

MINUTES

**Eugene City Council
Harris Hall, 125 East 8th Avenue
Eugene, Oregon 97401**

**January 13, 2020
5:30 p.m.**

Councilors Present: Betty Taylor, Emily Semple, Alan Zelenka, Jennifer Yeh, Mike Clark, Greg Evans, Claire Syrett, Chris Pryor

Mayor Vinis opened the January 13, 2020, work session of the Eugene City Council.

Councilor Zelenka arrived at 6:46 p.m.

1. Committee Reports and Items of Interest

- Councilor Semple – reported an increased presence of police officers in downtown; announced there were 64 more beds soon to open at the Dusk to Dawn site; said the McKenzie Willamette Watershed Council report indicated the second year of opening streams was successful; announced the Human Rights Commission would march as part of the annual Martin Luther King, Jr., celebration.
- Councilor Taylor – reported that constituents asked her about licensing cats and requested longer parking times at Skinner Butte Park as well as action on preventing e-scooters and short-term rentals within the city; expressed concern about the increase in toxins in the air near Amazon Park, especially with the expected increase in housing due to House Bill 2001; read a quote from Wayne Morse.
- Councilor Syrett – reported that she met with the Citizens’ Climate Lobby who asked for support on federal carbon dividend legislation and expressed interest in meeting with staff from the Intergovernmental Relations Committee about it.
- City Manager Pro Tem Sarah Medary shared that the CAP 2.0 would have a greater breadth of community input, including a Mayor’s committee; said the expansion of 64 beds at Dusk to Dawn site was designed to address the near-constant 50-person waiting list; announced the City has six additional plows for future snowstorms; introduced the new City Manager’s Office Director, Brooke Freed.
- Mayor Vinis – explained more about upcoming AARP walk audits; noted the STAR voting work session was tentatively scheduled for April 8.

2. WORK SESSION: Council Process Session

Policy Analyst Jason Dedrick and City Recorder Beth Forrest introduced the topic.

Council Discussion – Council Agenda Delivery Schedule

- Councilor Semple –noted the Thursday arrival of materials for council offered too little review time prior to Monday meetings; expressed interest in receiving meeting materials on Wednesdays.
- Councilor Taylor – expressed interest in receiving meeting materials on Wednesdays.
- Councilor Syrett – supported the Wednesday delivery suggestion.
- Councilor Yeh – said she liked receiving the meeting materials two weeks in advance, but was supportive of having at least a couple of business days to make phone calls if a later delivery schedule was chosen; asked for materials on lengthier items—such as the supplemental budget—farther in advance.

- Councilor Clark – supported distribution of the presentation materials/handouts in advance because they often revealed new information.
- Councilor Pryor – supported a Wednesday arrival of meeting materials; asked staff to give some information farther in advance when it was a “meaty” topic.
- Councilor Zelenka –supported a one-week timeline.
- Councilor Evans – supported reverting to the one-week timeline.
- Councilor Clark – suggested an index of agenda item topics dating back a couple of years and going forward.

MOTION and VOTE: Councilor Taylor, seconded by Semple, moved to return to a one-week agenda delivery schedule, but change the date to Wednesday. **PASSED: 8:0**

Council Discussion – Order of Council Agenda Items

- Councilor Taylor – preferred Items of Interest to stay at the beginning of the 5:30 p.m. work session rather than add to the length of the Public Forum meeting nights.
- Councilor Clark – preferred Items of Interest be returned to the 7:30 p.m. meeting because work sessions were too full.
- Councilor Pryor – said he valued efficiency and thought council should be flexible and fit the Consent Calendar wherever it made sense on its calendar—even at the 5:30 p.m. work session; noted people sometimes used Public Forum to speak on Consent Calendar items.
- Councilor Syrett – did not have a preference about the Consent Calendar; thought Items of Interest would work well at a 7:30 p.m. meeting when there were often more people present; proposed a six-month pilot.
- Councilor Zelenka – noted additional meetings had been added for deliberation because council needed more time due in part to the length of Public Forum; thought Items of Interest worked well at the 7:30 meeting in the past; said annexations and land use issues had sometimes been moved to the Consent Calendar but should have been regular agenda items.
- Councilor Semple – thought the system of pulling a Consent Calendar item was efficient and that having Items of Interest at the 7:30 p.m. meeting would result in people sometimes waiting for Public Forum to begin.
- Councilor Clark – noted voting on annexations could be problematic before Public Forum because council may not have the chance to hear from people who would like to comment about them.

MOTION: Councilor Clark, seconded by Councilor Zelenka, moved to remove all annexations from the Consent Calendar and have a once a month regular agenda item after the Public Forum titled “Annexations.”

- Councilor Pryor – asked whether land use items could be saved for a single meeting a month.
- Councilor Clark – suggested a friendly amendment to his motion that annexations, when they occur, be dealt with after Public Forum as a regular item.
- Councilor Taylor – said she thought anything that was potentially controversial should not be on the Consent Calendar.
- Mayor Vinis – noted that staff meet regularly to determine whether items are potentially controversial and that councilors have the right to pull any item off of the Consent Calendar for discussion.
- Councilor Clark – said removing annexations from the Consent Calendar would enable council to vote on it at the 5:30 p.m. work session without concern about missing comments any related Public Forum comments.

- Councilor Taylor – did not support voting on the Consent Calendar at the 5:30 p.m. work session because it does not take up much time regardless of where it is on the agenda.
- Councilor Semple – preferred not to vote on individual annexations and to hold the Consent Calendar vote until after Public Forum.
- Mayor Vinis – asked the council to consider what problem it was trying to solve.

