

March 4, 2019
6:05 P.M.
Newport, Oregon

CITY COUNCIL MEETING

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The Newport City Council met on the above date and time in the Council Chambers of the Newport City Hall. On roll call, Allen, Sawyer, Parker, Goebel, Hall, and Jacobi were present. Botello was excused.

Staff in attendance was Spencer Nebel, City Manager, Peggy Hawker, City Recorder/Special Projects Director; Steve Rich, City Attorney; Derrick Tokos, Community Development Director; Rob Murphy, Fire Chief; Tim Gross, Public Works Director; and Jason Malloy, Police Chief.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Council, staff, and the audience participated in the Pledge of Allegiance.

PROCLAMATIONS, PRESENTATIONS, AND SPECIAL RECOGNITIONS

Oath of Office - Fire Prevention Officer Mark Ragan. Hawker administered the oath of office to Ragan. Ragan's wife pinned his badge.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Deanne Dunlap reported that Buddhist monks will visit the area from March 12 - 17, and will be creating a sand mandala at the Pacific Maritime Heritage Center.

Marletta Noe reported that historically, the city has collected addresses of people participating in public comment during City Council meetings.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The consent calendar consisted of the following items:

- A. Approval of the minutes of the regular meeting of February 19, 2019;
- B. Recommendation to the Oregon Liquor Control Commission to approve a limited on-premises license for Bites on the Courtyard, located at 1654 North Coast Highway;
- C. Approval of requests to be excused from the following Council meetings: June - 17, 2019, Sawyer; October 21, 2019, Nebel, and November 4, 2019, Hall.

MOTION was made by Goebel, seconded by Parker, to approve the consent calendar as presented. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Public Hearing and Potential Approval of an Order Conveying the City's Intent to Vacate a Portion of SW 62nd Street. Hawker introduced the agenda item. Nebel reported that on January 28, 2019, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the vacation of a portion of the SW 62nd Street road right-of-way located in South Beach. He stated that the Southshore Owner's Association is asking that the city vacate the westerly 142 feet of SW 62nd Street. He noted that this portion of the street consists of a small roundabout in which vehicles can access portions of this private development through a gated entry. He added that the Southshore Owner's Association is proposing to replace the roundabout with a new vehicle turnout on SW 62nd Street immediately east of the roundabout. He stated that the vacation would allow them to construct a single gate to replace two existing gates for access to the private development. He noted that the turnout would require the Association to dedicate a portion of their land as part of the right-of-way.

Nebel reported that if approved by Council, the Association would proceed with completing the design and construction of the replacement turnout. He stated that once this work has been completed, Council would be asked to finalize the acceptance of the right-of-way, and vacation of the westerly 142 feet of SW 62nd Street.

Nebel reported that the public hearing would meet the statutory notice requirements for vacating this road. He stated that after comments are made, Council would be able to proceed with the initial motion, which expresses Council's intent to vacate a portion of the SW 62nd Street right-of-way once a public vehicle turnout is constructed and accepted by the city, and the required right-of-way is conveyed to the city. He noted that this initial action would allow the Association to proceed with the work.

Nebel reported that the Planning Commission concluded that the statutory requirements have been met, and recommended that Council adopt an order conveying its intent to vacate the subject portion of SW 62nd Street with the reservation of a utility easement over the vacated right-of-way, unless alternative easements are accepted by the city.

Sawyer opened the public hearing on Order No. 2019-1 regarding Council's intent to vacation a portion of SW 62nd Street, at 6:13 P.M. He called for public comment.

Leo Dobitz, president of the Southshore Homeowners Association, made himself available for Council questions. There were none.

Sawyer closed the public hearing at 6:14 P.M. for Council deliberation.

Allen asked whether there would be a vacation ordinance after the improvements are completed. Tokos reported that there would be an ordinance, and that the Southshore Homeowners Association plans to move the work forward in a timely manner.

MOTION was made by Goebel, seconded by Parker, to approve adoption of Order No. 2019-1, an order conveying the City Council's intent to vacate the westerly 142 feet of the developed SW 62nd Street right-of-way once a replacement, public vehicle turnout is constructed and accepted by the city, with reservation of utility easements, unless alternative easements are accepted by the city to replace the existing easements in SW 62nd Street. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote.

