ROUGHLY EDITED TRANSCRIPT

CITY OF EUGENE
WORK STUDY SESSION
MAY 21, 2025
3:00 P.M.

Captioning Provided by:
LNS Captioning
www.LNSCaptioning.com
Phone: (503) 446-4555

* * *

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

* * *

MAYOR KNUDSON: WELCOME TO THE MAY 21, 2025 CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION.
THANK YOU FOR JOINING US IN THIS VIRTUAL MEETING FORMAT.
FOR WORK SESSIONS WHERE THERE IS NO OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT YOU CAN WATCH THE LIVE STREAM AVAILABLE ON OUR WEBSITE, THE BROADCAST ON COMCAST CHANNEL 21 OR BY CALLING IN TO ONE OF THE NUMBERS ON THE PUBLIC WEBCAST AND MEETING MATERIALS PAGE.
THANK YOU FOR JOINING US.
I CALL THE MAY 21, 2025 CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION TO ORDER.
>> THANK YOU, MAYOR, THANK YOU, COUNCIL.
WE HAVE THE FULL 90 MINUTES TODAY TO TALK ABOUT REVENUE ALTERNATIVES AND TO CONTINUE THE CONVERSATION THAT WE HAVE BEEN HAVING THIS YEAR.
SO WE'RE GOING TO BREAK THIS INTO TWO PARTS.
WE'RE GOING TO CUT OUT ALL THE CONTEXT OF HOW WE GOT HERE.
I THINK WE COVERED THAT WITH A LOT OF SIGNIFICANCE OVER THE LAST HOWEVER MANY TIMES WE HAVE MET AND JUMP RIGHT INTO TWO PARTS.

THE FIRST WILL BE ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER RODRIGUEZ WALKING US THROUGH THE TWO DIFFERENT AREAS THAT YOU ASKED FOR INFORMATION ON, WHICH IS THE TWO POTENTIAL ALTERNATIVE FEE OR STORMWATER FEE OPTIONS.
WALK YOU THROUGH THAT AND SOME OF THE TABLES AND THE COST THEN SWITCH TO ME AND I'LL WALK THROUGH A LARGER TABLE THAT COMPARES THOSE OPTIONS AND CONTRASTS THEM.
I E-MAILED THAT TO YOU BUT WE'LL WALK THROUGH THAT ON MY COMPUTER AND EXPLAIN IT TO YOU.
WITH THAT I'LL TURN IT OVER TO MATT AND THEN HE WILL TURN IT BACK TO ME.
THANKS.
>> GOOD AFTERNOON, MAYOR, COUNCIL.
LET ME BRING UP THE PRESENTATION.
SARAH, TELL ME IF THAT'S SHOWING THE RIGHT SCREEN.
>> YES, IT IS.
>> ALL RIGHT, WE'LL GET STARTED.
SO AS SARAH SHARED WE'RE GOING TO TALK ABOUT THE TWO MOTIONS YOU PASSED ON MAY 14TH.
THE FIRST BEING AN ORDINANCE CONSISTENT WITH THE OUTLINE SET FORTH IN ATTACHMENT A TO THAT AIS, WHICH HAD TWO OPTIONS.
OPTIONS FOR A $6 MILLION OR $8 MILLION NEW FEE WITH A SUNSET OF FOUR YEARS.
THE SECOND OPTION WAS AN INCREASE TO THE EXISTING STORMWATER FEE OF ABOUT $4.7 MILLION WITH A FOUR YEARS AND ONE TIME INVESTMENTS THAT COULD GO ALONG WITH THAT.
SO THE FIRST, THE NEW TEMPORARY CITY OPERATIONS FEE WE HAD TO BUILD THE FEE STRUCTURE WHICH WE BASED ON THE EXISTING STORMWATER ACCOUNT INFORMATION THAT WE HAVE AND I'LL GIVE YOU A LITTLE BIT OF A REASON FOR THAT LATER ON THIS SLIDE.
BASICALLY WE WANTED TO MAKE SURE WE WOULD BE ABLE TO IMPLEMENT THIS.
WE USED EXISTING THREE RATE CATEGORIES FOR RESIDENTIAL, SO SMALL, MEDIUM AND LARGE, THEN WE TOOK WHAT EXISTS AS ONE GENERAL SERVICE CATEGORY AND THE EXISTING STORMWATER FEE AND BROKE THAT INTO SIX BINS, BASICALLY, BASED ON THE AMOUNT OF IMPERVIOUS AREA YOU HAD.
WE HAD A LITTLE BIT OF DIFFERENTIATION BETWEEN A VERY SMALL BUSINESS, FOR INSTANCE, AND A LARGE ONE.
SO AS I MENTIONED, THIS FEE WOULD SUNSET BASED ON THE WAY THE ORDINANCE IS WRITTEN NOW, JUNE 29, 2029, WHICH IS FOUR YEARS.
IT WOULD TAKE APPROXIMATELY SIX TO TEN MONTHS TO SET UP THE FEE.
ALL OF THIS IS TRUE FOR EITHER SIX OR EIGHT MILLION, IT'S STILL A NEW FEE STRUCTURE.

ONE THING WE HAVE RECENTLY LEARNED THERE HAVE BEEN ONGOING CONVERSATIONS WITH EWEB WHETHER OR NOT THEY MIGHT BE ABLE TO BILL ON OUR BEHALF.
THEIR BOARD HAS NOT DECIDED TO DO THAT BUT THEY DID ASK STAFF TO WORK WITH US TO GET INTO THE DETAILS.
ONE THING WE LEARNED THIS WEEK THEY HAVE AN OPINION FROM THEIR LEGAL COUNCIL THAT THEY WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO SHUT OFF ELECTRICAL OR WATER SERVICE FOR WHAT WOULD BE CONSIDERED A NONUTILITY FEE.
WHAT THAT MEANS IN PRACTICE IS THAT THEY WOULD HAVE TO SET UP A COMPLETELY SEPARATE BILLING ENVIRONMENT FOR A NEW FEE WITHIN THEIR BILLING SOFTWARE, WHICH WOULD BE A VERY LARGE INVESTMENT IN TIME AND MONEY LIKELY TAKING SIX TO TEN MONTH RANGE FOR A FEE THAT HAS A LIMITED DURATION. IT'S UNLIKELY THAT WOULD BE THE DIRECTION THAT WOULD MAKE SENSE SO WHEN WE LOOK AT THE COST OF COLLECTION WE'RE REALLY LOOKING AT USING AN OUTSIDE VENDOR TO DO THAT.
COUPLE OF THINGS I WANT TO HIGHLIGHT REGARDING THAT, WE GOT SOME INFORMATION EARLIER IN THE YEAR FROM VENDORS THROUGH OUR REQUEST FOR INFORMATION.
THE RANGE WAS 1.2 TO 1.5 MILLION TO COLLECT A FEE EARLY.
THAT IS EITHER A SIX OR $8 MILLION FEE.
IT'S A PER BILL COST.
WE ESTIMATE BETWEEN 300 AND $500,000 A YEAR IN UNCOLLECTED REVENUE AND REALLY THAT'S THE FOLKS THAT DON'T PAY THEIR BILL.
WITH EWEB BILLING FOR OUR EXISTING STORMWATER AND WASTEWATER WE HAVE A VERY HIGH COLLECTION RATE BECAUSE IT COULD RESULT IN THE SHUT-OFF OF SERVICE IF NOT PAID.
WE HAVE THIS ON ITS OWN EXPECTED IT WILL BE SLIGHTLY LESS COMPLIANCE WITH PAYING THE BILL.
THIS WOULD BE A NEW BILL THAT COMES IN ITS OWN ENVELOPE OR HAS ITS OWN ONLINE LOG-IN TO FOLKS.
THIS WOULD REQUIRE USE OF BRIDGE FUNDING BECAUSE IT WOULD TAKE EIGHT TO TEN MOMENTS TO IMPLEMENT.
WE WOULD HAVE TO USE SOME OF THAT 8 MILLION PUT ASIDE TO HELP BRIDGE TO A NEW REVENUE TYPE.
JUST A REMINDER THE DRAFT ORDINANCE DOES INCLUDE CREATION OF A TEMPORARY AD HOC CITIZEN FISCAL STABILITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO HELP REVIEW CITY EXPENDITURE SERVICES AND POTENTIAL REVENUES.
AS WE HAVE TALKED ABOUT WITH COUNCIL THAT WOULD REALLY BE A PART OF THE LARGER LOOK AT OUR LONG RANGE FINANCIAL PLANNING THAT COUNCIL HAS PLANNED TO START DOING THIS FALL.
SO LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT WHAT THESE RATES WOULD LOOK LIKE.
THIS IS WHAT THE RATE TABLE WOULD LOOK LIKE FOR $8 MILLION IN NET COLLECTION SO 8 MILLION THE CITY CAN USE TOWARD ITS SERVICES.
I'M GOING TO KEY IN ON THREE OF THESE CATEGORIES BECAUSE THEY ARE THE ONES WE MOST TYPICALLY USE AS COMPARISONS.
ONE IS MEDIUM RESIDENTIAL.

THAT IS WHERE THE BULK OF RESIDENTIAL BILLS WILL BE THIS AMOUNT.
YOU CAN SEE IN THIS OPTION IT'S $9.
THE SECOND ONE I WANT TO ZOOM IN ON IS GENERAL SERVICES TOO.
THAT'S A MEDIUM SIZE SUPERMARKET.
THIS OPTION IS $75, THESE ARE MONTHLY CHARGES.
THEN GENERAL SERVICE FIVE IS WHAT YOU THINK OF AS A BIG BOX STORE.
IT'S $1075.
NEXT WE'LL BRING IN THE $6 MILLION NET COLLECTION AND LOOK AT HOW THAT COMPARES.
YOU CAN SEE IN MEDIUM RESIDENTIAL THAT GOES DOWN TO $7 FOR GENERAL SERVICE TWO $60 AND 850.
WE'LL LOOK AT WHAT EACH OF THESE OPTIONS COULD FUND AT THE END OF THIS PRESENTATION.
LET'S TALK ABOUT THE TEMPORARY STORMWATER FEE INCREASE OPTION.
THIS ONE OPERATES DIFFERENTLY.
THIS IS REALLY USING THE EXISTING STORMWATER FEE WE ALREADY HAVE IN PLACE AND TAKING ALL OF THE SERVICES THAT ARE IN THE GENERAL FUND THAT ARE STORMWATER ELIGIBLE AND MOVING THEM INTO STORMWATER.
BASICALLY THAT'S PARKS, SERVICES, AND THERE'S ABOUT 4.1 MILLION IN PARK SERVICES THAT COULD MOVE INTO STORMWATER THAT FREES UP FUND IF YOU WANTED TO USE IT THAT WAY TEMPORARILY.
WE'LL SHARE A NUMBER LATER THAT SAYS 4.7 MILLION DOLLAR INCREASE IN THE STORMWATER FEE BECAUSE THERE'S A COUPLE OF SERVICES ALREADY STORMWATER ELIGIBLE THAT WOULD ADD ON TOP OF THAT 4.1 MILLION.
THAT WILL BE CLEARER WITH A TABLE.
AGAIN THIS IS BASICALLY AN INCREASE TO THE CURRENT RATE SO NO CHANGE IN METHODOLOGY.
IT USES THE ONE THAT'S IN PLACE.
TO GENERATE 4.7 MILLION IT'S ABOUT AN 18% INCREASE IN THE STORMWATER FEE.
THERE'S NO ADDITIONAL COLLECTION COST BECAUSE THIS IS ALREADY BILLED ON OUR BEHALF BY EWEB.
WE ALREADY PAY THEM A PERA BILL FEE THAT WOULD NOT CHANGE BECAUSE IT'S JUST THE DOLLAR AMOUNT GOING UP, NOT ANYTHING THAT WOULD BE DIFFERENT ON THEIR BILL.
THE FEE WOULD BE IMPLEMENTED BASED ON THE MOTION THAT'S IN YOUR AIS, UNTIL JUNE 2029, SO FOUR YEARS.
WHAT'S REALLY ANOTHER VERY DIFFERENT ASPECT OF THIS ONE IS BECAUSE IT'S AN ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS AND BASICALLY WE'RE AT A POINT WHERE WE TELL EWEB WE WANT TO IMMEDIATELY INCREASE THE BILL THEY WOULD DO IT.
THIS WOULD TAKE NINE TO TEN WEEKS TO IMPLEMENT IT.
THAT MEANS COLLECTION COULD BEGIN LIKELY IN AUGUST OF 2025
WHICH GIVES YOU THE OPTION TO THINK A LITTLE DIFFERENTLY ABOUT THE USE OF ONE TIME FUNDING BECAUSE WE WOULDN'T HAVE TO USE VERY

