

MINUTES

Eugene Sustainability Commission
McNutt Room—777 Pearl Street
Eugene, Oregon

July 21, 2010
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Josh Skov, Chair; Josh Bruce, Vice Chair; Shawn Boles, Howard Bonnett, Theresa Brand, Dave Funk, Kathi Jaworski, Mark Nystrom, Rusty Rexius, Alan Zelenka, members; Lorna Flormoe, Keli Osborn, City Manager's Office; Dave Brook, Team Red (via telephone); Jeannine Parisi, EWEB; Kathy Saranpa, guest.

ABSENT: Lisa Arkin, Steve Newcomb, Will Shaver, commission members.

1. Opening: agenda review, minutes approval

Mr. Skov called the meeting of the Sustainability Commission to order at 5:33 p.m. He mentioned that some slight adjustments might be made to the agenda to accommodate a call-in from Dave Brook for a car share report.

Commissioners reviewed the agenda and made no further changes.

The commission considered the minutes of June 16, 2010.

Ms. Brand moved to approve the June 16, 2010 minutes.

Mr. Bonnett stated that at the June 16, 2010 meeting, he had mentioned a letter from the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) to City Council, but actually the letter had gone through staff. He wanted to know whether the Council had received the letter or not so that he could report back. *(Staff note: Correspondence provided by Mr. Bonnett to CMO staff was forwarded as requested.)* He stated that Transportation staff would know if the letter had gotten to the Council, and that it was a letter in support of the commission's policy suggestion that funding for transportation not already committed to the automobile be dedicated to alternative or active transportation modes. He requested information from staff as to the fate of that letter – had Council received it?

Mr. Skov explained that the commission had testified, and BPAC had given comments, regarding Surface Transportation Program-Urban (STPU) discretionary funding and how it should be spent.

Ms. Brand asked about the status of the water rights sale to Veneta.

Mr. Boles seconded the motion to approve the June 16, 2010 minutes. The motion passed 5:0:2, with Mr. Bruce, Mr. Boles, Mr. Bonnett, Mr. Funk, and Mr. Skov voting in favor, and Ms. Brand and Mr. Rexius abstaining.

2. Public Comment

Kathy Saranpa, co-convenor of the Neighborhood Leaders Council on Sustainability (NLCS), explained that she and Mr. Funk met monthly. She said that the way she saw it, the commission worked on sustainability issues at the city level, and the NLCS worked on sustainability issues on a grassroots level. She stated that the NLCS was involved in bike tours (tours of neighborhoods that included sites where people were doing exciting things around sustainability, such as front yard conversions and edible landscaping). This year, the NLCS was using pedicabs for the tours. The next tour would be in the Friendly Neighborhood on August 7 and 8. The NLCS was planning for a teach-in on October 30th at the First Methodist Church, and she thought it would be great to have involvement in that from the commission. She mentioned the NLCS website, EugeneSustainability.org. She stated that content was being uploaded. The NLCS had members from 14 of Eugene's 19 neighborhoods, and was aiming for members from all of the neighborhoods. She encouraged commission members to participate in a bike tour and the teach-in.

Ms. Jaworski arrived at 5:41 p.m.

Mr. Funk suggested the NLCS and the commission share a booth at the Eugene Celebration, as a way of getting the word out. Mr. Skov reminded the commission that "enhanced outreach" was part of their goal for the next year, as was partnering with other organizations. He encouraged the commission's participation in the Eugene Celebration and in the NLCS teach-in. Mr. Funk and Ms. Saranpa agreed to work together to allow these collaborations between the groups.

Mr. Skov volunteered that some of the land use and transportation issues that were most controversial occurred in neighborhoods where a large percentage of adults were college students, and so the teach-in was an opportunity to reach out to this population.

Jeannine Parisi, Local Government Outreach Coordinator, EWEB, explained that the water sales contract with Veneta is a complex issue with no clear right or wrong answers – EWEB was dealing with archaic water laws that went back about 100 years and was trying to figure out how to apply those laws to scenarios that may or may not occur 100 years into the future. She stated that EWEB was doing its best to give the community the maximum flexibility over time.

Ms. Parisi explained that the situation was complex and its outcome could not be predicted. She stated that EWEB thought there were some aspects of its proposal that might not meet sustainability criteria. EWEB also felt it was its responsibility to do everything in its power to secure the third water right. It would be irresponsible to not do everything in its power to keep that water available for future generations. The contract with Veneta was the only mechanism EWEB saw available to do that at this time and addressed the following sustainability attributes:

1. **Keeps the McKenzie water right in public hands and in EWEB stewardship.** There were over 200 additional water right applications for the McKenzie River on file since EWEB's was granted in 1961.

