

ROUGHLY EDITED TRANSCRIPT
CITY OF EUGENE
WORK SESSION
APRIL 27, 2026
5:30 P.M.

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

* * *

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

* * *

>> Mayor Knudson: Welcome to the an April 27, 2026 work session. For work sessions like this there is no opportunity for public comment. Those wishing to access the meeting can watch the livestream available on the website. The broadcast on channel 21 or calling in to one of the phone numbers listed on the city of Eugene's website public webcast and meeting materials page. In case of a medical emergency an automated defibrillator is located behind staff on the left side of the room. In case of emergency evacuation the emergency exits are through the double doors located at the back of the room and doors to the patio can be used as needed. Thank you for joining us thing. I call the work session to order, and I'll turn it over to the city manager to introduce the first topic, work session on the parks and recreation bond levy update.

>> Jenny Haruyama: This is an annual update about the accomplishments with the levy funding. We will make numerous presentations. I'll turn it over to staff.

>> All right, I'm Craig, parks and open space manager, here with Peter the recreation division manager and Emily Proudfoot, our landscape architect. We're here to present the outcomes of the past fiscal year funding update related to the parks and recreation facilities bond and 2023 operating levy. 2018, \$30 million bond was passed by voters and to work on priority park and recreation facility projects. The system plan approved by Council in 2017 set up a 30-year vision for the parks and recreation system and represents an extensive public engagement process. The 2018 bond covered a portion of the projects within approximately 10-year

completion horizon. The 2023 five-year levy succeeded a prior levy from 2018, both measures passed with strong voter support to provide the maintenance required for the capital bond projects as new parks and recreation facilities are built and close a long-standing park maintenance funding gap. The \$5 hadn't 3 million in annual operating funds allows us to keep six park restrooms open and increase park maintenance services. Stand up a robust park safety program. Increase trails and natural area maintenance. And provide facilities, maintenance and recreation funding at several centers. There are two formal oversight mechanisms for the bond and levy measures. Parks and recreation citizen Advisory Board reviews progress on both the bond and levy. And annual independent fiscal audit run for bond expenditures. A letter of support from the Advisory Board for the work performed to date as well as audit report for fiscal year 2024 was included in the packet. Now we would like to give you a brief update on the past years. Bond projects prioritized were geographically spread out across the city A total of 38 projects to be completed with these fund and to date and 35 are done. We leverage other funding opportunities with bond dollars to do more with the funds. We spent approximately \$34 million in bond funds to date and built \$74 million of projects using grants, system development charges and other capital funds such as stormwater and transportation funding. Over the course of the bond we received \$2 million in year alone in grants for Suzanne ARLEE park and Maddy Reynolds parks and \$8 million since 2018. Community is now own joying newly built parks and recreation facilities at various parks, downtown Riverfront park and plaza, the delta bonds, loop trail as well as numerous other sport courts and fields, paths and trails and lighting and safety improvement projects. Over the last fiscal year we built Santa Clara community park phase 1, included a large playground spray play, restroom, parking lot and picnic shelter that included a new pedestrian bridge and pathway connecting the north and south sides of the park site as well as soft surface walking trails. Bond funds helped support the rewilding of Amazon creek near 24th avenue, a project that removed a concrete box channel with a naturalized stream with riparian plantings. Ongoing habitat restoration work is funded by the bond measure and recently focused on removal of highly invasive species and replanting with native species throughout the ridge line at sites like Amazon headwaters, Blanton ridge, Spencer butte, Suzanne ARLEE and wild river. Bond funded work has focused on skinner Butte park, removing invasive species on the south side of the Butte and adding native plantings to the Butte and in the riparian forest of the Willamette river and eastern portions of the park. We renovated Martin Luther King, Jr. Park. Improvements included updating the playground and plaza, added game tables and seating, accessibility improvements, a looped walking path and beginner friendly skate curb. Now I'd like to play a brief video, the opening of the park to give you a sense of the community and meaning this brings to residents.

>> Welcome to the reopening of Martin Luther King, Jr. Park! [Cheering]

>> hi, everyone, I serve as the public involvement department. Feeling blessed and grateful to be here. The design of this process began in 2022 and we just really came together and co-designed and co-visioned. So it's great to see the

fruits of our labor come out in this product. Just really grateful, thank you to all of the folks involved, the committee members, share their stories and expertise. Gratitude.

>> So great fun that we have at those grand openings and we will have another one later this spring for Santa Clara community park as well as university park and Suzanne ARLEE park. We hope that you can come out and join us. So upcoming projects, include the opening of the newly renovated university park this fall as well as Suzanne ARLEE park, mountain bike skills park with 13 miles of new riding trails. Other projects remaining to be built include Maddie Reynolds park in final construction document phase and should begin early next year. Also working on train song renovation, Alton Baker park renovation planning and more irrigation and lighting improvements. Remaining projects the renovation of Ferndale and west bank parks. The final design for golden gardens community park is near completion. This park includes playgrounds, paths, sport courts, for pickleball and basketball and a regional sports complex for soccer and softball baseball. Over the last 3 years alone the projects added a lot of maintenance -- amenities and physical assets that must be maintained. The 2023 levy projected full cost requirements but as many of you recall from discussions in 2023 the full amount needed for park maintenance was not included in the measure. We forecasted a funding gap to occur in late 2026-27. We're starting to see that gap occur. We're looking at many options to close this gap including lower some maintenance standards and gaining greater efficiency through resource optimization and possibly delaying projects on until additional maintenance funding is secured. Additional funding options for park maintenance could come from stormwater funds or renewed levy in 2028. Now we're doing a lot with the levy dollars that we do have. The levy has been vital to keep up the maintenance for new amenities as they're built and existing assets in the system. It allows us to keep it greener, cleaner, safer. We reopened six park restrooms that were previously closed due to budget cuts. We have increased daily maintenance service at parks, litter and trash pickup, restroom cleaning, graffiti abatement and higher levels of turf, tree, landscape care. And our natural areas and trails we're resurfacing more trails, repairing fences and roads and signs. Portable restrooms and more to maintain native habitat. Our park safety team includes four park Ambassadors, two cleanup staff, two EPD park resource officers, oversight security patrols and guardian camera trailers. They monitor the park, reminding follow becomes park rules, removing graffiti and large areas of garbage associated with a illegal camping. This team received an award from the Oregon recreation parks association for their work and I want to show this video presented at the awards ceremony.

