

ROUGHLY EDITED TRANSCRIPT

CITY OF EUGENE
CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION
OCTOBER 27, 2025
5:30 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.

* * *

>> Knudson: Thank you, council. Good evening, everyone, and welcome to the October 27, 2025, City Council work session. Thank you for joining us in this hybrid meeting format. For work sessions like this one, there's no opportunity for public comment and those wishing to access the meeting can do so by watching it open our website, the broadcast on Comcast channel or one of the phone numbers on the public webcast or meeting materials web page. In case of an emergency, an automated Defibrillator is located behind the counter on your left side of this room. And in case of an emergency evacuation, emergency exits are located through the double doors at the back of the room and the doors to the patio can also be used as needed. Thank you all again for joining us. I now call the October 27, 2025, work session of the Eugene city council to order. [Gavel pounded] And I will turn it over to our assistant city manager to introduce the first topic, which is the work session.

>> I think I'll turn it over to Josh Bates to get us started.

>> Bates: Good evening, Mayor and city council letters. I'm Josh Bates. In the last meeting we reviewed the 2015 and 2019 library levies and how those investments helped us expand hours, programs, and access across Eugene. Before hopping in, I want to take a moment to thank both the Eugene public library foundation and the friends of the library for their ongoing support and feedback throughout this process. So since 2000, the Eugene public library relied on current levies. The current 2020 levy as well as the first measure helped the library strengthen youth and teen services, expand digital access, and extend outreach across Eugene. These investments have supported record-high

community use serving over 1 million visitors annually, and 65% of Eugene residents hold active library cards. As a reminder, the current library levy will expire in June of 2026, which is why staff are bringing forward early concepts now to help shape what comes next. We are here today to share early concepts for the next potential library levy. What maintaining, growing, and expanding our services could look like, and hear your feedback before we refine these options further this winter. Rather than -- so you've seen this slide before. This is our timeline. We're currently at the midpoint of this process. In September we look back and discuss the framework with council. Tonight we'll walk through three initial service concept packages and a high-level financial overview. This is an informational work session where your feedback will shape what comes back to you in January '26 for further discussion and direction to all of us at oRCS. We'll be starting the next couple weeks in November. The city selected DHM research to conduct this work. You may remember them from -- because they conducted the parks and recreation polling to help inform the city's successful levy and bond measures, and they have a long track record of working with local governments across the state. They're an Oregon-based firm with deep experience in municipal polling. The goal of this polling effort is to better understand what Eugene residents value most about the library today and which service priorities such as early learning, technology, or neighborhood access resonate most strongly. Polling will help us both test service concepts and communication approaches, giving council and staff real-time feedback on community alignment in areas that may need additional outreach. And those results will inform the refinements you'll see when we return in January with updated concepts. So with that, I will now pass this presentation over to our library director Angela Ocana.

>> Ocana: Before we walk through these concepts, I want to take a moment to center us in the mission of the Eugene public library to provide equitable access to information, foster lifelong learning, and build community connection for all residents. This mission guides every decision that we make. From how we design programs to how we invest levy dollars, and it's at the heart of the three concepts we're going to talk about today. Each concept represents a different level of investment, but all are grounded in the same priorities. Maintaining accountability, meeting community need, and aligning with the city's strategic plan focuses on belonging, equity, and livability. Concept 1: Maintain current levy services. Annual cost of approximately \$3.3 million. This concept maintains the library's current level of service while advancing the community's priorities of access, equity, and safety. It preserves what our community values today while setting the ground work for tomorrow. The library selected this option to ensure continued stability among growing demand. We heard consistently from our community that Eugene residents value open hours, high-quality collections, and access to technology. This concept sustains those essential programs and ensures the library remains a trusted resource for navigating an increasingly digital world. It maintains 160 service hours across our three locations ensuring consistent and equitable access. Regardless of funding source, the library

remains committed to maintaining diverse and inclusive materials. This sustains those collections reflecting the diversity of Eugene's voices and experiences. It has device lending and digital literacy programs. It encompasses a range of strategies that bridge the digital divide, such as offering S.T.E.M. programs for youth, technology help for adults and seniors, hotspot lending, and as the conversation around artificial intelligence grows and shapes how information is created and shared, the library plays an essential role in helping our community discern what is fact and what is fiction in a complex digital landscape. We heard from our community survey in 2023 that there is a perception of safety in downtown. As we touched on previously with this council, the survey was conducted during a period of downtown camping before this council limited camping within a thousand feet of a library or school. This concept enhances building safety and accessibility creating more welcoming and secure public spaces. Finally, this concept funds the development of a library systems plan, a comprehensive roadmap to the future of Eugene's facilities and library systems. It would have long-term space and service needs at all three locations. With particular focus on planning for the next generation of the Bethel branch, which has outgrown its current facility, and evaluating the future options for the Sheldon branch to better serve a growing population.

