

ROUGHLY EDITED TRANSCRIPT
CITY OF EUGENE
WORK SESSION
FEBRUARY 18, 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.

* * *

>> Mayor Knudson: Good afternoon, everyone.

Welcome to the February 18th, 2026, session.

Thank you for joining us in this virtual format.

For work sessions like this one there is no opportunity for public comment and those wishing to access the meeting can do so by watching the live stream available on our website, the broadcast on Comcast channel 21 or by calling in to one of the phone numbers listed for this meeting on the public webcast and meeting materials page for the City of Eugene website.

Thank you again for joining us today.

I now call the February 18th work session of the Eugene city council to order, and I will turn things over to our city manager to introduce the first topic, which is a work session on city council Operating Agreements, a continuation.

>> Thank you, mayor.

You said it.

This is a continuation of your October, 2025, work session, and we have Katie LaSala our city recorder here to start the conversation.

So I'll give it to Katie.

>> Thank you.

I will share the screen.

Give me a moment.

All right.

Good afternoon, mayor and city council, Katie LaSala, your city recorder, and I'm back to support your continuing discussion.

Just some quick reminders, your last discussion was on October 13th of 2025 where council passed a series of administrative updates, which can be found in attachment B to your packet.

During that work session, additional topics were covered, but no decisions were made, because council expressed an interest in having further discussion.

Those additional topics are the focus of the conversation today.

I have slides for each of these items, and I'll talk about them more as we move through the presentation and at the end, I have a set of decision slides, which will show the motion, as well as outcomes for council to consider.

Current public comment speakers are in person and virtual public comment is accepted via e-mail.

There was discussion last time about bringing virtual public comment back to the public comment period.

If council would like to make this change, we do need direction via motion, but it does not require an update to your Operating Agreements.

Topic 1B, public comment prioritization of boards, commissions and neighborhood association speakers.

Currently, representatives from boards, commissions, neighborhood associations are prioritized ahead of other randomized speakers.

This has been the practice of Mayor Piercy but was never formalized in your Operating Agreements.

If councils wishes to formalize this process, it would require a motion and edits to your Operating Agreements.

Topic 1C, public comment, prioritization of new speakers.

Currently, speakers are randomized and new speakers are not prioritized over previous speakers.

At the last work session, council discussed restructuring the speaking process to enable new speakers to be able to go before citizens who have spoken at the previous meeting.

Staff have developed a process to operationalize this if that is the request of council.

Shout-out to the mayor's assistant for coming up with a very smooth and effective way of doing this.

This change would require a motion and edits to your Operating Agreements.

Topic two, placement of action items on the agenda.

Currently, action items are scheduled before public comment.

This is an informal change, and it's not reflected in your Operating Agreements.

If council would like to formalize this change, we do have a motion available, and it will require updates to your Operating Agreements.

Topic 3, postponing agenda items due to councilor absence.

Currently, councilors can request postponement of agenda items in writing to the mayor.

Council did discuss changing this process so that postponement requests would be handled within the meeting via voting.

If council wishes to make this change, it would require a motion and update to your Operating Agreements.

Topic 4, unplanned substantive motions and council discussion.

Currently, councilors can make unplanned substantive motions at any time during discussion.

At the last work session, there was a discussion around possible change to allow for a full round of councilor discussion before the introduction of an unplanned substitute motion.

If council would like to make this change, we do have a motion available as well as it would require edits to your Operating Agreements.

And our last planned topic, Topic 5, in-person Wednesday work sessions.

Currently, the Wednesday work sessions are held in virtual-only format.

This was a budget reduction strategy that was implemented during the 2023-25 biennium.

Council has expressed a possible interest in coming back to in-person Wednesday work sessions.

So some considerations for you as you continue this discussion are additional costs for security and staff time for 27 Wednesday work sessions per calendar year, and right now, that is approximately \$39,000.

This would require a motion and direction related to budget allocations for the upcoming supplemental budget.

It would not require an edit to your Operating Agreements.

And at that, I am happy -- that's the end of my presentation.

I'm happy to turn it back over to the mayor to walk through discussion and decision points.

Mayor, I do have slides available for each topic, if you would like me to keep those up or take them down.

I'm happy to do so as requested.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you, Katie.

There you all are.

I have my view in presentation and gallery, and I can see the full council and city manager and assistant, city attorney.

Thank you for that presentation.

As you quickly walked us through, we do have some several items to take action on within this agenda item.

And so to briefly overview this structure, we have a little over five minutes or so for each of these items.

Many of them are continuations of previous conversations.

We will also return to this topic in April, so just after council spring break, we will return to this discussion and anything that we don't finish today, we can get to.

But with the hope that we will be able to move through the Operating Agreements that we have on the agenda and also one noted from Councilor Zelenka that we will be able to get through these today, and have requested to staff that we'll have one minute for each of these as we head through.

So our proposal, keep the slides on for each one of these decision points, and I will briefly frame the motion or no motion options before turning to the council president for a motion for each of these items.

But Item 1A, public comment and virtual speakers discussion, I just want to check, a quick round of discussion if there are any councilors who would like to offer comments on this discussion today or any preferences related to connections between these different Operating Agreements or interrelated issues related to them.

I wanted to be sure to open that before we focus on each one of these discussion points.

Councilor Clark, councilor Groves.

>> Clark: Thank you, Mayor.

I just wanted to point out that these are all decision of whether or not they will return to us with motions, we can debate further or not, yes?

>> Mayor Knudson: Yes.

A motion, and a second required for each one of these points of discussion today.

>> Clark: So the question is shall we bring this back later as a motion?

>> Mayor Knudson: There will be motions for each one of the items related to our Operating Agreements, should council choose today.

>> Clark: Deciding now, not later, correct?

>> Mayor Knudson: Yes.

Yes.

>> So for the ones where you make movements to amend the operating agreement, the amended operating agreement will be referring to action.

>> Clark: So this is simply a question of shall this come back to us as a motion or not?

>> Councilor, there are two that don't operate your public Operating Agreements.

, to move something forward, and not necessarily impacting your operating agreement.

The other ones would come back as edits to your Operating Agreements through -- the resolution, I believe?

>> Clark: Okay.

>> So Councilor Clark just to clarify, there will be a motion or not a motion for each one of these items, and those motions give direction to bring changes in the Operating Agreements.

>> Clark: Right.

My larger point is this is simply to move forward with the idea we will finalize at a later point and have the opportunity to debate further if we want to?

>> Always an opportunity to continue discussion, councilor.

Councilor Groves, were you still in the queue or removed?

>> Groves: I moved myself, mayor, because Councilor Clark had virtually the same question I had.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Zelenka.

>> Zelenka: I understand the process, but I don't think it's prudent for us to have staff go do work on stuff that we're not going to change, so I would hope that councilors would think I want this to come back to us, because I want it to change, not, because I want to debate it yet again.

So I think these are pretty straightforward yes.

/no questions.

And the formality of changing them would be -- I would hope people would have the discussion now as opposed to then when it comes back in April.

>> Clark: I was considering the limited time.

>> Mayor Knudson: I think by beginning this discussion, I can see the possibilities illuminated, and there's always time for more discussion. I do think what Councilor Zelenka just described, that we are giving direction to ask staff to update or amend Operating Agreements in some cases and then bring those back, we'll do that, and then have another discussion about whether or not we actually want them to do that.