>> The city of Eugene's park safety team has transformed the way the city cares for its over 4,800 acres of parks and natural areas. Formed in 2018, the team pioneered a unique three-legged stool model, combining park maintenance staff, Eugene park resource officers, and park Ambassadors. Together this team works to address a list of activity, and ensure parks remain safe and welcoming. Instead of relying on complaints, they use innovative GIS mapping to proactively patrol parks, track camp sites, and direct resources where they're needed most. This approach

has reduced service requests by over 40%, improve response times from days to hours, and removed 20 to 30 cubic yards of debris daily while protecting sensitive habitats. Their impact is lasting, restoring the north bank of the Willamette river, activating Skinner Butte park for recreation and earning strong community support including levy funding. The park safety team is redefining public space management with innovation, compassion, and measurable results.

>> We routinely survey the community and they show high marks for the park maintenance and services provided about levy dollars. Thank you for that. With that I'll pass it along to Peter to talk about recreation work with levy dollars.

>> Thanks, Craig. Good evening Mayor and Councilors, appreciate the opportunity to talk to you tonight. As Craig mentioned, the 2018 bond expanded programmable space at three of our recreation facilities. Pool and fitness center, Sheldon. The levy provided funding to expand access to recreation services across our system. So beginning with Campbell community center, can I get a click, Craig, what you see on the screen are increase in space, total attendance and volunteer hours operating out of that facility, and then just below those total hours you see the total attendance and volunteer hours attributed to levy funding. These numbers accrue to the provision of traditional recreation classes, so fitness, arts, crafts, foreign languages, workshops, classes and presses related to senior planning. Retirement, Social Security, Medicare navigation, senior living options, and community building activities. You can think about lunch bunch or the Campbell bazaar. This has enabled us to expand and continue important support around decreasing social eye so lace, increasing life Long wellness and helping older folks navigate important quality of life decisions. Moving on to the two pools, Echo Hollow and Sheldon, another click Craig, as you can see from this slide Sheldon and Echo Hollow fitness centers hosted more than 285,000 visits in FY25. 34% is attributed to the levy. Diverse mix of swim lessons, recreation swims, on your own and low impact fitness enlivened the most welcoming gathering spots where they encounter the diversity Eugene has to offer. The role our pools play in supporting high school and competitive aquatics in the city, levy funding better positions our aquatics program to provide community wide safety and life long fitness for the family. The levy supports .5 of our athletic Supervisor positions, responsible for coordinating our city athletic leagues and coordinating access to community based -- I broke out the attendance on this slide into three categories to highlight the dual role that municipal recreation provider has. Of course many people think about the direct service we provide, our programs our services, our sports leagues. We also fulfill an important - - looking at the total attendance for FY25 just under 90,000 of that attendance are folks that are participating in our programming in our sports leagues. The number just below that you will see under 40,000 youth participated in youth recreational sports through our partnership with local nonprofit community organizations. LYSA, Eugene little league, those organizations certainly don't have fields themselves and so coordinating a scarce resource that we have in our community and distributing that across the community-based organizations. Then that final number 20,604, those are rentals to private entities if we have a moment of space available on these

fields, individuals can rent them through us. You can think about a group of friends that may want to organize a pickup soccer game on a Sunday morning. So I want to emphasize that in addition to our direct service, the coordinating and administrative municipal recreation provider is -- [Off MIC] finally it funds health and wellness programming across our system. And as well half of our centralized booker loose role it is to expand access to facilities. So in FY25 we provided 618 general fitness classes across 17 locations, attendance in those programs was just over 4,300. And then in terms of our centralized booking program we booked just over 1,800 reservations in FY25 across 11 facilities. The vast majority of those reservations were looking to rent space in our buildings. You can think about weddings, class reunions, family reunions, birthday parties, et cetera. A smaller subset of that 1,800 rentals were to either community partners which are partners that span the recreation division, big community partner for us, school district, and then can you also think about program partners who have specific relationships. Various groups, autism community has a partnership with Hilliard community park. Not only has the levy financed specific recreation programs and activities, more importantly it has fortified our infrastructure such that we're better able to fulfill as both stewards of public assets and providers of recreation services. I will be happy to answer questions.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you staff for that proceedings. I'll open the floor to Council discussion. Councilor Evans?

>> Evans: Thanks, makes and thank you, Craig and staff. For the work that you've done. Most particularly, with echo hollow pool. I know that was a long stretch. We opened that, what was it, a year and a half ago to parties and other things present over at Amazon, that our folks over in the north side were really anxious to have. Now that we have it, we're very pleased with the facility and what's going on there. Two quick questions. One, is Craig you and I have been in contact over the last week or two about state street park and Irving. What category do the maintenance of those parks come under, in terms of -- I know we do bond for improvements and facilities. But the levy, what is the levy covering in terms of security and maintenance and that kind of thing. Again, you know our issue with the lights on state street, then the constant use by people who are using our parks for illegal activities particularly drug use and alcohol use, how we're dealing with that. I was in state park on Saturday, and ran across a couple of the needles.

>> Craig: Our levy provides a great deal of resource for the park safety team and supplementing maintenance activities. For the specific issues that you mention at state street and Irwin park is smaller capital level projects, that wasn't a bond project, for bond funding. It comes out of our routine capital operating dollars. Our operation section would manage that project in conjunction with Emily's staff of landscape architects and such. We have -- we have a suite of smaller capital routine maintenance like lighting and irrigation and such. But that wasn't a particular bond project. The levy is critical for that day to day operation. As well as park safety team. We're sending park Ambassadors out there, guardian camera trail where is they are

available will be there to help out. Hopefully with the lighting started up here within some time this summer.

>> Evans: A lot of people are really expecting --

>> Craig: That was on order for a couple of months, waiting for the shipping and the materials and sometimes that takes a while. But we'll get it up and running. As you know we worked with EPD as well and park resource officers on getting more patrols in that area for some of the issues that we're seeing.

>> Evans: I appreciate you guys coming out.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Zelenka.