Concept 2: Read, learn, thrive. Strong readers build strong communities. At approximately 3.6 million, this concept is inclusive of the foundational services outlined in concept 1. In read, learn, thrive, it builds on concept 1 by increasing investment in Eugene's youngest learners and their families. Eugene families continue to face limited access to affordable childcare and early learning opportunities. The library selected this option because early literacy one is of the most effective investments we can make. Children who participate in early literacy programs before kindergarten are four times more likely to read proficiently by third grade. A critical predictor of long term academic success, high school graduation, and economic stability. This concept responds to the needs by bringing learning to families where they are, both inside the library walls and in partnership with local providers. It would add one early literacy librarian to coordinate learning efforts and measured outcomes, ensure consistency across all the programs. It reinstates the library story time to go program sending trained volunteers into preschools, daycares, and kindergartens to reach children directly in their learning environments. This option expands the number and variety of story times and early learning programs and it strengthens the youth collection increasing the number of materials for children age 0 to 5. It would allow the library to deepen its partnership with schools, early learning providers, and family-serving organizations such as the upcoming Ollie court and it trains teachers and staff with the tools and practices for nurture literacy across our entire community. Together we think these efforts will ease pressure on families in a crowded childcare environment, provide high-quality learning experiences in more accessible settings and strengthening community belonging by ensuring that every child has the tools they need to read, learn, and thrive in our community.

Concept 3: Expansion of services. At an annual cost of

approximately \$4 million, this concept inclusive of concepts 1 and 2. Adding neighborhood-based services that expand our reach, while maintaining the core operations in concept 1 and early literacy commitments of concept 2. This concept was selected because it reflects the library's long-term goal of ensuring every Eugene resident can engage with library services. This option would install book vending kiosks and return units in west Eugene, river road, and south Eugene. Extending library access into neighborhoods that are more than ten minutes away from a branch or limited by transit access. Each kiosk would allow for borrowing, returns, and holds, pickups integrated with our catalog and circulation system. This option provides scalable model for future growth that reflects both fiscal responsibility and innovation. Book vending kiosks have been identified by the American library association and peer libraries nationwide as an emerging best practice for improving library accessibility, reducing barriers, and expanding engagement in high-need areas. It provides cost effective service expansion without the financial and environmental footprint of constructing new facilities. This mirrors successful models in other cities where library vending kiosks have extended reach and circulation without adding long-term staffing cost. The is an Bernardino county library in California reported that the kiosks made up 8% of their total circulation at only 2% of the cost. So in concept 3, the library would deploy book vending kiosks in west Eugene and river road to increase access in those neighborhoods located more than ten minutes from a library branch. These kiosks would allow residents to borrow, return, or pick up material at their convenience. It would install a book vending kiosk in Eugene complimenting the pilot return bin and extending access. These kiosks integrate with the libraries existing catalog and circulation systems to ensure seamless access to materials and efficient restocking and maintenance. Finally, this concept also includes commissioning a comprehensive system study to evaluate long-term growth opportunities, including future kiosk expansion sites, identifying potential micro facility sites with cost estimates and phased implementation timelines. And it would begin the planning phase for the fourth floor at the downtown library. This concept extends access to new areas today while gathering the data needed to guide Eugene's next generation of library growth. It's a balanced approach to fiscally responsibility expansion to extend the reach of the library to more neighborhoods. Now I'll turn it over to Neil.

>> I'm Neil, and our team has been working with Angela and Josh. Next I'll walk through the financial commitments and impact associated with the three concepts. So I'll discuss the modeling that we've done thus far and discuss for each concept the projected rate per thousand of assessed value, the average household cost, and the estimated total annual revenue generated. So on this slide here you'll see the assumptions that we've built into our model. We're assuming a May election with tax impacts in FY27 through FY31. We're assuming a fixed dollar amount for the levy as opposed to a rate. This ensures certainty when funding a service level as opposed to a rate which may change from year to year. We've also inflated service levels to FY27 dollars. So we're

starting off the model right sized to the next five years. We're assuming a 7% inflation rate. Which would cover materials and services. It assumes a property tax collection rate of 94%, which is a bit more conservative than we would typically experience, but it does allow for some uncertainty as we plan for next five years. These are the primary pieces built into our modelling here that you'll see on the next slide. So this slide looks at the tax impact of each of the funding levels. For concept Number 1, which is to maintain current service levels under the levy, at the point of the last levy renewal in 2020, the average tax rate at that time was 15 cents per thousand. When we take that same 15-cent rate and apply it to the new five-year period we get 3.45 million with an annual cost to a homeowner of \$43. Now looking at concepts 2 and 3 which Angela described earlier. Concept 2, learn, read, and thrive, we need a gross levy amount of 3.86 million which would result in an average tax rate of 17 cents. And an annual cost to a typical homeowner of \$49. For concept 3, expansion, the levy amount would increase to 4.42 million with an average tax rate of 19 cents. And an annual cost to typical homeowner of \$56. These are preliminary estimates for today's discussion. We will take your feedback from tonight's work session and be prepared to return with additional financial information later this winter. I do want to touch briefly on compression. We think about the potential for compression when considering local option levies. And as a reminder, we have a \$10 per thousand limit on the general government rate. And if we were to go over that rate on an individual property basis, we may fall into compression. If we were in a situation where property was over the \$10 limit, first local option levies would be proportionately reduced. If after that a property was still over the limit, the other tax components would be proportionate will he reduced until the property was below the \$10 limit. On the slide shown here, we have listed the tax rates in effect for FY25. As you can see down below, we have 34 cents remaining until we see the potential for compression to impact the city. I do want to note that in the next couple of weeks we are -- we'll be getting updated information from the assessor's office for the new tax year. And when we come back later this winter, we will bring you updated numbers that reflect that new information from the assessor. So on this final financial slide, we show the three rate options presented earlier. And the amount remaining before possible compression. As you can see each additional 2 cents we add to the rate moves us closer to possible compression. Though it's still below the limit. So this -- this wraps up the financial topics I was hoping to cover. I hope that you find this background information helpful. I'll turn it back over to Josh.

