

EUGENE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY



Approval of Council Minutes

Meeting Date: May 14, 2012
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 February 15, 2012, Work Session, February 21, 2012, Regular Meeting, February 22, 2012, Work Session, February 27, 2012, Work Session, February 29, 2012, Work Session, March 12, 2012, Work Session, March 12, 2012, Regular Meeting, May 2, 2012, Boards and Commissions Interviews, and May 7, 2012, Boards and Commissions Interviews.

ATTACHMENTS

- A. February 15, 2012, Work Session
- B. February 21, 2012, Regular Meeting
- C. February 22, 2012, Work Session
- D. February 27, 2012, Work Session
- E. February 29, 2012, Work Session
- F. March 12, 2012, Work Session
- G. March 12, 2012, Regular Meeting
- H. May 2, 2012, Boards and Commissions Interviews
- I. May 7, 2012, 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

February 15, 2012
Noon

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

COUNCILORS ABSENT: Mike Clark.

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the February 15, 2012, work session of the Eugene City Council to order.

**A. ACTION:
Resolution 5055 Requesting that the United States Congress Refer to the States an
Amendment to the US Constitution Declaring that Corporations Do Not Possess the
Constitutional Rights that Natural Persons Possess**

City Attorney Glenn Klein was present to answer questions.

Mr. Zelenka, seconded by Mr. Brown, moved to adopt Resolution 5055, a resolution requesting that the United States Congress refer to the states an amendment to the United States Constitution declaring that corporations do not possess the constitutional rights that natural persons possess.

Mr. Zelenka shared highlights from an editorial written by Fred Wertheimer of Democracy 21 entitled “Super PACS a disaster for democracy.” He believed money was corrupting democracy and he encouraged the council to support the resolution.

Ms. Taylor, seconded by Mr. Brown, moved to delete the words “and unions.”

Ms. Taylor did not think that unions were comparable to corporations. She said unions exist to protect the rights of working people while corporations existed to make a profit. She did not think any other communities’ resolutions mentioned unions.

Mr. Poling could not support the amendment because the *Citizens United versus Federal Election Commission* decision was specific to unions, corporations, and special interests groups. If the amendment passed, he would be unable to support the resolution.

Mr. Zelenka agreed with Ms. Taylor. He supported unions and thought they were substantially different from corporations. He also agreed that unions did not wield the same power as corporations. However, he pointed out, the resolution was not about unions and corporations but about campaign finance reform

and the undue influence on money on democracy, no matter the source. He could not envision an amendment that did not limit all contributions.

Mr. Pryor concurred with the remarks of Mr. Zelenka.

Mr. Brown supported the amendment. He attributed many benefits enjoyed by all people, such as the weekend and sick leave, to the efforts of unions.

Mayor Piercy shared a communication from “We the People of Eugene,” which opposed the inclusion of unions in the resolution but recommended that if unions were addressed they be mentioned in Section 2 rather than Section H.

The amendment to the motion failed, 5:2; Ms. Taylor and Mr. Brown voting yes.

Mr. Zelenka offered a friendly amendment, accepted by Mr. Brown, to correct an error in Section 1 of the resolution, which should also read “corporations, unions, and special interest groups.”

Ms. Taylor said it was difficult to vote for the resolution because she did not think it made sense.

Mr. Farr said his vote against the resolution was not an indictment of the resolution but rather reflected his belief that the council diluted its attention and resources away from its mission to address issues it had no control over, nor was it chartered to have control over. The resources and time spent could be spent on issues the council had a direct impact upon. He invited residents with concerns about federal issues to take them to their federal representatives because they had the power to address such matters.

Speaking to Ms. Taylor’s comments about unions, Ms. Ortiz indicated support for unions but thought the resolution was about campaign finance reform. She pointed out that unions had considerable power in places such as California, where the California Correctional Peace Officers Association played a key role in getting Arnold Schwarzenegger elected as governor. Ms. Ortiz believed such resolutions were within the purview of the council.

Ms. Taylor agreed with Ms. Ortiz that such resolutions were within the purview of the council. She also believed that such local actions had an impact nationally.

Mr. Brown agreed with Ms. Ortiz and Ms. Taylor that it was appropriate for the council to consider the resolution. He emphasized the importance of symbolic statements.

Mr. Zelenka pointed out to Mr. Farr that the council took a position on State legislation that might not be pertinent to the City’s agenda but were reflective of the government as a whole, and he thought government “all the way up the line” had the responsibility to deal with such issues.

Mr. Poling did not find the argument that no other community had included unions in their resolutions to be persuasive. He expressed concern that the resolution did not speak specifically to limits on contributions and questioned who would make those rules. Mr. Poling advocated for campaign finance limits at the local level. Mr. Brown concurred.

Mr. Zelenka noted that some had advocated for referring the resolution to the voters but he opposed that due to the cost; in addition, the deadline for the May ballot was passed and there was time to discuss putting it on the November ballot.

The motion passed, 6:1; Mr. Farr voting no.

**B. WORK SESSION:
Neighborhood Analysis**

The council was joined by Lorna Flormoe of the Neighborhood Services Program. With the assistance of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms. Flormoe walked the council through the City of Eugene's *2011 Neighborhood Analysis*, copies of which were included in the meeting packet. Councilors asked questions clarifying the details of the presentation and were generally complimentary of the analysis.

Mr. Poling suggested it would be useful if two graphs on page U-13, *Type of Commute to Work* and *Travel Time to Work*, could be combined to give the reader a sense of the most efficient commute. He suggested the decline in crime in Trainsong could be attributed both to data-led policing and a lack of reporting.

Mr. Pryor suggested that information from the school catchment area would also be useful for a more complete picture of the area in question. He looked forward to seeing such analyses for all neighborhoods. Ms. Flormoe indicated all 23 neighborhood analyses would be available online soon. She said staff would look for other data types to include in the analysis.

**C. WORK SESSION:
Building Inspector Field Mobility**

Building Official Stuart Ramsing and Building Inspector Supervisor Kyle Richardson joined the council and presented on the City's Building Inspector Field Mobility. The council viewed a prototype of the vehicles used by building inspectors.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting at 1:15 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

February 21, 2012
7:30 p.m.

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

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the February 21, 2012, regular meeting of the Eugene City Council to order.

**1. PUBLIC HEARING:
An Ordinance Adopting Hazardous Substance User Fees for the Fiscal Year Commencing July 1, 2012**

City Manager Jon Ruiz introduced the item, an ordinance adopting fees for the City's Toxics Right-to-Know Program for fiscal year 2013. The Toxics Board recommended a fee of \$79 per full-time equivalent employee for affected businesses, up to a maximum of \$2,000 annually as mandated by State law.

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

**2. PUBLIC HEARING:
Proposal to Redesignate and Rezone "The Rexus Site" by: Amending the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan Diagram; and Amending the Eugene Zoning Map (City Files MA 11-12 and Z 11-4)**

City Manager Ruiz introduced the item, a public hearing on a request to amend the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan (Metro Plan) Diagram and Eugene Zoning Map for the Rexus site. The amendment would change the plan designation and zoning on the 29-acre site from Light Medium Industrial to a combination of Low-Density Residential, Medium-Density Residential, and Commercial. He noted the applicable approval criteria found in Eugene Code Section 9.7730(3) and 9.8865 and reported that Eugene Planning Commission's unanimously adopted findings of consistency were included in the meeting packet as Exhibit C.

Mayor Piercy asked councilors to declare conflicts of interest or *ex parte* contacts. There were none. Mayor Piercy reviewed the rules governing the hearing and opened the hearing.

Larry Reed, Ward 5, concurred with the Planning Commission's recommendation and asked the council to approve the application as submitted.

Rusty Rexius, Ward 8, shared his vision of a mixed-use development on the site and suggested that vision was in keeping with the tenants of Envision Eugene, the West Eugene Collaborative, and made sense from a sustainability perspective. He requested council support for the application.

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

Councilor Zelenka asked that the council be provided with a map showing the zoning of surrounding areas prior to its deliberation. He was also curious about the impact of retaining 3.55 acres of existing industrial zoning given its proximity to adjacent low- and medium-density zoning. He questioned whether it was a good idea to retain the industrial zoning and suggested that alternatively, the City could change the zoning and grandfather in the existing use.

Mayor Piercy determined that no councilor wished to keep the record open and deemed the record closed.

**3. PUBLIC HEARING:
An Ordinance Concerning Permitted Overnight Sleeping and Amending Section 4.816 of the Eugene Code, 1971**

City Manager Ruiz reminded the council that it adopted a temporary code amendment on December 20, 2011, that provided for an exception for the provisions in Eugene Code Section 4.816 regarding overnight camping. The amendment allowed overnight sleeping in tents at sites normally reserved for legal overnight car camping and expanded the definition of vehicles to include tents. City Manager Ruiz reported that the amendment would sunset on April 15, 2012. The council was scheduled to take action on March 12, 2012.

Mayor Piercy opened the public hearing. Councilor Taylor arrived during the hearing.

Donna Riddle, a resident of Lane County, supported the ordinance and hoped it was made permanent. She did not think it went far enough and called on the City to decriminalize sleeping in public. She continued to wait to see where the wet bed facility promised for opening in winter 2012 would be.

Irene Cardenas, Ward 1, supported the ordinance as giving people more places to sleep protected from the rain. She spoke of the healthful benefits of living with nature in a tent.

Randy Cain, Ward 1, supported the ordinance. He recommended that it be revised to allow homeless people to be involved in managing their campsites as a means to build community.

Terrill Purvis, Ward 8, supported the ordinance because it would facilitate the delivery of needed services to the homeless.

