Brown voting no. Mayor Piercy cast a vote in opposition to the motion and it failed on a final vote of 5:4.

Councilor Pryor, seconded by Councilor Clark, moved to amend the motion to adopt the text in Councilor Poling's resolution.

Councilor Pryor said he preferred Councilor Poling's revised text to the original resolution proposed by Councilor Brown because of what he considered small but significant changes.

Councilor Clark reiterated his support for the intent of the resolution but continued to be concerned about what he considered incendiary language as well as the hostility expressed toward those objections. Some in the community found the language in the resolution hard to accept. He wanted to express the same intent in different words. He said residents did not view issues uniformly, and he wanted to find a way to capture their similarities and move forward. Councilor Clark said he supported Councilor Poling's revisions because they addressed his concerns about Councilor Brown's resolution, such as the use of the word "occupation" instead of "war."

Councilor Farr suggested that it was more than slightly disingenuous for Councilor Brown to suggest that the resolution was not divisive, particularly after his remarks at the earlier work session about what he considered to be the divisiveness of the Pledge of Allegiance. He was baffled that Councilor Brown did not understand the resolution was divisive to the community.

Councilor Zelenka hoped to find a compromise. He preferred what he considered Councilor Brown's more inclusive text for Section 3. He suggested the council accept Councilor Poling's revisions for Section B and D of the preamble and Section 2 and retain Councilor Brown's Section 3.

Councilor Brown did not want to make additional revisions to the resolution. He believed that the word "occupation" was correct. The United States had invaded Iraq and Afghanistan without invitation, which was by definition a military occupation. He considered the word to be a statement of fact.

Councilor Ortiz supported both resolutions but preferred Councilor Poling's proposed revisions to Section 3. She also supported the inclusion of Councilor Brown's text calling for support for environmental clean-up and alternative energy programs in Section 3.

Councilor Clark supported Councilor Poling's revised Section 3. He said Councilor Brown's Section 3 presumed a list of spending priorities he did not agree with.

Speaking to Councilor Brown's remarks about last-minute changes, Councilor Clark said he was not attempting to surprise anyone but was offering a compromise knowing the council would be divided. He thought the mayor's resolution would be acceptable to most if not all the councilors.

Councilor Brown thought the original text in the resolution was acceptable. He believed the section in question was broad-based in the programs it mentioned for funding. He said the list could be expanded, which was what the motion accomplished. He thought it was a given that more funds would be directed

toward the services of concern to Councilor Poling but he did not think the resolution needed to be specific as to that. He saw no reason to expand the resolution further.

Councilor Zelenka determined from Councilor Poling that the funding priorities he had laid out in his revised Section 3 were not all equal because the costs would vary so much. Councilor Poling believed the council would have to decide, if it got funding, what amounts went to what priorities. Councilor Zelenka interpreted Councilor Poling's response as calling for full funding to meet national standards for police and fire staffing to the degree that the other priorities could not be funded. Councilor Poling disagreed. He said he had suggested revising the section to read "Increase funding to the Fire and Police departments" without mention of bringing staffing levels up to national standards but Councilor Brown had been unwilling to accept that suggestion.

Councilor Zelenka suggested that Councilor Poling eliminate the numbering in Section 3 to eliminate the implied priority order. Councilor Poling was unwilling to do so as he believed the council would only have to debate those priorities later.

Councilor Zelenka did not agree with the priority order implied by Councilor Poling's revised Section 3 and reiterated his assumption about the effect of the resolution should any money arrive. He preferred Councilor Brown's Section 3 because it did not assume any priorities. He endorsed Councilor Ortiz's suggestion to add support for environmental clean-up and alternative energy programs to Councilor Poling's revised Section 3.

Councilor Pryor said what he feared had happened; instead of talking about ending the war, the council was talking about spending money it did not have. It had substituted a discussion of budget priorities for a discussion of bringing the troops home. He found that unfortunate and urged the council to avoid it.

