

# MINUTES

Joint Elected Officials  
Eugene, Springfield, Lane County  
Bascom-Tykeson Room—Eugene Public Library  
777 Pearl Street—Eugene, Oregon

May 26, 2011  
Noon

## EUGENE

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

## SPRINGFIELD

COUNCILORS PRESENT: Hillary Wylie, Joe Pishioneri, Sheri Moore.

## LANE COUNTY

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Faye Stewart, Peter Sorenson, Rob Handy, Jay Bozievich, Sid Leiken.

## SPRINGFIELD

COUNCILORS ABSENT: Dave Ralston, Sean Van Gordon, Marilee Woodrow.

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the Eugene City Council to order.

Her Honor Christine Lundberg called the Springfield City Council to order.

Board Chair Faye Stewart called the Lane Board of County Commissioners to order.

### **I. Adjustments to the Agenda**

There were none.

### **II. Census/Population Estimates**

Risa Proehl of the Population Research Center (PRC) at Portland State University distributed and reviewed a presentation entitled *Oregon's Population Estimates as Developed by the Population Research Center*. Those present were also provided with a document entitled *Population Estimates*, which provided answers to common questions about population numbers, a report entitled *2010 Census Profiles, Oregon and its Counties and Metropolitan Areas*, and a document entitled *The 2010 Census Count Question Resolution (CQR) Program Frequently Asked Questions*.

Ms. Proehl briefly described the work of the PRC, how population estimates were used in Oregon, and the differences between the data sets used by the PRC and the United States Census Bureau. She then provided an overview of the PRC's estimate methods and how its estimates compared to the 2010 census counts. She reported that the Census Bureau used PRC estimates to adjust its population estimates.

Ms. Proehl reviewed the PRC's estimate methods for post-censal estimates. She discussed the differences between PRC's original 2010 estimates and the census counts and the reasons underlying those differences. She reported that the PRC's performance was very good overall, and the center continued to work to improve its methods.

Ms. Proehl reviewed the PRC's methods for the Revised Certified 2010 Population Estimates. She shared findings specific to Lane County about the reasons for the differences between the PRC's estimates and the 2010 Census. Ms. Proehl highlighted steps Lane County and its cities could take if they believed the census counts were wrong.

Ms. Proehl noted inconsistencies between the Census 2010 city boundaries and 2009 boundaries produced by Oregon's GEO in Cottage Grove, Dunes City, Eugene, and Springfield and indicated PRC would do follow-up research with the cities as to reasons for the inconsistencies.

Ms. Proehl encouraged jurisdictions with questions to call the PRC and invited their assistance in making the population estimates more accurate.

Ms. Proehl concluded her presentation by sharing some general Oregon trends, indicating that people were still moving to Oregon despite the current economic climate; smaller rural communities continued to lose population to larger metropolitan areas, although some rural areas with amenities were attracting retirees; senior citizens were increasing in number; the percentage of children in the population was declining in many counties; and the Hispanic population was increasing while the non-Hispanic population was decreasing.

Ms. Proehl invited questions.

Mr. Clark asked if the PRC's participation in the American Community Survey process allowed it to correct errors made by the census. Ms. Proehl said she could try to make such corrections, but it was likely the US Census Bureau would require detailed evidence, such as a sample of housing units and the population.

Responding to a question from Mr. Sorenson, Ms. Proehl indicated the Oregon Legislature employed the enumeration conducted by the US Census Bureau as of April 1, 2010, for redistricting. Those numbers were also used to determine the five Oregon Congressional districts and by other Oregon jurisdictions and special districts. Mr. Sorenson further determined from Ms. Proehl that the US Census Bureau numbers could not be changed and were fixed at a point in time.

Responding to a question from Mr. Leiken, Ms. Proehl said that declines in the numbers of people under age 18 were a national trend and she linked that fact to declining fertility rates.

Mr. Farr noted differences between the PRC and US Census Bureau population data for Eugene's Ward 3 and asked Ms. Proehl to explain the difference. Ms. Proehl suggested that PRC's group quarters population numbers were incomplete. It was also her observation that the number of registered voters in such populations was not as high as in older populations.

Mayor Piercy thanked Ms. Proehl for the presentation.

### III. Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Sustainable Communities Grant

Mr. Stewart explained that the Board of County Commissioners had recently heard a presentation about the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Partnership for Sustainable Communities grant. The presentation had raised questions for some commissioners. The meeting was an opportunity for the joint elected officials to discuss the value of the grant and the commitment it represented to Lane County, Springfield, and Eugene as participating agencies.