MUCH OF THAT $8 MILLION IN RESERVE THAT WE HAD SAVED TO BRIDGE TWO OTHER NEW REVENUE OPTIONS.
I'LL CHANNEL TWYLA MILLER, OUR CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, WHEN I SAY THAT THE MORE OF THAT WE CAN KEEP IN RESERVE THE BETTER BECAUSE THE ECONOMIC OUTLOOK IS UNCERTAIN IN MANY WAYS SO IT'S BETTER TO KEEP THAT IN RESERVE IF WE CAN.
LASTLY THERE'S A SEPARATE MOTION IN THE AIS.
IF YOU WANTED TO MOVE FORWARD WITH THE STORMWATER RATE INCREASE AND YOU ALSO WANTED TO ESTABLISH THAT CITIZEN FISCAL STABILITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE THERE'S A SEPARATE MOTION TO ESTABLISH THAT.
IF YOU ADD IN THE STORMWATER RATE HERE YOU WILL SEE ON THE RIGHT WE'LL KEY IN ON THE PARTICULAR CATEGORIES, ALL OF THESE ARE DIFFERENT IN STORMWATER BUT IT'S HARD TO BE COMPLETELY APPLES TO APPLES BUT YOU SEE HOW THE RANGE MOVES.
FOR MEDIUM RESIDENTIAL YOU WOULD BE AT $3.50 A MONTH.
FOR GENERAL SERVICE 2, THAT MEDIUM SIZE SUPERMARKET, YOU WOULD BE AT $47 A MONTH.
GENERAL SERVICE 5 FOR BIG BOX STORE YOU WOULD BE AT $672 A MONTH.
THAT'S REALLY THE WAY THOSE THREE RATE OPTIONS WOULD SHAKE OUT AND WHAT THE COMMUNITY WOULD SEE ON A BILL.
NOW WE'RE GOING TO MOVE TO TAKING A LOOK AT WHAT EACH OF THESE OPTIONS COULD FEASIBLY FUND.
>> THANKS, MATT.
>> FIGURE OUT HOW TO STOP SHARING.
>> ALL RIGHT.
SO THAT'S ALL WORKING?
OKAY.
YES.
I WANT TO WALK YOU THROUGH THIS TABLE BEFORE WE JUMP INTO IT.
FIRST IT'S SEPARATED INTO TWO PARTS.
FIRST IS INVESTMENTS AND THIS IS JUST A REMINDER THAT PART OF THE REASON OUR GAP GREW IS THAT WE WERE TRYING TO MAKE SOME ONGOING INVESTMENTS FOR THINGS THAT WE KNEW WE NEEDED, THINGS YOU HAVE BEEN FUNDING ONE TIME THAT WE'RE TRYING TO MOVE INTO A MORE SUSTAINABLE MODEL LIKE THE POLICE VACANCY SAVINGS.
THE PROPOSED BUDGET INCLUDED A NUMBER OF INVESTMENTS THAT WHEN WE NEED TO TAKE THE $8 MILLION OF REVENUE AWAY WE ACTUALLY IN SOME CASES WERE WITH THOSE INVESTMENTS.
I WANT TO TALK ABOUT THOSE FIRST BECAUSE IT WAS GETTING REALLY CONFUSING BETWEEN THE TWO AS I TOUCHED BASE WITH YOU.
WHEN YOU LOOK AT THIS TABLE IT GOES LEFT TO RIGHT.
WE'LL COVER THE DEPARTMENT AND THEN THE BUDGET LINE SHOWING WHETHER SOMETHING WAS IN THE PROPOSED BUDGET OR AMENDED BUDGET BECAUSE I MIXED THEM ALL TOGETHER FOR NOW.

THE PROGRAM SERVICE AREA FTE THIS DOESN'T INCLUDE TEMPORARIES, JUST ONE YEAR COST AND WE'RE LOOKING AT JUST THE FIRST YEAR OF THE BIENNIUM HERE.
THEN THE NEXT TWO COLUMNS ARE WOULD IT BE ARE THESE THINGS THAT COULD BE FUNDED WITH AN $8 MILLION NEW FEE, COULD BE FUNDED WITH A $6 MILLION NEW FEE.
THERE'S A SEPARATION.
IF YOU END UP GOING DOWN THE STORMWATER ROUTE AND WE HAVE MORE ONE TIME FUNDING POTENTIALLY AVAILABLE WE WANT THOSE TWO COLUMNS TO BE AVAILABLE.
IF YOU GO WITH THE 8 OR 6 THERE WILL BE VERY LITTLE ABILITY TO DO THAT.
AS MATT SAID IT DOES FREE UP A LITTLE BIT OF ADDITIONAL RESERVES IF WE DON'T HAVE TO SET UP A SYSTEM.
THERE ARE SOME THINGS WE COULD FUND WITH THAT.
THERE ARE SOME THINGS I WOULDN'T RECOMMEND FUNDING WITH THAT.
WE HAVE BEEN INVESTIGATING MAKING AN INVESTMENT IN THE PERS SIDE ACCOUNT TO BRING DOWN OUR RATES.
WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED IS THAT WE CAN RESERVE SPOTS TO DO THAT.
I DON'T THINK WE HAVE TO COMMIT TO IT FULLY UNTIL NEXT MARCH SO WE WOULD WANT TO HOLD THOSE FUNDS TO MAKE SURE WE CAN WEATHER THESE UNCERTAIN DAYS.
WE CAN PUT OUR NAME IN RESERVE THE AMOUNT WITH THE STATE AND AT LEAST BE IN THE FIRST BATCH.
WE DID THAT LAST TIME AS WELL SO IT'S A GOOD STRATEGY.
FOR THOSE REASONS WE WANT TO HOLD THAT BACK.
I'LL JUST WALK THROUGH THIS FIRST ONE.
REALLY QUICKLY, THESE ARE THINGS THAT JUST -- THE FIRST LINE IS AN EXAMPLE.
THE PROPOSED BUDGET SAID, WE WANT TO TAKE THESE LIMITED DURATION NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICE OFFICERS AND FUND THEM ONGOING FOR THREE OF THEM IF WE CAN.
THAT WAS FUNDED PROPOSED.
WHEN WE AMENDED THE BUDGET WE DROPPED IT TO TWO.
SO CURRENTLY WE'RE GETTING THAT.
WHETHER YOU DO A $6 MILLION OR $4.7 MILLION OPTION THAT'S ALREADY IN THE BUDGET.
THAT'S NOT EVEN RELATED TO THOSE OPTIONS.
BUT WITH AN $8 MILLION OPTION THOSE COME BACK.
SO THAT'S HOW THIS FIRST CHART READS.
SAME WITH STATE MANDATED PLANNING CAPACITY, WHEN WE DID THE AMENDED BUDGET WE FOUND A WAY TO FUND THAT IN THE BIENNIUM WITH ONE TIME DOLLARS AND IT SORT OF RETURNS IN THE OUT YEARS AS ONGOING.
I WON'T WALK THROUGH EVERY ONE OF THESE LINE ITEMS.
WE CAN COME BACK TO IT.
I GUESS I WILL TALK ABOUT EACH OF THEM.

POLICE VACANCY FUNDING RESERVATION, THIS IS MONEY BACK TO THE POLICE DEPARTMENT.
IT'S HALF A MILLION MORE THAN WHAT THEY HAD IN THE LAST BIENNIUM.
SO THIS IS HELPING THEM.
I HOPED TO MAKE THAT $1 MILLION BUT WE WEREN'T ABLE TO DO THAT.
SO THE ANIMAL SHELTER SERVICES AGAIN THIS IS JUST THE PORTION OF THE CONTRACT THAT WAS FUNDED ONE TIME LAST YEAR.
THAT'S REDUCED BUT WE'RE SHOWING THAT COMES BACK WITH AN $8 MILLION AND IT'S SOMETHING THAT COULD BE FUNDED WITH OTHER TWO OPTIONS.
THEN WE GET INTO THEORY DISCUSSIONS.
THESE HAVE BEEN SORTED.
NOW THEY ARE NOT BEING HELD TOGETHER BY DEPARTMENT BUT HELD TOGETHER BUT WHICH COULD BE FUNDED WITH 8, 6 AND 4.7.
THE THINGS THAT COME AT THE TOP.
I THOUGHT HERE'S THE THINGS WE HAVE HEARD FROM THE COMMUNITY WHAT COULD WORK AND WHAT COULD POTENTIALLY NOT WORK.
THE FIRST PAGE SHOWS A LOT OF STUFF -- SORRY.
JUMPING ON ME.
AS YOU LOOK DOWN THAT LIST ALL OF THE FIRST SIX ITEMS COULD BE FULLY FUNDED WITH THE STORMWATER OPTION OR THE $8 MILLION OPTION.
WHEN YOU GET DOWN TO THE OFFICE OF EQUITY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT, COULD BE FULLY FUNDED WITH 8 OR 6 AND WITH 4.7 YOU COULD DO A PARTIAL STILL MAINTAINS NEIGHBORHOODS IN THE MULTI-CULTURAL LIAISON.
IT REDUCES VOLUNTEERS IN POLICING AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT BY ONE FTE BUT MAINTAINS ONE FTE, SO IT'S PARTIAL.
THEN THIS IS THE SECOND PART.
THERE'S TWO PARTS OF THE ALTERNATIVE RESPONSE.
SORRY, I WANTED TO POINT THAT OUT.
THE NEXT SCENARIO 8 MILLION WOULD RESTORE THE FUNDING AND THEN THE OTHER TWO OPTIONS WE WOULD BE RECOMMENDING A ONE-TIME INVESTMENT TO HOLD THAT MONEY THERE UNTIL WE UNDERSTAND WHAT DOES THAT LANDSCAPE LOOK LIKE, WHAT KIND OF RFP MIGHT WE NEED TO PUT OUT.
THAT FUNDING WOULD BE AVAILABLE AND READY FOR THE FIRE DEPARTMENT TO USE.
HOMELESS SERVICES WE WERE -- THE 8 MILLION RESTORES THAT TEAM IN FULL.
THE AMENDED BUDGET SUGGESTS THAT WE MIGHT WORK TOWARD TRANSITION OF SOME OF THE CONTRACTS TO THE COUNTY WE HAVE BEEN WORKING WITH THE COUNTY.
WE DON'T HAVE CONFIRMATION OF THAT YET.
WE PROPOSE YOU COULD TO MAKE SURE THAT'S SAFE AND ESTABLISHED WE COULD CONTINUE TO WORK ON THAT.
PROVIDE THAT STABILITY.

THEN THE NEXT EIGHT ITEMS ARE THINGS THAT ARE JUST PART OF THE PROPOSED BUDGET.
IF YOU ADOPTED AN $8 MILLION FEE WE WOULD BE SAYING YOU'RE ADOPTING THE PROPOSED BUDGET.
ALL OF THESE ITEMS ARE FUNDED.
IF YOU SHIFT TO A LOWER OPTION NONE OF THESE ITEMS ARE FUNDED.
I CAN COME BACK AND TALK ABOUT THOSE WITH MORE DETAIL.
I'M GOING TO KEEP GOING TO THE BOTTOM OF THE LIST.
WE HAD THROWN IN THE 6 MILLION DOLLAR POTENTIAL OPTION, 1 MILLION DOLLAR OPTION, DOWNTOWN CLEANUP AND BEAUTIFICATION AS WE HEARD SOME INTEREST IN THAT.
CONTRACT STAFFING FOR PUBLIC WORKS, PARKS COULD BE PART OF A STORMWATER FEE AS WELL.
THAT'S HOW IT LINES UP.
THERE'S A LOT OF STUFF THAT DOESN'T REALLY COME FORWARD IN ANY OF THE SCENARIOS BECAUSE YOU CAN'T AFFORD THAT.
ALL OF THESE ARE IMPORTANT.
THERE'S A REASON THEY WERE ALL BUILT INTO THE PROPOSED BUDGET, ALL THINGS THAT I FELT WE NEEDED TO DO.
THAT SAID, THE TOP PART OF THE LIST THAT SHOWS UP WITH THE 8 AND THE 6 AND 4.7 ARE ALL OF THE THINGS THAT ACTUALLY ARE IMPORTANT TO THE COMMUNITY AND BUYS YOU TIME TO WORK THROUGH YOUR LONG TERM SCENARIO.
I DON'T WANT TO DISCOUNT ANYTHING ON THE LIST, I JUST WAS TRYING TO SORT IT SO YOU COULD UNDERSTAND WHERE DOES THE FUNDING DROP OFF FOR DIFFERENT THINGS.
SO LET ME SEE IF THERE'S SOMETHING ELSE I WANTED TO SAY.
I THINK THAT'S PROBABLY THE BULK OF WHAT I NEEDED TO SAY AND WE COULD PROBABLY TAKE QUESTIONS.
IF YOU WANT I CAN LEAVE THIS UP OR I CAN -- I CAN ALWAYS PULL IT BACK UP.
I'LL SAY ONE LAST THING.
MY HOPE IS THAT YOU'RE ACTUALLY ABLE TO PROVIDE SOME CLARITY AND DIRECTION.
I THINK I MAYBE HAVE SAID THIS AT THE BEGINNING, I'M GOING TO SAY IT AGAIN, IF COUNCIL IS ABLE TODAY TO SAY HERE'S THE DIRECTION WE WANT TO GO, HERE'S THE POLICY AROUND THE NUMBERS AND THE MECHANISM IT'S GOING TO BE I THINK IT ALLOWS THE REST OF THE CONVERSATIONS WITH THE BUDGET COMMITTEE TO FOCUS ON WHAT THEIR RECOMMENDATION IS TO YOU AS OPPOSED TO TRYING TO FIND A FUNDING SOURCE OR SWAP-OUT WHICH IS REALLY CHALLENGING FOR THEM TO DO.
THANKS.
MAYOR KNUDSON: THANK YOU, CITY MANAGER.
THANK YOU FOR THAT PRESENTATION.
THANK YOU ALSO ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER.