Public Hearing Regarding a Draft Ordinance Prohibiting Certain Types of Single-Use, Plastic, Carryout Bags at Retail Establishments and Various Events. Hawker introduced the agenda item. Nebel reported that on February 4, Council scheduled a public hearing

for this meeting to solicit comments on a possible ordinance to restrict the use of single-use, plastic, carryout bags in the city. He stated that at the January 22 Council meeting, Council heard a report from the Newport Chapter of Surfrider Foundation requesting consideration of an ordinance that would restrict the use of single-use, plastic, carryout bags from various retail establishments, events, and activities.

Nebel reported that Hawker put the model ordinance in a city ordinance draft format for public review. He stated that the draft ordinance prohibits distribution of single-use, plastic, carryout bags at retail establishments, city facilities, city-managed concessions, city-sponsored events, and/or city-permitted events, and discourages the use of paper bags as a substitute for reusable bags. He noted that the draft ordinance specifically excludes regulation of plastic bags used by consumers inside retail establishments for packaging fruit, vegetables, nuts, grains, small hardware items, plastic used to wrap meat or frozen foods, plastic used to wrap flowers, potted plants, or other items (where dampness may be a problem), plastic that is used to contain unwrapped prepared foods or bakery goods, or pharmacy prescription bags. He added that single dry cleaning bags, or bags sold in packages containing multiple bags intended to be used for home food storage, garbage waste, pet waste, and yard waste are excluded from this regulation.

Nebel reported that the draft ordinance provides that paper bags must be recyclable and contain a minimum of 40% post-consumer recycled content.

Nebel reported that there is a provision that requires a pass-through cost of not less than \$.05 per recyclable paper bag, and provides that if a retail establishment makes a reusable bag available to the customer, a charge of not less than \$.50 per reusable bag be assessed. He stated that retail establishments having 5,000 square feet, or less, of floor area are not required to charge for recyclable paper bags. He noted that single-use, plastic, carryout bags may be distributed to customers by food providers for the purpose of safeguarding public health and safety during the transportation of prepared takeout foods, and prepared liquids intended for consumption away from the food provider's premises. He added that a reusable bag or a recyclable paper bag must be provided at no cost to a customer who presents a voucher issued from the Women's, Infants, and Children's Program, and for electronic benefit transfer cards such as the Oregon Trail card.

Nebel reported that the ordinance provisions are scheduled to be effective July 1, 2019 for retail establishments with greater than 10,000 square feet of floor area, and on January 1, 2020 for all other retail establishments. He stated that the draft ordinance provides that a retail establishment may request, of the City Manager, an extension of not more than six months by indicating that these implementation dates would create an undue hardship. He noted that non-compliance with these regulations would result in a civil violation. He added that the first violation in the calendar year would result in a written warning, and subsequent violations would be \$100, and \$250 in a calendar year.

Nebel reported that on February 4, Council discussed a number of options on how to proceed with this policy issue. He stated that following this discussion, Council opted to schedule a public hearing for the March 4 Council meeting to obtain citizen input on a draft ordinance that would restrict the use of single-use, plastic, carryout bags. He added that following the March 4 public hearing, and considering any comments received or made at the hearing, Council can consider several options on how to proceed in addressing this issue. He noted that he has divided this process into two separate parts,

with the first part focusing on whether to adopt an ordinance, with the second part focusing on making the ordinance effective in 30 days, or referring it to the voters.

Nebel reported that the options include:

1. Schedule a work session to consider any modifications to the draft ordinance with the intent of formally proposing an ordinance for adoption at a future Council meeting. A work session could be scheduled on March 18, and the second public hearing and possible adoption of the ordinance being scheduled for April 15.
2. If following the public hearing, it is determined that there is a need to convene a work group to address specific concerns related to a draft ordinance, Council could direct staff to bring back a resolution to create a work group for the specific purpose of working through details of a plastic bag ordinance.
3. Following the March 4 public hearing, and considering any comments made, Council could make adjustments to the draft ordinance and schedule a public hearing to consider adoption of that ordinance at the April 15 Council meeting.
4. Council could opt not to move forward with an ordinance at this time, either waiting to determine what action the state legislature might take on a plastic bag ban during the current legislative session, or determine that it is not appropriate to move forward with an ordinance at this time.