EWEB was heavily invested in the McKenzie Watershed and had a number of initiatives under way to protect water quality, like the flood plain and drinking water protection ordinances EWEB was working with at the county level, its

work with private property owners with septic systems and moving hazardous materials away from the river, and habitat enhancements with the McKenzie River Trust, including a carbon-market study/sustainable forestry partnership with Oregon State University involving 500 acres of EWEB property upriver. The McKenzie is a tremendous natural asset and EWEB has taken a leadership role in protecting this resource for future generations.

2. **Access to clean water was a key component to increasing community resiliency to climate change.** This means access to water when it is most needed. While there is certainly room for increased conservation, more water will be needed for successful larger scale local food strategies, to protect the community against long periods of drought, and to have capacity to serve new residents who were not accounted for in current population estimates (e.g., climate change immigrants). It is true that demand projections look pretty flat since the 1960s but that was largely due to loss of major customers (Glenwood and Hynix).

If the third water right is not secured, any new permit application EWEB acquires to serve the thousands of new residents or manufacturing facilities that come to Eugene will have more restrictions on amounts and when EWEB could take those amounts from the river, while other senior users will not have to abide by those same criteria. Water was critical not only for drinking and agricultural needs, but for firefighting purposes, sewage treatment, and other critical services. Retaining EWEB's water rights meant EWEB had choices versus mandates in an uncertain future.

3. **Social equity and need for shared resources component** – Eugene's own needs to secure emergency sources of supply would require a partnership model with other water providers – EWEB cannot act as an island when it comes to water planning. Most climate change scenarios also envision increased interdependency to best allocate resources equitably and with attention to social justice aspects so that municipalities are not burdened with enormous capital improvement projects for essential services that residents could not afford.

4. **Veneta water basin impacts** – Veneta plans to continue to use the existing well system to meet current and future needs – this means increased pressure on natural systems that are slower to recharge, and are more energy- and chemical- intensive to meet drinking water standards, which has implications to both underground and surface water supplies.

5. **Economic development component** – Whether Veneta obtains water from EWEB, drills new wells or purchases it from some other facility may not have a large impact on growth in that community. It could however impact Veneta's ability to attract companies that could employ residents locally, or to move forward with its vision of creating more opportunities for local food manufacturing/storage/distribution facilities that took advantage of nearby agriculture.

Ms. Parisi explained that EWEB believes the most important contribution it could make to future

generations was providing access to clean water at affordable rates, and that there are economic, social and environmental benefits associated with the Veneta water contract. She saw the commission as a key stakeholder to help EWEB bring clarity to those benefits and seek mitigation options where there were less desirable impacts. She stated that EWEB was happy to meet with the commission in the future for a further discussion if desired.

Ms. Brand asked Ms. Parisi if EWEB had talked to the state Water Resources Board about the reality of losing the water right. Ms. Parisi stated that she did not deal with the Water Resources Board, but that EWEB had submitted permit extensions in order to hold on to the rights as long as possible. EWEB knew, however, that this was not permanent.

Ms. Brand asked about building the water pipes to Veneta, and asked if they would go through Fern Ridge. Ms. Parisi explained that the preferred route went along Cantrell, starting at the end of Seneca.

Ms. Parisi said that she had seen the letter that Mr. Boles, Mr. Bonnett and Mr. Funk had sent to the Council raising concerns. Mr. Boles stated that, in his opinion, the Veneta water rights issue was concerning because it was being done in a vacuum rather than in a larger context. EWEB was acting on what it perceived to be in the best interest of the larger community, but it was doing so with its blinders on. He encouraged the EWEB board and its new director to look at the larger issues. Unless EWEB could address some of the issues outlined in the letter, he said, some commissioners would be in opposition to the proposal as individuals.

Ms. Parisi acknowledged that EWEB had not undertaken significant community outreach, initially focusing on the legal question about charter authority, as Veneta had not anticipated the project for a number of years. With potential funding through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), EWEB decided to proceed. She acknowledged that EWEB's leadership was committed to increased openness with the public on this matter.

Mr. Funk stated his opinion that the issue seemed to have been sprung on the public with no conversation, and that EWEB had lost the chance for some more creative solutions. He said that he understood Veneta's ground water issues and all the downsides including the transportation effects it might cause (the building up of a community, 90 percent of which drives into Eugene for work). He stated that he also understood the argument that if Veneta had its own water, it could build its own industries. He stated his belief that had the issue been a little bit more public, and had more public input been accepted, there could have been a chance to hear more creative solutions to both issues.

