

EUGENE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY



Approval of Council Minutes

Meeting Date: November 28, 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, Regular Meeting, and October 17, 2011, Work Session.

ATTACHMENTS

- A. September 26, 2011, Regular Meeting
- B. October 17, 2011, Work Session

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

September 26, 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 September 26, 2011, regular meeting of the Eugene City Council to order.

1. PUBLIC FORUM

Mayor Piercy reviewed the rules of the Public Forum.

Kristin Taylor, TGB Architects and Planners, 132 East Broadway, Suite 200, represented Guard Publishing, which owned land on Chad Drive currently zoned I-1, Campus Industrial. She supported council initiation of a land use code amendment to revise the I-1 zone to remove the zone’s prohibition on clinics, which was item 2C on the Consent Calendar. Ms. Taylor spoke to the frustration felt by many owners of I-1 property who found it very difficult to develop their land due to the limited allowed uses and restrictive development standards in the zone. She suggested those limitations and restrictions were outdated. Guard Publishing had spent thousands of dollars on land use processes, including going through the City’s planned unit development (PUD) process voluntarily. Four years had passed since the PUD was approved and Guard Publishing was still unable to find a buyer or tenant for its land. She believed the proposed land use code amendment was an excellent opportunity to open up viable sites to development such as the proposed Veterans Administration Clinic and a first step in updating the zone to reflect the current market.

Josef Siekiel-Zdzienicki, 1025 Taylor Street, urged the council to communicate with the public about the potential loss of right-of-way associated with the establishment of transportation corridors. He recommended that the council hold public forums and perhaps even hold a vote. Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki said the City had “grand plans” it was not sharing with those most affected.

Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki recalled the Free Speech Movement and suggested that the council should keep that movement in mind when considering the Sign Code issues raised by opponents of EMX.

Cynthia Kokis, 2465 Jefferson Street, expressed concern that many Eugene buses did not operate past 7:45 p.m., making it more challenging for her to attend evening meetings. She also expressed concern about automobile-pedestrian conflicts and the lack of proper signage at many crosswalks. She suggested that Eugene should work more to be like Ashland, where drivers approached pedestrians more slowly. Ms. Kokis believed that automobiles had top priority in Eugene and it was hazardous to be a pedestrian in Eugene. She suggested pedestrian walk lights were much too short. She advocated for a driver education

and enforcement campaign to ensure drivers were aware of the laws governing crosswalks and suffered consequences for violating the laws.

Gary Jenkins, 90939 Prairie Road, called for the City to establish a policy that mandated polygraph tests for police officers in situations where there was doubt about what happened. He believed that would help establish trust in the police and could stop an officer from being untruthful. He noted his family's encounter with the police and maintained that Chief Kerns violated the law when he stated to the media that his officers were attacked by Mr. Jenkins' family when it was Mr. Jenkins' family who was attacked. He said that he still had not heard from the Police Auditor and asked what the community could do to make the police accountable for their actions.

Mayor Piercy closed the Public Forum and called on the council for questions and comments.

Councilor Ortiz shared with Mr. Jenkins that the City would have to bargain with the police union to administer polygraph tests to police officers. She said the council had no authority to institute such a policy. That authority lay with the City Manager. She noted that she had initially become involved with civic matters because of her interactions with the police and her interest in police transparency. She expressed regret for the trouble Mr. Jenkins' family had experienced.

Councilor Taylor shared Ms. Kokis' concerns about pedestrian safety and agreed with her about the short times provided for pedestrians to cross the street. She wanted the City to focus on enforcing the law so motorists were more cautious.

2. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Approval of Tentative Working Agenda**
- B. Adoption of Resolution 5042 Authorizing the Sale of General Obligation Refunding Bonds**
- C. Initiation of Land Use Code Amendment to Facilitate the Siting of an Outpatient Clinic Operated by the United States Department of Veterans Affairs**

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to approve the items on the Consent Calendar.

Councilor Zelenka pulled Item B. Councilor Ortiz pulled item C.

Roll call vote: The motion, with the exception of items B and C, passed unanimously, 8:0.

