

MINUTES

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

March 7, 2012
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Claire Syrett, Chair; Shanda Miller, Vice Chair; John Barofsky, Ken Beeson, George Brown, Chelsea Clinton, Pat Farr, Laura Illig, Andrea Ortiz, George Poling, Chris Pryor, Mark Rust, Doug Smith, Betty Taylor, Alan Zelenka, members; Mayor Kitty Piercy; City Manager Jon Ruiz; Assistant City Manager/Planning and Development Director Sarah Medary; City Attorney Glenn Klein; Central Services Director Kristi Hammitt; Police Chief Pete Kerns, Fire and EMS Chief Randy Grove, Public Works Director Kurt Corey; Library, Recreation, and Cultural Services Director Renee Grube; Mia Cariaga, Sue Cut-sogearge, Pavel Gubanikhin, Larry Hill, Central Services Department; Scott Luell, Planning and Development Department; Connie Bennett, Mike Magee, Library, Recreation, and Cultural Services; Lori Kievith, Eugene Police Department; Karen Gaffney, Lane County Animal Services.

ABSENT: Mike Clark, member.

I. OPENING REMARKS

Ms. Syrett had no opening remarks.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Syrett opened the public comment period.

Rita Castillo opposed the City's proposed reduction in its contribution to Lane County Animal Services (LCAS) suggested more than one person would be needed to address animal enforcement in Springfield, and further that she believed such calls would be a low priority for the police. She contrasted the cost of an animal control officer to a police officer and pointed out animal control officers were less expensive. She did not believe local nonprofit animal welfare agencies had the capacity to help.

Ms. Syrett closed the public comment period.

III. DISCUSSION

Committee members identified budget strategies proposed by City Manager Ruiz that they wished to discuss at more length or get additional clarification. They included: 1) administrative changes; 2) revenue increases and funding shifts; 3) reorganizations; 4) Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) dues and services held in abeyance; 5) Lane Regional Air Protection Agency (LRAPA) dues held in abeyance; 6) Human Services Commission reduction; 7) branch library hours reduction; 8) Animal Services

reduction; 9) increase ambulance capacity/eliminate second fire company at Fire Station 2; and 10) jail beds—additional funding.

Speaking to the subject of jail beds, Mr. Barofsky agreed as to the need but suggested the number of jail beds could be reduced slightly in number to provide needed funding in other areas.

Administrative changes

Ms. Ortiz, Mr. Rust, and Ms. Syrett asked questions clarifying the nature of the changes proposed in this area.

Revenue increases/funding shifts

Mr. Rust asked questions clarifying the nature of the changes as they regarded the Ambulance Transport Fund.

Ms. Ortiz noted that reductions in council memberships and travel were listed in this area and asked how those should be processed. Mayor Piercy recommended the council form a subcommittee to follow-up on that topic and develop a recommendation for council consideration.

Reorganizations

Mr. Barofsky suggested that garage security staffing costs could be eliminated in the Parking Services Fund by relying more on the additional police officers to be deployed downtown; that funding could be used to address some of the budget gaps the committee wished to fill. City Manager Ruiz expressed caution about the condition of the Parking Services Fund and suggested the General Fund had been over-reliant on the fund. He pointed out the additional officers had yet to be deployed and thought the money should be retained in the fund for the time being. Mr. Barofsky asked the committee to keep the idea in mind.

Ms. Ortiz hoped the manager's budget proposal expanded on the nature of the reorganizations being contemplated.

LCOG

While Mr. Pryor believed it would be a mistake for the City to not pay its dues to LCOG, he recognized the gravity of the current budget situation and hoped to return with some proposals for funding.

Mr. Pryor agreed to follow up on a question from Mr. Poling regarding LCOG's contract rates for non-members.

Mayor Piercy questioned whether there was a different overall approach to funding LCOG that would reduce the financial impact on all its members.

LRAPA

Ms. Ortiz suggested that the Joint Elected Officials needed to examine the future of the agency if the local jurisdictions could not pay their dues to LRAPA. She believed LRAPA provided essential business assistance. She understood that City Manager Ruiz was meeting with the director of LRAPA soon and looked forward to hearing his report.

Ms. Illig wanted the City to find new partnerships and ways to do things that ensured no program was decimated and minimal services levels were maintained throughout the community. She was interested in knowing what impact the reduction would have on the community's clean air and wanted more information about other service delivery models.