So today's meeting is actually, I think, quite important in that direction so that said and moving on to Topic 1A, which is public comment virtual speakers, I'll open the floor for council discussion related to this operating agreement.

Council has the motion to make a motion to add virtual speakers to public comment or to maintain the current operating agreement practices with in-person speakers for public comment and virtual comments by e-mail.

I'll open the floor to council discussion.

>> In the interests of figuring out what we want to do with the motion what I'll say with this is that I believe this was put in place initially because of concerns about Zoom bombing or inappropriate behavior coming through in the virtual comments.

And more difficulty controlling that in the virtual setting.

And so I believe the concerns probably still exist.

And where we are with our public comment now is that we are frequently running out of time, and not having enough time for all the speakers who have shown up in person to speak, and so I feel like that would just get worse if we moved to virtual public comment, as well.

So I'm good with leaving things as they are.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Zelenka.

>> Zelenka: Maybe staff could update us, the public about the ability to control Zoom bombing and that phenomenon.

>> Mayor Knudson: City attorney.

>> What you experienced three years ago roughly and a lot of cities experienced it and cities are continuing to experience is that you had a number of

individuals sign up during virtual, and they were saying very disturbing things, but those disturbing things were nonetheless protected by free speech so you cannot cut them off.

Because public comment can be on any topic, disturbing things can be brought up, and so that would be the same situation you would be in again.

>> Zelenka: And if someone were to do in public, in person setting, what would we do?

>> You would allow them to speak.

>> Zelenka: Yeah.

>> It would be the same.

What most cities were experiencing is it was an automated thing, people could fine up under fake names and connect fake e-mail addresses to it.

We just simply haven't experienced those things with live in-person, and you still allow -- without having virtual testimony, there's still a number of virtual avenues available to people, such as e-mailing you and things like that.

So the avenues still remain and yet the problem was resolved, because people aren't doing that in person.

>> Zelenka: I totally agree with that.

My experience is exactly that.

Different kettle of fish in person than it is virtual and much, much harder to control and so I'm pretty much in agreement with Councilor Kashinsky.

No changes required.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Groves.

>> Groves: Thank you, Mayor.

And I certainly understand where Councilor Kashinsky is coming from, and I agree with it.

My only concern is we have the same people that show up pretty much every public comment period, and there's a lot of people that I have heard from that feel intimidated to come in person, unless they're in a group.

And we are losing their comments.

Now, I always encourage them to send us e-mails, if they don't feel comfortable coming in person, but that's the flip side.

So there's two sides of this but also having been council president when we had very disturbing disruptions at a public comment period back in the LCC building, I really don't want to go through that again.

And some of those comments from people, I believe, staff believe they were from out of the area.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Keating.

>> Keating: Thank you, Mayor.

Can you hear me all right?

>> Mayor Knudson: Yes.

>> Keating: I appreciate my colleagues' perspectives on this matter.

I'm coming at it a little differently.

We are participating virtually as we speak and, though, I long that we would have more in-person engagement for our work sessions, it seems a bit ironic that we would want to continue the operating agreement that our community can't participate virtually when we're in a virtual meeting.

There are some members of the community who have provided testimony with a nom de plume in person, and we run the same risk in-person as we do virtual, someone signing up under a fake name.

While I recognize that we are -- that we have reached -- often reached our limit, our time limit, for in-person, for accessibility reasons, I would hope that we would still allow for virtual comment, if a member of the public can't attend with a priority for in-person engagement, meaning if we have an hour worth of in-person engagement, I'm over now.

I'll need a second round to articulate that more, mayor.

But I'm not in favor of further limiting virtual engagement.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you, councilor.

And I did not have a moment to advise you of that after our introductory comments related to this meeting.

I'll introduce myself briefly to the queue, because of something that you just mentioned, Councilor Keating, opportunities like this one where the council is meeting virtually, whether it's an opportunity for public comment.

And so I want to just remind that as we're discussing public comment, certainly, it is possible when councilors need to join those meetings remotely, as is necessary to accommodate many of the other responsibilities that people have but in practice, those are meetings where the council and mayor are present in-person, and so there's just a little bit of clarification around that opportunity for engagement that I wanted offer for anyone listening.

Councilor Yeh.

>> Yeh: Yeah.

Thanks.

I actually think this is one of the more harder decisions on our plate today.

I like to err on the side of making things as barrier-free as possible, and I know I personally have benefited from being able to join council meetings on Monday nights virtually, on rare occasions when my life has blown up, and I just can't make it down there on time.

So, you know, if it was a council of one I would say that we open up virtual and see how it goes and then if we need to make adjustments, make adjustments.

I would hate to limit opportunities based on a few bad apples abusing the system.

>> Clark: I tend to want to always support opportunities for anyone to speak to the council, even if what I think they're saying is crazy, because I appreciate them for at least publicly identifying themselves.

And I think it's really a good idea for us to make the greatest possible opportunity.

So my question is to Kathryn: If the chair of the meeting, in this case the mayor, found someone's comments disturbing or inappropriate, that was doing so via video, and they cut them off, what would be the consequence for that?

>> It opens up a lawsuit for a violation of the First Amendment against the Mayor and the city.

And there are such cases.

That is it's not an abstract idea.

There are numerous cases throughout the State of Oregon where people have been limited during public comment and in return, the city has been sued.

>> Clark: Thank you.

Well, that, then I get the wisdom of it, but I don't like it, but I get it and it makes sense.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Keating.

>> Keating: Mayor, I'm fine.

I went over before so for the sake of time, I think my colleagues know where I stand on the matter.

I want to give every member of the community the opportunity to participate in a way that's accessible, so I will be supportive of returning to a hybrid of in-person and virtual if possible.

With the caveat that we give priority to in-person testimony.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you council.

We will get to that item in a moment.

And Councilman, I'll now turn to you to put a motion on the table for Topic 1A.

>> Leech: Move to direct the city manager to enable virtual speakers during public comment.

>> Second.

>> Mayor Knudson: Any additional discussion from council?

Seeing none, Councilor Keating.

>> Keating: I was going to add this piece, the workplace I'm at right now in the legislature, this is the tried and true practice.

If it can work in Salem, it can work in Eugene.

>> Mayor Knudson: Any other discussion from council?

Councilor Leech?

>> Leech: Just quickly, I want to clarify that we are allowing virtual testimony for public hearings, which is like Councilor Keating just mentioned the format for our legislative body, that they allow public testimony for public hearings.

We are not proposing to change that today.

And I am not going to support this motion because of the experiences that we have had in the past and other -- I think it was really explained well by Councilor Kashinsky.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you council.

We'll take a vote for this motion to enable virtual speakers during public comment.

All in favor?

Two.

And all opposed?

Four.

And the motion fails.

A vote of 2-4.

>> There was five.

Five no votes.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you.

>> Clark: There are eight councilors present.

>> Mayor Knudson: Which Councilor can I not see right now?

Councilor Evans, I cannot see you on screen.

My apologies, councilor.

Still there were five voting against?

>> Correct, 2-7.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you very much, president Leech.

Very appreciated.

We will now move on to our second item for discussion.

Open up the council floor for Topic 1B, which is public comment on the prioritization of boards, commissions, neighborhood association speakers.

Council has the option to continue prioritizing speakers during public comment or to make no motion and allow this prioritization of specific groups to end on February 23rd, 2026.

