

**MINUTES**  
Mayor's Advisory Committee  
Hilyard Community Center  
July 12, 2005  
7pm

**PRESENT:** Councilor Chris Pryor, Chair; Corey Dingman, Art Farley, Dale Berg, Merle Bottge, Linda Swisher, Members; Charles Biggs, David Sonnichsen, Guests; Johnny Medlin, Mark Snyder, Sarah Medary, Renee Grube, Kevin Finney, Andrea Riner, Justin Grishkin, Staff

**ABSENT:** Dan Arkin, Roxie Cuellar, Steve Johnson, Terry Leary, Tim Whitley

**I. WELCOME AND AGENDA REVIEW**

Councilor Pryor convened the meeting at 7:05 pm.

**II. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Councilor Pryor solicited public comments from the meeting attendees.

Mr. Biggs noted that it would be helpful to know why and how changes to the Comprehensive Plan came about, including who was involved in making the changes.

Mr. Berg questioned the definition of the new priority system such as priority 1a and 1b.

Ms. Riner said that both of these concerns would become clear through the presentation she was about to give.

**III. PROS COMP PLAN UPDATE: PROPOSED CHANGES**

Ms. Riner gave a PowerPoint presentation which provided a summary of where the MAC group left off and the public meetings that occurred since the previous meeting. The presentation provided a summary of major pieces of the plan that were worked on. She noted that there have been many additions from the SDC (systems development charge) process, additions from public input process, and review from in-house staff on the financing section. The four main areas that were worked on include: sustainability, performance measures, project list/priorities, and financing.

Sustainability

Ms. Riner said that Staff received pro bono guidance from Josh Proudfoot of the Good Company. Sustainability has been a goal in the plan but Staff has subsequently added strong language to the Strategies and Actions section of the report (Chapter IV). Sustainability components have been added to the following sections: Management, Parks, Renovation/Restoration, Access and Connectivity, Maintenance, and Public Information.

Performance Measures

Ms. Riner said that an outline framework for performance measures was left in the draft, and Staff has subsequently added "meat" to it, with an emphasis on incorporating things Staff is already measuring in its budget and management processes. New performance measures include the following:

1. Provide opportunities to enjoy nature and the outdoors.
  - Number of acres of parks and open space per 1000 people.
2. Promote lifelong human development through diverse recreation opportunities.
  - Number of recreation amenities meeting guideline standards.
3. Support and enhance individual and community health and wellness.

- Number of miles of biking, pedestrian, and multi-use trails.
4. Build environmental stewardship through volunteer, environmental education and outdoor recreation.
    - Number of interpretive facilities and trails.
    - Number of volunteers participating in park stewardship programs.
  5. Promote human understanding and sense of community through cultural opportunities.
    - Number of acres of community and metropolitan parks per 1000 people.
  6. Distribute parks, open space and recreation services equitably throughout the community.
    - Number and type of parks and open space in each planning area.
  7. Build and maintain sustainable parks, recreation, and open space infrastructure.
    - Percent of community satisfied with park maintenance.
    - Comprehensive sustainability strategy completed.
  8. Protect and enhance diverse, healthy, and interconnected ecosystems.
    - Percent of community satisfied with water quality measures.
    - Compliance with federal stormwater discharge permit (NPDES) requirements.
    - Percent of parks and open space acreage managed for natural resource benefits.
  9. Make fiscal responsibility a high priority; and ensure the efficient use of resources.
    - Percent of operating budget funded by non-property tax revenues.
    - Service operating cost per acre of parks and open space.
  10. Build a sense of community by developing strong community partnerships.
    - Number of operating agreements with community partners in parks and open space.

Mr. Biggs asked if Staff was comparing anything to State of Oregon or other cities of comparable size. Ms. Riner responded that in the process Staff compared Eugene to averages of comparable cities and then established our own standards. Ms. Grube clarified that these performance measures are the additional performance measures to the ones in the draft Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Riner reaffirmed that she is only showing those that have been added since the draft.

Ms. Bottge commented on cultural opportunities measurement. She suggested the plan note the number of historical interpretive signs. Ms. Riner said that a cultural resources measurement will be added.