Andrea Riner of the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) introduced Chris Jones of the University of Oregon (UO) Sustainable Cities Initiative, Greg Mott of the City of Springfield, Stephanie Jennings of the City of Eugene, Tom Schwetz of the Lane Transit District, Bob Parker of the UO Community Planning Workshop, Larry Abel of HACSA, Sarah Majesky from Lane County, and Megan Banks from LCOG. They represented some of the agencies participating in the Lane Livability Consortium.

Ms. Riner provided a PowerPoint presentation entitled *Lane Livability Consortium*. Copies of the presentation as well as a document entitled *Recommended Changes Lane Livability Consortium Memorandum of Understanding* and a brochure entitled *Partnership for Sustainable Communities—A Year of Progress for American Communities* were provided to those present.

Ms. Riner's presentation included information about the HUD Partnership for Sustainable Communities Program and its goals. The program targeted resources through grants and other programs to help states and communities create jobs and strong economies by developing more sustainably; removed regulatory and policy barriers at the federal level to make it easier for states and local governments to access federal services and resources; and aligned agencies priorities and embedded Livability Principles in each agency's actions so that transportation, housing, and environmental protection efforts were coordinated. The program included several new grant opportunities, including the HUD Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grants.

Ms. Riner reported that the region applied for and received a Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant in the amount of \$1,450,000 to better integrate regional transportation, economic development, and affordable housing, to prepare the region to compete strongly within a new federal funding network, and to fund regional projects that provided jobs, transportation choices, and affordable housing.

Ms. Riner noted the consortium of agencies and organizations formed in Lane County to participate in the grant, which included the City of Eugene, City of Springfield, Lane County, University of Oregon Sustainable Cities Initiative, University of Oregon Community Planning Workshop, Lane Transit District, St. Vincent DePaul Society of Lane County, Eugene Water & Electric Board, Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization, Oregon Department of Transportation, and LCOG.

Ms. Riner identified core objectives of the grant, which were to advance interagency collaboration to successfully address complex regional issues; to build capacity for efficient and effective collaboration; to develop more effective strategies for affordable housing, economic development, and transportation; and to help the region identify, promote, and fund priority infrastructure investment strategies. She anticipated that three regional plans would be impacted by the process: 1) Regional Transportation Plan, 2) Eugene-Springfield Consolidated Plan 2010, and 3) Regional Prosperity Economic Development Plan.

Ms. Riner noted some of the concerns that had been raised about the grant. Those included concerns about responsibility for decision-making and regional policy setting; concerns about accountability to elected bodies; concerns about added bureaucracy, slowed processes, reduced efficiencies, restrictions, and constraints; concerns about the addition of future new parties; and concerns about the impact on staffing.

In regard to the first concern, Ms. Riner pointed out decision-making remained with each jurisdiction and recommendations would reflect existing policy direction and local values. She described how the consortium would work and anticipated that each jurisdiction's staff would pursue implementation at their respective agencies.

In regard to the second concern, Ms. Riner outlined steps to help ensure accountability to elected bodies, which included development of a communication plan that would ensure monthly updates.

In regard to the third concern, Ms. Riner emphasized that the process was intended to fill in the gaps between some of the existing plans with technical assistance. All the work contemplated was focused on increasing efficiencies.

In regard to the fourth concern, Ms. Riner said new members would only be added if all consortium members agreed.

In regard to the final concern, Ms. Riner emphasized that staff work outside of currently programmed activities would be funded with grant funds, and the funding would allow staff to better leverage the work they were already funded and required to do.

Ms. Riner acknowledged that some questioned the need for additional planning. In addition, there had been questions about how the process in question differed from the Region 2050 process. She pointed out the different funding source and group of participants involved in that effort, and suggested that lessons had been learned from the Region 2050 process that could be applied to the consortium.

Ms. Riner reviewed next steps in the process, which included revisions to the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between participating agencies.

Mr. Clark asked about the scope of Eugene's three-year commitment. Eugene City Manager Jon Ruiz anticipated it would largely be an in-kind match. Mr. Clark suggested the potential the federal funding approach changed again; what was the value of the work? Ms. Riner pointed to the reauthorization of federal transportation funding as one example of an area where the results of the consortium could be employed.

Mr. Poling did not believe the Eugene council had received sufficient information about the consortium and suggested the council schedule a work session on the topic. He had received the meeting materials too late for adequate review and did not feel able to discuss them. He questioned if Eugene would be looked to disproportionately as a source of funding.

Ms. Wylie supported the proposal. She spoke of Springfield's TEAM Springfield effort, a consortium of all Springfield public agencies, and said that effort had accomplished a great deal. She emphasized the important role that consortiums played in forming the relationships that were necessary to local problem solving.

Ms. Ortiz pointed out to Mr. Poling that there were many grant opportunities the council did not hear about. She supported the consortium and said it sounded exciting. She suggested the elected officials needed to have faith in the judgment of staff.