Mr. Rexius stated his opinion that the EWEB proposal was not a bad idea, and that it was not universally disliked on the commission. He said that he was not an expert, and it was a complicated issue, and that he did not necessarily think the proposal was a bad idea.

Mr. Bruce stated that the work EWEB was doing on McKenzie River Basin suggested they did have some land use expertise. He said that the commission and others could be more effective and offer creative solutions with greater communication and coordination.

Mr. Skov thanked Ms. Parisi for coming. He commended EWEB as stewards of the McKenzie and for their use of the watershed. He said that the commission needed to examine action Council had taken; figure out what the commission's advisory role to Council could and should be, and direct their efforts towards that.

Mr. Funk asked when the governance issue would be decided. Ms. Parisi stated that it was in court, so she did not know exactly when it would be decided. She said that she thought the first hearings would happen in September. She said that she thought these would be public, and that arguments would be heard by the three different parties to the proceedings. All three parties had asked for summary judgments, perhaps in an attempt to compress the timeline. The action that Council took was to do nothing until that decision had been made.

Ms. Jaworski stated that she had worked with the rural communities involved in the issue, and that she felt that part of the commission's role was to not assume that another community did not have a sense of sustainability, and that the different communities should engage in conversation with each other. She said that EWEB was the City of Eugene's utility, but that Veneta was also a member of the City's region, and she wanted communities to work together to find a third way to deal with the issue rather than making assumptions.

3. Items from Commissioners and staff

– Reports on liaison meetings and presentations to groups

Commissioner Reports

Mr. Boles thanked Mr. Bruce for sending him Minnesota's Sustainability Indicators. He suggested the commission take a look at them for help in solidifying indicators. He said he thought it was the next step for the commission, and would help them be able to determine if they were doing a good job.

Mr. Nystrom mentioned a race to the top competition for communities to get federal funding to put in infrastructure for electric vehicles. Right now, the vision was to link communities from Vancouver, BC, down to Eugene, including Seattle and Portland, as one community. Jeff Merkley was currently trying to get a bill related to this through the Senate.

Mr. Skov said he would send Sen. Merkley's bill to commissioners. He said he would also send out Minnesota's Sustainability Indicators.

Ms. Jaworski said that she was one of the content collaborators for upcoming best practices training and the Neighborhood Summit, both of which would include members of the City's boards and commissions. The summit is planned for Oct. 2 and the best practices training is set for Nov. 6.

Mr. Bruce said that climate change was entering into the conversation in the world of natural hazards and emergency management in local communities throughout the state, and he thought this was a good thing. He said that at the state level, Oregon Emergency Management was taking a hands-off approach to climate change. He said that there were many federal funding opportunities available around climate change. He said he would be speaking with Ethan Nelson, EWEB, Good Company and Earth Advantage about putting together a joint proposal centered on green building vis-à-vis climate change.

Mr. Skov said he would send around a link related to the potential grant funding. He also mentioned that he was on the Citizens Advisory Committee for the Pedestrian and Bicycle Action Plan, which would be part of the TransPlan revision that would happen next year.

Mr. Funk said he was focusing on education and communication. He had met with the Green Lane board about shared communication and messaging. He met with EWEB and Bold Steps and was working with neighborhood leaders. He said he was laying the groundwork for communication but needed help determining what the commission wanted to communicate. He said he had spoken with the Green Lane board about the 10 percent shift item that Mr. Bruce had sent out regarding local purchasing, and that they had been excited about it.

Mr. Bruce said he hadn't sent it to the whole commission, because he had wanted to get a couple people's eyes on it first. Mr. Skov said he would send items some commissioners had missed out to the whole commission.

4. Car share report

Mr. Brook said he was going to give the commission an update on a market study his company, Team Red, was doing for Lane Transit District. He said that he and his colleague, Patty Fink, had been holding stakeholder interviews in Eugene and Springfield and with the University of Oregon. He asked that commissioners give him guidance on some of the stakeholders Team Red may have missed. He said that one of the issues he hoped to address was the reason why car sharing needed public support. He said that public/private partnerships were important in making car sharing work. He said that he thought it was highly likely that there would be two car sharing providers in Eugene for a period of time, and that Team Red was not going to endorse one or the other. The two providers would probably be a rental car company and a local car sharing co-op. He said that there was a lot of support in the community, but no champion was emerging. He asked the commission for suggestions on who the champion might be.

