

MINUTES

Eugene Budget Committee
Downtown Library—Bascom-Tykeson Room—100 West 10th Avenue
Eugene, Oregon

May 3, 2010
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: John Barofsky, Chair; Claire Syrett, Vice Chair; George Brown, Andrea Ortiz, George Poling, Chris Pryor, Jennifer Solomon, Betty Taylor, Alan Zelenka, Terry McDonald, Mary Ann Holser, Shanda Miller, Joseph Potwora, Ramin Shojai, Doug Smith, members; Mayor Kitty Piercy, City Manager Jon Ruiz, Assistant City Manager Sarah Medary, Sue Cutsogeorge, Kristie Hammitt, Pavel Gubanikhin, Larry Hill, Mia Cariaga, Central Services Department; Police Chief Pete Kerns; Fire Chief Randy Groves; City Attorney Glenn Klein; Rene Grube, Mike McGee, Library, Recreation and Cultural Services; Scott Luell, Planning and Development; Keli Osborn, City Manager's Office; Kurt Corey, Public Works; Jeff Perry, Municipal Court; Karen Gaffney, Lane County Department of Human Services.

ABSENT: Mike Clark, member.

Mr. Barofsky called the meeting to order and welcomed those present. He outlined the procedures for providing public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Deb Frisch gave to examples of what she characterized as the pathology of Eugene's financial decision-making. She said cutting \$200,000 from animal control services while paying high attorney fees to pursue civil suits was an example of failure to prioritize. She said agreeing to rent 1.9 acres of City-owned commercially zoned property to the University of Oregon for zero dollars per month was an example of failure to maximize the return on assets. She asserted that the property would be used to plant a garden, which was an illegal use.

Zachary Vishanoff commented that it was opportunistic for the City to increase parking fees near the campus and take advantage of the parking shortage that would be created when the University's basketball arena was completed. He asked if a public hearing on the vacation of Moss Street had been scheduled and urged the City to conduct extensive outreach to the public, particularly the student population, on that issue. He suggested an article in the *Register Guard*.

City Manager Jon Ruiz replied that a hearing had not yet been scheduled on the Moss Street vacation. He agreed that public out reach was important, but noted the City did not have any control over what articles were printed in the newspaper.

Scott Bartlett stated he had been a Eugene resident since 1965. He had served on Lane County's Animal Services Committee and through that process learned that prior to 1978 the Sheriff's Office had a contract with Greenhill for animal control. He said that was before the advent of spay and neutering clinics and thousands of animals were euthanized each year. There had been great progress since then through the

partnership between the County and the City and very few animals were euthanized now. He said initially Lane County Animal Services (LCAS) had 32 employees; now there were 15. The agency was working on a shoestring budget. He urged the committee to explore options for avoiding significant budget cuts.

Mr. Barofsky called for comments from committee members.

Ms. Syrett asked for a copy of the intergovernmental agreement between the City and the University for use of property for a community garden. She hoped the committee would have a serious discussion of the impact of the proposed \$200,000 cut on LCAS and was concerned that no options or alternatives were being proposed. She noted that the issue had been discussed during the last budget cycle, but it did not appear that efforts were made during the interim to resolve the matter.

ANIMAL SERVICES PRESENTATION

Keli Osborn, City Manager's Office, and Jeff Perry, Municipal Court, jointly presented information on animal services. The City provided two core services: the City of Eugene spay/neuter clinic and a contract with LCAS for animal services to City residents. Both services were provided out of the same facility. They listed the services provided through the clinic, including vaccinations, and said it was a challenge to maintain the balance between cost recovery and the provision of low cost services. No reductions to the spay and neuter clinic budget were proposed for FY11.

The LCAS contract included enforcement, shelter and adoption, licensing and registration, cattery services, administration of the spay/neuter low-income voucher program and community outreach, education and training. A 2010 report to the Lane County Board of Commissioners (BCC) found the LCAS facility to be in poor condition and over capacity. Solutions included building or remodeling the facility through public partnerships or through public/nonprofit collaboration. Those recommendations were pending FY11 budget outcomes for the City and the County.

Statistics on LCAS activity levels for FY09 were reviewed, along with a ten-year history of the City's direct financial contributions to LCAS. The City's payment had increased by about \$163,000 over that period; the FY10 payment level was slightly less than \$700,000. The City's contract also allowed LCAS to retain license fee revenues up to a cap of \$357,000; County license revenue for FY10 was estimated at \$250,000. The city manager was recommending a review and consideration of alternative models, reduction of the City's FY11 direct contribution by \$200,000 and lifting the cap on license fee revenues with Lane County retaining 95 percent of revenue and applying 5 percent toward low-income spay/neuter vouchers. The City of Calgary's approach placed enforcement services with the city, while the bulk of animal services were provided by the local humane society.