>> Zelenka: That was a special presentation, especially Emily's part.
[Laughing]

>> Craig: The hard questions.

>> Zelenka: You have been very busy, impressive at 35 of 38 projects are at 90%. Promises made, promises kept, this is great. Projects in my part of town that were impressive, under way now. Playing back the concrete walls to. I just have to point out that the 285,000 attendees at the two pools, twice the attendance of athletics, making the point that we're way under-pooled. Also it was really impressive, in 2025 alone park staff had almost 800 instances of graffiti removal, 330 dump truckloads of garbage, that's a lot. Most impressively is park safety from 22 to 25, the decline for park safety, camping in parks has declined almost 43%. Last point, in the packet one of the things in the survey over 90% of the residents consider our parks extremely or volunteer high quality of life. As we go into this next session, the next phase of economic development of the parks we need to pro cuss on what our competitive advantages are. Our competitive advantages are parks and recreation. The number of people that use this, the number of people that say that this is 90% very important to their quality of life, that's our competitive advantage, one of many. But we need to make sure that those things get the things that we end up investing in. Great job.

>> Evans: It wasn't a simple process either.

>> Groves: Thank you for the presentation. I agree with what I heard already, kudos for the work being done. Our parks are feeling safer, cleaner. The lighting makes a huge difference as I shared with you, Craig, goes through my ward. We have had a lot of problems and that helps as well, cutting the sight lines into the creek itself. Takes away the Heidi holes. We're the only segment that doesn't have a community center, does not have a pool or even a dog park. I would be remiss if I didn't point that out. Constituents in pardon 8 would like those amenities as well.

There's no money at this time, I know we've secured property for both a park and community center. Is that something I'll see in my lifetime?

>> Craig: You will have a long lifetime, we hope to see that. We purchased the property and the property adjacent will give us impetus for a community center. We heard about the dog park. As we move into our system plan refresh process, that will be a project on the list.

>> Groves: Great, I appreciate that. I have a favorable opinion of the parks and the work that you do. It is really appreciated. I agree with that, I think the community has come to expect and appreciate this. I also appreciate the work that you have done up in wild Irish ridge which that area from a fire protection standpoint has always worried me. That's ripe for a place where a conflagration could start that would run the ridge line. I know you've been active in helping as well. That's appreciated. The lighting on the end of Bailey view drive has helped as well. Still wishing we could get BLM to take responsibility for the easement through there. That's an upslope steep grade with the southwest exposure. Ripe for the communication and spread of fire. I don't know if we had anymore inroads on that.

>> Craig: Not recently but a good reminder, we can ping them soon and keep going. But we will be up there around the fourth of July to make sure we can do everything we can to keep eyes on that. People like to shoot fireworks off of that area and we'll do everything we can to quell that.

>> Groves: We have a number of young people that like to build bonfires in the tall dry grass in the summer. It is scary, scares the neighbors, should scare all of us especially in the hills. Because that gets moving, it will go fast. We have our fire marshal, he's aware of what that could look like. Thank you for that. We will try to keep it under wraps. The neighbors offered to put work parties together but there's always concern. Overall, very enthusiastic and appreciative of what you do.

>> Mayor Knudson: I would be remiss if I didn't mention that people lighting off fireworks within our park spaces is not legal activity in our community based on ordinance passed by this Council a few years ago. While the process of following up on that law, with EPD, is a focus of our work. Thank you.

>> Groves: Part of the problem with wild Irish ridge you can't get there easily.

>> Mayor Knudson: It is beautiful. And a natural area. We'd like to keep it that way. Councilor leech.

>> Leech: Thank you, thank you for the work and the presentation. I think the thing that struck me the most today is I hear a lot of frustrations about a lot of our systems in code enforcement, that is complaint-based. The fact that you have been able to be more proactive and send teams out and reduce the number of complaints that come in so dramatically is really, really impressive. And appreciated. It is very

evident. Our parks and our pathways. Could we get an update on SCOBERT garden? I know the construction is supposed to begin this summer but I haven't heard.

>> Emily: It is not a bond funded project to be clear. So we are doing -- it is an important historic site. We have had to do serious archaeology work. That has delayed our process some. Then we have gone out for some grants that we're waiting on. By the time we hit this time next year I think we will be headed in a positive direction. I think it is good to wait a little more to bring it together in a solid way, I'm excited about that.

>> Leech: It is a long process and you have worked really hard on it.

>> Emily: We appreciate your support.

>> Leech: I look forward to the Santa Clara park opening as well.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Keating.

>> Keating: When we passed the bond in 2023, I recall a great many of us advocating for increased lighting for safety reasons. So it is nice to hear that is around the corner. I would be remiss if I didn't also advocate for a partnership with our dark sky partners, as Councilor Evans has brought up in previous work sessions. A formal request from Council to engage in that activity, is that what it takes, or embracing those best practices is that something on your team's to-do list? Is that part of the plan?

>> Craig: I'm not familiar with the process to get it a designated dark sky community. If that's what you are referring to. But I do know and Emily can talk to this better about a lot of the things that we do to light, provide safety and down-light so we're not providing more light spillage into the community. It is definitely a value that we have. And we consider it.

>> Emily: Under city code you must -- your lighting must be cutoff lighting. It can't be -- can't go to the sky. We follow that city code. In addition, you know, when we're working in natural areas in particular, think about the west bank path, it kind of goes up through pretty -- at night it's dark, feels scary, but it's pretty significant land that is valuable. So we've worked really hard to really focus the lights just on the path. So we do some sort of house side shielding. We have abilities within our specifications to focus the light where we want it to go. We also have done a lot of work on reducing light -- reducing how bright it is. So like the warmer the light the less impact it has. There's like 2700KELVIN is the number that we use to light paths and areas. We have a lower impact on habitat around our light fixtures. It is a balance in urban areas to provide lighting that provides safety for park users at nighttime and to consider what is a pretty high value for the community is conservation. Conservation values are also in the mix. And we did additional work

recently around night lighting at the plaza and we're responding and working with adjacent neighbors in the heartwood, it was pretty bright for them and it was the reflectivity that was bright. We turned down the lights a little bit and then at 11:00 we turn them down more. Lots of thoughtful work around lighting in our park systems and trying to balance a lot of different values.