>> Bates: Thank you, Neil. All right. Here's the slide again. The timeline. Moving forward this session, staff the refine what you heard tonight and do community engagement. Polling will be conducted in the next few weeks through DHM research in November. And they'll share those results when we return to council in early January of 2026. Based on your feedback, we will narrow the options. Tonight's goal is to not make decisions, rather to listen, receive your input, and identify what resonates most with all of you here at City Council.

Thank you very much for your time tonight.

>> Knudson: Thank you, staff, for that presentation. Very much appreciated. I now open the floor to Council discussion. Councilors. Counselor Groves.

>> Groves: Thank you, Mayor. I think the library is an important resource in our community I think the downtown library presents an anchor point in our downtown that we're trying to revitalize. But I also look at the fiscal realities of what we're trying to deal with. I know as far as compression goes that each property is evaluated more complicated than just the \$10 cap. We've been deal with that some with fire, so I think we've gotten pretty good education as a Council on that issue. I'll be interested in some more maybe granular information as we get closer. And another thing, I want to say up front, I support the library. But I do get some questions, not a lot, but I get some questions about the difference in cost between Salem, our closest municipal comparison, and Eugene. And you know, it's really, you know, somewhere between 25% and a third of the cost of what Eugene's is. Now a simple web search that I've done, I see a lot fewer services. But is that something that you can elaborate on for the public's benefit so they understand when they see those numbers that there is a difference and what that is exactly? I think it would be helpful for all of us to have an understanding of that. If you don't have a lot of specifics right now, that could even be something for a future session. But I do think it's important to at least address it.

>> Ocana: That's a really good question, Councilor Groves. Libraries check in with each other so I talk to Bridget at Salem quite often. With the Salem library, you're probably getting at least minimum of a third less services in terms of hours and access. They have fewer square footage than we do in the downtown library, which I think also is the jewel of downtown. I think five times bigger than the Salem main library is. And we also have two branches that we support as well. So I would say that Eugene is getting really good bang for its buck, but it's actually getting way more services than they receive in Salem just by the sheer growth of it. I like to think that's in part because we have an amazingly supportive community who loves the library and turns out to support it. And we've seen the challenge that Salem's had to have in keeping that funding for their library going as well. I can send you some more specifics, but...

>> Groves: I'm interested in all of us being able to see that. And also I will add that it looks like their usership is considerably less than ours, even though the communities are commensurate in size. I appreciate that and I appreciate the work that you're doing and definitely want to see some more as we move forward. But this is -- this is a good starting point to try to figure out where we're going.

>> Bates: Thank you very much for the question, Councilor Groves. At a future session we can come back with more specifics around Salem and Eugene.

>> Groves: That would be helpful. I have noticed a difference when I go in there from a couple years ago. It just isn't much -- it feels -- the environment feels very different. So thank you for that. I think that's especially important when we have a lot of children that are coming in and out. And knowing the vulnerabilities there. Councilor Zelenka.

>> Zelenka: Yeah, I too think the library is a tremendous asset to the city. And essential and important service on part of police and fire. I will point out in the last levy vote we won by over 76% -- not 67, 76%,.33 if you want to be precise. That means we had some head room in there. We didn't need to reduce the levy amount last time. I think people support the library as evidenced by all the comments we've gotten over the last six months. We have to be very careful about comparisons to other cities, often fraught with huge differences, often very difficult to make comparisons. Like in this case, it's not just apples and oranges, it's apples and lizards. When people make those kind of comparisons, they're not -- it's not necessarily just a one-to-one kind of comparison. I love the services that we're getting through our current levy level. I think the book kiosks are an awesome idea. I think they've been proven to work and they're very cost-effective. 8% increase in circulation is -- is a heck of a testimony. And adding in early literacy programs, I think incredible impact and benefit for our children and our community. One of the tenets about passing a measure, my experience, is to be very clear and concise about what the taxpayer gets, what are they buying for their dollars. In this case, I think the extra \$13 a year per household, which is not a lot of money, if you buy Starbucks coffee, \$13 a year we get three book kiosks and all those literacy programs. I think that's a heck of a deal. I think people will see that as -- I'm eager to hear how this all plays out, but none of this really bothered me in terms of the rates and the charges and I think buying more makes more sense here.

>> Knudson: Councillor Keating.

>> Keating: Apples to lizards. I love the way Councilor Zelenka's brain works, apples to lizards. That's great. Thank you so much. Neil, Angela, Josh, thank you for the presentation and enthusiasm, and I hope my set of questions and comments will -- I recognize I'm one of eight, but will help put us on the pathway for a successful May 2026. Yes, the community deserves a huge thank you for stepping up in May of 2020. The height of a global pandemic, and standing strong for our local library. And I would hope would -- I hope would rise to the occasion with the same level of enthusiasm and gusto. That being said, I don't want to reach for the top shelf just because there's goodwill in the community. I think there's an opportunity to show some fiscal responsibility while underscoring this community's continued investments and enthusiasm around early education. I have a question about the imagination library. Before I dive into that, I want to just underscore that the increase from the average taxpayer paying \$43 a year to

\$49 a year is just 50 cents per month per household. Cup of coffee in 1999, perhaps. So that's -- that seems to be a small enough dollar amount that I would suspect that the community could get behind the same way they did in 2020. My question around the imagination library. How many kiddos does that serve in Eugene and in the greater county area? Imagination library for those keeping score at home, this is for -- it's dolly Parton's imagination library serving free books on a monthly basis for kiddos age 0 through 4, correct?