Mr. Skov said that the commission had been tasked by council to report back on car sharing in Eugene. They learned about LTD's hiring of Team Red to do the same thing (conducting a feasibility study). He said the commission was relieved to hear this. He asked about the time frame for the release of Team Red's results, and asked if there were differences between the commission's charge and Team Red's charge.

Mr. Brook said that Team Red wanted a draft to Tracy Smith at LTD's point2point by the first week in August. They hoped to be finished with the report by the middle of August. He stated his belief that the sooner their results were released, the sooner car sharing could get moving in the community. He said that Team Red was not specifically doing a feasibility study. He said that he felt that there was no doubt car sharing could succeed in Eugene, and the fact that it hasn't happened there yet was not due to the fact that conditions were not right for car sharing.

Mr. Skov said that he did not mean to imply that the commission's charge was to complete a feasibility study. They were, however, supposed to report back and the one specific thing that might be different about their task was that their task arose over concern about parking scarcity in certain neighborhoods. One thing the commission needed to do was say how car sharing might address those concerns. He stated that he assumed that Team Red's study would have to address some of the clients or partners that might be a part of car sharing, such as the University of Oregon (UO) or the City of Eugene.

Ms. Jaworski said she was part of the car sharing subcommittee. She said it would be very helpful if one of the observations of the success factor was that both the university and the city were

participants in communities where it worked and that it involved both community residents and students. One of the commission's roles was as a convener of potential champions. She asked if it was fair to say that the study would include success factors observed in other communities where car sharing existed.

Mr. Zelenka arrived at 6:26 p.m.

Mr. Brook said that that was a fair assumption. He said that UO had identified the issue of parking congestion in surrounding neighborhoods. He said that he was confused by the UO's measured interest in car sharing.

Mr. Brook said that he would be in touch with both the UO and LCC. He said that it seemed the city did not have much interest in creating incentives for car sharing downtown. Mr. Zelenka said he had talked to UO President Lariviere about car sharing, and he had been interested.

Mr. Skov said the commission looked forward to seeing that recommendation in Team Red's draft report. He asked what the best way was for the commission to see an early draft of the report.

Mr. Brook said that he did not think Ms. Smith at LTD would be possessive of the report. He asked the commission to give him suggestions for the report when they saw it, and to feel free to use parts of the report for their own purposes. He said he would email Ms. Smith and ask her when she felt it appropriate to share with the commission, and that he would CC the commission's point person, Mr. Nystrom.

Mr. Brook said that the report would include case studies from other communities, including Ithaca, New York, which had done a great job with car sharing. He said that Team Red had been trying to find towns with similar situations as Eugene had, towns of about the same size with large college student populations.

Mr. Skov requested a description of the conditions that would make Eugene's market appealing to a nationally-known, well-established car sharing company which was doing car sharing in a number of major metropolitan areas, including small- and mid-sized university towns.

Ms. Jaworski mentioned that in the commission members' search, there were many local and non-profit models that were successful in other towns. She asked Mr. Brook if these other types of companies would be included in his report, and if he had a preference. Mr. Brook said that in some towns, partnerships with local governments and transit agencies helped local and co-op companies get traction. He said that some of the towns he was studying included Madison, WI and Ithaca, NY. He said he would connect the commission with Jennifer Dotson of Ithaca Carshare (she had grown up in Eugene).

Ms. Brand said that she had found a number of helpful studies on car sharing, including one on North American car sharing models and what made them successful. She said it might be helpful as background information.

Mr. Brook said that he and Ms. Fink would be coming to Eugene to give some summary presentations on the subject, and he assumed one of them would be in the form of a public talk. He said that perhaps a presentation to the commission or to City Council would be useful.

Mr. Skov asked to be informed of the presentations, and said the commission would help Team Red get as big an audience as possible for it. After Mr. Brook hung up, Mr. Skov said that his presentation had been helpful, and that he was happy to have learned some of the things he had shared about some of the national car sharing companies.

Mr. Nystrom said that it was helpful to hear that President Lariviere was interested in car sharing.

Mr. Skov said that it was helpful to hear Mr. Brook's precise language around the goals of some of the people at the UO, and that what the commission now needed to do was see if their goals overlapped with the more broad goals of different people at the UO.

Ms. Brand said that she heard that one of the reasons car sharing was not being more widely embraced by UO students was that it was marketing to a targeted segment (freshmen) at the beginning of a school year, but that the marketing had not been done continually. She said that the market was no doubt there, but that continual marketing needed to be done to ensure its success.