I JUST WANT TO OFFER MY APPRECIATION FOR THE AMOUNT OF INFORMATION THAT YOU HAVE SHARED AND THE WAY THAT YOU HAVE BEEN SUPPORTING THIS CONVERSATION AT COUNCIL WITH THIS BODY.
VERY HELPFUL TO HAVE HAD THE TIME TO WALK THROUGH THOSE ALTERNATIVES AND UNDERSTAND THE DIFFERENT PROS AND CONS OF EACH.
REALLY JUST APPRECIATE THAT WORK SO THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
WE'LL NOW OPEN THE FLOOR TO COUNCIL DISCUSSION.

COUNCILOR YEH, THEN COUNCILOR LEECH.
COUNCILOR YEH: THANKS, MAYOR.
FIRST I WANT TO ECHO THE MAYOR'S THANKS FOR STAFF.
I REALLY APPRECIATED FOLKS BEING WILLING TO SIT DOWN AND GO THROUGH OUR OPTIONS AND EXPLAIN THEM MORE ESPECIALLY SINCE WE ADDED A NEW ONE RECENTLY AND I WASN'T QUITE UNDERSTANDING IT IN OUR WORK SESSION SO THANK YOU SO MUCH.
I HAD A QUESTION ABOUT THE PROPOSED BUDGET ITEMS AND THEN SOME THOUGHTS.
MY QUESTION WAS ON OUR EQUITY DEPARTMENT.
IN THE 4.7 SCENARIO DOES THE AMOUNT THAT IT WOULD BE ALLOCATED INCLUDE THE SPONSORSHIPS AND GRANTS AND NEIGHBORHOOD MATCHING GRANTS OR IS THAT JUST STAFFING?

>> COUNCILOR, I CAN ANSWER THAT.
MY UNDERSTANDING IS YES.
THE ONLY REDUCTION IS THE ONE VACANT HR ANALYST POSITION.
THAT HR ANALYST HAS BEEN UNFILLED FOR ABOUT A YEAR.

COUNCILOR YEH: GREAT.
I JUST WANTED TO CLARIFY.
MAKE SURE I UNDERSTOOD THAT.
SO MY THOUGHTS.
I THINK IT'S UNFORTUNATE THAT THE INFORMATION WE HAVE GOTTEN FROM EWEB.
IT'S UNFORTUNATE IT TOOK THIS LONG TO GET IT BUT I APPRECIATE EWEB GETTING US THAT INFORMATION WHEN THEY DID.
I IN THEIR SHOES WOULD NOT EXPECT TO SET UP AN ENTIRE BILLING SYSTEM FOR ONE TEMPORARY FEE SO I CAN UNDERSTAND WHY THEY MIGHT BE HESITANT TO DO THAT CONSIDERING THE COST.
TAKING THAT INTO CONSIDERATION I DON'T REALLY WANT US TO BE SPENDING A QUARTER OR MORE OF A FEE ON ADMINISTRATION.
THAT SEEMS UNWISE FINANCIALLY ALTHOUGH I'M INTERESTED TO HEAR WHAT MY COLLEAGUES HAVE TO SAY.
WHILE 4.7 MILLION DOESN'T SOUND LIKE IT COVERS THINGS THAT I THINK ARE VERY IMPORTANT TO MY CITY, CONSIDERING THE SITUATION WE FOUND OURSELVES IN, I'M KIND OF LEANING IN THAT DIRECTION AT THIS POINT.

YEAH, I'M CURIOUS TO SEE HOW OTHER FOLKS ARE FEELING ABOUT THE SITUATION WHERE WE FOUND OURSELVES.
THANK YOU.

MAYOR KNUDSON: COUNCILOR LEECH.

COUNCILOR LEECH: THANK YOU, MAYOR.
THANK YOU, CITY MANAGER AND STAFF.
ACKNOWLEDGING THE CITY STAFF THAT HAVE BEEN IN THIS TERRIBLE POSITION FOR MONTHS NOW, THIS UNCERTAINTY WITH THEIR POSITIONS.
I THINK THIS IS HARD FOR US BUT IT'S BEEN HARD FOR EVERYONE INVOLVED.
I HOPE THAT WE CAN GET TO A PLACE OF CLARITY TODAY AS WELL.
I'M ALSO LEANING TOWARDS THAT STORMWATER FEE.
THE SAME AS COUNCILOR YEH.
IT'S HARD TO IMAGINE THAT NEARLY $2 MILLION WOULD BE GOING TO ADMINISTRATION.
REALLY MAKING THAT BENEFIT A LOT LESS FOR WHAT PEOPLE ARE PAYING.
I THINK THE WASTE OF TIME AS WELL TO IMPLEMENT AND WHAT IT WOULD TAKE TO BRIDGE TO THAT I JUST CAN'T SEE US BEING ABLE TO MANAGE THAT REAL SUCCESSFULLY.
TODAY I AM IN SUPPORT OF THE STORMWATER FEE OPTION IN HOPES THAT WE CAN SAVE WHAT WE NEED TO SAVE AND CONTINUE TALKING ABOUT OTHER SMALLER REVENUE PIECES THAT CAN FUND DIFFERENT PROGRAMS AND DIFFERENT PIECES OF COURSE OUR LONG TERM SUSTAINABLE PLANNING.
I DO HAVE ONE QUESTION AND THANK YOU FOR THE BRIEFING YESTERDAY.
I ASKED ABOUT THE ALTERNATIVE RESPONSE POSITION AND IT WAS ABOUT 241,000.
YOU MENTIONED THAT WAS A BIENNIUM NUMBER.
IT'S LISTED IN THIS PRESENTATION AS AN ANNUAL NUMBER.

>> YOU'RE RIGHT.
I APOLOGIZE.
I THINK I WAS WRONG YESTERDAY.
IT INCLUDES THE POSITION AND SOME OF THE OTHER MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES THAT GO WITH THAT.
THAT IS THE POSITION THAT WOULD COORDINATE ALL OF THE ALTERNATIVE RESPONSE, NOT JUST THE POTENTIAL --
[AUDIO NOT UNDERSTANDABLE]
ALL OF THE BLS, AND OTHER ALTERNATIVE SOURCES.

COUNCILOR LEECH: THANK YOU.
WHILE I'M NOT HAPPY ABOUT THIS LEVEL OF FUNDING, I AM IN SUPPORT TODAY, AND I HOPE THAT WE CAN KIND OF CONTINUE TALKING ABOUT ALL OF THOSE LITTLE PIECES THAT WE'RE ALL REALLY WANTING TO SAVE.

I THINK YOU HAVE DONE AN AMAZING JOB.
THANK YOU FOR THIS CHART SHOWING THE DIFFERENT OPTIONS OF WHAT CAN BE INCLUDED AND WHAT IS ON THE TABLE.
IN THE ORIGINAL PLANS I THINK OUR GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS WAS ON THE LIST AND I DIDN'T SEE IT ANYWHERE.
INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS.
I'M THINKING MONTHS BACK.
SO MAYBE IT WAS TOTALLY TAKEN OFF.

>> WE PUT THAT FORWARD AS ONE OF THE SERVICES AT RISK IN THE JANUARY OR FEBRUARY WORK SESSION BUT IT WASN'T INCLUDED AS AMENDED.

COUNCILOR LEECH: I'M INCREDIBLY SUPPORTIVE OF CONTINUING TO FUND OUR HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION, OUR NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATIONS, ALL THOSE ARE INCREDIBLY IMPORTANT IN TERMS OF COMMUNICATION WITH OUR COMMUNITY AND A LOT OF OUR STRATEGIC PRIORITIES OF BELONGING.
OTHER PIECES WE ALL KNOW.
THANK YOU SO MUCH.
THANK YOU.

MAYOR KNUDSON: COUNCILOR GROVES.

COUNCILOR GROVES: THANK YOU, MAYOR.
THANK YOU, SARAH AND STAFF, FOR YOUR WORK ON THIS.
I KNOW THIS WHOLE PROCESS HAS NOT BEEN EASY.
I WAS ONE OF THE THREE COUNCILORS THAT VOTED TO REFER THIS TO THE PUBLIC VOTE THEN ULTIMATELY VOTED AGAINST THE FEE TO BEGIN WITH.
I'LL TELL YOU SINCE THAT TIME JUST READING ALL THE COMMUNICATIONS WE HAVE RECEIVED, LISTENING TO PEOPLE TESTIFY, PERSONAL CONVERSATIONS I HAVE HAD WITH FOLKS, I REALLY AM UNDERSTANDING HOW IMPORTANT SOME OF THESE SERVICES ARE TO PEOPLE.
OF COURSE IT'S WHATEVER SERVICE YOU'RE CUTTING THAT'S THE GROUP YOU HEAR FROM.
SO WE HAVE GOT CONSTITUENTS ON THE OTHER END OF THE CONTINUUM AS WELL.
FOR ME THE 4.7 MILLION IS THE ONLY ONE OF THESE THAT MAKES SENSE.
IF YOU TAKE THE 6 MILLION DOLLAR OPTION, 1.5 TO 2 MILLION IN ADMINISTRATIVE FEES JUST TO GET THE THING OFF THE GROUND ACTUALLY NETS US LESS THAN THE 4.7 MILLION.
IF YOU ADD THE LENGTH OF TIME FOR IMPLEMENTATION IT MAKES EVEN LESS SENSE.
IT'S HARDER TO BRIDGE.
I'M CERTAINLY IN AGREEMENT WITH COUNCILORS YEH AND LEECH ON THAT PIECE.

I THINK MOST OF MY QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ANSWERED IN GOING THROUGH IT.
SOME OF THE THINGS I WAS REALLY INTERESTED IN RESTORING, CAHOOTS, ANIMAL SERVICES, NEIGHBORHOODS, THINGS LIKE THAT, I THINK YOU HAVE COVERED WELL.
DOESN'T MEAN THAT I'M NOT CONCERNED ABOUT LIBRARY AND POOLS AND COMMUNITY CENTERS, THOSE ARE IMPORTANT TOO, BUT AT SOME POINT WE HAVE TO WRESTLE WITH REALITY HERE.
ONE QUESTION THAT HAS NOT BEEN DISCUSSED AND ANSWERED IS WORKLOAD ON OUR EMPLOYEES WHO ARE LEFT.
ARE WE SCALING DOWN EXPECTATIONS WITH A REDUCED ABILITY TO FUND THINGS?
FOR EXAMPLE, PEOPLE TRYING TO IN THE SHORT TERM COVER MORE THAN ONE POSITION OR PICKING UP THE EXTRA WORKLOAD, HOW ARE WE ADDRESSING THAT SO THAT WE AREN'T BURNING PEOPLE OUT TO THE POINT THEY LEAVE?

>> THANK YOU FOR ASKING THAT.
THERE'S TWO DIFFERENT THINGS THAT ARE HAPPENING THAT ARE AT PLAY.
SO THE FIRST PIECE IS WE'RE HOLDING A LOT OF VACANT POSITIONS FOR LANDING PLACES IN CASE THERE'S A LARGE LAYOFF.
WE DO THIS ALL THE TIME.
SOME OF IT IS CONTRACTUALLY OBLIGATED.
WE HAVE SOME POSITIONS THAT ARE NOT PROPOSED TO BE CUT BUT ARE NOT FILLED YET BECAUSE WE DON'T KNOW IF WE NEED TO FIND A LANDING PLACE FOR SOMEBODY.
ONCE YOU MAKE A DECISION AND GIVE US CLARITY WE WILL OPEN THOSE POSITIONS AND WE WILL FILL THEM SO THAT WILL BE SUPER HELPFUL.
IT WILL PROVIDE SOME CLARITY OF WHO NEEDS A HOME.
THAT'S ONE PIECE.
SECOND PIECE, WE HAVE BEEN SCALING BACK FOR YEARS, AND I THINK YOU'LL SEE ACROSS THE ORGANIZATION AND OUR NONREPS AND REPRESENTED EMPLOYEES THAT PEOPLE ARE COVERING A LOT OF DIFFERENT BASES AND IT HAS BEEN PRETTY STRESSFUL.
I THINK IT'S RELATED TO COMING OUT OF COVID AND ALL THE DIFFERENT THINGS.
I THINK SCALING BACK EXPECTATIONS IS SOMETHING THAT'S HARD FOR EMPLOYEES TO DO EVEN FOR THEMSELVES.
IT'S DEFINITELY HARD FOR THE COMMUNITY TO DO, HARD FOR COUNCIL.
IT'S BEEN HARD FOR EVERYBODY.
THAT'S SOMETHING WE NEED TO WORK THROUGH.
WHAT'S REASONABLE TO EXPECT GIVEN LOWER STAFFING LEVELS ACROSS THE BOARD.