Sabra Marcroft, Ward 7, supported the ordinance because people without a legal place to sleep lost self-respect, which made them more likely to misbehave.

John Monroe, Ward 1, supported the ordinance. He suggested the ordinance be revised to permit more than three vehicles or tents on very large parking lots. He also wanted to see justification for any conditions placed by the City on participating property owners, such as conditions related to public safety or zoning.

Alley Valkyrie, Ward 1, supported the ordinance. She went on to criticize the City for not doing enough to solve the problem of homelessness and questioned why the City prohibited property owners from doing what they wanted with their property so people could build communities on private property.

Michael Carrigan, Ward 7, supported the ordinance. He acknowledged the City and St. Vincent de Paul was having trouble finding vehicle and tent camping sites, and hoped the City Manager directed staff to work harder to find more sites.

Ruth Duemler, Ward 3, supported the ordinance. She also hoped that more spaces could be found to reduce the existing waiting list. Her church accommodated a car camp and found the occupants helped the church with security and maintenance issues. She encouraged other churches and businesses to accommodate homeless campers.

Joe Tyndall, Ward 1, supported the ordinance, although he considered insufficient to meet the need that existed. He advocated for a publicly camping site based on the Occupy Eugene model.

Mayor Piercy closed the public hearing and called on the council for questions and comments.

Councilor Zelenka asked why the number of car camping sites had been limited to three and requested information about the pros and cons of adding more spaces to each site. He also wanted more information about the waiting list. He asked where more sites could be located.

Councilor Brown asked if there were site providers who would like to have more camping spaces on their properties but were limited by the City Code. Michael Wisth of the Community Development Department reported that the number of camping sites was limited to facilitate site management. Councilor Brown suggested that funding could be increased so service providers could add more site managers. Mr. Wisth said that the funding had been increased in fiscal years 2012 by \$50,000 to increase the number of sites and underwrite the cost of site management.

**4. PUBLIC HEARING:
An Ordinance Concerning Downtown Public Safety Zone; Amending Section 4.874 of the Eugene Code, 1971; and Providing a Sunset Date**

City Manager Ruiz reported that the City's Downtown Public Safety Zone (DPSZ) would expire on April 30, 2012, unless the council desired to extend it.

Mayor Piercy opened the public hearing.

Mark Rust, Ward 4, supported the continuation of the DPSZ. He believed the zone had improved conditions downtown, leader to greater community satisfaction with downtown, and ending the zone would undo that satisfaction and stifle additional improvements. He believed exclusion was a reasonable alternative to jail for both the offender and community due to limited jail capacity for low-level offenders.

Larry Leverone, Ward 3, encouraged the council to consider long-term solutions including a downtown youth community center; progress on the Opportunity Eugene Task Force; more well-trained and well-paid publicly accountable downtown police officers; just and equitable law enforcement; two or three more CAHOOTS vans or a publicly funded health facility; more public and private jobs; higher taxes on higher earners; integration of institutions of higher education into the downtown; improved medical care for all; and increased respectful dialogue between all.

Lauren Regan, Civil Liberties Defense Center, reiterated her organization's written testimony regarding its constitutional concerns about the ordinance. She suggested the ordinance failed to meet the tests of being the least restrictive means of dealing with a problem and being effective in actually solving the problem it was intended to solve. She believed the ordinance resulted in people being targeted for their economic status and appearance in violation of the Equal Protection Clause. She described the exclusion process and emphasized the burden it placed on homeless people. Homeless people were frequently excluded for 90 days and then charges against them were dropped.

Jan Wostmann, Ward 3, supported the expiration of the DPSZ because 20 percent of those issued exclusions had their exclusions dismissed later. He said that the council would not accept such a high error rate in other areas.

Claire Syrett, representing the American Civil Liberties Union of Oregon (ACLU), opposed the DPSZ because it infringed on the rights of the individual to travel and associate freely in public spaces without due process. She said there was no evidence that the zone helped make the downtown safer. The Eugene Police Department (EPD) seemed unprepared to provide the data the council needed to evaluate the program, although the deadline for that report had been known since the ordinance was established. Ms. Syrett said the community could not wait for the EPD to improve its data collection methods and called for the zone to end. Judges could already impose exclusion for criminal conviction, which could accomplish the council's goals without the process created by the zone.

Michael Carrigan, Ward 7, said his organization, Community Alliance for Lane County, opposed the DPSZ because people were not being treated with dignity and respect. He maintained the homeless were targeted by the EPD and treated differently. He advocated for a downtown "inclusion zone" that was where all were welcomed.

Joe Tyndall, Ward 1, opposed the DPSZ because of his belief it was targeted at the homeless and less well-off. He advocated for the establishment of a homeless camp based on the Occupy Eugene model as a more humane and effective solution.

Sabra Marcroft, Ward 7, opposed the DPSZ. She suggested that parking meters rather than homeless people and delinquent youth discouraged residents from coming downtown. She shared the story of a young homeless man who had been warned away from downtown by police. She suggested that such a zone caused decent people to lose self-respect, become marginalized, and turned them toward criminal behavior.

Jean Stacey, Ward 1, opposed the DPSZ because it deprived people of due process. She believed there were better solutions. She thought the zone was being improperly directed against homeless people. She asked the council to let the zone expire.

Charles Warren, Lane County, representing the Board of Directors of Midtown Business Associates, said his organization paid for private security patrols for the businesses it represented. The area was not included in the DPSZ although it experienced many of the same problems. His organization supported the DPSZ and urged the council to extend it. He said the monthly exclusion reports illustrated that those excluded were chronic, repeat offenders who were disruptive and in some cases violent rather than people who were down on their luck. Judges must approve the exclusions. He questioned what choice Eugene had in the absence of adequate jail bed capacity.

Carol Berg Caldwell, Ward 3, read the council a poem in opposition to the continuation of the DPSZ.

Vickie Nelson, Ward 1, asked the council to let the DPSZ sunset. She asked where the people excluded from downtown went and suggested they went to someone's backyard or lived on the river banks because they had to be somewhere. They were out of sight but people should still care. She questioned the constitutionality of the DPSZ and suggested it had not been challenged because the homeless lacked lawyers.

Donna Riddle, a resident of Lane County, did not think the DPSZ worked because of what she saw when she visited downtown. She termed the zone un-American. She questioned where excluded people would go to use the bathroom if they could not use the bathrooms in downtown. She recommended the council let the zone sunset. She also recommended the City fund a day center and a homeless shelter.

Irene Cardenas, Ward 1, opposed the DPSZ. She advocated for more harmonious interactions between the police and citizens. She spoke of the trauma of such exclusions. She also recommended that police provide homeless people with cards with information about where they could recreate, meditate, garden, eat, and camp.

Randy Cain, Ward 1, believed the ordinance should take into the account the fact that some people were attracted to downtown by the steam heat system, privacy partitions, and public bathrooms. He asked that the DPSZ be allowed to expire. He did not want to pay to fight a lawsuit against the City.

Bill Whalen, Ward 5, representing the Local Government Affairs Council of the Eugene Area Chamber of Commerce, expressed the council's support for the DPSZ because of the current lack of jail capacity. He said the council believed the DPSZ was conducted thoughtfully and responsibly. He said the DPSZ had deterred downtown crime and led to decreased trespass, alcohol-related crimes, and property crimes.

Joseph Newton, Ward 7, agreed with the remarks of Ms. Regan and Ms. Syrett. He maintained the DPSZ was counter-productive and useless and was directed against annoyances rather than real crimes, such as the assault he experienced at Kesey Square without a police response.

Ruth Deumler, Ward 3, agreed with the remarks of previous speakers and urged the council to end the DPSZ. She advocated for more public bathrooms and for publicly funded lockers so homeless people could store their belongings during the day and did not have to carry them around. She also advocated for a wet bed facility and a full-time community center for youth.

Alley Valkyrie, Ward 1, opposed the DPSZ because it punished people for a crime they had yet to be convicted of. She opposed excluding the homeless from downtown because that was where they lived and received assistance. She averred that exclusions "happened in secret" and that she had a right to know when a member of her community was excluded.

Walter Hunt, Ward 3, said he would not support the DPSZ if he believed it was used against Occupy Eugene and the homeless. Instead, he saw it used against really scary people doing really criminal things repeatedly, which led to their exclusion. He believed due process occurred because of a judge reviewed each exclusion order. Mr. Ward recommended that the council retain the DPSZ for the time being and that it direct the EPD to follow through on its review so it could convince the council that the zone worked.

David Mort, Ward 5, supported the retention of the DPSZ. In the three years he had worked downtown he had seen a drastic improvement in downtown conditions, particularly at the corner of Olive Street and

Broadway. He did not see random or unfair enforcement of the ordinance but instead witnessed officers addressing bad behavior and crime.

David Hauser, Ward 1, representing Downtown Eugene, Inc., supported the continuation of the DPSZ. He believed it was one of many important public safety tools. The DPSZ created consequences for chronic offenders in the absence of adequate jail capacity and temporarily displaced persistent violators from downtown. The Eugene Police Commission and Eugene Area Chamber of Commerce had expressed support for the DPSZ. Mr. Hauser feared that ending the zone would stifle improving conditions downtown and send the wrong message. He recommended the council extend the sunset provision to give the community a chance to reassess the cumulative impacts of all downtown tools.

Steven Michael Todd, Ward 1, opposed the extension of the DPSZ. He questioned why people were criminalized by sleeping. He hoped the council did not extend the law.

Art Bowman, Ward 2, opposed the DPSZ because he feared it would ultimately be used against activists expressing their First Amendment rights. He asked the council to end the zone.

