

EUGENE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY



Approval of Council Minutes

Meeting Date: October 24, 2011
Department: City Manager's Office
www.eugene-or.gov

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

ISSUE STATEMENT

This is a routine item to approve City Council minutes.

SUGGESTED MOTION

Move to approve the minutes of the September 26, 2011, Work Session, September 28, 2011, Work Session, October 5, 2011, Boards and Commissions Interviews.

ATTACHMENTS

- A. September 26, 2011, Work Session
- B. September 28, 2011, Work Session
- C. October 5, 2011, Boards and Commissions Interviews

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

September 26, 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 September 26, 2011, work session of the Eugene City Council to order.

**A. WORK SESSION:
Annual Meeting with Police Commission**

The council was joined by Police Commission Chair Juan Carlos Valle and Vice Chair Tamera Miller. Police Commissioners James Manning and Jim Garner and Eugene Police Chief Pete Kerns and Police Commission Analyst Carter Hawley were also present.

Ms. Miller reviewed the commission's 2011 work plan and highlighted the Public Outreach & Resource Committee's work on the closure of the Monroe Street Station and the Policy Screening & Review Committee's policy review work.

Mr. Valle presented the commission's proposed work plan for fiscal year 2012 and highlighted the hate crimes conference, community survey, and anticipated policy review and outreach efforts. He requested council approval to continue the commission's two current committees and to form a third committee to design the hate crimes conference.

Mayor Piercy, a member of the Police Commission, said commissioners worked hard and were engaged in their work. She found the meetings interesting, particularly the chief's monthly report.

Mr. Clark, who was also a member of the commission, agreed with Mayor Piercy about the commission's hard work. He commended the balanced, effective, and thorough work plan and the commission's continuing ability to implement its work plans. He was proud to be a commission member and thanked Mr. Valle and Ms. Miller for their leadership.

Ms. Ortiz was pleased to hear the commission would review the domestic violence policy. She determined from Mr. Valle that the Eugene Police Department (EPD) would pay for the community survey. Ms. Ortiz hoped the commission sought input from those who were hard to reach using typical survey methods, and in particular hoped to have feedback from youth and the homeless population. Mr. Valle welcomed suggestions for the survey and noted that the City would contract with a professional firm to prepare the survey. Ms. Miller added that the initial survey would be a telephone survey but the questions would be asked through as many venues as the commission could find.

Speaking to the subject of the survey, Mayor Piercy pointed out that some of the people the commission wanted to hear from might have to be surveyed where they could be found, such as in parks and at social service agencies.

Mr. Farr shared the concern expressed by Ms. Ortiz about the need to reach out to those who were not normally surveyed. He suggested that Human Rights Commission could be a conduit to the hard-to-reach members of the community.

Mr. Zelenka acknowledged the long-time service of former Police Commissioners Joe Alsup and John Ahlen and thanked them for their contributions. He requested a copy of the presentation the commission heard on marijuana.

Responding to a question from Mr. Zelenka about the commission's plans as they related to street gangs, Mr. Valle indicated the commission would continue to investigate the issue from a policy perspective. City Manager Jon Ruiz anticipated the council would hold a work session on street gangs later in the year. Mr. Zelenka asked for more information about the work session the commission planned to hold on jail beds. Mr. Valle said the commission planned to research the issue and determine if there was any follow-up needed. Mr. Zelenka was happy to hear of the proposed hate crimes conference and asked when that would occur. Mr. Valle anticipated the conference would occur in about two years. The exact date was not known but a planning committee that included members of the Police Commission and Human Rights Commission would be formed. Mr. Zelenka recommended the two commissions affiliate with a national association to put on the conference.

Mr. Brown noted his own past service on the Police Commission and commended the commission for its careful research, frank and open discussions, and willingness to take on contentious issues. He also thanked former commissioners Ahlen and Alsup for their service. He supported the work plan and emphasized the importance of the commission's policy work. He looked forward to the results of the survey. He thought the survey would be useful to both the department and residents.