COUNCILOR GROVES: THANK YOU FOR THAT.

OBVIOUSLY THE FIRE DEPARTMENT HAS BEEN NEAR AND DEAR TO MY HEART SINCE THAT'S WHERE I SPENT SO MANY YEARS WORKING BUT I HAVE WATCHED THAT FOR YEARS AS OUR GROWTH HAS NOT TAKEN PLACE IN OUR LINE LEVEL STAFFING.
OUR FIREFIGHTERS JUST KEEP RUNNING FASTER AND FASTER AND IT'S NOT HEALTHY.
IT BURNS PEOPLE OUT.
I KNOW WE HAVE LOST SOME REALLY GOOD EMPLOYEES THAT HAVE GONE WHERE THEY CAN GET PAID MORE AND HAVE A LOWER WORKLOAD.
THERE'S NOTHING IN THIS BUDGET THAT TAKES THAT INTO CONSIDERATION BUT THAT'S SOMETHING WE NEED TO BE LOOKING AT AS WE MOVE FORWARD.
THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

>> WE DID JUST RECENTLY SETTLE OUR CONTRACT WITH THE FIRE UNION. WE HAVE INCLUDED A NEW D-SHIFT WHICH WILL BE BRINGING IN 19 NEW FIREFIGHTERS STARTING IN JANUARY.

COUNCILOR GROVES: OUTSTANDING.
THANK YOU.

MAYOR KNUDSON: COUNCILOR ZELENKA.

COUNCILOR ZELENKA: SO ON THIS CHART YOU SHOW SO ALL OF THE ONES THEY KNOW ARE ORANGE ARE WHAT I CALL THE CHAMBER CUTS, RESULTS OF THE CHAMBER'S ACTION.
THIS IS WHAT WE HAVE TO DO BECAUSE OF THAT COMPARED TO OUR ORIGINAL PROGRAM.
THANK YOU FOR ALL THIS INFORMATION.
WE HAVEN'T HAD MUCH TIME TO DIGEST IT SO PARDON THE QUESTIONS.
THERE WERE 3.5 MILLION IN CUTS THAT WERE BEFORE YOU EVEN GOT TO THIS THAT ARE ON TOP OF ALL THIS. IS THAT CORRECT?

>> YES.

COUNCILOR ZELENKA: THAT'S 3.5 MILLION THEN ALL THE OTHER CUTS DEPENDING WHAT WE DO UNLESS WE DO THE $8 MILLION ONE.
OKAY.
AND EWEB CHANGE, WHEN WE DID THIS BEFORE WITH THE CITY SERVICE FEE AND IT WAS ON THE BALLOT THEY WERE OKAY WITH IT, NOW THEY ARE NOT.
IS THAT RIGHT?

>> THERE WAS NEVER AN AGREEMENT FROM EWEB.

>> THEY DIDN'T BRING THIS POINT UP.

WE TALKED ABOUT IT.
NOW THEY HAVE.
>> THIS IS SOMETHING IF THEY TOOK A DEEPER DIVE THAT THEY CLARIFIED.
COUNCILOR ZELENKA, ONE THING, WHEN SARAH SHOWED THAT LIST, THE ONES THAT HAVE A P, BUDGET P, THE PROPOSED BUDGET, MOST ARE AT THE VERY BOTTOM.
THOSE ARE THE REDUCTIONS THAT WERE IN THAT 3.5, SO THEY ARE SHOWN INCLUDED IN THE TABLE.
THEY ARE NOT IN ADDITION.

COUNCILOR ZELENKA: OH, IN THE COLUMN 2?

>> YES.

COUNCILOR ZELENKA: AT THE VERY END.
OKAY.
THANKS.
SO 1.5 MILLION IN TEMPORARY COSTS WE HAVE ALREADY BIT THAT BULLET ONCE BEFORE.
WE DID EXACTLY THIS ALREADY WHEN WE DID THE CSI.
OUR BUILDING WITH CSI INTERNALLY.
WE'RE PAYING THE ADMINISTRATIVE COST.
WE CAN'T USE THAT SYSTEM BECAUSE THEY CAN'T JUST EXPAND TO DO THIS.
WE HAVE DONE THIS ONCE WHERE WE PAID THE COST OF DOING BASICALLY THE COST OF DOING BUSINESS OF COLLECTING THE FEES.
WE ALREADY ASSESSED THAT ON THE CSI, THAT THAT WAS OKAY.
I'M IN SAME PLACE WHEN WE DID THAT AS WE ARE TODAY.
IT'S JUST THE COST OF DOING BUSINESS.
HOPEFULLY IT WILL REDUCE OVER TIME.
WE WOULD COLLECT $9.5 MILLION INSTEAD OF 8 TO PAY FOR THAT, RIGHT?
SO IT WOULDN'T BE A REDUCTION.
THAT'S JUST THE COST OF DOING BUSINESS FOR ME.
IT'S A LOT BUT WE FIND OURSELVES IN THE CIRCUMSTANCE WITH THE ACTIONS THAT THE CHAMBER TOOK.
NOT VERY EFFICIENTLY.
SO THE CUTS IN THE PS FOR THE $8 MILLION ARE ABOUT 1.5 MILLION.
WE GO TO 6 MILLION IT GOES TO 2.7 MILLION.
THEN IF THERE'S SOME BIENNIUM IT'S ABOUT 5 MILLION?
HARD TO TELL WHEN YOU GO FROM 6 MILLION TO THE STORMWATER 4.7
WHAT ELSE GETS CUT BUT IT'S MORE THAN 5 MILLION, RIGHT?
I'LL NEED A SECOND ROUND.
MAYOR KNUDSON: THANK YOU, COUNCILOR.

>> WHEN YOU GO FROM THE 6 TO THE 4.7, IT'S LISTED.
IT'S ON THE CHART, SHOWS WHAT DOES AND DOESN'T GET FUNDED.

I SHOULD SAY THERE'S A LOT OF THINGS -- I DIDN'T PUT EVERY SINGLE LINE ITEM IN HERE OF THINGS WE HAVE INVESTED IN OR NOT.
I TRIED TO PUT THINGS IN WHERE THERE'S BEEN A SHIFT AND A CHANGE AND PEOPLE ARE REALLY FOCUSING ATTENTION.
I THINK THE ISSUE WITH THE GOING FROM THE 6 TO THE 4.7 THERE'S NOT A LOT OF DIFFERENCE.
I THINK IF YOU INCLUDE SOME ONE TIME DOLLARS AND LEAN INTO YOUR LONG TERM STRATEGY I THINK THE REAL DIFFERENCE, I DON'T WANT TO ARGUE WITH YOU OR WEIGH IN ON THE POLICY BUT THE DIFFERENCE WE MADE THE INVESTMENT OF THE PAYROLL TAX BECAUSE IT'S A LOT LARGER NUMBER BRINGING IN 20 MILLION.
IT'S AN ONGOING -- IT WAS A LONGER TERM AND CONSIDERED TO BE SOMETHING THAT WAS GOING TO BE ONGOING.
AS OPPOSED TO A FOUR YEAR ONE TIME COLLECTION.
WHICH MAKES IT HARDER.

MAYOR KNUDSON: COUNCILOR CLARK.

COUNCILOR CLARK: THANK YOU, MAYOR.
I WANT TO JOIN MY COLLEAGUES IN SAYING THANK YOU TO SARAH AND TO ALL OF THE STAFF FOR BOTH THE HARD WORK AND FOR DEALING WITH THE UNCERTAINTIES OVER THE COURSE OF THIS PROCESS SO YOU HAVE HAD TO LIVE WITH SOME TOUGH TIMES.
A LOT OF PEOPLE IN OUR COMMUNITY HAVE FOR A LOT OF REASONS.
BUT WE'RE RESPONSIBLE FOR THAT SO THAT'S WHY I'M SAYING I APOLOGIZE TO THE STAFF FOR HAVING TO LIVE WITH THE DIFFICULT DECISIONS WE'RE MAKING HERE.
I WANT TO SAY THAT COUNCIL HAD MANY OPTIONS OVER TIME IN RESPONSE TO ALAN'S COMMENTS I NEED TO SAY THAT 8500 OF THE PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN OUR COMMUNITY MADE A DECISION TO RESPOND TO THIS COUNCIL'S MAJORITY DECISION.
THAT'S WHY SOME OF US WHO VOTED DIFFERENTLY DECIDED TO TAKE SOME OF THE HARDER DECISIONS HERE OFF THE TABLE BY TRYING TO COMPROMISE.
I'M GLAD WE HAVE LANDED IN THE COMPROMISE PLACE, BUT I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT TO REMEMBER THAT -- I TAKE OFFENSE FRANKLY TO MY COLLEAGUE'S COMMENTS BECAUSE THERE ARE A LOT OF PEOPLE IN THE COMMUNITY THAT I THINK THIS COUNCIL BROKE FAITH WITH AND THAT'S THE REASON FOR THE RESPONSE WE SAW.
THAT'S I THINK A FAITH THAT NEEDS TO BE REBUILT WITH TIME.
THEY DON'T AGREE WITH US AND THERE'S ON ALL SIDES A LOT OF DISAGREEMENT ABOUT OUR BUDGET YEAR PROCESS.
WE'RE GOING TO HAVE SOME WORK TO DO IN FRONT OF US TO RESTORE SOME COMMUNITY FAITH.
I LOOK FORWARD TO DOING THAT WORK.

ONE OF THE REASONS I BROUGHT UP THE IDEA OF TRYING TO FIND A COMPROMISE POSITION IN THE FIRST PLACE BECAUSE THERE ARE PEOPLE THAT HURT ON BOTH SIDES AND FOR ALL OF THE DECISIONS THAT WE'RE DISCUSSING MAKING.
SO I HOPE WE CAN WORK WELL TOGETHER AS WE MOVE FORWARD INSTEAD OF POINTING FINGERS.
I TOO LOOK AT THE 4.7 AS THE BEST OPTION.
I THINK IT'S THE ONE THAT MAKES THE MOST FINANCIAL SENSE, AND GIVES US THE BEST OPPORTUNITY TO MOVE FORWARD POLITICALLY AND OTHERWISE WITH WHAT THE COMMUNITY WOULD ACCEPT.
MY QUESTION IS TO SARAH OR MATT OR WHOMEVER, YOU MENTIONED A $500,000 ESTIMATED NONCOMPLIANCE NUMBER.
CAN YOU TELL ME ABOUT THE METRICS YOU USED TO ESTIMATE THAT NUMBER?

>> YEAH, I THINK I'M NOT GOING TO BE THE EXPERT ON IT.
OUR FINANCE STAFF CAN PROBABLY GET MORE INTO DETAIL, BUT 5% NONCOMPLIANCE IS FAIRLY STANDARD FOR SOMETHING LIKE THIS. WITH EWEB THEY HAVE EXCEPTIONALLY HIGH COMPLIANCE WITH THEIR BILLS.
I THINK IT'S CLOSER TO 98%.
SO WE BENEFIT FROM THAT IN OUR STORMWATER AND WASTEWATER FEES BUT WHEN YOU HAVE SOMETHING THAT IS ON ITS OWN JUST LOOKING AT THE INDUSTRY AND WHAT IT AVERAGES.
COUNCILOR CLARK: I ACTUALLY THINK THAT NUMBER WOULD BE CONSIDERABLY HIGHER WHEN DONE SEPARATELY.
THAT'S ANOTHER REASON I SUPPORT THE 4.7.
THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

MAYOR KNUDSON: COUNCILOR KASHINSKY.

COUNCILOR KASHINSKY: THANK YOU.
THANK YOU TO STAFF AGAIN.
I LIKE WHAT MY COLLEAGUES HAVE SAID ABOUT APPRECIATING THE WORK YOU ALL PUT INTO THIS VERY DIFFICULT SITUATION.
I HAD ONE QUESTION BEFORE I GET INTO SOME COMMENTS.
HAD WE IMPLEMENTED THE FIRE FEE WE WOULD HAVE HAD A COST TO ADMINISTER THAT AS WELL.
IS THAT RIGHT?
THAT WAS BUILT INTO THE FEE STRUCTURE FOR THAT AS WELL?

>> ANY TIME WE BUILD A FEE STRUCTURE WE INCLUDE THE COST TO ADMINISTRATE.
YES.

COUNCILOR KASHINSKY: WHAT WAS THAT NUMBER WE WERE BUILDING IN FOR THE FIRE FEE?