Brian Michaels, Ward 1, opposed the DPSZ as an attempt on the part of the City to “try to throw people away.” He suggested that it was more cost-effective to spend money on portable toilets rather than jails and law enforcement.

Tom Kamis, Ward 1, said while the DPSZ was not the best tool, it was a tool to address the problems caused by repeat offenders, who were not represented at the hearing. He said the zone was needed because of the lack of adequate jail capacity.

Michael Gannon, Ward 7, recommended the City and business community look to the Asian Festival and Oregon Country Fair as models for housing the homeless in self-maintained communities.

Curtis Surpress, homeless, suggested the ordinance would be challenged in court and the taxpayers would bear the cost of the legal fight. He hoped that the council let the ordinance expire. He averred that some of the people who had been excluded from downtown had been spending money in downtown businesses but apparently had not been spending enough.

James Black, Ward 3, opposed the DPSZ. He suggested that instead, the City establish an inclusionary zone. He believed the money used to enforce the zone could be better spent.

Janet Brown, Ward 4, shared some statistics about the use of the ordinance between October 2008 and June 2010. She believed that all citizens benefited equally from the ordinance. Ongoing reductions in jail capacity suggested it did not make sense to end the DPSZ. Ms. Brown said the ordinance was not about homeless, discrimination, or status; it was about behavior and accountability. She asked the council to support a two-year or more extension of the ordinance.

Kimberly Gladen, Ward 1, said downtown had unique problems not shared by other areas of the community. She believed that prior to the exclusion zone, the downtown looked like a “war zone.” People were threatened and harassed under the guise of free speech. She termed the DPSZ a “time out” for repeat offenders and asked the council to extend it until conditions improved and citizens did the right thing and supported a homeless shelter.

Betty Snowden, Ward 1, supported extending the DPSZ because it was effective in deterring downtown crime. She maintained the EPD had employed the tool sensibly. Her family had a business downtown

for more than 20 years. Before the zone took effect, her family was bullied and taunted with racial epithets for 15 years by offenders who knew there were no consequences for their actions. She asked where the ACLU had been during that time. The DPSZ had improved conditions for her family and customers. The zone was targeted at repeat offenders. She believed the zone was about inclusion of everyone.

Cynthia Kokis, Ward 1, maintained the zone was based on fear and unfamiliarity with those who were different. She believed the zone was unfair, discriminatory, and used against people because of the way they looked. She suggested there were solutions based more on compassion than rebuke and isolation. She offered to pay more taxes to support more compassionate solutions.

John Monroe, Ward 1, did not think the EPD's research supported the continuation of the DPSZ and called for more rigorous analysis of the statistics. He acknowledged the problem of downtown public safety and regretted the problems suffered by downtown merchants. However, he pointed out that there were now more police downtown as well as private security. Mr. Monroe said that those who were excluded from downtown were likely to go to neighborhoods more difficult to monitor and where there were fewer police. He suggested the council and those in support of the ordinance to view a show cause hearing at Municipal Court and then decide if the zone was being applied justly.

Henry Jones, Ward 6, opposed the DPSZ because he believed it was being used against people for the way they looked and as an "economic tool for class warfare." He suggested concentrated police enforcement downtown diminished the public response to other parts of the community. He advocated for a downtown drop-in center where the homeless were made to feel welcome. He refused to shop downtown until the DPSZ was gone.

Carla Newbre, Ward 1, opposed the DPSZ because there was no data to show it was working. In addition, the zone seemed to be quite polarizing and criminalized those who should not be criminalized. She also was concerned about a lack of due process. She said that homeless people were disadvantaged when dealing with the court system and trying to have their civil rights addressed. They were unaware of the resources that existed to assist them, some of which were in the exclusion zone, and lacked means to access those resources. They often just gave up.

Mark Johnson, Ward 4, representing Lane Transit District, supported the continuation of the DPSZ. He believed the zone had improved public safety and was targeted at criminals rather than at people because of their status.

Heather Marek, Ward 1, opposed the extension of the DPSZ. She challenged both the data and data analysis provided by the EPD. The data did not include information on how exclusions were used and enforced or the race, gender, economic status, housing status, and mental health background of those excluded, making it impossible to know the impact of the zone on marginalized communities. No information was included about the crimes leading to exclusion, making it difficult to assess the safety threat of those excluded. She found other factors lacking in the data that made the zone difficult to evaluate.

Cassandra Snowden, Ward 1, supported the extension of the DPSZ because it was proven to be effective. The zone did not discriminate against people because of their appearance or economic status. The violence and harassment her family had experienced had stopped and the entire downtown atmosphere had improved. Ms. Snowden believed eliminating the zone sent the wrong message to criminals. She reiterated Betty Snowden's remark that the ACLU never contacted her family to offer assistance when they were being harassed and called racial epithets.

Celeste Edman, Ward 4, Downtown Business Association, said downtown businesses had witnessed dramatic changes in downtown because of the DPSZ. She emphasized the importance of public safety to a vibrant downtown. Her association strongly supported the continuation of the DPSZ. She did not believe the zone was targeted at the homeless or marginalized; instead, it was targeted at career criminals who preyed on downtown businesses, their patrons, and the homeless. Ms. Edman asked the council to review the exclusions that occurred in the last two years, which were for repeat violent offenders who committed crimes with an acute human cost. She pointed out that judges made decisions that restricted where people could be all the time. She asked the council to extend the DPSZ for at least another 12 months. The ordinance protected more than buildings or assets; it protected people.

Jesse Lohrke, Ward 6, believed the DPSZ was an oversized tool that invited violation due to the length of the exclusions imposed. He suggested that if the zone was extended it should only be for a short time with an opportunity for changes to be made.

Jim Welsh, Eugene Association of Realtors, expressed his association's support for the DPSZ. He asked that it be extended until it was evident the increased police patrols were effective and jail space was available.

Mark Jordan, Ward 5, believed the DPSZ violated people's rights, including freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, due process, and equal treatment and protection under the law. He urged the council to end the DPSZ to protect the right of its citizens.

Mayor Piercy closed the public hearing. She thanked those who testified. She said that all people were in the community together and both proponents and opponents of the zone had legitimate and deeply held concerns. She reminded the audience the councilors were tax payers too. She encouraged dialogue among those testifying and emphasized her interest in an outcome that was fair and just and enhanced downtown safety.

Mayor Piercy called on the council for questions and comments.

Councilor Clark agreed with the mayor's remarks. He noted the community's lack of jail capacity and the impact that had on crime levels. He anticipated the community would lose more jail beds due to Lane County's budget shortfalls. He urged the council to extend the DPSZ for an opportunity for future review.

Councilor Ortiz expressed appreciation for the mayor's remarks and for the testimony offered by the public.

Councilor Brown also thanked those who offered testimony. Speaking to Councilor Clark's comments, Councilor Brown said he was unable to see a correlation between the decreasing number of jail beds and the zone's effectiveness. He requested data related to the sanctions imposed on individuals who violated the exclusion order more than once and also asked staff to provide crime data for the neighborhoods around the downtown so the council could determine if the zone had led to a spike in activity in those areas.

Councilor Zelenka asked staff for data characterizing the individuals excluded from the zone. He also asked staff for suggestions to improve advocacy for those excluded.

Councilor Taylor also thanked those who testified. She did not support the DPSZ and believed improved conditions downtown could be attributed to the increased police presence. She said that people had to be somewhere, and it was better to have them downtown where there were more people and more police. She also questioned how there could be no jail capacity but the City could still jail people who violated their exclusion order.

Councilor Farr asked Police Chief Pete Kerns questions clarifying some of the statistics provided to the council regarding the exclusions requested by officers but not granted by judges.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting at 10:05 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

February 22, 2012
 Noon

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

COUNCILORS ABSENT: Andrea Ortiz.

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the February 22, 2012, work session of the Eugene City Council to order.

**A. WORK SESSION:
 Envision Eugene**

Planning Director Lisa Gardner, Planner Jason Dedrick, and Planner Alissa Hansen joined the council for the item and shared a PowerPoint presentation entitled *Envision Eugene: Project update for City Council Work Session, February 22, 2012*. Mr. Dedrick led the council through the first segment of the presentation, which outlined the staff proposal for flexible implementation of the recommendations coming out of the Envision Eugene process as called for in the Seven Pillars of Envision Eugene. The proposal relied on several strategies: 1) an ongoing monitoring system that might require the development of new systems or tools, 2) ongoing reporting that summarized current and trend data, 3) development of a plan to address emerging needs, 4) periodic evaluations that could lead to adjustments to planning assumptions or regulations, and 5) City collaboration in various regional planning activities. Councilors asked questions clarifying the details of the presentation.

While she acknowledged the proposal called for five- and ten-year evaluations, Mayor Piercy encouraged staff to provide the council with more iterative and frequent updates over the monitoring period. She also recommended that the council review the list of monitored items to confirm they were the right things to monitor. She wanted the City to approach its monitoring from the point of view of what the council wanted to achieve, and advocated for a better way of knowing that the City was moving in the direction that the council agreed upon. She wanted the reporting to provide the public with both the underlying data and the conclusions. Mayor Piercy asked that the monitoring address the subject of how Eugene was doing in protecting its neighborhoods and whether its interventions were helping or not helping.

Mr. Clark agreed with Mayor Piercy. He said technology that provided real time analysis was available now and asked why the City was not using such technology. Ms. Gardner said that real-time analysis was the City's goal but the question was what platform to employ. She noted that there was also the issue of cost and compatibility with existing City permit tracking and land use application systems. The City's goal would be to have something that worked on a daily basis and provided long-term tracking as well.

