

ROUGHLY EDITED TRANSCRIPT
CITY OF EUGENE
COUNCIL MEETING
JANUARY 14, 2026
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. This is NOT the official record of the proceedings.

* * *

>> Good afternoon, everyone.

Welcome to the January 14th, 2026 City Council Work Session.

Thank you for joining us in this hybrid meeting format today.

For work sessions like this one, there is no opportunity for public comment and those wishing to access the meeting can watch the livestream available on our website, the broadcast on Comcast Channel 2 is or calling into one of the phone numbers listed for this meeting on the public webcast and meetings materials page of the city of Eugene website.

In case of medical emergency an AED is located behind staff on the west side of this room and in case of an emergency evacuation, emergency exits are through the double doors located 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 today.

I now call the January 14th, 2026 session Eugene work session and introduce to the City Manager for the first topic.

>> CITY MANAGER: Thank you.

Today we have the opportunity to share information from polling on the three library levy options you've been considering over the past couple months.

We have Josh Bates our library recreation and Cultural Services director and Angela Ocaña our Library Director to kick off the conversation.

>> Wonderful, good afternoon, Mayor and City Council.

It's wonderful to be back here with all of you.

I am Joshua Bates, Executive Director of Library Recreation and Cultural Services opinion.

On October 27th we shared three concepts and outlined our plan to test the concepts through polling through DHM Research.

The polling is now completed so we are back here before all of you.

So today Angela and I will review the timeline for the levy process, identify key decision points and present the final levy options and associated costs.

Following that part of the presentation, DHM Research will share the results of the November 2025 library levy polling and answer any questions you may have.

After that discussion, Council can choose to take action.

So here is the timeline.

We are nearing the conclusion of this process.

In September we revisited the framework with Council.

In October, we discussed the three different concepts.

Now throughout November, DHM facilitated polling and today once again we're presenting DHM Research's findings.

It is a trusted Oregon firm with extensive experience in municipal polling.

They conducted the parks and recreation polling that informed the city's successful

bond measures and have a long history of working with local governments across the state.

Council may decide to take action today.

If Council would like additional discussion or refinement we will return January 28th for further consult action if needed.

Early February is the last time for Council to act in order to place the Library Levy on the May ballot given statutory deadlines and the administrative steps required for ballot preparation.

With that I'll hand it over to our Library Director Angela Ocaña who will walk through the three levy options and associated topics.

>> Today I'll share the three final options for sustaining and expanding library service designed to balance community needs with responsibility.

Option one, maintain.

This option preserves the library's current level of service while advancing community priorities of access, equity and safety.

It ensures stability amid growing demand and maintains what Eugene residents consistently say they value, open hours, high-quality collections and access to technology.

Libraries are essential for navigating an increasingly digital world and this option sustains programming that bridges the digital divide, provides trusted information and creates safe, welcoming spaces for all.

It also positions the library to plan for future growth through our comprehensive systems.

Key components include hours across three locations, diverse, high-quality collections that reflect community interests, equity initiatives, device lending, and development of a

library systems plan to guide long-term improvements.

Every option has an average tax rate of 15 cents per \$1,000 of assessed value, which would cost each home approximately \$43 per year and support an average annual service level of 3.3 million.

Option two.

Maintain library levy services and expand early childhood literacy programs.

Option two builds on the foundation of option one by investing in early literacy, one of the most effective and equitable strategies for long-term community -- children who participate in early literacy programs before kindergarten are four times more likely to read proficiently by third grade of academic achievement and economic stability.

To affordable child care and early learning opportunities, this option responds to the need by bringing learning to families where they are as well as inside the library walls and through partnerships with preschools and community workers, including adding an early literacy librarian to coordinate programs and measure outcomes.

It recent states the Story Time to Go which sends volunteers into preschools and strengthening the youth collection for ages zero to 5 and keeping partnerships with schools and family-serving organizations expanding story times and early literacy programs.

This investment helps ease pressures on families, provides high-quality early learning, experiences and strengthens community belonging by ensuring every child has the tools to read, learn and thrive.

This levy option has an average tax rate of 17 cents per \$1,000 of assessed value costing the average home approximately \$49 per year and support an average annual service level of 3.6 million.

Option three, maintain library levy services, expand early childhood literacy programs

and expand book drop-off and pick-off locations.

Option three expands access through book vending kiosks and return units in underserved neighborhoods such as West Eugene and River Road and others limited by transit access.

These kiosks allow residents to borrow, return and pick up reserved materials at their convenience, integrating seamlessly with the library's catalogue and circulation system. This approach reflects a national best practice identified by the American Library Association and implemented successfully in other cities.

For example, San Bernardino County Library reported kiosked accounted for 8% but at only 2% of operating cost demonstrating a cost effective way to expand reach without building new facilities.

They include deploying kiosks and return units in West Eugene and installing a kiosk in South Eugene, commissioning a systems study to evaluate future kiosks sites and micro facility planning as well as beginning the planning phase for the downtown library's fourth floor to support its long-term growth.

This option combines innovation with fiscal responsibility extending library access today while gathering the data to gather the next generation of library services.

The levy option has an average tax rate of 19 cents per \$1,000 of assessed value which would cost the average home approximately \$56 per year and support an average annual service level.

Next we'll hear from DHM Research our polling partner who will join us to tell us about the levy options.

We ask you hold questions until they have completed their presentation.

>> Angela, would you like us to get started?

>> Yes, please, Tony.

>> Okay.

Mayor and Councilors thank you for the privilege and opportunity to partner with you and to engage with members of your community on this very important survey research.

As mentioned, my name is Tony, I'm a Senior Research Manager at DHM Research and joined by John, Senior Vice President at DHM and Lane Cooper, research assistant at DHM who also helped work on this project.

DHM Research is a non-partisan policy oriented public research firm, we're based in Oregon.

We've been conducting opinion research on issues that matter to the Pacific Northwest communities including Eugene for 40-plus years.

We've got a 20-minute presentation for you.