Mr. Skov said that the amount of evidence needed to judge the level of parking scarcity at the UO related to car sharing did not exist.

Ms. Jaworski said that Mr. Brook had mentioned something very important – that there was no reason why car sharing should not succeed in the Eugene market. For this reason, part of the commission's charge was looking into the issue to see if car sharing could work in Eugene. Mr. Skov asked that the subcommittee weigh in on how the focus that LTD had might differ from Council's concern so that they could be sure they were doing what Council asked them to do. He asked the subcommittee to let the commission know if Team Red's report was missing something that Council had asked them to look into.

Ms. Jaworski asked where the idea of examining parking concerns related to car sharing came from.

Mr. Zelenka said it had come from minor code amendments around the university neighborhoods. There was a proposal put forth by the Planning Commission to reduce the number of required parking spaces at a particular dwelling if there was a car sharing program. Therefore, Council had asked the commission to look into what it would take to have a viable car sharing program in Eugene, at the development level and city-wide.

Ms. Jaworski expressed her hope that the subcommittee's charge was to examine the viability of a car sharing program rather than conducting a site-specific parking analysis.

Mr. Skov said that this was why it was important to examine Team Red's report to see if it was missing anything that Council had asked the commission to do around car sharing.

Mr. Bruce said that when he worked at Rainbow Valley, they had looked at a condominium project at 15th and Walnut, east of the UO. Their initial intent for that project was to limit the structured parking costs, and to provide two cars that could be shared within the development. There were a number of barriers to that, some of them financial. Banks were not interested in projects like that, and a progressive architecture firm in Portland suggested they not do it because it would have been difficult to market the units. The thing that was telling to him, though, was

that at that time, they did not need parking reductions above and beyond what was already in the code to get to half the number of parking spaces for the number of units. He expressed his frustration, saying that he thought that the city needed to say it would support car sharing on properties and reduce the required number of parking spaces. It could be enforced the same way parking restrictions were enforced throughout in the city. He wondered why this was so difficult to do, given the fact that a parking enforcement program already existed.

Mr. Zelenka asked what would happen when the development let go of the car sharing program after it had been built.

Mr. Bruce said that it could be enforced through deed restrictions and other policies.

Mr. Zelenka repeated his and the Council's concern, asking how the enforcement could be made perpetual.

Mr. Skov said that this was a legitimate concern, but that scrapping the idea of car sharing was not the solution. He said that the city should assume that things would change over time and embrace the best option by changing codes.

Mr. Zelenka said that the problem was taking a permanent problem and using a temporary solution to solve it.

Mr. Skov said that to say that the problem was permanent was too narrow, but that the scale that really mattered, which was the neighborhood, many changes could occur over a five-year time period.

Mr. Zelenka said that the problem was that people did not think at that level, but thought about problems on a per-development level.

Mr. Skov agreed. He said that code needed to be such that these issues were examined at a more pulled-back level, over time.

Mr. Bruce noted that Portland allowed development with zero parking in certain parts of the community. He said that he was challenged by the notion that, forever forward, cars would be ubiquitous. He encouraged more solution-oriented, forward thinking. He said that at the least, car sharing should be given a chance.

Mr. Zelenka said that that attitude was fine at the theoretical level, but at the practical level, neighborhoods did not want to be experimented on.

Mr. Bruce said that he understood, but that some neighborhoods already had the problem, and car sharing seemed like an appealing solution. He said that the problem had certainly not been solved by providing additional parking.

Mr. Boles encouraged examining the characteristics of communities where car sharing had been successful in reducing parking problems, and finding out how Eugene differed from these communities.

Mr. Zelenka said that the UO felt that they could not limit parking at its residences because they

felt they could not market those units, and students chose instead to live off-campus where parking was available. He said that this seemed to be a perfect place for the city and the university to work together, to limit parking at UO residences and on city streets near the UO.

5. Items from Commissioners and staff, continued

– **Items from staff**

Ms. Osborn stated that Eugene had been selected to participate in the Institute of Sustainable Communities Leadership Academy in Boston in late September. The theme was going to be adaptation and resilience. Last year it had been land use and transportation. This year, Jon Ruiz was going to go with city planners, along with Felicity Fahy from EWEB, Babe O’Sullivan, the City’s new Sustainability Liaison, Matt McRae and Stacy Vynne from the Climate Leadership Institute at UO.