>> Ocana: All the way up until they turn their birthday at 5. So 4 and...

>> Keating: How many kiddos does that program serve?

>> Bates: We don't have those numbers, but I can certainly get those numbers back to you.

>> Keating: Tens of thousands?

>> Ocana: It's in the thousands, mm-hmm.

>> Keating: Great. And would the early literacy librarian and the story time to go program, how does that couple with the existing imagination library?

>> Ocana: Well, we're very fortunate that our foundation laid the groundwork to really help get state funding for the imagination library. The imagination library is paid through donations and fundraised through our foundation as a subcommittee. And so they've been able to expand that program. The ability to now have state dollars which were kept in this year's budget allow us to fund raise less, which is delightful. But it comes with us wanting to share what that program is to more and more households. And so we really see that advocacy of that program is where it is kind of the next step, now that we've guaranteed some of the dollars for it. I think that early literacy library and one of the things we've talked about is baby bags. So we used to give these away in 2020 when we had some additional funding, and we'd really love to bring it back. It's working with hospitals and early care providers, and it includes a sign-up for the imagination library. But it gives you baby's first board book, a puppet, and much to the chagrin of many young parents, a noise maker, so that children can really connect with reading even if you don't know how to read the words, just holding a book is so vitally important to your understanding of the written word. So we see them interplaying, and there's different avenues that we can really directly look at the advocacy of the program throughout lane County as a support system.

>> Keating: Great. You mentioned the pilot return bin in south Eugene. How successful has that program been?

>> Ocana: Extraordinarily successful. We get thousands of books returned there

every single week. It has on occasion been so full we've had to service it a few times. I'm so appreciative of folks returning their materials there. And it's led to its success and its pilot has taught us that this is a concept that could work in many neighborhoods.

>> Keating: You mentioned beginning planning phases of the fourth floor. Is that something that's only going to happen if we choose the expansion Option 3?

>> Ocana: No. It would help pay for the plan, if not, we'll fundraise for the plan for sure. All of these concepts are in alignment with where the library would like to go. This allows us to move quicker and with implementation timelines and planning. So we might be a little delayed. Our first start for the fourth floor is to ramp up what's possible through creative and innovative programs on the fourth floor. Yesterday, if you didn't catch it, was meet a mortician, and she was up on the forth floor. And so that plan would help us move quicker, but it doesn't mean we won't eventually get there. Same with all of these plans. We'd like to get there, maybe not now, maybe five years or ten years from now. But we're building an on-ramp to all of these.

>> Meet a Mortician.

>> Ocana: They're very important in our community.

>> Keating: I would love to say I would love to see everything in this suite of options, but it might be more prudent to go for that Goldilocks option that gets us just right and delivers services appropriately. Thank you.

>> Knudson: Thank you, Councilor Keating. Counselor Kashinsky.

>> Kashinsky: Thank you for all the work you do to help keep Eugene's library as an inspiring part of our community. I would be very interested in hearing the results of the polling. I think that will tell us a lot about where our community is now, about whether they are interested in paying the same amount that they're paying now, if they're willing to pay 50 cents more, a dollar more, I think that information will be very helpful as we're moving forward with these decisions. I do feel like investments in our library are strong investments. I feel like the way that the dollars get spent there provides a lot more service than a lot of other places where they're spending those dollars. I think e -- do think looking at the overlaps and goals for our community and city, one of the things that stuck out to me with concept 3 was climate and people being able to access services through multiple modes of transportation or even having to drive less to get their books. This is one where I see it not just helping further the library's goals of access to the community for these materials, but also furthering some of the other goals that we have in our community too. So I'm very, very interested in that. So thank you.

>> Knudson: Councilor Clark.

>> Clark: Thank you, Mayor, very much. I want to admire what my friend Matt said to encourage the Goldilocks option here. I don't want to be too harsh or critical on my friend Alan, but to say that comparing to what other cities do is apples to lizards is kind of ridiculous. We do it all the time. We do it with paying city managers, we do it with what we expend and look at wage scales all the time. So what we spend here and what they spend there is a pretty regular sort of comparison. But what we really need to do and what we often do is compare priorities within the city. And on Wednesday we had a presentation about fire and compression and all of the costs and the changes that are required so that our fire department can grow and stay whole and serve us all well. It is my opinion that over time, we have grown the library system dramatically and for good cause. It's a wonderful, wonderful service that's important to a lot of the people in our community. And I'm glad that we have such a strong system. We haven't done as good a job at growing our fire response, commensurately and proportionately. And so I think that as we move into the next couple of years, that's going to be more of our focus than not. So I would encourage you to reconsider the concept idea of expansion, because I think -- I think that we are in need of doing some expansion to our fire capacity, but not -- maybe not necessarily -- necessarily our library capacity at this time. So I hope you give that some good thought. I'm absolutely in favor of the levy. I think we ought to have it out and I'll be in support. But I hope we're thinking about it the right way rather than use as expansion the services, it would be my counsel to say, may even want to think of it impartial as backstop to what the city may be in a position to have to do as the next couple of years move forward. So give that some thought. And I will look forward to continuing the conversation with you guys. Thank you.

