

MINUTES

Eugene City Council
McNutt Room—City Hall
777 Pearl Street—Eugene, Oregon

June 20, 2011
5:30 p.m.

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

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

A. WORK SESSION:
Housing and Urban Development Sustainable Communities Grant

Assistant City Manager Sarah Medary introduced the topic, reminding the council that the Housing and Urban Development (HUD), through the Partnership for Sustainable Communities Program, had awarded the region a \$1.45 million Sustainable Communities Grant. The Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) was lead agency in developing the Memorandum of Understanding between the local partners in the Lane Livability Consortium, which would be funded by the grant. She reported that the deadline for submittal of the MOU had been extended by HUD.

Assistant City Manager Medary went on to place the grant in the context of several City of Eugene planning initiatives, including the Climate & Energy Action Plan, Envision Eugene, and the Diversity and Equity Strategic Plan. She suggested the grant was an opportunity to integrate that work with some of the other planning efforts in the region and leverage additional resources. She cited the Regional Transportation Plan, Regional Prosperity and Economic Development Plan, and the Eugene-Springfield Consolidated Plan as examples of those planning efforts.

Grants Manager Stephanie Jennings led the council through a PowerPoint presentation that provided additional information about the Partnership for Sustainable Communities and the funding available through the program. The presentation summarized the goals of the Lane Livability Consortium, which were to review existing plans and identify gaps and opportunities for linkages, and to create tools and resources for advancing existing plans in ways that leveraged multiple benefits. The presentation listed the partners in the consortium and described the allocation of funding.

Planning Director Lisa Gardner emphasized the competitive nature of the grant application process and the fact Eugene was one of very few west coast communities to receive a Sustainable Communities Grant. She invited questions and comments.

Mayor Piercy suggested the grant provided the City with an opportunity to move several of its planning efforts to the implementation phase.

Mr. Clark said economic conditions meant the City needed to work better with its regional partners. He pointed out the City was already involved in several regional problem-solving efforts, such as the Area Commission on Transportation. He was unclear about the value of the grant and suggested it would fund

research into additional grant opportunities that would lead to more things that did not produce as tangible a benefit as he hoped for. He asked what concrete products that participation in the consortium would provide for the City, outside of greater opportunities for cooperation. Mr. Clark also asked for information about the consortium's place in the governance structure and its relationship to regional decision-making organizations and the decision-making structures already in place. He determined from Assistant City Manager Medary that the City's commitment of staff time was limited to eligible activities that staff had already budgeted for and planned to do. Assistant City Manager Medary said the work Ms. Jennings already was doing, for example, could be counted toward the match.

Mr. Farr determined from Assistant City Manager Medary that Eugene's share of the \$1.45 million grant was \$52,000 and that LCOG would receive the majority of the grant funding as that agency was doing most of the work involved. She said the amount being received by the City of Eugene was in line with the funding to be received by Springfield.

Mr. Brown asked for clarification of Task 7.5, "Defining Our Region." Project Manager Andrea Riner of LCOG noted the many regional boundaries that existed in Lane County, which added to the challenge of determining what jurisdictions should be involved in various planning efforts. She anticipated that staff would inventory those boundaries to determine if "there were efficiencies we could look at." Mr. Brown asked if that information would be provided to HUD to clarify what region was involved. Ms. Riner anticipated that the information would be shared with the participating agencies, which would meet HUD's requirements.

Mr. Zelenka arrived.

Mayor Piercy pointed out that the draft MOU stated that the consortium members would ensure regional discussions occurred within the current governance framework. She believed that the partnership was being set up to respect and to employ the existing government framework. She further pointed out that the MOU referred to the consortium as an advisory body intended to provide assistance to partner agencies as and when requested.

Mr. Clark asked how the effort was different than the abandoned Region 2050 planning effort. Ms. Gardner recalled that Region 2050 was a planning framework focused on identifying regional priorities. The proposed partnership assumed that work had been done. She believed the partnership was an opportunity to leverage existing planning efforts to the next level. Ms. Gardner also pointed out that the federal funding approach had shifted to a new model that was no longer single-objective; instead, grant opportunities were multi-objective, such as the TIGER grant and Sustainable Communities grant. She believed that if Eugene could continue to be seen as an innovative city that gets things done it would be in better position for future funding opportunities, which she envisioned would translate to large capital projects.

Responding to a question from Mr. Farr about the allocation of grant funds, Ms. Gardner pointed out LCOG would be working on commonly identified objectives on behalf of all the partners.

Mayor Piercy observed that Oregon's two senators were watching the process closely because the program was promoted as a way for smaller communities to get more federal resources. She believed they were looking to Eugene to be successful and to be a model for other jurisdictions.