Which is an abridged and high-level version of a larger report complete with detailed analysis of survey findings by demographic group and more.

I believe you have copies of that report.

We'd like to ask you to hold questions until the end of the 20-minute presentation.

John and I will then be happy to answer any and all questions.

Finally, we understand at DHM that the survey findings here are just one element, the large e research planning, budgeting effort, engagement effort and that you're considering all of these elements as you decide whether to refer a library levy to the ballot and if so, which of the one, two or three options.

With that said --

>> Excuse me, Tony, can you hear me?

We're having connection issues in regards to your presentation so we're going to have Angela walk through your slides.

If you can let her know, she'll advance them as we're going through it, okay?

>> Sure.

>> One moment, please.

I believe the issue is Metro.

It's not Tony's issue.

>> I'm happy to share my screen.

>> You could try to share your screen, yes.

>> Okay.

>> We're able to see your screen.

>> Okay, you can all see that.

Please interrupt me at any time if you, if there are audio issues or connection issues.

Please don't hesitate to interrupt.

So the purpose of this survey more generally was to evaluate quality of life and key issues for Eugene voters and assess their satisfaction with key public services, and then much more specifically was to gauge support for several potential library levy options and to identify the strongest reasons for and against.

In order to do this, we employed a mixed mode survey of 400 Eugene voters, half of whom received a phone call and who spoke with a live interviewer.

Half of Zoom received a text message inviting them to participate in a survey online.

We typically employ these mixed mode approaches because we know voters have different preferences for how they'd like to engage.

Some prefer speaking interviewers on the phone.

Some prefer responding to surveys online.

We wanted to be attentive to the diversity of those preferences.

Something about who we spoke with.

We want to underscore that this was a representative survey not of Eugene voters in

general, but more specifically of likely May 2026 Eugene voters.

We know based on historical evidence and our own experience with election modelings that May primary voters are different than general election voters.

They tend to be more partisan, less non-affiliated voters.

They tend to be older, so fewer younger voters and tend to be higher income and have higher levels of education, and so our sample is a representative sample of those voters by age, gender, race, party, education level and ward.

The results here have a margin of error of plus or minus 4.9%.

Okay.

So what did we find?

First some good news we'd like to share.

About seven in ten Eugene voters say they're satisfied with their quality of life.

That's up from about six in ten since the last time we did this survey, a similar survey back in 2022.

So growing satisfaction with quality of life over the last few years.

We then asked voters that an entirely open-ended question with no pre-filled response categories.

The question was, what's the most important issue you'd like the City of Eugene to do something about?

After collecting 400 verbatim responses to this question, we then coded them into shorthand categories for analytical purposes.

A number of really interesting findings from the responses here.

First as you can see, most often mentioned as the most important issue you'd like the city to address, homelessness, housing costs, crime/public safety.

That's pretty evident from the percentages in blue there.

Now one thing to point out about homelessness, although mentions of homelessness are high, there is some good news here.

The last time we asked this question back in 2022 in Eugene, 51% mentioned homelessness, so there's been a ten-point drop of mentions and that's a sign that voters are seeing at least some progress on that particular issue.

Now, regarding housing costs, concerns about housing costs, a levy does add to overall housing costs, so it's a concern.

That's certainly worth taking into consideration as we review some of these other findings.

Concerns about public safety.

As you know all the levy options do provide some additional funds for public safety at the downtown branch.

So all three levy options are speaking to that particular concern.

Finally, one last thing to say about the open ends here.

Note that libraries were not mentioned as among the important issues they want the city to address.

That doesn't mean libraries are not unimportant an issue, but the finding does reinforce a later finding in the survey which is one that tested reasons against the levy and that is that, you know, libraries are not necessarily the top priority for voters, and so some voters have concerns about a potential levy.

Okay.

When we ask about satisfaction with services, we see that satisfaction with the library services is high, second only to fire and rescue services and parks.

We think a big takeaway here is the fact that Eugene voters are obviously happy, satisfied with library services and it's not a big stretch to say that they want to maintain

that high level of service, which is something that a library levy will help provide.

When it comes to library use, about six in ten voters say they've used the library services in the past year with nearly three in ten using them at least monthly or more.

That's the real focus of the survey.

I'm going to stop here just for a second to make sure that everybody can hear me well and we don't have any technical hiccups.

Any concerns?

>> We're good.

>> Okay.

As Angela and Josh mentioned, there are three levy options that we tested.

Option number one, the lowest cost option is really about maintaining the current level of library of levy-funded services.

Option two, slightly higher cost, builds upon everything in option one and also expands early childhood programs, literacy programs.

Option three, the highest cost levy builds upon everything in one and two and also expands services to include expanded book pickup and drop-off options.

Now let's take a look first at how voters responded to option one.

I should say that for all three options, we tested the options in two different ways.

First, simply by offering them a ballot title and nothing else.

This ballot title here is modeled on previous ballot question language that have been used in previous Eugene levies.

We do it this way because we know that some voters aren't going to read the summary.

They're not going to do research.

They may simply just make their decision based on a simple question.

So we asked the question, and we see that we got 63% support.

Now providing them with some additional information, a basic information about what the levy would provide that it would maintain the current level of library services, maintain services including hours, collections, digital access, all three branches, increase security at the downtown branch, and that it would cost the average household an average of \$43 a year, support goes up six points to 69% support.

Now, this is really important.

DHM, we often provide our clients with a general rule of thumb for evaluating potential ballot measures.

And here it goes.

If the proposed levy has a minimum of 60% informed support with half of that support certain support as opposed to somewhat support and in the absence of an organized opposition campaign, we find, although there's obviously no guarantee that such measures have tended to pass if you have met this threshold for option one.

Now let's take a look at option two.

A somewhat smaller majority of voters support option two, 55%, again with nothing but a ballot question, provide them with additional information that it will expand early childhood literacy programs and cost the average household about \$49 a year.

Support goes up seven points to 62% with 40% of that support certain, well more than half.

So here, too, you met that threshold for ballot measures that tend to pass.