Mayor Piercy recalled that the council had been invited to an event celebrating the kick-off of the consortium. She suggested that much of what was contemplated through the consortium was embedded in the City's Envision Eugene planning effort and fit into the work the City was already doing.

Mayor Lundberg said the hope was that the proposed MOU took advantage of the efforts now in place. While she acknowledged concerns about additional bureaucracy, she echoed Mayor Piercy's remarks about the intent of the consortium. She wanted the consortium to put the region in a better position to compete for project dollars. Mayor Lundberg envisioned those projects would include projects already in existing planning documents as well as new projects with a regional benefit. She recalled the Region 2050 process, which had "taken on a life of its own" and had been halted because of concerns the decision making process was working against community autonomy. She wanted the MOU to recognize community autonomy while helping the region move forward with projects of regional interest. She was also concerned about how the new dollars were shared.

Mr. Zelenka felt that \$1.4 million over three years was modest, which caused him to puzzle over the discussion. He asked if Mr. Poling wanted to see every grant the City applied for or if he was concerned about this particular grant. Mr. Zelenka also recalled that the council was notified when the community received the award and he had attended the kick-off at which HUD Assistant Secretary Shelley Poticha had announced the grant. He suggested the grant was about doing things "smarter, better, and cheaper." The grant spoke to many subjects and attempted to integrate them to a greater degree. He agreed with Mayor Lundberg's remarks about the importance of recognizing community autonomy.

Mr. Bozievich found it ironic that the grant arose from a program focused on the removal of regulatory policy barriers, but the participating jurisdictions were being asked to sign a 23-page MOU that referenced an 18-page contract with HUD, and buried inside that contract were references to 600 pages of federal regulations. He questioned how that reduced barriers. He noted the HUD contract prohibited the use of planning efforts to recruit businesses to the community if that might be to the detriment of another community. He asked what other policy decisions were included in those 600 pages of regulations. Mr. Bozievich believed that the elected officials should understand any contract they signed, and he had yet to receive a clear explanation of the policy decisions he was making by signing the contract. He called for clarity about what the community was agreeing to.

Speaking to Mr. Zelenka's assertion that \$1.4 million was a "modest" amount of money, Mr. Bozievich pointed out that amount would fund the four FTE Lane County was cutting from the District Attorney's Office budget over the next three years. He felt \$1.4 million was a lot of money.

Mr. Bozievich said he was more concerned about the reauthorization of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act than he was about the grant. He pointed out the County was being asked for offsets to the Secure Rural Schools money, and said he would gladly give up the grant to secure those unrestricted funds. He challenged the other elected officials to say the intended use was how they would spend the money if it was not restricted. It was not how he would spend the money.

Mr. Pryor suggested there were two issues, the grant itself and the consistency of the information being provided to members of the partnership. He said such significant grants required more consistent information sharing. He interpreted Mr. Poling's remarks not as opposition to the grant but as discomfort that he lacked information. He appreciated Ms. Wylie's remarks about TEAM Springfield, saying that approach was built on the notion of equal information for equal partners at all times. He believed the partnership in question would work if based on that model.

Mr. Farr also shared Mr. Poling's concern that Eugene might be viewed as a source of funding for other jurisdictions. He did not think that was the case, however, and was excited about the possibilities the grant funding presented.

Mr. Poling clarified he was not saying the grant was a bad idea; he did not know. He agreed with Ms. Ortiz there were many grants the council was probably unaware of, but pointed out the majority were reviewed by the Council Committee on Intergovernmental Relations. He said that not all councilors were able to attend all events, and the information shared at the kick-off was not shared with those unable to attend.

Like Mr. Bozievich, Mr. Poling found the money involved to be significant, particularly in the current economy. He did not know how much the City of Eugene would be asked to contribute to the partnership, and wanted a clearer picture of what was expected of Eugene. Mr. Poling objected to the fact that he had to obtain the meeting materials on his own. He reiterated he did not know his position on the grant. He waited until he secured all possible information before making a decision.

Mr. Leiken hoped the three chief executive officers of the three jurisdictions would meet to discuss the parameters of the MOU with the concerns they had heard today in mind. He had also been at the kick-off, but found the information shared at that time to be more conceptual than detailed in nature.

#### **IV. Fire Department Merger Update**

Due to a lack of time, this item was deferred.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting of the Eugene City Council at 1:35 p.m.

Mayor Lundberg adjourned the meeting of the Springfield City Council at 1:35 p.m.

Chair Stewart adjourned the meeting of the Lane Board of County Commissioners at 1:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest  
City Recorder

*(Recorded by Kimberly Young)*