

Speaker 1 ([00:00:00](#)):

Start the meeting. Good evening and welcome to the October 21st, 2025 Lawrence City Commission meeting. First item on the agenda is to consider a motion to recess into executive session. The action is to approve a motion to recess into executive session for approximately 20 minutes to discuss employer employee negotiations pursuant to employer employee negotiations exemption as set forth in KSA 75 dash 43 19 B three. Justification for the executive session is to keep employer employee negotiation matters confidential. At this time, city Commission will resume its regular meeting in the city commission room at approximately five 30. Is that right? We have 20 minutes, so 5 28 Is there a motion? So moved. Okay,

Speaker 2 ([00:00:52](#)):

Second.

Speaker 1 ([00:00:52](#)):

Okay. Motion to second to move into executive session by Littlejohn. Seconded by Larson. All in favor say aye.

Speaker 2 ([00:00:59](#)):

Aye.

Speaker 1 ([00:01:00](#)):

Aye. Those opposed? Motion passes 4 0 0. We'll see you at about 5 25.

Speaker 3 ([00:22:35](#)):

I'm sorry

Speaker 1 ([00:22:37](#)):

We're back from our executive session and we have nothing to report. Thank you. Commissioner. Sellers got such a long time since the meeting starts again. Yep. Okay. Ready? Okay everybody, we're back from our initial start of the meeting and we're going to go ahead and move on to the next part, which is to approve the agenda and the city commission reserves the right to amend, supplement, or reorder the agenda during the meeting, is there a motion to approve the agenda as is

Speaker 4 ([00:40:57](#)):

Move to approve the agenda.

Speaker 1 ([00:40:59](#)):

Second. Okay. That's a motion to approve the agenda by Commissioner Sellers. Second by Commissioner Littlejohn. All in favor say aye.

Speaker 2 ([00:41:07](#)):

A.

Speaker 1 ([00:41:07](#)):

Aye. Those opposed. Motion passes four zero.

Speaker 2 ([00:41:11](#)):

Mayor, do you want to do

Speaker 4 ([00:41:12](#)):

Housekeeping?

Speaker 5 ([00:41:13](#)):

Sure.

Speaker 1 ([00:41:14](#)):

Thank you. Before I move on, I'm going to go ahead and ask Sherry Reedman our clerk to read us the rules of the meeting.

Speaker 6 ([00:41:23](#)):

Good evening everyone. If you would please silence your cell phones. The primary format for accessing the meeting is in person at City Hall. Virtual access cannot be guaranteed due to potential technology issues. When the mayor calls for public comment, please approach the podium to indicate you wish to speak. Virtual participants should use the raise hand function. When prompted, select join as panelists. There will be a brief delay as your role changes. Once your name is called, please unmute and turn on your camera to provide your comments. Please state your name and zip code before providing your comments. Comments will be limited to three minutes. The city reserves the right to turn videos off or mute participants. Thank you Mayor.

Speaker 1 ([00:42:10](#)):

Thank you Sherry. Okay, the next item on our agenda is to proclaim October 24th. 2025 is World Polio Day and I think Heather Hoy is here along with Melissa even to talk to us this evening about this proclamation.

Speaker 7 ([00:42:32](#)):

Here we go. Good evening, mayor and commissioners. I'm Melissa Seban and this is Heather Hoy. And together we represent two Oh, we've got another one. We represent three, I believe three of the Rotary clubs, three of the rotary clubs here in Lawrence. And do you have Steve Johnson? Steve Johnson? Yes. Steve. Okay. Okay. Alright, well thank you guys for having us to recognize world polo today, which is this Friday, October 24th. We're here tonight representing all three Lawrence Rotary Clubs and over 1800 clubs globally that are registered to take action on this Friday regarding the fight against polio as clubs, we recognize that this tremendous progress made on vaccine preventable diseases has occurred, but a new era is starting to reduce funding and there is a proliferation. Proliferation, I'm going to hurry tonight, of anti-vaccine sentiment and we are at risk of the resurgence of diseases like polio.

([00:43:31](#)):

Although Rotary and its global, partners have eradication, partners have reduced polio cases by 99.9% since 1988. Worldwide there are still cases while polio occurring in Afghanistan and Pakistan. So far this year in Afghanistan, seven cases and in 2024 there were total 25 while in Pakistan we have 29 cases so far in 2025 and there were 74 in 2024. The continuance of while polio and the numbers are increasing in these countries, meanwhile there are other preventable by vaccine diseases like measles that are starting to reoccur globally. The recent renewal of the Longstanding Gates Foundation partnership with Rotary through 2029 will help us be able to produce \$450 million in critical funding in the polio eradication efforts. And this is a great contribution to Rotary's global efforts. I would urge all of us here today in our

community to join with our three rotary clubs here in Lawrence to Champion Immunization and Public Sleeps publicly support polio eradication. For those that are interested, visit endpolio.org to learn what actions you can take to stop the spread of preventable diseases and create a polio free world. Thank

Speaker 1 ([00:44:54](#)):

You. Thanks Melissa. You guys want to add anything or is that it?