Staff concluded the presentation with a review of the current LCAS funding structure and a comparison of enforcement and licensing procedures among Lane County, Eugene and Springfield. Potential long-term solutions included collaboration with Lane County and Springfield in determining the desired scope and level of services; exploring public, private and nonprofit alternatives; and considering a competitive process to assess options for cost-effective services.

Mr. Ruiz stressed the need for a community discussion of animal services and sustainable funding. He said enforcement and care were equally important and best outcomes would address community safety, protection of companion animals and prevention services such as spay/neuter programs. In order to provide those services in the best way possible there should be collaborative exploration of alternative models during the coming year before investing in a new facility.

Mr. Barofsky invited comments, questions and suggestions from the committee.

Ms. Holser stated it was a public health responsibility to properly care for animals. She said the LCAS budget was small compared to public safety and a \$200,000 reduction had a disproportionate impact that could cause a setback on the reforms that had been made over the years. She said it was a public responsibility to care for animals and was not certain about delegating the responsibility to a nonprofit organization. She indicated that she would not support the proposed budget cut of \$200,000.

Ms. Syrett commented that the lack of discussion with the County before the reduction was proposed would make collaboration more difficult. She felt a 29 percent reduction in the LCAS contract was disproportionate. She said animal services had a citywide impact and the City should demonstrate leadership in promoting collaborative discussions. She was concerned with the impact on public safety if there was a decrease in LCAS enforcement activity.

Mr. Smith said the City's contribution to LCAS for animal services was comparable to the expenditures of other similarly-sized communities. He said there did not appear to be a national organization for animal control that could assist communities with their efforts. He asked what costs were included in the materials and services category. Ms. Osborn said that it included supplies such as equipment and vaccines for the spay/neuter clinic and miscellaneous supplies for LCAS.

Ms. Taylor pointed out that the proposed budget included \$200,000 for economic development initiative, which was the same amount as the cut to LCAS. She questioned whether the City could contract with Greenhill Humane Society instead of the County. She said she had observed LCAS employees driving around in expensive vehicles and being more involved with enforcement than services, although she had not been to the LCAS facility. She asked how LCAS spent its funds.

Ms. Miller agreed with the concept of exploring alternative models and ways to increase efficiency and effectiveness; however, the conversation about animal services might be a lengthier one about collaboration and new models and somewhat misaligned with the budget process. She proposed maintaining the current level of LCAS fund or decreasing it by a smaller amount than \$200,000 and exploring options during the interim. She asked what were the estimated dog population, the current licensing compliance rate, and any efforts to increase that rate. Ms. Osborn said the County was conducting educational clinic in communities to provide information on licensing and vaccination requirements and increase compliance rates.

Ms. Solomon pointed out that in 2007 the County had completed an exhaustive study of animal services and the report was widely distributed. She said the County should take the lead on exploring long-term solutions, but it did not seem to be a high priority. She asked what conclusions the County had drawn from the study and whether any actions had been taken to pursue solutions. Mr. Ruiz said staff would determine what the County had done to address issues raised in the report. He said that the City's financial situation is different now than it was in 2007, and that there were new challenges to sustaining existing services.

Ms. Solomon commented that based on complaints from her constituents she did not see how a reduction in already strained animal services would help citizens feel safer. Mr. Ruiz said the City was reducing funding in some budget areas without reducing services or raising fees, and his intent was to examine how to maintain services with less money, perhaps using a different service model.

Mr. Zelenka asked about the impact of the \$200,000 reduction on LCAS and why the number of licenses issued was low given the City's high dog population. Kristie Hammitt, Central Services, replied that adult dogs were required to be licensed, but not all owners were willing to license their dogs. She said LCAS

had done a good job of working with the public to encourage licensing. She said the County had provided a memorandum indicating how services would be affected by the proposed cut; the City wanted to review all services offered and determine what would best meet the City's needs.

Mr. Zelenka asked for information on what percentage of households licensed their dogs. He questioned why there was no requirement to license cats and asked for an estimate of the revenue from cat licenses. He also asked for an estimate of the revenue that could be generated from a surcharge on pet food, both in Eugene and countywide.

