

ROUGHLY EDITED TRANSCRIPT

CITY OF EUGENE
WORK SESSION
SEPTEMBER 14, 2025
12:00 P.M.

* * *

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.

* * *

>> GOOD AFTERNOON, EVERYONE.

WELCOME TO THE SEPTEMBER 24TH, 2025 CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION.

THANK YOU FOR JOINING US IN THIS VIRTUAL MEETING FORMAT.

FOR WORK SESSIONS LIKE THIS ONE, THERE'S NO OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT.

THOSE WISHING TO ACCESS THE MEETING CAN DO SO BY WATCHING THE LIVESTREAM AVAILABLE ON OUR WEBSITE, THE BROADCAST ON COMCAST CHANNEL 21, OR CALLING INTO THE PHONE NUMBERS ON THE PUBLIC WEBCAST AND MEETING MATERIALS PAGE AT THE CITY WEBSITE.

THANK YOU AGAIN FOR JOINING US.

I NOW CALL THE SEPTEMBER 24TH, 2025 WORK SESSION OF THE EUGENE CITY COUNCIL TO ORDER.

I WILL TURN IT OVER TO OUR CITY MANAGER TO INTRODUCE THE FIRST TOPIC, WHICH IS A WORK SESSION ON THE CITY OF EUGENE CHARTER REVIEW PROCESS AND COUNCIL REQUESTED RESEARCH.

>> THANK YOU, MAYOR.

THAT WAS A GREAT INTRODUCTION.

AND JASON HAS BEEN WORKING ON THIS CONSISTENTLY OVER THE LAST YEAR-PLUS, AND WILL LEAD US THROUGH A PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION.

>> THANK YOU, SARAH.

I'M HERE TO PROVIDE AN UPDATE ON THE AMENDMENT PROCESS.

I WILL SHARE MY SCREEN AND WE WILL GET STARTED ON THE PRESENTATION.

IS THAT LOOKING GOOD?

ALL RIGHT.

SO QUICK OVERVIEW -- I GOT TO ADVANCE THE SLIDES.

THERE WE GO -- OF THE PRESENTATION.

WHAT I'LL DO FIRST IS REVIEW YOUR RECENT DISCUSSIONS ABOUT CHARTER AMENDMENTS.

I'LL SHARE SOME OF THE RESEARCH THAT YOU DIRECTED STAFF TO PROVIDE REALLY JUST KIND AT THE HIGH-LEVEL TOUCH ON THE KEY RESEARCH.

THE REMAINDER IS IN YOUR PACKET.

A REMINDER THERE ARE FOUR PRIORITY NOTE TOPICS THAT YOU SELECTED TO MOVE FORWARD FOR REVIEW.

THEY ARE DEPARTMENT HEAD RESIDENCY, LANGUAGE REVIEW, MAYOR AND COUNCIL COMPENSATION, AND THE VACANCY APPOINTMENT PROCESS.

AND THEN WE HOPE THAT YOU'LL BE ABLE TO PROVIDE DIRECTION TO STAFF ON EACH OF THOSE.

I'LL TALK ABOUT THAT MORE IN A MINUTE.

A QUICK UPDATE ON THE CHARTER.

WE HAVE LOCAL AUTHORITY TO DRAFT AN AMENDMENT CHARTER AS AN ASSOCIATION.

WE DON'T SPECIFICALLY HAVE A CHARTER REVIEW PROCESS, NOR ONE IS REQUIRED.

YOU CAN AMEND BY COUNCIL-INITIATED AMENDMENTS BY REFERRAL.

THE OTHER WAY IS CITIZEN-INITIATED AMENDMENTS BY PETITION.

IN EITHER CASE, BOTH OPTIONS ARE PLACED ON THE BALLOT FOR EUGENE ELECTORS TO DECIDE.

A RECAP OF YOUR RECENT DISCUSSIONS ON THIS TOPIC.

BACK IN FEBRUARY OF 2024, YOU RECEIVED AN OVERVIEW OF PAST AMENDMENT PROCESSES TO THE CHARTER.

YOU DISCUSSED TOPICS THAT YOU WERE INTERESTED IN PURSUING AMENDMENTS ON, AND YOU DIRECTED STAFF TO WORK ONE-ON-ONE WITH COUNCILORS WHO HAD IDEAS ON POSSIBLE AREAS OF REVIEW IN THE CHARTER.

THEN IN MAY OF 2024, STAFF RETURNED WITH A REVIEW OF THE FEEDBACK WE RECEIVED FROM THOSE MEETINGS WITH EACH OF YOU.

YOU DELIBERATED ON THAT, AND DETERMINED FOUR PRIORITY NOW TOPICS THAT YOU WANTED TO MOVE FORWARD, AND DIRECTED STAFF TO DO RESEARCH ON EACH OF THOSE FOUR TOPICS TO INFORM ANY POTENTIAL AMENDMENTS.

SO THAT RESEARCH THAT STAFF DID INCLUDED REVIEWING THE CURRENT CHARTER LANGUAGE.

IT INCLUDED REVIEWING -- OR RESEARCHING OTHER CITIES.

OUR FOCUS WAS ON THE SIX LARGEST CITIES IN OREGON, NOT INCLUDING PORTLAND.

WE LOOKED AT THE LEAGUE OF OREGON CITIES MODEL CHARTER.

OFTEN WE'LL END THE PRESENTATION WITH A TIMELINE, BUT BECAUSE IT MATTERS FOR YOUR PROCESS HERE TODAY WE'LL LEAD WITH THIS, WHICH IS A REMINDER THAT IF YOUR INTENTION IS STILL TO MAKE THE MAY 26 -- MAY 19, 2026 GENERAL ELECTION, YOU'LL NEED TO BE DOING MOST OF YOUR DELIBERATION, ALL OF YOUR DELIBERATION OF THE AMENDMENTS TO THE CHARTER OVER THE PAST COUPLE OF MONTHS, BECAUSE BEFORE YOU GO ON BREAK IN DECEMBER YOU NEED TO PROVIDE STAFF ON ACTUAL RESOLUTIONS THAT YOU WOULD TAKE ACTION IN JANUARY TO MAKE THE DEADLINE.

IN ORDER TO STAY ON THAT TIMELINE, WHAT WE HOPE TO GET FROM YOU TODAY IS A QUICK SENSE ON THESE FOUR TOPICS, OF WHERE YOU ARE, AND SO THERE ARE REALLY THREE GENERAL OPTIONS ON EACH OF THE FOUR TOPICS.

IT COULD BE THAT YOU HAVE ADDITIONAL RESEARCH THAT YOU'D LIKE STAFF TO DO.

IT COULD BE THAT YOU HAVE EVERYTHING YOU NEED TO DELIBERATE ON ANY OF THOSE FOUR TOPICS, AND YOU'RE READY TO BRING THOSE BACK FOR DELIBERATION, OR YOU MAY CHOOSE TO NOT PURSUE CHANGES TO THE CHARTER AT THIS TIME ON ANY OR ALL OF THOSE TOPICS.

WHAT I'LL DO NOW IS QUICKLY WALK THROUGH EACH OF THE FOUR PRIORITY NOW TOPICS, AND SO THIS FIRST ONE, DEPARTMENT HEAD RESIDENCY, THE OVERVIEW OF THIS IS THAT THE CHARTER SPECIFIES THAT THE OFFICES OF THE MANAGER AND DEPARTMENT HEADS MAY BE FILLED FROM CANDIDATES OUTSIDE THE CITY BUT WHILE THOSE INDIVIDUALS SERVE IN THOSE ROLES THEY NEED TO RESIDE IN THE CITY.

SIMILARLY, ALL EMPLOYEES ALSO HAVE A SIMILAR REQUIREMENT, EXCEPT AS THE COUNCIL AUTHORIZES THE MANAGER TO PRESCRIBE TO THE CONTRARY, IE THAT STAFF DON'T NEED TO LIVE WITHIN THE CITY, AND THAT IS CURRENTLY THE PROVISION THAT WE'RE WORKING UNDER.

IN TERMS OF RESEARCH ON THIS, NONE OF THE OTHER COMPARISON CITIES IN OREGON HAVE A RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT IN THEIR CHARTER.

THESE ARE THE OPTIONS THAT YOU'VE RAISED THUS FAR.

ONE OPTION IS TO REMOVE THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT ENTIRELY FROM THE CHARTER.

THIS IS THE ONLY ONE OF THE FOUR PRIORITY NOW TOPICS THAT HAS A MANAGER RECOMMENDATION, AND THE MANAGER RECOMMENDS REMOVING THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT FROM THE CHARTER.

THE OTHER ONE IS TO REMOVE IT FOR THE FIRE CHIEF.

ANOTHER OPTION IS TO AMEND THE REQUIREMENT TO ADD A MILEAGE RADIUS.

ANOTHER OPTION WOULD BE TO REMOVE THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT FROM THE CHARTER AND PUT INTO ORDINANCE.

YOU'LL SEE THAT SHOW UP ANOTHER ONE OF THE FOUR PRIORITY TOPICS.

SIMPLY REMOVING SOMETHING FROM THE CHARTER AND PUTTING IT IN THE OTHER THANS BASICALLY MAKES FOR FUTURE CHANGES EASIER.

THEN FINALLY, YOUR FINAL OPTION ON THIS ONE COULD BE THAT YOU CHOOSE NOT TO PURSUE ANY CHANGES TO THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT AT THIS TIME.

NEXT TOPIC IS LANGUAGE REVIEW.

TOPICS AROUND THIS THAT YOU RAISED PREVIOUSLY INCLUDE ADDRESSING ANTIQUATED LANGUAGE IN THE CHARTER, PRIMARILY BINARY GENDER PRONOUNS, POSSIBLY ADDRESSING CONSISTENCY OR INCONSISTENCY IN LEVEL OF DETAIL ACROSS THE CHARTER, AND POTENTIALLY INCLUDING A DEFINITION OF WHAT THE CITY'S CORE SERVICES ARE IN THE CHARTER.

SO STAFF RESEARCH ON THIS, TWO OF THE CITIES THAT WE RESEARCHED, HAVE AMENDED THEIR CHARTER TO ADDRESS PRONOUNS.

NONE OF THE CITIES DEFINE CORE SERVICES IN THEIR CHARTERS, AND NONE HAVE ADDRESSED LEVEL OF DETAIL.

STAFF RESEARCH ON THE CHARTER SHOWS THE MOST DETAILED PARTS OF THE CHARTER ARE THE AMENDMENTS WHICH CAME AFTER THE INITIAL BODY OF THE CHARTER WAS ADOPTED.

THE BODY ITSELF IS FAIRLY CONSISTENT IN ITS LEVEL OF SPECIFICITY, HOWEVER THE AMENDMENTS ARE IN SOME CASES MUCH MORE DETAILED.

SO THAT MAY LEAD TO THE PERCEPTION OF INCONSISTENCY IN DETAIL ACROSS THE CHARTER.

SO SOME POTENTIAL OPTIONS HERE ARE AMEND IT TO ADDRESS GENERAL LANGUAGE UPDATES.

COULD BE ANY OF THOSE THREE TOPICS THAT YOU RAISED.

OR YOU COULD DECIDE NOT TO PURSUE CHANGES TO ADDRESS GENERAL LANGUAGE UPDATES AT THIS TIME.

THE THIRD PRIORITY NOW TOPIC IS MAYOR AND COUNCIL COMPENSATION.

CURRENTLY MAYOR AND COUNCILORS RECEIVE A STIPEND FOR THEIR SERVICE.

THAT STIPEND WAS INITIALLY SET AND HAS BEEN ADJUSTED EACH FISCAL YEAR BASED ON THE CONSUMER PRICE INDEX WEST.

THE CURRENT ANNUAL STIPENDS FOR THE MAYOR IS JUST OVER \$32,000, AND STIPENDS FOR COUNCILORS ARE JUST OVER \$21,000 ANNUALLY.

STIPENDS ARE IN ADDITION TO EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENTS THAT MAYOR AND COUNCILORS RECEIVE.