Nebel noted that if Council opted to enact an ordinance, it could enact the typical ordinance provision in which the ordinance would take effect 30 days after adoption, or after approving an ordinance, Council could refer the ordinance to the voters, as was done in 2013. He stated that if this item is referred to the voters, the next election at which it could be considered would be held on November 5, 2019. He added that Council could discuss this option following the public hearing, or at the work session, to provide direction to the public on how the Council intends to proceed.

Nebel reported that under the Oregon Constitution, if Council approved and enacted an ordinance, or if Council took no action on an ordinance, there is a provision that allows citizens to initiate legislative action by obtaining the signatures of 15% of the registered voters in the city (that would require just over 1,000 signatures) to either repeal an ordinance or approve an ordinance. He stated that in either case, the city would be responsible for the cost of the election, and the County Clerk estimates the cost to be \$7,000 - \$8,000.

Sawyer reported that Council received a petition from the Surfrider Foundation that included several hundred signatures. He reported that Council also received e-mail late today from Bill Windell, who noted that the voters voted and rejected a plastic bag prohibition ordinance; Claire Wood who supports the ban; Maryanne Beggs who supports the ban; Richard Heal who supports the ban; and Michael Field who supports the ban. Sawyer read the messages from each of these individuals.

Sawyer reported that he appreciates the input and the process. He provided ground rules for the hearing. He noted that this is an opportunity for audience members to provide testimony or comments on the issue being considered by Council. He instructed that there be no applause.

Sawyer opened the public hearing at 6:27 P.M.

Mark Fisher spoke in opposition to the potential ban on single-use plastic bags. He stated that the citizens voted a resounding no on this issue, adding that he hopes Council will consider the wishes of the voters.

Dave Szymanski spoke in opposition to the potential ban on single-use plastic bags. He stated that he is opposed to the proposed ban. He reported that there are many uses for the plastic bags, and questioned the validity of statistics indicating that there is a problem.

Rex Capri reported that there have been some gross exaggerations at previous hearings related to this issue. He suggested that if a problem exists, it is likely related to the improper disposal of trash. He recommended that this issue be presented to the voters.

Susan Sprague spoke in support of the potential ban on single-use plastic bags. She reported that it is important that people are able to take groceries home in bags. She noted that they do not care what kind of bags they use. She stated that there is too much plastic, and no one takes responsibility for recycling.

Anden Mulin spoke in support of the potential ban on single-use plastic bags. He reported that he and his father like to clean the beach, and usually see lots of plastic bags in the ocean and rivers. He added that his grandfather cleans the beach every morning, and the most common trash is plastic bags. He asked how many more reasons are needed to ban the plastic bags.

Oliver Peralta spoke in support of the potential ban on single-use plastic bags. He reported that he believes plastic bags should be banned as they are harmful to animals, and there are alternatives to plastic. He stated that canvas bags could be used. He asked whether Council wanted to make a difference.

Bill Kucha spoke in support of the potential ban on single-use plastic bags. He stated that that he agrees with the youth who previously addressed Council. He reported that the environment is dying due to careless and selfish ways. He urged Council to do the right thing and vote to enact a plastic bag ban and initiate the healing of the earth.

Paul Haeder spoke in support of the potential ban on single-use plastic bags. He suggested listening to the youth testimony. He noted that he has seen firsthand the damage that plastics have had on the environment. He urged Council to enact a ban on single-use plastic bags rather than holding an election on the ordinance.

Bri Goodwin, staff person for the Surfrider Foundation, spoke in support of the potential ban on single-use plastic bags. She stated that she has received a lot of research that shows that education does not work as well, on issues such as this, as legislation. She highlighted some of the outreach efforts that the Surfrider Foundation has conducted in the last month. She added that the petition contains more than 400 signatures that were collected in five days.

Consuela Kammerer spoke in support of the potential ban on single-use plastic bags. She reported that she has personally been talking with businesses, and received positive feedback from all. She stated that Fred Meyer and Ray's each donated 100 reusable bags, noting that reusable bags saves money for the stores.

Natalie Bailey spoke in support of the potential ban on single-use plastic bags. She stated that the bags end up on beaches and in the oceans, and have a negative impact on aquatic life.

Oliver Card spoke about the potential ban on single-use plastic bags. He noted that the bags are not harming the city, noting that it is impossible to prove that a bag from Newport got to the great plastic garbage patch in the Pacific Ocean. He noted that there is likely more than 4,900 plastic bags used in Newport in just one week. He added that this will be our problem because we did not fix it before or after it started. He

recommended that the issue be put to a vote. He added that a lot of people are not doing anything, but they do have opinions.