>> Keating: Thank you. I see on I guess slide 3, 35 of the 38 bond projects are funded and under way. Tugman park, I walk my dog there daily, and there's still in progress pieces to habitat restoration at tugman park. Am I to understand that in-progress part aren't bond dollars? And/or are they connected to the volunteerism that the tugman tuggers are doing? If I can use this time to amplify the great work of our tugman tuggers. And what is your relationship with tuggers or other volunteer groups that we may have invested bond dollars, shameless plug ward 2, I know. But what's the engagement with volunteers so throughout the system, once we have invested and we have completed these bond projects, what's that handoff like to keep the project moving?

>> Emily: I'll talk about the bond piece real quickly. Off the bat we had right when the bond measure was passed, first project was to renovate, take part of the renovation dollars and regulate the playground at tugman park. So great that we were able to respond so quickly to the passage of the measure and provide a quite visible renovation to the site. We have bond measure funding left over that we're looking at how best to spend it. I think natural area enhancements are largely in part due to our volunteer work. That group has been super active for a long time and very engaged in the park and consider them an important stakeholder when you talk about renovations there.

>> Craig: Tugman volunteer piece, we have a pretty extensive volunteer program, about 25,000 hours of volunteer labor annually throughout the system. All sorts of groups, like ones you mentioned other friends of groups that supplement the maintenance work. We are very connected and interrelated with a lot of the folks that want to help with the parks. We have a program that is always ready. Excited to work with the new groups but also long-standing existing groups. I would say the handoff is relatively seamless to make sure that we take advantage of people that want to get out there and work in the parks and take care of places.

>> Keating: Thank you. I'm gob smacked when I hear 20 to 30 yards of refuge removed daily. That's wild. Thank you to the teams doing it. Are they instructed on the front end, like, hey, this is something you will get into? How are they trained? For their -- the workers' personal safety do they have the proper equipment, the right PPE, the right footwear? What if anything can we do to ensure their safety while they pick up so much of this degree. Debris.

>> Craig: We have a highly professional team of folks that clean up, resource officers, and coordinate with the state on training from safety to actual working in terms of how to relate with other folks having a crisis. There's all sorts of training

that people get. We definitely give them up front information what you get into. Interestingly enough, there seems to be a real deep passion to do this work and excited to do it. I can't tell you how many times that I've been amazed at the extent that they'll go to to make sure they're taking care of our parks and people out there and doing the best job they can. We have a very, very -- I'm proud of our team and the competency, the professionalism and the passion that they show out there every day.

>> Keating: Cool. Is there a program like a solve, a beach cleanup that, occurs locally for our parks?

>> Craig: There are dozens, dozens of groups like that. In specific parks, that's pretty much what our volunteer program does, work with those groups that want to go out and clean up and work in the parks. We have a myriad of different types of opportunities for volunteers to help out with cleanup or whether it's with plantings other improvements. There's a full range of opportunities.

>> Keating: Finally for real this time, Mayor, parkwatch reporting safety issue at Eugene/OR.gov. Does that come out of bond dollars? I've been amplifying to it constituents who noted some issues in parks that they wanted to report. If it doesn't come out of bond dollars, that's a conversation for another day. I want to give credit to the people monitoring the parkwatch program.

>> Craig: It does not come out of bond dollars, it's a program that we stood up possibly 12, 13 years ago just to allow people to get in touch. With the QR codes and digitally in the park system. It's been very, very effective for communication. The more we know what's going on in the parks the better we can get out there and respond to it. It allows us to perform our work.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Yeh then I'll add a few comments and we'll head into the second item.

>> Yeh: Thank you for being here, I'll never say how thankful I am for the IMSO project, people talk about it, bring it up every once in a while. I will just keep telling you how amazing you are. I'm sure that same amazingness went to the next park and the next park and the next park. Thank you. I have a question about recreation that might be, I'm not sure if you can answer today. One of the great things that city governments are able to do is find the gaps and fill them in the community of what people need. I wonder if you can share with us those places where folks are underserved or maybe not served at all but we can fund them.

>> Peter: The needs, and I want to combine needs and wants to make sure that we appropriately position recreation within our community. And certainly the needs and wants that are out there span the diversity of programming that we offer. Where we really notice gaps is in terms of access to those programs. So that could be geographic, language, that could be financial ability. So we're in the middle of

restructuring, reimagining recreation. Part of what we look at is the portfolio that we offer and who is accessing those programming. We recently added a new tier into our scholarship program. Previously we scholarshiped folks at 25% or 50% for registration fee. We just this year introduced the 90% scholarship rate. One of the things that we were seeing at the 25% and the 50% rate is that scholarship, that subsidy, still didn't provide enough access for a lot of families out there trying to get into recreation programming. I think probably financial access and then as well just our ability to offer programming. We are bumping up against capacity in our pools, you saw the numbers related to pools. Certainly our sports fields. Our summer camps are full. Registration day was last Thursday. Community center camps filled on Thursday. What are our high volume programs, and can we expand those. As we review our total portfolio, there are other programs that aren't as in demand. So starting to shift our portfolio to more accurately represent the demand out there. Capacity in terms of these high demand programming then we just don't have the facilities to offer all of the things that people want. Campbell community center for example, versus athletics. You talk to anybody in youth sports they say we don't have fields, we don't have enough pool time, thank you Councilor Zelenka. Those are two things that we look at. As we move through.

>> Yeh: Thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you for the presentation, I would be remiss if I didn't say something to you all that I shared with several Federal agencies in D.C. last week for the united front trip. Reminder of the really great work that our parks and open space division has done on fuels mitigation and removal from our parks and natural areas. 1200 acres in 25 different parks and open spaces and natural areas that fuel reduction work has touched over several years. It is a great example of how we are connecting our parks and open space work with our communities work to be resilient and to be better prepared for future where wildfire is a present condition. Within and around the community. That's related to the opportunity that I'm curious to hear about next time we talk with you all. That has to do with the westward and south of the Butte expansions of our trail systems. Partnerships with amazing organizations like McKenzie river trust and conservation areas that they have. But also Eugene parks foundation. And the opportunity to think about how our recreation access which I do believe is an essential component of the economic development opportunities and differentiation as a community how that connects with our efforts to expand access and offer a generational contribution as we plan this next cycle and couple of cycles of work. Thank you for all of your efforts to connect the dots and make our parks and open spaces accessible to everyone in the community. Help us accomplish a lot of different goals at the same time. We will be delighted. Thank you all for this time today. With that, that concludes our first agenda item. And we'll now move to the second agenda item, I will turn it over to the city manager for a work session on our City Council operating agreements and additional topics as needed.