Councilor Zelenka commended City staff for the action reflected in the resolution, explaining that the City was cashing in some of its older bonds with higher interest rates to take advantage of current low interest rates. The action would save the City a substantial amount of money.

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to approve Item B on the Consent Calendar. Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Speaking to Item C, Councilor Ortiz suggested the council's initiation of a land use amendment to revise the I-1 zone demonstrated that Eugene was more "open for business." She hoped the proposal worked for the affected property owners and attracted businesses.

Councilor Poling reminded those present and the viewing public that the item merely initiated a land use amendment process.

Responding to a question from Councilor Zelenka, Ms. Hansen clarified that clinics of any type were prohibited in the I-1 zone. Staff proposed to add clinics that satisfied the definition of government services as an allowed use. Councilor Zelenka said it appeared the changes contemplated were quite narrow.

Councilor Zelenka reported he had learned that the Veterans Administration clinic and buildings would be leased and thus subject to taxation.

Mayor Piercy referred to Kristin Taylor's testimony and suggested the changes being proposed were more narrow than desired by some property owners. Ms. Hansen concurred. She said Ms. Taylor had shared her concerns with staff and staff had proposed some changes to the I-1 zone through Envision Eugene to provide more flexibility. Mayor Piercy recognized that the City was attempting to accommodate the Veterans Administration Clinic and did not want to pass an opportunity to fix other problems. However, she was satisfied that staff appeared to be working on those issues.

Councilor Poling did not want to get lost in the politics of the land use amendment given that the goal of the amendment was to help give the Veterans Administration as many options as possible so it could construct a new clinic to serve local veterans.

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to approve Item C on the Consent Calendar. Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

**3. ACTION:
Ordinance Concerning Fire & EMS Response Fees to Out-of-Area Users and Adding Section 2.610 to the Eugene Code, 1971**

Deputy Fire Chief Mark Walker was present to answer questions.

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to adopt Council Bill 5054 concerning Fire & EMS response fees to out-of-area users and adding Section 2.610 in the Eugene Code, 1971.

Councilor Zelenka expressed support for the fee. At his request, Mayor Piercy read the response to an e-mail of inquiry she sent to Fire Chief Randy Groves asking about other units of government that charged first-response fees that indicated those included several Lane County communities and fire districts as well as other Oregon fire districts.

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

**4. ACTION:
An Ordinance Concerning Multiple-Unit Property Tax Exemptions and Amending Sections 2.945 and 2.947 of the Eugene Code, 1971**

Senior Planner Nan Laurence of the Planning and Development Department was present for the item.

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to adopt Council Bill 5055 adopting a new sunset date for the Multiple-Unit Property Tax Exemption program in the Downtown Plan area.

Councilor Ortiz determined from Ms. Laurence that there were two current applications for the MUPTE; one had been approved and needed to be extended, and the other had not been considered because there was insufficient time to build the project under the current timelines.

Councilor Taylor indicated she would vote for the motion because the exemption was focused on the downtown area.

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

**5. WORK SESSION:
Housing and Urban Development Sustainable Communities Grant**

Intergovernmental Relations Manager Brenda Wilson was present for the item. She first provided background on the region's receipt of a Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Sustainable Communities grant. The Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) applied for the grant and assembled the consortium of partners. However, the Springfield City Council decided not to proceed as a partner in June 2011 and the Lane Board of County Commissioners also had concerns about the grant. Ms. Wilson had been asked to take over the project to address those concerns, which were related to the management of the grant and the purpose of the grant. Subsequently, she created a new governance structure. Ms. Wilson described the structure, which was designed to give the partners that contributed the most funding more control over the grant.

Ms. Wilson reported that a leadership committee that included Mayor Piercy, Springfield Mayor Christine Lundberg, Lane County Commissioner Faye Stewart, and a representative of the University of Oregon had been formed to ensure that the policy decisions that had to be made through the life of the grant were communicated in a timely way to consortium members, and Stephanie Jennings of the Eugene Planning and Development Department had agreed to be the grant project manager.