Jordan Ingalls spoke in support of the potential ban on single-use plastic bags. He stated that no vote is needed to ban the bags, and listed the Oregon cities that have enacted a bag ban. He added that the youth cannot vote, but that it is their future.

Diya Heal spoke in support of the potential ban on single-use plastic bags. She stated that the ocean belongs to all of us and knows no city boundaries, and that plastic bags from Newport end up in Seal Rock and other places. She noted that there is a global recycling crisis. She reported that micro plastics are found in marine animals, sea salt, and most humans. She recommended that the issue be voted on by the City Council rather than putting it to a vote.

Fred Holzmer spoke in support of the potential ban on single-use plastic bags. He stated that change is hard, but that this issue is low hanging fruit in the reduction to the waste stream. He reported that he lived in a community that implemented a similar change, and that people adapted very quickly. He noted that many vendors would provide reusable bags for advertising purposes.

Dakotah Gilette spoke in support of the potential ban on single-use plastic bags. He stated that the bags are harmful to animals; not part of nature; and do not break down.

Anaid Hernandez-Castro spoke in support of the potential ban on single-use plastic bags. She stated that plastic bags should not be used in Newport because thousands of sea animals die every year. She noted that the great Pacific garbage patch is twice the size of Texas.

Michael Card reported that NOAA conducts scientific experiments on fish, and is having difficulty finding enough species with stomach contents other than micro plastics.

Susan Pilling spoke in support of the potential ban on single-use plastic bags. She reported that she recently visited Olympia, Washington, where a plastic ban has been enacted, and noted that it was quite clean. She added that banning single-use plastic bags is a small, but important step.

Makenzie Moore spoke in support of the potential ban on single-use plastic bags. She reported that plastic bags end up in the ocean, and often animals, and take years to decompose. She stated that the ban would help the environment.

Fran Mathews spoke in support of the potential ban on single-use plastic bags. She reported that her background is in fisheries and education. She stated that customers at her Bayfront shop typically do not want a bag. She noted that one plastic bag can kill a 45-foot gray whale. She added that anything that can be done to reduce micro plastics will help the problem. She concluded her comments with the quote, "don't teach your trash to swim."

Margo Cunningham reported that she does reuse plastic bags. She stated that she understands that there are irresponsible people who do not dispose properly of plastic bags, but that she did not believe the ban should be mandated. She recommended that another vote be held on the issue.

Sally Compton spoke in support of the potential ban on single-use plastic bags. She reported that, in her work with the Oregon Coast Aquarium, she has seen the impacts on wildlife. She stated that Newport has a tourist economy, and asked whether visitors would prefer to visit a clean beach. She noted that in beach clean-ups, in which she has participated, a large majority of the plastics found were from Newport businesses.

Carol McYnarski spoke in support of the potential ban on single-use plastic bags. She provided an example of visiting Indonesia prior to its plastic reduction, and how while surfing, her face was covered with a plastic bag. She noted that the majority of speakers at this meeting have been young, and their voice would not be heard if this issue was put to a vote.

Olivia Schroeder spoke in support of the potential ban on single-use plastic bags. She reported that she is a teacher, and that the students have gotten the support of the schools and community in supporting a plastic bag ban. She urged Council to vote to adopt an ordinance banning single-use plastic bags for the betterment of the community.

Marletta Noe recommended that Council refer any ordinance banning single-use plastic bags to the voters.

Hearing no further comment, Sawyer closed the public hearing at 7:30 P.M., for Council deliberation.

Nebel stated that he appreciates the comments made this evening. He reviewed the Council options.

Goebel thanked the young people who commented, adding that he learned a lot from them. He stated that it is time to take action on this issue, and recommended that Council look at what it can do without taking this back to the voters.

Parker thanked everyone for their time. He stated that his volunteerism on Council is more meaningful when the room is packed. He added that it means a lot when people show up regardless of the issue.

Goebel noted that the people affected most by a public vote would be the young people who will inherit the mistakes of earlier generations. He reiterated that it is time to take action on this issue.