Mr. Clark advocated for a focus on where the council wanted to be rather than where it thought it should be. He preferred to take a more aspirational approach rather than a “safe harbor” approach that merely complied with State law.

Mayor Piercy suggested there was a tension between the short-term goals, the aspirational, and what appeared to be long-term trends. She was unsure how to address that tension.

Mr. Zelenka agreed with the remarks of Mayor Piercy and Mr. Clark. However, he thought the City needed to take a more holistic and long-term approach; it was good to know “where we are on the dial” but he did not want to make abrupt adjustments because growth was not a smooth steady line. He thought the staff proposal made sense.

Mr. Brown supported the staff proposal but observed the trend charts related to population and employment growth shared by staff demonstrated much was out of the City’s control. He supported continued regional planning and noted the many service delivery and planning partnerships that already existed, such as the Metropolitan Wastewater Management Commission.

Mr. Farr agreed with Mr. Clark about the need for real time analysis so the land use system was able to respond more quickly. He advocated for having a plan in place to support that response.

Mr. Pryor suggested the City could benchmark on a more frequent basis but he believed the council should be deliberative about the changes it made based on the trends it found. He thought the staff proposal addressed that concern. Mr. Pryor advocated for a focus on the “best reality” possible based on the data the council had about trends.

Mayor Piercy advocated for an innovative rather than reactive approach and suggested monitoring and analysis would help guide the City toward that goal. If the City had better information it could be better prepared to weather downturns and maintain a more level course.

Mr. Poling agreed with Mr. Clark about the importance of real time analysis, which would allow the council to evaluate progress more frequently and make needed adjustments. He wanted to use the analysis so the community could carve out its own destiny rather than let destiny happen to it.

Ms. Taylor suggested residents had different aspirations in regard to the future. She said the council could influence outcomes through regulations and take actions at the appropriate time to make things happen.

Mr. Farr agreed with Ms. Taylor. He wanted to ensure the staff proposal provided a balanced approach that recognized people aspired to different things.

Responding to a question from Mr. Zelenka, City Attorney Emily Jerome conceded that it was not likely that all the planning assumptions being used were correct but staff believed the periodic evaluations that would occur would allow for adjustments and reduce the for land reserves. If evaluation indicated more land was needed, it would be relatively easy to bring it into the UGB because of the work that had already been done by staff.

Ms. Hansen then led the council through the second phase of the presentation, an update on the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) Study Areas that included more detailed information on the first priority lands within the study areas and the urban services currently in place. Councilors asked questions clarifying the details of the presentation.

Mr. Poling advocated for a distinction between “usable” acres and “available” acres to counter legal arguments that the City was bringing in too much acreage.

Mr. Farr found the presentation exciting and noted that the areas identified were adjacent to existing development and constituted some of the nicest areas of the community. However, he was concerned that there had been no discussion about how the City would provide transportation services to those areas. Ms. Gardner anticipated that the council would make policy decisions about the needed infrastructure when it selected the areas for expansion. She did not think that taking land from all the identified areas was the most efficient use of resources.

Mr. Clark agreed with the remarks of Mr. Poling and Mr. Farr. He determined from Ms. Gardner that Planning was working with Public Works to provide the council with the best possible information regarding the infrastructure needed to serve the expansion areas, including long-term financing.

Mr. Zelenka requested a memorandum with a short explanation of why an area was selected and the methodology used by staff to calculate density. He also asked for a high-level explanation of how infrastructure was paid for and what share the City bore when development occurred.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting at 1:34 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

February 27, 2012
5:30 p.m.

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

COUNCILORS ABSENT: Mike Clark.

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the February 27, 2012, work session of the Eugene City Council to order.

A. COMMITTEE REPORTS AND ITEMS OF INTEREST FROM MAYOR, CITY COUNCIL, AND CITY MANAGER

Mr. Brown reported he had attended the Valentine Day’s Party at First Place. The event recognized all the facility’s volunteers for their work.

Mr. Poling reported that Phase 1 of the Willakenzie Crossing affordable housing development was occupied and applications were being taken for Phase 2. Phase 3 was currently under construction. He believed the development would be a good addition to the community and neighborhood.

Ms. Taylor had received a constituent complaint about wild turkeys and questioned if there was something the City could do. Mayor Piercy shared her own encounter with wild turkeys earlier that day on Blair Boulevard. Mr. Zelenka also had turkeys in his ward and reported that United States Fish and Wildlife personnel warned against feeding turkeys as a way to keep them out of residential neighborhoods. Ms. Taylor said her constituent recommended the City pass a law banning the feeding of wild turkeys.

Mr. Zelenka noted upcoming meetings of the Fairmount Neighbors and the West University Neighbors.

Ms. Ortiz reported on the most recent meeting of the Joint Elected Officials Ambulance Task Force, during which members had seen examples of emergency responses. Ms. Ortiz, Mr. Farr, and Mayor Piercy attended the recent National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) dinner. Ms. Ortiz commended the youth performers from ACT-SO who performed at the dinner and noted that Deputy City Recorder Sandra Stubbs delivered the benediction and opening prayers. She had lunched with Mayor Piercy and the mayor of Littleton, Colorado to discuss immigration, and came away with the need to focus on citizenship and English language learning. Ms. Ortiz reported that the Opportunity Eugene Task Force had completed its work and its recommendations would soon be coming to the council.

Mr. Farr noted that the Bethel Education Foundation was recently honored with an Outstanding Service Award by the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG). He reported that the foundation recently held its first Trivia Night at Willamette High School as a fund raiser. The event was well-attended. He congratulated the foundation for the work it did.

Mayor Piercy noted the recent presentation regarding Connecting Communities. She added to Ms. Ortiz's remarks about the Opportunity Eugene Task Force by saying she believed the members of the task force were dedicated to finding a solution.

**B. WORK SESSION:
Urban Goat Keeping**

City Manager Jon Ruiz introduced the item, a work session on urban goat keeping requested by Mr. Brown. Mike McKerrow of the Planning and Development Department presented on the City's current regulations for the keeping of livestock. City Attorney Emily Jerome was also present for the item. Mr. McKerrow reported that if certain conditions were met, goats were allowed on R-1 (low-density residential) lots of 20,000 square feet or more. Each goat required 5,000 square feet, so an individual with a 20,000 square foot site could keep up to four goats. He acknowledged such lots were much larger than average and were becoming fewer in number over time. Mr. McKerrow noted that Springfield's regulations were similar to Eugene's. He shared information about the regulations of Seattle, Portland, and Berkley, which allowed goats on residential lots. Councilors asked questions clarifying the details of the presentation.

Mr. McKerrow noted that the Climate & Energy Action Plan and Food Security Scoping and Resource Plan spoke to the topic of urban agricultural and called for revisions to Eugene's code to facilitate additional urban agricultural opportunities. The draft Envision Eugene proposal also called for the removal of barriers in the permitting policy to allow for urban agriculture. He believed the City's policy direction supported further exploration of the topic. He suggested the code could be amended to facilitate urban livestock as part of the code amendments required to implement the recommendations coming from Envision Eugene.

Mayor Piercy solicited council questions and comments.

Mr. Brown reviewed the statements of purpose from the Seattle, Washington and Lacey, Washington codes governing goats, which were the most cogent of those he researched.

Mr. Poling supported going forward with changes to the code that enabled urban goat keeping. He had some concerns about enforcement given the challenge the City faced funding animal control. He asked how other communities enforced their ordinances.

Ms. Taylor believed if the code was changed that individual goats should be licensed. She observed that many people ate goats and asked if the slaughter of goats would be allowed inside the city limits. Mr. McKerrow said the codes he had examined did not speak to that issue. Ms. Taylor recommended staff look into the topic.

Mr. Zelenka suggested the council place miniature goats in their own category without a property size restriction and cap the number allowed in a manner similar to dogs. He recommended that the City also consider regulating pot belly pigs. City Manager Ruiz anticipated that could be addressed during the Envision Eugene code amendment process.

Ms. Ortiz supported a reduction in the minimum lot size for keeping goats as well as differentiating between full-size and miniature goats in the code. Speaking to the question of goat slaughter, Ms. Ortiz recommended that the council not attempt to dictate what people did with their animals. She did not think people would irresponsibly leave carcasses lying around.

Mayor Piercy suggested that anyone employing goats for food would have to meet minimum health and sanitation standards. She hoped staff would consider both the regulatory aspect of the issue and what the City was trying to encourage. If the City was trying to encourage food production, it should approach it more holistically to ensure it produced the best results. She believed that might include incentives and assistance to help people meet the standards the City established.

Mr. Pryor believed the council needed to keep in mind all possible outcomes. Some residents would keep livestock as pets and treat them accordingly but others might wish to engage in animal husbandry. He questioned to what extent the City wished to encourage full-scale farming on residential property, particularly in a neighborhood context.

Mr. Brown shared the names of some other communities that allowed urban goats. He continued to review the ordinances that seemed pertinent to Eugene and some of their commonalities.

Mr. Farr supported moving forward with changes to the code because he believed in the future it would be critical for food production to occur close to those who consumed it.

Mr. Brown asked how many complaints the City had received about chickens since relaxing the ordinance governing their keeping. He was not supportive of moving forward through the Envision Eugene code amendments process because those advocating for changes to the code wanted to see action before people began their spring preparations.

Mayor Piercy acknowledged that people were eager to move forward with more opportunities for goat keeping. She wondered if there was some limited short-term action that the City Council could take to address that desire. Mayor Piercy suggested that some smaller scale commercial uses might be allowed. She did not want to close that door entirely.