Ms. Wilson briefly discussed the repurposing of the grant, which would be used by the region to find new ways to integrate planning efforts in a variety of areas. There were no mandates or outcomes associated with the grant. She said the receipt of the grant improved the region's chances of receiving future grants.

Ms. Wilson distributed copies of a handout entitled that illustrated the connection between the strategies of Envision Eugene and the grant work plan.

Ms. Wilson reported that the Springfield City Council supported the revised work plan and Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). She requested council support for the City's continued participation, and noted that the Lane Board of County Commissioners would discuss the grant the following day.

Mayor Piercy thanked Ms. Wilson and other staff for their work on the grant. She also thanked Mayor Lundberg and Commissioner Stewart. She said the funding would speed the implementation of some City initiatives and gave the region "an edge" in making future grant applications.

Councilor Pryor, the council's representative on the LCOG Board of Directors, reported that the grant had a profound impact on LCOG's approach to its government partners. LCOG staff was aware that the

process had gone wrong. He believed that Springfield's support demonstrated that progress had been made on both the project and LCOG's relationship with its government partners. He believed the management and governance structures could be models for future projects.

Councilor Pryor indicated support for the grant. He thanked Ms. Wilson and the staff of the other involved jurisdictions for their work on the grant.

Councilor Zelenka supported the grant. He was pleased it was not a single-purpose grant and would support many desired outcomes. He also supported the proposed governance structure.

Responding to a question from Councilor Zelenka, Ms. Wilson confirmed that the grant would not impact the City's planning for greenhouse gas scenarios. However, it would help the City make progress in that regard.

Councilor Ortiz also thanked those who worked on the grant and was pleased to hear that the process had caused LCOG to relook at its approach. She commended Ms. Wilson's work on the grant. She also thanked City Manager Ruiz, Mayor Piercy, Mayor Lundberg, and Commissioner Stewart. Councilor Ortiz anticipated that the grant would help the partners to think more regionally.

Councilor Farr was glad to hear Councilor Pryor's report. He had found the process frustrating and costly. He was glad to hear about the repurposing of the grant. He questioned who was paying for Ms. Wilson's time. Ms. Wilson said she had addressed the task in her capacity as Intergovernmental Relations Manager. Councilor Farr commended Ms. Wilson's work.

Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Brown, moved to direct the City Manager to have the City continue as a partner of the Lane Livability Consortium. Roll call vote: The motion passed, 7:1; Councilor Clark voting no.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting at 8:27 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 17, 2011
5:30 p.m.

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 October 17, 2011, work session of the Eugene City Council to order.

**A. WORK SESSION:
Eugene Civilian Review Board 2010 Annual Report**

The council was joined by Civilian Review Board (CRB) Chair Tim Laue and Police Auditor Mark Gissiner. City Attorney Kathryn Brotherton was also present for the item. Mr. Laue provided an overview of the CRB's 2010 Annual Report. He reported that the CRB met ten times in 2010 and reviewed seven allegations of misconduct and four service complaints. He described the CRB's case review process and said the board generally commented on the auditor's adjudication recommendations. Mr. Laue also described the periodic training undergone by members of the CRB to ensure they understood different police policies, practices, and training approaches and briefly noted some of the board's training topics.

Mr. Laue said the board identified three areas of concern for 2010 that were passed along to Police Chief Pete Kerns and the Eugene Police Commission for follow-up and possible policy changes: 1) warrantless entries; 2) community care-taking and how it was employed in Eugene; and 3) search and seizure policies.

Mr. Laue noted the CRB's role in evaluating the Police Auditor and shared the seven dimensions board members used to evaluate Mr. Gissiner's performance. He said Mr. Gissiner's review was positive.

Mr. Laue highlighted the CRB's recommendations to the council, which included recommendations for greater openness and transparency for open and closed cases to be accomplished by summaries of closed and open cases produced by the Police Auditor; creation of a definition of "good cause" for exceptions to the six-month complaint filing deadline; Police Auditor consultation with the CRB when designating Community Impact Cases; and CRB authority to order the Police Chief to re-open a closed case. He invited questions.