Allen stated that he appreciates everyone attending this meeting. He added that he might not agree with all the testimony, but that having differing opinions is part of the process. He noted that it is not good when people agree all the time, and suggested that it is a good idea to challenge others beliefs on this issue. He added that, in response to a comment suggesting that he did not want testimony at the February 4 meeting, he listened to the audio file, at which he suggested that people ask their own city councils if they are willing to do what is being asked of Newport.

Allen reported that it is not about whether he believes plastics should be banned. He stated that he does not use plastic bags anymore. He noted that a vote was taken of the citizens of Newport, and the result was to reject the plastic bag ban. He reiterated the importance for voters to have weighed in on the issue in the past, noting that he still believes that is the case. He added that some people have said that a citizen vote is unnecessary process and procedure. He noted that the vote would be the best way to show that the community is ready for a ban.

Jacobi reported that she disagrees with Allen. She stated that Council has adequate information to vote on the issue at the Council level. She noted that attendees who do not live in Newport reported that they buy groceries in Newport. She thanked the audience for attending.

Hall reported that at the election in May of 2013, 38% of the total community votes. She noted that this is not a majority of the community. She stated that Council is capable of leading as the voters have entrusted it by virtue of their vote. She acknowledged the Vision 2040 Plan, which envisions the community as livable, sustainable, and green. She noted that enacting this ban is one small step. She recognized that a ban might seem to

be inconvenient, but noted that the community will rally if the ban is enacted. She stated that she appreciates that the ordinance was drafted in partnership with the grocers. She added that she favors a work session to refine the draft ordinance.

Sawyer stated that he is disappointed that Allen received negative emails, and noted that he only received one. He reported that someone sent him an e-mail stating that he had voted not to support the ban when the issue arose earlier. He stated that he voted with the majority of Council to refer the ordinance to the voters. He added that he respects people in the community and everyone's opinion. He noted that there is no way to make one decision that everyone agrees with. He stated that the gold standard is to ask the voters to weigh in on issues, and that he believes strongly in the decision of the voters. He added that he would like to see another vote on the issue.

Nebel noted that one of the biggest issues is how the ordinance would be enacted. He suggested that information on how it would be enacted be included in any upcoming motion.

Allen suggested including language regarding referring the ordinance to the voters.

MOTION was made by Parker, seconded by Hall, to schedule a work session on March 18, 2019 to consider comments received at this meeting, potential adjustments to the draft ordinance, and no further public comment on the potential ordinance; and to schedule a second public hearing on April 15, 2019, at 6:00 P.M., followed by potential adoption of the ordinance with no referral to the voters. The motion carried in a voice vote with Sawyer and Allen voting no. Allen noted that he prefers that the ordinance be referred to the voters.

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Approval of an Intergovernmental Agreement with the Oregon Department of Transportation to Fund the Newport Transportation System Plan Update. Hawker introduced the agenda item. Nebel reported that the city has been a partner with the ODOT in an update of the city's Transportation System Plan. He stated that this plan will address areas north of the bridge. He added that transportation components include commercial core area highway street upgrades, potential intersection realignments, improvements to local street rights-of-way, parking improvements, right-of-way acquisition, and signal installation adjustments, in conjunction with the city's Northside Urban Renewal Plan. He noted that the process would focus on the revitalization of the commercial core area, both on Highways 101 and 20, and, develop an Agate Beach Neighborhood Plan.

Nebel reported that this plan update is an opportunity to address long-standing issues with the community, including, all modes of transportation (vehicles, pedestrians, bikes). He stated that the plan would specifically improve non-motorized access along Highway 101 and Oceanview Drive, identifying a possible north/south corridor more practical than the existing Harney Street corridor (which is in the current transportation plan), northside pedestrian improvements, examine alternative transportation issues, such as the possible use of ferry transportation to shuttle people across Yaquina Bay, and looking at the long-term alignment and future replacement/upgrade of the Yaquina Bay Bridge.

Nebel reported that these processes will take two to three years, and involve a substantial amount of public input to develop a transportation plan to work toward funding the highest priorities in the plan.

Nebel reported that the IGA has been tied up with the state, but the agreement has been forwarded for the Council review and possible approval.

Tokos reported that there is currently \$200,000 appropriated, and the additional \$50,000 would not be due until 2021.

Hall asked whether flashing LED crosswalks are part of this plan. Nebel reported that they are not as this is a comprehensive study, but that Council could suggest specific issues to be evaluated.