>> I DON'T HAVE THAT IN FRONT OF ME, BUT THAT WAS ASSUMING HOPEFULLY AT THAT TIME THAT WE MIGHT BE ABLE TO BUILD THROUGH EWEB SO LOWER NUMBERS THAN WHAT WE ARE ASSUMING IN FEE MODEL.

>> THERE WAS STILL A BUILT IN COST WHICH I THINK IS IMPORTANT TO KEEP IN MIND.
I AM OVERALL VERY FRUSTRATED THAT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT MAKING ALL OF THESE CUTS AS PART OF A COMPROMISE WITHOUT ACTUALLY HAVING THE CONVERSATION ABOUT THE FOLKS IN THE COMMUNITY WHO ARE FINE WITH THE FIRE FEE, WHO WANT TO SEE THESE SERVICES FULLY FUNDED, WE'RE SAYING THAT A GROUP OF PEOPLE WHO ARE SAYING NO WE DON'T WANT YOU TO MOVE FORWARD WITH THIS ARE ABLE TO DRIVE THE CONVERSATION IN A WAY THAT HURTS A LOT OF PEOPLE IN OUR COMMUNITY.
I'M VERY FRUSTRATED BY THAT.
WITH THAT SAID, THE LONG TERM GOAL OF ALL THESE CONVERSATIONS HAS BEEN TO DEVELOP A STRUCTURALLY SOUND SUSTAINABLE BUDGET.
THE THINGS THAT WE CAN SAVE WITH OUR 4 MILLION DOLLAR FEE ARE THE THINGS WITH THE MOST CLEAR COMMUNITY VALUE.
I AGREE WE NEED TO SAY THOSE THINGS BUT WHEN WE TALK ABOUT LONG TERM SUSTAINABILITY COUNCILOR CLARK -- IN ORDER TO CREATE A LONG-TERM SUSTAINABLE BUDGET WE NEED TO GROW OUR TAX BASE, GROW OUR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, CREATE MORE HOUSING.
THAT'S WHAT'S ON THE COVERS FOR ALL EXCEPT THE $8 MILLION ARE BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT EXTENSION AND PLANNING WORK THAT WILL HELP CREATE MORE HOUSING.
IT FEELS SHORTSIGHTED TO BE CUTTING PROGRAMS THAT ARE GOING TO HELP US GET TO SOME OF THAT LONGER TERM SUSTAINABILITY.
I'M LOOKING AT HOW WE COMMUNICATE CLEARLY AND WE'RE TALKING ABOUT CUTTING COMMUNICATIONS STAFF.
WE HAVE ONCE TALKED ABOUT SUSTAINABILITY.
THESE OPTIONS ARE NOT INCLUDING SOME OF OUR SUSTAINABILITY PROGRAMS.
SO I THINK BOTH THE 6 AND 4.7 MILLION DOLLAR OPTIONS CUT TOO MUCH.
I'M WILLING TO PAY A LITTLE BIT MORE IN ADMINISTRATIVE FEES TO PRESERVE THINGS THAT ARE GOING TO HELP US SOLVE THIS PROBLEM IN THE LONG TERM, NOT JUST KICK THE CAN DOWN THE ROAD AGAIN.
THANK YOU.

MAYOR KNUDSON: COUNCILOR KEATING, IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO JOIN ROUND 1, COUNSELOR ZELENKA, YOU WILL BE ON ROUND 2.

>> I DON'T THINK I COULD AGREE WITH MY FRIDAY MORNING COFFEE DRINKER COUNCILOR KASHINSKY THAT SHE JUST SO ARTICULATELY POINTED OUT.

THANK YOU, COUNCILOR.
MAYOR, I ALSO WANT TO THANK STAFF AND OUR CITY MANAGER IN PARTICULAR.
LIKE COUNCILORS BEFORE ME, I WANT TO APOLOGIZE TO STAFF NOT JUST FOR HAVING TO LIVE WITH COUNCIL'S DECISIONS BUT TO ENDURE THIS PARTICULAR COUNCILOR'S OFTEN PRICKLY, OVER ANIMATED OR OVERLY ENTHUSIASTIC SUPPORT FOR SERVICES AND IF I HAVE OFFENDED ANYONE I DEEPLY APOLOGIZE FOR DOING SO.
MAYOR, MANAGER, I HAVE A QUESTION REGARDING THE SUPPORT FOR VITAL SERVICES THAT HAVE BEEN OFFERED IN AN 8, 6 AND 4.7 CATEGORY.
I SEE THEM AS 4.7 BEING GOOD.
6 BEING BETTER.
8 BEING BEST.
I RECOGNIZE IT WILL ALWAYS COST MONEY TO IMPLEMENT A REVENUE GENERATING SYSTEM BUT I FEAR WE ARE OFFERING OR DOING A GREAT DISSERVICE TO THE LINE ITEMS, TO THE PEOPLE AND PERSONNEL AND CUTS, THAT WOULD BE AFFECTED IF WE DID A 4.7 OR EVEN A 6 THAT JUST ARE NOT GETTING HEADLINES.
MY QUESTION IS, WHAT SCENARIO OR IS MY GOOD, BETTER, BEST 4.7, 6 AND 8 SCENARIO, ACCURATE REFLECTION OF REALITY, CITY MANAGER?
IN REGARDS TO THE AMOUNT OF SERVICES THAT WOULD BE STABILIZED AT A BEST SCENARIO OR SAVED OR RESTORED AT AN 8 MILLION, THAT BEING BEST, THE BETTER BEING THE 6 -- EXCUSE ME, 4.7 BEING GOOD, 6 BETTER, 8 BEING BEST.
IS THAT AN ACCURATE DESCRIPTION?

>> SO I MIGHT ANSWER IT A LITTLE DIFFERENTLY.
THE BUDGET I PROPOSED INCLUDED 8 MILLION OF NEW REVENUE BASED ON PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS AND PREVIOUS POLICIES.
I STILL THINK IT'S RESPONSIBLE TO DO THAT, BUT THAT DOESN'T TAKE INTO ACCOUNT ALL OF THE DIFFERENT THINGS THAT HAVE HAPPENED SINCE THAT TIME.
SO WHEN YOU START CHANGING THAT FROM BEING AN ONGOING, STABLE REVENUE SOURCE TO FUND CITY SERVICES AND IT STARTS BECOMING A SHORT-TERM GAP THEN IT GETS HARDER TO -- IT GETS HARDER TO JUSTIFY FINANCIALLY, RIGHT.
FOR AN $8 MILLION SCENARIO THE COST OF IMPLEMENTING IT YOU'RE GETTING 81 CENTS ON THE DOLLAR.
6 MILLION ABOUT 75 CENTS ON THE DOLLAR.
STORMWATER GETTING A DOLLAR FOR A DOLLAR EVEN THOUGH IT'S A MUCH SMALLER AMOUNT.
IT'S NOT MY FAVORITE TO NOT BE BRINGING FORWARD A BUDGET THAT HAS ALL OF THE THINGS THAT YOU ALREADY SAID YOU WANTED TO KEEP, BUT IT FEELS LIKE THE STORMWATER SCENARIO IS A GOOD SCENARIO.
I WOULD LOVE TO BE ABLE TO RESTORE 8 MILLION.
WE JUST DON'T HAVE THAT MUCH CAPACITY THERE.

>> FOLLOW-UP QUESTION.
THANK YOU SO MUCH.
EITHER OF THE THREE SCENARIOS ARE WE LOCKED IN BASED ON OUR MOTION THAT WE MADE THAT APPLIES TO THIS FOR THE AUTOMATIC FOUR YEAR CESSATION OR WE DO A SIX YEAR SUNSET?

>> YOU COULD CHANGE THAT WITH A MOTION.

COUNCILOR KEATING: IF THAT'S THE CASE, AND I'M HEARING A LOT OF COLLEAGUES HAVE SUPPORT FOR THE LOWER SCENARIOS AND IT SEEMS THERE'S A HANDFUL, MAYBE JUST A COUPLE OF US, IN THE 8 MILLION CAMP, IF WE ARE TO GO LOWER I WOULD WANT THE SUNSET TO GO HIGHER.
FOR EXAMPLE IF WE DO AN 8 MILLION LET'S DO FOUR.
6 MILLION, SIX.
FOUR, TEN.
I LOOK FORWARD TO SPIRIT THE DIALOGUE ON THAT MATTER.

MAYOR KNUDSON: COUNCILOR ZELENKA.

COUNCILOR ZELENKA: I THINK COUNCILOR EVANS DIDN'T GET A FIRST ROUND.

MAYOR KNUDSON: I'M SO SORRY.
COUNCILOR EVANS.

COUNCILOR EVANS: THANK YOU, MAYOR.
I ALSO WANT TO EXPRESS MY DEEP GRATITUDE FOR THE WORK THAT STAFF HAS DONE AND GETTING US TO THIS POINT WHERE WE CAN HAVE THIS CONVERSATION IN REAL TIME.
SO HERE'S WHERE I'M AT ON THIS.
I THINK THAT 4.7 OVER FOUR YEARS IS A REASONABLE COMPROMISE.
WE SUNSET AT THE END OF FOUR YEARS.
THIS WAY WE DON'T GET INTO THE STICKY SITUATION WHERE WE HAVE BEEN IN A LOT OF OTHER SITUATIONS WHERE WE GET TO SAY AT THE END OF THE SIX YEAR SUNSET THAT, WELL, WE CAN'T LIVE WITHOUT THIS MONEY.
WE CAN'T LIVE WITHOUT THIS REVENUE.
YOU KNOW, THEN WE'RE PUTTING OURSELVES IN ANOTHER BOX AT THAT POINT.
SO I RESPECTFULLY DISAGREE WITH COUNCILOR KEATING ON THAT.
THIS TO ME IS A SHORT-TERM COMPROMISE.
IT BRIDGES US OVER FOR FOUR YEARS, KEEPS IN PLACE A LOT OF THE CRITICAL SERVICES THAT WE HAVE BEEN HEARING ABOUT WITH ANIMAL SERVICES AND PARKS AND LIBRARIES AND EVERYTHING ELSE, AND IT'S DOLLAR FOR DOLLAR SITUATION.

IT'S COMING OUT OF STORMWATER FEES THAT WE'RE ALREADY BILLING TO PEOPLE.
SO WE DON'T HAVE TO SET UP A SEPARATE MECHANISM TO BILL IT.
IT'S NOT GOING TO COST US $1 MILLION PLUS AS IT WOULD IF WE WENT THROUGH EWEB.
ONCE WE CONCLUDE THIS CONVERSATION, I'M READY TO MOVE FORWARD WITH A MOTION AND ANOTHER MOTION BEHIND THAT TO NAIL THIS DOWN AND GET US MOVING OFF THE DIME.
THAT'S MY STORY.
I'M STICKING TO IT, MAYOR.

MAYOR KNUDSON: THANK YOU, COUNCILOR ZELENKA.

COUNCILOR ZELENKA: I AGREE WITH EVERYTHING COUNCILOR KASHINSKY SAID.
THE CUTS IN EITHER THE 6 OR THE 4.7 MILLION SCENARIO ARE TOO FAR FOR ME.
ADMINISTRATIVE FEES ARE JUST A COST OF DOING BUSINESS.
THAT'S WHERE WE FIND OURSELVES.
THE 4.7 MILLION STORMWATER LET'S BE REALLY CLEAR, THAT'S FIVE PLUS SIX MILLION DOLLARS WORTH OF CUTS.
TEN FTES AND SIGNIFICANT CUTS TO VERY IMPORTANT SERVICES.
SO IT'S NOT MUCH OF A COMPROMISE TO ME.
AND THE 8 MILLION OPTION IS WHERE I WOULD FALL.
THE COST OF DOING BUSINESS THAT'S NOT THE DECIDING FACTOR OF WHY YOU DO THIS.
I THINK WHAT CUTS GET MADE AND WHAT SERVICES WE LOSE SHOULD BE THE DECIDING FACTOR, NOT WHETHER OR NOT THE ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS ARE ALSO A BIT TOO HIGH.
I WOULD SUPPORT A SIX YEAR SUNSET ON AN $8 MILLION THING.
THE STORMWATER FEE, IT DOESN'T NEED TO SUNSET.
I'M CURIOUS WHY COUNCILORS THINK WE SHOULD PUT OURSELVES IN THE SAME EXACT POSITION FOUR YEARS FROM NOW KICKING THE CAN DOWN THE ROAD BASICALLY AND WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DO IN THE FOUR TO SIX YEARS THAT WHILE THIS IS IN PLACE IF WE DO IT THAT WAY.
WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DO THAT'S NOT GOING TO HAVE US HAVING THIS CONVERSATION AT THAT TIME, SHORTLY BEFORE THAT TIME.

MAYOR KNUDSON: THANK YOU, COUNCILOR.
COUNCILOR CLARK.