>> Jenny Haruyama: There were two additional topics raised but not discussed. One was the unplanned substantive motion and Council discussion. The other was discontinuing the randomization of quasi-judicial land hearings. Katie will take it away once she gets set up.

>> Mayor Knudson: For the listening audience when any of you turn on your microphones please move them closer to you so that people are able to hear online. A few people's voices are quiet.

>> Katie: So sorry I will be ready shortly. This might be karma for the room issues. I could read, yes. Everyone has the slides in front of them so we can do it that way.

>> Mayor Knudson: Sure.

>> Katie: All right, got plugged in case it decides to work. Thank you Mayor and City Council, I'm back to talk about Council report have operating agreements. The last time I was here I had a couple of additional topics raised but ran out of time to discuss. And Council expressed an interest in revisiting the four discussions. We did update the operating agreements on March 9 based on previous decisions. Rose it doing it, all right. All right. So we'll just dive into our topics. Topic 1 unplanned substantive motions and Council discussion. Currently Councilors can make unplanned substantive motions at any time during discussion. And possible change raised would be to allow for a full round of Councilor discussion before introduction of an unplanned substantive motion. The other topic that was raised but not discussed is removing randomization of speakers for quasi-judicial land use public hearings. Currently, all public hearing speakers are randomized for quasi-judicial land use hearings. Speakers are organized by their stated position. And then randomized. So the possible change that was raised would be to maintain the speaking sign-up order after being sorted into the stated position. That's all I have, I'll turn it over for discussion and decision points. I have the motions available for these two if you like.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you, staff, for that brief presentation. I will now open the floor for Council discussion. Counselor Clark then Councilor Keating then Councilor Groves, then Zelenka.

>> Clark: I know the choice of wording was to facilitate a good discussion among Council. I wonder how you are defining substantive.

>> Katie: This was not how I defined it. This was brought forward by Councilor Groves. So I have nothing more than what he provided which is unplanned substantive motions.

>> Clark: That seems like a subjective word that would be difficult to put parameters around if we're going to try and make a general rule that applies. That

would be my only comment I guess. That is more meaty about what that motion would require.

>> Groves: It's more than that.

>> Clark: I didn't hear what you said.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor groves you will of an opportunity to answer that question in a moment. But Councilor Keating?

>> Keating: It is my understanding reading Roberts rules that a substantive motion is considered a main motion. It is a main motion when other motion is pending. Defined in Roberts. It requires a second. It requires debate. And it require as majority. I hear where my colleague is coming from. And we're going to hear in 2:25 again where are you coming from. Out of respect I disagree. I think that any motion that is brought up by any member, at any time, should be recognized. If it is out of order for whatever reason that member has the ability to bring it up again and get two-thirds of the body to agree that it should be considered. Any one of us can vote to end debate at any time. Ensuring there is a full round of us providing an opinion before we even entertain an action is contrary to the very rules that are established in Roberts rules of order. The guiding principles that this body has embraced. So I would urge my colleagues if it ain't broke don't fix it. If folks think there are elements that are broke, I think there are better ways to encourage spirited debate rather than mandating that each one of us have a full round before even the introduction of a main motion. I think that is unwieldy and unnecessary. I will be voting no and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor groves.

>> Groves: Thank you. Councilor Clark, Councilor Keating explained kind of the difference between the two. I brought this up, it occurred at a Council meeting where we had an issue that we were discussing. Myself and I believe two other Councilors were in the queue to speak, wanted to ask questions, understand things. And a motion was made. Once the motion was made and seconded we could only discuss the motion. Not the issue. I don't think it leads to good question. I don't want to stifle another Councilor's voices. Each one of us represents roughly 22,000 people. Essentially the three Councilors in the queue we just stifled 66 thousand of our residents. Their representative. I don't think that's right. As far as Roberts rules of order we've got issues where we deviate from Roberts rules when it make sense. For this, this is about us having a voice at the table. It's not going to postpone it long term. A person can certainly say at the end of the first round I intend to make a motion on this issue. It is not taking away their prerogative to do that. At the same time it is allowing us to have a full dive in to the issue where we can ask quos and have them answered. To ask questions. Before shutting it down before the rest of us can talk, we had been in the queue for quite a while, it is something that we should fix. I'll stop there. Thank you, Mayor.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Zelenka.

>> Zelenka: Yeah. First we need to be able to make motions and have flexibility during meetings and discussion. This means not -- [Off MIC] problem is as was described, the conversation stops and you have to pivot and turn only to that part of the conversation that that particular Councilor -- I like hearing what everybody has to say. Stopping it means we don't get to hear what everybody else has to say. Maybe a happy compromise is that people, we can create a queue, Mayor can keep the queue, when it is your turn to speak you ask or signal that you are going to make a motion, describe it, and then that preserves the order just like before but we have the full discussion then we have the motion. That is more orderly. So maybe we can add that as a friendly amendment or understanding.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Kashinsky then counselor Clark for a second round if there are no other Councilors in the first round.

>> Kashinsky: Thank you. What I will -- thank you both, everyone, for their comments so far. I understand the intent with this but I think one of the things that does need to be kept in mind is that we have time constraints on these meetings. In a if we're talking about fully discussing an agenda item, which isn't defined in here either, is that one round, until people stop wanting to be in the queue. What that could mean is particularly for a complex item the motion gets pushed off until unscheduled future meeting. So I think there are tools within Roberts rules that Councilor Keating mentioned that mean, if someone made a motion and you want to continue discussion you can. I note when we have motions connected to an agenda item, they are related to what the agenda item is. I've seen in the past, when we say speaking to the motion, that's usually still broad enough for someone to ask questions they might need to ask in order to make an informed decision about the topic. I think it is sort of a general rule, as a general vibe, sort of courtesy. Yes, I agree, someone should make the motion at the time after everyone has had a chance. Councilor groves, this is a motion that you discussed was one that I made. I think you and I have discussed how that sort of came to be and why that came to be. In the future I would have waited having had some of these conversations. But I think reading into the operating agreements as opposed to being a courtesy thing, which as I said could have done better, gets to us a place where it puts restrictions in place that may disenfranchise people in different ways in the future. Are we talking about both items now or just the one?