I'll open the floor for discussion.

Councilor Keating.

>> Keating: Thank you, Mayor.

I encourage colleagues to continue this practice.

I've got neighborhood leaders who were not aware and have taken advantage of the opportunity, and I wish more boards and commissions would.

I want to respect the volunteer work and the dedication to make the community better that our neighborhood associations, boards and commissions do, and I think it's important to have them as we currently are at the front of that line so we can hear those reports first-hand right out of the gate.

I support continuing the practice.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Groves.

>> Groves: Thank you, Mayor.

I support the practice, as well.

However, I think that if we pass the rule where if you've spoken once during a month, you go to the second group.

I almost think this should be the same thing, because we do have neighborhood association leaders that show up every public comment period, and I love hearing from them, but they basically say the same thing.

And one of the things I think we need to try to do is get the voices in there that we don't hear all the time, because it's discouraging for people to show up and never get a chance to speak when people that speak every Monday night that we have a public comment period say virtually the same thing, over and over again.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Zelenka.

>> Zelenka: I think we should be respecting the volunteer works that boards and commissions and neighborhood association leaders do.

It's hard to do that work.

It takes a lot of time and effort and out of respect for that bumping them to the front of the queue makes a lot of sense, out of respect for them, allowing them to move on with their evening if they need to.

But notwithstanding what Randy said, I think it's a good rule, that we keep it and put it in there and formalize it.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Clark.

>> Clark: I agree Mayor with my colleagues and their comments so far.

My only question is, how to treat someone who wears multiple hats, who may come, and I'm not sure exactly sure how to do that, but I can think of someone, for example, on my board who is paid in her position to speak to us frequently but is also a member of our planning commission, and never requests the opportunity to speak first, but should be given adequate -- I don't know how we differentiate, in other words, if somebody's comments are majority in their role as one of these that we're privileging to speak before others, perhaps that's the line of demarcation for whether or not we put them forward.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Leech.

>> Leech: Thank you.

I move to support this.

I don't have a problem with them being prioritized and would like to have more of the boards and commissions and representatives come to speak to us about their current -- and I think this one and the next, 1C could be combined in some way.

I don't know that we want to try to wordsmith that into reality today, but I think there's something there that Councilor Groves was alluding to.

There's prioritization, and then there's this kind of level of frequency that we're trying to address, as well and ensuring everyone gets a chance.

And so maybe there's other interest to do that work today, or I am happy to support this one.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Kashinsky.

>> Kashinsky: Yes.

I am happy to support this.

I would agree that if we do prioritize new speakers, that should apply to boards and commissions and neighborhood association Members, as well.

Maybe they get to go first in the round of new speakers or repeating speakers if they've been there before.

To Councilor Clark's point, it was my understanding that in order to be prioritized as a board or commission member, you have to be speaking behalf of the board or commission or neighborhood association, so sustainability or planning passed a motion and said please tell council this, as opposed to I'm just on that body.

Is that right?

>> That is correct.

And I was actually going to provide that feedback.

That is exactly correct.

They have to be speaking on behalf of the board, not just be a member of the board or commission.

>> They will nominate.

And speak on behalf of them.

>> Mayor Knudson: Typically, some kind of guidance or request for direction.

They will nominate either someone or the chair to go and speak on behalf of them.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Yeh.

>> Yeh: Yeah.

So actually you answered my question so thank you for clarifying that.

That was my understanding, as well.

I'm also supportive of this.

As many articulated, our boards and commissions and neighborhoods do a lot of work and, you know, I don't think it's necessary to have them prioritized.

There may be certain individuals who come more often than others, but, to be honest, we don't get that many folks who are jumping the line, because they're affiliated with a board or commission or neighborhood at our general meeting.

The most we've ever had is two so I don't think it's hugely disruptive, and I think it's a good way to value that time that folks are putting in.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you.

Councilman, I believe we heard consistency around this, but in this motion or in this item and all items forward I will turn to you either with really for a decision of whether or not to put a motion forward, because in some cases we may not need one.

We'll turn to you to address Topic 1B.

>> Leech: Thank you, Mayor.

Move to add to Section 1.05 of the Operating Agreements official representatives of boards, commissions and neighborhood associations will be prioritized for speaking during public comment ahead of other randomized speakers.

>> Second.

>> Mayor Knudson: Any further discussion from council?

Seeing none, I'll now take a vote for this motion.

All in favor please raise your hands.

Seven, thank you, council.

And the motion passes with a vote of 7-0.

Now, I'll open the floor for discussion of Topic 1C, which is public comment and prioritization of new speakers, already something that has been discussed by the body in comments today.

Council has the option to make a motion to prioritize new speakers who did not speak at the previous public comment or to make no motion and continue to randomize speakers without prioritization.

Open the floor for council discussion.

Councilor Groves.

>> Groves: Thank you, Mayor.

Darn switch!

I support this.

I think we actually need it so that we aren't just locking up every public comment period and others that wish to express their opinion just give up.

And I've heard some of that already.

So I'm going to be supporting this.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Zelenka.

>> Zelenka: Yeah.

Every good idea has its time.

I think I proposed this five or eight years ago but that's when we were switching to this new system of randomization.

We didn't have the experiences that we have now of being able to work within that system, and we didn't really know how to do this.

I think it actually is not that difficult to do and being able to put forward the people that don't come every single time or haven't been there in a while and hearing that different point of view.

One of the key factors about the public comment is it helps councilors with their thinking process and their deliberation process by hearing these different points of view.

And so we want to hear as many points of view as possible.

Hearing the same folks say the same thing over and over again is fine, but hearing the new points of view actually helps me as a Councilor, and I think all of us so I'm in support of doing this and figuring out how to do it.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Keating.

>> Keating: Thank you, Mayor.

I just have questions.

Does staff have the capacity to police this?

What constitutes -- if -- let me -- I apologize, because I want to hear from staff.

It seems to me like this might be a bit burdensome for our staff who are already working their tail off for our meetings to be executed as efficiently as possible.

>> Thanks, councilor.

We were able to develop a process so that the checking, comparing the lists is not -- will not be overly burdensome within the meeting.

Where the challenge comes is if someone uses a name that is not the name that they used last time, if they spell their name differently from last time.

Unless council directs us to, we would not be checking ID's to verify what people's names are.

>> Keating: That's helpful.

So there are ways to game the system, but in addition I also don't want to ignore that there might be constituents or members of the community who have an issue that they keep coming to council for us to take action, and we may have not taken appropriate action and just because we've heard from them multiple times does not mean their message is any less relevant or germane.

I'm going to vote against this motion if made.

I think we should continue the current practice, and I'm cautious about adopting this new process.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you council.

I'll now turn to the council president to determine if a motion is needed for Topic 1C.

>> Leech: Sure thank you, Mayor.

Move to make the following changes to Section 1.05 of the Operating Agreements to prioritize new speakers.

Request-to-speak forms will be shuffled so that speakers are called in random order with persons who did not speak at the previous public comment prioritized ahead of persons who did speak at the previous public comment.

>> Second.

>> Mayor Knudson: Any further discussion from council?

Seeing none I'll take a vote for this motion.

All in favor.

Six in favor.

All opposed?

One.

And the motion passes with a vote of 6-1.

I'll now open the floor for discussion of Topic 2, which is placement of action items on the agenda.