>> Knudson: Councilor Leech.

>> Leech: Thank you, Mayor, and thank you for this presentation. I don't normally do this, but today I'm going to talk a little bit about myself. When I was a little girl, anyone that would have known me and my family would have put the likelihood of me being able to pursue a higher education at about 0% because we were poor. And we came, you know, I came from a family who I was very, very much first generation among, you know, a lot of working class folks. But I lived right next to this little hole in the wall library and it was my refuge. I poured myself into the library and the library poured itself into me. I developed a special relationship with learning about the world and other world views, and to this day I attribute whatever little bit of success in my higher education to that special place. So then I grew up and devoted my career to helping support other families and raising healthy new generation. So the health and wellness of the families in our community is extremely, extremely important to me. And I see so many programs being stripped away from us right now. Our systems are struggling, our

head start programs are struggling. And funding is being taken away from a lot of the places that are really going to be impactful as we move forward. So I'm deeply passionate about your concept Number 2. Let's support these families. Let's support these children. And their ability to do what I did, beat the odds, go get educated, go do some good stuff in this world. I would also love to see us expand and I love this idea of accessibility and being able to navigate and access, you know, our library in our parks, in our neighborhoods and have that be, like for me was right next door. It was right there. We need to learn a little bit more, I think, before we go to that next step. And so I'm really excited to see how our plan goes. Like Councilor Zelenka mentioned, we've never not supported our library in our levy. So thank you again for all of the work that you do. And I'm excited to continue moving on with this.

>> Knudson: Councilor Yeh.

>> Yeh: Thank you, Mayor, and thank you for coming today. I want to say how impressed I am with the way you've approached this. What we can do as a city to support not only our community, but our other community partners who be in this space in the best way that really gets as much as we can from every dollar. So I just want to say I just am very impressed by what you brought us back. Just focusing on early literacy and that whole focus on, you know, the future of our community, but also it supports, you know, people that are doing daycares today, you know, it supports our school system. It supports our families and what they're working on right now. So it does that short-term and it does that long-term view of our community. And then your expansion package, and I often talk to people who, you know, I have a branch library in my area but not everyone does. I know there are other parts of the city who feel like they would benefit from that, but that's probably not fiscally responsible right now, and you guys recognize that. You could have asked for that. But you didn't. You said how can we meet this need in a fiscally responsible way moving forward. Then when I see for \$56 a year my household can do all of this stuff, I don't know where else you're going to get your return on investment. Like it's huge. So like my colleagues, I'm really interested to see what feedback we get, but I think you guys knocked it out of the park when we said, you know, bring us something that we can work with, something that really fits the community's need and is relevant for right now. Right now what we need today. So my only -- my only thing I would say is when I read concept library expansion, when I just read that, to me, it doesn't mean kiosk. It makes me think of more like a structural infrastructure. You know, I wonder if there's a better -- because I'm afraid if someone just read that they'd think, I don't want to build another building. And none of us are at that point. We don't want that either. So just having titles that help people understand what's coming, that might maybe a little wordsmithing there might be helpful. But really looking forward to hear what you guys give back and see where we go from there.

>> Bates: Thank you for the feedback, Councilor.

>> Knudson: Thank you, council. I will insert myself into the queue for a couple of comments. I want to first say that the Mayor's inbox, my email inbox is an exciting place. But one of the most incredible messages that I received from our community is about the love and appreciation and pride that people have in our public library. Those messages are memorable, hard felt, always include very personal descriptions of what a family or a visiting family member usually a grandparent is experiencing with their grandchildren. And it's a powerful memory that people are attaching to the experience of Eugene as a place and the kind of thing that people have access to in this community that they really see as unique and a powerful expression of our community's value and care for education and access to opportunity and community space. So I wanted to share that with you, because these are such memorable messages. I also wanted to just say that I agree with many of the sentiments that Councilor Yeh and other Councilors have shared with regards to just this presentation of work and the care that you are taking with the confidence that this community has expressed to the library with previous levy conversations. Clearly you are being very thoughtful about the financial environment that all community organizations are facing and trying to think of ways to deliver really remarkable return on investment for dollars. And it is incredible to think that we're talking about, like, \$3.50 a month, \$4.08 a month, \$4.67 a month is the range of cost to average household. I agree that some people might misunderstand the description of concept 3. It sounds more like libraries in your neighborhood, and it is, I think, a very contemporary response to expectations that modern households have about immediate access and proximity of access to resources and it helps our library be competitive with other options that are much more expensive to people to access. I can't think of a single subscription service that I'm even in the ballpark of accessing the kind of resources available at our library for these sorts of price points. And to think of those being present, close by, within a walk shed, that's pretty powerful as an amenity and a point of access for our community. I also just want to add in my last few seconds that when we as a community talk about the importance of public education and we talk about our concerns related to high school graduation, as we're tracking back through that information, being able to read at grade level by third grade is one of the most direct indicators, being ready to learn to read at kindergarten is one of the most direct indicator to third grade and pre literacy work is the most direct indicator to being ready to learn to read in kindergarten. So that's powerful work that is really supportive to a lot of other concerns and values in our community. Thank you. Any other second comments or rounds from council? Then seeing none, I think we will all look forward to our next conversation with you. And thank you for this presentation and discussion. That concludes our first agenda item. And I will slowly now turn to our assistant city manager to introduce our next agenda item which is a work session, continuing discussion of unlawful transfer on vehicular portion of the right of way.