Speaker 7 ([00:44:59](#)):

No, we appreciate

Speaker 1 ([00:45:00](#)):

She did an amazing job. She did do amazing job. She's talking to us though, so it's probably unfair. Well thank you very much for your efforts at Rotary and of course everyone who's trying to help eradicate this horrible disease across the world,

Speaker 8 ([00:45:11](#)):

We would invite you all to join our clubs if you're not in one, there's one on Monday at noon, one on Wednesday at noon, and then there's also a Thursday morning at 7:00 AM so please join us.

Speaker 1 ([00:45:21](#)):

Oh, perfect. A pitch.

Speaker 8 ([00:45:22](#)):

We love new members. Alright,

Speaker 1 ([00:45:24](#)):

Awesome. Thank you very much. Well, I'm going to go ahead and read the proclamation. I appreciate you guys coming here to accept it. Whereas Rotary, in 1985 launched Polio Plus and spearheaded the Global Polio Eradication Initiative, which today includes the World Health Organization, US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, UNICEF, and the Gates Foundation to immunize the children of the world against polio. And whereas Rotary is a global network consisting of over 1.2 million members in more than 45,000 clubs in 200 countries and geographical areas. And whereas polio cases have dropped 99.9% since 1988 and the world stands on the threshold of eradicating the disease and to date Rotary has contributed more than \$2.9 billion in countless volunteer hours to protecting nearly 3 billion children in 122 countries. And whereas Rotary is working to raise an additional \$50 million per year, which would be leveraged for maximum impact by an additional 100 million annually from the Gates Foundation.

([00:46:26](#)):

And these efforts provide much needed operational support, medical personnel, laboratory equipment and educational materials for health workers and parents. And whereas there are 4,000 Rotary Club members in more than 105 clubs throughout Kansas District 5710 sponsoring service project to address such critical issues as poverty, health, hunger, illiteracy, and the environment in their local communities and abroad. And whereas Lawrence Rotarians have committed their time, talent, and treasure to continue support of Polio Plus until polio is finally eradicated from the Earth. Now therefore, I'm Mike Dever, mayor of the city of Lawrence, Kansas through hereby proclaim the day October 24th, 2025 as World Polio Day and encourage all citizens to participate in this observance. Thank you very much. She took off.

Speaker 5 ([00:47:22](#)):

Yeah,

Speaker 9 ([00:47:26](#)):

There you go. Thank you. Thank

Speaker 1 ([00:47:28](#)):

You Heather. Okay, we're going to move on to the consent agenda and I'm sorry, sorry. The next item is to recognize the city's, how could I miss this? The city's Clinton water treatment plant for winning the best tasting tap water award and Steve Noel Kansas section of the American Water Works Association board chair will present the trophy to the plant staff. So thank you very much. I please come on the head.

Speaker 10 ([00:48:00](#)):

Alright, well thank you mayor and thank you city council members. I just wanted to real quick say good evening to everybody here and your audience along with your water treatment folks. My name's Steve Ell and I'm the current chair for the Kansas American Water Works Association. I'm here tonight to present the best tasting water award to the city of Lawrence, Kansas. This year in August, water utilities across Kansas participated in bringing their water samples to the annual Kansas A WWA conference. And I just want to read off some of the requirements of that and it's personal attendance is required, samples must be received at room temperature. All entries must have incurred no state federal water violations, MCL monitoring, record keeping, et cetera. During the previous year, the panel of judges of this year's contest was Kansas, A WWA members and Kansas Water Environmental Agency members.

([00:48:59](#)):

So contest judging samples are judged basically on a scale of one to seven. The lower point is better. It's kind of like golf game. If you have a high game, it's not so good. So I don't know how low that score was, but I understand it was low. So I, it's also important for me tonight to mention that Lawrence Kansas is also a past winner and Steven reminded me that it was the call plant that won in 2019. So I would also be amiss not to recognize those hardworking staff that you have that at those water treatment plants that have made this possible. So it's great pleasure that I award the city of Lawrence, Kansas, the Clinton water treatment plant as this year's best tasting water for 2025.