THERE'S NO FRINGE HEALTH BENEFITS, HOWEVER HEALTH INSURANCE CAN BE PURCHASED FROM THE CITY.

SO LOOKING AT OTHER CITIES, THE CURRENT STIPEND THAT THE MAYOR AND COUNCILORS RECEIVE IS SLIGHTLY BELOW COMPARISON CITIES.

SEVERAL CITIES DO NOT OFFER HEALTH INSURANCE AT ALL.

FOR THOSE THAT DO OFFER HEALTH INSURANCE, A HIGHER PERCENTAGE OF THE PREMIUMS ARE PAID BY THE CITY COMPARED TO EUGENE.

OTHER NON-STIPEND BENEFITS ARE SIMILAR TO WHAT OTHER CITIES PROVIDE.

NONE OF THE CITIES SET THEIR COMPENSATION AMOUNT IN CHARTER.

IT'S ALL DEALT WITH IN OTHER DOCUMENTS.

AND THEN SEVERAL CITIES USE A CITIZEN COMMITTEE TO REVIEW AND SET THEIR COMPENSATION AMOUNTS.

SO YOUR OPTIONS HERE COULD INCLUDE PURSUING CHANGES TO THE AMOUNT OF COMPENSATION IN THE CHARTER, AND LEAVING COMPENSATION IN THE CHARTER.

ANOTHER OPTION COULD BE TO PURSUE CHANGES TO COMPENSATION BUT REMOVE THE LANGUAGE FROM THE CHARTER AND DELEGATE OVERSIGHT OF FUTURE COMPENSATION TO A CITIZEN COMMITTEE BY ORDINANCE.

OR YOU COULD CHOOSE TO NOT PURSUE CHANGES TO COMPENSATION IN THE CHARTER AT THIS TIME.

THEN YOUR FINAL PRIORITY NOW TOPIC WAS THE MAYOR AND COUNCIL VACANCY APPOINTMENT PROCESS.

CURRENT LANGUAGE INCLUDES FILLING VACANCIES BY APPOINTMENT WITHIN 90 DAYS OF WHEN THE VACANCY OCCURS, AND THAT PERSON WILL HOLD OFFICE UNTIL THEIR SUCCESSOR IS ELECTED.

THEN THE VARIATION BASED ON WHEN THE VACANCY OCCURS.

IF MORE THAN 100 DAYS PRIOR TO THE MAY ELECTION, AN ELECTION WILL BE CONDUCTED IN THE SAME YEAR.

IF IT'S LESS, THE ELECTION WOULD BE CONDUCTED IN THE NEXT YEAR.

IN LOOKING AT WHAT OTHER CITIES ARE DOING AROUND VACANCY APPOINTMENTS, IT VARIES.

WITH MANY NUANCES.

ALL OF THE CITIES INITIALLY FILL THEIR VACANCIES THROUGH COUNCIL APPOINTMENT.

HOWEVER WHERE THINGS VARY ACROSS CITIES ARE TYPICALLY BASED ON WHEN THE VACANCY OCCURS IN RELATION TO UPCOMING ELECTIONS.

SO SOME OPTIONS HERE.

BASED ON EITHER YOUR PREVIOUS DISCUSSION OR WHAT OTHER CITIES ARE DOING, THERE COULD BE OTHER OPTIONS THAN WHAT IT IS HERE.

COULD BE THAT THE COUNCIL CONTINUES TO APPOINT THAT INDIVIDUAL THEY SERVE UNTIL THE END OF THE TERM REGARDLESS OF WHEN THE VACANCY OCCURS.

VARIATIONS ON THIS COULD BE IF IT'S LESS THAN ONE YEAR, THEY WOULD SERVE OUT THE TERM.

IF IT'S MORE THAN ONE YEAR, THEN SERVE UNTIL THE NEXT ELECTION.

ANOTHER OPTION COULD BE YOU'RE APPOINTING AN INDIVIDUAL SERVING UNTIL THE NEXT GENERAL ELECTION.

ANOTHER OPTION, THAT INDIVIDUAL SERVES UNTIL THE NEXT SPECIAL ELECTION.

OF COURSE, YOU COULD CHOOSE NOT TO PURSUE CHANGES TO THE APPOINTMENT PROCESS AT THIS TIME.

WRAPPING UP HERE, TAKING ANOTHER LOOK AT THE TIMELINE FOR AMENDMENTS, SEPTEMBER 24TH, THE WORK SESSION, NEEDING TO PROVIDE FINAL COUNCIL DIRECTION PRIOR TO WHEN YOU GO ON BREAK IN DECEMBER.

SO REALLY HERE THROUGH OCTOBER-NOVEMBER IS WHEN ANY ADDITIONAL STAFF RESEARCH, ANY OF YOUR DISCUSSIONS AND DELIBERATIONS ON THE TOPICS WOULD NEED TO OCCUR.

AND THEN TAKING ACTION ON ANY AMENDMENTS TO THE CHARTER VIA RESOLUTION IN JANUARY.

THAT'S IT FOR MY PRESENTATION.

AS YOU MOVE THROUGH EACH OF THE FOUR TOPICS, THE APPROACH FOR NOW REMAINS IN SCREEN SHARE MODE AND HAVE ON SCREEN THE FIRST TOPIC THAT YOU'LL BE DISCUSSING SO THAT YOU CAN SEE THE OPTION.

THEN AS WE MOVE THROUGH THE TOPICS, I'LL CHANGE SLIDES.

BACK TO YOU, MAYOR.

>> THANK YOU SO MUCH, JASON, FOR THAT PRESENTATION.

COUNCIL, I'LL ON THE FLOOR TO DISCUSSION IN JUST A MOMENT AS STAFF JUST INDICATED OUR PLAN IS TO REVIEW EACH OF THESE PRIORITY TOPICS, ONE AT A TIME, AND THEN HAVE ON SCREEN THE DIFFERENT OPTIONS RELATED TO EACH.

AS WE'RE WALKING THROUGH ROUNDS, IT WOULD BE HELPFUL IF YOU HAVE INDICATION OF WHERE YOU'RE LANDING, THAT YOU'D LIKE TO SHARE IN THAT FEEDBACK, AND HELP US TO KEEP TRACK SO THAT WE CAN BUILD AN APPROPRIATE MOTION FOR EACH ONE OF THOSE SLIDES.

I CANNOT SEE ANY HANDS RAISED AT THE MOMENT.

ON THE FLOOR FOR DISCUSSION.

COUNCILOR CLARK.

>> THANK YOU, MAYOR.

I'D BE HAPPY TO LET OTHERS GO FIRST.

ALAN JUMPED IN THERE.

EXCELLENT.

ALL RIGHT.

THE ONLY THING THAT I HAVE AN INTEREST IN, IN ENTERTAINING, I SUPPOSE, IS THE RIGHT WORD, IS THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT ISSUE.

I LOOK AT THAT AND I SEE, YOU KNOW, IF SPRINGFIELD HAD THE SAME RULE, WE'D HAVE A HECK OF A PROBLEM WITH THE CITIZEN -- YOU KNOW, THE ISSUE OF WHERE A FIRE CHIEF WOULD LIVE.

SO THAT I'M AT LEAST OPEN TO HOW TO BE JUST AND FAIR IN THAT DISCUSSION.

I'M NOT TERRIFICALLY INTERESTED IN PURSUING ANY OF THE OTHERS AT THIS POINT.

SO THAT'S MY OPINION.

>> COUNCILOR ZELENKA?

>> YEAH.

I AGREE THAT THE FIRE CHIEF IS PROBLEMATIC, AND THAT THAT ONE PROBABLY NEEDS TO BE CHANGED.

I'M IN FAVOR OF THAT BEING A RADIUS AROUND SPRINGFIELD AND EUGENE.

AS FOR OTHER DEPARTMENT HEADS, I'M IN FAVOR OF MORE OF A HYBRID MODE.

IF IT'S AN EXISTING PERSON BEING PROMOTED, THEY ALREADY LIVE IN THIS AREA, THEY HAVE A HOUSE, IT'S NOT IN THE CITY OF EUGENE, I'M IN FAVOR OF A RADIUS FOR EXISTING POSITIONS BEING PROMOTED INTO THAT.

BUT IF IT'S SOMEONE FROM THE OUTSIDE OF THIS COMMUNITY, THAT'S MOVING HERE, I THINK WE SHOULD HAVE A REQUIREMENT THAT THEY LIVE WITHIN THE CITY OF EUGENE.

BUT I DON'T WANT TO SEE SOMEONE MOVE BECAUSE THEY GOT A PROMOTION.

THAT DOESN'T MAKE SENSE TO ME.

SO I'M IN FAVOR OF KIND OF A HYBRID ON THAT ONE.

I'M NOT INTERESTED TOO MUCH IN THE OTHER THREE, ALTHOUGH THE VACANCY ONE -- NO REAL STRONG OPINION ABOUT THAT, ALTHOUGH IT IS SOMEWHAT PROBLEMATIC.

LINDSIE CAN ATTEST TO THIS, THAT IF YOU'RE FILLING A VACANCY, YOU HAVE TO RUN A SERIES OF ELECTIONS AND CAMPAIGNS, POTENTIALLY IN QUICK SUCCESSION, AND MAYBE THAT THE THING THAT WE DO THERE -- AGAIN, I DON'T HAVE A STRONG OPINION -- IS JUST CHANGE THE LENGTH OF TIME BEFORE YOU HAVE TO RUN AGAIN, SO THAT IT'S NOT THAT QUICK SUCCESSION ELECTION AND CAMPAIGN PROCESS THAT WE'VE SEEN WHEN CLAIRE WAS RECALLED.

SO OTHER THAN THAT, THOSE ARE THE FOUR FOR ME.

SYLVAN THANK YOU.

COUNCILOR GROVES, I HAVE YOU NEXT, BUT I JUST WANT TO CHECK THAT OUR TIMER IS RUNNING WITH COUNCIL, AND THAT YOU ALL CAN ALSO SEE THAT.

I WASN'T SURE IF IT RESET BETWEEN OUR FIRST AND SECOND COMMENTS.

IF IT DID, MY APOLOGIES TO THE BODY, BECAUSE I WOULD HAVE EXTENDED THAT ROUND TO COUNCILOR ZELENKA.

MOVING ON TO COUNCILOR GROVES.

>> THANK YOU, MAYOR.

THANK YOU, JASON, FOR PUTTING THIS BEFORE US IN A VERY CLEAR FASHION.

I HAVE A PROPOSAL FOR THIS.

I CERTAINLY UNDERSTAND WHY THE ESF CHIEF WOULD BE IN A DIFFERENT SETTING, BUT IF WE LOCK OURSELVES IN, IT JUST MAKES A PROBLEM DOWN THE ROAD IF THERE'S ANOTHER SERVICE AREA THAT CHANGES.

HOW ABOUT JUST SAY THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT IS FOR THE SERVICE AREA THAT THAT DEPARTMENT SERVES?

THEN IT WOULD STILL HAVE SOME PARAMETERS.

I THINK THERE IS SOME BENEFIT TO LIVING IN AN AREA THAT YOU'RE CHARGED WITH SERVING, BUT AT THE SAME TIME THE WAY IT'S WRITTEN NOW IT REALLY GIVES, AS WE KNOW, NO FLEXIBILITY AT ALL.

AND I THINK THAT NEEDS TO BE REVISITED.

SO I CAN -- I'D BE FINE WITH B, BUT I THINK IT WOULD BE BETTER JUST TO MAKE IT FOR ALL SERVICE AREAS.

THANK YOU.

>> AND CITY MANAGER, DID YOU WANT TO JUMP IN OR WAIT TILL THE END OF THE ROUND?

THANK YOU.

>> YES, KASHINSKY?

>> I'D LIKE TO REMOVE THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT, ESPECIALLY THAT THE OTHER PLACES DIDN'T INCLUDE A RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT IN THEIR CHARTER.

I'D BE RELUCTANT TO COME UP WITH COMPLEX SYSTEMS FOR HOW WE NAVIGATE THIS IN THE CHARTER.