Mr. Pryor wanted to hear more from staff about how the City would manage enforcement of the code if revised to accommodate more opportunities for urban goat keeping. He also asked about enforcement mechanisms and if fees or permits would be sufficient to underwrite those costs. He suggested that good regulations made good neighbors.

Mr. Brown, seconded by Ms. Ortiz, moved to direct the City Manager to have staff research an ordinance in the very near future that would allow up to three goats [pygmy, dwarf, or miniature] in no less than 400 square feet of permeable surface.

Mr. Brown believed the existing regulations worked for larger animals but not for miniature goats. He said if the council moved forward with such an ordinance, people could begin to plan for spring. He believed that those who advocated for goats were responsible people who would not enter into a decision to purchase a goat casually and would be responsible for their care and upkeep. He did not want to wait until next year.

Ms. Ortiz determined from Mr. Brown that his motion was specific to miniature goats such as pygmy goats and Nubian dwarf goats. Ms. Ortiz favored language that limited the number of livestock animals

that residents could keep, such as two goats, or two rabbits, or two chickens. She was concerned about the potential a household could have many animals, adding “it’s not Noah’s Ark.” Mr. Brown declined to accept a friendly amendment from Ms. Ortiz to limit the number to two, pointing out the number could be adjusted later.

City Manager Ruiz did not anticipate that staff would be able to return with a proposal before May or June because of the existing work load. He also anticipated the neighborhood associations would want to provide input. He said staff could return with a proposal after the summer recess.

Mr. Poling could not support the motion because of his concerns regarding enforcement in the light of proposed reductions to Lane County Animal Control. He was not opposed to urban goat keeping but it was his perception staff was already working on the issue and he did not want to rush something through.

Councilors had no objection to the timeline outlined by City Manager Ruiz.

Ms. Ortiz asked City Manager Ruiz to direct staff to think about how urban goat keeping integrated with Envision Eugene and to let staff know that the subject was a priority for the council. City Manager Ruiz anticipated staff would provide some information about sequencing and how the topic could be integrated into the planning process.

The motion passed 6:1; Mr. Poling voting no.

**C. WORK SESSION:
Plastic Bag Ban**

The council was joined by Waste Management and Green Building Manager Ethan Nelson of the Planning and Development Department for the item, who led the council through a PowerPoint presentation regarding *Plastic Bag Bans*. The presentation provided information about local and state attempts to regulate plastic bags through recycling and taxation as well as information about the regulations governing plastic bags adopted by the cities of Portland and Seattle; described some of the environmental, economic, and social equity impacts of a plastic bag ban; and highlighted the council goals and statutes most relevant to a plastic bag ban. Mr. Nelson recommended that staff conduct further analysis and outreach to impacted businesses to develop a program recommendation, including scope, budget, and timeline, by fall 2012.

Mr. Zelenka said he had been working with the Northwest Grocers Association, Oregon League of Conservation Voters, Environmental Oregon, and Surf Rider to develop a model ordinance promoting the use of reusable bags at retail ordinances by banning single-use bags and allowing stores to charge for recyclable paper bags. He believed the environmental benefits of such a ban were clear. Few plastic bags were recycled and most bags became litter, lasted forever, and did harm to the environment and wildlife. He said such a ban was consistent with the council’s goals and the Climate & Energy Action Plan (CEAP). He pointed out the cost of the ban was easily avoided by the use of reusable bags, which many residents already did. He noted that Market of Choice had stopped offering its customers plastic bags. Mr. Zelenka further noted that Oregon produced paper bags but no plastic bags. He suggested social equity concerns were mitigated by the exemption for low-income residents on WIC. Mr. Zelenka said Portland worked with manufacturers to get low-cost bags to its residents. He commended the model ordinance in the meeting packet to the council.

Mayor Piercy noted that the City had already taken positions in support of such a ban at the State legislature.

Ms. Taylor asked if there were biodegradable grocery bags. Mr. Nelson said yes, but he did not think Eugene would want to encourage their use at this time because of the potential for additional contamination in the commercial composting program. He said that composters do not currently accept biodegradable bags.

Mr. Poling looked forward to moving on to the next step in the process. He said grocers in his ward indicated that the shift was occurring on an industry wide basis.

Mr. Brown opposed the use of plastic bags and supported the staff-proposed motion to move a plastic bag ban forward. He did object to the proposed cost pass-through, which forced vendors to charge customers for a service that they previously received for free. He did not think the City should try to tell vendors what they could and could not charge customers. Mr. Brown wondered if there was value to adding wholesalers to the list of vendors.

Ms. Ortiz agreed with Mr. Brown about the cost pass-through. She hoped stores would incentivize people to bring their own bags such as several local stores already did with a bag rebate.

Mr. Pryor suggested the council proceed thoughtfully, pointing out that the production of paper bags required more energy, water, trees, and CO₂ than plastic bags did. He did not think the goal was to replace plastic bags with paper bags but rather to replace them both with reusable bags. He believed a ban would not solve the problem but would begin to move the community toward that goal in the same manner as returnable bottles had reduced the waste stream. While he wanted to keep the needs of the low-income in mind, he asked how they would be identified as low-income for the purposes of exempting them from a bag charge.

Mr. Farr had no objection to retailers charging for bags, and suggested some retailers might try to gain a competitive advantage by offering free bags. He noted that Jerry's Home Improvement Center had discontinued the use of plastic bags some years ago.

Speaking to Ms. Taylor's earlier question, Mr. Zelenka said he understood that biodegradable bags did not break down without high temperatures. He suggested the concerns expressed by Mr. Brown and MS. Ortiz about the cost pass-through could be addressed by changing the word "shall" to "may" in Section 6.860.

Speaking to Mr. Pryor's remarks, Mr. Zelenka said that paper bag manufacturers maintained that paper bags produced 59 percent less greenhouse gases than plastic bags. For the benefit of the audience, Mr. Zelenka reviewed the definition of a carryout bag.

Mr. Brown endorsed Mr. Zelenka's suggested change to Section 6.860. He believed local retailers had been anticipating the change for some time and did not envision much opposition. He agreed with Ms. Ortiz that vendors could incentivize the use of reusable bags in a positive way through a small rebate. He noted that his own downtown grocery store, The Kiva, sold bags for a nickel above cost and had given away hundreds of bags to customers during special promotions. He believed the proposal would give stores time to use up their supply of plastic bags. Stores could also use that time to educate their customers about the benefits of bringing their own bags.

Mayor Piercy wanted to know more about the other cities' experience with retailers distributing bags to customers and if there were any safety issues. She suggested that Intergovernmental Relations Director Brenda Wilson be present for future discussions of the topic because Ms. Wilson was familiar with the State Legislature's debate on the subject.

Mr. Zelenka, seconded by Ms. Taylor, moved to proceed with a variation on Option #3: direct staff to develop an ordinance to promote the use of reusable bags and ban plastic bags, similar to the model ordinance included in the packet, and schedule this item and conduct the research identified in Option 2 in the packet to be brought back to the council for final action before the December 2012 break. The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting at 7:03 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

February 29, 2012
 Noon

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

COUNCILORS ABSENT: Andrea Ortiz, Mike Clark.

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the February 29, 2012, work session of the Eugene City Council to order.

**A. WORK SESSION:
 Review of 2011 Implementation of Bond Measure to Fix Streets and 2012 Pavement Management Program**

Public Works Director Kurt Corey reminded the council that Eugene voters approved a \$35.9 bond measure for street repairs in November 2008. The measure included a contract with an outside auditor to report on the use of the bonds as well as establishment of a Street Repair Review Panel to advise the City Manager on the expenditure of those funds and to ensure they were spent in accordance with the bond resolution adopted by the City Council. He referred the council to the auditor's letter, included in the meeting packet, which found the City in compliance with the purpose and limitations of City Council Resolution 4953 and noted no exceptions. The packet also included a report from the Street Repair Review Panel finding the City in compliance with the resolution, included in the meeting packet as Attachment A. Mr. Corey highlighted some of the report's recommendations.

Maintenance Director Jeff Lankston and Surface Operations Manager Eric Johnson then led the council through a PowerPoint presentation entitled *2012 Pavement Management Report*. The presentation highlighted key points in the full report in the council packet, and included information showing the impact of renewing the 2008 bond on the street maintenance backlog. Councilors asked questions clarifying the details of the presentation.

Mayor Piercy want to know when residents of badly damaged roads such as North Seneca Street could expect repairs. She asked if a slurry seal was possible on such a street. Mr. Langston said the focus of the slurry seal program was on improved residential streets with asphalt. The segment in question was gravel, and the City's grading and gravel program ceased in the early 1990s due to budget concerns. Mayor Piercy acknowledged the budget and the fact the streets in question were unimproved, but suggested the street conditions might make residents living on such streets to feel like second-class citizens. They seemed to occur where people had the least ability to do something about them. Mr. Corey concurred. He suggested that the City might be able to use some Road Fund dollars to make nominal repairs on gravel streets.

Mayor Piercy appreciated what the City had done to repair streets in the Harlow area as a result of public pressure but believed the City needed to be cognizant of the social equity of its expenditures.

Ms. Taylor thanked staff for its work. She reported that she had received more compliments and thanks for the street repairs than anything else and those she spoke to had expressed support for another bond measure.

Mr. Farr concurred with Mayor Piercy's remarks regarding North Seneca Street, saying it was one example of many throughout the community. He agreed the City should revisit its maintenance approach toward such facilities as alleys for the reasons mentioned by Mayor Piercy. He agreed with Ms. Taylor that citizen satisfaction regarding the bond measure results was high.