Speaker 5 ([00:49:49](#)):

Right

Speaker 1 ([00:50:06](#)):

Here's the nice little bag. Well, thanks very much for the recognition and I think we're all proud to have two sources of great tasting water in Lawrence and these guys do a tremendous job and I appreciate them getting this recognition in the city also, but these are the guys that make it happen, so thanks very much for giving us this great quality product.

Speaker 10 ([00:50:28](#)):

Alright, you all take care, have a good evening. Thank you.

Speaker 1 ([00:50:30](#)):

Thank you

Speaker 11 ([00:50:30](#)):

Guys. Thanks.

Speaker 1 ([00:50:40](#)):

Okay, we're going to move on to the consent agenda. And items on the consent agenda are considered under one motion and approved by one motion. Members of the governing body may remove items for separate discussion if desired, and members of the public may remove items considered as quasi-judicial for separate discussion if desired, members of the public will be limited to three minutes for comments. Commissioners, do you have any items you'd like removed from the consent agenda?

Speaker 5 ([00:51:06](#)):

Nope.

Speaker 1 ([00:51:07](#)):

Nope. I don't see any quasi-judicial items. Therefore, is there a motion to approve the consent agenda?

Speaker 2 ([00:51:16](#)):

Moved to approve the consent agenda.

Speaker 1 ([00:51:17](#)):

Second. Alright, that's a motion to approve the consent agenda by Larson. Second by Littlejohn. All in favor say aye.

Speaker 2 ([00:51:24](#)):

Aye.

Speaker 5 ([00:51:24](#)):

Aye.

Speaker 1 ([00:51:25](#)):

Those opposed? Motion passes four zero. Okay. The first and only regular agenda item this evening is to conduct a public hearing and render a decision regarding the impasse between the city of Lawrence and the international. A associ of firefighters local 1 5 9 6. So the first action is to open a public hearing this evening and we're going to first receive a presentation from the city.

Speaker 12 ([00:52:02](#)):

Good evening commissioners. My name is Megan Dodge. I'm the HR director here at the city and we're going to kick off the hearing this evening just by presenting some slides that summarize some background of why we're here before you tonight and then we'll be handing it over to our fire union partners for their presentation as well. But first to kick us off, I would like to just kind of zoom out and think about where we are right now with our fire union. So of course we have what we call a memorandum of understanding, it's an MOU with our union and this is the first year of the current MOU. So we were negotiating with the fire union last year and in our current MOU we came to agreement on several items. Some of them are highlighted on this slide here. So under the current MOU, we adopted a new nine step pay plan that we worked with the union on and when we put employees on that pay plan that was implemented for this year, they saw an average of an 8.5% increase.

(00:53:13):

We also provided cancer insurance coverage paid by for the city. For those covered members, we worked on some important issues regarding pay for emergency callback, so employees that are called back for emergencies, how they get compensated. We worked on acting officer pay, we put together language that would appoint a station bid committee so that the union and management and the fire department could work together and figure out how employees could bid to work at certain stations. We increased workers' comp benefits and then we worked with the union on some benefit time changes specifically to personal and vacation day accruals and Kelly days. But you might recall those issues are currently in our MOU and we made good progress on those. But today we're here just to talk about wages. So when we brought the MOU to you all to adopt last year, there was language in there called a wage opener and the wage opener says basically, hey, the two parties will come back and they'll negotiate wages for the out years.

(00:54:18):

So here where just talking about next year's wages and we'll dive into more details here in the coming slides. Again, like I said, the issue at impasse is wages under the rule spelled out in our resolution. We've met six times since February for these wage opener discussions. Really the discussions have centered around the wage adjustment, which is the percentage increase that we apply to every single position on our scales and we'll go into more detail, but we also have talked about step increases. So as you recall, we have a step pay plan and as employees move up steps, they get increases of generally at least within this pay plan for fire 5%. We've talked about wage adjustments and the timing for when those step increases will be applied for the coming year. Really today we're focused on just 2026 wages. We're on the same page with the union that we'll be back here in a year to talk about 2027 wages. So we're looking at another wage opener for the final year of our MOU for 27. So today we're just looking at next year's wages. Before we dive more into the issues, I'm going to hand it over to Zach f Fredell to talk about the resolution and some other details.

Speaker 13 (00:55:38):

Let's

Speaker 1 (00:55:39):

Megan

Speaker 13 (00:55:39):

It. Good evening, mayor and commissioners. I'm senior assistant city attorney Zach f Fredell. I'm going to talk to you about the resolution that guides our process of negotiation between the city and its unions, how we got here, the timeline and what to expect from tonight's hearing. So as you know, the city has opted out of the Kansas Public Employer Employee Relations Act known as pira and instead we have our own process. It's been amended a number of times over the year. It's currently embodied at resolution number 75 11 that has the timelines and procedure for our discussions that we go through each year when we have a negotiation contract. Although this wasn't a full contract negotiation for the opener, we decided to follow the same procedure that required us to meet at least by April 20th. We actually started earlier back in February and then we met more than six times before we got to July 1st.