IT SEEMS LIKE THIS IS SOMETHING THAT WOULD BE MORE APPROPRIATELY REGULATED VIA AN ORDINANCE AS OPPOSED TO IN THE CHARTER, TRYING TO WORK OUT.

SO I'D BE FINE WITH JUST REMOVING IT.

I'D BE FINE WITH REMOVING THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT FROM THE CHARTER AND PUTTING IT INTO AN ORDINANCE.

I WOULD NOT BE FINE TRYING TO REPLACE THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT WITH SOMETHING MORE NUANCED OR DIFFERENT WITHOUT A DIFFERENT FORUM FOR DISCUSSION OF WHAT THAT SHOULD BE.

THANKS.

>> COUNCILOR EVANS.

>> LET ME UNMUTE MYSELF.

WHAT I CAN SAY IS THAT I TOTALLY AGREE WITH WHERE COUNCILOR KASHINSKY IS COMING FROM.

I LIKE THE IDEA OF HAVING THE FLEXIBILITY OF PUTTING IT IN THE ORDINANCE VERSUS THE CHARTER.

CHARTERS ARE HARDER TO CHANGE THAN ORDINANCES ARE.

GIVEN OUR CURRENT SITUATION, MAYBE FUTURE SITUATION, WITH HOUSING AVAILABILITY AND, YOU KNOW, TYPE OF PROPERTY THAT SOMEBODY MIGHT BE LOOKING FOR, I WANT TO HAVE -- I WANT TO HAVE THAT FLEXIBILITY BUILT IN TO THIS PARTICULAR PROCESS, AND NOT HAVE IT MEMORIALIZED?

THE CHARTER.

WITH THAT BEING SAID, I TOTALLY AGREE WITH COUNCILOR KASHINSKY.

>> COUNCILOR KEATING.

>> THANK YOU, MAYOR.

MY HEAD'S IN THE SAME PLACE AS COUNCILOR EVANS AND COUNCILOR KASHINSKY.

I'M SUPPORTIVE OF AN INDEPENDENT COMMUNITY-DRIVEN COMMISSION TO PROVIDE THE OVERSIGHT TO MAKE THE PROPER RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS IN REGARDS TO EQUITABLE COMPENSATION FOR COUNCIL AND MAYOR.

IT'S WOEFULLY INADEQUATE AND FRANKLY SHOULD BE RIGHT-SIZED TO BE SOMEWHERE NEAR THE MEDIAN INCOME FOR THE COMMUNITY.

SO I APPRECIATE THAT RECOMMENDATION IN PARTICULAR.

I DO THINK THAT RESIDENCY SHOULD NOT BE A BARRIER TO EMPLOYMENT.

FRANKLY THE ONLY EIGHT OR NINE OF US, INCLUDING THE MAYOR, SHOULD HAVE THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT.

WE SHOULD REMOVE THAT AS A BARRIER AND RECOGNIZE THAT THE EUGENE/SPRINGFIELD AND BROADER COMMUNITY, WHETHER IT'S SOUTH TO CRESWELL, OR WHETHER IT'S OUT WEST TO ELMIRA, NOR TO COBURG OR JUNCTION CITY, WE ARE ONE COMMUNITY, AND TO DISCOURAGE FOLKS FROM APPLYING JUST BECAUSE THEY DON'T LIVE IN SAID COMMUNITY, OR MANDATE THAT THEY DO LIVE HERE IF THEY DO SECURE EMPLOYMENT WITH OUR COMMUNITY, WITH OUR CITY, IS A POTENTIAL BARRIER THAT I WOULD LIKE TO -
- I WOULD LIKE TO SEE REMOVED FROM OUR PROCESSES.

SO I'M IN FAVOR OF EXPLORING ALL -- AND FOR THE AFOREMENTIONED PIECES ABOUT MAKING THOSE CHANGES EASIER AS REFERENCED -- OH, I'M OVER.

I'LL STOP.

APOLOGIES.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILOR.

MY APOLOGY TO THE BODY AND THIS FORMAT HAVING TO ADAPT TO A DIFFERENT INTERFACE.

I CANNOT SEE THE CLOCK.

PLEASE KEEP YOUR EYES ON THAT IF YOU CAN SEE IT.

COUNCILOR YEH.

>> THANK YOU, MAYOR.

NO NEED TO APOLOGIZE.

YOU'RE DOING FANTASTIC.

WE'RE ALL ADAPTING TO TECHNOLOGY ALL THE TIME.

I JUST WANT TO SAY I'M ALSO IN AGREEMENT ABOUT THE RESIDENCY.

I DON'T THINK IT'S SOMETHING I WOULD LIKE TO KEEP AROUND.

I SEE NO REASON.

COUNCILOR KEATING WAS SAYING SOMEONE LIVING IN JUNCTION CITY CAN'T FULLY REPRESENT EUGENE IN THEIR JOB, THEY'RE ARTIFICIAL BOUNDARIES, IN MY OPINION, AND I WOULD NOT TO LIMIT THE ABILITY TO KEEP A GOOD CANDIDATE BECAUSE THEY HAPPEN TO LIVE IN SLIGHTLY THE WRONG AREA.

THAT'S THE ONE I THINK THAT IS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO TAKE CARE OF RIGHT NOW.

THANKS.

>> COUNCILOR LEECH.

>> THANK YOU, MAYOR.

I AGREE.

I WOULD LIKE TO SEE US REMOVING THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT.

I'D BE HAPPY TO PUT IT INTO AN ORDINANCE AT SOME POINT, IF THAT WAS THE MAJORITY OF FOLKS' OPINION, BUT I THINK REMOVING IT ENTIRELY IS APPROPRIATE.

AND I WOULD NOT MIND TAKING A LOOK AT A CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR OUR COMPENSATION.

MORE SO LOOKING AT, LIKE, EVEN SOME OF THE OPERATING AGREEMENTS.

I THINK SARAH IS AT ANOTHER WORK SESSION THAT WILL BE TALKING ABOUT OPERATING AGREEMENTS -- OKAY, I SEE A NOD.

EVEN THOUGH I WAS INCREDIBLY IMPACTED BY THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE VACANCY, AND ALL THE ELECTIONS INVOLVED IN THAT, I DON'T THINK WE SHOULD BE PURSUING THAT AT THIS TIME.

SO YEAH, THAT'S MY TIME IS UP.

THANK YOU.

>> COUNCILOR ZELENKA.

>> I THINK THERE ACTUALLY IS A CASE TO BE MADE FOR DEPARTMENT HEADS, WHICH ARE HAVING TO LIVE IN THE CITY, IF THEY'RE MOVING HERE.

I DON'T WANT TO SEE PEOPLE MOVE, BUT IF YOU'RE -- AND IF YOU DID A MILEAGE RADIUS, SAY IF YOU DID WITHIN 25 MILES, SO THE FIX WITHIN THAT MILEAGE RADIUS.

BUT IF YOU'RE NEW, YOU'RE MOVING HERE, I THINK THERE'S A CASE TO BE MADE FOR -- AND I WOULD LIKE TO SEE US ADOPT -- THAT IF YOU'RE GOING TO MOVE HERE, AND YOU'RE GOING TO BE SERVING THE CITY OF EUGENE, YOU'RE GOING TO BE WORKING HERE, YOU'RE GOING TO BE USING THE SERVICES, THAT YOU LIVE IN THE CITY.

AND THAT MIGHT BE A LITTLE BIT CONSTRICTING, BUT FOR NEW PEOPLE I DON'T THINK IT'S THAT CONSTRICTING.

I THINK THAT MAKES SENSE.

I'D RATHER NOT SEE PEOPLE MOVE IF THEY GET PROMOTED, BUT HAVING SOMEONE MOVE HERE --

>> COUNCILOR.

>> -- AS A DEPARTMENT HEAD, MOVE TO COTTAGE GROVE, DOESN'T MAKE SENSE TO ME.

>> COUNCILORS, I CAN NOW SEE THE TIMER.

I'M GOING TO BE ABLE TO KEEP CLOSER TRACK.

WE HAVE COUNCILOR CLARK AND COUNCILOR EVANS, AND THEN ASK THE CITY MANAGER TO OFFER COMMENTS THAT SHE HAS.

COUNCILOR CLARK.

>> THANK YOU, MAYOR.

I JUST WANT TO SING THE VIRTUES OF OUR CURRENT FIRE CHIEF TO SAY THAT HE DID IN FACT MOVE FROM COTTAGE GROVE TO EUGENE IN ORDER TO BECOME FIRE CHIEF.

I ASSISTED HIM WITH THAT, AND I WAS HAPPY TO.

MY QUESTION IS FOR JASON AND/OR KATHERINE.

I'M NOT SURE.

IF THERE ARE MULTIPLE CHANGES, IF WE AGREE TO CHANGE MORE THAN ONE OF THESE ITEMS, THE QUESTION IS WOULD WE NEED TO HAVE ALL OF THOSE CHANGES COVERED IN ONE QUESTION ON THE BALLOT OR WOULD IT BE MULTIPLE QUESTIONS FOR MULTIPLE VOTES ON THE BALLOT?

>> IT WOULD BE MULTIPLE QUESTIONS.

THERE WOULD BE MULTIPLE BALLOT ITEMS, BECAUSE YOU COULD VERY MUCH HAVE A SITUATION WHERE SOMEONE WOULD WANT TO VOTE YES ON ONE AND NO ON ANOTHER.

YOU WOULD ABSOLUTELY HAVE SEPARATE RESOLUTIONS, AND SEPARATE BALLOT TITLES.

>> EXACTLY THE REASON FOR MY QUESTION.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

MY FEELINGS WOULD BE -- ARE SUCH THAT I WOULD BE WILLING TO ALTER TO CONSIDER A RADIUS OR AS RANDY SUGGESTED, BUT I DON'T FEEL THAT STRONGLY ABOUT IT ONE WAY OR ANOTHER.

THANK YOU.

>> COUNCILOR EVANS.

>> I JUST WANT TO POINT OUT ONE THING HERE.

SEVERAL YEARS AGO, IT HASN'T BEEN THAT LONG AGO, I HAD A HIRE THAT CAME IN FROM OUTSIDE OF THE COMMUNITY, AND THIS PERSON COULD NOT FIND HOUSING IN EUGENE OR SPRINGFIELD THAT MET HIS FINANCIAL NEEDS.

HE ENDED UP GETTING A PLACE IN CRESWELL, AND THEN LATER MOVING INTO EUGENE/SPRINGFIELD AREA, THE METRO AREA.

BUT I WOULD RATHER HAVE THIS DONE IN ORDINANCE RATHER THAN DONE BY THE CHARTER, SO THAT WE CAN HAVE THAT FLEXIBILITY WHEN PEOPLE WE'RE HIRING COME IN FROM OUTSIDE THE COMMUNITY, OR EVEN INSIDE THE COMMUNITY, AND HAVE A TOUGH TIME FINDING RENTAL HOUSING OR PERMANENT HOUSING IN THE COMMUNITY.

SO, YOU KNOW, WHEN WE'RE READY TO MOVE FORWARD, I'M READY TO MOVE FORWARD WITH A MOTION SUPPORTING PUTTING THIS INTO ORDINANCE.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILOR.

CITY MANAGER, I SEE COUNCILOR GROVES HAS ONE MORE ROUND, AND THEN I'LL COME TO YOU FOR A QUESTION, AND THEN RECAP WHERE WE ARE ON THE FIRST PRIORITY TOPIC OF THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT.

>> THANK YOU, MAYOR.

I SPOKE EARLIER ABOUT, YOU KNOW, MY SUGGESTION THAT MAYBE WE LOOK AT SERVICE AREA AS OPPOSED TO CITY, BUT I ALSO DIDN'T ADDRESS THE CHARTER VERSUS ORDINANCE.

I THINK THIS -- I AGREE WITH THE SENTIMENT OF MOVING THIS OUT OF THE CITY CHARTER.

I DON'T THINK THIS NEEDS TO BE THERE.