Mr. Farley asked if there was any connectivity measure. Ms. Riner said that it was a good idea, and that staff will add it if it isn't already in the list of performance measures. Mr. Biggs suggested a criminal statistics measurement in the light of the new bike patrol.

#### Changes to Capital Project List

Ms. Riner emphasized that the draft didn't lose any projects. Changes include the clarification of some terms to further define the scope of the project, and some cost refinements. She noted that a lot of the changes came out of the SDC methodology. This process has been very vigorous in looking at the project costs because they are directly linked to what the City will charge for new developments.

Ms. Riner added that when the group did the original prioritization for the draft, it was a loose prioritization based on when a project was hoped to be started, without specifying when money would be spent. In order to fit into the Capital Improvement Program (CIP), she said, the new prioritization clarifies when the dollars would be spent. This is reflected in the new capital project list. Staff also costed-out all of the projects, whereas previously only Priority 1 and Priority 2 projects were costed-out. Eventually, she said, columns will be added identifying what portion of project costs will be covered by grants, partner funding, bonds, other city funds and SDCs.

Ms. Riner then reviewed the meaning behind the refined priorities. She explained that the intention was to keep Priority 1 projects as top priority, so Priority 1a projects are things done and spent within first 5 years. She noted that some acquisitions will occur over multiple phases and thus are both 1a and 1b priorities. Priority 1b projects occur within the first 10 years, Priority 2 projects occur within the first 15 years, and Priority 3 projects occur within 20 years. She noted that Priority 4 projects are those which are too difficult to scope at this time and that it would be unreasonable to allocate costs right now.

Ms. Riner commented that with the original priorities, in an effort to place a high priority on a number of projects, we overburdened the first five years. The original priority list was not feasible, either financially or in terms of staff workload. With the new priority list, the first five years - Priority 1a - are focused on land acquisition (27 of 29 million dollars for 1a projects). Because facilities such as aquatic centers and community buildings involve additional operating costs most of these projects are pushed back in the schedule. Renovation of existing facilities remains a top priority.

Ms. Riner turned the group's attention to the table, "Review of CIP Cost and Project Summary by Improvement Type". She noted that the new priority list attempted to address the imbalance of projects in priority 1 in the draft, and that the new priority list, while still a little heavily loaded on Priority 1a and 1b, is a much more balanced approach.

Mr. Berg asked, if \$67 million was the ideal funding for the first five years, what the funding reality was - what the City likely would have to actually spend on projects. Mr. Medlin responded that the figure depends upon funding sources, of which there are many scenarios. Particularly, it depends upon the amount of funding from a bond measure.

Ms. Bottge commented that there was a concern from the Rates Advisory Committee for building things with capital funds that the city doesn't have money to operate, so she could see the reason for focusing on acquisition in the first five years. In response Councilor Pryor said that this is always a concern to policy makers. He explained that the process begins with a wish list, and then is refined to what is possible, and ultimately is refined based on what we can get.

Mr. Medlin said that \$60 million over 5 years is not unreasonable, with the combination of SDC funds, grant money, and a bond. He said that it is not beyond the realm of possibility to say this kind of a project list can happen.

Ms. Riner turned the discussion to a review of the distribution of projects (in number and costs) through planning districts. She noted that analysis shows the new priority list is fairly evenly distributed through the planning areas.

Mr. Berg asked if, according to the tables, South Eugene is currently the "rich kids," and this is why they have a reduced share of project costs for Priority 1a. In response, Ms. Riner said that South Eugene has fewer and less expensive projects. She noted that existing projects and park developments in Bethel are one of the reasons fewer projects are slated there. She added that the Citywide planning area has the largest share because it includes Ridgeline acquisition and Alton Baker.

Ms. Riner noted that other plan revisions include: Santa Clara Community Park changed to reflect a 40 acre acquisition; the financing chapter was clarified; considerable opposition and support was voiced regarding this acquisition in the public forums and riverfront acquisition priorities were pushed back to reflect the long time-line needed to accomplish additional river acquisition.

Mr. Medlin added that, textually, the new finance chapter has been extensively revised. He said Staff clarified some of the terminology (ex: serial levies versus local option levies). Finance brought funding options that weren't listed in the draft to Staff's attention; options that have already been brought before Council. He also said that some of the funding options identified in the draft are no longer available. Generally, the chapter is expanded. He emphasized that the major change is to get continuity with language council has seen in other programs.