Parker noted that a crosswalk would be beneficial at Eads Street and Highway 20. Goebel noted that a crosswalk would also be warranted at Highway 20 and Harney Street.

Jacobi reported that her least favorite crosswalk is located at Highway 101 and 15th Street. She suggested that this crosswalk be reevaluated.

MOTION was made by Goebel, seconded by Parker, to approve an intergovernmental agreement between the City of Newport and the Oregon Department of Transportation to fund the Newport Transportation System Plan Update. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote.

Consideration and Potential Adoption of Resolution No. 3842 Adopting a Medical Emergency Services Response Matrix for the Newport Fire Department. Hawker introduced the agenda item. Nebel reported that since the early 1980's, in addition to the ambulance service, the Fire Department has been responding to medical calls. He stated that the department has staff and volunteers with various levels of medical response training. He noted that the department carries advanced life support equipment and medications on response vehicles and can provide quick and effective medical emergency care and treatment.

Nebel reported that when the Willamette Valley Communications Center (WVCC) dispatches a medical call, it dispatches both Pacific West Ambulance and the Fire Department. He stated that several years ago, the department began responding to all medical calls whether they are deemed to be life threatening medical calls or nonlife threatening calls, and that this was a change from the past when the department would not respond to all types of medical calls.

Nebel reported that every time the department responds to a medical call that Pacific West Ambulance has also been dispatched to, department vehicles and personnel are traveling with lights and sirens. He stated that this poses risk, and causes wear and tear on the vehicles. He noted that it can result in having to call in additional personnel, with a marginal need being met, when responding to nonlife-threatening medical situations that the ambulance is also responding to. He added that while the ambulance is reimbursed for those calls, the Fire Department is not.

Nebel reported that this matter has been discussed at several work sessions, and as a result of those discussions, additional information has been compiled that has been reviewed by Council. He stated that in conducting an informal survey of eight fire and rescue agencies on the Oregon coast, only three of the agencies respond to all EMS calls; two agencies respond to all EMS calls, except for lift assists; and three agencies only respond to high priority medical calls.

Nebel reported that in reviewing the information compiled by Murphy, he believes that the matrix would better utilize the limited resources to respond in situations that truly require a lifesaving response, as well as the ambulance service.

Nebel reported that under the new response model, non-injury lift assists would shift to Pacific West Ambulance. He stated that Pacific West Ambulance would bill for lift assists. He stated that the Fire Department does not charge for that service, and the department has been called to specific addresses multiple times for this service.

Nebel reported that adopting the matrix would provide some relief from the number of calls, wear and tear on equipment, and creation of some overtime for the department, without impacting life safety issues for our residents in Newport. The matrix of medical service response is attached to the resolution for your review.

Murphy and Jeff Mathia, from Pacific West Ambulance, addressed Council. Murphy reported that this issue has been discussed with Council on several occasions. He stated that if the Fire Department does not respond to a low priority call, and Pacific West needs Fire Department assistance, the Fire Department is available to respond. He noted that the Fire Department is reaching the limit of what it can provide, which has caused increased response times. He noted that there is a 28% call increase this year, but that the staff and volunteer roster has not increased. He reported that occasionally, the Fire Department is tasked with running several simultaneous calls. He noted that many calls are from assisted living and skilled nursing facilities, and do not necessitate a Fire Department response. He stated that this plan would help the community, and reserve Fire Department resources for true emergency response. He added that the plan is acceptable to Pacific West Ambulance, and noted that he would instruct Willamette Valley Communications Center on which agency to call out for specific requests for assistance. Murphy stated that as long as Pacific West Ambulance has three or more ambulances in the area, it would be the primary responder to non-emergency lift assist requests.

Goebel asked whether this would create risk for the community. Murphy responded that he did not believe it would, or if so, it would be extremely minimal. He added that it would simply mean that there would not typically be a firetruck and an ambulance at non-emergent calls. He stated that the ambulance crew can decide whether it needs the Fire Department's assistance. He noted that people are still receiving appropriate care.

Goebel expressed concern that people on a limited income might not call for assistance due to the cost. He stated that people pay taxes to the city to provide services. Matias reported that the ambulance bill for a simple lift assist will be between \$65 and \$95. He added that if the requestor has insurance, the costs will be billed to the insurance company. He noted that if people sign up for Life Guard, they are entitled to two free services.