RESTATEMENT OF MOTION and VOTE (*with friendly amendments*): Councilor Clark, seconded by Councilor Zelenka, moved to separate out and remove annexations from the Consent Calendar and list them as their own individual item after Public Forum during regular council meetings. **PASSED: 6:2**, Councilors Yeh and Semple opposed.

- Councilor Clark – clarified the intention of his motion was to group annexations into a single vote separate from the Consent Calendar.
- Councilor Syrett – voiced her understanding of the motion was as Councilor Clark described.
- Councilor Zelenka – thought the vote was not only about annexations, but about other land use issues.
- Councilor Clark – agreed with Councilor Zelenka about the need to address land use items separately.
- Councilor Semple – supported a six-month pilot of the change.
- Mayor Vinis – read a draft motion regarding the timing of the Consent Calendar.
- Councilor Taylor – indicated she was not supportive of the draft motion.

MOTION: Councilor Taylor, seconded by Councilor Semple, moved to pilot a change to the order of agenda items, scheduling Committee Reports and Items of Interest as well as the Consent Calendar before the Public Forum at regular council meetings. **VOTE: 7:1**, Councilor Taylor opposed.

Council Discussion – Proposed Updates to City Council Operating Agreements

- Councilor Semple – questioned whether the last work session of the month was needed; wanted constituents to know how long they would have to testify in advance of the meeting; raised concerns about action items—especially contentious ones—on the agenda for after a Public Forum; pointed out that the bicycle mileage also applied to walking.
- Councilor Zelenka – thought the length of the public forums got in the way of council doing business; thought resolutions should go through the same polling process as work sessions.

MOTION: Councilor Zelenka, seconded by Clark, moved that resolutions be treated the same as work session items that are scheduled through council polls and the poll needs to reflect the time-sensitivity of the resolution as well.

- Councilor Clark – thought most resolutions focused on state and federal issues rather than on city matters; said the total number of resolutions should be limited.
- Councilor Syrett – noted council’s Operating Agreements provided two avenues for councilors to get items on the agenda and supported both avenues for resolutions.
- Councilor Semple – was reluctant to dedicate an entire work session to a resolution.
- Councilor Pryor – supported a polling process for resolutions because those without enough support would not get time on the agenda; noted it would be helpful to know if the resolution was coming through a board or commission.
- Councilor Yeh – thought resolutions should be handled through a separate process from work session topics.

- Councilor Clark – asked for clarification on process; requested work sessions not be held at the end of a meeting.
- Councilor Evans – thought the current process for resolutions worked fine.

VOTE: PASSED 7:1, Councilor Evans opposed.

Council Discussion – Public Forum

- Councilor Syrett – thought the presiding official should have discretion to decide the length of time people could speak at Public Forum; did not support having a lot of items on the agenda following Public Forum and did not support work session items at that time.
- Councilor Clark – supported administrative changes; noted Wards 4, 5, or 6 were frequently underrepresented and many from Ward 5 did not feel welcome; said there are many people who speak frequently and on the same topic; said limiting constituents to 15 minutes of total testimony time per year would save time and allow for different forums.
- Councilor Zelenka – thought the purpose of public forum was for the public to bring new information and/or complaints—one of many communication tools citizens have access to; thought limits on time and frequency were warranted for council’s time management; said the first-come, first-served format was also problematic.
- Councilor Taylor – thought public forum was one of the most valuable things council did; opposed to limiting total time for the Public Forum; said she wanted constituents to be able to rely on the amount of time they’d have for testimony; said she did not find people repeating their comments to be a problem and thought groups should get more time than individuals.
- Councilor Syrett – thought public forum should be used for people to express their opinions on community matters; wanted to explore what role staff could play in facilitating peacekeeping and creating a culture welcoming to all community members; thought staff and security should be prepared to uphold standards of behavior set for the audience; thought there was a need for more respectful speech; supported limiting each speaker to two minutes, limiting total time of Public Forum on the agenda, and randomizing speakers.
- Councilor Pryor – supported reducing speaking time to two minutes; thought the purpose of public forum was for people to have an opportunity to be heard by council on matters relevant to the city; supported randomizing speaking order; supported a maximum total time of one hour; thought council should maintain an expectation of respectful speech.
- Councilor Yeh – said that establishing rules with clear consequences was needed; supported two minutes as long as the time was not reduced to one minute; supported randomization of speakers; asked for someone with expertise in equity issues to review proposed rules.
- Councilor Evans – supported shortening the forum to two minutes as well as randomization of speaking order; thought holding meetings at other venues would be valuable, especially for residents of wards that were further away from downtown; supported limiting overall time to 45 minutes or an hour.
- Councilor Semple – supported two-minute comment time; was interested in randomizing; expressed concern about limiting overall length.
- Mayor Vinis – noted that randomizing and limiting overall time might work well together.

MOTION: Councilor Zelenka, seconded by Councilor Clark, moved to limit testimony to two minutes, to limit the times to two times a month for one hour, and to randomize the order of people speaking once they’ve signed up.

- Councilor Syrett – supported the motion and thought the public would adapt to a new system if council adopted one.
- Councilor Clark – thought there should be clear consequences for abuse of the rules.

- Councilor Yeh – supported the motion as a pilot.
- Councilor Semple – supported some parts of motion and not others and planned to vote against.

MOTION TO DIVIDE AND VOTE: Councilor Semple, seconded by Councilor Taylor, moved to divide the motion into three parts. **PASSED: 5:4**, Councilors Clark, Evans, Pryor and Zelenka opposed, Mayor Vinis in favor.

MOTION AND VOTE: Councilor Clark, seconded by Councilor Syrett, moved to postpone and table the main motion until Wednesday. **PASSED 8:0**.

Mayor Vinis adjourned the meeting at 7:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Beth Forrest
City Recorder

(Recorded by Cas Casados)

Link to the webcast of this City Council meeting: [here](#).