Councilor Clark accepted a friendly amendment from Councilor Pryor to amend the motion to add support for environmental clean-up and alternative energy programs to Section 3 of the revised resolution.

Councilor Farr suggested if Councilor Brown had wanted a more inclusive resolution, the mayor's resolution should have been acceptable. He believed the mayor's resolution covered all the needed points without a specific "laundry list" of services.

Councilor Brown suggested there was more unanimity between Republicans and Democrats in Washington, DC, about the subject of bringing the troops home and returning the money to the states than there was on the council now. He believed the council had taken a straightforward resolution and made it complicated. He said that when the money arrived, the council could be specific about how to spend it. He could not support the amendment.

Councilor Zelenka expressed support for the amendment.

Councilor Ortiz expressed support for deleting the numbering in Councilor Poling's revised Section 3.

At the request of Councilor Ortiz, City Attorney Klein summarized the revisions to the resolution as follows (italicized text added; struck text deleted):

Section 3. The financial resources used to finance the war be redirected, if they become available to the City of Eugene, to the following priority list: 1) Full benefits for returning veterans and veterans of all wars, 2) Increase *funding to* ~~and maintain personnel of~~ the Eugene Police Department and the Eugene Fire and Emergency Services Department ~~to meet national staffing standards,~~ 3) Increase workforce development and job creation, 4) Rebuilding of our

infrastructure, and 5) Public health and social safety net, which included full benefits for veterans, sufficient funding for police and fire services to meet national standards, workforce development, infrastructure reconstruction, and the public health and safety net, *and support for environmental clean-up and alternative energy programs.*

Councilor Poling agreed with Councilor Pryor about the turn the discussion had taken. Speaking to Councilor Brown's remarks about the degree of unanimity among councilors, Councilor Poling disagreed. He said the council was unanimous in its belief the country needed to end both wars, bring the troops home, and redirect the funding spent on the work to domestic priorities.

Roll call vote: The amendment to the motion passed, 7:1; Councilor Taylor voting no.

Roll call vote: The amended motion passed, 7:1; Councilor Farr voting no.

**4. ACTION:
Adoption of Resolution 5036 Adopting a Supplemental Budget; Making Appropriations for the City of Eugene for the Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2010, and Ending June 30, 2011**

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to adopt Resolution 5036 adopting the Supplemental Budget; making appropriations for the City of Eugene for the Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2010, and ending June 30, 2011. Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting of the Eugene City Council and convened a meeting of the Eugene Urban Renewal Agency.

**5. ACTION:
Adoption of Resolution 1060 Adopting a Supplemental Budget; Making Appropriations for the Urban Renewal Agency for the Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2010, and Ending June 30, 2011**

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to adopt Resolution 1060 adopting the FY11 June Supplemental Budget; making appropriations for the Urban Renewal Agency for the Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 2010, and Ending June 30, 2011. Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting of the Eugene Urban Renewal Agency and convened a meeting of the Eugene City Council.

**6. ACTION:
Resolution 5037 Electing to Receive State Revenue Sharing Funds Pursuant to Section 221.770 of Oregon Revised Statutes; Resolution 5038 Certifying that the City of Eugene Provides the Municipal Services Required by the Oregon Revised Statutes Section 221.760 in Order to Receive State Shared Revenues; and Resolution 5039 Adopting the Budget, Making Appropriations, Determining, Levying, and Categorizing the Annual Ad Valorem Property Tax Levy for the City of Eugene for the Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2011, and Ending June 30, 2012**

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to adopt Resolution 5037 electing to receive State shared revenue sharing funds pursuant to Section 221.770 of Oregon Revised Statutes.

City Manager Ruiz acknowledged the work of the Budget Committee and staff. He believed the budget reflected the organization and community's values.

Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to adopt Resolution 5038 certifying that the City of Eugene provides the municipal services required by Oregon Revised Statutes Section 221.760. Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Councilor Clark, seconded by Councilor Poling, moved to direct the City Manager to amend the FY12 City of Eugene budget to fund 10 additional jail beds in FY12 (35 total including 15 and 10 currently funded with Lane County and Springfield respectively) by using unspent FY11 funds in the Police Department budget, and to fund up to (at the City Manager's discretion) a total of \$450,000 to be split between FY12 and FY13 budgets for gang prevention initiatives and/or Buckley House. In addition, the City Manager is requested to consider including funding for 25 jail beds (currently 15 with Lane County and 10 with Springfield) in the FY13 proposed budget.

Councilor Clark recalled the action the Budget Committee had taken to fund the items in question out of the Eugene Water & Electric Board Contribution in Lieu of Taxes (CILT). City Manager Ruiz had suggested the shift in funding to preserve the CILT funding and ensure it went to the City's Beginning Marginal Working Capital (BMWC).

Councilor Zelenka liked the concept in the motion but was not comfortable with the funding proposed for gang prevention. He did not know what was being proposed and advocated for delay until the council had a comprehensive work session.

Councilor Zelenka, seconded by Councilor Taylor, moved to amend the motion by deleting the phrase "and to fund up to (at the City Manager's discretion) a total of \$450,000 to be split between FY12 and FY13 budgets for gang prevention activities and/or Buckley House."

Councilor Brown supported the amendment, pointing out the council could fund gang prevention at a later time. He did not have enough information at this time to support the expenditure.

Councilor Clark said he made the motion at the request of the City Manager. He acknowledged the council had not yet heard a presentation on local gang activities. He had wanted the council to hear a presentation on the topic on June 13 but was asked not to go forward with that.

Mayor Piercy asked if Chief Kerns requested the money for gang prevention. City Manager Ruiz deferred to Chief Kerns and recalled discussion of the topic at the Budget Committee. In response to the mayor's question, Chief Kerns said the Eugene Police Department did not have a fully developed plan regarding gang prevention but could draw on other models. The department was meeting with representatives of the schools and other police agencies to discuss more focused strategies. He did not yet have an idea of cost but believed it could be accomplished within the current budget.

Councilor Ortiz supported the original motion. She was unhappy the council had yet to hear a presentation on gang activity. She said the Police Commission heard a presentation on the topic and viewed a video filmed in her neighborhood of a gang member “jump in.” As the area’s councilor she was unhappy not to have heard about such activity occurring in her neighborhood. She wanted to ensure the department had money to implement whatever solution might be needed.

Councilor Farr determined from City Manager Ruiz that if the motion did not pass, the City would fund the expenditure in the manner approved by the Budget Committee.

Councilor Zelenka did not support the motion because Chief Kerns had not requested funding for gang prevention in the budget process and he was unclear as to what was involved in such an initiative. He wanted to know more before the council funded it.

Councilor Zelenka determined that Councilor Taylor did not object to a friendly amendment to the motion to amend that read “As soon as possible, the council will hold a work session on a gang prevention initiative.”

Roll call vote: The amendment to the motion failed, 5:3; councilors Taylor, Zelenka, and Brown voting yes.

Roll call vote: The motion passed, 6:2; councilors Zelenka and Brown voting no.

Councilor Clark, seconded by Councilor Poling, moved to direct the City Manager to amend the FY12 City of Eugene budget to restore the engine company positions at Fire Station #2 by using \$317,000 of unanticipated EWEB CILT moneys and to schedule, within six months, a work session on solving the ambulance transportation problem and to start with the Joint Elected Officials-developed solutions and other proposed staff solutions for that work session.

Councilor Clark emphasized the seriousness of the ambulance transportation funding problem and the importance of solving it. He thought the department’s proposal was a good start but the loss of the company was too much for him to accept. He wanted to retain the company and find a solution to the ambulance transportation problem this year.

Mayor Piercy appreciated the intention of the motion but was concerned that it would not solve the long-term financial issue that existed.