Mr. Biggs asked if riverfront acquisition priorities have been dropped out of the plan. Ms. Riner responded that they went from Priority 1 to Priority 1b (referring to the River Road / Santa Clara project to "acquire additional river frontage, including property to the north").

Ms. Riner mentioned another priority refinement for the covered skate park. She said the city received a very large petition, with four or five thousand signatures, for a covered skate park. She suggested this project be done in the first five years because it is a positive and well supported project.

Ms. Riner noted that some details, requested in the public comment process, could not be included in the plan. She mentioned that there are requests to provide facilities for some new recreation types (archery and equestrian) but that it is not appropriate to identify locations at this point. Additionally, public comments regarding specific property acquisition (ex: Nectar/Dillard and Santa Clara School) are not identified in the plan. Finally, request for more specific details on projects and programs are not appropriate in the comprehensive plan but will be explored in individual site management plans in the future.

At the conclusion of Ms. Riner's presentation on proposed changes, Councilor Pryor opened the discussion to reactions, comments, or suggestions from the group, specifically on the framing of the capital project piece.

Mr. Dingman asked what the formal update plan is for updating the plan that we have. He noted that realistically the 1b projects could be pushed out even further and that priorities could change in the next five years. In response, Ms. Riner said that the goal is to revisit this plan every five years, without going through the entire process. She added that she is pretty sure it's required as part of the SDC methodology.

Mr. Biggs commented that earlier, Ms. Riner said Staff shifted priorities to acquire land and enhance existing facilities. He said that Striker Park is still listed as a Priority 1a project despite the fact that it is still an expensive endeavor. He wanted to know why this is the case.

Ms. Riner said that the committee recognizes a shortage of active recreation in the city and Striker is a parcel that is our best option for meeting our goal. She noted that the setback of acquiring land in Santa Clara affected our range of options. It is a high priority and is the only place we are doing something like that, she said.

Councilor Pryor responded by asking, for the purpose of feedback, if this project should be a different priority. Mr. Biggs said, based on staff feedback as a whole, he thinks the project should be a lower priority. He added that Sheldon will have to replace their turf, which will be an additional expense.

Mr. Farley stated that he felt we need a mix of things for the bond measure, other than acquisition. Projects including new recreation facilities would be an attractive mix for the new bond measure, providing immediate gratification for recreation folks, so that it is not just a land measure. He noted the Bethel pool upgrade as an example of different kinds of activities needed in the bond measure.

Ms. Bottge asked who decides what projects are to be funded by a bond measure, and what projects are funded by SDC and ongoing funding, and whether this is identified as part of the comprehensive plan. Ms. Riner responded that identification of other funding types, grants, partnerships, etc won't be included in plan. The plan will only identify what portion is SDC eligible. She said we then adopt the plan and then it is a council decision to determine whether or not - or more likely when - we put together a project list for a bond measure. There will be a committee for this process.

Councilor Pryor related his experience with project list development for schools. He said that you don't want to commit these allocations to a Comp Plan because there are so many ways to do it.

Mr. Medlin clarified that council will make every one of the decisions. Staff will make assumptions about proposals and timing, he said. Council, after public process, will pass judgment on the CIP, and Council, after public process, will pass judgment on the operations budget. He added that Staff makes certain assumptions about funding, and as the CIP moves forward, we'll have time to develop projects and budgets. In each of those cases there is a direct public process for expenditures for that period of time.

Mr. Farley asked which metropolitan park is the 1a priority. Ms. Riner responded that the 1a metropolitan park project is riverfront acquisition at the EWEB site for the new courthouse.

#### **IV. NEXT STEPS: PLAN ADOPTION**

Ms. Riner prefaced her summary of the adoption process by saying that MIG has finished final documents for parks and open space analysis (including standards analysis) and community needs assessment (which combines the analysis data with public input process). Those documents are completed. She said that once we figure out the new website, we'll get those documents on there.