Ms. Osborn said that Mr. McRae had been sharing the draft Eugene Climate and Energy Action Plan (CEAP) with various entities, including the LCOG board, the Planning Commission, and the EWEB Executive Team. She said that Mr. McRae was still trying to set up meetings with the Chamber of Commerce and Lane County Executive Management.

Ms. Osborn asked if any commissioners had been able to attend the health impact assessment presentation. She said that Upstream Public Health, a non-profit in Portland, had conducted it, and it was the first time in the nation that a health impact assessment had been conducted on a climate plan. It was focused on land use and transportation, and the general findings showed that implementing the recommendations of the plan to reduce auto use and to increase bus, bicycle and foot traffic, would have a positive impact on public health.

Ms. Osborn said that Mr. McRae would be taking the draft CEAP to the Mayor and City Council on September 15, and he suggested that those on the commission who had been appointed by councilors contact the councilor who appointed them and find out what kinds of reservations, uncertainties or questions they might have in terms of supporting the plan.

Ms. Osborn mentioned the EWEB Riverfront Master Plan Council work session. She also mentioned the work session where Mr. Bruce and Mr. Skov would present their FY 2011 Work Plan and Annual Report on August 9. She said that the Council would hold a work session on September 8 at noon on the Chicken/Food Security climate plan issue.

Ms. Osborn said that the new Sustainability Liaison, Babe O’Sullivan, would start on August 5, and that part of her orientation would be to meet with the commission.

Ms. Osborn mentioned the article in the Register-Guard about the Eugene Library’s switch to BPA-free receipts.

Ms. Osborn said that the first six months of 2010 had the highest temperatures on record for the globe.

Mr. Skov mentioned that the twelve months ending in April, 2010, were the hottest 12 months on

record for the globe.

Mr. Nystrom said that poison ivy and poison oak were more responsive to the increase in CO2 than any other plants.

Ms. Osborn said that Alan Durning of the Sightline Institute was coming to town on October 15 and would be at the Hult Center (it was to be a free event). She said that the City Manager's Office was co-sponsoring the evening presentation with the Southwestern Oregon Chapter of American Institute of Architects (AIA). Mr. Skov asked if the commission also could be a sponsor of that event.

Mr. Zelenka asked if she and Mr. McRae had thought to reach out to Springfield's Executive Management about the CEAP. Ms. Osborn said that they were working on it.

Mr. Zelenka said that he was on the Transportation and Land Use subcommittee working with the Oregon Global Warming Commission to put together a strategy to meet the 2050 goals for greenhouse gas reduction. He said that he had forwarded all of the Eugene CEAP's transportation and land use elements into the inventory of the issues they were examining. He said that it was well-received, and that it was excellent work.

6. Break

Mr. Skov called for a brief break at 7:18 p.m. The meeting resumed at 7:31 p.m.

7. Work plan & annual report

Mr. Skov explained that the commission would work in groups on the draft work plan, most of which was completed by Mr. Bruce. He asked the groups to come up with changes to the draft, including the overall structure. He stated that this new proposed work plan was different from the last work plan in the way the commission was transitioning from dealing with previous backlog to having focused goals to act on.

Mr. Funk asked if the Sustainability Board was still in existence. Ms. Osborn said that what executive managers seemed to embrace shifting to a different model with focused action teams. She said that city department heads had been invited to the commission's September meeting to talk about sustainability efforts with commissioners. *(Staff note: This has been postponed to October 2010, because of new scheduling conflicts.)* She suggested changing the language to "city leadership liaisons" rather than "sustainability board."

Mr. Zelenka asked about action teams. Ms. Osborn said the teams would have oversight from executive management, and would organize around specific initiatives with appropriate staff assignments and scope of work. For example, the right staff people in the organization would be identified for coordination on the Community Climate and Energy Action Plan, while several different staff would lead implementation of the internal climate plan focused on fleet, facilities and other City activities. Action teams could be more nimble than a board. The idea was for the action teams to be more results-oriented.

Mr. Boles asked if this model was being adopted throughout the city. Ms. Osborn said that more of this was happening, and ad hoc groups were forming to solve specific problems. Mr. Skov expressed his support for the new model.

Mr. Funk stated his belief that community forums were a lot of work and resulted in little educational gain. He suggested coordinating messaging with partners instead; expressing his belief that this would be more effective, especially if multiple groups presented the same message after working together. Mr. Skov said that it was meant as a goal to enhance community forums that would occur anyway. He said he would alter the language to make that more clear.

Ms. Jaworski asked if developing messaging should be part of the list of key tasks. Mr. Skov said that it should be, and that he would make that change.