Mr. Brown determined from Mr. Valle that the commission was currently working on the department's search and seizure policy.

Mr. Clark also commended the service of Mr. Alsup and Mr. Ahlen and said they had taken lead roles on some of the commission's most difficult issues. He reported that the commission heard a presentation on street gang issues earlier in the year and he had been surprised by the level of local gang activity. He thought it important that the council held a work session on the subject and looked forward to its discussion.

Responding to a question from Ms. Ortiz, Ms. Miller confirmed that the commission continued to revisit the results of its policy work to see how things were working. She recalled that the commission revisited the taser policy in 2010 and said it would revisit the domestic violence policy in the coming year.

Speaking to the issue of street gangs, Mayor Piercy said concerns had been expressed that certain groups would be perceived as members of street gangs and she wanted the council to be cognizant of that concern.

Ms. Ortiz hoped the council heard the presentation on street gangs provided to the Police Commission and discussed the issue thoroughly.

Speaking to Mayor Piercy's remarks, Mr. Valle said that Chief Kerns had been reaching out to different groups to hear their concerns about the City's approaches to street gangs. He believed those discussions were just the beginning of the City's outreach on the topic.

Ms. Taylor, seconded by Mr. Brown, moved to approve the Police Commission's Fiscal Year 2012 Work Plan. The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

**B. WORK SESSION:
Ward Redistricting**

Division Manager Keli Osborn of the City Manager's Office and Jason Dedrick, Lauren Hammond, and Sarah Zaleski of the Planning and Development Department were present for the item. Ms. Osborn, Ms. Hammond, and Mr. Dedrick led the council through a PowerPoint presentation entitled *Ward Redistricting*. The presentation outlined the principles driving redistricting, summarized past council deliberations and public input, and provided an overview of the two redistricting scenarios and some variations on the scenarios. Councilors asked questions clarifying the information presented.

Ms. Osborn requested council direction regarding its preferred scenario. She anticipated the council would adopt a scenario in October.

Mayor Piercy solicited additional council questions.

Ms. Taylor thought downtown should be inside the boundaries of Ward 1 and that the Amazon neighborhood should be included in Ward 2 because the residents in the area associated with each other and shopped at the same places. She believed where people shopped was relevant to the question of ward boundaries.

Mayor Piercy observed that in the best case scenario the council would never split up a neighborhood association with ward boundaries but that was not always possible. That issue was the subject of much of the input the City received.

Ms. Ortiz liked the boundaries for wards 6 and 7 as depicted in Scenario 1C.

Referring to Scenario 1D, Mr. Zelenka said he requested staff prepare the scenario, which included the Amazon neighborhood in his ward, Ward 3, because of the common issues faced by that neighborhood and other neighborhoods in his ward created by their proximity to the University of Oregon. He believed the neighborhood had a natural affiliation with Ward 3.

Mr. Zelenka suggested the new realignment of the Cal Young worked best under Scenario 2 and solicited comment from Mr. Clark and Mr. Poling.

Mr. Pryor expressed a preference for Scenario 1 with some adjustments.

Responding to a question from Mr. Poling about the evolution of the scenarios, Ms. Osborn explained that Scenario 1C was derived from Scenario 1A and 1B and Scenario 1D was based on the addition of the Amazon neighborhood to Ward 3. Mr. Dedrick suggested a next logical step would be Scenario 1E, which he anticipated would be based on a combination of scenarios 1C and 1D.

In response to Mr. Zelenka's question, Mr. Poling reviewed the division of the neighborhood association as it related to the scenarios under consideration and suggested there would not be much of a change of representation. Mr. Clark agreed with Mr. Pryor and anticipated the council would see a Scenario 1E that reflected some of the adjustments discussed. Speaking to Mr. Zelenka's question, he believed that Scenario 1 worked best with the realignment.

Mr. Farr was pleased with the non-politicized nature of the redistricting process.