>> Just the one. Can you come back to both decision points shortly.
Councilor Clark and Councilor Zelenka.

>> Clark: Thank you. I want to agree with my friend and I understand the reasoning behind why you would like to make this rule. I, too, think sometimes we get into issues that are complex enough that they may have multiple different types of resolutions that require multiple votes and successive iterative discussion, and

series of votes. I would hate to have us have something drag on too long for the sake of discussion if we could move through it more expeditiously. Maybe so like Alan, I'm trying to think of a good half way. Maybe the City Attorney can you tell me if I'm right or wrong. But the Mayor does have some latitude with conducting when a motion is in order or out of order to some degree to make that choice. Could the Mayor keep separately from a discussion queue, a motion queue. That way you preserve order and say I'd like to get in the queue for motions.

>> Kathryn Brotherton you could, something would prevent two separate coups.

>> Clark: Give everybody a chance to speak then motion at the appropriate time.

>> Brotherton: Problems that it could solve and problems that it can create is what I'm thinking. Motion queues are interesting when there's a main motion then if somebody wants to amend that motion you have to have the main motion on the table. And you often have a treble effect. Amendments that amend amendments. Keeping a queue will potentially have a limit on actually the desired actions that you are seeking to take. At the end of the day we want Roberts rules to be facilitating your actions and get you where you want to go. That is the big picture, not trying to use Roberts rules as an obstacle or anything else in a would prevent from you taking the actions you want. I think that a motions queue has the potential of causing problems when actually a motion, somebody would need to come out of that queue to facilitate the action they want to take. They want to do a friendly.

>> Clark: Under Roberts rules and our current operating agreements if a Councilor makes a motion and someone shouts out second, what are the Mayor's choices at that moment for what to do next? Is the Mayor obligated to change the discussion at that point or is the Mayor, say, the vote and the discussion to the motion is subject to completion of the previous queue of discussion.

>> Brotherton: Generally speaking the Mayor can call a motion out of order. Typically the way that that has worked within your Council has been when it's just off-topic. I mean it hasn't typically just been used from a procedural standpoint. You have something, we're talking about two things. A motion that is kind of coming out of the blue versus motions that are amendments. You do have some rules that speak specifically to amendments. When a main motion is put on the table your operating agreements currently provide that everybody gets a chance to speak to that main motion before an amendment can be made. So that's already in your operating agreement. We're just talking about a motion that may potentially end the discussion. Could the Mayor call it out of order is your question. Yes. That hasn't been the practice, it's usually been if it's completely off-topic.

>> Clark: It is my opinion that we have a Mayor very skilled at being fair about doing this. But we have had past mayors who were not. For whom that chair was a tool to accomplish an outcome. So I want to make sure that --

>> Brotherton: I know what you are speaking of, I've been in meetings where it has motions -- which is why I think having either you have a rule or you accept a practice where that's not the case. Leaving it up to just general, this is generally how we want to do it leaves open the ability for motions to be shut down in ways that are guiding a conversation versus, this is the way we as a Council want to run our meetings. Which is the intent of your operating agreements. I don't think you want it to change based on who happens to be sitting with the gavel.

>> Mayor Knudson: All right, I'm going to move Councilor YEH ahead of Councilor Zelenka.

>> Yeh: I appreciate mike's thinking. If someone makes a motion and someone seconds it that's two people who want to stop. There's more than two people on Council. My assumption is someone can just say, hey, I want to table this to continue the discussion. If the majority of us are like yeah we're not done that would be the way to solve the problem. True?

>> Brotherton: It is. What I see happen is all of these tools are there and we think and talk about them after the meeting ends. We're like wait we could have -- those things happen. Some momentum starts rolling. You are right. Someone makes a motion it gets seconded. Somebody could then you got to get in the queue and get called on. Someone can make a motion to postpone action until everybody has had an opportunity to speak to the substantive item. Then you vote on that, yes. We're all wrapped up, you all are in on the substance and some of these procedural things --

>> Yeh: There's a momentum but maybe as a team we can be aware of these are our options. And I think that might be a better way of solving it than creating another rule that is a little fuzzy to me and complicated. That's where I'm at.

>> Brotherton: Moving to postpone until a date certain or tabling it so somebody -- is always a tool within your tool Bock. Moving postpone until avenues discussion, does require a second. Can you actually then speak to that. It is debate an. So that -- debatable. That would accomplish that.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you City Attorney. Councilor leech I'll move you before Councilor Zelenka, and Councilor groves have a second round.

>> Leech: I want to say a Council President, potential maker of the motion today, that I'm not intending to make the motion. Not seeing as much interest as would be needed to pass it. Unless I hear otherwise. I was going to allow more discussion if that was changing that in any way. That's my take at the moment.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you. Now Councilor Zelenka, then Councilor groves then Councilor Keating.

>> Zelenka: I agree, Jennifer, it is a bit fuzzy. I'll try to add a little clarity. I agree with what you said, Eliza, this shouldn't be a tool to delay or push things off. But should, we still should try to hear what everyone has to say. At least through the first round. We want to preserve the order of speakers. So a motion queue in this case -- said that this was -- motions are in order after the first round. I think that would work. It would allow everybody to say what they want. Any subsequent rounds same rules as now. If we just changed this to, I'm reading, notwithstanding section 701 generally substantive motions not on the agenda should be made -- fully, the opportunity to discuss the agenda item through the first round. Everybody gets to say their piece. Then the regular rules apply. The way that we do the queue is if you're first in line in round one, you are first in line in round two. If you ask. To preserve that. [Off MIC].

>> Councilor groves then Councilor Keating. Depending where we are with the motion.