COUNCILOR CLARK: THANK YOU, MAYOR.
I ALSO WANTED TO POINT OUT IN THE SPIRIT OF MY COLLEAGUE POINTING OUT OUR OPTIONS IN THE FUTURE WHICH ARE LIMITED AND WHICH ARE NOT.
WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT TODAY IS SIMPLY UNLESS I'M MISTAKEN WE'RE SIMPLY TALKING ABOUT THE REVENUE MECHANISM.

BECAUSE THE ACTUAL PROGRAMS THAT GET FUNDED STILL HAVE THE BUDGET COMMITTEE TO WEIGH IN AND WITH THE 4.7 OPTION WITH THE STORMWATER OPTION WE HAVE SOME OTHER ONE TIME ADJUSTMENTS WE CAN MAKE THAT ARE MORE FLEXIBLE IN DOING IT THAT WAY WITH THE BUDGET COMMITTEE'S INPUT.
SO JUST ANOTHER IDEA OR THOUGHT PROCESS FOR THE 4.7 OPTION.
I TOO HOPE THAT WE'LL LIMIT IT TO FOUR BUT WHAT COUNCIL DOES YEARS FROM NOW IS THEIR DECISION.
THANK YOU.

MAYOR KNUDSON: COUNCILOR KASHINSKY.

COUNCILOR KASHINSKY: YES, IN RESPONSE TO COUNCILOR KEATING'S COMMENTS IF WE'RE LOOKING AT FIRST I THINK A FOUR YEAR SUNSET IS TOO SHORT FOR ANY OF THE OPTIONS.
WITH THAT SAID I WOULD SAY INCREASING THE SUNSET IS AN INCREASED AMOUNT OF MONEY MAKES MORE SENSE BECAUSE THEN WE'RE GETTING THAT GREATER LONGER TERM RETURN ON INVESTMENT FOR THAT SORT OF PIECE OF IT.
WE ALL RECEIVED A DOCUMENT LAST WEEK THAT SAID THIS IS WHAT THE CHAMBER WOULD LIKE TO SEE.
THIS IS WHAT THEY FEEL WOULD BE A REASONABLE SOLUTION TO THIS.
AND TO A LARGE DEGREE THAT IS WHAT MANY OF YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT.
THIS DOES NOT FEEL LIKE A COMPROMISE, THIS FEELS LIKE A CAPITULATION.
WE TALK ABOUT THE SOURCE OF THE REVENUE.
WHEN I THINK ABOUT WHAT COMMUNITY MEMBERS SAID, THEY WERE CONCERNED ABOUT THE FIRE FEE.
FRUSTRATED IT WAS CALLED A FIRE FEE.
I UNDERSTAND WHY IT WAS CALLED A FIRE FEE BUT THERE WAS A LOT OF CONFUSION ABOUT THAT NAME SAYING WE'RE MOVING STUFF AROUND.
WE'RE PROPOSING TO INCREASE THE STORMWATER FEE.
I DON'T SEE HOW THAT'S RESPONSIVE TO THAT CONCERN THAT THE COMMUNITY HAD.
THERE WAS A LOT OF CONCERN ABOUT ADMINISTRATIVELY RAISING FEES.
WE'RE TALKING ABOUT ADMINISTRATIVELY RAISING FEES 18%.
THAT'S ANOTHER PIECE THAT I THINK IS WHEN WE THINK ABOUT THE STATED CONCERNS WERE WITH THE FIRE FEE, THIS IS NOT A SORT OF REASONABLE COMPROMISE.
THIS IS SAYING WE ARE WILLING TO CUT SERVICES TO AVOID AND MOVE INTO SHORT TERM SOLUTIONS TO CALM DOWN A GROUP THAT'S BEING VERY LOUD.
SO THAT'S -- I WOULD NOT BE IN SUPPORT OF USING THE STORMWATER FEE TO SOLVE THIS PROBLEM.

MAYOR KNUDSON: COUNCILOR YEH.

COUNCILOR YEH: I HAD A QUESTION ABOUT THE FOUR VERSUS SIX.
AT ONE POINT WE TALKED ABOUT HOW THE LENGTH OF THE ALTERNATIVE ORDINANCE OPTIONS COULD HAVE AN EFFECT ON OUR CREDIT RATING AND SUCH.
WOULD WE HAVE THE SAME EFFECTS IF WE DID FOUR YEARS POTENTIAL EFFECTS IF WE DID FOUR YEARS ON THIS WITH A SUNSET AS OPPOSED TO SIX?

>> SIX YEAR ALWAYS LOOKS BETTER IN THE FORECAST BECAUSE YOU FORECAST SIX YEARS.
THE BIGGEST SHIFT IN THE BOND RATING WOULD BE USING TOO MUCH ONE TIME DOLLARS FOR ONGOING THINGS, NOT MAKING THE CUTS YOU NEED TO MAKE TO BALANCE YOURSELF TO BE LIVING WITHIN YOUR MEANS.
IF THE INTENT IS TO FUND FOR FOUR YEARS WE WILL SHOW IN THE FIFTH YEAR OR THAT BIENNIUM WILL SHOW AN EQUAL AMOUNT OF CUTS.
WE'LL HAVE TO SHOW THE CUTS THERE.
COUNCILOR YEH: OKAY.
YOU KNOW, I WOULD NOT BE OPPOSED TO SIX YEARS.
WE COULD HAVE A CHECK-IN IN FOUR TO SEE.
ANY COUNCIL, US OR SOMEONE IN THE FUTURE, WE ALWAYS TALK ABOUT THIS, THEY CAN CHANGE THEIR MINDS.
THIS ISN'T SET IN STONE, SO GIVING THEIRSELVES MORE TIME FOR COMMUNITY OUTREACH AND EDUCATION I THINK IS NEVER A BAD THING.
IF WE ARRIVED AT A SOLUTION IN THREE YEARS, WE CAN ALWAYS -- THERE'S NO REASON TO WAIT, RIGHT?
IN SOME SENSE THE NUMBER IS A LITTLE BIT OF TRYING TO GUESS HOW MUCH TIME WE WOULD NEED SO I WOULD SUPPORT SIX YEARS IF THAT WAS --
MAYOR KNUDSON: COUNCILOR EVANS.

COUNCILOR EVANS: QUESTION FOR THE CITY MANAGER.
IF WE WOULD GO WITH THE SIX YEAR SUNSET AT $6 MILLION, WHAT WOULD THAT LOOK LIKE AND WELL BASICALLY WHAT WOULD IT LOOK LIKE IF WE WENT SIX AND SIX?

>> THE ONLY WAY YOU CAN DO A SIX MILLION DOLLAR REVENUE IS TO ADOPT A NEW FEE STRUCTURE.

COUNCILOR EVANS: OKAY.

>> THEN YOU KNOW, IT'S A LONGER AMOUNT OF TIME, SO LOOKING AT THE CHART THAT I GAVE YOU IT'S JUST THINGS ON THAT CHART, WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN IS THAT IF YOU HAVE A SIX YEAR NEW FEE THAT IS GROWING WITH CPI, YOU WOULD HOPE YOU WOULD BE ABLE TO KEEP SOME THINGS, THE 6 MILLION CHART GOING FOR SIX YEARS.

IT'S HARD TO KNOW HOW MUCH OUR COSTS ARE GOING TO RISE, ESPECIALLY RIGHT NOW WE DON'T KNOW OVER TIME.
WHAT I ALWAYS TRY TO SAY WITH A NEW FEE OR WITH THE STORMWATER FEE IS YOU CAN FEEL REALLY GOOD THAT YOU'RE STABILIZING THINGS THROUGH THE BIENNIUM.
AS SOON AS WE GET INTO THE OUT YEARS EVERYTHING IS UNCERTAIN.
SO THAT'S WHY IT'S IMPORTANT TO HAVE THAT RESERVE IN PLACE.
COUNCILOR EVANS: SO COMING BACK WITH A FOLLOW-UP TO THAT, SO WE GO WITH 4.75, AND DO A SIX YEAR SUNSET, THAT WOULD GIVE US A LITTLE MORE WIGGLE ROOM TO HAVE THIS CONVERSATION AND WE WOULD GO THROUGH THE STORMWATER PROCESS WHICH WE ALREADY HAVE IN PLACE AND IT WOULD NOT COST US ANY ADDITIONAL MONEY TO ADMINISTER.
CORRECT?
SO THAT COULD BE A WAY FORWARD.
OKAY.
I'M PROUD TO PLAY AS WE'RE TALKING SO THANK YOU, CITY MANAGER.

MAYOR KNUDSON: COUNCILOR GROVES.

COUNCILOR GROVES: THANK YOU, MAYOR.
EVERYTHING WE DO TOUCHES SOMETHING ELSE.
I'M CURIOUS WHAT OTHER LEVY OR BOND RENEWALS LINE UP WITH A FOUR YEAR TIME HORIZON AND A SIX YEAR TIME HORIZON?

>> THAT'S A GOOD QUESTION.
I WOULD HAVE TO PULL OUT AND I CAN.
IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS GO AHEAD AND I'LL PULL UP THAT SLIDE THAT WE GAVE YOU LAST WEEK AT BUDGET COMMITTEE.

COUNCILOR GROVES: I HAVE SEEN IT BEFORE.
I THINK THAT SHOULD BE PART OF THIS DECISION PROCESS.
JUST TRYING NOT TO OVERLOAD THE SYSTEM.
AND I GUESS I DON'T HAVE ANY OTHER QUESTIONS AT THIS POINT BUT JUST A COMMENT.
WHATEVER WE DO, AT LEAST MY THOUGHT IS THIS IS BUYING US TIME WHILE WE COME BACK AND GO THROUGH THIS MORE ITERATIVE PROCESS OF GOING THROUGH OUR BUDGET AND TRYING TO FIND ALTERNATIVES INCLUDING DIFFERENT WAYS OF DELIVERING SERVICE.
IF WE GIVE OURSELVES FOUR YEARS IT WILL TAKE FOUR YEARS.
IF WE GIVE OURSELVES SIX YEARS IT WILL TAKE SIX YEARS.
IF WE GIVE OURSELVES TEN YEARS WE WILL TAKE TEN YEARS.
THAT'S THE REALITY OF HOW WE OPERATE.
I THINK WE NEED TO PUT A SENSE OF URGENCY INTO THIS PROCESS SO THAT WE CAN REALLY START TRYING TO GET AHEAD INSTEAD OF PLAYING CATCH-UP ALL THE TIME.
THAT'S HOW I'M SEEING THIS FULL THING.

ANYWAY WITH THAT IF YOU HAVE AN ANSWER, GREAT.
IF NOT, LITTLE BIT FROM NOW.

>> I CAN PULL THAT SLIDE UP IF YOU JUST GIVE ME ONE SECOND.
YOU CAN JUST TAKE A QUICK LOOK AT IT.
COUNCILOR GROVES: OKAY.

>> YOU SHOULD BE ABLE TO SEE THAT NOW.
THIS IS THE SEQUENCING.
FOUR YEARS IS '29.
BETWEEN THAT TIME YOU HAVE A LIBRARY LEVY TO START TALKING ABOUT THIS FALL.
WE'LL START TALKING ABOUT THE PAYROLL TAX IN 2027.
YOU HAVE TO MAKE DECISIONS ABOUT THAT.
DEPENDING ON WHAT YEAR YOU USE,.

COUNCILOR GROVES: TO CONFIRM AND FOR THE PUBLIC LISTENING, A LEVY CONTRIBUTES TO COMPRESSION, A BOND DOES NOT.
IS THAT CORRECT?

>> CORRECT.

COUNCILOR GROVES: THANK YOU.

MAYOR KNUDSON: COUNCILOR EVANS.

COUNCILOR EVANS: YES, MAYOR, I'M SORRY.
I HAD TO UNMUTE MYSELF.
IN THE INTERESTS OF US MOVING SOME OF THIS FORWARD AND THEN KIND OF FINDING A PLACE WHERE WE CAN BEGIN TO LAND, I WOULD LIKE TO MOVE TO DIRECT THE CITY MANAGER TO INITIATE A STORMWATER FEE AMENDMENT PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 6 OF THE EUGENE CODE THAT PROPOSES A FEE INCREASE THAT WOULD GENERATE APPROXIMATELY $4.7 MILLION IN NEW STORMWATER FEE REVENUE UNTIL JULY 1, 2029.
AND MOVE TO DIRECT THE CITY MANAGER TO SCHEDULE A ONE-SESSION IN THE FALL OF 2025 TO DISCUSS CREATING IN ACCORDANCE WITH EUGENE CODE 2.013 AN AD HOC SUSTAINABILITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE CITY'S EXPENDITURES, SERVICES, AND POTENTIAL REVENUES.

>> SECOND.

MAYOR KNUDSON: THANK YOU.
DISCUSSION FROM COUNCIL?
COUNCILOR KASHINSKY.

