



COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. 5081

**A RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE 2013 OREGON
LEGISLATURE AND THE CITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE
ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS OPERATING
AGREEMENTS ADOPTED BY RESOLUTION NO. 5043.**

PASSED: 8:0

REJECTED:

OPPOSED:

ABSENT:

CONSIDERED: February 11, 2013

RESOLUTION NO. 5081

**A RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE 2013 OREGON LEGISLATURE
AND THE CITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL
RELATIONS OPERATING AGREEMENTS ADOPTED BY
RESOLUTION NO. 5043.**

The City Council of the City of Eugene finds that:

A. Section 2.007 of the Eugene Code, 1971, contains provisions regarding Council meetings and the establishment of Council groundrules.

B. The Eugene City Council Operating Agreements (referred to as groundrules in the Eugene Code, 1971) were adopted by Resolution No. 4588 on April 12, 1999, and have subsequently been amended, most recently by Resolution No. 5043 on October 11, 2011.

C. Included in the Operating Agreements is the document titled "City Council Committee on Intergovernmental Relations Operating Agreements" which contains the process for the City's participation in sessions of the Oregon Legislature. The City intends to pilot an alternate process for the 2013 Oregon Legislative Session as set forth in Exhibit A to this Resolution, and Resolution No. 5043 should be temporarily amended to enable the City to try the pilot process.

NOW, THEREFORE,

**BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EUGENE, a
Municipal Corporation of the State of Oregon, as follows:**

Section 1. Based on the above findings, the process for review, prioritization and lobbying of legislation for the 2013 Oregon Legislative Session shall be as described in Exhibit A to this Resolution, rather than the process set forth in Resolution No. 5043.

Section 2. A copy of this Resolution shall be appended to Resolution No. 5043.

Section 3. This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.

The foregoing Resolution adopted the 11th day of February, 2013.



City Recorder

Exhibit A

PROCESS FOR REVIEW AND PRIORITIZATION OF LEGISLATION FOR THE 2013 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The 2013 session will start on February 4, 2013. The Legislature convenes annually in February at the State Capitol in Salem. Sessions may not exceed 160 days in odd-numbered years and 35 days in even-numbered years. Five-day extensions are allowed by a two-thirds vote in each house. In odd-numbered years, the Legislative Assembly convenes on the second Monday in January, to swear-in newly elected officials, elect legislative leaders, adopt rules, organize and appoint committees, and begin introducing bills.

REVIEW OF LEGISLATION BY CITY STAFF LEGISLATIVE COORDINATORS

In past years, bills have been assigned by the IGR staff to appropriate staff throughout the city. This has resulted in the generation of a tremendous amount of work, both for staff, as well as for the IGR committee, often with limited or no tangible benefit. Very few bills that we take positions on merit targeted lobbying efforts on behalf of the city of Eugene. This year, we will be approaching the legislative session in a much more targeted way, with the goal of being more efficient, and effective in our lobbying efforts.

The most obvious change in the process will be that IGR staff will no longer routinely assign bills to legislative coordinators for comments and positions. Instead, we will rely primarily on departments to identify significant legislative issues/bills that merit taking a position on and actively lobbying. Department/division staff will be asked to rely on professional affiliations and jurisdictional counterparts across the state to stay in touch with legislative issues arising in their area of expertise. In addition to bills identified by departments, bills will be identified in a two other primary ways, through the League of Oregon Cities, and through paid lobbyists. The League of Oregon Cities has recently implemented a new bill tracking software system, which will be a significant new resource this session. Additionally, the city council or city manager may identify issues that come to their attention for IGR staff. It is strongly believed that all significant legislation of potential impact to the city will be identified through this approach.

Once an issue/bill is identified by department staff, legislative coordinators will assess consistency of the issue with adopted City policies and past legislative positions, and will provide comments and a recommended position and priority for referral to the IGR committee. Bills/legislative issues brought to IGR staff should be limited to those determined to be high priority; that is, the bill would have significant impact on City operations, services, or finances in such ways as to fundamentally impact department administration, organization, personnel, allocation of City resources, or local decision-making, either negatively or positively. Examples of legislative issues that have already been identified for this session include PERS reform, telecom, and public safety. Legislation related to these issue areas could have significant

financial or operational impact on the City – therefore we plan to actively lobby the city’s interests in these areas.

LEGISLATIVE ADVOCACY

As described in the previous section, advocacy efforts will be narrowed and targeted to focus on a very few, high priority issues of potential impact to the City. In the past, this was done on the basis of the priority assignment and recommendation system. Because only bills of potential impact will be referred to the CELEG system, the priority assignment system will be modified. Staff will be asked to provide a “support,” or “oppose,” recommendation for all bills to be reviewed on which we want to take a position. In rare cases, there may be a need to “monitor” a bill. In that case, specific information will be provided to explain the merits of tracking such a bill.

Position Recommendations:

Support: From the City’s perspective, we are in favor of the bill and the impacts. Legislative Coordinators should note why we are in favor of the bill and note any amendments that would make the bill better.

Oppose: From the City’s perspective, we are opposed to the bill and the impacts. Legislative Coordinators should note why we are opposed and make any recommendations that would make the bill better, if applicable.

Priority Recommendations:

- **High Priority Bills:** We will be highly selective in identifying priority bills to be forwarded to the Intergovernmental Relations Committee (IGR). For a bill to be recommended as a high priority bill to be actively lobbied, either in support or in opposition, the bill would have a significant impact on City operations, services, or finances in such ways as to fundamentally impact department administration, organization, personnel, allocation of City resources, or local decision-making, either negatively or positively. The issues addressed by the bill are of significant interest to the City even if they do not directly impact the operations, services, or finances of the City. Examples of high priority bills could include Telecom/local pre-emption efforts, PERS reform, Public Safety, and transportation funding.
- In addition to be bills identified as high priority, other bills and legislative issues may be forwarded to the IGR committee to enable staff to provide supportive or opposing written or oral testimony. Examples of issues that may require supporting testimony (as opposed to active lobbying) include support for the Oregon Cultural Trust, support for

one of our partner agencies lobbying efforts (University of Oregon, City of Springfield, EWEB), etc.

Voting on bills:

The IGR Committee votes on all bill priorities and recommendations.

All unanimous positions are presented on the full City Council's agenda for review and approval. The minutes of the IGR Committee are ratified by the City Council. Any bill that has been reviewed by the IGR Committee may be pulled for discussion at the request of any Councilor or by the Mayor.

If a position the IGR Committee has taken on a bill is not unanimous, the position on that bill will be Neutral until the full City Council weighs in and directs a position. If possible, the bill will then be placed on the next available City Council agenda. If time makes placing the bill on the City council agenda impossible, City council members will be emailed with the details of the bill and asked for their direction.