In response to a question from Mr. Potwora, Ms. Osborn said the City could revisit the percentage of licensing revenue the County retained as part of its contract negotiations. She said the revenue percentage retained by the County was in addition to the City's direct financial contribution. Mr. Perry said there was little revenue derived from enforcement activities and fines were assessed by the Municipal Court.

Mr. Potwora asked for information about the fee schedule for licensing dogs and the compliance rate. He observed that animal services funding could consist of enforcement action fines, licensing or public funding and it was time to find alternatives.

Ms. Ortiz commended LCAS for the quality of services being provided. She said LCAS was an integral part of the community. She asked how much additional revenue LCAS would realize if the County retained 100 percent of license fees. Ms. Osborn estimated that it would be around \$9,000.

Ms. Ortiz remarked that the committee's operating rules required that any funds restored to LCAS be deducted elsewhere in the budget. She was not certain that a \$200,000 cut was the wisest choice, but hoped that the proposal would generate discussions of sustainable solutions for funding animal services.

Mr. Barofsky agreed with the need to look at the larger picture during the budget process and the question was whether the loss of two enforcement officers was a price the City was willing to pay to begin the conversation about better models.

Mr. McDonald asked how alternative service models might differ from the current structure. Mr. Ruiz said there were several jurisdictions, including Calgary and Washoe County, Nevada, that had public/nonprofit partnership models.

Mr. McDonald asked how long it would take to implement a different approach to providing animal services. Ms. Osborn said a model that retained enforcement in the public sector, but moved other services to a nonprofit would require a competitive request for proposals (RFP) process could take one to four years, but there would be interim strategies in place much sooner.

Mr. McDonald asked what the next steps would be if the proposed LCAS reduction was adopted and whether the council or the Budget Committee would be presented with recommendations and alternatives during the interim or the next budget cycle. Mr. Ruiz said the City would need to follow the County's lead.

Mr. McDonald said if the proposed cut was adopted, the first step should be how to implement a nonprofit or public/private partnership model, followed quickly by an RFP process before FY11. Mr. Ruiz agreed that staff wanted to complete that process during FY11 and present a recommendation in the next budget cycle, with the goal of providing better services.

Mr. Poling noted that he had submitted a list of written questions and asked that responses be provided to the entire committee. He questioned whether the County had decided to reduce the number of enforcement

officers as because that was the most visible way to illustrate the impact of a budget cut. In response to Ms. Taylor's concerns about LCAS vehicles being driven throughout the area, he explained that officers responded to calls for service and transported animals and were not generally driving around looking for violations.

BREAK

The committee took a break from 6:50 p.m. to 7 p.m.

ANIMAL SERVICES (CONTINUED)

Mr. Barofsky reconvened the meeting and introduced Karen Gaffney, Lane County Department of Human Services, who was available to respond to animal services questions.

Mr. Smith asked what percentages of cats and dogs were claimed by owner, adopted or euthanized. Ms. Gaffney replied that during 2009 LCAS had a live-release rate (owner, adoption or transfer) was about 93 percent. She indicated that she would provide details to the committee.

Mr. Smith asked if there was a national organization that could provide assistance on shelter management. Ms. Gaffney said the County's 2007 study included a thorough review of best practices nationally and ten recommendations related to licensing, volunteers, foster programs and other aspects of service. She said there were a number of national organizations that provided information and training resources used by LCAS.

Ms. Holser asked to have the County's 2007 report summarized and sent to the Budget Committee. She said the budget proposal would reduce the number of animal control officers, result in less effectiveness and fewer fines. She said the cuts were proposed without consultation with the County. She did not feel it was necessary to explore alternatives in other communities when there was a good study with specific recommendations already available. She felt there was no excuse for poorly funding core animal services when there were no alternatives in place.

Ms. Taylor asserted that cats should be licensed, perhaps on a voluntary basis. Ms. Gaffney noted that the Calgary model included mandatory cat licensing, although it took several years of community conversations to implement.

Ms. Ortiz asked if the issue of animal services was on the BCC's list of priorities. Ms. Gaffney said that staff had engaged with commissioners in discussions of the topic through the past year. She said animal services were important to the BCC and the County Administrator's proposed budget included funding for a continued service level from the County.

Mr. Potwora asked how the costs of licenses and enforcement actions were set. Ms. Gaffney said each jurisdiction established its own license fee.

Mr. Potwora expressed an interest in increasing the license fees and fines to help fill the budget gap. He thought that 3.5 enforcement officers was thin coverage. Ms. Gaffney encouraged the City to review its fine for failure to license a dog; the County's fine is \$250 while the City's is \$40.