Ms. Ortiz noted that the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality would be the agency responsible for air quality if LRAPA ceased to exist. She believed it was good to have a local agency that residents could contact for assistance and information.

Mr. Barofsky suggested the City's Community Development Block Grant (CDGB) funding could be used as an alternative funding source. He encouraged staff to look to funds other than the General Fund that might have a legitimate nexus to such expenses.

City Manager Ruiz said he would work with the City's partners in LRAPA to maintain services. He said he had been conscious of scalability when he proposed the expenditure. He would consider other funding sources of money but cautioned that would have an impact on other expenditures.

Mr. Pryor agreed the manager should consider scalability in his recommendations, saying the service did not have to be "all or nothing."

Ms. Taylor endorsed Mr. Barofsky's suggestion for using CDGB funds to support LRAPA.

IV. MOTIONS

HSC

Ms. Syrett, seconded by Mr. Farr, moved to recommend restoring the \$175,000 allocation listed in Strategy 6 for Human Services on a one-time basis and find alternative revenues or resources to fund the Opportunity Eugene proposals.

Responding to a question from City Manager Ruiz, Ms. Syrett confirmed she was proposing one-time funding for human services and anticipated that staff would identify the funding needed to implement the recommendations of the task force when it completed its work and made its report to the council.

Speaking to the \$175,000 allocated to implement the recommendations that came out of the Opportunity Eugene Community Task Force, Ms. Illig said she did not want to lose long-standing and accountable programs that now served many people in order to shift funding to unknown programming that might potentially serve fewer people with less accountability.

Ms. Syrett agreed with Ms. Illig's remarks. She did not believe that all of the recommendations that came from the task force would require funding and many might be accomplished in non-monetary ways.

Mr. Pryor pointed out the proposed reduction to human services was ongoing. He said the Council Committee on Human Services Funding was formed to discuss ways to stabilize and increase funding for human services and the proposed reduction moved the City away from that direction. He hoped to find permanent funding to support the human services infrastructure currently in place because it would be very expensive to rebuild. The current service delivery system had a proven record and he did not want to decrease funding.

Mr. Barofsky agreed with Mr. Pryor's remarks. He hoped the council committee's recommendation would lead to increased funding. He supported the one-time funding proposed for the use in question.

Mr. Barofsky suggested as a possible separate motion that the funding come from the last \$150,000 allocated to Occupy Eugene in the last supplemental budget. He anticipated he would offer the body a future motion to replace the Occupy Eugene funding previously allocated to street and parks maintenance from Marginal Beginning Working Capital.

Mr. Zelenka arrived.

Mr. Farr was also concerned about the cost of replacing the service infrastructure now in place. He anticipated that some of the task force recommendations might not require the entire amount allocated. He supported the motion.

Ms. Ortiz emphasized the need that existed. She supported the motion.

Mayor Piercy recalled that representatives of the task force had testified at the last Budget Committee meeting that they did not want the City to create new services by defunding existing services.

Mr. Rust was not confident new funding would be identified for fiscal year 2013 given the need that existed in so in any areas.

Ms. Syrett said she proposed that the funding be one-time in recognition of the manager's attempt to create a stable budget and because of the work of the council committee.

Ms. Syrett restated her motion as follows:

Ms. Syrett, seconded by Mr. Farr, moved to recommend restoring the \$175,000 of budget Strategy 6 to the HSC on a one-time basis and identify Opportunity Eugene Task Force money from another source.

Responding to a question from Mr. Poling, Ms. Syrett clarified that she was not recommending a funding source to implement the task force's recommendations.

The motion passed, 14:1; Mr. Rust voting no.

Branch libraries

Ms. Ortiz noted the information provided by staff in the meeting packet regarding the savings realized by closing the downtown library one day a week. While she acknowledged that the downtown library was somewhat of a "sacred cow," she suggested that using those funds to restore branch library hours would maintain some equity between geographic areas of the community.

Mr. Poling did not want to use one-time money to maintain current hours at the branch libraries and did not want to cut the hours or days at the main library. He pointed that voters had supported a measure that made the branch libraries possible. If all branch library users were to use the main library its usage would increase by 30 percent. He did not find any of alternative reductions proposed by the City Manager acceptable and invited committee ideas for funding. He suggested the work now being done by the Sustainability Program could be spread out among the departments for a savings of \$130,000.