(00:56:32):

On July 1st, we still hadn't reached an agreement, so the parties decided that we were at impasse at that point. We exchanged final proposals and we requested a fact finder. We selected names, struck names off a list and ended with Mr. Doug Bonnie and he held a fact finding hearing for us here at City Hall back on August 5th. Later that month on August 26th, he provided us with his report and his recommendations that you have in front of you tonight. So that brings us to tonight the parties have continued to meet to try

to reach a resolution, but we are unable to do so. So now it comes to you. The only requirement in the resolution is that the commission shall hold the public hearing for the purpose of receiving explanation and supporting documentation for each party's proposals on the remaining impasse issues. The look of this hearing is up to you and we'll be happy to answer questions or follow whatever procedure you would like. Obviously we've set it up as one presentation after another, but feel free to ask us things along the way.

(00:57:34):

We do have some guidance in the resolution about the decision that you're asked to make tonight. The resolution says the city Commission shall render its decision by taking such action as it deems to be in the public interest, including the interests of the public employees involved. Considerations of the commission may consider and evaluating the public interest shall include evidence supplied in support supported the propositions, the financial situation of the city, comparison with similar comparable municipal employers in the area, labor market and other relevant considerations. The city commission's decision shall be final and binding, so that means that whatever decision you come to tonight and pass with a vote we'll take back and put into a contract for the remaining wage issue in front of you this evening. With that, I'll turn it over to Acting Fire Chief Joe Hardy with some information about the department.

Speaker 14 (00:58:34):

Good evening, mayor Commissioners Joe Hardy, acting Fire chief with L-D-C-F-M. My goal is to go over a couple slides to explain the group that we're talking about, the members employees under our pay plan. We've got firefighters broken down as EMTs and paramedics and our pay plan also as driver or engineer EMT paramedics, lieutenant EMT paramedics. And we also have mobile integrated health technicians that are included in that pay plan, which would equal a total amount of 124 employees. Kind of a current status, I was asked to give a status where we are with our employees recruitment retention. We are currently short 10 employees just with the environment we had over this last year looking at our budget and to kind of figure out where we were. We've lost employees since January until today. And so we are going to start that recruitment process here shortly.

(00:59:32):

Our pay plan is broken up into nine pay plans and so each of these are 5%, each of these boxes are 5% and so employees will get moved to the next step at their hire date anniversary. And so if you look at this, you start at pay step one, the next year you would go to two and continue on to nine and that's when you would be maxed out. Our average, this is broken down also if you look at it, 29 12 employees versus 2080. 2080 are the employees that are working 40 hours a week. Average overtime is what we've spent in 2024, which was a full year average to be \$8,900 approximately per firefighter. And looking at the average salary, look for 2025, we're looking at approximately \$85,000 a year.

Speaker 5 (01:00:33):

Thanks Joe.

Speaker 12 (01:00:40):

Alright, so to start diving in again to our wage opener discussions starting last year, we started using interest-based bargaining when we intern negotiations with the fire union. And really that just means that each party will identify what's important to them, what they hold at the center of the negotiations, and we work more collaboratively at the table to try to come to solutions that would work for each party. And so we're proud we've tried that and it just lays a really good foundation for more collaboration at the table. So as we talk about wages, we agree on a way to approach that is to select a market. So we look at comparable agencies in the area with comparable positions and agree on those agencies together with the

union. And so we'll go into more detail on that, but I want to note that we don't have a current pay study available to help inform this.

[\(01:01:41\)](#):

And so coming together at the table and having that set of agencies is an important part of the process. But we're looking forward to kicking off a pay study this year that will help inform wages and negotiations and the budget for 2027 that will really bring us current. It will help us have a professional come and say, Hey, here are the market comparators that you should look at not only for the union or covered positions but all positions and really just give their best recommendation. So we're looking forward to having that data, but absent that, this is how we've approached it with these agreed upon agencies with the union also, not only for the fire union but all positions as we're looking at and planning for wages for the coming year, we look at other cities in the northeast Kansas area and so we have a slide that spells that out.

[\(01:02:35\)](#):

We also look at the consumer price index to help inform what an appropriate wage adjustment might look like. That's something that was recommended by our last pay study consultant. So that's an important economic factor we look at every year to help inform. And then of course as we were entering wage opener discussions for and just planning for wages, budget concerns were not surprisingly top of mind as we looked at a significant general fund deficit for the coming year and knowing that wages take up the majority of our general fund and they're just such a driving factor in our costs. So that is front and center.