>> Hammitt: I'm going to turn it right over to chief Skinner to get the conversation started. Thank you.

>> Skinner: Thank you, Kristie. Chief Skinner and my only unsolicited comment would be in light of the first item on the work session, if we're going to continue to fight crime, we need to invest in our kids. Big fan of early literacy. This is a continuation of a conversation that we had on September 17th. At that particular work session, we talked about three different things. We had an opportunity or I had an opportunity to update council on metal theft and kind of the trajectory of metal theft after we had experienced some significant issues here in the City of Eugene. We also talked a little bit about our strategy around the prevalence of shopping carts and the theft of shopping carts from many of our retailers and how they're showing up in our community. I'm happy to report that that's ongoing and we're making some significant headway in that space as well. And lastly, we talked a little bit about the unlawful transfer from the vehicular portion of the right of way. Council had some robust discussion, we had a Councilor that was missing and suggested we wait until he came back and was able to join us for the discussion. So that is that time is to talk about that. As you saw in your packet, we're hoping at the end of tonight's discussion there's one of three option forces council to consider. So with that, I'll yield back to you, Mayor, to facilitate discussion.

>> Knudson: Thank you, chief. Thank you very much for the reminder of our last work session and the number of topics that had come along with this one. I will now open the floor to council discussion. Councilor Groves.

>> Groves: Thank you, Mayor, and thank you, chief. Couple things that I want to dispel that I've heard come from this body about this issue. One is the comment from several of you that there are no statistics to support that this is a problem. Well, being the only Councilor sitting at this table that's actually filled out an incident report as a fire captain, I want to say that there are -- there's no way to collect that information of somebody soliciting a donation that gets hit. If a person gets hit soliciting a donation in a travel lane, they are a pedestrian -- motor vehicle/pedestrian accident. If somebody swerves to miss a pedestrian and hits another motor vehicle, it's a motor vehicle accident. And if you look at our statistics in our the corridors where most of our motor vehicle/pedestrian accidents happen, they also coincide with most of our vehicle-pedestrian accidents. That's one point I wanted to touch on. The second point was the whole piece -- nobody's saying in this proposition that people cannot donate to people, it's just get out of the travel lane. It shouldn't be done in the middle of the street. It poses a danger to the motorists. It poses a danger to pedestrians. And it also disrupts traffic flow. It doesn't mean somebody can't pull off of a street and still make a donation. So I'm hoping we can move forward on this, because I think the practice is not a good one, and I think it causes a number of problems. And I know I've certainly seen more frequently near misses as I drive around

town with some of these behaviors. And then the last point that I made the last time was that our city told our firefighters they couldn't collect for MDA soliciting on the streets. And again, these are people who are fit, they're agile, they have good situational awareness, and they're trained and they work every day on motor vehicle accidents on our streets and on our highways. And if it's too dangerous for them, how is it safe for members of the public that don't have that level of training, don't have that level of experience, don't have the reflective clothing, and aren't using traffic cones to control traffic flow? So I think this is coming back to, again, it's not saying people can't make these donations. It's just where and when. So I think that's plenty for now. I may need a second round depending on what I hear. Thank you.

>> Knudson: Councilor Kashinsky.

>> Kashinsky: Yes, thank you. I want to clarify that I -- there's actually a great deal of data about traffic safety and what causes accidents on our roadways. There's a place where you can look up all the different incidents throughout our time and filter out and there's a great deal of what's happened with them. And we have staff who look at that data and develop strategies to help make our streets safer based on that data. And what that data is telling them is that the major contributing factors to fatalities and serious injury crashes, we have a report that we received about this about six months ago, a year ago, fatal crash reports, the biggest causes are speeding, driving while intoxicating, and visibility. More crashes happen at night. If we're going to be targeting resources or investing energy to try and make sure streets safer, I would rather that be based on the data that we're getting from our teams that we've had presented in different contexts that are targeting those strategies towards the things that are actually data driven as to how to improve safety in our streets as opposed to anecdotal. And so I don't believe that this ordinance would be successful at making an impact on the number of serious injury or fatality crashes on our streets. And I -- so I just -- I can't support investing resources and time for this.

>> Knudson: Councilor Clark.

>> Clark: Thank you, Mayor. There are things we've passed an ordinance over time, haven't always agreed all of, but the argument that we should be creating ordinance around what we would -- behaviors we would encourage the public to adopt and behaviors that people should avoid from -- from lighting fireworks it all different sorts of things, have been done even when we knew we weren't going to spend a lot of resources with regard to enforcement or enforcement was impossible. It was still an issue, there still have been these issues in had our community that the community wants us to make a decision about what we think is okay for behavior and what isn't. In my opinion, we could have an argument about statistics all day long. But we spend an awful lot of money intentionally trying to create an environment trying to keep people safe. And saying to people,

hey, we have a rule against walking into the road on purpose doesn't seem like a bad idea, that seems like a good idea. And what we're talking about now is not coming to a conclusion about whether or not it's a good idea, it's one simple question. Should we ask the general public what they think? Because that's the only question on the table is moving this to a public hearing or not. And I for one would like to be transparent about this issue. And I would like to ask the general public, hey, what do you think, and get better information about what our community thinks about this question. So I'll be in favor of a motion. And by the way, I apologize, do we have that on the agenda as a suggested motion today or no? Excellent, thank you.