Council has the option to make a motion that would schedule action items on a regular city council meeting before public comment or make no motion and have action items scheduled after public comment per the existing Operating Agreements effective February 23rd, 2026.

>> Mayor, I'll just clarify.

I should have made this clearer in the presentation.

This is for regular action items.

This would not impact priority goal actions or your consent calendar.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you, Katie.

Councilor Kashinsky.

>> Kashinsky: Just as a clarifying question.

I kind of like what we're doing right this second which is the majority of items coming before public comment, but the consent calendar, that's things that people might be there to public comment on where that hasn't been another opportunity coming at the end.

Would this accomplish that?

>> Councilor, if you're asking about whether the process we currently have is reflected in this motion, yes.

If you don't make this motion, we would go back to what is originally in your Operating Agreements, and that is that regular action items are scheduled after public comment.

>> Kashinsky: Okay.

So what our agenda looked like last week is what agendas will look like if we do this.

Okay.

Thank you.

I liked what our agenda looked like last week.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Zelenka.

>> Zelenka: Katie, can you explain what the exemption would be for priority goal actions?

How does that work?

>> Because priority goal actions are addressed separately in your Operating Agreements, they're agendaized differently.

So they are already agendized.

This is dealing specifically with regular action items.

>> Zelenka: So I guess I'm not familiar with priority goal.

So if we have something on the agenda, and it's time sensitive, and it's on the agenda, does that make it a priority goal action item?

>> Council has defined priority goal actions within their Operating Agreements.

So things like LURPTEs are an example of what council has defined as a priority goal action so they end up ahead of your Item 1.

I have the Operating Agreements in front of me, I can try to find the page.

>> Zelenka: So if we have a 90-minute public comment, then some of these items will be pushed to after that, which can be very late for deliberations and then we have a 10:00 deadline that could push items off the agenda potentially?

>> Correct.

>> Zelenka: Okay.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Knudson: Any other discussion from council on this item?

Councilor Clark.

>> Clark: I just want to confirm my vote here.

If I'm voting in favor of this motion to keep things as they currently are, am I correct, where we do the business first and public comment is last predominantly?

>> The consent calendar would be the exception to that, which is agendized.

>> Clark: But that's reflected in a yes vote correct?

>> Correct.

>> Clark: Thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you.

I'll now turn to the Councilman to determine if a motion is needed for topic number two.

>> Leech: Thank you, Mayor.

Move to make the following change to Section 3.6 of the operating agreement.

In general action on ordinances on councilor-introduced resolutions had been placed on regular city council meeting agendas and shall be scheduled before public comment.

>> Second.

>> Mayor Knudson: Any further discussion from council?

Seeing none, I'll take a vote for this motion.

All in favor?

And seven votes in favor and zero votes opposed.

The motion passes 7-0.

Topic 3.

I'll open floor for council discussion of an item related to postponing agenda items due to councilor absence.

Council has the option to make motion to require a council vote to postpone a

--

[reading slide]

>> Clark: City attorney am I correct in assuming that either option, no matter how we vote here, would be the case under the city's charter because the chair has the right to say whether or not they have an item or not, recognized?

>> I think --

>> Clark: A council vote is still a council vote and the chair recognizing something is still the chair recognizing something, right?

>> Yes.

I think I would look at this maybe a little bit differently when it comes to whether or not there's actually a vote by the council versus simply a request that is done.

I look at this as a request being done kind of outside the public meeting, and it's just a request that goes to the mayor, versus a motion that is made in the public, and a vote is taken.

>> Clark: So in other words, the council vote then overrides the chair's opinion on whether something is, in fact, a motion in order?

>> No.

I guess I'm not really clear.

If -- so if there's an item scheduled and let's say you don't change the Operating Agreements.

And somebody requests postponement of an item, and the mayor concludes this item needs to come forward.

It's going to come forward regardless of that absence, then so the item comes forward, there's a motion put on the table to adopt ordinance X.

It is entirely within any councilor's ability and authority to say move to postpone action on this item until X date.

That entirely remains within a councilor's ability to do.

The difference is postponing the entire item to the point that a motion doesn't even get put on the table to adopt the ordinance, versus the postponement happens after a motion is put on the table for adoption.

That's kind of one of the distinctions there.

>> Clark: But my question is doesn't the mayor already have the right as chair to decide the agenda, and what's in order, and what's not in order?

>> Yes.

>> Clark: So would this vote change that?

Would us voting that it requires something different change that?

>> It changes the practice around when somebody is expecting to be absent, and they proactively request postponement of an agenda item.

It does generally -- in theory, what should be happening now is someone is going to be absent --

>> Clark: Like Greg is today, for example.

>> Correct so if Greg wanted to not have any of -- this entire item fraught discussed today, and he reached out to the mayor and said can we please wait until I'm able to be in attendance, then it would be -- then the mayor could say yes or no, and we continue forward.

So I'm not -- so then if this motion passes, if instead, you make the motion, that request to the mayor is still -- the request to the mayor would still need to be made technically.

It needs to be made to somebody.

The request needs to be made so that a vote could be had.

But there would actually be a vote by the councilors of whether this item was postponed.

So for the example you gave of Councilor Evans being absent today, if he wanted to postpone this entire item, and the mayor said --

>> Clark: What about the rest of us besides the absent councilor?

>> Well, if the motion passes, if the motion to change the operating agreement was to pass, then you all would be voting on whether this item should be postponed in light of the request of the absent councilor.

I'm sorry, I don't feel like I'm answering your question.

>> Clark: I'm saying we're going to have this real reality in just a few minutes, because I'm going to make that motion, because we're short, I'm sure and our Item No. 2 in today's agenda is something I expect -- at least I will want the full council to vote on, but we're -- and the mayor doesn't have the right once we pass this to say okay, we should do that.

>> I think it is always within your and any other councilor's authority to move to postpone action on an item.

>> Clark: Sure.

But now, the mayor can't make that decision as a function of the chair being able to decide what motions are in order and which are not?

Or items are in order, correct?

>> Mayor Knudson: City attorney, if I could jump in for a moment, but one of the distinctions, because, of course, there are opportunities to postpone an action to a date certain, but in this case, the clarification of the process around the request to postpone the entire body's discussion of an agenda item, not just postpone an action but postpone the entire body's ability to discuss that action, and trying to establish more clarity around how that should happen.

Or how council would like to have that happen.

That's my one summary point that I think Kathryn as a point of emphasis.

>> Clark: What's on the agenda, and what isn't?

>> Mayor Knudson: And whether or not the body is able to continue doing its business if something is scheduled or the entirety of that conversation is withheld, not just the decision point.

Councilor Groves and Councilor Clark we'll come back for round two if you need.

>> Groves: Thank you, Mayor.

I thought we were kind of following this now, but I think it's smart to codify it if you would.

I think there should be a couple of things at least be agree on, I don't know it needs to be in writing.

Number one that the item be substantive.

Because we have a lot of things, motions we pass and things we do, they really aren't the meat and potatoes of our work.

That would be one.

And two, that there's actually an affirmative request that is made.

I know I've made requests to postpone the decision, but not stop the work session in the past, because we didn't have a full slate of councilors present, and there's some issues I think it's important that we all weigh in on.

So I wouldn't want to see the work session stopped, for example, but I would like to see us allow for a councilor to be absent.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Zelenka.

>> Zelenka: Yeah.

This isn't used very often, but when it is, it's because someone's not able to be there.