Hall asked about insurance coverage, noting that she had heard that an ambulance ride costs approximately \$1,000 per mile. Matias reported that he would have to consult with the billing officer manager to find out what insurance covers, and how much. Hall suggested that the city distribute information regarding the Life Guard program. Nebel reported that the cost for ambulance transportation does not change. Hall noted that she has other questions as a result of this issue coming before Council.

Allen suggested adding the priority response definitions at the bottom of the resolution attachment, so that people know what the different priorities mean. Murphy reported that the priority levels are set by dispatch.

Hall asked about response time. Murphy reported that if the Fire Department is needed, the average response time is approximately eight minutes.

Park asked whether the Fire Departments responds to medical calls with a standard, full-length firetruck when called out on a medical lift assistance. Murphy reported that the

firetrucks are used because the department does not know what/when the next call will happen, and the firetruck is equipped to deal with all types of emergencies. Murphy reviewed the staffing levels of the three stations.

Nebel reported that this item could be brought to the next meeting with the priority descriptions included with the resolution attachment. Matias stated that he would bring the ambulance billing manager to the next meetings to respond to Council questions.

Marletta Noe reported that many elderly and disabled community members are on Medicaid which covers ambulance costs.

MOTION was made by Hall, seconded by Allen, to table this item until the Willamette Valley Communication Center priorities 1 - 4 are received and included as a part of the attachment to the resolution. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote.

Consideration and Potential Adoption of Resolution No. 3843 Supporting the Public/Private Climate Change Partnership. Hawker introduced the agenda item. Nebel reported that at the September 17, 2018 Council meeting, Council approved a motion to support the creation of a public/private climate change partnership in Lincoln County. He stated that this partnership is being formed to meet and discuss upcoming carbon reduction strategies, and legislation that will be before the 2019 state legislature, and to direct staff to participate in the work of the partnership as described in the Vision 2040 Plan. He added that the Lincoln County Board of Commissioners adopted Resolution No. 18-28-11A, convening a public/private partnership on climate change, last fall.

Nebel reported that Allen has taken the lead on behalf of the city in the creation of a public/private partnership. He stated that the original intent is to bring together environmental groups, and business and general interests to understand how potential state legislation might address impacts that human activity is having on climate change, and how legislation could impact the coastal economy. He added that the public/private partnership could help the coastal population understand the environmental challenges, and how regulatory efforts could impact communities. He noted that it could be a forum to shape policies that would be meaningful in protecting the environment knowing what economic costs would be borne by communities. He stated that with any significant policy making, there are offsets that can be addressed to meet the environmental goals of climate policy with mitigating impacts on coastal economies. He added that the partnership was envisioned to have these types of discussions.

Nebel reported that a number of Lincoln County cities have expressed interest in participating in this dialogue. He stated that it is appropriate for Council to formalize its role in the partnership through the adoption of a resolution, which could be shared with other communities to further these discussions and analysis of environmental concerns, and the potential regulations/taxing processes to address these concerns.

Nebel reported that Allen has been very involved in representing the city in this effort, but has requested that other councilors consider taking the lead on behalf of the city in the partnership.

Allen reported that Bill Kucha has been working on this issue. He added that Wayne Belmont recommended Council adopt a resolution rather than supporting the public/private climate change partnership by a simple motion.

Kucha stated that he grateful that the city is taking the lead on this partnership in conjunction with the county. He stressed the importance of the partnership in mitigating future environmental damage and addressing critical concerns.

A brief discussion ensued regarding the public hearing on HB2020 on carbon reduction. It was noted that the hearing focused on Newport and Ontario, and that comments from Ontario focused on how carbon regulations might affect a border city. It was further noted that Newport's testimony was more balanced between environmental and commerce concerns. It was mentioned that there was discussion about trying to get everyone together to better understand the problems and the impact the regulatory solutions would have on the central coast.

Parker stated that he would be willing to be the city's lead with this group. Jacobi indicated that she would be willing to assist. Allen added that he would do what he could to assist.

MOTION was made by Parker, seconded by Allen, to adopt Resolution No. 3843, a resolution of the City of Newport supporting the public/private climate change partnership. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote.