Ms. Riner explained that during the month of July, Staff takes comments and finalizes the text of the Comp Plan, and once the Rates Advisory Committee (RAC) will finish their work on the SDC portion of the Capital Project List we will have a final plan. The final plan needs to be submitted to LCDC 45 days prior to the public hearing. The 45 day review period makes August 17<sup>th</sup> the earliest date for a public hearing. Because a public hearing in the last 2 weeks of August is not desirable, a public hearing is slated for sometime in the first two weeks of September. She added that Staff also plans to copy colleagues in the region - they have the option to weigh in on the plan.

Ms. Riner noted that the first series of a work session, public hearing, and approval piece is for the City of Eugene Planning Commission. Assuming things go well with the Planning Commission, she explained, the plan proceeds through the council process, which again includes a work session, public hearing, and approval process. This will probably occur in October, she said. Staff requests and encourages the participation of MAC members in the planning commission and council approval process.

Councilor Pryor said this is the first check in to review specifically the changes to the Comp Plan. He recognized that the group members did not have a copy of the draft for review. He said that once members have that copy, we encourage you to review it, get back in touch, and let us know additional comments reactions that you think will be helpful for us. Having seen the genesis, we'll rely on your perspective and experience, he said. Two roles for the members in the future are: 1) provide continuous feedback as you get a copy of the plan, and 2) be there for us as we move down the road.

Mr. Sonnichsen said he didn't think there was a quorum here of committee members, and asked if it would be a good idea to have another meeting once everyone has a final copy of the plan, as opposed to receiving ad hoc comments. Councilor Pryor said that if there is energy to continue meeting as a group that is fine. Otherwise, he is willing to work with members on an individual basis.

Mr. Berg asked, due to the fact that the group was convened by the previous mayor, what the official capacity or status of the group is. Do we exist, or did we end with Mayor Torrey's regime, he asked. Councilor Pryor said that the committee that was formed under Mayor Torrey, that committee's function probably ends. He continued that that is not to say that Mayor Piercy is not interested in a parks and recreation advisory group, and this is why the Mayor has asked him to be involved.

Mr. Berg noted that probably 8 or 9 of the original 11 or 12 of the MAC are interested in continuing on with public input. Councilor Pryor said that he will definitely fold that in to what is going on.

Mr. Biggs asked what the public's role is now. If they have concerns about a priority or feel that their comments weren't reflected, he asked who they should lobby. Councilor Pryor said that when you look at the plan adoption process, there are opportunities for public input throughout the adoption process. In terms of who to contact, me, your council, and staff are all possibilities, he said.

Mr. Sonnichsen said that he thinks it is important to get as broad an accord as possible, which could include meetings with neighborhood organizations.

Ms. Riner said that she had sensed from the committee that as park advocates they hope to get the plan adopted sooner rather than later. We are still looking at October for plan adoption and the idea of having 20-plus neighborhood meetings puts it off another 3 months, she said. She added that it is important to look at the history of the public input process for the document to get a feel for the amount of public input in the plan. Councilor Pryor said that we need to stick to the timeline but input will be sought.

Mr. Medlin said we have a legal process and we have a conversation process. He explained that what we submit to LCDC cannot change before the public hearing of planning commission process. We can talk

about doing presentations parallel to this if the groups really want it, but staff is not going to do 20-plus presentations. Councilor Pryor suggested that staff issue written material - newsletters, etc. – as a way to continue public involvement.

Mr. Medlin said staff's feeling was that this committee was pushing hard for a bond. He said that if we don't get council adoption for this by December, a 2006 bond is in jeopardy. He added that there are many ways to do this. One approach is to get the plan finished and ask the mayor to get a committee together for a bond recommendation, which is several months worth of work. Council will look at it and could initiate a bond. At the same time a private political action committee would need to market, do outreach, and campaign for the bond which could take another 10 or 11 months. That, to me, is what drives the timeline to get this before Council, he said. Mr. Medlin noted that since the Comp Plan is a land use document it could be appealed. There is potential for some of this to happen due to issues around buildable lands and the amount of acquisition recommended in the Comp Plan. He said he didn't know about the merit of an appeal, but he would be surprised if an appeal didn't happen. Ms. Bottge confirmed that there are people already planning to appeal.