Our current practice, and I agree with it is some kind of notice in writing, text or e-mail that you're not going to be there and you would like to have this item pushed off to when you can be there.

And that needs to be before the meeting.

The problem with taking a vote is that it's on the day of the item, and if that person can't be there, they can't vote yes or no.

So that is problematic.

And a motion to table to postpone can always be made.

That's just a -- that's during the course of a meeting.

But for me, it's really -- the issue is going to be around time sensitive issues that have deadlines.

And in that case, the city manager, and the mayor should notice and not allow that.

You don't want this to end up being a tactic to kill an item by being able to say I want to postpone this past the deadline, and then we don't even get to vote on it.

So our work is hard enough.

I think it's a, and we're all busy and life comes up and it's a matter of respect and privilege for the council to be able to push an item out if it's not sensitive with a deadline.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Kashinsky.

>> Kashinsky: Yes.

I will say that the current language says the request shall be honored, unless the majority of councilors determine that item shall be acted upon.

This vote is a confirmation that the majority of councilors are good with postponing, because as it stands right now, the default is we postpone, unless someone -- there's no mechanism to say a majority of councilors think we should move on with this or not.

And so that's a little bit -- given the way the current language is phrased, it sort of defaults to we postpone, because one person asked, even though there's that space there to say no actually, we shouldn't postpone this.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Keating.

>> Keating: Thank you, Mayor.

The current custom and practice of a councilor requesting action be delayed, because they can't be present is sound.

And the changing practice seems to be -- I can't wrap my head around why we would want to change that practice.

I recognize as Councilor Kashinsky was pointing out that a majority of councilors could override the request, and that seems highly irregular.

If any one of the eight of us and a few of us have done this, we've been on a trip or unable to participate or sick, for whatever reason, the work continues but the action on items where we all want to be present, the custom and practice is we recognize it.

I would recommend no change to that.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Zelenka.

>> Zelenka: Yeah.

That second part of the current operating agreement is intended to, if someone requests that we delay it, it's intended not to be able to kill something because of a deadline.

If someone requests, it should be granted, our current practice, but if it has a deadline, and that's used as a tactic to kill the motion, because we can't vote on it, that's what this is intended to come up with.

So I agree that we shouldn't do any change.

So maybe council president, the motion is no change to the Operating Agreements.

>> Mayor Knudson: It does not appear that you need a second round?

Confirming.

Thank you council.

Then with that, and this will be the last of these topics that we get to today, five out of eight, not bad.

I'll turn to the council president to determine if there's a motion needed to move forward.

>> Leech: I am not wanting to make the motion, and I think that that is the general consensus so I will not be making a motion on this item.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you council president.

That is consistent with what I heard in the discussion from the body, as well.

Thank you council.

As I mentioned, at the outset to our meeting, we do have an intention to return to this agenda topic in April, and we will need to do that to address the final two, plus the one additional request that was made earlier today, and we will do that, and if there's even time at the end of our meeting today we can return to do that, but I want to be sure that we address our second agenda item and don't run out of time so I will now turn to the -- I will conclude discussion of this first agenda item and topic, and we will move on to our second topic on today's agenda, and I'll turn to city manager to introduce this item.

Councilor Clark, do you have a clarifying question?

Thank you.

>> Thank you, Mayor.

So this next work session is on unlawful transfer of vehicular portion of the right-of-way and this time is yours.

There's no presentation, but we do have staff on hand to answer questions.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you very much, staff.

We appreciate that.

I'll now open the floor for council discussion.

Councilor Clark.

>> Clark: Thank you, Mayor.

When, and if a motion is made, I would like to move -- I will have an amendment or a motion for us to consider the idea of not making a decision on this item until all of us are present.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Kashinsky.

>> Kashinsky: Speaking to whether or not we should be making a decision on this item today, I will point out that the initial motion to have this be a lengthy conversation, which I believe it's our fourth or fifth work session or public hearing on this topic in the past year was made in a meeting without being announced in advance when we had councilors absent.

I don't know if we would even be having this conversation if that initial motion had not been made at a meeting where councilors were absent.

We've postponed this once before because a councilor was absent and requested.

Our time, our meeting time, the staff time to prepare for this is a resource that is valuable.

It's a resource that the city has and that we need to be thoughtful about how we spend it.

And so I feel like have postponed this multiple times because of councilors being absent.

I don't believe that Councilor Evans requested that we postpone so that he could be here.

I could be wrong about that.

And so I would like us to wrap this up today.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Yeh.

>> Yeh: Yeah.

Thanks, mayor.

I've got some questions for staff.

I've been doing a lot of thought about this, as Councilor Kashinsky mentioned, we've been talking about this a lot for many years.

And I think I've boiled it down to maybe two primary goals and one secondary goal.

Our first goal is we want people to be safe.

We want people to not be in unsafe places and our second goal is that we want to help connect folks who are making this choice to services so that they have other options, so that standing on a corner asking for money is not the option, it's not their primary option, not the choice that they're making.

And I think under those two goals there's another goal of having better data about what's going on?

Why are these people here?

What are their goals?

What is the path they're taking?

Are they connected to services?

All that kind of data we've wanted during that discussion, but we don't have any of it right?

So my first question for staff is we often talk about how it's unsafe to be doing this activity.

And I'm wondering if there are already existing laws around being in places that are not sidewalks.

So inside the curb where there's no sidewalk that exists.

Those medians or we often see folks in these places doing this activity.

I don't know what they're called, but do we have laws about not being there?

Already?

Or is that something we could add in?

>> Councilor Yeh thanks for the question.

I'll take a stab at this.

The part of our Oregon statute that would address that type of stuff is generally found in two different places.

One is the traffic code, which is our Chapter 800, and then the criminal code, which is generally scattered throughout the rest of the ORS.

The specific ORS that would address somebody being in traffic or off the curb in traffic would be what we call disorderly conduct, which is a low-level misdemeanor, but the spirit of that statute was put on the books in the hopes of deterring people that were out purposefully trying to stop and disrupt the traffic flow.

In this particular case I would suggest that we not subscribe the disorderly conduct statute every time somebody steps into the roadway for this particular purpose.

I think it ends up penalizing the individual that's asking for the money or food that's happening, and I've got just my own lived experience being here where I actually quite honestly blamed the motorist more often than the pedestrian for enticing somebody into the roadway.

They're likely not going to pass up that opportunity for money and/or food, and they do I've seen put themselves in very risky positions in an attempt to get to the vehicle to collect those things.

So I think we're for lack of a better term we're enforcing against the wrong person if we use dis con as the statute for the person stepping into the roadway.

>> Yeh: That's fair.

I appreciate that feedback.

This is something we can all agree on that we don't want people in places that are not sidewalks hanging out no matter what they're doing.

And it might be a good area for us to look at, but I appreciate that feedback.

My other thought is that for our second goal, which is really the main goal is to have folks connecting with services and not being here.

We are going to be having peer navigators in our city whose job it is to connect people with services.

Is there a possibility, and I don't know if there's the right person here today that we could be able to have a way for our E.P. officers to see someone engaging in this type of behavior and be able to contact a peer navigator to be able to connect with that person and get them services?

And we could even collect data at that moment.

I assume these peer navigators are going to be adding things into HMIS.

I wonder if there's someone that can answer that question.

>> I'll also take a stab at this, even though maybe I'm not the right person.