Now let's take a look at option three.

Again in that initial test with nothing but a ballot question, you've got slightly less than majority support, 47%, provide them with a little bit more information that it would do everything that options one and two do but also expand book pickup and drop-off locations and cost the average Eugene household about \$56 a year.

Support grows about four points to 51%.

Now, obviously that does not meet the threshold, that 60% threshold which we think is a safer one when it comes to a greater likelihood of the measure passing.

One of the other things we did in the survey was to ask voters about possible reasons that they might support or oppose the levies.

As you can see here, voters find all the reasons to support options one and two compelling with reasons to support option three less so.

We tested various arguments that the library would prevent levy-funded service cuts.

It would maintain hours, maintain digital access, improve safety, maintain collections.

These are just shorthand descriptions of more elaborate sentences that we pose to voters but we're providing the shorthand here.

As you can see for all of the reasons to potentially support option one, you have pretty robust, solid majorities of 60% or more saying hey, these are good reasons to support the levy.

For option two you've also got robust majorities, strong majorities saying expanding story time and early learning programs and increasing youth projections are good reasons to support the levy.

For option three, expanded book pickup and drop-off locations you have less than a majority of voters saying this is a good reason to, this is a good reason to support the levy.

When you take these two major pieces of evidence together, the fact that option one and option two have north of 60% support and secondly that both options one and two for both options one and two, voters think the reasons behind them are good reasons to support.

It follows that either two of these proposals if referred to voters, again, we're not in the

prediction business per se, and we can't guarantee results, but again, measures that have this kind of support tend to do well.

We also tested a few reasons why people might oppose the levies and we see a couple of the arguments that it's not a top priority, it will add to housing costs and it's going to make, you know, Eugene less affordable.

More than a majority of voters do find these good reasons to oppose.

This is not to say that 59% or 56% of voters oppose the levy, because it's not their top priority or that it might be unaffordable, but it does nevertheless indicate that a majority do at least have some concerns and that those concerns are in consideration when thinking about which levy to potentially put before voters.

Now we come to the final slide.

We conducted a head-to-head test.

We asked voters after learning all of this information, which of the following options would you prefer?

Option one?

Option two?

Option three?

None of these?

Or you still just don't know?

Now of the various options of plurality, 29% favors option three.

So how to interpret these results.

Now we feel strongly that it's less that option three has the most support city-wide, but rather that you have a die-hard group of library supporters out there nearly 30% who will likely support libraries no matter what, and that's wonderful.

But it's not -- it's likely not enough support for option three to carry the day.

Those who prefer option three are highly likely to lend of their support to options one and two but were less certain that those would lend their support to option three.

Just a note of caution here and some of our thoughts on how to interpret this particular finding.

Okay, so that's all we have for you, and John and I are happy to entertain any questions.

>> Thank you very much for all of that, Tony.

So prior to hopping in to questions, I want to make sure that we review the three options before Council today.

The first is move to direct -- these are the different motions that are on the table.

The first one is to move to direct the City Manager to return to Council on January 28th with a resolution referring to the May 19th, 2026 ballot a library levy measure consistent with option one as described in the AIS.

The second one is to move to direct the City Manager to return to Council on January 28th with a resolution referring to the May 19th, 2026 ballot a library levy measure consistent with option two as described in the AIS.

And the third is to move to direct the City Manager to return to Council on January 28th with a resolution referring to the May 19th, 2026 ballot a library levy measure consistent with option three as described in the AIS.

With that, are there any questions for either us or DHM?

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: Thank you, staff.

Thank you also to our team remotely for that presentation.

I'll open the floor for council discussion.

Councilor Evans and then Councilor Zelenka and Councilor Groves in the queue.

>> EVANS: Was there a breakdown of the award in terms of the analysis presented?

Do we know what people in ward one favor versus people in ward six or ward five?

>> Yes, Councilor Evans, there was a disaggregation of the different wards.

That was in the larger report that we sent over last night, and then also DHM, do you have the information, if there's any follow-up questions they can answer that succinctly.

>> EVANS: Can we get a quick breakdown because I didn't see that

>> Yes, I would be happy to share that with you, yes.

We broke things down by demographic groups and by party affiliation and also by ward.

If you bear with me for -- looks like there's potentially a delay --

>> He's going to get it up here in a second.

We do have that and we have it in the report and will show it here in a second and we should also be humble about interpreting the results.

We're starting with a sample size of 400, you divide that relatively evenly across eight wards, 400 divide by eight the sample sizes are relatively small but there's patterns in the results that we think are instructive.

>> Could you make this full screen?

>> Yes.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: It's over there but not on the main screen.

>> EVANS: It's not on our main screen.

>> Can you see that?

>> EVANS: I can see it.

>> Okay, so this is the total vote yes or those who support -- support for option one by ward, and we see that for option one, you have a pretty strong majority support in every ward.

You have majority support in ward six as well, where support is lowest, but a majority of voters in all wards support option one.

Let's jump ahead to option two.

Again, you've got majority support in all wards, though in ward six support begins to drop significantly.

Option three, you have support in four wards, majority support in five wards and slightly less than a majority in wards four and seven and significantly less support in ward six.

We think this slide is another reason why, you know, option three is has less chance of success than either option two or option one.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: Any additional questions, Councilor?

>> EVANS: No, that helps a lot.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: Councilor Zelenka?

>> ZELENKA: Thanks for the presentation and the data points.

What was the percent in favor of the 2020 levy?

>> 77%.

>> ZELENKA: Can you describe in option three the vending kiosks.

I think that's one of the coolest things happening in the library sciences in a very long time.

Can you describe that a little bit more?

>> Yes, absolutely.

Essentially what they are, do you remember red boxes, those video dispensers that were all over the place?

It's sort of akin to that except for materials and books.

This means that essentially a person would be able to go to one of these kiosks to drop off their materials but also pick up materials so they could pick up books, movies, all the different materials we provide at the library actually inner that neighborhoods.

Initially River Road, south Eugene and West Eugene.