Ms. Syrett asked how the fine for licensing noncompliance could be increased. Ms. Hammitt explained that the municipal court judge established the fine schedule.

Mr. Barofsky reminded committee members that if funding to LCAS were to be restored, there should be a similar reduction elsewhere in the budget. Mr. Ruiz added that restoring \$200,000 to LCAS would be an ongoing, not a one-time, expense and any compensating reductions would also need to be ongoing.

POLICE PRESENTATION: STRATEGIES & DOWNTOWN SAFETY INITIATIVE

Police Chief Pete Kerns presented information on policing strategies and downtown safety. He said Eugene's problem with high rates of property and behavior crimes was a consequence of low police staffing and criminal justice capacity. He said Eugene's police officer staffing per capita was below both the national and state average in 2008; Lane County had the fewest jail beds per 1,000 arrests in the state. Eugene's index and behavior crime rates were significantly higher than national and state averages, as was the number of arrests per officer.

Chief Kerns explained how data led policing (DLP) maximized use of authorized staffing through crime analysis, prevention and directed patrols. He said that DLP had resulted in a considerable reduction in specific offenses in targeted areas and was regarded as an effective strategy for using available resources. The FY11 budget reflected repurposing to support DLP and downtown safety initiatives, including allocations for a crime analyst, operations analyst, forfeiture analyst/supervisor and downtown officers.

Chief Kerns provided an overview of the City's downtown strategy and the proposed urban renewal plan amendment that would provide support for downtown development and safety. He described the downtown safety initiative components and the status of each:

- Downtown work crew – in progress
- Seasonal and more consistent lighting – in progress
- Better coordination with Downtown Eugene, Inc.(DEI), private security, red capped guides, parole and probation officers – in progress
- Address sales and consumption of fortified wine and malt liquor – in progress
- Automated crime reporting – in progress
- Downtown Public Safety Zone adjustments – in progress
- Enhance CAHOOTS contract and add two police officers to downtown program – part of FY11 proposed budget
- Business Improvement District – discussion phase, not yet funded
- Add five additional police officers, one sergeant, one community service officer (CSO) to existing officers downtown - discussion phase, not yet funded
- Umbrella strategy to coordinate downtown issues – discussion phase, not yet funded
- Addition of jail beds – discussion phase, not yet funded
- Overnight facility for alcohol/drug abusers – discussion phase, not yet funded

Chief Kerns stated that the enhanced CAHOOTS contract would provide a second van to provide assistance to the homeless and those suffering from mental health problems. He said the vans would have slightly different purposes and were equipped to provide shelter and some medical care.

Ms. Ortiz asked if Eugene's police personnel costs were comparable to communities elsewhere in the country, for example in Florida. She asked if the per capita statistics included all police department employees. She agreed with the need for an additional CAHOOTS van. Chief Kerns replied that the per capita data included only sworn officers.

Ms. Ortiz said that local elected officials and community members should be willing to be advocates if legislative action was necessary to address the sale of fortified beverages.

Mr. McDonald commented that jail bed capacity had been a concern for many years. He noted that two departments had been subjected to cuts in the proposed budget: animal control and Municipal Court. He asked how that impacted EPD and downtown safety. Ms. Hammitt responded that in the Municipal Court budget the city prosecutor's office was reduced by one-half position and the court by a full position. She said that was possible because streamlining operations had improved efficiency while maintaining services.

Mr. McDonald said it was important to slow down offenders, especially repeat and serial offenders and questioned how that was being achieved in the budget. Ms. Hammitt said there were no reductions in the jail services contracts and cases would still be processed in the same way. She said the intent was to maintain sanctions at their current level. She said there was a difference between jailable and nonjailable offenses and the focus was on the former; contract reductions did not include jail services.

Mr. McDonald asked if the goal was for serial offenders to spend more time in jail. Ms. Hammitt said that was the goal and the City was exploring options for adding jail beds and sanctions to efficiently handle chronic offenders.

Mr. McDonald asked where jail beds were included in the proposed budget. Ms. Hammitt replied that jail beds were part of the Municipal Court budget, as was the work crew arrangement with the County. She said discussions with the City of Springfield to acquire additional jail beds were in progress.

Mr. McDonald asked how many jail beds the City contracted for in various jurisdictions. Ms. Hammitt replied that the Municipal Court contracted for 15 beds; other beds were available through the County for state offenses. She said additional beds would be for the Municipal Court.