Mr. Brown preferred Scenario 1C because it kept the Friendly neighborhood inside a single ward. He suggested Scenario 1D could change that. He also suggested that Civic Stadium be retained in Ward 1 because it would keep the stadium aligned with its communities of interest. He said he would not object to seeing a Scenario 1E.

Ms. Taylor did not think there was anything wrong with a neighborhood association being represented by multiple councilors. She favored Scenario 1C.

Mr. Zelenka suggested that Scenario 1D could be modified by the addition of Civic Stadium to Ward 1 because it would not change the population numbers significantly.

Ms. Osborn indicated that staff would revise the scenarios in accordance with the discussion and share the results soon.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting at 6:40 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

September 28, 2011
Noon

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

In the absence of Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy, Council President Betty Taylor called the September 28, 2011, work session of the Eugene City Council to order.

**A. WORK SESSION:
Envision Eugene: Housing and Industrial Lands**

Planning Director Lisa Gardner and Associate Planners Heather O'Donnell and Jason Dedrick joined the council for the item and Ms. O'Donnell led the council through a PowerPoint presentation entitled *Envision Eugene: Project Update for City Council Work Session, September 28, 2011*. The first presentation on housing highlighted the current ratio of 61:39 in the mix of single-family and multi-family housing and the key role the ratio played in determining housing need. The presentation included a review of the data that provided the basis for deciding the mix, which comprised reports and statistics, statewide trends, State planning law, and consistency with the Seven Pillars of Envision Eugene. The presentation also included information about Eugene housing trends as they related to household demographics as well as statistics about housing affordability that emphasized the lack of housing affordability in Eugene, particularly for low-income households. The presentation posited that an increase in the ratio of multi-family housing would help the State to meet the goals of its planning framework.

Ms. O'Donnell then shared information about the trends in other Oregon communities that indicated those communities were moving toward a higher ratio of multi-family housing and contrasted Eugene's existing housing mix ratio to the ratios recommended by EcoNorthwest, the Housing Mix Subcommittee, the Technical Resource Group, the Planning Commission, the Sustainability Commission, and the Housing Policy Board.

Ms. O'Donnell suggested that the Seven Pillars supported planning for multi-family housing and specifically cited the pillars related to housing affordability and compact development/transportation.

Ms. O'Donnell said most of Eugene residents who earned less than 80 percent of the median family income were typically renters, were typically cost-burdened, and typically lived in multi-family housing. She believed it was reasonable to assume new multi-family housing could be built more affordably than new single-family housing. The staff analysis indicated the construction of multi-family housing now would increase multi-family housing stock overall in the future as well as increasing the amount of aged stock was typically more affordable than new housing. An increase in multi-family housing in conjunction with other strategies could help towards the deficit in the stock of affordable housing.

Increasing the stock of multi-family housing would also help meet the City's goal for more compact development and was a key component of the transportation corridor strategy.

Ms. O'Donnell shared that the staff believed the information just discussed was leading Eugene toward planning for a 55:45 housing mix ratio, reporting that this mix would result in 8,250 single-family units and 6,750 multi-family units, shifting the mix of new housing by about six percent, and shifting the overall housing mix by about one percent.

Ms. Gardner emphasized that Eugene's current housing mix had been the same for last 20 years and was not meeting the needs of many residents. Eugene's high housing costs and low incomes were a significant factor in the recommendation. She anticipated that given existing trends, the gap in housing affordability could grow even wider without action. Ms. Gardner believed the 55:45 mix was reasonable given it shifted the overall mix by only one percent. While the change might move development patterns toward higher densities, she did not think those higher densities would be felt in existing neighborhoods. Speaking to suggestions staff's heard that a more aggressive approach was needed, Ms. Gardner did not think a more substantial shift was justified by the market, and pointed out the City's incremental approach gave it the opportunity to revisit the issue and adjust the ratio if needed.