>> ZELENKA: Put in a library card and get a book, it's free, part of the service.

That's such a cool thing.

I just wanted to point out that for the record, the attachment it says that I was a no vote on the 2020 levy, not because I didn't support the library levy.

To the contrary, my no vote was because I felt the Council was making a mistake not going for a higher level of funding on the levy.

Council decided to play it safe and turned out I was correct and the levy passed with 77% of the vote.

If I'm not mistaken the polling showed that the polling was actually a lot lower than that and we underestimated the support for library services.

I hope we'll take that into consideration this time around and this presentation really seems like deja vu all over again.

We were in 2020 we did three options and we ended with increasing investment similar polling results and I know it's different this time but I think that the library services are essential to our city and people want to support it and they want to pay for it and we have only one shot at this every five years so my intent is to maximize and get as much library services as we think voters will support and to me that's option three which adds one of the coolest ideas most innovative things in libraries is the kiosks.

We can catch up to vending kiosks or at the forefront invest in now or we can be behind the eight ball and catch up later.

Option three only adds \$56 per year.

Most of that you're already paying right now.

So it's a really good buy for the money.

I believe voters will see it like that and I noticed on question, on slide 23 for the DHM guys, the question was about expanding book pickup and drop-off and it wasn't about

vending kiosks.

Did we test the vending kiosk support?

>> I do not believe that we tested vending kiosk explicitly in the polling.

DHM, would you want to hop in?

>> No, we kept the language fairly simple, and just mentioned expanded book drop-off and pickup locations.

>> ZELENKA: Do we know, Josh, what the added cost would be if we only added in the vending cost in option three and not the other stuff in option three -- option two.

>> The hard part with that, it's not just the cost of the kiosk.

It's the service.

It's the entire thing.

We built the packages with a lot of fiscal responsibility around them.

But it provides for the staff and special collections with their own little robust amount while supplementing.

Kiosks themselves may be inexpensive.

>> ZELENKA: Yeah but I suspect a lot of that return drop-offs around the city are the majority of this, though of option three cost increase.

I'd like to see if we can just add the vending kiosk, what that would cost.

>> Angela, can you confirm your mic is on and if so, point it more toward your face.

>> It's definitely not on.

Thanks.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: Councilor Groves?

>> GROVES: Thank you, Mayor and thank you very much for the presentation, presentations, I should say.

I'm curious about the 4.9% margin of error.

That seems higher than most surveys I see.

Is that because the sample size was smaller?

>> Tony, would you like to take that question?

>> I can take that, Tony, if you don't mind.

4.9% margin of error is the margin of error for a sample size 400 people.

We get this question a lot, in case people are wondering and hasn't been asked directly.

The margin of error is not dependent on the population size, so the margin of error is the same in a 400 sample survey in Eugene as it would be in Tyler's Grove as it would be in Portland.

I believe the work DHM has done for Eugene in the recent years has been 400.

I have to double-check that but I think that that's correct and I would say that there is a practical limit to what is possible in a community this size of Eugene.

The number of available contacts, what response rates are, trying to model it for a primary smaller electorate than all voters for general election, 400 is about what is practical while still ensuring that the sample, the participants are representative of the group of people we want to talk to.

So I think it is pretty consistent with what we've done in Eugene before and the margin of error is reflective of the sample size.

>> GROVES: Thank you very much.

That was helpful hearing that explanation.

I think that's all I have as far as questions at this point.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: We have Councilor Clark and then Councilor Leech and then Councilor Keating.

>> CLARK: Thank you, Mayor.

Remind me, refresh my memory current budget year '26 -- '25-'26 levy dollar amount

right now for this budget here from the 2020 levy?

>> It's, let me get you the exact number.

It's 2.85.

Each year the levy does build because -- because it's probably three right now for this fiscal year.

>> CLARK: I'm going to ask, I see Twila sitting over here.

The last revenue forecast we had shows us off in future years.

Do we still see that as off of previous planning in future years forecast?

>> Thank you, Councilor Clark.

Chief Financial Officer.

Do you mean our property tax rejection?

>> CLARK: Yes, general fund revenues.

>> Our property tax revenue projections are lower than we were.

We reduced the assumptions based on information from the assessor.

>> CLARK: Okay, thank you very much.

My question is, option three appears, and I'm uneducated about this in specifics, but it appears to add hardware costs for the kiosks themselves as well as the personnel.

Is there additional staff cost with option number two?

Are you hiring new staff?

>> Correct, option two does include an early literacy librarian and a temporary staff.

So one city full-time employee and then temporary staff.

>> CLARK: Here's my question.

In next year's process of budgeting, if we had to cut general fund revenues to the library next year and in the next biennium, would these new services represent the first cuts or would they not factor into -- would the reason of what cuts you all would recommend if

we had to cut, would that be on some other basis?

Can you help me understand that?

>> Thank you very much for the question, Councilor Clark.

Any of the services that would be funded through the levy would likely need to continue to be funded due to the essentially the promise we made to our community by funding the levy.

So each of these services would be held relatively harmless.

That being said, if there was a reduction that came up in the future around our general fund budget, what we would do is look at the entire system and figure out how we can maintain the best service even in a reduced general fund allocation for the library.

Those services would not be reduced.

Other services would potentially be reduced.

>> I would say as a point of clarity, when we built this new levy we were understanding of general fund fluctuations.

Option A has 18.4 staff members in it from what we do to maintain services.

Option B adds one additional, and how we've pivoted and made more efficient services with that is to balance guaranteeing the promises we've made to the community and so we think that we will be able to navigate general fund reductions while keeping our levy promises.

>> CLARK: Okay, that helps.

That was -- I have made previous years decisions based on what kind of promises we're making to the public with the levy that increases the amount of money we're asking for while at the same time knowing or having a good guess that we're going to have to turn around and cut money to the library in general fund dollars in the future, and not wanting to get caught in that box really, what we promise people and being straight up.

I appreciate the response.

Thanks.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: Councilor Leech?

>> LEECH: Thank you, Mayor, and thank you for the presentations and this information.