I have involved in our hope of putting peer navigators in our community for a variety of reasons up to and including a gap in services around kind of some of our lower acuity calls and welfare checks.

I think really what it comes down to is whether or not we want to direct their work that way.

And I think we wrote the RFP in the hopes that we could direct work.

We want people, our contractors to be doing the work that actually is making a difference in our community.

And if we so choose to say we would like you to call a location in that has an individual on a street corner, we would like you to go out and connect with that person and see if there's a way of bringing supportive services there, I think we have the ability to potentially do that.

As with everything, our success in that environment is predicated on people volunteering to avail themselves of those services and as we've seen over history, that's a bit hit or miss.

>> Yeh: Well, obviously people are not always ready for help, but you keep asking, and that's what we hope.

I think I'm going to run out of time.

I'm going to ask for a second round to wrap up.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Groves.

>> Groves: Thank you, Mayor.

And I appreciate Councilor Yeh, the questions you were asking, and the comments you were making.

I think those are very noteworthy.

Regarding whether we had all the councilors here or not, I guess my recollection is very different than Councilor Kashinsky's.

When we voted to take this to a public hearing it was a 4-4 split with the mayor breaking the tie to take it to the public hearing.

So I don't think it's as one sided as some of my colleagues believe it is.

I think it's a serious issue.

I think it's something we should be giving attention to.

There's other communities who have already gone down this path for a lot of the very same reasons.

If you talk to the people who are actually out there doing the work, and I'm talking about police officers and firefighters, they see the wisdom in this.

We have people that are talking against it that really don't have the experience.

But more importantly I think this is one of the community impact decisions that warrants having all eight councilors here to make this decision.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Zelenka.

>> Zelenka: Yeah.

I was just at the meeting, 250 people talking about traffic safety and issues like that.

Not a single person brought this up, because it's not really an issue, and there's no statistic that shows this is a problem.

We haven't seen it actually create a problem.

I think there's much better uses of time like catching bad guys than doing this.

I agree with Councilor Yeh, education about services is paramount, and the navigator is a good route to do that.

To me, this is really a free speech issue.

People have testified it's not, but I don't think it's been challenged anywhere in the state, because I think the outcome would be really clear that the Supreme Court would like this down as an infringement of free speech.

And so my conclusion is this isn't a safety issue.

It targets homeless people.

So when it looks like a duck, quacks like a duck, walks like a duck, it's a duck.

This is an anti-panhandling, anti-homelessness issue and not a safety issue.

So I would encourage councilors to vote no on this.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Leech.

>> Leech: Thank you, Mayor.

And thank you, Councilor Yeh, what you said in your questions was really poignant and well received on my end.

My opinion on this particular ordinance has not changed since the last time we have spoken on the matter.

I do want to say if it really was about public safety, why has no one addressed the fact that several people have died on bicycles in rights-of-way in the past year?

And we have not even subpoena out loud about that or what we could possibly do about that?

We have a very obvious issue with safety that people are dying from, and if this in particular was a bigger issue, we would be seeing a lot more evidence, data specifically pointing.

So let's take some time and actually really take a look at some of these public safety measures.

I think several of us have asked for a wider, broader impact analysis of where safety is really needed, where our attention is really needed.

Let's take care of this today so that we can do some more of that really important work and have a better, broader understanding of what we can do.

I appreciate being able to do that today.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Keating.

>> Keating: I was at the aforementioned public safety forum, along with the 250 community members at Roosevelt High School last week.

I appreciate the forum was held and there was a lot of great discussion but every single -- not each person had their voices heard.

Each table selected a person to speak on their behalf.

Our presenter, for example, admittedly went off-script and gave his own suggestions without reflecting the will of the table, so that seems -- I just want to just highlight that piece right there.

You've mentioned to me about -- it's anecdotal, about a pedestrian interaction that you saw with your own eyes that you deemed dangerous off beltline and Coberg.

Can you explain in a little more detail what you saw?

>> Thank you, Councilor Keating for that question.

It was the Monday before the public hearing that we had on that Tuesday after the holiday in January as I was coming off the offramp off beltline to be able to go to Costco and if you know that offramp, it's three lanes of travel, the far left is left hand turn only, the middle lane is left hand turn and straight onto the onramp back onto beltline and the right-hand lane is to turn right onto Coberg and there was an elderly gentleman standing with a sign and using a cane to get mobile and a Good Samaritan in the middle lane happened to hold something out of the window, it looked like a dollar bill, I don't know the denomination but a dollar bill, and I watched this elderly gentleman try to navigate his way between cars into the middle lane while our light turned green, and people were trying to turn both left to Costco and right to Coberg, and it caused a little bit of chaos.

And the only thing I can think of.

People were very patient.

They were very patient and understood what was going on.

There was a couple little minor honks people from behind us.

What I was thinking at that time as your chief of police and trying to pay attention to all the safety-related issues in this town and traffic is one of those, and that will be a focal point for us in 2026.

I've heard councilor Leech loud and clear about the expectation to create safety for our bicyclists, what I was thinking is any time we can cut down on vehicle-pedestrian conflict, that's a good thing to do and in that moment it just reiterated for me the risky behavior that we see from time to time as people are enticed out into the roadway to either grab food or money.

And so from my perspective, I'm just looking at the generality of the safety aspect of this, and whether we can do anything to prevent the near misses that we've seen in our community.

>> Keating: Thank you chief.

Question to star if I have enough time, mayor.

We've heard testimony from our chamber partners longing to be a partner in regards to the education piece should this pass.

Do we have to codify that?

What does it look like to encourage the community?

And maybe chief you could address this.

I don't know if it's an EPD thing, if there's another department, or if it's partnering with our chamber partners to encourage the community about where their dollars go.

A dollar to Lane County can generate three meals while a dollar while you're in traffic not only creates a potentially dangerous situation, but you don't know where your dollars necessarily go.

How on the back end should this pass do we formulate the education part?

What does that look like?

>> What I would say is that this isn't the first time we've done something like this when it comes to trying to educate our community around a new rule.

It wasn't so long ago that we were having the same conversation around ceremony use and other kinds of distracted driving where we did not want to come out heavy-handed with that, and engaged in an education campaign.

We're always open to having partners in that education campaign, whether that be the chamber of commerce or in some enhances, it's the school district that helps us with a variety of other issues that pertain to kids and the safety and some of our younger drivers.

I think we have the unique ability to do a good education campaign and point people in a different direction, and we're sensitive to the fact that that moment in time and this instant gratification society that we have, in that moment of time it feels good to be able to donate to that individual that's on the street corner.

And so giving them alternatives to that and make it easy for people to be able to do that in that moment of time will be really important.

So I think we can do that, and I think we'll have a variety of partners that would like to be a voice in that.

>> Keating: Great thank you.

Mayor I don't see my clock, I don't know how much time I have left.

>> Mayor Knudson: 1:10.

>> Keating: I hope I don't take it all up.

I recognize the longing to have a full complement of council here.

I would support that motion if made, but I just want to reiterate that criminalizing or penalizing the most vulnerable among us is not acceptable but ensuring that the safety of all folks who use our roadways, our walkways, our bike lanes are not impeded, and we keep the sidewalks clear, and we discourage distracted driving, all of those are good things, and if we amplify and lift up our not-for-profit partners as I believe the City of Boulder has done in the past with their signage, that's a net benefit to our community, as well.