>> Knudson: Councilor Keating.

>> Keating: Thank you, Mayor. I really appreciate colleagues' flexibility with allowing for a full complement of us to be present for this vote. Chief, thank you for the presentation. I was able to listen on my flight and hear a great deal of comments before I lost the signal. But I would respond to the conversations I heard seemingly between Councilors Groves and Kashinsky pointing at 7th and chambers. 6th and chambers. 11th and Garfield, Willamette Street between 28th and 29th. Hilliard and 30th. One of the most dangerous intersections in the community. There are folks who are in the public right of way and there are folks -- I've been them. I've given bags of dog food and helped folks with their K-9s. And it breaks my heart and temperature not safe to be distracted as a driver. It's -- the practice encourages from a mobility justice standpoint the public right of way to be occupied and not cleared through. I could go on. I won't. Instead, I want to underscore my longing for three things. A, not penalizing any of our unhoused or persons who are occupying the right of way. Instead, as you indicated in our last work session, this would be an education effort largely educating the drivers of said vehicles. I appreciate that. B, educating the public around vehicular safety and mobility justice. And C, establishing signs, visible signs at the aforementioned and other places throughout the community where we see these -- where we see motorists giving dollars or food or whatever to folks most in need. Establishing signs that drive the donations to do more, whether it's donating to community support or shelter or donating to food for Lane County. I understand that's not in the police budget and I'd like to find out where that might exist in the budget. If we're going down this road, and I would be supportive of the motion that was alluded to earlier, I would want to ensure that we're -- as we're educating the community, we're saying exactly where your dollar could do the best good. And with this bleak federal budget in dollars being clawed back in our non-for-profit partners struggling to help our most vulnerable community members, I would like to do everything we can to drive more resources to those who are doing the most good for the most vulnerable in our community.

>> Knudson: Councilor Zelenka.

>> Zelenka: I don't believe the data supports that this is dangerous. As Councilor Kashinsky said. I also believe it's unconstitutional or think it fairly targets homelessness under the guise of safety. It's already handled by existing law. So I don't think we need this to do an education campaign. So I'll be a no vote on it.

>> Knudson: Any other rounds or comments or discussion from council?
Councilor Evans.

>> Evans: I want to be clear for everyone, we're not making a decision on this particular issue tonight. What we are doing is saying let's put this before the public for a public hearing to hear from -- input from our residents about this particular practice and whether or not we should establish an ordinance that prohibits people from giving out money and resources at key traffic points throughout the community. Now I'll be totally transparent, I have given money out of my window coming off of belt line on to River Road multiple times over the years. One of the things that I realized is that I'm not really helping the people that I'm giving money to in that fashion. I'm better off writing a check and putting it in the mail to one of our social service agencies or something of that nature that would require people to go to safe spaces to be able to get the help that they need. I'm not helping anybody by giving them money out of the window. I may be endangering them or myself in doing that, not from me danger coming from the people who are soliciting those kinds of donations, but just in the concept as Councilor Groves said, of traffic and the way traffic flows or doesn't flow. And holding people up, particularly people who are behind you in terms of moving that traffic along. So I think tonight what we are being asked to do, and what is on the council agenda is to move forward with the public hearing on this proposed ordinance. Hear from the community what they think about it. And then we make decisions based on receiving that public input.

>> Knudson: Councilor Yeh.

>> Yeh: Thanks, Mayor. First I'll say that if we had adequate services in our community for folks who are experiencing homelessness, then I can understand where Councilor Evans would be coming from in saying that your dollars would be better spent somewhere else. But we're so far below the necessary services that there are hundreds, if not thousands, of folks in our community who are -- who want to access services. But those services do not exist. And if someone chooses to use their funds to give to someone or a bag of dog food to help someone as they wait for their turn to get services, I don't feel like I'm in a position to tell them that's not a good use of their -- of their money. This is the second time this has come -- at least when I've been on council. I know some folks are new and weren't around the first time. But I decided to come upon this with, you know, like a fresh look and see has something changed. Is there new information? Is there a new perspective? Is there something that wasn't there last time when we made the decision and we said no. And there isn't. You know,

all -- the arguments are all very similar. They're pretty -- I would say exactly the same. And so for me that means I have not learned anything new. I have not received any new information. And so my decision remains the same, that this is not a good choice for our community at this time. It does not send the message I think we want it to send. And on top of that, there's -- there's not data to support that this is a serious issue in our community. So I'll be voting no as well.

>> Knudson: Thank you, council. Seeing no additional -- oh, Councilor Leech.

>> Leech: Thank you, Mayor, for squeezing me in there. I concur with Councilor Yeh and others who -- I just want to be able to focus our attention and our time and our resources on things that will be most impactful. As we know, we are facing all kinds of budget issues and our resources are -- we need to be very targeted. I understand that this is a very -- a small piece that people think could be making a big impact. But I'm definitely not supportive of, you know, paying for a bunch of new signs or paying for our officer to spend inordinate amount of time addressing this issue. I would love for us to come back and look at public safety as a bigger topic and really look at the things that are the most impactful. And if that -- if this rises to the top of that supported by data, I'd be happy to explore it further. But we said no in 2019, earlier this year it failed to go to public hearing and we said, yeah, come back with more information. And we didn't really get more information other than we have a feeling that this will be helpful. I don't necessarily believe that to be true. I'm going to vote no tonight, but I would like us to bring back more -- more information on how we can be more impactful with the limited resources that we have. Thank you.