Thank you for being so thoughtful and innovative and responsive to the community needs.

Each of these packages really talks to what our community is going through, what we're going through kind of nationally when we're thinking about cuts to some of these other early childhood programs.

I really appreciate the attention to detail and being able to look forward into the next five years.

I love the innovation of these kiosks.

I think it's an awesome idea.

It would pull me in, too, if it was in a park, my local park.

I would be more likely to go to the park and to the library, right, like two birds, one stone.

So I love that.

I am waiting to hear more from my fellow counselors on where we're going to land.

I'm not willing to go below option two.

I'm willing to go up to option three if there's enough support around this table.

I think we all have to consider all of the different funding mechanisms that we are asking from the community in this next year.

I think we have to be responsible.

We have to be, you know, like you are cognizant of the port, our city and our operations and our general fund, but I love the idea that this is protected and that we will always for the next five years be able to depend on these services to help support our community.

So I'm going to let others have their round and we'll come back for a second round.

>> Thank you.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: Councilor Keating remotely.

>> KEATING: Thank you, Mayor.

Can you hear me?

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: Yes, we can.

>> KEATING: Great.

Angela, Joshua, thank you for your service and the overview and John and Terry, thank you for the detailed presentation.

I so greatly appreciate the level of detail with regard to the polling and your perspective and professionalism.

This was one of if not the best teed up presentations to get an elected body ready for a levy that I've seen in my 12 or so years of elected service, so thank you.

What I see in front of us is a good, better, best suite of options.

Unfortunately, the good option is not good enough.

The better option polls so well, it almost mirrors option one in its level of support as articulated by Tony that could get across the finish line and win the day with seven out of eight wards a majority of supporters coming out strong in the survey, coming out strong for option two, that "better" option.

The best option, unfortunately, doesn't poll well as was articulated in the presentation and I am cautious about putting our resources and all of our chips all in for an effort that doesn't get across the finish line.

I think it's fiscally prudent and responsible to go for the nice even round number of \$50 on an average per month, average per month per household.

Actually, clarification on that, a \$50 annual average per household, is that accurate?

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: \$49 annual for option two, Councilor Keating.

>> KEATING: Thank you.

I'm enthusiastic about that second option.

I don't want to risk the credibility of the library or risk maintaining the services by advancing option three, and the key point for option two that I trust won the day with when voters were polled and the key that will win this May is the critical investment in early learning.

So thank you for making that investment, for increasing staff at the library.

When it comes down to it, count me in as a staunch supporter and I hope I've made it abundantly clear that I think option two is the best option for Council to take today.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: Councilor Kashinsky?

>> KASHINSKY: Thank you, and thank you so much for all the work that you've done with this and all the work you do in our community.

It is greatly appreciated and it's very important work in our community.

You know, looking at priorities and what the early part of the poll talking about where community members are seen work being needed, I think one of the things to keep in mind is that people tend to say we need to focus on things that are broken or that aren't working well, and so I think that some of the commentary about the library not being like oh that's the top of the list is because it is working so well and is providing such service to our community.

I think that if we started seeing that service decline, we would hear about it.

It would rise up that list pretty fast of things that we should be paying attention to.

From a question standpoint, if it doesn't pass, if we put out option three and it doesn't pass, what would then happen?

>> Thank you for that question, Councilor Kashinsky.

We have a small amount of funding that allows you to thoughtfully consider what comes next.

Ultimately the services currently funded through the levy would be ramped down.

I do believe that there would potentially be another opportunity to go out for another levy.

That being said, there would still be a disruption in the service if there was, if it was not to pass on the May ballot.

>> KASHINSKY: Thank you very much.

I was really excited about the kiosks.

Like I think that would be an amazing thing to have in our community and looking at the polling is there an opportunity to do kiosks down the road someday, if not now maybe later?

I see nodding so I will say that.

>> It's not an official question.

It is our long-term strategic plan and maybe five years from now you see this come back as option two instead of option three.

It has legs.

>> KASHINSKY: I feel we should invest in our library.

And given the strong polling for option two, I would be leaning towards that.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: Councilor Yeh?

>> YEH: Thank you.

Thank you guys, again, as everyone has said, for this process.

Like the last one, you guys do an excellent job of making sure we're really well informed about the different options and that your thought process behind this.

I've been really impressed that I think all of these options are incredibly responsible and use the money, they would be allocated in ways that are really getting a maximum amount for the dollars.

I also am leaning towards option two.

I think focusing on early literacy is really smart right now and those upstream solutions, so that we're not dealing with problems as they are coming downstream.

I think that's a smart way to use the money that we do have, and I'm really encouraged that both of the first two -- all the options include this creation of library systems plan and I think that's going to give us an opportunity to have more conversations about these more innovative ideas, that some of it may be that people don't see the value but they may also not understand what exactly what we're talking about and how this resource can really benefit them and their neighbors, and the system plan would give us an opportunity to really dig in and talk about these different options and ones that we're not talking about, and figuring out, okay, what does the future look like, and then we can have these conversations about how to we expand our services to support our ever-growing community in the ways that it needs and deserves.

So I'm very comfortable with option two based on all of that, but also on this polling it is very helpful.

Thank you guys for doing all that work for us as well.

>> Thank you, Councilor Yeh.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: Councilors and staff I'll add myself to a queue and maybe launch into a second round if any other Councilors would like to have a second round.

I first just want to say Monday night State of the City I had shared the metrics for AIS.

For people not following along closely at home, the 99,000 library cards you are out in our community and 4H students and participating Charter schools is a great example of

the type of program Councilor Yeh was speaking to in terms of the upstream engagement that we do in our community.

We spend and have spent this year I think a lot of very important time and conversations about innovation and the ecosystem that we are trying to cultivate here in our community of opportunity and richness of opportunity and when I think about the role that public libraries play in opening doors to education, curiosity, worlds that otherwise not be present in people's lives but also opportunities to begin the process of initiating a change in career or the development of a new skill or the pursuit of a new certification, these are very important supports to our larger economic development goals, and I just wanted to reiterate that, because we have been talking a lot about this in different conversations about our community and I really do believe that our library system and the return on investment that it delivers in myriad of ways is a great example of a strength and of a real pride and confidence that our community has in that up-river work.