I look forward to rest of council's discussion today.

I appreciate the engagement and chief thank you for weighing in and thank you for our partners who have expressed their desire to be part of this solution, part of that education effort should this pass.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Groves.

>> Groves: Thank you, Mayor.

And since this was brought up about the intent behind the, I believe I'm the one that raised this issue, and it had nothing to do with our unhoused population.

I've watched well-intentioned community members with their grade school-aged children at the corners of 18th and Chambers, 11th and Chambers, collecting money to fight cancer.

A very noble cause.

They had these little kids out running between cars with butterfly nets.

That's just a disaster and a tragedy waiting to happen.

This is not trying to single out our unhoused.

This is about anybody in the street.

It doesn't stop people from pulling off the street, out of the travel lane and making an exchange.

That's perfectly legal under this proposal.

This is about getting people out of the travel lane before we pull people into the travel lane.

And also I think it's important when we're speaking legal advice that we get it from attorneys.

And I'll just leave it at that.

And one last thing, just last month my wife, and I were driving northbound, and we witnessed a road rage that was caused by transfer of money from a vehicle to a pedestrian.

And it was at the offramp from I-105 onto Coberg road westbound and somebody stopped with the green light to hand money, and then they continued to engage in a conversation, pick-up truck behind was very angry, laid on the phone, used foul language and ran the red light, and almost hit another car.

And she was ready to call 9-1-1 but the thing resolved itself eventually.

This causes more problems than just even hitting a pedestrian in the street.

When you see a green light people tend to drive, and that's a good way to have a rear end accident.

It just creates issues that we don't need in our community.

And again, we keep talking about the lack of data, and I keep sharing from a responder standpoint the data isn't collected for this.

If a person that's panhandling gets hit by a car, it's a motor vehicle versus pedestrian accident.

You've never seen anyone from ELCOT all -- the reports are nationally standardized for both police and fire.

And there is no box to check for panhandling.

It's a pedestrian.

And we have plenty of those accidents every year.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Kashinsky.

>> Kashinsky: Just for the reference, I was previously referring to the vote at the April 23rd work session, 2025, where not all councilors were present, just for the record there.

We've had a lot of conversations about prioritizing and investing our resources in things that are going to have the most impact.

Passing an ordinance doesn't change people's behaviors.

And regardless of what we think about these behaviors, whether they're good behaviors or bad behaviors or how dangerous we think they are, those are not going to change without investing resources, and I asked previously what type of resources would be needed for this, and I didn't really get a clear answer.

So we're looking at something that has an unknown price tag to actually make any sort of difference in accomplishing any of our goals.

I don't think that this would be best use of our resources to improve traffic safety, because even though there may be incidents where this creates situations that people have found uncomfortable or felt were dangerous, we do know what is causing most of our traffic safety deaths, like that is data we do have.

And this is not on that list.

And so I would rather see us prioritize our resources towards those things when we talk about reducing homelessness in our community.

There are strategies that we can do that that we can use to do that, and I would rather invest our resources there.

So I feel like if we pass this, then what we're going to be doing is either we've done nothing, we've passed an ordinance that nobody is going to follow, or we're investing resources in something that's going to be less effective at accomplishing any of our priorities as a city than other things that we could be doing with those resources to accomplish those priorities.

I'm going to be -- I appreciate the chamber's willingness to invest resources in this, but they don't need us to pass this ordinance in order to invest resources in an educational campaign about better ways to give.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Yeh and Councilor Keating I have you both in the queue.

I'm going to briefly insert myself into the discussion, because some of the thoughts raised and adding this to your understanding of where I am and also what I hear in our community about this issue.

First, I want to reiterate and the connections to the transportation hub forum that was held last week at Roosevelt Middle School, about 200 people attending that forum, an enormous amount of concern within the community about the safety of our bicycle and pedestrian networks, the extent and the utility of those networks, the equity of those networks, and also real concerns about unsafe driving, our resources of EPB on that aspect of the work.

We ask our police officers to do a lot of different things, and what I can tell you and I think I've heard clearly from the chief and other conversations is I absolutely expect that transportation safety and the safety of our transportation system will be a conversation of focus in this coming year and that we do need to address unsafe behaviors in the right of way and there does need to be more attention, especially on driving, distracted driving, reckless driving, unsafe behaviors and unsafe decisions, driving impaired, for example.

We have an enormous amount of data that would point towards those things and also towards the importance of protected facilities for people who are choosing to

bike and walk, as we know, many people do once we build them, there they are, all of a sudden, magically using the systems we've designed just like roadways.

People drive in cars in places where there's not roads.

So designing the system matters, the safety of this system matters.

I expect that will be a focus.

I also want to ground us in the fact that this conversation is happening at a moment in time when we are in the process of reconstructing part of our social safety net system.

It is incredibly important to this community and alternative response, peer navigation, RFP, that capacity paired with the new capacity that's come on board this year with Lane County mobile crisis paired with other street response, I personally think this is an important resource for us as a community, as a separate issue from unlawful vehicle transfer and this particular discussion, but related in time and space, because we do want -- one thing I've heard across this community from people very concerned about our public realm and about provision of services and access to services is that that is the goal, to gather good information, to gather data, and then to do the best that we can to connect the right resource with people in time and space across our community.

So I'm expecting we will learn a lot in the next 12 to 18 months, and it won't be the end of any of these conversations today.

And I do want to reiterate that I also think it's important that we prioritize resources towards the things that will be meaningfully about addressing safety in our transportation network.

Councilor Yeh back to you and then Councilor Keating.

>> Yeh: Thanks, mayor and thank you for what you just shared.

I think that's really important to keep in mind.

What we want out of this, what everyone wants out of this is to make a positive difference.

We all want to feel like the actions that we're taking are moving us forward in the direction that we want to go.

We're all on board with that.

I don't know that this ordinance is necessarily by itself alone going to do that.

I do believe that if we take advantage of our new peer navigators that are going to be coming on board, and that we will have access to, that we can use them to connect with these folks to gather the data we need to make future decisions and to support them to be doing -- accessing services they need to be accessing and making different choices and we will change behaviors, and we will see less people standing on the side of the road, and if we don't, we will have the data to be able to make future decisions so what I would suggest that we do instead of doing this and creating an enforcement device that the police will have not have time to do, will not have time to be pulling over multiple people a day to have conversations and write them a warning what we can do is put resources into our peer navigators to be able to have conversations with people, collect the data and then come back at the end of the year and say where are we?

What is happening on these street corners with these folks?

How can we address this in new ways, putting more resources into things that we're doing to actually make a difference and change behaviors rather than just having an ordinance that seems like we're checking a box, but we're not making positive movement where we want to go.

I don't have a problem with that.

If we're making the decision today and this is the only thing on the table by itself, I would be a no vote.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Keating.

>> Keating: Thank you, Mayor.

Point of information.

Our ordinances have changed behavior.

In particular I point to the ordinance banning fireworks in our community, has reduced the amount of fireworks that are set off on New Year's Eve and the 4th of July and the dates around those holidays, respectively.

Chief, were there any exorbitant resources spent educating the public around our fireworks ordinance?

>> The majority of that effort, Councilor Keating, comes out of our public information office and our director there, Melinda McLaughlin, and Michael ray, who do a really good job.

It's added as part of their normal duties, but we kind of drift in and out of these type of educational opportunities all the time.