Mr. Pryor questioned whether the payoff from an additional two hours a day at the branch libraries was worth the expenditure given the state of the General Fund. The amount involved did not seem like much in overall context of the budget but because it involved the General Fund and the funding was needed elsewhere, he was unable to support it. He was not happy about his decision.

Mayor Piercy questioned what the City could save if it opened the downtown library two hours later on Saturday and Sunday and used that funding to retain branch library hours. Ms. Grube cautioned that the department would have to weigh the use against the expenditure. Mayor Piercy thought staff should look into that. She believed that it would save money yet people would have almost full access. She also believed the staff should keep in mind the concept of shared pain. Ms. Grube pointed out the complication created by shifts and employees hours but said staff would return with that analysis.

Mr. Farr raised a brief process question about the fact the mayor was at the meeting table with the committee, which was a break from past precedent. Mayor Piercy indicated she had been placed at the table by staff and had sent the committee an e-mail asking if members objected to her presence at the table. No one had responded with objections. She acknowledged she was not a voting member. Mr. Farr appreciated the response.

Mr. Farr said the savings realized by the reduction in branch library hours equated roughly to the cost of operating the downtown library for one-quarter of a day.

Ms. Taylor opposed delaying the library opening on Saturday mornings because many families had a tradition of going to the library at that time. In addition, the downtown library brought people downtown. She pointed out that many areas of the community lacked branch libraries. She had been pleased that the manager proposed to reduce branch library hours rather than close the branch libraries. Ms. Taylor believed the downtown library had sufficient capacity to serve the branch library users.

Ms. Miller suggested the potential of another library operating levy. In the meantime, the City could use one-time moneys to maintain existing hours at the branch libraries.

Mr. Zelenka agreed with the remarks of Mr. Pryor regarding the branch libraries.

Speaking to the subject of a library levy, Mr. Zelenka believed the council needed a broader conversation about the City's revenue needs and anticipated that discussion would occur soon.

Speaking to Mr. Poling's proposal that the work of Sustainability Program be assumed by the departments, Mr. Zelenka did not support that idea because he did not think that initiatives such as the City's sustainability initiative made progress without specific staff support.

Mr. Barofsky, seconded by Mr. Poling, moved that Library, Recreation, and Cultural Services (LRCS) and staff look at reducing the main library hours of operation between four and six hours a week, using their discretion to figure out what the best outcome for that

would be, and use the savings from that to help bolster the branch libraries to the whatever extent the committee can.

Responding to a request for clarification from City Manager Ruiz, Mr. Barofsky said the motion gave staff flexibility to find the best use of the money and spoke to the concept of shared sacrifice. He proposed to spread the reduction out on a system wide basis rather than requiring the branch libraries to absorb all the reduction. He wanted staff to find a way to close the downtown library four to six hours weekly and use those savings to help restaff the branch libraries.

Ms. Syrett acknowledged that some reductions would be needed. She appreciated the shared sacrifice inherent in the motion. She pointed out that even if the committee adopted the manager's proposal, it was framed in terms of a temporary reduction with the hope those hours could be reinstated or even expanded in the future. She believed the motion represented the kind of sacrifice the community could bear.

Mr. Smith did not support the motion. He believed that staff had the best information about how things worked and what reductions worked best. He acknowledged that councilors whose wards were affected would not want to see any reductions at all. Mr. Smith pointed out that pool patrons regularly adjusted to shifting pool closures and he thought branch library patrons would also adjust. He suggested that more City jobs could be affected by fewer hours at the downtown library. While he disliked pitting the services against each other, Mr. Smith believed the higher usage hours at the downtown library justified the proposed reduction. He thought it would be relatively easy to restore lost branch library hours in the future.

Mr. Rust determined from Mr. Barofsky that the intent of the motion was to use the savings from the reduced downtown library hours to increase the branch library hours from the proposed reduction level. Mr. Rust supported a broader discussion of revenues and services.

Responding to a question from Mr. Rust about the City's 24-hour reference service, Ms. Grube indicated the service was provided through a library consortium and no library staff was involved. It was a data base service that was well-used and valuable to library patrons.

Ms. Grube explained that staff evaluated two options, reducing the branch library hours or closing the downtown library on Fridays. After evaluating the proposals in terms of access, impact on employees, and the most cost-effective service delivery, staff recommended the branch library hours reduction.