I also just want to share an observation and maybe ask a question, because our polling consultants observed that the die-hard support for our library system that's present within this community but two, maybe if you all could speak to this a little bit.

Slide ten speaks to 61% of the population using the public, the library in the past year. 34% a few times, 27% monthly or more, and then on a second slide, slide eight, we have 76% of the community describing their high degree level of satisfaction with these services.

I'm just wondering if our polling team could speak a little bit to the fact that we have a significant percentage of people in our community who are speaking to their satisfaction with this system, but are not directly engaging with it frequently.

Can you share a little bit about that?

>> Tony and John, can you hop in?

>> Yes, sure.

Well, I mean, I think you don't have to use the library frequently necessarily to appreciate its benefits.

There are clearly people who use it and are satisfied and those who use it less frequently who are aware of the benefits that it provides, I think that's probably the best way we could explain it.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: Thank you.

I wanted to also open that doorway for similar insight.

My conclusion and based on my inbox is similar.

There's a lot of love for our library, but also a lot of appreciation for the jewel of our community that it is oftentimes described as.

So just want to echo my support for this work and I do think that what's described with the early literacy is really important.

>> If I could just add one point.

You know, across demographic groups, there is widespread support for various levy options.

When you look at support for early childhood literacy, for example, it's not just coming from families that have kids at home.

It's coming from members of the community who don't have kids at home, and so there's, again, there may not be that direct experience there, but there's an understanding or an appreciation.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: Thank you.

Councilor Zelenka?

And then Councilor Clark.

>> ZELENKA: Yeah, given what the Mayor was talking about and Eliza mentioned about, it doesn't show up as a service because it's not broken and works really well and taking into consideration the history of the polling on libraries tends to underestimate the support for libraries, dramatically underestimated last time.

77% was a stunningly big number and also doesn't take into consideration the die-hards working hard for this measure and there's likely going to be no organized opposition to it.

So I don't think the Council needs to be constrained by the three options that are presented here.

We can create our own option as well, and unfortunately it wasn't tested, but I think the vending kiosk is a fantastic idea and would be an enhancement to option two.

So I don't think it costs that much.

If we can get that back, so I intend -- I think we're going to push option two forward, but maybe I could either add it as an additional motion or it could be a friendly to have staff bring back a separate additional option of just adding the vending kiosks to option two.

>> Thank you for that, Councilor Zelenka.

We can certainly come back with the cost of the vending kiosk as an individual item.

>> One thing if I might jump in, Mayor.

I want to ask our team to clarify.

I think I was under the impression we did not poll for the last library levy.

>> We did not poll for the 2020 levy.

We polled for the levy prior to that.

>> Thank you.

Councilor Clark?

>> CLARK: For a refreshing change, I want to offer a counter idea to my friend, Alan.

The economic realities of today, I would suggest of the general public are significantly different than they were in 2020, and I would -- I believe the polling research, and every time I've ever worked on the campaign, I have always adhered to the number mechanism that our pollsters here have recommended as a result.

I see option number two as adding almost \$1 million a year to what we're currently getting from the levy, an additional \$1 million a year.

I would support that as the ask.

I would, however, caution my friends that I think we will see general fund next year that requires maybe bringing some of that back down, so planning for that might be wise, but certainly for the additional services and the way you've talked about planning for it already, that makes sense that option two seems like a good idea to me.

Thank you.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: Councilor Evans?

>> EVANS: I think that based on the conversation we've just had that option two seems to be the way that the majority of Council will go.

With Alan's proposed amendment supporting the kiosk, do we have a number of what that would look like?

Because right now, option two is at \$49 as opposed to option one, which is at \$43 in terms of a tax increase.

Does that push us over 50 if we add the kiosk in, because option three has us at \$56.

>> Angela, would you like to answer that?

>> Yes, I am going to navigate an interesting middle ground with Council, which is when we built these, we knew strategically that all of them played a role in where we want to go in the future, and meet the needs of what we had heard the community say.

Part of that could be if we were to rework our package or to seek additional funding

would be to do not three kiosks but something more manageable, say we started with one as a pilot that didn't include some of those.

The reason we put three was we identified three areas where we thought we could initially have the most impact.

When you get to the number of three, it adds an additional component that makes it somebody else's almost entire job, whereas one does not necessarily get us to that point, and so we have had discussions that potentially we could do this as a pilot project that would build affinity for it for when we came back to you in another five years when this proposal moved.

It would also give us a lot of really great data.

We can go back and rework the package, realistically to make the least fiscal impact on moving that number, it will move that number a little bit from option two, but we could do it in a smaller capacity that would balance fiscal.

>> EVANS: So with that thought, I would like to build some specificity around what Councilor Zelenka is suggesting, and that is if we are going to do kiosk and we're going to pilot one kiosk that that pilot be in West Eugene, where we have no library service at now, specifically in the Churchill area, because again, I'm noting the breakdown of support by ward.

I know that my ward is least supportive of the library, but there's several factors and reasons to go into that, and one of those that would impact maybe not this vote but future votes around library support is the cost of the increase and you factor in what we're experiencing with the inflationary spiral in food, in utilities and in everything else, and my hat's off to our Assistant City Manager over here who helped us dodge a bullet earlier in the year with our budget, and moving over into the wastewater increase instead of us having to go back out and do fee increases to the voters in general, which

I think would have fell extremely flat.

So if we're going to move forward, I would hope that Councilor Zelenka would specify his amendment with an ask for the kiosks to be presented in West Eugene specifically in the Churchill area and that as much as we could work it, if it's \$49.50, as close as we can keep it under \$50 I think the better chances that we have of maximizing the support in a levy.

>> Thank you very much for that Councilor Evans.