[\(01:03:21\)](#):

I talked about interest-based bargaining. What are the city's interests? So last year and this year we came to the table with a few interests here spelled out first our strategic plan. We centered all of our strategic plan commitments, especially fiscal stewardship and engaged empowered teams working with the fire union, coming to the table, trying to figure out solutions that work for both parties drives engaged and empowered teams. But then balancing that and the wages we agree upon and the other provisions that cost money that we agree upon is about fiscal stewardship. So it's really about that balance efficient and effective processes also come into play when we're talking about, Hey, what does it look like to administer all of these things that we're agreeing upon that end up in our MOUs. Internal equity and market competitiveness is also extremely important to us. To be internally equitable and competitive in compensation and benefits is critical to attracting and retaining diverse talent while showing that we have fiscal stewardship.

[\(01:04:25\)](#):

And then we have been looking at ways that we can streamline our MOUs and so that is across the board, but we want more concise, fair, accurate, and responsive administration of our MOUs. So if you think about it, we've got four MOUs. We also have the primary pay plan employees, the non-represented employees, and so we've got all these agreements that we're administering. We're always looking for opportunities to achieve some efficiencies where it makes sense so that we can do things in the same way if it makes sense across the board that came up during those negotiations with the timing of the step increases, diving more into wages, again, we talked about how important the market comparison is. We had those 12 agreed upon agencies that we looked at.

[\(01:05:20\)](#):

I mentioned that we adopted the new nine step pay plan for this union and this MOU and we believed that it was, and we still believe that it's a competitive pay plan and that we made great progress when we put employees on that new pay plan, the average increase was 8.5% that was applied this year. So in the first year of this current MOU, when we entered wage, the wage opener discussions for this year, we generally looked at the minimum and maximum pay per position and compare those at the city with our other agencies and our comparator market. And again, as I mentioned, we're really looking forward to having

that pay study that we'll use industry standard methods to compare the market with what we're doing at the city. So some ways that they might do that is a consultant might pull incumbent data. What we're actually paying people, they might look at a range, an employee might feel that they're not getting paid the average salary and so that's not right or that's not competitive. But generally a consultant, a paid professional will say, Hey, you got to look at a range within midpoint and that would make you competitive. So we're looking forward to getting those recommendations and using those next year. I want to note that we're working collaboratively with employees including representative from unions and having a group working together with HR and with that consultant on the PAP study.

(01:06:53):

Okay, here's one way of looking at the market comparison. This is a list of all of our positions, excuse the acronyms, but it's firefighter, EMT, firefighter Paramedic and so on. So driver, EMT, Lieutenant, EMT, Lieutenant Paramedic, and then those mobile integrated health technicians. So we looked at the median pay for each of those positions across the 12 agencies that we compare with and then the far right, the second to far right column, you'll see the cities or LDCs pay. Then we look at, okay, so how do we compare to the market, to the median market? And so you'll see on the far right how we stack up our last study said that hey, if you're within about 10%, you can consider yourself market competitive. So you see that we meet the mark pretty clearly on some and then on others, not as clearly if you're looking at just that one metric. Again, there are a lot of different ways to look at this. That is one of them. So we wanted to share that slide.

(01:08:02):

I mentioned the Northeast Kansas cities. This is information that we gather collaboratively with other cities, with colleagues in other cities as we're planning for the next year wages. So we look at this for all employees and all unions and it's one factor that we consider. So these were likely recommendations that were discussed over the summer. Of course people have adopted their budgets, but this is what was being considered generally on the left side of you'll see kind of the total percentage increase that people were or that cities were planning and then it's generally broken up between what some call a cola and a merit. Everyone administers their pay plans differently and have different structures. So how they do that is going to look different. And of course for us, we have a step plan and then we do wage adjustments. So it's kind of those two pieces.

(01:08:58):

I'll get into the different proposals, but when we were looking at this data and planning what we were proposing for all employees and for this union, we felt that our proposal was well within range of what was being planned for other Northeast Kansas cities or even kind of at that tap range. Another important factor that we look at is the consumer price index. This is something that was recommended by the last paid study by that consultant. They just note that it's so important to use an economic indicator and to look at it every single year to help inform what your wage adjustment looks like so that you're not falling behind. And so the one that we pulled in May was 2.4% increase year over year. So comparing May this may to last May. And so we felt that our proposal is fair and in line if using the CPI as one of the factors I want to highlight before we go into the union proposals and wages where we're at for compensation for next year for all of our employees.