**B. WORK SESSION:
City Council Process Session**

City Manager's Office Division Manager Keli Osborn reviewed proposed changes to the City Council's operating agreements. She indicated that with the council's approval, staff would return with a resolution to memorialize the changes proposed to sections 1.05 (Public Forum), 1.06 (Public Hearings), 1.07 (Executive Sessions), 3.04 (Committee Reports and Items from Mayor, City Council, and City Manager), 6.03 (Standing Advisory Bodies to the Council), and 7.02 (Other Meeting Guidelines).

Mr. Pryor arrived.

There was general council support for revising Section 1.05 to indicate that by council majority vote, time-sensitive issues could be moved up in the agenda order before hearing from all wishing to speak in the Public Forum. In addition, the council supported revising the agreements to reflect the current practice of allowing all speakers, rather than limiting the Public Forum to 60 minutes, and not shuffling the "Request to Speak" forms. Section 1.06 was revised to reflect the current practice of public hearings occurring on the third Monday evening of the month. Section 1.07 was changed to show that Council supervises three employees. Sections 3.04 and 6.03 were also updated, and Section 7.02 was revised to confirm the three-minutes-per-speaker limit for each councilor during rounds.

Community Relations Manager Jan Bohman of the City Manager's Office solicited council comments on the reports provided to it by the Public Service Officer. Councilors expressed general satisfaction with the reports.

The council then discussed the practical effect of a motion related to pending legislation that failed to receive a second during meetings of the Council Committee on Intergovernmental Relations. Ms. Taylor advocated for delay in City lobbying activities on such legislation pending action on it by the full council. She suggested that alternatively, all committee motions could receive a courtesy second.

Mr. Clark pointed out that if the committee delayed action on all such motions, it would require considerable time at the council level to discuss and vote on the many bills involved. The committee had changed the ground rules to stipulate that the staff recommendation on a bill would prevail in such instances until the bill went before the full council, at which time it could be pulled for further discussion. He supported that change because it avoided a situation that allowed one councilor to dictate the City's actions by stalling its position on a bill.

Mayor Piercy suggested that such bills be flagged as not having a unanimous position. Mr. Zelenka supported that approach. He acknowledged that the staff recommendation would continue to stand until that point.

Mr. Clark also supported the mayor's suggestion. Mayor Piercy determined there was general support.

The council then discussed a proposal by Mr. Clark to say the Pledge of Allegiance at regular council meetings. Ms. Osborn called the council's attention to a list of other jurisdictions and their practices.

Mr. Clark advocated for recital of the Pledge as a means of uniting the council and of recognizing the values of more traditional members of the community.

Councilors discussed issues, including: reciting the Pledge should be voluntary rather than mandatory; a lack of participation could be falsely interpreted as a lack of patriotism; some residents did not identify

with the Pledge of Allegiance, which could mean council meetings would be less welcoming and inclusive for those individuals; saying the Pledge would not feel like a choice if it was an agenda item; those who refused to participate might be ridiculed by others; recital of the Pledge had the potential to be a rote action and people might not think about what it meant when they said it; people had been persecuted in the past for failure to say the Pledge; residents such as agnostics and atheists could object to the phrase “. . . under God” in the Pledge; and those with certain religious convictions were precluded by those convictions from saying the Pledge.

Mr. Zelenka enlarged on a proposal first offered by Mayor Piercy, which was that the council would recite the pledge at special meetings, such as those closest to Veterans Day, Memorial Day, Flag Day, and the Fourth of July. He suggested the council could invite organizations such as the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Boy Scouts to participate.

Mr. Poling suggested the State of the City was another opportunity to recite the Pledge.

Mr. Clark emphasized that his intent was that reciting the Pledge be voluntary. He was willing to support the compromise proposal voiced by Mr. Zelenka.

Mr. Brown saw no connection between the process session and the proposal to recite the Pledge of Allegiance at council meetings. He said the Pledge had been divisive in American politics throughout its whole history. There were multiple legal challenges to the recital, and federal courts had ruled that the required recital of the Pledge violated the First and Fourteenth amendments.

Mr. Zelenka suggested that he work with Mr. Clark to craft a proposal for the council that incorporated the comments made by various councilors.

Mr. Clark, seconded by Mr. Farr, moved to recite the Pledge of Allegiance at the council meetings closest to Veterans Day, Memorial Day, Flag Day, and the Fourth of July as well as the State of the City.

Mr. Zelenka moved to table the item.

With the concurrence of his second, Mr. Farr, Mr. Clark withdrew his motion.

Emergency Program Manager Joe Rizzi and Safety/Loss Control Environmental Manager Craig Sorseth provided the council with a briefing regarding the actions people should take in the case of earthquakes.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting at 7:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest

Beth Forrest
City Recorder

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)