Ms. Taylor solicited council questions and comments.

Ms. Ortiz determined from Mr. Laue that the CRB wanted to see the ambiguity between the charter amendment and implementing ordinance be resolved. The charter amendment establishing the CRB gave the board the authority to request a case be reopened while the implementing ordinance stated that the

board could only request that community impact cases be reopened. Mr. Laue said there was no disagreement among CRB members that the auditor had authority regarding the designation of community impact cases, although the CRB had suggested the auditor might wish to confer with board members before making that decision.

Ms. Ortiz endorsed the CRB's recommendation that "good cause" be defined and recalled that the council had repeatedly heard from an individual interested in filing a complaint past the deadline. Mr. Gissiner said he had created a definition he had not yet been able to share with the board. He characterized the issue as more of an administrative process. Speaking to the case Ms. Ortiz had referred to, Mr. Gissiner said the CRB decided against reviewing the case at this point in time, and the decision had nothing to do with the timeline for filing a complaint. Speaking to the CRB's recommendation that it be able to request that a case be reopened, Mr. Gissiner clarified that the catalyst for the request was not concern about the thoroughness or quality of an investigation but rather a concern about the case's outcome. He suggested that whether the council would want the CRB to be able to direct the chief to reopen the case mentioned by Ms. Ortiz was a separate issue. Ms. Ortiz clarified her concerns were more general in nature.

Ms. Ortiz emphasized the importance of continued vigilance in police oversight and expressed appreciation for the CRB and auditor.

Responding to a question from Mr. Brown about the type of community involvement the CRB envisioned it would be engaged in, Mr. Laue anticipated that CRB members would attend neighborhood association meetings and events such as the recent Prevention Convention. Mr. Brown endorsed such outreach as he believed it would help inform the public of the CRB's work.

Mr. Brown observed that a board member had suggested during the auditor's evaluation that the Human Rights Commission (HRC) could play a role in the complaint intake process. He asked if the CRB had discussed that possibility. Mr. Laue said yes. He recalled that there had been discussion when the oversight system was established that HRC members could serve as advocates for complainants. Those advocates would walk complainants through the process and represent the complainant's point of view. Some had also advocated for the HRC to be involved in the classification of complaints. Mr. Laue said the implementing ordinance did not provide for that and the CRB believed that task was better left to the Police Auditor. He believed the HRC could have a role in helping complainants go through the complaint process as well as help them understand the limits of the auditor's authority. Mr. Brown agreed that would be useful as there was still some public ambiguity about the role of the auditor.

Mr. Brown concurred with the recommendations of the CRB, in particular its recommendation that the board have the authority to order closed cases to be reopened. Mr. Laue said while the board could recommend to the chief that a community impact case be reopened, but for a variety of reasons, some of them legal, the board did not have that authority on closed cases. In those cases, due process had been done. He noted that the case that impelled the CRB's recommendation was the case involving the tasing of a Chinese student. A narrow board majority had voted to send the case, which was a closed case, back to Chief Kerns for further investigation.

Responding to a question from Mr. Brown about the distinction between the board's authority over community impact cases and its authority over closed cases, Mr. Laue attributed the distinction to concerns about double jeopardy for officers who had already gone through the administrative process. He said the CRB was not designed to judge the adjudication of cases but rather was designed to serve as a quality assurance and performance evaluation body.

Mr. Brown asked if the board had specific recommendations for possible ordinance revisions. Mr. Laue said he would recommend that the council reaffirm the ordinance as a statement it did not intend for the board to have the authority to reopen closed cases. He believed the board would recommend the council consider such revisions because of the ambiguity between the charter and ordinance.

Mr. Zelenka asked Mr. Gissiner to provide the council with the charter language and ordinance language regarding the CRB's authority over closed cases.

Responding to a question from Mr. Zelenka, Mr. Laue clarified that community impact cases were not closed when they came to the board. The police chief made a preliminary determination on such cases, but the CRB commented on the case before it was closed. He said the board would not ask the chief to reopen a case because it agreed or disagreed with the adjudication, but because it was concerned there were lines of inquiry that were not followed up on or facts that were not considered. He noted that the case involving the Chinese student was not a community impact case, and that Eugene had only had such case to date.