Mr. Rust agreed with Mr. Smith that the staff-proposed reduction made more sense in terms of the number of residents served.

Ms. Illig agreed with the remarks of Mr. Pryor. She found the reduction sad and frustrating and acknowledged it would impact people living near the library branches. However, she could not support restoring the reduction given the alternative reductions.

Ms. Ortiz supported the motion. Speaking to Mr. Zelenka's remarks, Ms. Ortiz indicated a preference for "small bites" approach rather than a global approach, which she found overwhelming. She said the City Council should start with proven services it knew the public supported.

Mr. Brown indicated reluctant support for the motion, although he preferred the original proposal. He did not want to see any library hours reduced due to the importance of the service and pointed out the branch library patrons did not have to come downtown to secure materials as they could order materials to be

delivered to the branches. He said that reduced hours meant less browsing opportunities for library patrons, which he did not like to see. He pointed out the downtown library was already well-used.

Mr. Pryor expressed discomfort that the committee was second-guessing staff's professional recommendation without the benefit of staff's expertise. He did not think that was the committee's role. He suggested there were implications to the motion that the committee might be unaware of. He trusted that Ms. Grube had considered those implications and offered the committee the best of the worst alternatives. Mr. Pryor did not support the motion.

Mr. Zelenka did not support the motion. He believed that if staff had proposed a reduction in downtown library hours the committee would have heard an even greater outcry. He hoped to restore the branch library hours at a later time.

Mr. Farr supported the motion. He wanted to see the staff analysis before making a final decision.

Mr. Beeson did not support the motion and agreed with the remarks of Mr. Smith and Mr. Pryor. He had been impressed by the level of usage at the downtown library. He believed the impact of reducing hours at the downtown library would be quite substantial and supported maintaining the facility that served the largest number of residents. Mr. Beeson agreed none of the alternatives were good ones.

Ms. Clinton did not support reducing the hours of operation at the downtown library. She said the downtown library had more room for computer services, which were very important to low-income residents, particularly job seekers. She encouraged the council to consider a library levy to restore the branch hours back and to keep in mind the "silent majority" who used the main library.

Mr. Barofsky said the committee was merely giving the manager some feedback regarding his recommendation. He pointed out the vote was not the final committee vote on the topic.

Ms. Syrett agreed with Mr. Barofsky. She anticipated that staff would return with information about the motion's impact on the community and that the committee would hear public input about it before it made a final decision.

Responding to a question from Mr. Zelenka, City Manager Ruiz anticipated that, depending on the level of support the motion enjoyed, he would integrate the motion into the proposed budget.

The committee discussed the process moving forward. Mr. Beeson questioned why the committee needed to take formal action to direct staff to return with further analysis involving a slight modification of downtown library hours. Mr. Barofsky wanted the information before the committee took action in April. He said the committee only had advantage of the analysis that led to the staff recommendation, and he wanted to know what else staff considered.

Ms. Syrett acknowledged that the process was somewhat muddled. She had envisioned that formal changes to the budget strategies would be made in the form of a motion with the expectation that the manger would incorporate those into the proposed budget.

Mr. Barofsky reiterated that the intent of the motion was to give the committee options for restoring branch library hours.

Mr. Rust indicated that the source of the funding would be a key element in the decision for him.

Ms. Syrett determined that committee members had no objection to turning the motion into an information request.

Ms. Syrett called for a brief break.

Animal Services

Mr. Poling, seconded by Mr. Barofsky, moved to recommend restoring \$130,000 to Animal Services from the one-time funding of Occupy Eugene allocation moneys that was left over.

Mr. Poling wanted to maintain the services now in place while staff developed another service model. HE said the funding for Occupy Eugene was from General Fund moneys allocated for roads, parks, and the council's contingency fund, so no other services were affected.

Ms. Syrett supported the motion. While she acknowledged the reduction had been previously contemplated and should be no surprise, she was hearing from nonprofit agencies that if they had more time they could form a consortium or respond to a Request for Proposals (RFP) but were not in a position to do so now. She suggested that if no new model were found, the City might have to restore funding in a supplemental budget. She thought the proposal represented a worthwhile use of the funding. She did not think people should interpret the proposed reduction as a reflection on the service.

Mr. Brown supported the motion because he believed developing a new model would take time.