Ms. Gardner reviewed next steps, which included contact with property owners of the areas required to study first if we need even one acre of expansion, public outreach, and work continuing to refine the housing need with a City Council work session in November.

Mr. Clark determined from Ms. O'Donnell that the housing ratio of 61:39 reflected the ratio in 2007 and served as the baseline for the Eugene Comprehensive Lands Assessment (ECLA). Mr. Clark suggested that 2001-2007 represented a "boom time" for housing construction and had resulted in a single-family housing ratio that was closer to 68 percent. He asked why the ratio was not more current. Ms. O'Donnell said that the ECLA technical advisory committee examined that issue because the State required Eugene to consider the years 2001-2008 and consider the average, which was about 69 percent single-family. The technical advisory committee had decided to use 2007 housing mix as the baseline year because the ratio for 2007 more closely mirrored the housing ratio of the last 20 years.

Mr. Clark expressed interest in knowing if the impact of Eugene's decision regarding its housing ratio would result in a higher percentage of single-family housing in nearby communities such as Veneta and Junction City and if it had an impact on their demographic mix, particularly as it related to the percentage of families. He also questioned why the basis for the decision did not include an economic impact analysis. Ms. O'Donnell indicated that staff's efforts were focused on planning for Eugene and the State did not require the City to take into account what was occurring in other communities.

Mr. Clark agreed about the need for more affordable housing but suggested that required a land surplus rather than a small land supply.

Responding to a concern raised by Mr. Farr about the fact that Eugene's housing costs were among the highest in the country, Ms. Gardner emphasized the importance of a mix of strategies based on the Seven Pillars to accomplish the goals of the process.

Speaking to Mr. Clark's remarks about the land supply, Ms. Gardner said her research indicated that there was currently a surplus of development lots in the community.

Mr. Farr emphasized the importance of a continuing focus on job creation. He believed the City needed to consider all the factors that made housing in Eugene more expensive because he did not think merely

aging the housing stock was going to make it affordable. He suggested that making housing more affordable to build was the best way to create affordable housing. Mr. Far also believed the City needed to consider where people wanted to live.

Mr. Brown noted that those residents aged 45-65 were the fastest growing segment of the population and they would start to reach age 75 in ten years, which coincided with the age homeownership rates started to decline. That suggested to him that there would be significant turnover in the ownership of single-family homes in 2021, and he asked if staff had quantified the number of houses that might be available. Ms. O'Donnell indicated she could provide that information.

Mr. Brown asked why whether multi-family housing will always be subsidized and suggested that the council receive a brief presentation on why Eugene lacked unsubsidized affordable housing.

Mr. Pryor emphasized the importance of taking a balanced approach to the issue of the housing mix, which required the council to consider all factors, including demographics, markets, livability, neighborhoods, and land supply. He did not believe he could support a figure for single-family housing that was less than 55 percent. He said residents were very concerned about the impact of the council's decision on their neighborhoods, and he did not want to sacrifice them to achieve more density.

Mr. Zelenka indicated support for the staff presentation and 55:45 mix.

Ms. Ortiz also supported the 55:45 housing mix. Speaking to Mr. Farr's concerns, Ms. Ortiz suggested that many factors came into consideration when a person purchased a house, and a person might choose to live in Veneta for the quality of life there even if the housing was more expensive.

Mr. Poling agreed with Mr. Pryor about the need to consider neighborhood livability. Speaking to Ms. Ortiz's remarks, he observed that he worked with people who would like to live in Eugene but lived in outlying communities because they could not afford housing in Eugene. He believed that Eugene was creating a situation that caused outmigration to such communities and increased vehicle miles traveled. He said that was counterproductive. He suggested that Eugene could add land for single-family development that could be maintained in its present use for some time if single-family development did not occur. Mr. Poling was not yet convinced of the merits of the proposed ratio and looked forward to hearing more public input. Whatever the mix, he hoped it had enough flexibility to respond to market demands.