Responding to a question from Mr. Zelenka about the language in the ordinance, City Attorney Brotherton clarified that the code was very specific about the CRB's authority over community impact cases; by negative implication, the CRB had the authority over no other cases. The CRB was asking the council to revise the code to be more explicit. Mr. Zelenka concurred with the CRB's recommendation.

Mr. Zelenka asked Mr. Gissiner to speak to the recommendation that he consult with CRB members before designating a community impact case. Mr. Gissiner indicated that his current practice was to confer with the CRB if he thought it was possible a case would be designated as a community impact case. Mr. Laue clarified that the CRB was less interested in seeing that codified than in seeing that direction reflected in the Police Auditor's policies, procedures, and operating manual. He said that the ordinance as written reflected the Police Auditor Ordinance Review Committee's recommendations.

Responding to a question from Mr. Zelenka, Mr. Gissiner said he worked with City Attorney Glenn Klein to establish a definition of "good cause" and would provide it to the council and mayor.

Responding to a question from Mr. Zelenka about the CRB's concerns regarding public transparency, Mr. Laue said current law limited the public's ability to review information that would give it more confidence that cases were thoroughly and completely investigated. He said the Attorney General had considered some changes to the Public Meetings Law that would have allowed the CRB to share information about cases where no discipline had been involved but those proposals had made no headway during the last legislative session.

Mr. Zelenka suggested the City could pursue changes to State law. City Attorney Brotherton briefly reviewed the statutes in question and concurred that statutory changes would be needed to achieve the transparency desired by the CRB.

Mr. Farr thanked Mr. Laue for his work on the CRB. He determined from Mr. Laue that he was suggesting the council reaffirm the existing ordinance to clarify the board's role for the community. Mr. Farr asked City Manager Jon Ruiz to consider the mechanics of that process.

Mr. Poling expressed concern that the board's recommendation for CRB consultation prior to Mr. Gissiner designating a case as a community impact case could delay Mr. Gissiner's investigations. He also wanted to ensure that if such consultation was codified it be clear that the board's recommendations

were just that, and the auditor had authority to make a final determination. He did not support granting the board authority to reopen a closed case for the reasons mentioned by Mr. Laue.

Mr. Poling supported the creation of a definition of “good cause.” He thanked Mr. Laue and other board members for their service.

Mr. Zelenka suggested the CRB become involved in planning for the proposed Hate Crimes Conference to be sponsored by the Human Rights and Police commissions.

**B. WORK SESSION:
Criminal Street Gang Presentation**

The council was joined by Police Chief Pete Kerns and Detective Greg Harvey. Chief Kerns first provided a brief update on Occupy Eugene.

Chief Kerns prefaced the presentation by noting that presenter Detective Harvey was an expert in the field and had been involved in many investigations of street gang crime, including some with interstate implications. Chief Kerns said street gangs often involved people of color and street gangs in communities larger than Eugene were often race-based organizations. While that was not the case in the Eugene-Springfield area, he acknowledged many people made that assumption. He also acknowledged that people of color were disproportionately represented in local street gangs. Chief Kerns reported that the Eugene Police Department (EPD) had reached out to the Communities of Color to discuss the issue. The EPD found that those residents feared that officers would engage in racial profiling due to the assumption gangs were race-based, and they were concerned that people of color would be stereotyped. As a result, Detective Harvey was providing training to the schools, media, and a variety of other groups and staff had meet with executives of the local police agencies and other service agencies to raise awareness of the issues involved with the goal of holding a summit in 2012 to produce community strategies to address local street gang crime.

Detective Harvey led the council through a PowerPoint presentation entitled *Street Gangs* that provided information on gang activity in the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area. He emphasized the importance of community partnerships in fighting street gang activity as well as the importance of making contact with youth who might be targeted for gang membership at an early age. The presentation commenced with a video of a “jump-in” gang initiation rite that occurred in a Trainsong neighborhood park. Detective Harvey defined a gang, noted the different geographical levels at which gangs were organized, and identified national gangs represented at the local level.