Mr. Zelenka recalled that a portion of the funding in question was intended to support a wet bed pilot project and asked if staff had an estimate for that project. Assistant City Manager Medary said she did not yet have an estimate. The City would not have that information until it had a partnership in place with all parties available to discuss funding.

Mr. Zelenka offered a friendly amendment to the motion to delete the costs of the wet bed pilot from the \$130,000 proposed to be allocated to Animal Services. Mr. Poling declined to accept the friendly amendment on the basis that the City had no estimate of those costs.

Mr. Zelenka was unable to support the motion because of the City's prior commitment to fund wet beds.

Mr. Beeson determined from City Manager Ruiz that the proposed restoration of funds ensured the City's contribution to Animal Services remained the same as in fiscal year 2012.

Mr. Rust suggested that difficult budget times required the Budget Committee to make difficult ongoing budget reductions. He valued Animals Services and understood that Eugene had one of the best programs on the west coast. He suggested that great programs came at a great cost. He pointed to Exhibit B, a 2010 memorandum to the committee from staff listing the cost per capita of various programs that indicated Eugene's costs were twice as high as any other jurisdiction analyzed. He did not support the motion and would not agree to one-time funding. He valued the service but urged the committee not to push the problem into the future.

Ms. Illig agreed with Mr. Rust. She also valued the service and understood the decades of work that had gone into making the service what it was today. However, she believed the community needed to face the reduction now. She did not support the motion.

Mr. Barofsky believed the fact that Mr. Poling did not generally support the use of one-time funding spoke to the seriousness of the issue. He acknowledged the proposed funding was stop-gap but supported it due to the major reductions he believed that Lane County faced. He speculated that the City's funding might be all that Lane County Animal Services received in fiscal year 2013. He supported the motion.

Mr. Poling wanted to maintain the City's contribution to LCAS for fiscal year 2012 while staff worked on the Request for Proposals for a different model. The City Manager would have to find money for the new model next year. In the meantime, the funding was a stop-gap.

Responding to a question from Ms. Ortiz, Ms. Hammitt said the interagency transition task team would meet for the first time on March 9 with the goal of issuing an RFP for shelter and adoption services by mid-April 2012. Ms. Ortiz liked the intent behind the motion but suggested the amount in the motion be reduced by half to help fund LCAS through the transition period. Mr. Poling supported the suggestion but was concerned the process could take more than six months.

City Manager Ruiz suggested that alternatively, the committee could reduce the Council Contingency Fund by \$50,000 on an ongoing basis to cover a portion of the transition period. The council could allocate more funding through Supplemental Budget #1 in December 2012 if necessary.

Mr. Zelenka expressed concern about using the fund allocated to Occupy Eugene to support the expenditure. He recalled that a council majority had already committed a portion of those funds to wet beds and asked City Manager Ruiz how he addressed such a conflict. He asked City Manager Ruiz how he dealt with such a conflict. City Manager Ruiz indicated that was why he suggested the contingency fund. Mr. Zelenka did not object to using half the funding allocated to Occupy Eugene because he believed it would be sufficient to allow the City to move forward with the wet beds.

Ms. Syrett reminded the committee that it approved \$130,000 in reduction in Animal Services last year and the proposed reduction was on top of that. She did not know why Eugene had higher costs than other jurisdictions and suggested it might be attributable to the shelter's no-kill policy and the fact employees were paid a living wage. She appreciated Mr. Zelenka's remarks regarding the City's commitment to wet beds and supported reducing the amount in the motion by half. Ms. Syrett believed the funding helped to bridge the transition to another service delivery model, which did not necessarily mean a lower service level.

Mr. Pryor liked all the possible uses mentioned for the funding in question. He could spend the funding three times over and suggested that was the committee's problem. He believed the community needed a new animal services system but wet beds also had a real public safety payoff. The money could also be directed to its initial use, road maintenance. Mr. Pryor was willing to support the motion if the amount was halved. He was willing to support the motion if the committee was willing to revisit expenditures for less vital expenditures such as council travel and memberships.

Responding to a question from Ms. Taylor, City Manager Ruiz said that both he and Lane County Administrator Liane Richardson agreed that a new animal services model was needed. He said the goal was to maintain 92 percent of services in a sustainable model. He was not presupposing who provided the service.

Ms. Taylor expressed support for the motion and believed the funding should come from Council Contingency.

Ms. Clinton expressed concern about the impact of the motion on the wet bed pilot. She supported a motion that allowed the City to meet its commitment in that regard while also assisting LCAS.