Scheduling a Public Hearing for March 18, 2019 on the Adoption of Goals for the 2019/2020 Fiscal Year. Hawker introduced the agenda item. Nebel reported that the packet contains the draft report from the Goal Setting Session held by Council on March 1. He noted that any goals that three or more Councilors identified as a priority are included as the Council goals for the purposes of budget issues for the 2019/2020 Fiscal Year. He stated that for each of these goals, he plans to identify how they impact the proposed 2019/2020 budget as part of the budget message. He added that he indicated the number of Councilors prioritizing each item in the report. He noted that he included with the report, goals added by consensus. He stated that if any Councilors wish to make changes to the goals by adding or dropping a goal, this should be done by motion and majority vote at this meeting or following the public hearing on March 18.

Hall asked how Nebel oversees the goals. Nebel reported that he includes the goals as part of the budget message, and if the city is unable to fund the goal, a note to that effect would be included in the message.

MOTION was made by Hall, seconded by Goebel, to formerly propose the 2019-2020 goals for possible adoption, and schedule a public hearing on the goals for the 2019-2020 Fiscal Year for March 18, 2019. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote.

Status Report on the Upcoming Meetings of the City Council. Hawker introduced the agenda item. Nebel reported that Council has been very involved in a number of meetings outside of the normal meeting schedule. He stated that on February 27, Council participated in a tour of city facilities. He added that on March 1, Council was involved in a goal setting process to guide the budget development for the 2019/2020 Fiscal Year, and today, Council met in a work session, followed by this meeting. He noted that on March 5, there will be a meeting of elected and appointed officials from across Lincoln County to meet with the consultant conducting the housing study, through a grant obtained by Lincoln County. He stated that this would be the third meeting to discuss regional housing issues. He added that on March 5, there is a preliminary Budget Committee meeting. He noted that on March 21, there is a joint Planning Commission/City Council meeting regarding the Parks Master Planning process. He stated that there will also be a work session on Friday to further discuss the potential single-use plastic bag prohibition ordinance.

A discussion ensued regarding the scheduling of work sessions generally, and it was concluded that the Mondays of Council meetings, at 4:00 P.M., would work best for the group.

LOCAL CONTRACT REVIEW BOARD

The City Council, acting as the Local Contract Review Board, began its meeting at 9:17 P.M.

Approval of Change Order No. 2 with Earthworks Excavation for the Power Ford Storm Drain Improvements Project in the Amount of \$46,513.95. Hawker introduced the agenda item. Nebel reported that Council awarded the project for storm drain improvements at Power Ford and Sun West Motors to Earthworks Excavating in the amount of \$1,632,449.00. He stated that he has approved one change order in the amount of \$22,876.29. He added that in reviewing conditions in the field, staff would like to include a complete excavation and rebuild of NW 11th Street, between Grove Street to Highway 101. He noted that the original plans called for a mill and overlay on this block, but there is only two inches of asphalt and a minimal base under this road, and Gross is proposing to excavate the existing roadbed, add eight inches of rock, and apply four inches of asphalt, which would provide a much longer-lasting road. He noted that there are sufficient appropriated project funds to cover the work in Change Order No. 2.

Gross responded to Council questions.

MOTION was made by Goebel, seconded by Parker, to approve Change Order No. 2 with Earthworks Excavating for the Power Ford Storm Improvement project in the amount of \$46,513.95, and authorize the City Manager to execute the Change Order on behalf of the City of Newport. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote.

RETURN TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING

Having no further business as the Local Contract Review Board, Council returned to its regular meeting at 9:22 P.M.

COUNCIL REPORTS

Sawyer reported that Council submitted written reports that are included in the packet.

Sawyer reported that he spent time with former Mayor Roumagoux, adding that her husband, Dan, is recovering well.

Sawyer reported that Wednesday is "Dine Out for Samaritan House" at the Chowder Bowl.

Sawyer reported that due to a scheduling conflict, he would not be holding Mayoral office hours tomorrow.

Allen reported that he would attend the upcoming Solid Waste Advisory Committee meeting, as Parker has a scheduling conflict.

It was asked whether there is a list of Council liaison roles on the city website.

Gross reported that he will be in Salem tomorrow regarding HB2285 on dam safety.

Allen reported that he spoke with Senator Roblan's staff regarding the potential \$44 million grant. He stated that this issue is now SB894, but that no hearing has been scheduled.

ADJOURNMENT

Having no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:28 P.M.

Margaret M. Hawker, City Recorder

Dean H. Sawyer, Mayor