Mr. Rexius asked if, in the second sentence in section 1.3, if Mr. Skov had meant “TransPlan process” rather than “Envision Eugene process.” Mr. Skov said that that was what he meant, and that he would make the change.

Ms. Jaworski said that the commission had the task of “delegating members of the Sustainability Commission to serve on the Joint Land Use committee” was stated three different times in the draft plan, under tasks 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3. She encouraged streamlining the language to make it easier to report back results.

Ms. Jaworski said that tasks 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 seemed only reactive. She said that she thought that one of the values the commission brought was to provide insight as to sustainability-related issues in various plans and guiding principles. She asked if that was implied in the draft plan.

Mr. Skov said that he thought this was addressed in the section that read “respond to time-sensitive and/or emerging issues as requested.” He said that this was deliberately targeted at decision points Council would have in the coming year.

Ms. Jaworski asked if tasks 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 all needed to get done.

Mr. Skov said that EmX, Envision Eugene, TransPlan and car sharing all needed to get done.

Ms. Jaworski asked if they were supposed to suggest additions or changes to these issues.

Mr. Skov said that if the work plan was approved by Council, Council was saying that they wanted the commission to have an opinion on those issues.

Mr. Zelenka said that he agreed with Ms. Jaworski, in that the language should be explicit, i.e. “weigh in on sustainability issues related to topic a.”

Mr. Bruce asked to whom they should be sharing their opinions, in the process of the issues being examined in the community.

Ms. Jaworski said that she did not want the commission to be in a position of rejecting something at the end of its process because one of their opinions was not voiced.

Mr. Skov said that he heard different things: 1) He wanted to be sure that Council was mentioned

in the plan on each task, because he wanted it to be clear that the commission would be doing what Council asked of them; 2) Bringing a commission message to the groups commissioners were involved in as individuals.

Mr. Zelenka asked what “maintain individual council involvement” meant.

Mr. Bruce said that, for example, three commission members were involved as individuals in Envision Eugene, and not as commission members. He expressed his view that he did not think they should be inserting themselves into the process as commission members.

Mr. Skov said that he thought the opposite.

Mr. Zelenka said that the difference was that when commission members spoke at meetings of other entities, they spoke as individuals. If they were appointed to an entity as a commission member, they were supposed to represent the position of the commission. He said that this policy was also true for City Council members.

Mr. Boles said that, under “outreach” in the draft plan, the commission would be well served in mentioning strengthening its web presence. He said that there had been some conversation about bringing the website inside the city portal. He also mentioned the inclusion of measures to measure the commission’s progress on their tasks, and including this data on the website.

Mr. Skov asked how this could be done, since the commission had little staff support.

Mr. Boles mentioned some of the content he wanted to see on the website, and said that he thought there were ways to enhance an already-existing framework. He mentioned including links to other websites, such as eugenesustainability.org.

Mr. Skov suggested task number 2.0, “develop and disseminate message.”

Mr. Zelenka asked what the message was, and Mr. Funk said that the issue went back to what results were desired, and that they were setting up the infrastructure now to disseminate the message, which would be developed.

Ms. Brand asked about an ongoing need for a task force related to car sharing, which the subcommittee would have representation on.

Mr. Skov said that he was concerned about staff time, and thought that this could be included in task 3.5, “Respond to emerging issues.”

Mr. Zelenka suggested including the need for a task force in the recommendations to Council.

Ms. Brand said that, under 1.5, “Inform Council on issues related to electric vehicles,” that the action might be participating in this action.

Mr. Zelenka asked if she was suggesting promoting electric vehicles.

Ms. Brand said that she meant being involved in the analysis, which was already being done.

Ms. Brand mentioned 2.2, community forums, saying that she did not see anything about educating the community, and encouraged its inclusion in the work plan.

Ms. Brand said that there were groups that were involved in food security issues, and suggested including in the work plan the idea that the commission be linked up with those groups.

Mr. Boles said that he was a liaison to the Lane County Food Policy Council, and that the strategy was that the Food Security Scoping Document (FSSD) would get embedded within the CEAP. He said that there was no intention to fund the FSSD other than in its relationship with the CEAP.

Mr. Skov said that he would rephrase that section as “track and support staff efforts” or something to that effect.

Mr. Zelenka said that the commission would also make recommendations to Council related to the FSSD.

Mr. Bruce encouraged focus on the commission’s charge to provide policy direction to Council.

Mr. Bonnett asked Mr. Skov about content related to his involvement on the bicycle and pedestrian plan in relation to the TransPlan. He said he hoped the commission could remain involved in that issue.