IF WE FEEL STRONGLY ABOUT DEFINING AN AREA THAT'S ACCEPTABLE, THEN I THINK THAT THAT COULD BE PLACED INTO ORDINANCE.

THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU.

CITY MANAGER, DO YOU WANT TO ANSWER A QUESTION AND --

>> NO, I WASN'T GOING TO ANSWER A QUESTION.

I WAS JUST GOING TO OFFER MY OPINION SINCE I GET TO DO THAT SOMETIMES.

I THINK THIS IS A REAL -- THIS IS AN ANTIQUATED WAY TO ESTABLISH THIS.

IT PUTS EUGENE AT A COMPETITIVE DISADVANTAGE.

IT'S GOING TO GET WORSE AND WORSE AND WORSE AS TIME GOES ON.

WE HAVE REAL LIVE EXAMPLES OF EXECs ON OUR TEAM THAT HAVE HAD TO SELL AND UPROOT THEIR FAMILIES TO MOVE INTO THE CITY AT GREAT COSTS TO THEMSELVES.

I'M SURPRISED THEY DID IT.

WE'VE ALSO HAD CANDIDATES THAT HAVE NOT BEEN ABLE TO COMPETE THAT LIVE IN THE AREA, NOT IN EUGENE, THAT ARE OTHER VERY QUALIFIED CANDIDATES THAT MAY LIVE IN SPRINGFIELD OR COTTAGE GROVE, AND HAVE NOT BEEN ABLE TO APPLY OR COME TO THIS JOB.

SO I JUST THINK, YOU KNOW, IF YOU WANT TO PUT IT IN ORDINANCE, THAT'S FINE, BUT I THINK IT'S A REAL PROBLEM TO HAVE SEVEN EMPLOYEES OF ALL OF YOUR EMPLOYEES HAVE THAT REQUIREMENT.

>> THANK YOU.

COUNCILOR ZELENKA?

>> YES.

QUICK QUESTION.

MAYBE SOMEONE CAN OUTLINE THE PROCESS OF PUTTING SOMETHING INTO ORDINANCE AND TAKING IT OUT OF THE CHARTER.

SO YOU HAVE TO DO A BALLOT MEASURE.

THEN YOU HAVE TO DO THE PUBLIC HEARING ON AROUND ORDINANCE AND CREATE THAT, PROVIDED IT PASSES.

CORRECT?

>> THAT IS CORRECT.

ONCE IT'S REMOVED FROM THE CHARTER, WHETHER YOU ULTIMATELY DECIDE TO MOVE IT TO ORDINANCE WOULD BE ENTIRELY WITHIN YOUR PURVIEW.

YOU COULD HAVE IT REMOVED TO CHARTER, AND THEN SAY, YOU KNOW WHAT, WE'RE GOING TO LEAVE IT AS NO REQUIREMENT AT ALL.

AND JUST INTEND AT A LATER DATE, IF YOU WANTED TO LOOK AT AN ORDINANCE.

OR YOU COULD DO IT CONSECUTIVELY.

IT'S WITHIN YOUR DISCRETION.

>> IF YOU HAD A RADIUS, IF SOMEONE IS MOVING HERE FROM OUT OF STATE, OR SOMEPLACE, THAT WOULD BE DIFFERENT, I THINK, AND SHOULD BE CONSIDERED.

I DON'T CARE IF IT'S IN THE ORDINANCE OR CHARTER.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCIL.

JUST TO BRIEFLY RECAP ON THE FIRST PRIORITY TOPIC, THE MAJORITY OF THE BODY HAS EXPRESSED AN INTEREST IN REMOVING THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT FROM THE CHARTER.

THERE'S SOME DISCUSSION ABOUT THE NEXT STEPS, AND WHETHER OR NOT THAT WOULD BE ADOPTED INTO AN ORDINANCE.

THAT WOULD GIVE US A PATH IN TERMS OF DIRECTION TODAY.

AND COUNCIL PRESIDENT, I WILL TURN TO YOU TO PUT A MOTION ON THE TABLE.

>> THANK YOU, MAYOR.

THE CITY MANAGER DRAFT A RESOLUTION AND SCHEDULE A WORK SESSION ON DEPARTMENT HEAD RESIDENCE RESIDENCY, TO REMOVE THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT FROM THE CHARTER, TO REMOVE THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT ONLY FOR THE EUGENE/SPRINGFIELD FIRE CHIEF, I BELIEVE THAT'S RIGHT, WE'VE GOT ESF IN THIS, TO AMEND THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT TO ADD A MILEAGE RADIUS --

>> COUNCILOR EVANS, THESE ARE ORS.

>> OH, ORS, OKAY.

>> THE A, B, C AND D ARE ORS.

>> GOT YOU.

I'M GOING TO EDIT THIS.

>> OKAY.

>> SO TO GO BACK, I'M NOT GOING WITH C, REMOVING THE MILEAGE -- AMEND THE RESIDENCY AMENDMENT TO ADD MILEAGE RADIUS, I'M NOT GOING TO PUT THAT IN, BUT TO REMOVE THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT FROM THE CHARTER AND PUT INTO ORDINANCE.

SO THOSE THREE THINGS.

REMOVE THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT FROM THE CHARTER.

TO REMOVE THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT ONLY FOR EUGENE/SPRINGFIELD FIRE CHIEF -- DO WE REALLY NEED THAT, CITY ATTORNEY?

>> NO.

I WOULD RECOMMEND THAT YOU PICK ONE OF THE FOUR TO PUT ON THE TABLE.

>> OKAY.

I GOT THAT.

I GOT IT.

>> OKAY.

>> OKAY.

SO THE ONE THAT I'M PICKING IS REMOVE THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT FROM THE CHARTER AND PUT IT INTO ORDINANCE.

>> SECOND.

>> IS THAT HELPFUL?

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILOR.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION?

COUNCILOR YEH.

>> YEAH.

SO I'M TOTALLY IN FAVOR OF REMOVING THE RESIDENCY, BUT I'M NOT THRILLED ABOUT -- I WOULD JUST LIKE TO GET RID OF IT.

SO DOES THIS REQUIRE -- DOES THIS MOTION REQUIRE US TO THEN CREATE AN ORDINANCE?

IT KIND OF SOUNDS LIKE IT.

>> IT DEFINITELY -- IT SAYS -- I MEAN, YOU COULD AMEND THE MOTION JUST TO SAY, MAYBE A FRIENDLY THAT SAYS, AND CONSIDER PUTTING IT INTO ORDINANCE.

>> I COULD LIVE WITH THAT.

>> I'M GOOD WITH THAT.

>> IS THE SECOND ACCEPTABLE?

>> YES.

>> PERFECT.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILORS.

COUNCILOR CLARK.

>> JUST A QUESTION FOR CLARITY, WAS THAT JUST THE SF, OR ALL EXECUTIVES OR --

>> ALL.

>> RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT IN GENERAL.

THE MOTION ITSELF, GREG, WAS THAT --

>> IN GENERAL.

THAT WOULD BE FOR ALL.

>> THANK YOU, THANK YOU.

>> COUNCILOR KEATING.

>> THANK YOU, MAYOR.

THIS QUESTION IS FOR COUNCIL PRESIDENT.

COUNCILOR EVANS, DO YOU INTEND TO ALSO MAKE A SECOND MOTION TO -- THAT REVOLVES AROUND LANGUAGE REVIEW AND MAYOR AND COUNCIL COMPENSATION?

>> THAT WILL BE OUR NEXT TOPIC FOR DISCUSSION, I BELIEVE.

>> YES.

WE'RE STILL MOVING, COUNCILOR KEATING, WE'RE STILL MOVING TO THOSE DISCUSSION TOPICS.

>> YEAH, GREAT.

I DIDN'T WANT US TO TAKE ONE ACTION AND LEAVE THE OTHERS ON THE TABLE.

SO GREAT.

>> WE'RE NOT CO-MINGLING ANYTHING.

>> THANK YOU ALL.

WE HAVE A MOTION TO REMOVE THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT FROM THE CHARTER AND CONSIDER PUTTING IT INTO ORDINANCE AT A FUTURE DATE.

THAT HAS BEEN SECONDED.

ANY LAST OR ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION FROM COUNCIL ON THIS ITEM?

SEEING NONE, I'LL TAKE A VOTE.

ALL IN FAVOR -- THIS MAY TAKE ME A MOMENT, BECAUSE I'M REARRANGING ON MY SCREEN.

COUNCILOR KEATING?

>> I'M TRYING.

I'M A YAY.

>> THE MOTION PASSES BY A VOTE OF 8-0.

THANK YOU SO MUCH.

THANK YOU, STAFF, FOR HELPING US TO KEEP TRACK.

MOVING ON TO THE SECOND PRIORITY TOPIC, THE LANGUAGE REVIEW, SIMILARLY WE HAVE DIFFERENT OPTIONS, ONE TO PURSUE TO REQUEST ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, ONE TO PURSUE AMENDMENTS, AND ONE NOT TO PURSUING CHANGES.

IF I'M ON THE RIGHT PAGE IN MY OWN DOCUMENTS.

ANY DISCUSSION FROM COUNCIL?

>> THANK YOU.

I SEE COUNCILOR KASHINSKY WAVING HER HAND.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILOR KASHINSKY.

>> YES.

SO THANK YOU.

THE ANTIQUATED LANGUAGE SEEMS PRETTY STRAIGHTFORWARD.

IF WE'RE GOING THROUGH ALL OF THE WORK OF PUTTING SOMETHING ON THE BALLOT ANYWAY, MIGHT AS WELL KIND OF DO SOME OF THAT CLEANUP AT THE SAME TIME.

THE OTHER TWO, THE CONSISTENCY AND LEVEL OF DETAIL, AND INCLUDING CORE SERVICES, THOSE SEEM TO GO BEYOND BASIC LANGUAGE REVIEW TO ME.

THOSE ARE -- FEEL MORE SUBSTANTIVE.

I WOULDN'T BE INTERESTED IN MOVING THOSE FORWARD WITHOUT A MORE THOROUGH DISCUSSION, INCLUDING CITIZEN REVIEW AND THINGS LIKE THAT.

SO THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILOR.

COUNCILOR LEECH.

>> I AGREE WITH COUNCILOR KASHINSKY.

IF WE ARE PUTTING SOMETHING ON THE BALLOT, LET'S CLEAN UP THE LANGUAGE, BUT I'M NOT AT THIS POINT -- SO FOR NUMBER A.

I'M NOT INTERESTED IN B OR C AT THIS TIME.

>> OTHER DISCUSSION FROM COUNCIL?

COUNCILOR GROVES.

>> THANK YOU, MAYOR.

YEAH, I THINK 2A IS A NO-BRAINER.

AS FAR AS CONSISTENCY, LEVEL OF DETAIL, AND INCLUDING CORE SERVICES, I'M FINE COMING AT THIS FROM A DIFFERENT DIRECTION, BUT I THINK PART OF THE PROBLEM WE HAVE NOW IS EVERYTHING IS NUMBER ONE ON THE PRIORITY LIST.

WE HAVE NO SET OF PRIORITIES TO FOLLOW.

AND I THINK THAT MAKES IT VERY DIFFICULT WHEN WE COME FOR BUDGET REDUCTIONS, AND OTHER THINGS.

I MEAN, AT SOME POINT WE'RE GOING TO HAVE THIS DISCUSSION.

I'M LESS CONCERNED WITH WHERE THAT DISCUSSION IS AND WHERE IT ENDS UP.

AS PART OF ONE OF OUR OPERATING DOCUMENTS.

THANK YOU.

>> COUNCILOR ZELENKA.

>> YEAH.

I DON'T UNDERSTAND WHAT REMOVING THE ANTIQUATED LANGUAGE WOULD DO.

SO I DON'T KNOW WHAT I WOULD BE VOTING FOR.

IT'S NOT SPECIFIC ENOUGH FOR ME.

COULD SOMEONE EXPLAIN THAT BETTER?

JASON, SARAH?

>> IT MAY BE THAT YOU NEED MORE DETAILED MOTION LANGUAGE.