>> Knudson: Thank you, Council. Not seeing any additional requests for a second round. Councilor Keating.

>> Keating: I'll be brief. It's my understanding that the public hearing would be the vehicle by which we would bring back more information and allow the public to weigh in. So this by no means was referenced is a vote to affirm or deny. This is a vote to answer that larger conversation. Advance that fact finding. Advance the opportunity to learn from the public about where they stand on this particular issue.

>> Knudson: Councilor Kashinsky.

>> Kashinsky: I would say that we have limited meetings, limited public hearings, limited time, limited staff resources. By saying we want to have a public hearing on this topic, we are saying that some other priority topic or priority issue is going to take longer or maybe not even happen. And so when we're talking about should we have public hearings, should we get more information, some of that is do we think we're going to learn something that is really going to change the perspective there. And if the answer to that is no, then I feel like really looking at

the things that we're saying like, hey, these are the most important issues in our community right now and these are the things that we think are going to have the most impact and investing our time there.

>> Knudson: Councilor Groves.

>> Groves: Thank you, Mayor. Thank you, Mayor. I want to counter that last comment. How many nights do we come here for public hearings and we're here for maybe six to ten minutes and then we leave because nobody really showed up to testify. It certainly seems that we could tack this on to one of those public hearings that's maybe a lighter weight issue, and I think we can all be -- sit here for an additional period of time and hear what the public has to say. And my colleagues who have said this is about taking this to the next level and having a public hearing, that's absolutely right. This is to hear from the public what they think. And you know, I'll go back to the data. The data isn't collected on this particular issue. Isn't that correct, chief? Is.

>> Skinner: Any time we take a pedestrian vehicle collision and we -- and we have to fill out the contributing factors, this particular issue is not one of the contributing factors that we often will ever collect. So the data's probably there, but it's probably embedded in the narrative of every single traffic crash that we have as to the background of the pedestrian before they were impacted. But that would take a hand search of all of those traffic crashes to better understand what was happening or what the predicate event was right before the collision.

>> Groves: Thank you, chief. You're saying you could not query that, correct?

>> Skinner: Not easily, no. It would take an individual search of all of our traffic crash data.

>> Groves: That's the same for fire reports. We follow a model called national fire incident reporting system, and everything's built to build databases in a certain direction. It doesn't get that granular. It's more about recording and collecting data on the incidents that happen. So anyway, I don't want to belabor that point. Again, I'll go back to this is about getting more information from the public. I don't know about all of you, I do frequently hear about this and it's more than just people who are unhoused asking for money. It's -- there's people out there soliciting money for all kinds of causes in the streets. I see it at 18th and chambers all the time and we have quite a few people on corners in my ward on very, very busy streets. Thank you.

>> Knudson: Councilor Leech.

>> Leech: Just a quick question. You mentioned the database. I've worked in a lot of different kinds of databases. I don't know how this one works where you

could theoretically put in checkbox or something like that if this was something that we could look at and study further into the future. Is that a possibility?

>> Skinner: We could certainly build something internal to the Eugene police department. The majority of the data that's being held is held at the state level because of our traffic crash data goes to the state and then they hold that database. So yes, kind of. Some in-house stuff we could influence, but at the state level probably not influence an adjustment there.

>> Leech: Okay, thank you.

>> Knudson: Councilor Yeh.

>> Yeh: So I think I said this last time, but if we want to have a conversation about how to make our streets safer, I'm here all day long for that conversation. And we get our transportation people in here and EPD and we have the conversation and we say, what can we do to make our streets safer. Because that is a legitimate problem in this community. We all have seen the data. Our streets are not always safe. So if we want to have that conversation, I am totally fine with having that conversation. And we can find some things that we can, you know, strategically do to make our streets safer that are within our budget and within our scope. And I -- and if this is the one -- I think Councilor Leech said, if this is the one that rises to the top, then so be it and we'll do that. But I would be so surprised if this is the thing that would do it. Because honestly, I don't think that's what this is about. I think what this is about is when I see homeless people on the side of the street, it makes me uncomfortable. It should make all of us uncomfortable. And that's okay, because we're supposed to be uncomfortable about things in our community that we need to change. And I think putting it out of our sight is not the solution. It's not the right solution, anyway. So anyways, that's just my thought. If that's what we want to do, talk about street safety and transportation system safety, then I think we should do that.

>> Knudson: Thank you, Council. Seeing no additional requests for another round, then with that, I will turn to the Council president and ask for him to put a motion forward.

>> Evans: Thank you, Mayor. Move to district the city manager to schedule a public hearing on the draft unlawful transfer on vehicular portions of the right of way ordinance as set forth in attachment "A" to this AIS.

>> Second.

>> Knudson: Any further discussion from Council? Seeing none, I'll now take a vote for this motion. All in favor, please raise your hand. Four. And all opposed, please raise your hand. Four. The vote is tied at 4-4, and the Mayor will cast the

deciding vote to move this forward to public hearing. And the motion passes with a vote of 5-4. And with that, thank you. That concludes our agenda for tonight. I will now close the October 27, 2025, City Council work session. We are adjourned.

[Gavel pounded]