Detective Harvey acknowledged gang numbers were increasing but the department was not sure why; he suggested media glorification of gang lifestyles could be a contributing factor. He stressed the youth of those being recruited and the intergenerational nature of gang membership. Detective Harvey reported that gang activity was extremely mobile and many national gang “sets” were represented locally. Frequently local gangs had a “mother chapter” in another city that provided them with direct support and stayed in touch using social media.

Detective Harvey emphasized that gang violence could affect innocent people as well as gang members because gang violence often occurred in public places. He shared a list of crimes committed by local gangs, which included prostitution, drug dealing, home invasions, assaults, bank robberies, attempted murder, and murder. Detective Harvey then shared examples of gang graffiti and encouraged residents to report graffiti.

Ms. Ortiz thanked Detective Harvey. She was very concerned about the issue of street gangs. She asked when gangs evolved from Aryan-type gangs such the Free Souls to the street gangs the EPD was now seeing. Detective Harvey said that the Free Souls were still an active gang and such gangs presented some of the same problems as street gangs. He confirmed there were now more street gangs than Aryan-type gangs.

Mr. Farr thanked Detective Harvey for the presentation.

Responding to a question from Mr. Brown, Detective Harvey indicated that the 18th Street Gang out of Los Angeles was the largest gang represented in the metropolitan area. It was broken down into smaller subgroups. Most local gangs had 8 to 12 members, while some others had as many as 20. He confirmed, in response to a follow-up question from Mr. Brown, that the West Side Gangsters were formed in Eugene and evolved into a prison gang.

Mr. Clark expressed appreciation for the presentation and asked Chief Kerns for more information about EPD's future plans. Chief Kerns said the EPD hoped to draw on expertise from other parts of the country with the goal of discussing what would work best in Eugene. He planned to meet with representatives of Medford to discuss that city's strategy, which seemed to be working well and which involved schools, churches, police, and the Department of Youth.

Mr. Poling hoped more people had a chance to hear the presentation. He recalled that gang activity began to grow in the community during the late 1980s and early 1990s and said left unchecked, it had grown to current levels.

Ms. Ortiz expressed concern that the City organization was not already prepared to address the situation. She said when people lived in poverty and could not achieve the American dream they began to look for other ways to feel included. She believed that gangs provided that sense of inclusion for many people, including homeless youth. She said street gangs were not merely an EPD problem but a community issue, and she hoped whatever strategy the EPD developed included community involvement. She determined from Detective Harvey that the presentation was available to the public and had already been shared with several neighborhood associations.

Chief Kerns spoke of the importance of training for EPD officers to help them recognize gang signs and gang activity and work with services providers to help them recognize those things as well. It was important that officers knew what to look for so they could help contribute toward an effective strategy.

Ms. Ortiz encouraged staff to make the presentation to the Bethel School District. Chief Kerns said the department had made that contact and provided district staff with background information and discussed how the district and department could move forward together.

Responding to a question from Mr. Zelenka regarding other approaches staff used, Detective Harvey said EPD officers were working with ex-gang members to enlist their aid in reaching out to potential gang members and helping them to escape gang life.

Mr. Clark asked about gang activity in downtown. Detective Harvey said the department saw an increase in downtown gang activity in February 2011, although had been some gang-related incidents in downtown prior to that. There were also reports of street robberies committed by gang members in downtown.

Mr. Zelenka determined from Detective Harvey that gang activity occurred throughout the community and gang gatherings frequently created problems, particularly when gang members perceived they were being disrespected by other gang members.

Ms. Taylor asked if it was dangerous for young people to wear the color red. Detective Harvey said no. He said gang colors were not the sole indicator of gang affiliation. However, it could be risky to claim one was a gang member when one was not.

Ms. Ortiz encouraged residents to report graffiti to Detective Harvey at 541-682-5174 and to report all crimes to the EPD.

Ms. Taylor adjourned the meeting at 7:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest
City Recorder

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)