WHAT CAME UP IN COUNCIL DISCUSSION WERE REFERENCES TO HE AND SHE GENDER PRONOUNS, AND BROADENING THOSE TO SORT OF MATCH -- RECENTLY WHAT OTHER CITIES HAVE DONE.

SO KIND OF CLEANING UP THAT LANGUAGE WAS THE PRIMARY THING.

SO YEAH, MAYBE THE MOTION ISN'T AROUND ANTIQUATED LANGUAGE -- THE ACTUAL RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE CHARTER WOULD SAY SOMETHING MORE SPECIFIC ABOUT WHAT YOU WOULD BE DOING.

>> LIKE GETTING RID OF HIS AND HER?

>> RIGHT.

>> WHAT WOULD IT CHANGE TO?

>> IT WOULD INCLUDE THAT AS WELL.

IN MANY CASES IT WOULD BE CHOOSING GENDER NEUTRAL PRONOUNS LIKE THEY OR THEIRS.

>> OKAY.

>> COUNCILOR CLARK?

>> THANK YOU, MAYOR.

I FEEL VERY STRONGLY AS COUNCILOR GROVES DOES THAT WE SHOULD -- THAT IT IS A GOOD IDEA FOR US TO HAVE THE COMMUNITY SPEAK ABOUT WHAT -- WHAT WE INCLUDE IN THE IDEA OF CORE SERVICES, BECAUSE WE WILL HAVE DIFFICULT CHOICES MOVING FORWARD.

I JUST THINK THAT IT'S POSSIBLE, RATHER THAN PUTTING SOMETHING IN THE CHARTER, THAT THE COMMUNITY SENTIMENT OF CORE SERVICES MAY CHANGE WITH TIME, WHERE A CHARTER IS DESIGNED INTENTIONALLY NOT TO CHANGE OVER TIME.

SO I'D RATHER GET THAT INFORMATION BY MEANS OF SURVEY WORK, I SUPPOSE, THAN I WOULD BY MEANS OF CEMENTING IT INTO THE CHARTER FOR ALL TIMES.

SO I WOULD PROBABLY BE LESS IN FAVOR OF DOING THAT.

AND ON -- THE ANTIQUATED KNOWLEDGE THING HAS -- I HAVE A SIMILAR FEEL FOR THAT.

I UNDERSTAND THE REASONS WHY THERE ARE MANY PEOPLE WHO WOULD WANT TO CHANGE THE KNOWLEDGE.

MY SENTIMENT IS, IS THAT THIS IS A PERMANENT DOCUMENT, AND, OKAY, MAYBE, YOU KNOW, CREATING A MORE NEUTRAL LANGUAGE IS A GOOD IDEA.

I'M AMBIVALENT ON IT, BUT I DON'T KNOW THAT I WANT TO PERMANENTLY PUT IN THE CHARTER WHAT ARE CORE SERVICES AND WHAT ARE NOT.

THANK YOU.

>> CITY MANAGER.

>> YEAH.

TWO QUICK THINGS.

ULBE, AS PART OF YOUR LONG-TERM STABILITY CONVERSATION AND WORKSHOP, YOU DO HAVE ACTUALLY AN AREA IN YOUR FINANCIAL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES MANUAL, WHICH WE DON'T REVISIT VERY OFTEN, THAT DOES SAY WHAT THE CITY'S PRIORITIES AND FUNDING SHOULD BE.

SO YOU'LL HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO RELOOK AT THAT AND GET COMMUNITY FEEDBACK IF YOU'D LIKE.

I WOULD SAY THE LANGUAGE PIECE, I THINK AS WE LOOKED AROUND THE COUNTRY, AS WE HEARD FROM YOU, LOOKED AROUND THE COUNTRY, THERE CERTAINLY ARE CITIES WHERE THERE WAS STILL A LOT OF LANGUAGE THAT HAD RACE IMPLICATIONS, GENDER IMPLICATIONS AND THINGS, AND WE WANT TO MAKE SURE, I THINK WHAT WE HEARD FROM YOU, LET'S MAKE SURE THAT'S NOT IN THERE.

IT COULD BE REALLY SIMPLE, NOT A BIG COMPLEX PROCESS.

>> THANK YOU, CITY MANAGER.

COUNCIL.

, I'LL TURN TO YOU FOR A MOTION.

I'VE HEARD A LOT OF CONSISTENCY FROM COUNCIL AROUND AMENDING TO ADDRESS THE LANGUAGE UPDATES.

I JUST SEE THAT COUNCILOR ZELENKA HAS RAISED HIS HAND.

JUST ONE MOMENT.

COUNCILOR ZELENKA?

[UNINTELLIGIBLE]

>> MINE WAS A DIFFERENT TOPIC.

I DON'T WANT TO SOMETHING ON THE BALLOT, WHERE THE ONLY THING ON THE BALLOT, COSTS US \$60,000 TO DO IT.

MAKE SURE WE DO IT WHEN IT'S LOW COST, BUT THAT'S DIFFERENT.

>> THANK YOU.

COUNCILOR PRESIDENT, WOULD YOU PLEASE PUT A MOTION FORWARD.

>> ALL RIGHT.

THANK YOU, MAYOR.

MOVE TO DIRECT THE CITY MANAGER TO DRAFT A RESOLUTION AND SCHEDULE A WORK SESSION ON LANGUAGE REVIEW TO ADDRESS ANTIQUATED LANGUAGE.

>> SECOND.

>> THERE'S A SECOND.

ANY FURTHER DISCUSSION FROM COUNCIL?

SEEING NONE, I'LL NOW TAKE A VOTE FOR THIS MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSES WITH A VOTE OF 8-0.

THANK YOU, COUNCIL.

MOVING ON TO OUR THIRD TOPIC, BUT ALSO I WANT TO NOTE THAT WE WERE AWARE THAT TODAY'S AGENDA IS VERY FULL WITH SOME DETAILED WORK, AND ALSO AN IMPORTANT UPDATE AS OUR SECOND AGENDA ITEM ON FIRE GOVERNANCE, AND WE COULD SPEND A FEW MORE MINUTES DISCUSSING THE TWO REMAINING PRIORITY TOPICS OR WE COULD BREAK AT THIS POINT AND MOVE OVER TO DISCUSS THE EUGENE/SPRINGFIELD GOVERNANCE.

MY SENSE IS THAT THERE MAY BE -- I NEVER WANT TO PRESUME THE AMOUNT OF DISCUSSION THAT COUNCIL WILL WANT TO HAVE ABOUT EITHER OF THESE TWO REMAINING ISSUES.

WE DID HEAR SOME FEEDBACK OF INTEREST IN THE FIRST ROUND, BUT I WOULD BE WILLING TO PAUSE OUR DISCUSSION AT THIS POINT WITH THE FEEDBACK WE HAVE, AND COME BACK.

CITY MANAGER, DO YOU HAVE A PREFERENCE?

>> MAYOR, I DON'T HAVE A PRESENTATION FOR THE FIRE GOVERNANCE.

I'M JUST GIVING AN UPDATE, LETTING PEOPLE KNOW WHAT WE'LL DO THIS FALL.

YOU COULD PROBABLY SPEND ANOTHER 10 MINUTES FOR SURE.

>> OKAY.

COUNCIL, WITH 10 MORE MINUTES, LET'S MOVE ON TO THE THIRD OF THESE PRIORITY TOPICS, WHICH IS MAYOR AND COUNCIL COMPENSATION.

STAFF, THANK YOU FOR PUTTING THE SLIDE OF THOSE OPTIONS, OPTION ONE TO DIRECT ADDITIONAL RESEARCH, OPTION TWO TO PURSUE AMENDMENTS AND BRING BACK DELIBERATION, AND OPTION THREE TO NOT PURSUE CHARTER AMENDMENTS ON THIS TOPIC.

I SEE COUNCILOR KASHINSKY.

>> I'M NOT INTERESTED IN PURSUING CHARTER AMENDMENTS ON THIS TOPIC AT THIS TIME.

THANKS.

>> THANK YOU.

COUNCILOR CLARK?

>> I WAS INTERESTED IN BEING OPEN TO THE DISCUSSION UP FRONT, AND PROBABLY WOULD STILL BE WILLING TO HAVE THE DISCUSSION, HOWEVER I CAN'T SEE THE WISDOM OF MOVING FORWARD WITH PUTTING A QUESTION TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC BECAUSE MY BELIEF IS THE ANSWER WOULD BE, OH, HECK NO.

OKAY?

I THINK WE ENDANGER THE OTHER THINGS WE PUT ON THE BALLOT TO THE DEGREE THAT WE EVEN ASK THE QUESTION.

I WOULD ENCOURAGE MY COLLEAGUES NOT TO PUT THE QUESTION ON THE BALLOT AT THIS TIME.

THANK YOU.

>> COUNCILOR GROVES.

>> THANK YOU, MAYOR.

I AGREE WITH BOTH COUNCILOR CLARK AND COUNCILOR KASHINSKY.

I JUST DON'T THINK NOW IS THE TIME TO EVEN BE HAVING THIS DISCUSSION, GIVEN OUR FINANCIAL SITUATION AND KNOWING THAT THERE ARE MORE CHALLENGES BEFORE US.

THANK YOU.

>> COUNCILOR EVANS?

>> GIVEN THE TENOR OF THE CONVERSATION, I'M READY TO MOVE FORWARD WITH A MOTION.

NOT TO PURSUE.

>> THANK YOU.

COUNCILOR PRESIDENT, I'LL BE WITH YOU IN JUST A MOMENT.

COUNCILOR KEATING.

>> THANKS, MAYOR.

I WOULD JUST INDICATE THOSE ARE COMMENTS FROM THREE COUNCILORS.

THE REST OF US HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO WEIGH IN.

I VEHEMENTLY, RESPECTFULLY, DISAGREE WITH THE SENTIMENTS OR STATEMENTS THAT MY COLLEAGUES HAVE MADE.

THIS IS A MATTER OF PARITY.

IF WE WANT TO SEE A DIVERSE ARRAY OF PEOPLE RUNNING FOR OFFICE, THEN AT ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT THAT PUBLIC SERVICE NEEDS TO BE FAIRLY AND EQUITABLY ALLOCATED.

IT'S WOEFULLY INADEQUATE, AND IT'S EMBARRASSINGLY LOW.

I ENCOURAGE MY COLLEAGUES TO AT LEAST ADVANCE THE CONVERSATION TO PUT IT TO -- ULTIMATELY TO A VOTE OF THE PUBLIC.

I THINK YOU WOULD FIND YOURSELF PLEASANTLY SURPRISED IN THIS PROGRESSIVE COMMUNITY THAT FAIR AND EQUITABLE COMPENSATION FOR ELECTED OFFICIALS IS AN APPROPRIATE ASK AND AN APPROPRIATE ACTION.

>> I SEE COUNCILOR YEH, COUNCILOR LEECH.

COUNCILOR YEH?

>> YEAH.

I DON'T DISAGREE WITH COUNCILOR KEATING.

>> I THINK WE MAY HAVE LOST YOU.

>> I DO THINK THAT -- OH.

CAN YOU HEAR ME?

>> COUNCILOR YEH, YOU MAY NEED TO TURN OFF YOUR VIDEO.

YOU'RE BREAKING UP A LITTLE BIT.

WE CAN HEAR YOU.

>> OKAY.

IS IT WORKING NOW?

>> YES.

THANKS MUCH BETTER.

THANK YOU.

>> OKAY.

SO I AGREE THAT THERE ARE MANY BARRIERS TO PEOPLE RUNNING.

THE IDEA THAT ANYONE CAN RUN FOR CITY COUNCIL AND DO THIS JOB IS NOT ACCURATE.

THERE ARE MANY PEOPLE THAT WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO DO THIS, AND ALSO HOLD A JOB TO BE ABLE TO PAY THEIR RENT AND BASIC NEEDS.

SO I DO THINK IT'S A CONVERSATION WE NEED TO HAVE.

I DON'T KNOW IF IT'S -- I THINK IT'S A LARGER CONVERSATION, THOUGH, THAN JUST ABOUT COMPENSATION.