(01:10:11):

So we've wrapped up negotiations with our other represented groups. They're listed here. We've got the police, the solid waste, and the street stormwater and traffic. So those last two I mentioned are represented by the teamsters. Of course the police are represented by the LPOA, they've all tentatively agreed upon is the phrase we use in negotiations, a 3% wage adjustment and that is the same for non-represented employees for those union represented employees, those will be proposals that will be before you as a commission in the coming weeks. But we wanted to share that kind of zoomed out big picture of what we're looking at for all the other employees. So again, it's that 3% wage adjustment and then step

increases for employees generally that is a 5% step, a 5% increase moving up the steps unless you're at the top of the step in some of the pay plans, it's a lower percentage increase at the top of the steps. But for the fire union like Chief Hardy said, it's 5% between each step. Okay, we'll dive into that a little bit. Okay, so as Zach mentioned, we received the fact finder report. You have it there, but basically what the fact finder did is heard from both parties and made their best recommendation as to what they think should happen. What the FactFinder recommended is a wage adjustment for these represented employees in the fire union of 4.5% applied on January, well applied in December for the first paycheck of the new year.

(01:11:49):

The FactFinder also recommended that we provide the step increases in the first pay period as well. So they would see that 4.5% increase and the step increase moving up to that next step and the 5% increase at the same time at the beginning of the year. That's the fact finder recommendation. They didn't take either party's proposal wholesale, it was a balancing of what they heard and then what they recommended based on the information received during fact finding. Okay, this table has a lot of information on it, but this is a comparison of the different wage scenarios that we've seen during this process. Okay, so on the far left side is the city's final proposal that you have before you tonight in the middle is the proposal that the IAFF brought to fact finding. So it's at that point in the process that's what we were looking at from the IAFF and then on the far right is the fact finder's recommendation that I just went over and what we understand is the union's final proposal tonight.

(01:13:00):

Okay, so as we're looking at proposals, kind of the two chunks, we have the wage adjustment, so that percentage increase and then we have the timing of the step increase. It's implied or assumed by both parties that hey, the step increases are going to happen. That's an important part of our pay plan of how it works, but the timing of when that happens is what's where we differ or have differed in the past. So the city's final proposal again is 3% wage adjustment in line with what other employees are receiving for the new year, the step increase to happen on the first paycheck of the new year. And then we have a cost estimate for each proposal down there at the bottom. So the cost estimate is \$775,000 for this proposal for the city's proposal and that's included in the budget that's been adopted for next year.

(01:13:56):

I also want to note I just highlight again here just the importance. One of our values or guiding factors has been that internal equity. So that is what's been tentatively agreed upon or planned for next year for other employees. And then the middle one there is again what the union brought to fact finding. What they were requesting at that juncture was a 4% wage increase in the first pay period and then adding an additional 2% midway through the year. So by the end of the year there would be a 6% increase for employees. They were recommending that we stick with current practice, which is those step increases only happen on the anniversary date or the evaluation date for employees. So right now those step increases are happen throughout the year. And then you see the estimates on these last two, we have estimates for just covered employees in the union and then if those things were going to be applied for all employees, what that would be.

(01:14:57):

And then finally the fact finder's recommendation, that 4.5% wage adjustment and then the fact finder did acknowledge hey administering, applying that step increase at the beginning of the year is something I want to recommend because it does help streamline things. So that is part of the recommendation as well. You have the estimate there of the fact finder's recommendation for just the fire union covered employees and then for all employees as well. Okay, this is another comparison table. The top half is information you just saw on the last slide, which is high level what each of those kind of wage scenarios look like with wage adjustment and the timing of the step increase. The bottom half is new information and it just looks at under each proposal what is the percentage pay increase that employees in the union would receive and then the breakdown on those bullet points at the bottom.

(01:15:56):

So I want to note that of the covered employees, about 53 of them are what we call topped out, which means they're at step nine, that's the top step. So unless those employees get a promotion and move to another scale and they start at a lower step and then they can start progressing again, they're at that step nine, they're topped out. So if those employees, the 53 would not receive a step increase, but they would receive that wage adjustment amount. So for the city's proposal it's that three to 8% depending on where you are on the pay plan. And then for if F'S proposal they brought to fact finding six to 11% by the end of next year, once that additional 2% would be added, 11% on the top end and then the fact finders report, if the recommendation was adopted, pay increases would range from 4.5% to 9.5%. So again, those top out members would be getting the wage adjustment amount only and then the rest of them, those 70 members that can still have movement on their step plan would be receiving the higher increase. Okay, so next steps, again, we're asking the city commission to make final determination on the issue at impasse, which is wages and then we'll work with the union to come finalize an amendment that would come to you all for final approval to amend the MOU and so that we can implement the new wages and be ready for their first paycheck of 2026. That concludes my presentation. Thank you very

Speaker 1 (01:17:36):

Much. Thank you very much, Megan.