And so as a matter of course, we have the ability to absorb this and other educational opportunities as they come up.

>> Keating: So this wouldn't be a drain on resources?

>> The educational campaign would not be a strain on resources and as I listen to discussion, part of the strategy, when you look at, for instance, the traffic code, and I'll use that as an example, there's so many traffic-related laws that are pointed to, to safety.

There's a certain strategy around those that suggests that there's no way we can enforce everything.

By virtue of having something being unlawful, you get a certain amount of compliance from people that are paying attention to that.

Just as a matter of their own basic ethics or integrity, they choose not to engage in that behavior, because they know it's unlawful.

That is a strategy, coupled with education and coupled with enforcement when needed.

>> Keating: Great.

On 30th and Hilliard, that's one of the most dangerous intersections in Eugene, is it not?

>> I don't know the answer to that.

I know we have statistics to show from our traffic crash data what our most dangerous intersections are and likely traffic engineers have that data ready and queued up when we think about photo red light projects, that I personally believe is something that could change the trajectory of our safety here, as well but we get data.

>> Keating: In the northbound lane, coming from Hilliard through 30th, as you're heading into Eugene, there's often someone in need standing in that median and thankfully, presumably, they weren't there when just recently, a vehicle went up over that median and smashed into a sign and the sign is down.

Had that person been there, I highly suspect that person would no longer be with us.

>> We have several areas that have that divided median.

Another one that comes to mind is there at chambers and 7th to turn onto 7th.

There's a divided median.

We often see people standing there, and I get nervous when I drive by there, too, for the same reasons, and I believe that council made some decisions around some of the camping ordinance that we have around being five feet from a vertical curb for the same reason.

You hope you never have to endure a pedestrian versus vehicle accident of this nature.

If you're in this business long enough, you can see where that could happen based on some of the driving that we've seen happening in and around the city.

>> Keating: I'm at time.

I appreciate it.

Like Councilor Yeh I want to make sure we have a full complement of councilors here for this action today.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you, council, for that discussion.

I appreciate all of the feedback.

I will now turn -- we are at time, as well so councilors, I need a little bit of feedback from you if we need to do anything in order to extend our meeting, but if council, I've had nods from all of you to continue for a few more moments.

>> Zelenka: Move to continue for 10 more minutes.

>> Clark: You don't have to make a motion.

>> Mayor Knudson: We are in agreement, very appreciated.

I'll now turn to the --

>> Zelenka: You have to vote on the motion.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you.

>> Clark: We don't have to make a motion.

>> Mayor Knudson: Between the two of you, city attorney, do we need a motion or just council agreement to extend?

>> You can just extend it, but since a motion, and a second has been made, it needs to be voted on.

>> Mayor Knudson: Council would you please complete that request?

And the motion passes with a vote of 7-0.

I want to turn to our council president to put a motion forward today and likely continue some of this conversation.

>> Move to adopt an ordinance concerning unlawful transfer on vehicular portion of right-of-way, adding to the Eugene code 1971 and amending Section 5.990 of that code.

>> Second.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Clark, and then Councilor Yeh for further discussion.

>> Clark: Thank you, Mayor.

Kathryn, and I always get confused here.

I want to have a vote -- I want to amend to postpone -- to table until we have a full slate of councilors here to vote?

>> So it would be a motion to postpone to a date certain and that date certainty would be the date upon which all councilors are present.

>> Clark: Moved.

>> Second.

>> This is a debatable motion.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you.

Any further discussion from council?

Councilor Yeh.

>> Yeh: When I said I didn't mind putting this off for Greg, if he requested it.

So did he reach out and ask us to hold off?

>> Mayor Knudson: I checked again during our meeting, I do not have any repeat correspondence from Councilor Evans.

>> Yeh: Okay.

>> Mayor Knudson: And I'm looking again now.

But ideally, it would be before our meeting gavels in.

>> Yeh: I would assume if this was something that was important to him, that he would reach out and let us know that he would prefer us to wait.

Councilors have missed votes on this before.

It is not uncommon.

And sometimes important votes.

So I don't know.

I'm kind of in the air if he hasn't reached out.

>> Mayor Knudson: I'll go to Councilor Keating and Councilor Leech for discussion on the motion.

Councilor Keating.

>> Keating: I don't know the details nor do I want to, if I even did know, share any health-related details about a colleague, but I would caution us taking an action without a full complement of council here recognizing that there might be a member of this body who's unable to request a delay for whatever reason, health-related or other emergent or emergency reasons.

You all honored the request that I made when I was trying to get connectivity on an airplane to be part of this discussion, and I so greatly appreciated and respected that.

I did not know the connectivity through 30,000 feet in the air was going to be as subpar as it was.

So I appreciate that you allowed for me to fully participate.

And I would want to extend that same courtesy to Councilor Evans.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Leech.

>> Leech: Thank you, Mayor.

I appreciate the sentiment of wanting participation and Councilor Keating's example here, he personally requested that.

We have not heard from Councilor Evans.

We have had this topic on the table many times this year.

I would like to conclude that today so I'll not be supporting the motion to extend this conversation further.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you council.

Councilor Clark.

>> Clark: Thank you, Mayor.

I was just going to say what Matt ended up saying plus I sent Greg a note about 11:00, and he has yet to respond to it and for the first time, since I've known him, not to respond to a text, so take that for what you will.

I don't know why he isn't present, but it sounds like he may be dealing with something very important.

So take that for what you will.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you, Councilor Clark.

I will now take a vote on the motion to postpone this decision until full council is present.

All in favor?

Three.

And all opposed.

Four.

And the motion to postpone fails.

Returning to the motion on the table, Councilor Groves, are you in the queue still?

No.

Sorry.

I saw you and then departed.

Thank you.

>> Groves: That was my vote.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you, councilor.

So returning to the motion on the table, any further discussion from council?

Then seeing none I'll take a vote on this motion.

All in favor?

>> Keating: Mayor, can you read the motion, please?

>> Mayor Knudson: Council president.

>> Move to adopt an ordinance concerning unlawful transfer on vehicular portion of right of way adding Section 5.170 to the Eugene code 19-71 and amending Section 5.990 of that code.

>> Mayor Knudson: And we have a second.

I'll take a vote on this.

All in favor.

I see two votes in favor.

And all opposed?

Five votes opposed.

And the motion fails with a vote of 5-2.

Thank you council.

Thank you for your extra few minutes today for allowing us to conclude.

City manager, would you like to offer something before we depart?

>> Yes.

Just briefly.

I know there's been a lot of conversation about transportation safety during this conversation in and light of some of the tragedies that have happened lately in our community I just wanted to let council know that we are planning a work session in either April or May depending on when we can fit it in on an update to the vision 0 transportation safety program, some of the new work that's coming out of the team and also some of the work that's being done in response to what we're hearing from the community.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you very much, city manager pro tem for that important update.

A lot of people very relieved to hear that.

>> Keating: Mayor?

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Keating.

>> Keating: Because I'm on my mobile device, it's hard to hear and see.

Who are the two affirmative votes on the last motion?

>> Mayor Knudson: The two affirmative votes were Councilor Groves and Councilor Keating.

>> Keating: Thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: City council, thank you for your time today.

Staff thank you for your time today.

This does conclude our agenda, and I now close the February 11th, 2026, city council work session, and we are adjourned.