COUNCILOR KASHINSKY: MOVE TO REPLACE JUNE 30, 2029 WITH JUNE 30, 2031.
>> SECOND.
>> I APOLOGIZE, COUNCILOR KASHINSKY.
IT'S REPLACING JULY 1, 2029 WITH JULY 1, 2031.
THAT WAS MY MISTAKE.
I APOLOGIZE.

>> COUNCILOR KASHINSKY: THANKS.
>> I CAN SPEAK TO THAT.
THIS WOULD EXTEND THE SUNSET FROM FOUR TO SIX YEARS.
I THINK WE NEED TO THINK ABOUT HOW MUCH TIME HAS GONE INTO THIS DISCUSSION SO FAR.
WE HAVE BEEN HAVING THIS DISCUSSION ABOUT THE FIRE FEE FOR OVER TWO YEARS NOW.
ONE OF THE REASONS WHY IT WAS SELECTED WAS BECAUSE WE WERE LOOKING AT TIME IT WOULD TAKE TO IMPLEMENT.
EVEN IF WE HAVE A VERY EXPEDIENT CONVERSATION ABOUT WHAT THE OTHER SOLUTIONS ARE TO THIS IT'S GOING TO TAKE TIME TO IMPLEMENT THOSE SOLUTIONS.
IF WE'RE GOING TO LOOK AT CHANGES IN THE WAY WE DELIVER SERVICES IT WILL TAKE TIME FOR THOSE THINGS TO BECOME REALITY.
RIGHT?
IF WE'RE LOOKING AT GROWTH OF SOME KIND IT WILL TAKE TIME FOR THOSE TO SHOW UP ON OUR ROLLS.
HAVING A LONGER SUNSET GIVES US TIME TO HAVE THESE THOUGHTFUL DISCUSSIONS WE NEED TO HAVE AND TO START SEEING IMPLEMENTATION OF THOSE SOLUTIONS WITHOUT HAVING TO STOP AND SAY, OKAY, WE THINK THIS IS GOING TO START WORKING IN SIX MONTHS, NOW WE HAVE TO EXTEND THIS SO WE HAVE TO TAKE SHORTCUTS.
THAT'S WHY I THINK A LONGER SUNSET MAKES MORE SENSE BECAUSE I JUST THINK FOUR YEARS DOESN'T GIVE TIME FOR DISCUSSION AND IMPLEMENTATION.

MAYOR KNUDSON: COUNCILOR GROVES.

COUNCILOR GROVES: THANK YOU, MAYOR.
MY QUESTION IS ABOUT THE SECOND PART OF THE MOTION THAT COUNCILOR EVANS MADE.
I COULDN'T TELL, COUNCILOR EVANS, IF YOU SAID SUSTAINABILITY OR STABILITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE.
I DON'T KNOW THAT IT MAKES A DIFFERENCE BUT I THINK FOR PURPOSES OF THE NOTES I JUST WANT TO CLARIFY.

COUNCILOR EVANS: STABILITY.

COUNCILOR GROVES: THANK YOU.
THAT'S ALL I HAD.

MAYOR KNUDSON: THANK YOU, COUNCILOR CLARK?

COUNCILOR CLARK: TO THE AMENDMENT, THE FIRE FEE AND THE ORIGINAL DISCUSSIONS WAS FOR A MUCH LONGER PERIOD OF TIME.
CHAMBER ASKED FOR TWO YEARS.
I WAS WILLING TO SAY FOUR IN A COMPROMISE.
I THINK THAT LONGER THAN FOUR PLANNING AND OBVIOUSLY AS EVERYONE HAS MENTIONED BEFORE MORE ELOQUENTLY THAN I, COUNCIL IN THE FUTURE CAN DECIDE TO DO WHAT IT WILL.
THERE'S NOTHING WE CAN DO AT THE MOMENT TO CONSTRAIN THAT COUNCIL OF THE FUTURE.
THEY WILL DO WHAT THEY NEED TO DO.
BUT I WOULD SUGGEST WE PLAN THIS FOR FOUR RATHER THAN VOTING IN FAVOR OF THE AMENDMENT BECAUSE I THINK WE'LL HAVE AGAIN SUBSTANTIAL PUSH BACK FROM OUR COMMUNITY AND POTENTIALLY SEE PETITIONS AGAIN IF WE'RE TO DRAW THIS OUT FOR A LONGER PERIOD OF TIME.
THANK YOU.

MAYOR KNUDSON: COUNCILOR YEH.

COUNCILOR YEH: THANK YOU.
I AM GOING TO SUPPORT THIS I THINK. COUNCILOR KASHINSKY MAKES A GOOD POINT.
THIS PROCESS OF WORKING WITH OUR COMMUNITY IS GOING TO TAKE A WHILE PLUS IF WE DO COME TO SOME SORT OF AGREEMENT IT'S GOING TO TAKE TIME TO IMPLEMENT WHATEVER THAT IS THAT WE COME TO AGREE UPON.
I DON'T WANT TO BE HAVING THOSE DISCUSSIONS AT THE SAME TIME THAT WE'RE, OKAY, NOW WE HAVE TO DISCUSS HAVING TO EXTEND THIS STORMWATER THING OR NOT EXTEND IT BECAUSE WE'RE BUMPING UP AGAINST IT.
IT MAKES A LOT MORE SENSE TO GIVE OURSELVES SIX YEARS AND THEN IF WE GET DONE IN FOUR WE GET RID OF IT.
THERE'S NOTHING STOPPING US FROM DOING THAT.
CORRECT, CITY MANAGER?
WE CAN STOP HAVING IT AT ANY TIME THAT THE DISCUSSION IS OVER AND WHAT WE WANT TO GO GOING FORWARD HAS BEEN SELECTED.
IT MAKES MORE SENSE TO GIVE YOURSELF A LITTLE MORE TIME THAN TO CUT IT SHORT THEN HAVE THIS CONCURRENT CONVERSATION GOING ON THAT COULD REALLY CONFUSE FOLKS IN THE COMMUNITY.
I'M GOING TO SUPPORT THE SIX YEARS UNLESS I HEAR SOMETHING THAT CHANGES THAT.

MAYOR KNUDSON: COUNCILOR LEECH.

COUNCILOR LEECH: I SUPPORT THIS AMENDMENT.
WE WENT FROM 11.5 MILLION DOWN TO 4.7.
A HUGE CONCESSION AND THERE'S A LOT OF CONCERNS INVOLVED IN MAKING A LOT OF THOSE CUTS.
SO I WOULD LIKE TO PROTECT OUR BUDGET AND OUR FORECASTING TO THE SIX YEARS SO THAT WE CAN HAVE A LITTLE EASIER TIME TO UNDERSTAND AND KNOW WHAT THAT LOOKS LIKE AS WE GO THROUGH THIS PROCESS.
THAT IS WHERE I WILL BE VOTING YES ON THE AMENDMENT.
MAYOR KNUDSON: COUNCILOR GROVES.

COUNCILOR GROVES: THANK YOU, MAYOR.
I JUST WANT TO POINT OUT SOMETHING I THINK IS PRETTY OBVIOUS.
OBVIOUSLY WE HAVE HEARD FROM PEOPLE WHO HAVE AN ATTACHMENT TO A PARTICULAR PROGRAM OR PROGRAMS.
WE HAVE NOT BEEN HEARING FROM THE GROUP OF PEOPLE WHO ARE ADAMANTLY OPPOSED TO ANY INCREASE IN COSTS AND WE'RE TALKING QUITE A BIT ABOUT THAT UNTIL REFERRAL INITIATIVE PETITION.
SO THE REFERENDUM PETITION.
SO ANYWAY, WE GOT TO REMEMBER THAT'S PART OF OUR COMMUNITY TOO.
WE'RE GOING TO BE HEARING FROM THEM I'M PRETTY CONFIDENT DEPENDING WHAT WE DO HERE.
SO I DO THINK WE HAVE MADE A COMPROMISE.
I'M PERSONALLY MORE COMFORTABLE WITH THE FOUR YEARS.
THERE'S NOTHING TO SAY WE CAN'T EXTEND IT IF WE FEEL WE'RE CLOSE TO HAVING SOME SOLUTIONS AND WE NEED A LITTLE MORE TIME.
BUT ESPECIALLY WHOEVER IS ON THE CURRENT SEATED COUNCIL AT THE TIME THEY CAN CHANGE IT ANYWAY.
I WOULD RATHER START OFF WITH THE FOUR YEARS.
TRY TO STICK TO IT.
THANK YOU.

MAYOR KNUDSON: COUNCIL, I'M GOING TO INTRODUCE OR INTERJECT MYSELF INTO THE QUEUE.
I PULLED UP THE IMAGE OF THE ELECTION SEQUENCING OVER THE NEXT SEVERAL YEARS BEFORE WITH COUNCILOR GROVES AND THE REQUEST OF THE CITY MANAGER TO SHARE THAT.
EVERY CONVERSATION WE'RE HAVING IN OUR COMMUNITY IS NOT JUST ABOUT THE BUDGET.
IT'S HOW IT IS WE'RE WORKING AS A COMMUNITY TO MEET OUR WHOLE COMMUNITY'S NEEDS.
THAT IN THIS NEXT SEVERAL YEARS WE DO HAVE SEVERAL REALLY IMPORTANT CONVERSATIONS ABOUT OUR LIBRARY LEVY AND THE

COMMUNITY SAFETY PAYROLL TAX, STREET BOND, OUR PARKS AND REC LEVY.
THOSE ARE ALL COMING UP WITHIN THE FOUR YEAR WINDOW OF THIS CONVERSATION.
THEY ARE CERTAINLY ALSO WITHIN A SIX YEAR WINDOW AND I APPRECIATE WHAT'S BEEN OBSERVED THAT THIS IS NOT A NUMBER THAT CAN'T CHANGE.
BUT I WANTED TO OFFER THAT I THINK THESE CONVERSATIONS AND THESE DECISIONS OF YOU ALL ARE MOVING FORWARD ON A PATH TODAY AND TRYING TO ESTABLISH STABILITY.
IT'S ALSO I THINK IMPORTANT TO CONSIDER THE STABILITY IN THAT PROCESS.
ALSO UNDERSTAND THAT WE'RE GOING TO BE IN CONTINUOUS CONVERSATION WITH OUR COMMUNITY ABOUT THESE NEEDS AND HOW WE FUND THEM.
I JUST WANTED TO OFFER THAT OBSERVATION.
WE HAVE A LOT OF WORK, FOREVER WORK, TO DO ON THIS FRONT WITH OUR COMMUNITY.
EVERY END OF THE CONVERSATION IS THE FIRST SENTENCE OF THE NEXT ONE.
COUNCILOR EVANS.

COUNCILOR EVANS: I WOULD LIKE TO CALL THE QUESTION ON THE AMENDED MOTION.

MAYOR KNUDSON: WITH THAT I WILL TAKE A VOTE FROM COUNCIL ON THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION.
ALL IN FAVOR?
PLEASE RAISE YOUR HANDS.
FIVE.
ALL OPPOSED?
THREE.
THE AMENDED MOTION PASSES WITH A VOTE OF 5-3.
RETURNING TO THE ORIGINAL MOTION WITH THAT AMENDMENT, ANY ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION FROM COUNCIL?
COUNCILOR KASHINSKY.

COUNCILOR KASHINSKY: I JUST WANT TO BE CLEAR THE REASON WHY I'M VOTING AGAINST IT I FEEL THIS IS NOT ENOUGH MONEY AND THIS IS NOT A REASONABLE COMPROMISE IF WE WANT TO CALL IT THAT.
SO I VERY MUCH AM IN SUPPORT OF ALL THE SERVICES THAT WILL BE SAVED WITH THIS MONEY AND I FEEL LIKE WE NEED TO BE SAVING MORE.

MAYOR KNUDSON: OTHER DISCUSSION?
COUNCILOR KEATING.

COUNCILOR KEATING: MAYOR, I HAVE DANCED AROUND. I'LL TALK ABOUT WHAT I HAVE DONE.
I HAVE ALLUDED TO AND DANCED AROUND WHAT OTHER AREAS OF OUR SERVICES WILL BE CUT.
WHAT WILL BE RESTORED.
I WOULD LIKE SOME CLARITY FOR MORE FORMAL PROPOSED FUNDING LIST WITH THE PROPOSED 4.7.
PLEASE.

>> I CAN SPEAK TO THAT, MAYOR?
ACTUALLY APPRECIATE THAT.
WE PUT FORWARD A PROPOSED BUDGET AND AN AMENDED BUDGET.
I HAVE TAKEN A STAB AT WHAT I THINK YOU WOULD WANT TO PROPOSE WITH THE 4.7.
I COULD SIMPLIFY THIS LIST AS A STARTING PLACE FOR YOU AND FOR THE BUDGET COMMITTEE.
OR WE CAN KEEP GOING WITH THE ONE THAT WE HAVE.
BE HAPPY TO PROVIDE MY BEST RECOMMENDATION FOR WHAT YOU WOULD RESTORE WITH THAT 4.7 GIVEN ALL WE HAVE HEARD.