Mr. Farr asked how much of the deterioration of West 11th and West 18th avenues could be attributed to the lack of the West Eugene Parkway, which would have accommodated some of the traffic that now went down those arterials. Mr. Corey said the City had not performed such an analysis. Generally, deterioration on asphalt streets was proportionate to time and load. Mr. Farr suggested the City was spending more to maintain those streets than it would have had the parkway been in place.

Mr. Zelenka maintained that the West Eugene Parkway would never have been built because "the feds would have stopped it." He agreed with Ms. Taylor about constituent satisfaction and noted the local jobs that were created as a result of the bond.

Mr. Zelenka said without further funding, the maintenance backlog would grow. The City must have \$15 million to \$18 million more to make progress. He recalled past discussion of a transportation system fee and suggested it had more of a nexus to road repair than a bond. In addition, he believed it was unfair for Eugene residents to pay full cost of the roads when 50 percent of those using them paid nothing. He maintained a transportation system fee "would get us there" and asked for further information about the status of that mechanism. Mr. Corey had nothing new to report. He suggested the issue was complicated by the current economy. He thought the City needed to continue to consider such a fee and reminded the council that the City had been limited in the past by its ability to collect the fee.

City Manager Ruiz reminded Mr. Zelenka that the council had asked staff to return with information in the near-term to support future discussions about different taxing mechanisms.

Mr. Brown thanked Public Works and the members of the panel. He also thanked the council for developing the bond measure, which he considered a great model for the future to address problems where there was wide agreement.

Mr. Poling also thanked the panel, staff, and the voters. Speaking to the potential of renewing the bond, Mr. Poling acknowledged his concerns about passing such a bond in the current economic climate.

Mr. Pryor thanked staff and the panel. He believed that with the support of the voters, the repair backlog had been brought under control to some degree. He also commended the council for taking action to address the backlog, but agreed with Mr. Zelenka that there was more work to be done. He wondered if there was a way to consolidate the council's discussions about taxes or approach them in a more unified way given there were only so many taxing mechanisms available. Mr. Pryor did not want the council to forget the operations and maintenance backlog and questioned how the City could approach that and what the community would be comfortable funding. Street repair was one of the most important expenditures the City was making and he anticipated it would continue to be an important topic. He did not want to lose the progress that had been made.

Mayor Piercy emphasized the importance of roads to all modes of travel. She pointed out some roads were in such poor condition that parents had to drive their children to school because they were too rutted to bicycle or walk. Their poor condition affected residents' ability to get around the community and earn a livelihood. Many residents were not in a strong financial position to contribute to the solution but they still needed roads.

Mr. Zelenka emphasized that the council had not fixed the problem; it merely put a bandage on it. While he supported a broader conversation about revenue and wanted that to happen sooner rather than later, he would not be likely to support another bond measure unless a council majority supported a transportation utility fee.

Speaking to Mr. Zelenka's remarks, Ms. Taylor pointed out that residents got to vote on the bond measure. She believed that residents liked the bond measure and would probably vote for it again.

Mr. Corey anticipated the Street Repair Review Panel would discuss the potential of another street repair measure at upcoming meetings and staff would share the panel's recommendation later in the year.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting at 1 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

March 12, 2012
5:30 p.m.

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

COUNCILORS ABSENT: Betty Taylor, Mike Clark.

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the March 12, 2012, work session of the Eugene City Council to order at 5:40 p.m.

A. COMMITTEE REPORTS AND ITEMS OF INTEREST FROM MAYOR, CITY COUNCIL, AND CITY MANAGER

Mr. Brown reported that the McKenzie Watershed Council (MWC) heard a presentation from Greg Grant of the United States Forest Service on the geology and hydrology of the McKenzie River basin at its February meeting. Brian Wolfer of Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife had discussed the status of cougars and bears in the basin at the March meeting and AmeriCorps volunteer Danielle Hummel had shared information about the FEAST (Food, Agriculture, Agricultural Solutions Together) Program.

Mr. Farr reported that the Food for Lane County Dining Room Task Force had issued its final report and it appeared the downtown Dining Room would remain open.

Ms. Ortiz noted that “We Are Bethel” event would take place on June 2 at Petersen Barn. She had visited the Bethel Health Center and said it was very nice.

Ms. Ortiz said she had followed up the concerns that North Seneca Road residents had regarding the condition of their road with City Manager Jon Ruiz and hoped to have some responses soon.

Mr. Pryor said the Housing Policy Board continued to discuss how to streamline its Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The Lane Council of Governments Board of Directors met to discuss the agency’s budget.

Mr. Zelenka reported that he and Mr. Pryor had attended the Birth to Three fund-raising event on March 9, which was a very good event and much money had been raised.

Mr. Poling asked those wishing to make food donations to “Harlow Serves” to drop them off at Bertha Holt Elementary or Papa’s Pizza on Coburg Road by March 19. He noted the success of the last event.

Mr. Poling said the Board of Directors of Travel Lane County would meet on March 14.

Mayor Piercy called attention to the upcoming performances of the opera “Nixon in China” and encouraged residents to attend. She noted that unemployment was down while rail ridership was up. She reported that Oregon Research Institute would break ground on its new building and the Inn at 5th would have a ribbon cutting later in the week.

Mayor Piercy had attended the most recent Oregon Metropolitan Planning Organization Consortium meeting in Corvallis. She reported that Corvallis stopped charging for the bus and added the costs of the system to the utility fee. That had increased transit ridership by 30 percent.

Mayor Piercy circulated a copy of Portland’s Climate Smart Scenario Project. She suggested Eugene might want to pay attention to the work Portland was doing regarding importing in its economic development plan.

Mayor Piercy said the State had issued its new highway mobility standards.

**B. WORK SESSION:
Adoption of Federal Priorities List**

The council was joined by Intergovernmental Relations Director Brenda Wilson, who presented the Federal Priorities List.

Ms. Wilson recalled the council’s passage of a resolution calling on Congress to refer an amendment repealing the Supreme Court decision in *Citizens United versus the Federal Communication Commission* to the states; the resolution also stated the item would be included on the City’s 2012 federal legislative agenda. She recommended that the City not propose to add the item to the United Front list because, based on past actions, it was unlikely to be supported by Springfield or Lane County. Staff would continue to advocate for the issue as part of the City’s federal legislative agenda.

Ms. Wilson reviewed the items on the list. Councilors asked questions clarifying the status of the items on the list.

Mr. Brown, seconded by Mr. Farr, moved to adopt the recommended Eugene United Front 2012 Federal Priorities List. The motion passed unanimously, 6:0.

**C. WORK SESSION:
Capstone Collegiate Community Housing Development Proposal**

The council was joined by Nan Laurence of the Planning and Development Department, who introduced the members of the Capstone Collegiate Properties development team who were present. Ms. Laurence led the council through a PowerPoint presentation titled *Proposed Downtown Student Housing Project*. The presentation highlighted adopted City plans and policies governing downtown development and included maps showing the site location in the context of downtown and nearby neighborhood associations. The presentation described the project phases and included information about the proposed alley vacation and related bicycle and pedestrian improvements. The presentation concluded with a schedule of public engagement opportunities and the council timeline for action. Councilors asked questions clarifying the details of the presentation.

Mayor Piercy asked that the council be provided with the notes of the public forums held on the proposal.

Mayor Piercy expressed appreciation for the inclusion of open social space in the proposal. She also appreciated the proposed bicycle and pedestrian plans and hoped City staff looked carefully at what other bicycle/pedestrian amenities could be included in the development.

Mayor Piercy encouraged the developers to meet with residents of the Olive Plaza to allay their concerns. She asked about the possibility of including non-student housing in the development. Ms. Laurence indicated that was possible.

Mayor Piercy reported that two local agencies that worked with individuals with disabilities had expressed interest in having space in the development so their staff could work with the students.

Mr. Farr suggested that with the exception of policy 5, the proposal appeared to satisfy the City's Growth Management Policies. Referring to Policy 6, *Increase density of new housing development while maintaining the character and livability of individual neighborhoods*, Mr. Farr asked how the proposal satisfied that policy. Ms. Laurence suggested that placing student housing in the proposed location could lessen the pressure for development in other established residential neighborhoods.

Mr. Farr asked how the proposal satisfied Policy 9, *Mitigate the impacts of new and/or higher density housing, in-fill, and redevelopment on neighborhoods through design standards, open space and housing maintenance programs, and continuing historic preservation and neighborhood planning programs*. Ms. Laurence said the development plans considered the needs of adjacent historic properties including such as the Kennel-Ellis Building and the Florence Apartments and attempted to provide additional and improved access to the Florence Apartments. The Kennel-Ellis Building was less impacted.

Mr. Farr believed that the development was supported by the City's Growth Management Policies. It would provide needed downtown housing and would promote other downtown economic development because students had needs.

Mr. Pryor acknowledged residents' concerns about the proposed development. He believed the council needed to recognize those concerns and address them head-on in a thoughtful and realistic way. He concurred with Mayor Piercy about the need for outreach to residents of Olive Plaza. He suggested that Eugene was turning into a different kind of community and that was sometimes painful. The Growth Management Policies spoke to a desire for more density and that was not just talk. The goal must be accomplished, but the City must be sensitive about how that occurred.

Ms. Ortiz asked if the council timeline worked for the developer. City Manager Ruiz said the developer needed to finalize its plans about mid-May and his goal was to ensure the council could make a decision at the end of April or beginning of May. He said the project was large and unusual for the community and he wanted to ensure there was time to get people answers to their questions.