Speaker 9 (01:17:43):

You help me get into I think

Speaker 10 (01:17:48):

They should be okay.

Speaker 15 (01:17:49):

Very cool.

Speaker 5 (01:17:52):

Thank you.

Speaker 15 (01:18:23):

Good evening commissioners. My name is Shamus Albritton. I have with me Simon Stevenson. We're both elected members to the executive board of IAFF Local 1596 colloquially known as Lawrence Professional Firefighters or International Association of Firefighters or the proverbial the Union. So that would be, and behind me have two members who are also on our executive team as well and a handful of members with us tonight. So here to speak on our perspective of the MOU discussions, I've had the pleasure of representing my peers many times through these processes and we are asking for some resolution in our disagreement. Ultimately what we are here for tonight, as I just indicated and the Miss Dodge indicated, we are appealing the recommendation that you are receiving from city management at that 3%. But I do want to check my tone for tonight's evening and be explicit that I'm not here to bang my fist on the table and tell you that the city of Lawrence of L-D-C-F-M is a bad place to be employed.

(01:19:29):

To the contrary, even amongst all the controversy that we have had between us and city management around issues beyond this over the last two years, I'm still a proud member of this department. I'm still proud to say that I'm employed here in Lawrence, but we do have some serious issues around process of employee relations that we would like to address. I am going to speak professionally but candidly about

where there can be some improvement. Ultimately this disagreement that we're having tonight we feel is two years in the making. We were hours away from having a similar hearing last year like this over similar issues and in the 11th hour we're able to get to an agreement. So we're here tonight because the resolution allows and I believe requires some transparency in getting all the stakeholders in the same room to make sure that all our opinions and our attitudes and our proposals are accurately portrayed, not just from us to you, but you to our members, members to city management and of course our citizens. So hopefully this can be the catalyst to a better relationship moving forward.

(01:20:44):

Just a little background and Chief Hardy touched on this, but I do want to emphasize a few things and address, give me that sheet address a few items. We are at the nine step pay plan, just some definitions. Step raise, as you've heard, is movement through that plan. That is normal and that is not a novel concept against the market. Most other fire departments in the agreed upon market do have step plans with explicit steps in which they are prescribed to move depending on timing. GWA and wage adjustment, that's COLA are meant to move you in pace with cost of living. There is something here that I do want to address or at least call attention to the hours column in our pay plan. So keep in mind many of our members work a 24 hour shift. We fall under specific FMLA guidelines under federal overtime rules and definitions.

(01:21:50):

Those firefighters, paramedics and EMTs that are riding on the ambulances and firetruck throughout the city are already scheduled to work before overtime 2,912 hours in an annual period that's significantly more than your standard nine to five employee throughout the country who's going to be scheduled for a little more than 2000 hours. Now I think now would also be an appropriate time to provide further context on a comment that Chief Hardy made around concerning the average overtime. Can you give me my water for me brother? Concerning average overtime, let's remember that a certain and significant portion of our overtime budget is baked in to the way we do operations because we are handling standbys for all KU athletics as well as other athletics. And that's not just football and basketball, that's excuse me, NCAA event. Those costs are reimbursed at a percentage of 115% by the university.

(01:23:00):

Okay, so as Ms. Dodge indicated, you guys have seen similar information here. Our proposal that we have to you in front of you tonight is different than what we brought to fact finding. We are attempting to be reasonable. We are attempting to make a deal and move forward. Here we are aligned with exactly what the fact finder has proposed. That is an individual who is unbiased and looked at the facts and we can accept that. I do want to point out that you guys don't have a binary decision in front of you tonight. Last time we had this discussion it was between you have to take union or you have to take city management proposal. It's not what you guys have tonight. There is some flexibility in which you can manipulate what we're doing here and try to come up with a better compromise. But as far as where we're at tonight, we are presenting the what the fact finder is recommended.

(01:23:55):

Okay, some background, excuse me. As I've indicated, I've had the pleasure of being part of these processes for a long time now. Came into executive leadership of our union back in 2017 and was involved in processes in the background before that there are some trademarks that set up a good foundation to get to a successful discussion process with an agreement. And it is built on making instrumental decisions together as a group in a collaborative way to build a common measuring stick in which we can measure each other's proposals against a market with the same measuring tape. And multiple times we have done this and we have gotten success and that really starts with defining a market, defining what data you should collect from that market, how you should analyze that data, and then you can use that analysis to compare from each other. But it's very important to make a commitment to use that information that was agreed upon early in the process as you move forward.