Mr. Barofsky accepted a friendly amendment from Mr. Poling to reduce the amount in the motion from \$130,000 to \$65,000.

Ms. Syrett observed that the funding in the motion was itself derived from past committee allocations for other purposes, which suggested to her that there might be other funding sources, such as Council Contingency, to support the wet bed pilot.

Mr. Barofsky hoped the committee was able to replace the funding for parks and streets that had been reallocated to Occupy Eugene.

Mr. Pryor supported the revised motion. He wanted to be mindful of the City's various commitments and thought the motion addressed that concern.

The amended motion with the lesser amount of \$65,000 passed, 12:3; Mr. Rust, Mr. Smith, and Ms. Illig voting no.

Fire Station 2 Engine Company

Committee members discussed Chief Groves' proposal to eliminate an engine company at Fire Station #2.

Ms. Ortiz wanted to retain the engine company but was unsure how to fund it. She was committed to keeping the current infrastructure intact while the Ambulance Transport Task Force completed its work.

Mr. Rust also wanted to retain the engine company and hoped that staff could get creative and find some ongoing funding. He referred to the list of alternative reductions prepared by staff and said some looked more interesting than others but he needed to know more about them.

Ms. Syrett suggested that Mr. Rust request that staff provide additional information about the reductions he wanted to know more about.

Ms. Illig acknowledged that proposals to reduce public safety were alarming for many citizens. However, when she examined the data she believed it supported the staff recommendation. She pointed out the overall response reliability average was 85 percent and the response reliability for Station 2 was 92 percent. She questioned the severity of the impact if the reduction meant the station response time would be similar to other areas of the community.

Ms. Syrett appreciated Ms. Illig's comments as she had a similar reaction. She said the City was not proposing to close a fire station. She understood the importance of a robust public safety system and believed Eugene had one. While she understood that some might find the proposal disconcerting, Ms. Syrett trusted Chief Groves not to endanger the citizens of Eugene. The reduction seemed dramatic, but in the big picture it did not put citizens at undue risk.

Mr. Zelenka asked Chief Groves how the proposal affected trends in the call response. Chief Groves responded by describing the City's tiered response, which generally involved a first response by a fire suppression company with the same equipment and similarly trained personnel on medic units. He acknowledged the proposal was not ideal but the City would always put together the best system it could with the resources it had. He anticipated that response reliability would drop.

Ms. Ortiz, seconded by Mr. Poling, moved to extend the meeting for 10 minutes. The motion passed, 12:3: Ms. Miller, Mr. Poling, and Ms. Taylor voting no.

Ms. Ortiz, seconded by Mr. Rust, moved to reallocate \$317,000 from the Reserve for Revenue Shortfall on a one-time basis to fund the second engine company at Fire Station 2.

Ms. Ortiz emphasized the importance of retaining the company. The community had grown but the fire department had not kept pace. She believed it was important to retain as much of the department's infrastructure while the task force completed its work.

Speaking to Ms. Illig's comments, Ms. Ortiz explained that response times were shorter at Fire Station 2 because it was at the epicenter of the community and responded to medical calls at the Eugene Mission and Highway 99, which were both quite proximate to the station.

City Manager Ruiz suggested that rather than use the organization's reserves, the committee consider selecting some of the items on the alternative reductions list and use the money to add \$100,000 to \$150,000 annually to the department's budget over the next two years. He emphasized the importance of maintaining the City's reserves and suggested if the committee found the fire company to be an important service, it identify what service it should be prioritized above.

Mr. Barofsky supported the motion as currently worded as it got the City "over the hump," which was the purpose for having reserves.

Mr. Rust supported the one-time nature of the proposed funding given the essential nature of the service involved and the need for reliable response times.

Mr. Barofsky, seconded by Mr. Rust, moved to extend the meeting for eight minutes. The motion failed, 8:7; Ms. Miller, Mr. Farr, Mr. Smith, Mr. Poling, Ms. Taylor, Mr. Pryor, Ms. Illig, and Mr. Zelenka voting no; Ms. Syrett, Mr. Brown, Mr. Rust, Mr. Barofsky, Ms. Ortiz, Ms. Clinton, and Mr. Beeson voting yes.

Ms. Syrett tabled the motion to the committee's April 18, 2012, meeting.

Ms. Syrett adjourned the meeting at 9:15 p.m.

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)