I'M NOT SURE IF THIS IS THE WAY TO DO IT, BUT I'M INTERESTED IN WHAT OTHER FOLKS THINK.

>> COUNCILOR LEECH.

>> THANK YOU, MAYOR.

I DO AGREE WITH COUNCILOR KEATING.

PART OF THAT IS BECAUSE OF A LOT OF THE COMMUNICATION THAT I'VE GOTTEN FROM THE COMMUNITY, FROM MY CONSTITUENTS, ABOUT HOW MUCH EFFORT AND TIME THAT THEY EXPECT AND WANT FOR US TO BE ADDRESSING ALL OF THE CHALLENGES THAT WE ARE SEEING IN OUR COMMUNITY.

TO DO THAT ON A SMALL STIPEND IS VERY DIFFICULT.

IT IS AN EQUITY THING.

IT IS A PARTICIPATION IN GOVERNMENT.

AND SO I WOULD WANT IT TO COME FROM A CITIZEN COMMITTEE.

WHETHER THIS IS A TOPIC THAT WE BRING UP IN THE NEXT ELECTION, OR SOME OTHER TIME, I DO THINK IT'S SOMETHING THAT WE SHOULD BE TALKING ABOUT AND ADDRESSING WITH OUR COMMUNITY, AND WHAT THEIR EXPECTATIONS ARE FOR WHAT WE ARE ABLE TO ACCOMPLISH.

IF THAT'S MOVING TO DIRECT ADDITIONAL STAFF RESEARCH, I WOULD BE WILLING TO PUT THAT FORWARD, OR A NUMBER OF OTHER THINGS, BUT THAT'S KIND OF WHERE I'M SITTING RIGHT NOW.

>> COUNCILOR ZELENKA AND THEN COUNCILOR KASHINSKY.

>> YEAH.

I DON'T THINK IT'S RIGHT FOR PUTTING A MOTION OUT ABOUT THE CHARTER CHANGE, BUT I DON'T HAVE A PROBLEM WITH HAVING STAFF DOING MORE RESEARCH AND BRINGING BACK SOME OTHER OPTIONS TO COUNCIL ABOUT THIS TOPIC, INCLUDING A POTENTIAL ORDINANCE OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT, BUT I THINK IT'S -- IT MERITS A LOT MORE DISCUSSION THAN WHAT WE'RE HAVING RIGHT NOW.

SO PURSUING IT A LITTLE BIT FURTHER IS A GOOD IDEA, BUT I DON'T THINK WE SHOULD PUT IT ON THE CHARTER, ESPECIALLY AT THIS TIME.

>> COUNCILOR KASHINSKY.

>> YES.

I WAS BRIEF TO START WITH, BECAUSE IN THE INTEREST OF TIME, BUT MY JOB, WHICH THAT'S NOT THIS, WHICH WE PRETTY MUCH ALL OF US HAVE, BECAUSE THIS IS NOT A POSITION THAT PAYS A LIVING WAGE, IS SURROUNDING COMPENSATION, HOW MUCH TO COMPENSATE PEOPLE, AND INCLUDES HOW MUCH TO COMPENSATE ELECTED OFFICIALS.

I WOULD SAY THAT PARTICULARLY FOR ELECTED OFFICIALS COMPENSATION WHERE I'VE SEEN THAT HAPPEN, IT'S VERY FREQUENTLY CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEES WILL ADVISE ON RATES, ON METHODOLOGIES, ON THINGS LIKE THAT, ON WHAT EXPECTATIONS ARE, ON WHAT ARE COMPARABLES, IF WE WANT TO PURSUE SOMETHING LIKE THAT, I WOULD BE OPEN TO HEARING WHAT SUCH A GROUP HAS TO SAY, BUT THIS IS NOT AN ISSUE TO PUT ON THE CHARTER RIGHT NOW -- PUT OUT TO THE BALLOT RIGHT NOW.

>> COUNCILOR CLARK.

>> THANK YOU, MAYOR.

IT'S RED LETTER DAY.

I AGREE WITH BOTH ELIZA AND ALAN, THAT THIS IS NOT THE RIGHT TIME TO FOR US TO PUT THIS ON THE -- THE QUESTION OF ALTERING THE CHARTER TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC.

I'D WEE INTERESTED IN FUTURE DISCUSSION OF AN INFORMED COMMITTEE, BRINGING BACK MORE INFORMATION, MAKING IT MORE OF A COMMUNITY CONVERSATION, WHERE OTHERS CAN WEIGH IN.

BUT AT THIS POINT PUTTING IT ON THE BALLOT IS A QUESTION -- IT WOULD BE -- IT WOULD APPEAR, WHETHER IT'S FAIR TO SAY OR NOT -- IT WOULD APPEAR, IN MY OPINION, SELF-SERVING, AT A TIME WHERE WHERE WE ARE FACING SOME POTENTIAL REVENUE CHALLENGES, ADDITIONALLY, TO WHAT WE'VE FACED ALREADY IN THE PAST.

I THINK THERE ARE A LOT OF HARD DECISIONS AHEAD.

IT'S THE WRONG FOR US TO PUT THIS PARTICULAR QUESTION OF CHANGING THE CHARTER ON THE BALLOT.

THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU.

COUNCILOR EVANS.

I'VE HEARD A LOT OF DISCUSSION AROUND THE IDEA OF A FUTURE CONVERSATION AND ENGAGEMENT WITH A CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE, OR REVIEW, AND ALSO NOT INTEREST IN ADVANCING THIS AS A BALLOT QUESTION AT THIS POINT.

I LOOK FOR YOU TO PUT A MOTION FORWARD.

>> MAYOR, I'M NOT SEEING TOTAL CONSENSUS AROUND THIS YET, BUT I THINK THAT HAVING ADDITIONAL STAFF RESEARCH WOULD BE APPROPRIATE IN THIS, BASICALLY BECAUSE I DON'T THINK WE HAVE ENOUGH INFORMATION, COMPARABLES, WHAT OTHER COMMUNITIES AND OTHER CITIES ARE DOING, WHETHER THAT'S WITHIN THE STATE OF OREGON OR NATIONALLY, AND A LOT OF THINGS WILL NOT BE -- IT'S AN APPLES TO ORANGES COMPARISON, BECAUSE WE'RE NOT CHICAGO, WE'RE NOT NEW YORK.

AT THE SAME TIME WE'RE NOT MEDFORD, EITHER.

SO THE SOLUTION TO THIS IS MORE IN I WOULD SAY A CITIZEN COMMITTEE, BUT IN LIEU OF US MAKING THAT DECISION I WOULD MOVE TO DIRECT ADDITIONAL STAFF RESEARCH.

>> SECOND.

>> CAN I SEE CLARIFICATION FOR STAFF THAT I KNOW WILL ULTIMATELY START THIS WORK, WHICH IS THAT ADDITIONAL STAFF RESEARCH AND COMING BACK

TO YOU FOR ANOTHER WORK SESSION WOULD NOT BE IN ANTICIPATION AND ON A TIMELINE THAT WOULD ALLOW FOR THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT -- TO ALLOW FOR A CHARTER AMENDMENT TO MOVE FORWARD IN MAY.

IS THAT OKAY?

I'M SEEING HEAD NODS.

>> YES.

THAT'S OKAY, BECAUSE I THINK THIS IS A LONGER DISCUSSION THAN WHAT AND A MORE INVOLVED DISCUSSION WITH THE COMMUNITY THAN WHAT WE'RE HAVING RIGHT NOW.

>> OKAY.

THANK YOU FOR THAT CLARIFICATION.

>> SO I MADE THE MOTION, I THINK LINDSIE SECONDED IT.

>> THANK YOU.

THAT WAS MY CLARIFICATION.

I WAS REQUESTING A MOTION AND A SECOND.

I'LL TAKE A VOTE ON THIS MOTION.

IN FAVOR?

SEVEN IN FAVOR.

COUNCILOR GROVES, YOU'RE THE ONE VOTE THAT I DID NOT SEE RAISED.

>> I OPPOSE.

>> THANK YOU.

THE MOTION PASSES 7-WITHIN.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCIL.

WE WILL BREAK AT THIS POINT IN OUR DISCUSSION, AND COME BACK TO THE FINAL PRIORITY AREA RELATED TO CHANGE TO THE CHARTER.

AND WITH THAT, THIS COMPLETES OUR FIRST AGENDA ITEM.

I'M NOW GOING TO TURN IT BACK OVER TO THE CITY MANAGER TO PROVIDE US WITH AN UPDATE ON OUR EUGENE/SPRINGFIELD --

>> I WANT TO PROVIDE A SIGNIFICANT AND IMPORTANT PROJECT, MOSTLY TO SHARE PLANS FOR THE FALL, MAKE SURE YOU HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO SHARE FEEDBACK AND QUESTIONS YOU HAVE PRIOR TO OUR NEXT SET OF MEETINGS.

AS A REMINDER, JUST OVER A YEAR AGO, WE HAD A PRESENTATION FROM AN OUTSIDE CONSULTANT WHO HAD CONDUCTED A FEASIBILITY STUDY ON DIFFERENT GOVERNANCE MODELS FOR EUGENE/SPRINGFIELD FIRE, A FUNCTIONALLY MERGED DEPARTMENT, AND CHALLENGES HAVE CONTINUED OR NEW CHALLENGES HAVE DEVELOPED OVER THE LAST 18 YEARS.

THIS -- YOU KNOW, THAT JUST POINTS OUT IF THIS WAS A CLEAR AND EASY FIX, WE WOULD HAVE ALREADY DONE IT.

I'M PRETTY SURE THERE'S SOMEBODY ON THE ZOOM SCREEN WOULD HAVE CARRIED THIS FORWARD HAD IT BEEN SIMPLER.

I WANT TO ACKNOWLEDGE, WHILE WE'RE WORKING ABOUT THIS, THE AMOUNT OF STRESS THAT'S BEEN CARRIED BY MANY, AS THIS HAS STAYED UNFIXED, PARTICULARLY OUR CHIEF.

NOT THAT IT HASN'T HAD IMPACTS ON EVERYONE, BUT IT'S HARD ON THAT LEVEL AND THE ORGANIZATION.

I ALSO WANT TO KNOWLEDGE THE EXCEPTIONAL SERVICE THAT EUGENE/SPRINGFIELD FIRE PROVIDES TO OUR COMMUNITY.

THIS CONVERSATION HAS NEVER BEEN ABOUT THEIR EXCELLENT SERVICE.

THEY'VE CONTINUED TO PROVIDE THAT.

WHEN WE LEFT OFF LAST JULY, I MADE IT CLEAR TO YOU THAT WE WERE GOING TO NEED TO EXPLORE SOME OF THE UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES OF A NEW MODEL.

BUT I HAVE A LOT OF TRUST IN THE CONSULTANT.

THEY DID REALLY GOOD WORK, BUT THEY CAN ALSO GO ONLY SO FAR IN UNDERSTANDING THE IMPLICATIONS OF SOME OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS ACROSS THE LARGER SYSTEM AND ORGANIZATION AND ACROSS THE TWO CITIES.

BOTH NANCY AND I, SPRINGFIELD CITY MANAGER, HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY TO EVALUATE ALL OF THAT IN ORDER FOR YOU TO MAKE -- EACH CITY TO MAKE A DECISION ABOUT WHERE THEY WANT TO GO.

AS YOU KNOW, WE SPENT A LOT OF TIME THROUGH THE FALL.

WE CAME BACK INTO THE FALL.

WE SPENT A LOT OF TIME TRYING TO RESOLVE A SIGNIFICANT BUDGET GAP.

AS PART OF THAT TRYING TO ALSO PROVIDE NEW AND MORE STABLE FUNDING FOR EUGENE/SPRINGFIELD FIRE.

I'M GOING TO SAY THIS, NO MATTER WHAT MODEL IS CHOSEN GOING FORWARD, I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT TO RECOGNIZE WE NEED TO BE MAKING INVESTMENTS INTO EUGENE/SPRINGFIELD FIRE.