>> Groves: I like what you described Councilor Zelenka, that's kind of what I'm looking for. Not prolonged approach but to get through the first round. We should all have that opportunity and want each other to have that opportunity. In the case when this happened, there was an opportunity given to withdraw the motion and remake it. That was declined by the person who made the motion. So there was nowhere to go with this. That is true, Eliza, watch it on the video, I did tee. Thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Keating then Councilor Kashinsky.

>> Keating: I'm going to paint a bizarre scenario, bear with me. If an unplanned motion is brought up to discuss that the sky is green, it would be a gross waste of time, even if that motion has a second, for all eight of us to discuss whether the sky is green until one of us moves to amend that the sky is blue. We don't necessarily need a whole other round of each one of us weighing in on whether the sky is green or the sky is blue if whatever, more of us has their say and it seems as if debate is coming to a close and we move forward with the vote. That's an efficient use of our time coming to a reasonable conclusion. The way it's currently written works allow for a full round of Councilor discussion before introduction of the sky is green, then we allow for a full round of Councilor discussion before the substantive motion to substitute that the sky is blue. That is clunky. Inefficient. So I would greatly appreciate embracing the spirit of what we're hearing to allow for conversation to breathe. I think if we adopt what city manager alluded to, and Kathryn if you don't mind reading that into the record F we adopt this piece that is already in our operating agreement for amendments, the spirit of that for motions, then I think that gets to us where we need to be without codifying this unplanned

substantive piece which ties our hands and elongates and extends meetings unnecessarily.

>> Brotherton: So section 7.02 speaks to motions. Then specifically to amendments. It says the Mayor and Council will be limited to commenting only on the main motion prior to discussing any proposed amendments. If an amendment to the motion is made during the initial round on the main motion substantive remarks - - subsequent remarks on the amendments will be postponed until all wishing to speak on the main motion have done so. So this is existing -- you haven't always followed this practices, to be honest. I have watched a lot of meetings where this hasn't happened. Amendments are made during the first round, you move and talk about the amendments and go back to the main motion. But again your reporting agreement it is in the agenda item summary, specifically says if a main motion, the Councilor will be limited to Mayor and Council limited to commenting only on the main motion prior to discussing any proposed amendments. If an amendment to the motion is made during the initial round on the main motion, subsequent remarks on the amendments will be postponed until all wishing to speak on the main motion have done so. So that's when move to adopt resolution saying X, why, Z. Somebody gets in the queue first to talk about the resolution, moves to amend the resolution. What this operating agreement says is you are going to put that, everybody still gets to speak to the main motion before they're required to speak to the amendment.

>> Keating: If I want to amend that the sky is blue I have to wait for all of us to talk about the sky is green.

>> Brotherton: Not that there's a motion on the table yet I think is what Councilor groves is saying. You have an agenda item summary, it has a discussion, it's an agendized item. Then as you talk about that agendized item somebody makes a subsequent -- substantive motion that potentially can -- that will end the discussion. And it is before everybody has had a first round or ability to speak.

>> Keating: If we adhered to that more strictly would that satisfy the concerns that have been brought up today?

>> Brotherton: It doesn't get at what Councilor groves is concerned about. What is existing in the Council operating agreements there has to be a main motion put on the table for this to get triggered. And you have agenda items where no motion is planned at all but somebody can still make a motion that potentially ends the discussion. And this wouldn't touch that at all. This is your current operating agreement only relates to when you have a main motion put on the table. And then subsequent amendment needs to wait until everybody has had an opportunity to talk about the main motion on the table.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you City Attorney. Councilor we're going to drop it down to one-minute round as we move into the third and fourth on this operating

discussion. I have Councilor Kashinsky, and Councilor Clark, then Councilor Zelenka.

>> Kashinsky: I want to share some math that our agenda items are scheduled for 45 minutes. Typically or frequently the presentation can be 15 minutes or more. There are eight of us with three-minute rounds each, that's 24 minutes. If you add in the Mayor and the answers to questions, we don't always have time to even get through the first round for some of these agenda items. I think saying that's going to be the rule, is saying that we're not going to allow -- we're going to say whether or not are you able to introduce a motion on a time sensitive matter is very dependent whether or not people choose to delay and take their full time. So that's a little bit where I see a challenge with this.

>> Councilor Clark.

>> Clark: I just want to have clarification in what you were reading, Kathryn. Is that in the case that there is a suggested motion from the manager or if --

>> Brotherton: Your operating agreements say main motion. It would apply whether it is a motion, like, organically arises from the Council --

>> Clark: Hearing items I make a motion that the sky is purple.

>> Brotherton: That would be the main motion. That is always the primary motion that is yet to be amended, that is a main motion.

>> Clark: We're not talking about motions that haven't been made but suggested by the manager under the item itself.

>> Brotherton: That would be considered a main motion as well.

>> Clark: Before it is made?

>> Brotherton: Not clear on the question.

>> Clark: The Council President makes the suggested motion that the manager suggests in the AIS. Before the motion is made, is a discussion time period in most cases. That does not apply to this or does? The discussion that takes place, everybody gets one round, is before the motion is made or after?

>> Brotherton: Technically under Roberts rules you aren't supposed to have any discussion until there's a motion on the table. That has been a practice that you all have chose wren not to have because it completely limits your ability to ask questions and have the dialogues that you all enjoy having prior to taking action. In the situation where what we are talking about with Councilor groves is that you are just having a discussion. There has been no motion put on the table. You are having

a discussion and? One just puts a motion -- and someone just puts a motion on the table that is substantive in nature.

>> Groves: No matter Council President or someone else?

>> Brotherton: The practice has been Council President, that motion does not get asked to be put on the table until you're done with the rounds or we're at time.

>> Groves: I'm talking about the rule.

>> Brotherton: There's no specific rule --

>> Groves: I'm talking about making a rule.

>> Brotherton: You are talking about two different things. He's speaking of, I believe it says not on the agenda. Substantive motion not on the agenda is his requested motion. The motions that you are speaking of and I'm sorry I wasn't clear, the motions you are speaking of that the Council President makes are motions on the agenda. He's speaking to different motions.

>> Groves: Thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Zelenka.