Ms. Ortiz suggested that the proposed development was exactly what was wanted to downtown to create a critical mass of residents, so she questioned the amount of process that was required and suggested the council re-evaluate the process following its action on the Multi-Family Property Tax Exemption (MUPTE) application.

Responding to a request from Mr. Zelenka for an estimate of the projected annual MUPTE, Community Development Director Mike Sullivan said tentative figures indicated a range of \$900,000 and \$1.6 million annually. That analysis was still underway. Mr. Zelenka observed that the amount involved was larger than the cumulative amount of taxes exempted to date.

Mr. Zelenka agreed with Mayor Piercy about the importance of communal open space. He emphasized the importance of onsite management for such a development because of the anticipated student population and asked what the City could do to ensure that long-term site management occurred. He suggested that the City codify a requirement for on-site management based on the number of units in a development.

Responding to a question from Mr. Zelenka, Ms. Laurence said the developer planned to build to the LEED silver standard or to Earth Advantage standards. The developer was looking into car sharing and electric vehicle charging stations. Mr. Zelenka challenged the developer to meet the LEED gold standard.

Responding to a question from Mr. Zelenka about bicycle parking, Ms. Laurence said the bicycle parking proposed would exceed the City's code standards. Mr. Zelenka wanted to ensure that there was sufficient vehicle parking on the site to avoid a situation where students drove around looking for on-street parking spaces.

Mr. Brown asked what entities on the property were paying property taxes. Ms. Laurence indicated she would return with more detail.

Mr. Brown requested information about University of Oregon enrollment projections, the current student vacancy rate, and the number of student housing units still under construction.

Mayor Piercy suggested the on-site management proposed would help address behaviors that people were concerned about. She did not think the community would ever be completely in agreement about the MUPTE application.

Mayor Piercy emphasized her commitment to urbanizing the community. Otherwise, she feared Eugene would face sprawl, increased carbon emissions, and less livability. She acknowledged it was a big shift for the community to grow vertically and acknowledged it made some people uncomfortable, but it was where the council said it wanted the community to go.

Responding to a question from Mr. Zelenka about how the City could codify long-term on-site management, City Manager Ruiz said staff would look into what legally could be done.

Mr. Zelenka believed that the development would relieve pressure on neighborhoods around the University of Oregon, where old houses were being removed for the construction of high-density housing right next to single-family houses, which dramatically changed the character of those neighborhoods.

Mr. Brown believed the council should hold as many meetings as possible and hear from as many stakeholders as possible given the size of the proposed development. He said the Downtown Neighborhood Association had been very concerned about the project because of the massing and fact the residents would be students.

Responding to a question from Mr. Farr about the timeline, Ms. Laurence said the developers hoped to begin construction in June so they could begin to rent units in fall 2012. Mr. Farr determined from Ms. Laurence that the timeline took site preparation into account.

Mr. Poling agreed the scope of the proposal warranted extra council scrutiny and he welcomed a two-way conversation with the development team. He asked what experience other communities had with such developments when school was not in session.

Ms. Ortiz suggested that students came in all forms and likened the concerns about the anticipated student residents to profiling. Speaking to the size of the project, Ms. Ortiz pointed out that the MUPTE did not have a maximum unit limit and suggested the City was open for business or it was not.

Mr. Brown said those at the public meeting at Cosmic Pizza were not adamantly opposed to the development but were concerned about long-term on-site management. He had investigated Capstone's development history and found that it had sold three of its four off-campus Texas developments and that pattern was repeated in every state the company operated in. He had found that Capstone tended to retain its on-campus developments. Mr. Brown reported that after Capstone sold its properties, the residents' satisfaction ratings went down.

Mr. Zelenka suggested to Ms. Ortiz that the cohort in question presented a challenge to many of his neighbors and he was willing to pass on some of the e-mails he received. He also noted the fact of the party patrol and its focus on the campus area.

Mr. Zelenka wondered if the on-site parking could be constructed so it could be converted to another use in the future.

Councilors briefly discussed the potential of sending a team of councilors to view a Capstone project in another community or holding a virtual work session with a community that had such a project.

Mr. Farr believed the Capstone project could be a legacy project for the council.

Mayor Piercy hoped the council and community could focus on what it would take to make the project work rather than worry about the bad things it might bring.

Mr. Brown suggested the potential that the general public could use unused parking on the site.

Mr. Zelenka was interested in knowing what the City could do to ensure the property was cared for into the future to maintain its value and ensure that it continued to attract residents. He also wondered what the council could do to ensure the construction jobs created by the project would be filled by local residents.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting at 7:27 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

March 12, 2012
 7:30 p.m.

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

COUNCILORS ABSENT: Mike Clark, Betty Taylor.

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the March 12, 2012, regular meeting of the Eugene City Council to order.

1. PUBLIC FORUM

Mayor Piercy reviewed the rules of the Public Forum.

Lars Henke, Ward 1, advocated for improved skateboard facilities in Eugene, particularly around the University of Oregon campus, and changes to the City Code that classified skateboarders as cyclists rather than pedestrians to allow them to use bicycle lanes. He reported on student surveys that indicated support for his recommendations.

Kortney Jolley, Ward 1, agreed with the remarks of Mr. Henke. She proposed that Eugene pass legislation modeled after Title 16 in the City of Portland's code, which reclassified skateboarders as cyclists. She anticipated that such an action would result in more places for skateboarders to ride lawfully and increased pedestrian safety. The revised regulations would be more enforceable. She hoped to see the changes create a more comfortable commuting environment for those who used skateboards.

Judi Horstmann, Ward 3, urged the council to accept the Bicycle Pedestrian Master Plan (BPMP) and direct the City Manager to incorporate it into the Transportation System Plan update. She urged that the BPMP be funded and recommended that the City reinstate the Sidewalk Infill Program. She also urged council support for a new street repair measure that supported active transportation and encouraged the council and staff to rethink the City's definition of collectors and arterials to include streets with high volumes of bicycle use.

Irene Cardenas, Ward 1, advocated for a homeless camp so the homeless could be integrated into the socio-economic structure. She said there were successful examples of such camps in other communities.

Joe Tyndall, Ward 1, discussed a recent incident involving a member of Occupy Eugene and an officer of the Eugene Police Department (EPD). He maintained the involved officer had perjured himself and asked what the City was going to do about it. Mr. Tyndall opposed other contemplated regulations that he believed were aimed against the homeless in downtown, such as a ban on dogs. He was opposed to tax breaks for the proposed Capstone development. Mr. Tyndall concluded by asserting that the downtown

crime rate had dropped by 90 percent while the Occupy Eugene encampment was open and suggested it was a good alternative to the Downtown Public Safety Zone (DPSZ).

Kayla Schott-Dressler, Ward 7, representing the Lane Coalition for Healthy Active Youth, asked the City Council to adopt a “Health for All” policy and that public health be considered at all stages of the policy development process in order to achieve a sustainable community. She said her organization would be happy to partner with the City.

Kimberly Gladen, Ward 1, favored the proposal to expand the car camping program to allow tents. She suggested it was the least that the City could do and criticized the community for not doing more to help the homeless. She criticized local activists for targeting the downtown for its actions, which put stress on local low-income people, low-income downtown workers, and small unique downtown businesses rather than major chains. She suggested the community would have an open homeless shelter by now if activists spent half the time raising money that they put into actions.

James Scott, Ward 7, discussed the impact of a new development on North Seneca Street, an unimproved City street. He said the City allowed the building to be built without adequate drainage, leading to the formation of a large body of water on the street. Mr. Scott did not object to maintaining the street but could not do so without drainage. When he contacted the Public Works Department it was suggested to him that he dig a ditch on the other side of the street, but that would require that he dig up the sidewalk, Eugene Water & Electric Board accesses, and the new development’s driveway. Mr. Scott requested the council’s assistance.

Alley Valkyrie, Ward 1, shared her version of an encounter she had with an EPD officer downtown. She averred she was cited not because she committed a crime but because the officer disliked her. Subsequently, the charges were dropped. Ms. Valkyrie challenged the details of the police report. She questioned how many of the people who were arrested for trespass in the community had been convicted on the officer’s word and called for a review of all the criminal trespass citations written in the DPSZ in the past year.

Kathy Ging, Ward 3, asked that the community be allowed to vote on the Capstone Collegiate Communities Multi-Unit Property Tax Exemption application. She did not support the number of student tenants being proposed by Capstone and questioned how that many students in the downtown core would enhance the community’s quality of life. She noted some of the concerns expressed by residents at a neighborhood association meeting, which included the noise from the proposed development and the impact of residents’ behaviors on nearby senior residents. Ms. Ging suggested that instead, the site be developed with owner-occupied condominiums and occupants offered 40-50 year mortgages with no penalty for prepayment.

Mayor Piercy closed the Public Forum and thanked those who spoke. She determined that Councilor Farr planned to request a council work session on the issues raised by Mr. Henke and Ms. Jolley. Speaking to testimony advocating for funding for the BPMP, Mayor Piercy reported the City was seeking federal funding as part of its United Front effort. Speaking to testimony advocating for the incorporation of public health considerations in City policies, Mayor Piercy noted the work the City had done to tie health considerations to its planning for land use and transportation. Speaking to the comments of Ms. Ging, Mayor Piercy noted that apartments were planned for the former Taco Time Building and former City Hall II, but she understood there was very little bank financing for condominium development at this time.

Councilor Ortiz thanked those who spoke. Speaking to Mr. Scott's comments about North Seneca Street, Councilor Ortiz reported that Mayor Piercy had shared photographs of the street with the council. City Manager Jon Ruiz was examining available funding sources to determine what could be done. She hoped to see action by the next winter.