IT'S NOT THE KIND OF SERVICE, WHEN I WAS OUT TALKING TO THE COMMUNITY, IT'S NOT THE KIND OF SERVICE THAT YOU NEED TO BE REACTIVELY FUNDING.

IT NEEDS TO BE PROACTIVE.

WE NEED TO BE READY FOR THE THINGS BEFORE THEY HAPPEN.

THAT REVENUE WORK, WHEN THAT REVENUE WORK WENT TO -- TURNED INTO AN ELECTION MEASURE, AS YOU KNOW, THAT SORT OF CAME OFF THE TABLE, FOR US TO BE ABLE TO TALK ABOUT IT.

I KNOW IT'S BEEN VERY FRUSTRATING FOR SOME TO HAVE TO HAVE WAITED A YEAR.

IT'S FRUSTRATING TO ME AS WELL.

WHAT I HOPE TO DO THIS FALL IS BRING BACK TO YOU MORE INFORMATION, DEEPER DIVE INTO SOME OF THE UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES IN ORDER TO ALLOW YOU TO POTENTIALLY MAKE A DECISION ON DIRECTION BEFORE THE END OF THE YEAR.

THAT'S MY HOPE.

THAT'S MY GOAL.

AS A REMINDER, THE MODELS THAT WERE BEING EXPLORED WERE STAYING THE SAME.

SO CONTINUING IN OUR INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT.

ONE OF THE MODELS WAS ONE CITY ACCOUNT CONTRACTING WITH THE OTHER, ESTABLISHING AN INTERGOVERNMENTAL ENTITY, IGE, DIFFERENT THAN AN IGA.

PEOPLE POINT TO THE METROPOLITAN WASTEWATER COMMISSION AS AN EXAMPLE OF THAT.

WHEN WE DIVE DEEPER INTO THE FALL, I WILL EXPLAIN HOW THE TWO MODELS ARE DIFFERENT, BUT THAT'S ESSENTIALLY WHAT WE POINT TOWARD.

FORMING AN INDEPENDENT FIRE DISTRICT, DISSOLVING THE FUNCTIONAL MERGER, BOTH CITIES HAVING THEIR OWN FIRE DEPARTMENT.

AT THE TIME OF -- AT THE TIME OF THE LAST MEETING, THE CONSULTANT DID SAY THE RECOMMENDATION WAS THEY FELT THAT THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL ENTITY BEST MET MOST OF THE DESIRED OUTCOMES THAT THEY HEARD FROM THE STAKEHOLDERS.

SINCE THAT TIME, I'VE ASKED A NUMBER OF QUESTIONS, AND ASKED QUESTIONS OF THE CONSULTANT.

IN FACT, WE'LL BE MEETING WITH HIM AGAIN THIS WEEK, AROUND HOW IT COULD ACTUALLY WORK, PUTTING SOME REAL LIVE PROBLEMS, PARTICULAR BUDGET PROBLEMS INTO THAT MODEL, FIGURING OUT HOW TO RESOLVE THAT.

AT THE SAME TIME I WANT TO KNOWLEDGE YOU'VE HEARD FROM -- YOU HEARD IT AT THE BUDGET COMMITTEE TABLE, YOU HEARD IT AT THE PUBLIC FORM, HEARD IT IN EMAILS.

A LOT OF FOLKS THAT ARE PUSHING FOR US TO EXPLORE AN INDEPENDENT NEW TAXING DISTRICT MORE FULLY.

AS YOUR CITY MANAGER, I DON'T KNOW HOW YOU'RE GOING TO BE -- HOW ANY OF US WILL BE ABLE TO MOVE FORWARD WITHOUT STUDYING A LITTLE BIT FARTHER, IN PARTICULAR, BECAUSE WE HAVE A NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES THAT ARE -- THAT ARE ASKING US TO DO IT.

AND EVEN JUST BASED ON MORALE AND CONFIDENCE IN LEADERSHIP, I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT THAT WE LOOK AT THAT.

SO RIGHT NOW WE HAVE A CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION.

90 MINUTES HELD ON OCTOBER 22ND, HELPING US GUIDE THROUGH A DECISION.

THE PROCESS WITH A CONSULTANT, WE HAD A -- AN ADVISORY TEAM, ADVISORY GROUP, WHICH WAS TWO EUGENE CITY COUNCILORS, TWO SPRINGFIELD CITY COUNCILORS, AND BOTH CITY MANAGERS.

THAT GROUP TYPICALLY MET AND EXPLORED AND ADVISED US BEFORE WE CAME TO COUNCIL.

WE INTEND TO BRING THAT GROUP BACK TOGETHER, TRYING TO DETERMINE WHAT INFORMATION WE'LL PROVIDE THEM.

WE'LL MEET WITH THAT GROUP BEFORE WE COME BACK TO YOU IN OCTOBER.

THE INTENT TODAY WAS TO LET YOU AND THE PUBLIC KNOW THIS CONVERSATION IS COMING, AND GIVE YOU AN OPPORTUNITY TO SHARE ANY THOUGHTS PRIOR TO OUR DIVING BACK IN THIS FALL.

WITH THAT, I'LL TURN IT OVER TO YOU, MAYOR.

OR NOT.

>> THANK YOU.

THANK YOU FOR THAT PRESENTATION, CITY MANAGER.

I WILL NOW OPEN UP THE FLOOR TO COUNCIL DISCUSSION.

COUNCILOR GROVES.

>> THANK YOU, MAYOR.

THANK YOU, CITY MANAGER.

I LOOK FORWARD TO TRYING TO GET THIS THING BROUGHT TO A CONCLUSION IT FEELS LIKE IT'S DRUG ON FOR AN AWFULLY LONG TIME.

I UNDERSTAND THAT THERE ARE REASONS.

I WANT TO SHARE THE INFORMATION ON WHAT'S DELAYED THE PROCESS, BECAUSE I THINK THERE'S A REAL MISUNDERSTANDING AMONGST THOSE WHO UNDERSTAND WHAT IT IS WE'RE TRYING TO DO.

THE QUESTION KEEPS COMING UP, WHY IS THIS TAKING SO LONG.

THAT'S PART OF BRINGING TRANSPARENCY AND CREDIBILITY TO THE PROCESS.

I DO APPRECIATE YOU PUTTING A PAUSE LONG ENOUGH TO TAKE A LOOK AT THE DISTRICT PIECE.

I THINK THERE'S SOME QUESTIONS THAT NEED TO BE ANSWERED ON THAT.

BUT IF WE DON'T FULLY VET THAT, LIKE WE HAVE THE OTHER OPTIONS, I THINK WE LOSE CREDIBILITY THERE AS WELL, AS WELL AS MAYBE WALKING AWAY FROM A VIABLE SOLUTION, ALTHOUGH WE WON'T KNOW THAT UNTIL THE ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS IS DONE.

SO THANK YOU FOR THAT.

THANK YOU FOR MOVING THIS FORWARD.

I DO LOOK FORWARD TO THE REST OF THE PROCESS, REENGAGING AS SEEING THE SUBCOMMITTEE REENGAGING ON THE ISSUE OF GOVERNANCE.

THANK YOU.

>> OTHER COUNCILORS?

WOULD YOU LIKE TO OFFER FEEDBACK?

I WILL OFFER THAT IN COMMUNITY CONVERSATIONS, THERE'S A LOT OF INTEREST IN THIS WORK.

THERE IS UNDERSTANDABLY A LOT OF CONCERN ABOUT ACCESS TO EMERGENCY SERVICES, AND THE CAPACITY OF OUR FIRE DEPARTMENT TO RESPOND TO CHALLENGES THAT WE FACE.

THERE ARE ALSO A LOT OF QUESTIONS THAT I HAVE NOT BEEN IN A POSITION TO ANSWER, SPEAKING TO THE INFORMATION THAT YOU JUST DESCRIBED, AROUND THE VARIOUS COSTS AND BENEFITS OF THESE DIFFERENT STRATEGIES THAT ARE BEFORE COUNCIL, AND THAT IS CONTEMPORARY, AND THAT WE HAVE A VERY -- WE HAVE AN EXCELLENT REPORT FROM TRITON TO BUILD THIS CONVERSATION FROM, BUT I KNOW CURRENT CONVERSATION ALSO TO BE ADDED TO THAT DISCUSSION.

SO I ALSO LOOK FORWARD TO OUR 90 MINUTES ON THE 22ND OF OCTOBER, AND BEGINNING TO BUILD A SHARED UNDERSTANDING OF THE ALTERNATIVES, HOW THEY COMPARE WITH ONE ANOTHER, AND WHAT THE BENEFITS OF EACH ARE, AND HOW WE WORK TOWARD A SUSTAINABLE STRATEGY FOR OUR EMERGENCY RESPONDERS AND OUR FIRE RESPONSE.

CITY MANAGER?

>> IF THERE'S NOT A LOT OF QUESTIONS OR FEEDBACK, I WANT TO SUGGEST, ONE OF THE REASONS IT TAKES A LONG TIME, IT'S HARD TO GET ON YOUR CALENDAR, BECAUSE YOU HAVE A LOT OF TOPICS.

YOU COULD TAKE A BACK SEAT AND FINISH YOUR CHARTER CONVERSATION.

I WANTED TO SUGGEST THAT.

>> I WOULD BE HAPPY TO RETURN TO THAT DISCUSSION FOR OUR FINAL PRIORITY TOPIC, IF COUNCIL IS WILLING.

CITY ATTORNEY, PLEASE LET ME KNOW IF THERE'S ANYTHING SPECIFIC WE NEED TO DO TO RETURN TO AN AGENDA ITEM.

>> NOPE.

I WAS GOING TO SAY GET JASON AND SEE HE JUST POPPED ON.

>> STILL HERE.

>> PERFECT.

>> THANK YOU TO STAFF FOR ALSO ADAPTING TODAY TO CHANGING CIRCUMSTANCES.

WITH THAT, THEN, I WILL CLOSE THIS COUNCIL DISCUSSION ON THIS UPDATE RELATED TO EUGENE/SPRINGFIELD FIRE GOVERNANCE AND WILL RETURN TO OUR DISCUSSION OF THE CHARTER PROCESS AND PRIORITIES.

AND THE FINAL ITEM FOR DISCUSSION -- STAFF, IF YOU ALREADY HAVE THAT ON SCREEN -- THE MAYOR AND COUNCIL VACANCY PROCESS.

LET'S USE THE SAME STRUCTURE OF DISCUSSION AS PREVIOUS AND TRY TO IDENTIFY IN ROUNDS THE DIRECTION THAT COUNCIL WOULD LIKE TO PURSUE.

THEN WE'LL HAVE A MOTION PUT FORWARD BY OUR COUNCIL PRESIDENT AT THE END.

SO DISCUSSION OF MAYOR AND COUNCIL VACANCY APPOINTMENT PROCESS.

COUNCILOR KASHINSKY?

>> MY UNDERSTANDING IS THIS WAS RECENTLY AMENDED BASED ON A COMMUNITY THAT CAME UP WITH A RECOMMENDATION.

I THINK WE HAVE SEEN THAT THE PROCESS DIDN'T REALLY WORK, I THINK, THE WAY THAT IT WAS INTENDED.

I THINK IT WAS INTENDED TO HAVE A VOTE BEFORE, YOU KNOW, THREE OR FOUR YEARS FROM NOW, NOT TO HAVE AN APPOINTED COUNCILOR HAVE TO RUN THREE OR FOUR ELECTIONS IN A ROW WITHIN A YEAR I THINK IT'S WORTH EXPLORING HOW TO FURTHER IMPROVE THIS.

I DON'T THINK IT'S READY VIA A CHARTER AMENDMENT THAT WOULD GO OUT IN MAY.

>> OTHER COUNCILORS?

COUNCILOR CLARK?

>> THANK YOU, MAYOR.

I AGREE WITH COUNCILOR KASHINSKY.

I HAVE TO SAY I'M NOT 100% SURE OF THE PROBLEM WE WOULD BE SOLVING FOR BY PUTTING SOMETHING ON THE BALLOT.