We can certainly pull together a concept around how much that would cost to have a discreet kiosk in Churchill.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: Councilor Zelenka?

>> ZELENKA: Yes, my intent was to explore this, so that what we'd ask staff is to bring back information to us for informed conversations since they weren't prepared to do that today.

So if we had staff bring back separate additional options for adding the vending kiosk service to option two, including a kiosk in West Eugene, you can bring back various options, something like that, so we could see what that looks like and what the impact is.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: Councilor, one moment.

We have Councilor Groves and Councilor Kashinsky in the queue.

Councilor Evans, I will add you right back.

>> ZELENKA: Because we're not deciding right now, we're asking staff to bring back information.

Then we'd decide with that additional information.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: Councilor Groves?

>> GROVES: Thank you, Mayor, and thank you, Councilor Evans, for bringing up West

Eugene, the Churchill area.

I've been sitting over here end coup of on my hands.

I have had conversations with our staff on this issue and I do appreciate that.

I was trying not to make it about ward eight, because this is really a city-wide issue that I think is incredibly important, but I do think it's appropriate if we're going to add a resource like that, that it does go into the Churchill area.

It's the only part of town that doesn't really have a community center, doesn't have, a lot of things we don't have, including a dog park, something as simple as that is.

People are paying taxes and they aren't necessarily seeing a lot in return as much as we are in other parts of the city.

So I think from an equity standpoint, that's important as well.

I've been, from the beginning, leaning towards option two on this.

I, too, agree with the comments that have been made.

Lindsay, you brought this up about early childhood development and how important that is.

You know, the best way to build a stronger future for our community and beyond is to take care of our youth, and you know, I think one of the most important things in society, one of the most important responsibilities society has, and I've said this before, it's preparing the next generation.

And we can avoid a lot of cost and problems down road by adequately supporting our youth in our community, whether that's through the libraries, through recreational opportunities.

It's a bunch of things.

It's no one single component, but I think it's important that we have our eye on that all the time and I don't think you have to be a parent to be an advocate for that.

We're all getting older, and it's this next generation that's going to be helping us get through our senior years, too.

I'm speaking broadly when I say "we."

I mean the community.

So yeah, I definitely am in support of option two.

I would be interested to see what the kiosk would do.

I think it's important that we test that and see where we can go.

I've been a fan of even the short reading or the airport.

I brought that up, too, and I still think we need to make that center there, that machine more prominent, because it's buried where it is right now.

I missed it a while back.

I went back to look for it and found it finally, but things like that that give us other opportunities to get literature and important information out to the community are things we should be looking at, and thank you very much.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: Councilor Kashinsky?

>> KASHINSKY: Thank you.

I am looking at slide three from the presentation and I note that it says that February 2026 is the last day that we have to take -- is the last month that we have to take action if we want it on the May ballot.

Can we clarify what day in February?

>> It's February 9th, wait, I'm sorry.

February 18th is the last.

So from the meeting standpoint.

So we have a little bit of time in February, which was actually one of the things I wanted to speak to when it comes to the motions you have in front of you.

They're very specific to having resolutions returned to you, and these are options available.

Sounds like you want to actually have a greater conversation around the kiosk, the cost of the kiosk, the kind of scalability of the kiosk option as well.

That conversation can come back to you on the 28th.

Then the next thing that happens is based on where you want to go with that information, then a resolution comes back to you.

Because writing resolutions with -- the resolutions will look different depending on if you decide you want to move forward with adding the kiosk option to option two or not.

So writing various resolutions depending on all the various kiosk options becomes a little difficult.

It would be nice to land where you want to land on the kiosk, then we come back with a resolution for you.

And your motion options don't really envision that.

It's envisioning the 28th that you have a resolution and maybe there's an option four for you, if you want to have that discussion.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: If I can just clarify that, if Council has a lot of interest in gathering more information, learning about the kiosks options and scaling them to essentially come back for another work session and at that work session give direction on a resolution.

>> Correct.

It gets you the easiest, instead of having to wordsmith something in front of you, we get you what you need based on you've got all the information you need.

>> We have 60 minutes scheduled on January 28th, so that would give you time to consider that, but we would need direction then to bring back a resolution if that's where

you wanted to go.

>> On that day?

>> On that day.

>> KASHINSKY: Thank you.

What I'll say if we can get that done, like the addition of the kiosk will probably not be enough to diminish the support particularly if it's not, you know, a bazillion dollars which I doubt it will be more than option three, and so that I think helps get us moving in that direction while also still preserving the sort of integrity of getting the other.

So I would be open to that.

>> A clarification as well, depending on where you land, but if Council is feeling like they'd like us to bring back that fourth option that we don't need a motion for that.

We can do that if there's general support for that to bring it back on the 28th.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: I will say strong support for that continued -- sorry, Councilor Keating?

Apologies, please.

>> KEATING: Thanks, Mayor.

I'm unclear how the kiosks if at all were followed.

They were only in the option three of the suite of options.

Tony or John, I think John left.

Tony, can you provide some clarification if kiosks were mentioned at all, A, and B, even if they were scalable, does that mean that this option as Councilor Evans pointed out would then -- if Council were to support option two plus, would it bring plus any levels of investment in these kiosks would it bring it north of the \$50 mark?

>> Tony, can you answer the first part of that question?

>> Yes.

As to the question were kiosks mentioned in the survey?

No.

Basically the argument for option two was that or option three is that it would expand the number of book pickup and drop-off locations to ensure that neighborhoods across the city enjoy convenient library services.

>> KEATING: So broad in how it was framed and yet that polled the worst of the three.

>> Yes.

>> KEATING: Yes.

As attractive as having these things would be, I want to adhere to the pulse, I want to listen to the pulse of the community.

I think we have an opportunity to send a signal where we want to be or what we want to support the library.

We want to make an investment very clearly in early literacy.