Mr. Skov said that he could serve as a liaison to the TransPlan process, and that he was thinking about bicycle and pedestrian issues in relation to that topic. He said he would include a comment about “representing alternative transportation modes” in liaison responsibilities in the work plan.

Ms. Jaworski asked for clarity around individual commission members’ roles in various entities outside the commission.

Mr. Zelenka said that speaking as members of the commission at meetings of other entities limited the options for commission members.

Ms. Jaworski said that not all commission members understood the issue in the same way.

Mr. Skov said that this was a governance issue that should be addressed at the next meeting.

Mr. Funk said that the issue was addressed in the training the commission received with City Attorney Glenn Klein, and that the lesson had been that commission members needed to be careful about what they said and who they represented when they spoke at other meetings.

Mr. Zelenka said that the overall filter for this issue was that the purpose of the commission was to make recommendations to City Council.

Mr. Bruce said that when the commission made recommendations to the Council, they were made by commission members who were also members, on an individual level, of other entities.

Mr. Skov encouraged focus on the commission’s role of providing guidance to Council, and for commission members to use their best judgment when serving in other groups.

After the commission worked as groups on the work plan, Ms. Jaworski requested an agenda item for the next meeting related to aligning measurable commission goals with City Council's goals.

Mr. Zelenka pointed out that many of the product timeline relationship to Council goals were left blank. He expressed his view that distinguishing the relationship between commission's goals from Council's was not helpful, as most of them were intuitive.

Mr. Skov stated that that aspect of the work plan could be taken out.

Mr. Zelenka stated that car sharing did not include product timeline goals on the work plan, but it was one of the few projects the commission was working on that would have products.

Mr. Skov said that that could be added to the work plan. He expressed his discomfort with the idea of removing specific expectations and signposts from the work plan, because these were needed for shared understanding with the Council and amongst commissioners.

Mr. Zelenka suggested putting these items in bullets in the work plan. He stated that when he read standing committee work plans he assumed the actions and goals the groups took and had were consistent with Council goals, and he did not need the work plans to point out how this was so.

Mr. Skov pointed out that Mr. Zelenka may have understood some things that other councilors might not.

Mr. Zelenka stated his belief that all councilors assumed items and goals on standing committee work plans were related to Council goals. He stated that the reason standing committees needed to have their work plans approved by the Council was because the Council wanted to make sure goals and actions were consistent with the goals of the Council.

Mr. Skov asked Mr. Zelenka if he meant that outlining how commission goals aligned with Council goals was unnecessary.

Mr. Zelenka stated that this was correct, and that pointing out commission/Council goal alignment in the work plan was more work for the commission and commission staff.

Mr. Skov asked Mr. Zelenka to let the commission know if he saw them drifting from Council goals.

Mr. Zelenka stated that that was the whole point of the approval of each standing committees' work plan.

Mr. Boles asked how the commission would track accomplishments it made based on the work plan, specifically for goals that did not have products, in anticipation of presenting accomplishments before the City Council when the work plan year was complete.

Ms. Jaworski stated that she understood Mr. Zelenka's concerns, but expressed her view that outlining how commission goals aligned with Council goals would benefit commissioners, and that this outline, in addition to a timeline, and evaluation tools should be developed before the next commission meeting, for the commission's own use.

Mr. Skov explained that commission was going to create a streamlined version of the work plan for the Council, and then create a work plan for commission use that included an outline of how commission goals aligned with Council goals, in addition to a timeline, and evaluation tools.

Mr. Zelenka stated that Council would let the commission know if they thought their work plan goals were straying from Council goals. He expressed his view that he agreed with Mr. Boles' suggestion to find a way of measuring progress on goals.

Mr. Skov explained that he and Mr. Bruce would incorporate revisions as brought up in the meeting. He asked commissioners to give him items they had written down but had not voiced.

8. Proposed bylaws change: extending chair and vice chair terms

Mr. Bruce asked for a motion to extend terms for the Chair and Vice-Chair to match with commission schedule.

Mr. Bonnett, seconded by Mr. Boles, moved to extend the terms of the Chair and the Vice Chair to match the commission schedule.

Mr. Funk stated that the last year, the commission had created a work plan and then a report, and it had been clear what they said they would do, including outcomes and timelines. He advocated for including those items in the work plan.

The motion passed unanimously.

9. Closing, next meeting, follow-up

Mr. Skov adjourned the meeting at 8:30 p.m.

(Recorded by Katie Dettman)