SO I WOULD BE INTERESTED IN FURTHER DISCUSSION OF HOW TO MAKE THIS PARTICULAR PROCESS BETTER IN THE FUTURE CERTAINLY, BUT I DON'T KNOW THAT THERE'S A CLEAR DIRECTION FOR THAT.

SO I'M NOT -- I'M RETICENT TO PUT THE QUESTION INTO THIS TIMELINE SCENARIO TOWARD A CHARTER AMENDMENT WHEN I DON'T UNDERSTAND CLEARLY WHAT PROBLEM WE'RE SOLVING FOR.

THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILORS.

I BELIEVE WE HAVE TWO COUNCILORS WHO HAVE INDICATED AN INTEREST IN NOT PURSUING CHARTER AMENDMENTS ON THIS TOPIC AT THIS TIME.

ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM COUNCIL BEFORE REQUESTING -- COUNCILOR ZELENKA?

>> YEAH.

I DON'T THINK IT'S RIGHT FOR CHARTER, BUT I DO WANT TO HAVE A CONVERSATION.

AND IF WE DO IT IN A TIMELY FASHION, WE MIGHT BE ABLE TO PUT IT ON THE CHARTER -- OR ON THE SAME BALLOT.

I'D HATE TO HAVE IT BE A STANDALONE THING.

BUT IT IS A CLEANUP THAT PROBABLY SHOULD BE MADE.

HAVING SOMEONE -- I DON'T THINK IT'S IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST TO DO THREE ELECTIONS IN THE SAME YEAR, FOR INSTANCE.

THAT DOESN'T MAKE ANY SENSE TO ME.

IT'S A WASTE OF RESOURCES, A WASTE OF TIME.

IT'S A WASTE OF EFFORT ON A LOT OF PEOPLE'S PARTS WHEN -- ESPECIALLY WHEN ALL THREE OF THE OUTCOMES ARE EXACTLY THE SAME.

SO THAT'S THE PROBLEM I THINK, THAT IT'S JUST A MATTER OF WHAT'S THE PUBLIC INTEREST TO HAVING RUN THREE ELECTIONS IN THE SAME SHORT PERIOD OF TIME.

SO WE CAN SOLVE THAT, FIX THAT, MAYBE IT'S AS SIMPLE AS MOVING THE DAY.

YOU KNOW, OTHER CITIES HAVE DONE THAT, WHEN WE LOOK AT THAT.

MAYBE IT'S THAT SIMPLE.

IF WE CAN GET MORE INFORMATION, MAYBE WE CAN DECIDE WHETHER TO PUT THAT ON THE BALLOT.

THE DEADLINE IS DECEMBER FOR THE MAY 26TH BALLOT, RIGHT?

WE MIGHT BE ABLE TO RESOLVE THIS BY THEN.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILOR.

COUNCILOR KEATING.

>> THANK YOU, MAYOR.

I'M THINKING ALONG THE SAME LINES.

I WOULD ADD THAT THERE COULD BE A STATEWIDE FIX THAT WOULD CHANGE WHEN A RECALL WOULD HAPPEN, IF A RECALL WERE TO TAKE PLACE -- RECALL ELECTION WERE TO TAKE PLACE ON A REGULARLY-SCHEDULED ELECTION DATE, A SPECIAL PRIMARY OR GENERAL ELECTION, WE WOULDN'T HAVE THIS PROBLEM THAT -- OR A PROBLEM THAT ONE OF OUR COLLEAGUES IN WARD SEVEN REALIZED IN REGARDS TO HER CONSECUTIVE MULTIPLE ELECTIONS AFTER BEING DULY APPOINTED, AND THEN ELECTED, AND THEN HAVING TO RUN FOR RE-ELECTION.

SO I THINK THERE IS A PROBLEM, IT NEEDS TO BE CLEANED UP.

SO SIMILAR TO THE ACTION THAT WE TOOK ON THE LAST PIECE, AROUND COMPENSATION, I WOULD ENCOURAGE COLLEAGUES TO SUPPORT MORE INFORMATION AND PATHWAYS ABOUT HOW AND WHEN WE COULD BEST CLEAN THAT UP, BUT I CONCUR IT DOESN'T RISE TO THE TOP OF THE CROP OF URGENT NEEDS FOR THIS MAY'S BALLOT.

>> COUNCILOR CLARK, BEFORE I RETURN YOU TO, CITY ATTORNEY, I'LL ASK A CLARIFYING QUESTION.

ONE OPTION IS TO PURSUE AMENDMENTS AND BRING BACK FOR DELIBERATION.

THE COUNCIL WILL STILL HAVE THE OPTION TO DECIDE WHAT ACTUALLY GOES FORWARD TO THE BALLOT AFTER THAT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IN THESE COMING MONTHS.

IS THAT CORRECT?

>> WELL, SO, THERE'S A LITTLE BIT OF A TIMING PROBLEM, BECAUSE IF YOU -- IF YOU WANT TO ACTUALLY PURSUE AMENDMENTS THAT WOULD APPEAR ON THE MAY BALLOT, WE NEED SOME SPECIFICITY FROM YOU TO WRITE UP THE RESOLUTION THAT YOU WOULD NEED TO ADOPT AND COME BACK WITH THAT RESOLUTION THAT YOU COULD DELIBERATE.

NOW, YOU COULD CHOOSE THEN NOT TO MOVE IT FORWARD, BUT DOING ADDITIONAL STAFF RESEARCH TO PROPOSE SOME OPTIONS WOULD INCLUDE ANOTHER WORK SESSION IN BETWEEN AND ALSO THEN -- THEN THAT'S A DECISION YOU WOULD MAKE TO PURSUE AMENDMENTS.

THE TIMELINE'S JUST PRETTY TIGHT FOR THAT.

KNOWING WHAT YOU'VE GOT ON YOUR CALENDAR BETWEEN NOW AND THE END OF THE YEAR, AND WITH SARAH'S DEPARTURE AT THE END OF THE YEAR.

I WOULD RECOMMEND TWO PATHS.

ADDITIONAL RESEARCH, LIKE YOU HAVE REQUESTED FOR THE COMPENSATION, AND THAT'S A DATE UNCERTAIN, OF WHEN THAT COMES BACK TO YOU.

IT WILL BE BASED ON YOUR AGENDA.

IT WILL HAVE NO BEARING REGARDING THE MAY ELECTION.

THE OTHER PATH IS YOU PICK ONE OF THESE A, B OR CS, AND WHAT COMES FOR PURSUING AMENDMENTS, AND WHAT COMES BACK FOR YOUR DISCUSSION IS ACTUALLY A RESOLUTION FOR YOU TO CONSIDER AND TALK ABOUT, OF WHETHER IT'S GOING TO GO FORWARD TO THE MAY BALLOT, THE KIND OF GENERAL DO RESEARCH FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE MAY BALLOT IS PROBABLY THE HARDEST FOR STAFF TO ACCOMMODATE, KNOWING WHAT YOUR AGENDA LOOKS LIKE.

>> THANK YOU, CITY ATTORNEY.

EXACTLY THE INFORMATION THAT WE NEEDED.

COUNCILOR CLARK?

>> YEAH, THANK YOU, MAYOR.

I WASN'T SURE WHAT PROBLEM WE WERE SOLVING FOR, BECAUSE YOU CAN'T CONTROL, TO THE BEST OF MY UNDERSTANDING, WITH COMPLETE SPECIFICITY WHEN A RECALL ELECTION, OR WHEN OTHER VACANCY MAY TAKE PLACE.

THERE'S NOT A WAY TO DO THAT WITH A GREAT DEGREE OF SPECIFICITY.

SO IT HAS HAS DIFFERENT IMPACTS WITH THIS TIMING.

IF WHAT WE'RE TRYING TO SOLVE FOR IS RUNNING X NUMBER OF CAMPAIGNS IN A ROW WITHIN A CERTAIN TIME FRAME, I THINK WE'RE GETTING INTO A COMPLEX MATRIX OF WHEN THIS SORT OF THING CAN TAKE PLACE.

THUS, AGAIN, I DON'T -- I'D BE INTERESTED OR WILLING TO HAVE A FURTHER DISCUSSION ABOUT WHAT WE MIGHT.

I DON'T THINK IT'S SOMETHING WE BRING BACK WITH SPECIFICITY FOR A CHARTER, WITHIN THE CURRENT CHARTER TIME FRAME, IN THE FALL.

THANK YOU.

>> COUNCILOR EVANS.

OR A MOTION IF YOU ARE PREPARED.

>> TWO THINGS.

ONE IS A QUICK COMMENT.

I UNDERSTAND, YOU KNOW, WHAT MY COLLEAGUE IN WARD SEVEN WENT THROUGH, BECAUSE I WENT THROUGH THE SAME THING, 12 YEARS AGO, WHEN I WAS APPOINTED TO COUNCIL.

SO I HAD TO RUN -- YOU KNOW, GO THROUGH THE APPOINTMENT PROCESS IN THE INTERVIEW, RUN BASICALLY TWO ELECTIONS, AND THEN A THIRD ELECTION, YOU KNOW, IN NOVEMBER OF THAT YEAR.

I THINK THAT THIS REQUIRES US TO HAVE FURTHER DISCUSSION IF WE'RE GOING TO MAKE ANY KIND OF CHANGES.

BUT I DON'T THINK NOW IS THE TIME TO HAVE THAT DISCUSSION SIMPLY BECAUSE WE HAVE OTHER PRIORITIES FOR COUNCIL ON THE PLATE RIGHT NOW.

AND SO MY MOTION WOULD BE -- I'M NOT MAKING IT YET, I'M JUST WAITING FOR A LITTLE BIT MORE FEEDBACK -- IS TO NOT PURSUE A CHARTER AMENDMENT ON THIS TOPIC.

AT THIS TIME.

>> THAT IS CONSISTENT WITH WHAT I HEARD FROM COUNCIL AS WELL, COUNCIL PRESIDENT, AND THAT THERE'S A DESIRE FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND THIS WOULD NOT GO FORWARD FOR THE MAY 26TH ISSUES.

>> EXACTLY.

WOULD YOU LIKE ME TO A MOTION?

>> YES -- OH, COUNCILOR ZELENKA.

>> THERE ARE TWO PARTS ON THAT.

ONE IS NOT ON THE MAY BALLOT, BECAUSE WE DON'T HAVE TIME FOR IT, I AGREE WITH THAT, BUT THE SECOND PART WASN'T CLEAR TO ME.

AND IT SHOULD BE PUT ON OUR AGENDA FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION.

IF YOU'RE MEASURE COULD CLARIFY THAT, GREG, THAT WE WILL BRING IT BACK, I'D BE SUPPORTIVE OF THAT.

>> I THINK I CAN DO THAT.

SO I WOULD MOVE TO DIRECT ADDITIONAL STAFF RESEARCH AND NOT TO PROPOSE -- NOT TO PURSUE CHARTER AMENDMENTS ON THIS TOPIC AT THIS TIME.

WOULD THAT BE CLEAR ENOUGH?

>> PRETTY CLEAR FOR A BLURRY KIND OF GUY.

>> SECOND.

>> YEAH.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILOR.

ANY ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION?

SEEING NONE, I'LL NOW TAKE A VOTE FOR THIS MOTION.

ALL IN FAVOR?

I THINK I CAN SEE ALL OF YOU.

EIGHT IN FAVOR, ZERO OPPOSED, AND THE MOTION PASSES.

THANK YOU ALL VERY MUCH FOR THE DISCUSSION AND FOR ALONG BACK.

THAT CONCLUDES OUR AGENDA FOR TODAY.

COUNCILOR EVANS, DID YOU HAVE ANYTHING TO ADD AT THE END?

>> NO.

>> JUST WANTED TO BE SURE.

JUST SAW YOUR HAND.

THANK YOU SO MUCH.

>> I'M GOOD.

>> THEN I WILL NOW CLOSE OUR SEPTEMBER 24TH, 2025, CITY COUNCIL
WORK SESSION, AND WE ARE ADJOURNED.

THANK YOU.