Councilor Poling supported the motion because it made it clear the funding was a “band-aid” fix. He supported the use of one-time moneys in this case. He thanked Councilor Clark for his willingness to work with staff and other councilors toward the common good on this and the previous issue. He thought his solution was a good one.

Councilor Pryor expressed appreciation to the City Manager for his continual reminders that the council should not use one-time money for ongoing expenses. He agreed that the motion represented a one-time fix that required a future structural discussion. With the expectation of a future work session on the issue, he supported the motion as a way to buy the community more time. Councilor Pryor supported the City Manager in his continued endeavors to find a long-term structural solution to the problem of ambulance transportation funding.

Councilor Brown did not support the motion because of the one-time nature of the funding. He felt one-time money should be used for one-time projects, such as rebuilding City Hall and seismic upgrades of publicly owned buildings. He agreed the funding represented a band-aid solution.

Councilor Farr also expressed concern about the one-time nature of the expenditure. He determined from Fire Chief Randy Groves that the three positions proposed for elimination were Captain 1 positions. The department planned to shuffle positions to ensure maximum coverage.

Councilor Ortiz supported the motion. She said that she and Councilor Clark had spent considerable time working on the issue of ambulance transportation funding. She understood Chief Groves' rationale for how he planned to implement the necessary 1.8 percent reduction mandated by the manager, but she considered that to be a band-aid as well. She said the conversation about ambulance transportation funding needed to be finished, but she was only one person on a council of eight. She thought there needed to be more understanding of the problem that existed, its cost, and its impact on the community.

Councilor Zelenka acknowledged the proposed budget did not address the need for ambulances that existed. He asked if the council would be able to realize the savings from the proposed reduction in the future. City Manager Ruiz did not think the savings could come from the same source.

Councilor Zelenka asked how the City could solve the ambulance transportation problem. City Manager Ruiz said the funding was a top priority in the City's Multi-Year Financial Plan. The City had to either find the money somewhere in the General Fund or a new revenue source. Chief Groves recalled that the Ambulance Transport Task Force indicated support for another revenue source.

Councilor Taylor did not want to spend one-time money and wanted to think more about the CILT money before the council spent it. However, she did not think the department was a good place to make cuts. She determined from Chief Groves that if the funding was not restored the proposed reductions would move forward on July 1. Restoration of the funding meant the City would retain an engine company at Fire Station 2. City Manager Ruiz pointed out there was also the possibility the positions could be restored in the future.

Chief Groves confirmed, in response to a follow-up question from Councilor Taylor, that response times would be increased at an unknown rate, and response reliability would decrease.

Mayor Piercy supported the motion because of importance of the firefighting service, and pointed out the City Council was talking about an existing service, not a new service. She did not want to spend CILT money on new services given the importance of closing the funding gap.

Councilor Farr preferred to pass the manager's recommended budget and do data collection and analysis over the next six months to determine the impact of the reduction and the appropriate Fire Station 2 response structure. He appreciated the hard work it took for the department to achieve a 1.8 percent budget reduction.

At Councilor Farr's request, Chief Groves described the different responses made possible by different company and apparatus combinations.

Councilor Clark agreed with Mayor Piercy's remarks. He believed the last service the City should cut was first responders. He suggested the result of the manager's recommendation to eliminate an engine company would mean that placing a crew on the fourth ambulance would make that crew unavailable for the other apparatus. He suggested the council needed to consider whether there were other reductions that might be more appropriate than reducing the number of firefighters.

At the request of Councilor Zelenka, Chief Groves reviewed the percentage of calls for service in the Whiteaker neighborhood, reporting that 31.9 percent of the engine company's responses were in the neighborhood and 14.2 percent of the truck company's responses were in the neighborhood. Both apparatus would remain if the staff recommendation was adopted but only one three-person fire crew would remain. The ambulance would be staffed by firefighter paramedics. The engine and ladder truck would remain; the fire crew would take one apparatus or the other following policy guidelines now being developed.

Councilor Farr indicated support for the manager's original proposal and opposition to the motion. He clarified the details of secondary coverage with Chief Groves.