>> Zelenka: I think this is actually pretty simple. The question before the Council is should everybody get to speak before we do a motion. That may have been our practice. Now any Councilor can short-circuit that discussion and questioning putting a motion out if they're the first one in the conversation. I think the better practice to have us all go through round one, say our piece, and ask questions for clarity. Then have someone put a motion. Either the one that's in the agenda or one that someone has. So by simply saying, having an opportunity to discuss the agenda item.

>> Mayor Knudson: For unplanned substantive motion. That is the language.

>> Brotherton: The motion proposed is notwithstanding section 7.01, substantive motions not on the agenda should be made after all Councilors have had an opportunity to fully discuss the agenda item. That is because otherwise the practice is -- so what Councilor Zelenka has suggested is it read had an opportunity to discuss the agenda item through the first round.

>> Zelenka: Technically you have to make a motion then speak to it in Roberts rules. We don't do that, we've never done that in 20 years, always have the conversation then the motion put on the table. That allows for a full and robust conversation about any topic that any Councilor wants. In the spirit of that, having

everybody allowed to go through the first round would allow them to then have a motion, one that's in the agenda or not.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Yeh?

>> Yeh: How does it play out? In this scenario, not a planned motion, there is a possibility we won't know the motion is even happening or what it's about. So I would guess in practice the Mayor would then maybe know that it's happening. Someone would be like I'm going to make this motion. She would have to be hey -- we don't always talk, everyone doesn't always make a comment on a topic. Then you would be like does -- we have a motion coming, we don't know what it is, does anyone who didn't talk want to talk? I get what people are saying and I understand everyone should have an opportunity to be able to say what they need to say. I do think it will waste time and I think there's a perfectly acceptable way to be like I didn't get to talk I want to table. This I'm happy to give someone an opportunity to talk if they didn't get an opportunity and motion came out and was seconded. Why would I stifle discussion? There's a discussion to this problem, we didn't use it and mistakes were made. Adding extra layers of complexity to a job that's complicated enough -- I'm going to vote no. I think it's unnecessary.

>> Mayor Knudson: Council President has indicated based on temperature from the table not bringing this motion forward for topic one. We do not have a Council majority interested in moving forward. Any other Councilor like to make a motion? Councilor Groves?

>> Groves: I'm going to make a motion as suggested by Councilor Zelenka. Move to add the following sentence to section 7.02 of the operating agreements notwithstanding section 7.01 generally substantive motions not on the agenda should be made after all Councilors have had an opportunity to discuss the agenda item through the first round.

>> Mayor Knudson: Further discussion from Council? Seeing none I'll take a vote for this motion. All in favor? Raise your hands. Three hands in favor. All opposed? Five opposed. The motion fails by a vote of 5-3. We have a second topic of discussion for our operating orders which is removing the randomization of speakers for quasi-judicial land use hearings. There is a motion included for discussion from your packets. That our Council President could make. Councilor Zelenka I'm going to ask if you would like to be first since it was your topic.

>> Zelenka: Sure, thank you. The land use quasi-judicial issues are very complex. They're hard to follow. It takes a concerted effort, concerted organizational effort to make your case. Instructions for the applicant just in the last hearing said that you can spend your time any way you want in any order. For the opponents, you don't get to do that. You are randomized. You can't organize your testimony. It goes item 4, 6, 7, 4, 1, 2. And it takes the punch out of it. The process is already structurally stacked against opponents. This just makes it harder to make their case.

I think it is blatantly unfair. What is the rationale for randomizing the opponent's testimony and not randomizing the proponent's testimony? When it was institutionalized randomized testimony it was for the gaming we were seeing in public comment. I think this is a completely different animal. The unintended consequence of how this was applied was we applied this to only part of the quasi-judicial land use proceeding for the opponents. Not the proponents. We should allow the opponents the same rules as the proponents in these complicated quasi-judicial and allow them to spend their time anyway they see fit, any order of speakers. It levels the playing field. Doesn't put them at a disadvantage that already has a disadvantage. Doesn't make sense, it's complex enough. This is a very different type of testimony and completely different purpose than is the public comment. I'm not worried about precedent setting, they're completely different things. I don't think we should apply a random testimony order in this instance to only one party in the proceeding and not the other. That seems blatantly unfair. I support, tend to bring forward the motion that is in the packet. To eliminate that randomization for the opponent.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you. If Councilor Clark in the cue, and Councilor I want to observe we have two minutes.

>> Clark: Madam City Attorney, can you give any kind of legislative intent as to why there is more time for the applicant in this way, the way that it's structured?

>> Brotherton: It is in the city code for quasi-land use proceedings, it may be in state law.

>> Clark: Why is it structured different?

>> Brotherton: They are structured different, quasi-land use hearings. They get a certain amount of time, it's in the city code. Now, the component about randomizing --

>> Clark: I'm asking a specific question. The reason why the structure of an applicant's ability and length of time to speak is different than an opponent's would be. Is there a reason the legislature thought it was wise to have an applicant have more time?

>> Brotherton: I don't every the legislative history, I don't have an answer to that.

>> Mayor Knudson: I have to apologize I'm following a clock on the wall that is not the actual time. So we have a few more minutes than I thought we had to continue.

>> Clark: I have one more thing to say.

>> Zelenka: He has the floor.

>> Mayor Knudson: You have 16 seconds.

>> Clark: I'd like to say yes but I didn't like the organized opponent presentation in a row. I don't know why the state legislature decided to set it up differently. But before I make that decision to do that I'm kind of, would like to know why.

>> Brotherton: I can speak generally to that, the proponents have the burden of proof. They have to carry the day. If you are -- they're the ones that have to establish compliance with the criteria. Generally speaking that's why the proponents would be given more time and they go first. And they have the opportunity to rebut. That's generally speaking why it would be structured that way.

>> Mayor Knudson: Council do we have a motion to extend this meeting for ten minutes?

>> Zelenka: Ten minutes.

>> Mayor Knudson: We have staff that need to set up this room for our meeting at 7:30, we don't have a lot of time between the meetings. We will have to continue this agenda item and look for a place in the schedule. Thank you very much Katie for your work. Thank you City Council --

>> Zelenka: Can I make a clarifying comment?

>> We need to wrap it up. I close the work session and we are adjourned.