COUNCILOR KEATING: FROM MY VANTAGE POINT IT WOULD BE MOST WELCOME.
EVEN YESTERDAY OR MONDAY ON THE HUMAN SERVICES COMMISSION MEETING CLARIFYING THE DIFFERENCE ABOUT THE PROPOSED BUDGET VERSUS AMENDED BUDGET.
IF COUNCIL AS A WHOLE TODAY, NOW THAT WE HAVE ADOPTED THIS SIX YEAR SUNSET, I'M WILLING TO STAND WITH THE MAJORITY, THOUGH I HAVE MADE IT CLEAR WHERE MY -- THE NUMBER OR NUMBERS THAT I WOULD LONG FOR, I WOULD APPRECIATE GREATLY THE CLARITY AROUND THE NEW OR TO BE ADOPTED 4.7 OR DIRECTED 4.7, PLEASE.

MAYOR KNUDSON: COUNCILOR EVANS.

COUNCILOR EVANS: MAYOR, I WOULD LIKE TO CALL THE QUESTION ON THE MAIN MOTION AS AMENDED 4.7, WITH A SIX YEAR SUNSET.

MAYOR KNUDSON: THANK YOU, COUNCIL PRESIDENT.
WE'LL TAKE A VOTE FOR THIS MOTION.
ALL IN FAVOR?
SIX.
ALL OPPOSED?
TWO.
AND THE MOTION PASSES WITH A VOTE OF 6-2.
THANK YOU, COUNCIL.
I JUST WANT TO OBSERVE FOR THOSE FOLLOWING ALONG AT HOME AND IN THE COMMUNITY TODAY THAT WE WANT TO THANK THIS BODY.

THIS HAS BEEN A CHALLENGING BUDGET SEASON AND THERE'S STILL A LOT OF WORK AHEAD TO DO WITH BUDGET COMMITTEE BUT I WANT TO APPRECIATE THE DIFFICULTY THAT SOMETIMES GOES ALONG WITH THE HONORIFIC OF BEING A CITY COUNCILOR IN EUGENE.
I SUSPECT THE DECISIONS LIKE THIS ONE ARE THE REASON WHY SOME PEOPLE MIGHT SAY THEY NEVER IMAGINED SEEKING PUBLIC SERVICE BECAUSE IT'S VERY DIFFICULT TO BALANCE ALL OF THE COMPETING INTERESTS AND CHALLENGES AND CONSTRAINTS.
I JUST WANT TO APPRECIATE YOUR WORK IN DOING THAT.
ALSO THANK YOU FOR THE MEASURE OF STABILITY THAT THIS DECISION OFFERS TO OUR SERVICES AND CLEARLY LAYS OUT A PATH IN TERMS OF CONTINUING WORK FOR OUR COMMUNITY.
THANK YOU ALL FOR YOUR TIME IN OUR WORK SESSION TODAY.
I WILL NOW CLOSE --

>> MAYOR?
YOU HAVE AN ADDITIONAL MOTION.

MAYOR KNUDSON: I'M SO SORRY.
I WAS MOVING ON.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT.

>> CAN THE ATTORNEY CLARIFY IT TO MAKE SURE THE FISCAL STABILITY IF THAT WAS PART OF THE FIRST MOTION ARE SEPARATE.

>> THAT WAS PART OF THE FIRST MOTION BUT I STILL THINK COUNCILOR EVANS HAD INTENTIONALLY ANOTHER MOTION.

COUNCILOR EVANS: I DO.
I'M TRYING TO GET TO IT.
JUST A SECOND.
OKAY.
MY NEXT MOTION IS -- OKAY.
MOVE TO REPEAL ORDINANCE 20717, AN ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING A FIRE SERVICE FEE AND ADDING NEW SECTIONS 6.760, 6.765, 6.770, 6.775, 6.780, 6.785, AND 6.790 TO THE EUGENE CODE, 1971.

>> SECOND.

MAYOR KNUDSON: ANY DISCUSSION FROM COUNCIL?
COUNCILOR CLARK.

COUNCILOR CLARK: CITY ATTORNEY, DO I REMEMBER THAT EVEN WITH ANY OTHER THINGS WE HAVE DONE SUCH AS THE MOTION WE HAVE JUST PASSED, WE STILL HAVE A SEPTEMBER 3 DEADLINE TO REMOVE THE CURRENT MOTION, SUBJECT FROM THE BALLOT?

AM I CORRECT?

>> THAT IS CORRECT.
YOU HAVE UNTIL SEPTEMBER 3RD TO REPEAL THE ORDINANCES REFERRED TO THE BALLOT.
COUNCILOR CLARK: I WILL SAY TO THE MAKER I RESPECT AND APPRECIATE MY FRIEND GREG'S DESIRE TO HAVE CLARITY ON THIS ISSUE.
I THINK I'M LIKELY JUST OFF THE TOP OF MY HEAD I DIDN'T KNOW IT WAS COMING, I KIND OF WANT TO VOTE AGAINST THIS RIGHT NOW BECAUSE I BELIEVE THE COMMUNITY WOULD TELL THE COUNCIL THAT WE -- I BELIEVE THEY WOULD TELL US THAT THE FIRE FEE WAS A BAD IDEA AND IT WOULD FAIL.
I BELIEVE IT'S GOOD FOR US TO HEAR THAT ONE WAY OR THE OTHER BUT THAT THE COMMUNITY COULD HAVE THEIR SAY.
EITHER WAY I THINK IT DETERMINES MORE DISCUSSION NOW THAT WE KNOW WHAT THE REVENUE PICTURE LOOKS LIKE FOR CERTAIN WE KNOW WHAT THE FLOOR LOOKS LIKE.
THAT VOTE STILL DESERVES A LITTLE MORE DISCUSSION BEFORE I'M WILLING TO SAY LET'S TAKE IT OFF THE BALLOT.
THOSE FOLKS WORKED HARD TO BE HEARD.
WE HAVE A PODIUM IN FRONT OF COUNCIL FOR PUBLIC COMMENT EVERY MONDAY NIGHT BECAUSE WE WANT TO KNOW WHAT THE PUBLIC HAS TO SAY.
I THINK WE SHOULD HAVE SENT THIS TO THEM IN THE FIRST PLACE, BUT CERTAINLY 8500 PEOPLE SIGNED PIECES OF PAPER THAT SAID, YEAH, WE WANT OUR SAY.
I'M NOT COMFORTABLE WITH REMOVING THAT IMMEDIATELY.
SO THANKS.

MAYOR KNUDSON: COUNCILOR LEECH.

COUNCILOR LEECH: I WOULD AGREE WITH COUNCILOR CLARK.
THIS IS A LITTLE TOO SOON.
I WOULD LIKE TO LET THE DUST SETTLE A BIT ON THIS DECISION THAT WE JUST MADE TODAY.
NOT TAKE KIND OF THIS IMMEDIATE ACTION TO REPEAL UNTIL WE KNOW A LITTLE BIT MORE.
I WOULD LIKE TO HEAR PUBLIC TESTIMONY.
WE HAVE PLENTY OF TIME TO REPEAL THIS BEFORE OUR BREAK.
SO I WOULD LIKE TO TAKE THIS TO FURTHER CONVERSATION AS WELL.

>> IS THERE A SECOND?

>> YES.
ANY OTHER COUNCIL DISCUSSION?
COUNCILOR KEATING.

COUNCILOR KEATING: THANK YOU, MAYOR.
CITY MANAGER, WHAT ACTION WOULD GIVE THE BUDGET TEAM MEETING TONIGHT, WHAT WOULD GIVE OUR BUDGET TEAM MORE CLARITY?
CONTINUING WITH THE FIRE SERVICE FEE AND TABLE IT AT A LATER DATE OR TABLING AN ACTION AT A LATER DATE, OR REMOVING IT ENTIRELY?
WHAT ARMS OUR BUDGET COMMITTEE PROCESS MORE, THEM AND STAFF MORE CERTAINTY?

>> THAT'S A LAYER.
I'LL GIVE YOU A LAYERED ANSWER.
THE DECISION YOU ALREADY MADE TO INCLUDE THE REVENUE FROM STORMWATER FEE IS GOING TO PROVIDE THE CLARITY FOR THE REMAINDER OF THIS BUDGET PROCESS.
YOU WON'T GET THAT CLARITY ANYTHING STILL ON THE BALLOT THAT'S UNCERTAIN WILL NOT HELP IN THIS CONVERSATION.
YOU HAVE PROVIDED CLARITY I THINK THE BUDGET COMMITTEE NEEDS.
I THINK IT WILL BE -- THE CLARITY THAT THE COMMUNITY NEEDS THAT I THINK COULD BE SOMEWHAT CONFUSING.

>> THANK YOU.
I HOPE TO PROVIDE THAT CLARITY TODAY AND SUPPORT THE MOTION.
IF COUNCILOR LEECH WERE TO AMEND IT AS COUNCILOR ZELENKA PROPOSED, TABLING TO A DATE CERTAIN, I COULD SUPPORT THAT AS WELL PROVIDED WE SEND A VERY CLEAR MESSAGE TO THE COMMUNITY AND TO THE BUDGET COMMITTEE AND TO STAFF, VERY CLEAR, CONCISE MESSAGES OF CLARITY AROUND OUR BUDGET.
I DON'T WANT TO CONFUSE, SO IF COUNCILOR LEECH WOULD ENTERTAIN THE IDEA TO TABLE TO A DATE CERTAIN I'M OPEN TO IT.
IF NOT I'LL SUPPORT THE MAIN MOTION.

COUNCILOR LEECH: HAPPY TO TABLE TO A DATE CERTAIN.
IS THERE ANYONE, CITY MANAGER, CITY ATTORNEY?

>> IF I COULD INTERJECT, YOU HAVE A COUPLE OF OPTIONS.
YOU CAN VOTE THE MOTION DOWN AND SOMEONE CAN MAKE IT AGAIN AT A LATER DATE.
THIS IS FOR THE FOLKS THAT DON'T WANT TO VOTE IN FAVOR OF IT RIGHT NOW.
YOU CAN MOVE TO TABLE IT WHICH IS NOT DEBATABLE, NOT TO A DATE CERTAIN, SOMEBODY WOULD HAVE TO MOVE TO TAKE IT OFF THE TABLE.
OR YOU CAN MOVE TO POSTPONE TO A DATE CERTAIN AND WE WOULD PROVIDE YOU THAT DATE.
I WOULD SAY -- PRIOR TO YOUR SUMMER BREAK.
AT SOME POINT BEFORE JULY 16 IS WHEN YOU WOULD NEED TO DO IT, POSTPONEMENT TO A DATE CERTAIN.
IF THAT GETS A SECOND THAT'S DEBATABLE.

>> I WOULD LIKE TO POSTPONE TO A DATE CERTAIN BEFORE OUR SUMMER BREAK.

>> SECOND.
MAYOR KNUDSON: ANY DISCUSSION?

>> IS THAT A DATE CERTAIN?
I DON'T THINK IT IS, IS IT?

>> PRIOR TO JULY 16 IS A SPECIFIC ENOUGH DATE IT'S CONSIDERED A DATE CERTAIN.
TABLING IS -- YEAH.

COUNCILOR EVANS: MAYOR, I'M WILLING TO GO ALONG WITH COUNCILOR LEECH'S SUGGESTION WE TABLE TO A DATE CERTAIN.
THAT WAY IT GIVES US SOME MORE WAYS FOR US TO HAVE PUBLIC INPUT AROUND THIS AND THEN WE CAN SEE WHAT WE COME UP WITH BY THE MIDDLE OF JULY.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILOR.
WITH THAT, CITY ATTORNEY, UNLESS YOU ADVISE ME OTHERWISE I'LL CONSIDER THAT MOTION NO LONGER REQUIRING A VOTE TODAY?

>> WE HAVE ON THE TABLE A MOTION TO POSTPONE A VOTE ON THIS ON THE ORIGINAL MOTION TO REPEAL UNTIL SOME POINT BEFORE JULY 16TH THEN WHEN THAT IS SCHEDULED, WHEN THAT COMES UP FOR A VOTE IT WILL ALREADY BE ON THAT TABLE.
THE MOTION TO REPEAL WILL BE MADE AND SECONDED.
THE THING LEFT WILL BE FOR COUNCIL TO VOTE ON.
YOU DO NEED TO VOTE ON THE MOTION TO POSTPONE.

MAYOR KNUDSON: ALL IN FAVOR?
SIX.

COUNCILOR EVANS: I'M THERE.
MY VIDEO IS WONKY.

MAYOR KNUDSON: SEVEN IN FAVOR.
ALL OPPOSED?
ONE.
THE MOTION PASSES WITH A VOTE OF 7-1.
THANK YOU ALL VERY MUCH.
ANY OTHER ITEMS?
CAN I TAKE US OUT?
THANK YOU.

I NOW WILL CLOSE THE MAY 21, 2025 CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION.
THANK YOU ALL VERY MUCH.
WE'RE ADJOURNED