Councilor Poling also thanked those who spoke. He expressed appreciation for the comments he had received from constituents who supported the motion he offered the Budget Committee to return \$65,000 to Animal Services. He noted that many of those who contacted him either worked for or volunteered for animal rescue groups and suggested they should be thanked for the work they did. He also expressed appreciation to the Budget Committee for supporting the motion.

Councilor Farr emphasized the importance of increasing street maintenance funding to prevent additional North Seneca Roads from happening.

2. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Approval of City Council Minutes**
 - November 30, 2011, Work Session
 - December 12, 2011, Work Session
 - December 14, 2011, Work Session
 - February 10, 2012, Retreat
- B. Approval of Tentative Working Agenda**

Councilor Brown, seconded by Councilor Farr, moved to approve the items on the Consent Calendar. Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 6:0.

3. ACTION:

Eugene Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan

City Manager Jon Ruiz introduced the item, reminding the council that the master planning process was initiated in 2010 and was intended to provide the community with the policies and projects needed to create a first-class city for bicycling and walking over the next 20 years. He asked the council to accept the plan as an interim step until it could be adopted as a component of the Transportation System Plan when adopted in 2013.

Councilor Brown, seconded by Councilor Farr, moved to accept the Eugene Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan prepared pursuant to ODOT TGM Grant No. 26778 and to direct the City Manager to integrate the plan into the proposed Transportation System Plan update.

Responding to a question from Councilor Zelenka about next steps in moving the plan to the project-level stage, Associate Transportation Planner Reed Dunbar said staff would ask the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee to prioritize the projects in the plan and would use the list as a working document to review biannually when City staff applied for grants and other available moneys.

Councilor Farr was pleased to see that bicycle and pedestrian improvements were planned for and occurring all across the community.

Mayor Piercy noted the several innovative bicycle facility improvements that had occurred close to campus and were being enjoyed by many residents, who liked being in bicycle lanes that did not compete with vehicles.

Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 6:0.

**4. ACTION:
An Ordinance to Redesignate and Rezone “The Rexus Site” by Amending the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan Diagram and Amending the Eugene Zoning Map (City Files MA 11-2 and Z 11-4)**

City Manager Ruiz introduced the item, a proposal to redesignate and rezone 27.9 acres of the 48-acre Rexus site from Light-Medium Industrial to a combination of Low-Density Residential, Medium-Density Residential, and Commercial. He reported that the Eugene Planning Commission had unanimously recommended approval of the proposal. Findings of consistency with applicable City plans and policies were found in Exhibit C of the Agenda Item Summary included in the council meeting packet. Planner Steve Ochs was present to answer questions.

Mr. Brown expressed support for the ordinance as he believed the site would be put to a better use.

Councilor Brown, seconded by Councilor Farr, moved to adopt Council Bill 5065, an ordinance to redesignate and rezone “The Rexus Site” by amending the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan Diagram and amending the Eugene Zoning Map (City Files MA 11-2 and Z 11-4).

Responding to a question from Councilor Zelenka about potential conflicts between industrial and residential uses on the property, Mr. Ochs anticipated the residential development would have a \PD overlay so it would have to demonstrate compatibility with the industrial site. Any proposal would go through the planned unit development application process with a decision made by the hearings official to determine compatibility. Twenty-foot setbacks and screening would be required.

Mr. Pryor was pleased to see the proposal because it was consistent with other work the council had done regarding redevelopment along West 11th Avenue. It would lead to a mix of uses. He hoped it was just the beginning of the gradual transformation of the entire area.

Councilor Farr believed the envisioned development would be a more appropriate use for the site.

Councilor Zelenka agreed with Councilor Farr and Councilor Pryor.

Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 6:0.

**5. ACTION:
An Ordinance Concerning Permitted Overnight Sleeping and Amending Section 4.816 of the Eugene Code, 1971**

City Manager Ruiz recalled that in December 2012 the council adopted a temporary amendment to Eugene Code Section 4.816 that allowed tents to be redefined as vehicles for the purpose of car camping. He recommended the ordinance be extended to the end of the calendar year and said staff would use that

time to evaluate the effectiveness of the amendment. Council Coordinator Beth Forrest distributed an amended ordinance with a sunset date of December 31, 2012. City Attorney Kathryn Brotherton was present to answer questions.

Responding to a question from Councilor Brown about the reason for the selected sunset date, Community Programs Analyst Michael Wisth said staff planned to do a long-term feasibility study of including tents in the definition of vehicles. There were only two current tent sites and staff hoped to have a larger sample size to evaluate the long-term effects of the change before returning to recommend a permanent amendment to the ordinance. Councilor Brown suggested the effort might be moot if there were no more tent sites and he questioned why the sunset would be in the middle of winter rather than later in the spring.

Councilor Brown, seconded by Councilor Farr, moved to adopt an ordinance amending Section 5 of Ordinance No. 20484 to extend the sunset date to December 31, 2012.

Councilor Zelenka determined from City Manager Ruiz that the manager concurred with Mr. Wisth's remarks regarding the need for more data.

Speaking to earlier testimony in the Public Forum, Mayor Piercy said none of the council believed a tent camp would solve the community's homeless issue or was ideal for most people to live in. The amendment was an attempt to ensure that people were not totally unsheltered.

Responding to a question from Councilor Ortiz, Mr. Wisth said St. Vincent de Paul's contract for the car camping program was up for renewal in August 2012. Councilor Ortiz hoped that whatever data was gathered would be folded into the contract. She supported the sunset and wanted to know if the program was working. She hoped to see other solutions to the problems of homelessness.

Councilor Farr supported the motion. He agreed with the mayor's remarks. He reminded the audience of Eugene's long history of providing assistance to the homeless. He believed Eugene led the nation in its efforts and was doing its best with the resources it had.

Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 6:0.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting at 8:37 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

May 2, 2012
5:30 p.m.

COUNCILORS PRESENT: George Brown, Andrea Ortiz, George Poling, Alan Zelenka.

COUNCILORS ABSENT: Betty Taylor, Chris Pryor, Mike Clark, Pat Farr.

Council President George Brown called the May 2, 2012, session of the Eugene City Council to order.

A. BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS INTERVIEWS

The council interviewed Christopher Nunes, Nichole Sharette, Heather McGill, Denise Griewisch, and Miaya Sustaita for vacancies on the Human Rights Commission. Each candidate was asked the following questions:

1. *Can you tell us a little bit about your efforts to promote diversity, equality, equity, and understanding of human rights within the community, either through volunteer work or in your employment activities? Please give examples.*
2. *Volunteering for a City human rights commission that advises elected officials and works with City staff is different from a community-based human rights organization. Given those differences what skills or abilities do you have that would make you effective in this role?*
3. *The Human Rights Commission's 2012-13 priorities include working with the community and advising the City Council on issues involving integration of immigrants into the community; homelessness; problems experienced by youth; and racism and other expressions of bias and hate. Can you comment on your experiences and/or your interest in addressing these issues?*

The council interviewed Jill Fetherstonhaugh, Richard Varner, and Marshall Wilde for vacancies on the Budget Committee. Each candidate was asked the following questions:

1. *Suppose that the City of Eugene is projected to experience a long-term financial deficit where its expenditures are expected to exceed revenues for the foreseeable future. What policy options would you consider to create a balanced City budget?*
2. *What City services do you consider to be the most important to the community in general and to you personally?*
3. *Taking into account broad community input is an important part of the Budget Committee discussions and decision-making. What types of information and community feedback would you consider as part of analyzing and discussing the City's budget?*

Mr. Brown thanked each candidate and indicated that the council would make its appointments soon.

Mr. Brown adjourned the meeting at 7:50 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

May 7, 2012
 5:30 p.m.

COUNCILORS PRESENT: George Brown, George Poling, Alan Zelenka.

COUNCILORS ABSENT: Betty Taylor, Andrea Ortiz, Mike Clark, Chris Pryor, Pat Farr

Council President George Brown called the May 7, 2012, session of the Eugene City Council to order.

A. BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS INTERVIEWS

The council interviewed Laurie Bernstein, Stephan Adams, Jim Wilcox, Ivan Campbell, Denise Griewisch, Sasha Luftig, and Sarah Mazze for vacancies on the Eugene Sustainability Commission. Each candidate was asked the following questions:

1. *What prompted you to apply for the Sustainability Commission? Based on what you know about the role of the commission, what skills, knowledge and community connections could you bring to help the commission be successful?*
2. *What do you consider to be the most important issues to address in Eugene to enable the community to become more sustainable in ways that encompass social equity, economic prosperity and environmental stewardship?*
3. *The commission is asked to advise the council on a policy that has the potential to provide significant “green” results (e.g. energy efficiency, natural resource protection, etc.) but appears to have negative impacts to social equity in the community. How would you reconcile these impacts? What priorities should guide the commission’s position?*

The council interviewed Robert Clark for a vacancy on the Budget Committee. Mr. Clark was asked the following questions:

1. *Suppose that the City of Eugene is projected to experience a long-term financial deficit where its expenditures are expected to exceed revenues for the foreseeable future. What policy options would you consider to create a balanced City budget?*
2. *What City services do you consider to be the most important to the community in general and to you personally?*
3. *Taking into account broad community input is an important part of the Budget Committee discussions and decision-making. What types of information and community feedback would you consider as part of analyzing and discussing the City’s budget?*

Mr. Brown thanked the candidates and indicated that the council would make its appointments soon.

Mr. Brown adjourned the meeting at 7:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest
City Recorder

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)