Councilor Ortiz supported the motion because response times across the community would fall if the City adopted the manager's recommendation. She described how the fire response system worked to illustrate that loss of coverage. She advocated for additional discussion of the ambulance transportation funding problem and said it should be a council priority. Councilor Ortiz did not think the council understood the urgency of the challenge facing the department.

Roll call vote: The motion passed, 6:2; councilors Brown and Farr voting no.

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to adopt Resolution 5039 adopting the budget, making appropriations, determining, levying, and categorizing the annual ad valorem property tax levy for the City of Eugene for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2011, and ending June 30, 2012, including the following amendments: 1) reduce the Central Services Department budget by \$650,000; 2) increase the Fire Department budget by \$317,000, and 3) decrease beginning working capital by \$333,000. Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting of the Eugene City Council and convened a meeting of the Eugene Urban Renewal Agency.

**7. ACTION:
Adoption of Resolution 1061 of the Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Eugene Adopting the Budget, Making Appropriations, and Declaring the Amount of Tax to be Certified for the Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2011, and Ending June 30, 2012**

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to adopt Resolution 1061 of the Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Eugene adopting the budget and making appropriations for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2010, and Ending June 30, 2011.

Councilor Brown observed that the financial summary for the Riverfront Research District indicated it held beginning working capital of slightly more than \$4 million and anticipated revenues of slightly under \$1 million. The budget indicated that \$250,000 would be spent on planning and development, which was 20 percent of the district's income. He asked if the City planned on building anything in the district in FY12. Finance Director Sue Cutsogeorge said no.

Councilor Brown said the Riverfront Research District exemplified some of his objections to urban renewal. He said the community had many pressing service needs and the district was spending money on what was essentially overhead. He believed the council needed to reconsider the use of urban renewal

when the City's two districts sunsetted. He advocated for project-specific urban renewal districts with broad public support demonstrated through the ballot box.

Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting of the Eugene Urban Renewal Agency and convened a meeting of the Eugene City Council.

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to extend the meeting for 15 minutes. Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

**8. ACTION:
An Ordinance Concerning Amendment of Animal Regulations Regarding Service Animals**

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to adopt Council 5051, an ordinance concerning amendment of animal regulations regarding service animals and amending sections 4.330, 4.335, 4.340, 4.395, 4.410, 4.427, 4.435, and 4.440 of the Eugene Code, 1971. Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

**9. ACTION:
Appointments to Boards, Commissions, and Committees**

Budget Committee

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to appoint Ken Beeson to Position 1 on the Budget Committee for a three-year term beginning July 1, 2011, ending on June 30, 2014. Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to appoint Chelsea Clinton to Position 2 on the Budget Committee for a three-year term beginning July 1, 2011, ending on June 30, 2014. Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to appoint Laura Illig to Position 5 on the Budget Committee, an unexpired term ending on June 30, 2013. Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to appoint Mark Rust to Position 7 on the Budget Committee for a three-year term beginning July 1, 2011, ending on June 30, 2014. Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Human Rights Commission

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to appoint Richie Weinman to Position 1 on the Human Rights Commission for a three-year term beginning July 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2014. Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to reappoint Martha Fish to Position 2 on the Human Rights Commission for a three-year term beginning July 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2014. Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to reappoint Ken Neubeck to Position 3 on the Human Rights Commission for a three-year term beginning July 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2014. Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to reappoint Ann Marie Lemire to Position 5 on the Human Rights Commission for a three-year term beginning July 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2014. Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to reappoint Elizabeth Andrade to Position 6 on the Human Rights Commission for a three-year term beginning July 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2014. Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to appoint Andrew Thomson to Position 9 on the Human Rights Commission, an unexpired term ending on June 30, 2012. Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to appoint Rod Buck to Position 11 on the Human Rights Commission, an unexpired term ending on June 30, 2012. Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to appoint Ron McMillin to Position 13 on the Human Rights Commission, an unexpired term ending on June 30, 2012. Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest
City Recorder

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)