Mr. McDonald observed that EPD's arrests per officer statistic was about triple the national average. He asked if that meant officers had to spend time away from other duties in order to go to court. Chief Kerns clarified that Lane County had approximately 200 jail beds for local offenders; Eugene leased 15 beds. He hoped to add 10 beds to that amount during the next fiscal year to address behavior crimes. He said the statistics of 60 arrests per officer per year likely reflected the repeated arrests of certain offenders and noted it was expensive to keep arresting the same individual and adding jail beds would help to assure those offenders were accountable by being able to hold them for trial and sentencing. He acknowledged that 10 more beds was not adequate, but was an improvement.

Mr. McDonald asked what percentage of funds in the proposed urban renewal plan amendment was allocated to Farmers' Market improvements. Mr. Ruiz replied that \$500,000 of \$17.5 million was allocated for the Farmers' Market.

Mr. Brown congratulated EPD for the decrease in property crimes. He asked if the additional police officers funded through the urban renewal plan would only patrol in downtown. Chief Kerns said the officers would focus on behavior crimes, which was concentrated in or near downtown, but would direct their efforts wherever there was a need in the community through DLP. He said the officers would also be involved in problem-solving policing.

In response to a question from Mr. Brown, Chief Kerns said that jail beds were less expensive through the City of Springfield.

Mr. Zelenka also congratulated EPD on the property crime decrease. He asked about the number of volunteers participating in the Seniors on Patrol program and their duties. Chief Kerns replied that there were 101 participants involved in graffiti abatement, home vacation checks, assisting homeowners to catalogue possessions, certain types of investigations, program development and cold cases.

Mr. Zelenka indicated he was willing to work with legislators if necessary on the issue of fortified wine and malt liquor. He noted that downtown police officers would also address property crimes.

Ms. Holser questioned how cutting the Municipal Court's budget would help with public safety concerns and holding offenders accountable. Ms. Hammitt stated that all of the crimes being cited did not go through Municipal Court; some went to Circuit Court. She said changes in processing Municipal Court cases brought about efficiencies that allowed reductions in certain contracts, but not in the level of service.

Ms. Taylor asked for a definition of "other sex crimes." Chief Kerns said it was a broad category and he would provide details to the committee.

Ms. Taylor asked if EPD volunteers could conduct DLP. Chief Kerns said the data was considered intelligence information and could not be made available to volunteers.

Ms. Syrett questioned why the CAHOOTS funding was in the public safety budget and not considered part of social services. She asked how the funds for CAHOOTS vans would be spent. She was pleased that the officers being added through the downtown safety initiative would be available elsewhere in the community as needed. She asked if there was a role for EPD volunteers in downtown.

Mr. Poling requested a breakdown of data on the CAHOOTS call loads for downtown compared to the rest of the community.

Mr. Potwora asked what percentage of habitual nonviolent offenders could be rehabilitated over time. Chief Kerns said he could not answer that question, but it was clear from studies that the earlier the criminal justice system intervened in an offender's criminal activity the likelier they were to be rehabilitated; the longer an offender went without intervention the more difficult it was for them to change.

Mr. Potwora asked what percentage of fees or fines levied by the Municipal Court went into the General Fund. Ms. Hammitt replied that 100 percent of the revenue, other than parking-related fines, went into the General Fund; the total was about \$2.7 million annually.

Mr. Potwora asked what percentage of assessed fines was actually collected. Ms. Hammitt said the collection rate varied by type of charge and fine amount; parking fines were paid at a much higher rate than, for example, misdemeanor fines. Mr. Perry said there was an internal collection program that worked with people on payment of fines; those who did not pay were turned over to an external collection agency with more resources for pursuing payment.

Mr. Barofsky pointed out that decisions regarding the urban renewal plan amendment would be made by the City Council and were not part of the budget recommendations from the committee; they would be included in a supplemental budget when the amendment was approved.

Ms. Miller asked for clarification on the operation of two CAHOOTS vans. Chief Kerns said presently the CAHOOTS van responded to calls from throughout the community; a second CAHOOTS van would focus on downtown and engage in more problem-solving activities.

Ms. Ortiz expressed support for acquisition of a second CAHOOTS van. She asked for clarification of the distinction between “wet beds” and the services provided through Buckley Center. Chief Kerns said Buckley Center had a sobering station where someone could go voluntarily and also had some detox beds available. People at Buckley Center could not use alcohol or drugs while staying there. A wet bed was transitional housing that provided a safer residential environment for an alcoholic who was still drinking, but working toward a better lifestyle.