Speaking to the issue of neighborhood livability, Ms. Gardner again reminded the council of the Seven Pillars, which were intended to help preserve the neighborhood character. She recalled that the City's density strategy was focused primarily on transit corridors and mixed-use areas.

Mr. Clark agreed with Mr. Pryor about the importance of balance. He reiterated the importance of considering factors outside the community's boundaries. He pointed out that schools in Eugene closed in the past year while schools in outlying communities were growing. Mr. Clark suggested that City policy was at odds with the market. Eugene had been encouraging dense development while the market demand was for affordable single-family housing, so the market was sending people to communities where housing was less expensive because of lower land costs. He asked why the answer to more affordable housing in Eugene was a call for more multi-family housing. Mr. Clark wanted to know how Eugene could decrease its land costs to be more competitive with those communities. He suggested information about demographics in nearby communities, their land costs, and the rates that single-family development occurred would be instructive.

Mr. Farr said the cost of land in Eugene meant that housing was too expensive to develop for many residents to buy. He also recalled that in the past, homebuilding had been a driver of economic prosperity, and reducing the number of single-family dwellings that could be built negatively affected that part of the economy.

Mr. Farr observed that Junction City's urban growth boundary was at Meadowview Road, very proximate to Eugene. That community welcomed growth and would need to provide more municipal services and infrastructure to its residents so they could get to their jobs in Eugene.

Mr. Brown reminded the council that the City was going through the process because it was a State requirement. He said that Eugene used to be part of regional planning compact and if that was still the case he doubted the council would be having the discussion because there was room in Springfield for more housing and industrial development. He regretted the move away from regional planning.

Ms. Taylor asked how the City could reduce land costs. She expressed a preference for a 40:60 housing ratio because she believed the country was running out of land and it was important to save forested and agriculture land for future generations. She suggested the City consider revising its regulations to make it easier for developers to build multiple-family housing. While it was not her personal preference, Ms. Taylor believed that many residents preferred multiple-family housing. She suggested if the City Council subsidized firms that paid low-wages it would increase the number of people who needed affordable housing.

Mr. Dedrick then provided a project update on industrial lands. He reminded the council that it directed staff to analyze lands outside the UGB for their development potential. He shared a series of maps showing the locations of potential development sites and described the sites in question and staff's property owner contacts. He concluded by saying that there had been considerable property owner interest and staff would continue to work with the property owners and refine the site analyses.

Responding to a question from Mr. Brown, City Attorney Emily Jerome said in order for the City to be able to count industrial land in Goshen toward its identified need, it would have to bring the land inside its urban growth boundary, which was impossible due to its location. It would require formal regional planning to be able to count that land toward the need.

Ms. Taylor adjourned the meeting at 1:21 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

October 5, 2011
5:30 p.m.

COUNCILORS PRESENT: George Brown, George Poling, Chris Pryor.

COUNCILORS ABSENT: Betty Taylor, Andrea Ortiz, Mike Clark, Alan Zelenka, Pat Farr.

Council Vice President George Brown called the City Council meeting to order.

A. BOARDS AND COMISSIONS INTERVIEWS

The City Council interviewed David McLean, David Sohm, John Jaworski, Sara Mason, and Mark Baker for vacant positions on the Eugene Planning Commission. Each candidate was asked the following questions:

- 1. What key issues would you hope to address as a member of the Planning Commission?*
- 2. The Eugene Planning Commission often works on lengthy processes and decisions as a group. Describe your prior skills and experience that will assist you in working with the Planning Commission.*
- 3. Please describe how you would contribute to the diversity of views on the Planning Commission. In what ways would you seek to bring the perspectives of under-represented members of our community in the land use planning and decision process?*
- 4. The Planning Commission must often consider and balance complex issues when reviewing planning documents and making land use decisions. As an example, the City is in the process of determining how to accommodate 34,000 new residents over the next 20 years. In your opinion, what are the most important factors for the commission to consider in this effort?*

Mr. Brown adjourned the meeting at 6:47 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest
City Recorder

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)