I've heard that around this table today, and as attractive as other add-ons may be, I don't know how responsible they are fiscally in this climate, in this economy, and I would have hoped to advance one of the three options, pretty clearly option two is the most supported around the table, I would have hoped we would advance option two, and then support an additional motion to explore a pilot program and what that cost might be as I strongly suspect that it's going to change the dollar amount which is nestled nicely under \$50 right now, any level of investment in any of those kiosks is going to bring this north of \$50, which changes the equation.

I think they're two separate things in front of us and I would encourage Council to consider passing what's on the table today and coming back by getting more information but keeping those conversations parallel rather than married together.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: I have Councilor Yeh and Councilor Clark and we'll also note a

time check to Council that we have about seven, six and a half minutes remaining of this session before another session.

So Councilor Yeh.

>> YEH: Thank you so much.

I had a real quick question about how the kiosks work.

They dispense materials but can you drop them off as well?

Okay, so they drop off, perfect.

That was my question if you don't have both it's not super feasible to use it as your primary avenue.

I want to thank Councilor Evans for what he said.

I think back to my own area and using the lens explaining for the Churchill area, how important our Sheldon Branch is to our community, for all different parts of our community, different generations, being able to access it for your kids or for yourself as an adult.

I hear from many seniors who access the Sheldon Community Center and when I think about all that and imagine it not being there, it's really hard to imagine our community, my part of the community being the same.

And so when I'm thinking about these different options and I'm applying that equity lens that we talk about frequently at this table, it really, the Churchill area really rises to the top for me, and I understand we're very sensitive to the amount and I don't think that's a bad thing.

I think thinking about how much we're asking folks to contribute is extremely important.

So I'm in favor of getting this option back and seeing what it looks like, but I also just wanted to share I'm wondering if there aren't some small adjustments we might be able to make in option two, to kind of help lower that burden.

So I know that there's money going into youth collections and that's very important, but I also think that this idea of bringing services to Churchill is very important, and I know readjusting the plans at this point is very difficult, but maybe there's a little small shift that we can make to kind of be sensitive to these competing considerations that are both important, right.

>> I think that -- thank you very much for that, Councilor Yeh.

I think that if we have a little bit of time, we can try to come up with different essentially like balances that could potentially support both the majority of option two along with a pilot kiosk somewhere in Churchill.

We don't have the numbers in front of us on how much it would cost to add an additional kiosk and of course we want to be cognizant of the impact on staff so all of these concepts did incorporate that, and I think that we can come up with some ideas and bring it back to you all.

So thank you for that, Councilor Yeh.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: For this last round we need to shift to one minute to wrap up our meeting on time.

Councilor Clark and then Councilor Zelenka and then Councilor Evans.

>> CLARK: Thank you, Mayor.

I tend to agree with Councilor Keating's rationale, and so my question is to Council President, do you intend to put a motion on the table?

>> EVANS: No, not at this time.

>> CLARK: I have a fuller explanation for this I'd happy to make after doing so.

I would move that we pass option number two and if I have a second, I'll speak further to that.

>> KEATING: Second.

Second.

>> CLARK: Thank you.

I would say that I don't know about the rest of you, but I saw enough emails to note that there's an awful lot of people who are waiting for us to act on this, and I think that the further discussion is a good one, but I want to say, hey, we advanced motion number two and we're definitely doing that, and we have time at a future meeting to look at maybe we add two it.

Once we know more of the details.

But at least we came out of here today and said option two is going to go to the ballot.

So we want to at least do that.

That would be my motion.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: We have a motion and a second.

Now Council discussion to that motion?

Councilor Zelenka?

>> ZELENKA: Well, the motion is to bring back a resolution.

I think option two is going to move forward, but it's the clarity around the kiosk that's going to screw up the resolution.

So if we can -- I don't think that -- I think we're going to move forward with two.

Everybody around the table said that.

So I think that message is really clear.

It's around the kiosk and what the options are and what it does to it.

So if we have one, two or three, where they are, how that works, what does it add to it.

Then we can have the resolution.

You're asking the staff to do more work by coming up with a resolution now.

As to a pilot, a pilot still costs money and if you want it to be a pilot that goes on for

more than a one-time funding, which I don't know where you'd come up with one-time funding for it, we would have already done it if we could, it has to be included in the levy anyway.

Then we'd be back to where we are right now, which is asking for more information what the kiosk problems would look like.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: Any other discussion from Council of this motion?

I will say I agree with Councilor Zelenka's summary in that I think we have support broadly for option two, but we're trying to do this as an efficient of a process administratively as possible.

Councilor Evans and then Councilor Clark.

>> EVANS: The only reason why I would say not moving this now is because we have at least a few more days before we can have a total package put together before the end of the month that would be incorporated.

The suggestions that we talked about at this table into a resolution that would be more comprehensive at that time and still give us time to put this out, put it on the ballot.

>> CLARK: I didn't intend to direct staff to create the motion but we want to proceed with option number two, just so we have that out in the public sphere.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: Katherine, do you want to clarify again?

I think there's a question about the work that's happening but the development of the resolution is specific detailed that and wordsmithing that is complicated.

>> I think Councilor Clark, what I hear you saying is you just want a motion of intent out of the Council.

The motion is -- you're not making motion number two on the AIS.

I think it's a whole different animal.

It is this is the intent of Council to move forward with option two and potentially other

changes, right, and potentially additions.

So it's really no direction to Council at all based on what his motion is.

>> CLARK: It's not specific staff direction.

>> It's not direction to return with a resolution.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: Would you restate, clarify the motion, Councilor?

>> CLARK: I move to express the will of the Council for option number two and further discussion upon staff's return to us with what some of those other detailed choices may be.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: Thank you.

Councilor Keating you seconded that motion.

I'm assuming you agree with that clarification.

>> KEATING: Affirmative.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: Thank you.

Any other discussion of this motion?

I will now take a vote and all in favor, Councilors, please raise your hands.

One, two, three, four, five --

>> KEATING: Aye.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: -- six, seven, eight.

The motion passes 8-0.

We will return to follow up on the Council's intention to support option two with additional information.

Thank you all very much.

That concludes our agenda for today and I now close the January 14th City Council work session.

We are adjourned.