Mr. McDonald commented that Mayor Piercy had established a community task force two years ago to examine the problem of homelessness. He said the task force concluded that wet beds were critical to diminishing the amount of repetitive bad behavior on the street. He was surprised that solution had not been placed on the priority list. He asked if there was a plan and timeline for making that type of housing available. Mr. Ruiz replied that there was no plan at this point; that type of housing would represent a sizable investment for the City.

Mr. McDonald noted the amount of public safety resources used by habitual offenders and said a mandated program through the courts was necessary to slow the rate of return to the streets for those individuals. He suggested that increasing the number of CAHOOTS van was not going to solve the problem. Chief Kerns said there was no one solution the problem, but felt the combination of strategies in the downtown safety initiative would greatly improve the situation. He agreed with the need to improve services to those people who were drug- and alcohol-addicted and chronically homeless.

In response to a question from Ms. Solomon, Chief Kerns explained that CAHOOTS drivers were EMTs, not police officers, and were employed by White Bird; under the City’s contract with White Bird the vans were dispatched by EPD dispatchers. He said the initial cost included acquisition of the van, plus operation and maintenance; in subsequent years the budget paid for operation (personnel, fuel) and maintenance only for both vans. He pointed out that CAHOOTS handled calls that were formerly handled by officers the fire department. He said CAHOOTS provided outstanding service to the community.

Ms. Syrett requested a memorandum providing details of the downtown work crew and how it would intersect with Municipal Court. She stressed the importance of maintaining the other human services that were needed by those the CAHOOTS vans encountered. She asked for statistics on the CAHOOTS calls in the downtown core. Mr. Perry said the City was negotiating with DEI for management of the downtown community service work crew program. He said the work crew would be an option available to the court for individuals to perform community service.

Mr. Barofsky expressed hope that the city manager would convene the Budget Committee to solicit its opinions on a supplemental budget containing urban renewal funds since that funding would be part of the current discussion if the urban renewal plan amendment had already been approved by the council.

Ms. Holser commended CAHOOTS for their effective crisis intervention. She was interested in receiving more details on how the second van would be used.

Ms. Ortiz asked if the downtown work crew, which was funded through the Council Contingency for the coming summer months, would provide cleanup services on the weekend. Mr. Perry said there were no plans at this time for weekends, but that could be considered in the future, depending on the number of people in the program. He said the current shift began early in the morning.

Ms. Ortiz suggested establishing a schedule that would attract the most participants and provide cleanup services during the times they were most needed.

Mr. Poling commented that the work crew schedules should be established to allow those who had jobs to fulfill their community service obligations.

In response to a question from Ms. Miller, Chief Kerns said it was illegal to camp along Amazon Creek in or around Amazon Park, as well as other City parks. He said being passed out in the park was not a crime, but if they had a campsite it would be a crime.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/INFORMATION REQUESTS

Ms. Ortiz favored an increase in animal control fines and asked what amount would be feasible, given the County's fine schedule. She also asked how much additional revenue would be generated if the fine for failing to license a dog was increased by various amounts. Ms. Hammitt pointed out that the judge established the baseline fine schedule.

Mr. Potwora asked for the same information related to licensing fees. He noted that while the budget reduced FTE count by 80, the response to a question indicated that equated to between four and seven employees actually leaving the organization. He requested a detailed breakdown of the 80 FTEs. He reiterated his interest in hearing from union leadership and asked whether volunteers could be used for animal control.

Mr. Poling asked for a comparison of animal control fine schedules among Eugene, Springfield and Lane County.

Ms. Solomon commented that the dog license requirement was triggered when owners had their pets vaccinated for rabies.

Ms. Holser remarked the ability to make people comply with court sanctions was an important element in the system.

Ms. Taylor said that retaining City employees was good for the economy and perhaps the \$200,000 budgeted for economic development and \$200,000 budgeted for the Olympic Trials could be reduced in order to retain the four to seven employees who would be leaving City employment. Mr. Ruiz replied that the City had made a commitment to contribute to the Olympic Trials and the \$200,000 for economic development was a one-time investment; retaining staff would require an ongoing funding source.

Ms. Taylor expressed concern with increasing animal control-related fines. She said there was much injustice in the laws related to dogs.

Mr. Barofsky asked staff to provide responses to questions from the committee as early as possible via e-mail, to be followed by the written responses. He said that public testimony would be scheduled for 7 p.m. at the May 5 Budget Committee meeting.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 8:50 P.M.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)