Mr. Farley commented that one disadvantage to refining the priorities is that people will think that these are rigid timeframes. The 1a and 1b prioritization makes things much more fixed, he said. We have to make it clear - either the document has to stress or through the process - the flexibility of the project priorities. He said we may make this not adoptable if we try to map it out too much.

Ms. Riner responded that the reprioritization part had to happen because of the SDC methodology requirements. However, she noted that the rigidity is not required for the bond. We can have some language that provides flexibility based on public input. We will make sure that it is clear that this is a proposal and not a rigid CIP. Mr. Medlin added that it was mapped as flexibly as possible.

Mr. Farley suggested staff make this flexibility very clear. As an example, he noted that because Striker is Priority 1a doesn't mean it will happen in the first 5 years. Conversely, Priority 1b projects may happen in first five.

Mr. Biggs voiced concern about the Santa Clara area because there are community members who have strong feelings about riverfront acquisition for bike paths. He asked if Goal 5 can ease concerns about river frontage and preservation. Ms. Riner noted that all the Santa Clara riverfront is outside the UGB. She added that there are active sand and gravel permits on the frontage - and a golf course - and said she does know that the golf course was excluded from Goal 5.

Mr. Biggs noted that he felt it would be a shame if two landowners' interests trumped community concerns. Councilor Pryor said we could take a look at it but there are jurisdictional issues.

Ms. Bottge asked Councilor Pryor for his opinions of the Comp Plan; Councilor Pryor responded that he thinks it is good. He likes the flexibility of it without trying to be too prescriptive, but it will become a document people will rely on (SDCs being the primary example). It is a good document for visioning where we want to go and what we want to accomplish, he said. It identifies good projects and distributes projects very well and he'd like to use this document to help plan where we want to be over the next 20 years.

In response to a question from Mr. Biggs regarding comment on acquiring the Civic Stadium, Councilor Pryor said he hasn't looked at it in detail. The property is zoned for "education use," because it is sometimes used for school games. He asked if it is an acquisition we want but he hasn't studied it yet. Right now the property is useable as a recreational facility, and is not in danger of being developed. Thus it is not the kind of thing we have to do anything about right away and have time to study it.

Mr. Berg asked if it is not school district property. Councilor Pryor clarified that it is school district property.

Ms. Riner mentioned that tomorrow Staff is presenting an action plan for Council's goal for an economic development strategy around arts and the outdoors. She noted that some of the feedback from that process has been interesting. Some folks don't think that anything in the Comprehensive Plan will bring people to Eugene and have a tourism draw, she said. She asked if the group has specific things in the plan that they think are good challenges to that opinion, such as proposals or even existing facilities that contribute to the economy – things that people think, “lets go to Eugene and stay there.”

Ms. Swisher mentioned the West Eugene Wetlands, noting that she's heard of people from England coming for butterfly observation. Ms. Bottge added that she's had people at a motel ask her how to get to the river trail. Mr. Berg said he thinks it makes life for people who live here want to be here. It makes everybody's life better, he said, noting that people are resorting back to being part of a family, activities for families. Ms. Grube added Cuthbert, the Hult Center, bike trails, and Pre's trail. Mr. Sonnichsen mentioned the talking stones. Councilor Pryor noted the interconnected bike trails. Ms. Riner added the environmental education center for the West Eugene Wetlands. Mr. Berg said that the Track City Track Club is bringing 15,000 kids to compete at Heyward Field. Ms. Grube noted the recent state swim meet at Amazon pool which brought 1,000 kids. Mr. Snyder mentioned a recent three day swim meet at Echo Hollow. Councilor Pryor added that skate parks can draw from all over the region. He said there is a professional skate team working Seattle, Portland, and eventually Eugene because of our world class skate facilities.

Mr. Dingman said there is an Ultimate Frisbee tournament that brings 800 people to Eugene every summer, and that this number could be a lot larger if we had more fields. Ms. Bottge mentioned the Rhododendron Garden and Rose Garden bring people. Mr. Berg added the Saturday market in Park Blocks. Ms. Riner thanked the group for their suggestions and ideas.

## **V. CLOSE**

The meeting adjourned at 8:50 pm.  
(Recorded by Justin Grishkin)