

## MINUTES

**Eugene City Council  
Harris Hall, 125 East 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Eugene, Oregon 97401**

**April 17, 2019  
12:00 p.m.**

Councilors Present: Emily Semple, Jennifer Yeh, Alan Zelenka, Mike Clark, Chris Pryor, Greg Evans, Betty Taylor, Claire Syrett

Mayor Vinis opened the April 17, 2019, work session of the Eugene City Council. She noted that she had been communicating with council via email to schedule an additional work session in May to continue their community safety revenue discussion.

**1. POSSIBLE ACTION: A Resolution Requesting the Federal Government to Update Studies on Potential Health Risks of 5G Radio Frequency Wireless Emissions and Publish Findings, as Federal Guidelines Push for More Rapid Deployment of 5G**

Council Discussion:

- Councilor Taylor – said the council has heard a lot from the community about this topic and a resolution may help to clarify the council’s position.
- Councilor Clark – said he would vote for the motion because he would like to be better educated about the topic.
- Councilor Zelenka – noted the resolution was very similar to Portland’s and he would support it.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Semple, moved to adopt a resolution requesting the Federal government to update studies on potential health risks of 5G radio frequency wireless emissions and publish findings, as Federal guidelines push for more rapid deployment of 5G. **PASSED 8:0**

**2. WORK SESSION: Municipal Court Presiding Judge**

Interim City Manager’s Office Division Manager Becky DeWitt presented the council’s options related to the salary and job description for a new presiding judge.

Council Discussion:

- Councilor Clark – asked whether it would be possible to let Interim Presiding Judge Gill know what questions council would like to ask; specifically, noting that he would like to ask about a recent news article critiquing community court.
- Councilor Semple – asked for clarification about the two salary options presented and how they would be negotiated.
- Councilor Zelanka – asked whether the average salary reflects the Beaverton geographic pay differential, whether the second option included a salary range, and whether business expenses would be included.
- Councilor Syrett – asked for clarification regarding the Beaverton geographic pay differential; supported asking Judge Gill about community court considering he had a role in establishing it; stated willingness to vote for the second option presented.
- Councilor Pryor – said he supported the second option because it gives council the opportunity to negotiate with a candidate using a salary range.

- Councilor Taylor – asked for clarity about whether a decision needed to be made that day; noted she would also like to ask questions regarding community court; asked when an interview would occur.
- Councilor Clark – said he supported the second option; wanted to make sure that the pay range would adjust in accordance with other similar positions around the City.
- Councilor Semple – asked whether council had used these same strategies when hiring the Police Auditor; expressed her support for the second option.
- Councilor Zelenka – asked for clarification from the City Attorney regarding the purpose of the salary range and where it will appear; asked whether experience in community court should be included as a requirement.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Semple, moved to move forward with the presiding municipal judge’s contract salary consistent with option two and with a job description consistent with Attachment A to the agenda item summary. **PASSED 8:0**

### 3. **WORK SESSION: Local Options for Inclusionary Zoning**

Grants Manager Stephanie Jennings gave a presentation to council on what inclusionary zoning is, how it is used around the country and in Oregon, about local market conditions worth considering in a local program, and community perspectives recently gathered through the Housing Tools and Strategies process.

#### Council Discussion:

- Councilor Zelenka – asked staff how the fee-in-lieu-of option is determined and whether the percentage of units is established locally; said he did not like that the local government doesn’t get to decide what to do with the funds.
- Councilor Taylor – said one of the advantages of inclusionary zoning is to integrate housing types, which is especially good for children; asked for clarification about whether a condominium is considered a “home” under the legislation that allows for inclusionary zoning in Oregon; expressed support for inclusionary zoning in Eugene.
- Councilor Clark – opposed the idea of inclusionary zoning because it discourages development; preferred to incentivize affordable housing rather than issue directives.
- Councilor Syrett – asked whether the funds could be used if the City didn’t have any inclusionary zoning housing projects; asked whether it was required to have other incentives in addition to the construction excise tax; asked for clarification about what happens if a building with inclusionary zoning units is sold; supported the concept but expressed doubt that it was the best tool to use for building more affordable housing because of the restrictions the State puts on the CET funds.
- Mayor Vinis – asked staff for information about what made the program successful in Portland.
- Councilor Semple – asked what proportion of the developers in Portland chose the fee-in-lieu-of option rather than building the units; asked for clarification about what could be done with new CET funds; asked whether Portland’s program was mandatory; asked about the time and cost it would take to establish such a program compared to the impact and whether a voluntary program would work; preferred that council have authority over what to do with CET funds.
- Councilor Pryor – highlighted the shared goal of dispersing different types of housing throughout the city; recommended a review of the Housing Dispersal Policy in order to reach the desired outcome.

- Councilor Taylor – expressed a desire for economically integrated housing throughout the city; said she would like to lobby the legislature to change the problems with the bill.
- Councilor Yeh – asked whether buildings with IZ units would still offer social services to residents—something that’s frequently offered in low-income housing.
- Councilor Zelenka – asked whether the boundaries of IZ could be restricted and whether that, correspondingly, limits the CET; asked what other incentives Portland used; likened IZ to the multi-unit property tax exemption.
- Councilor Evans – asked whether the IZ has disincentivized development in Portland.
- Councilor Syrett – thanked Councilor Pryor for bringing up the Housing Dispersal Policy and agreed it should be reviewed; said she would like to see a proposal for a voluntary IZ program; requested more details on the IZ program and process in Corvallis.
- Councilor Clark – said the city would need 6,700 units of multi-family housing before 2035 in order for the City to meet its stated goals in Envision Eugene; advocated for incentivizing development; asked whether developers—under a mandatory IZ program—would be required to rent their more affordable units to people/families with incomes below a certain level; would like the City to have its own down payment assistance program to help people get out of poverty.
- Mayor Vinis – noted this topic was one of the items in the Housing Tools and Strategies conversation, so it would return to council.

The meeting adjourned at 1:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Beth Forrest  
City Recorder

*(Recorded by Cas Casados)*

Link to the webcast of this City Council meeting: [here](#).