(01:25:09):

Otherwise anybody can go cherry pick any piece of data they want and call it fair against their proposal. We do not think it's fair for the city to bring in the cities from northeast Kansas because that was not the agreed upon data for the same reason that if I go back to my membership and they want to know why we should ratify something that is not starting pay of \$90,000 for a firefighter because that's what they get in Denver. Well friends, that's not what we agreed with city management on what would be relevant to this conversation. So that is the kind of mutual respect that it takes in conversations in the background with our stakeholders. That's how we speak with our members and we need to get to a place where city management's having that discussion with you guys.

(01:26:00):

Okay, so what were the original comparables that were agreed upon back in early in this process? So I have 'em in front of you. Most of them are self explainable. They have the name of the agency attached right in front of fd, some of the other ones, Joco Consolidated Fire District number two. That's like a Prairie Village mission area. A little bit into Merriam Central Jackson County Fire Protection District. That's like Blue Springs area and I think the rest of them are pretty, go ahead. No. Okay, so what I really want to bring attention to is the chart that we have up. Hopefully if you guys have seen this before, it was produced in our pay study last year. This compares services that each of our agreed upon market, peer cities are doing. All those in green are doing the things that we are doing.

(01:26:50):

L-D-C-F-M is a comprehensive all hazards department and we should be proud of that. But there's not a lot of people out there like us. We are performing not only performing our services well, we're performing more services to your community than most people are. The largest difference you'll see is an EMS transporting agency. We're not just a fire department, we're also the ambulance service for our citizens. That means when you compare us to places like Overland Park Fire or Olathe Fire, you should remember that we are being asked to do more skills, to spend more time at emergencies and to master more responsibilities, master more responsibilities. But as you see, we are not necessarily compensated for standing out like that. Hold

Speaker 16 (01:27:41):

On real fast. I just want to step in here real fast and just talk. So this agreed upon list of comparable agencies. This isn't new to just this year. This is the same list that we used last year as well. The same list that was agreed upon with the city last year to use for a market compensation study. So it wasn't just this year that we came up with this list, this was a list that we used last year to help drive conversation and was agreed upon at the start of this year to drive conversation as well. Okay,

Speaker 2 (01:28:08):

Thanks Senator.

Speaker 16 (01:28:09):

Thank you Simon.

Speaker 15 (01:28:16):

So data analysis last year we did a very comprehensive study and of course we thought we had agreement with the city moving incrementally of what all do we want to look at And we got into the weeds. We not only looked at base wages, we looked at pay, all sorts of pay, all sorts of different compensations because apples to apples among fire department is difficult. So lump sums, longevity pays employer contributions into different deferred comp programs. We're dealing with a market across two states, which means we

have multiple different pensions. So we made adjustments to adjust for that to make sure that we were looking at a fair wholesale compensation, total compensation, a lot of work went into it. So this might be some charts that you saw last year or at least I hope you do.

(01:29:12):

It became apparent towards the end of that process last year that maybe the city wasn't totally comfortable with that analysis and that's fine. So going into this year, the conversation was how do we change our analysis to get back on the same page with each other and per the city's request, we stripped it down, we went to just base wages, we cut out all the other pieces of compensation that you're seeing employees receive, a government employees receive across the market. So we're just looking at market averages of base top and bottom and some mediums and trying to look at the speed in which people are moving through their step plans and then trying to look back and try to get an understanding of the pace of the market is moving. When we're looking at general wage adjustments, coal is whatever different cities you're going to call 'em. So I do want to point out that this is a piece that we have been flexible on. We have moved this way and now you're being told by the city that we should wait for another pay study that will be more comprehensive. When last year we did a very comprehensive one. So there is a level of frustration on our side about this.

(01:30:19):

That being said, with the stripped down analysis of just some base wages, top bottom mediums and means one positive, we did fine. That as far as the nine step plan, eight years to top out, that's right on the market. So that's about where people are taking about eight, nine years to get through a pay plan to get to top pay from day one at the fire department to I'm at the top of my scale and we're right there as Lawrence and we should celebrate that however we are behind. But if we look at this chart, I want to walk you through it a little bit up to the top, you have the comparables and going down, you'll have their per hour pay rates and this is for 24 hour employees, people on a 24 hour shift. F-F-E-M-T stands for firefighter, EMT PM is paramedic. Now because fire departments are not apples to apples, we have different rank structures. We may be using people with the same title in different ways because tradition or what have you. But where we have the least amount, least amount of nuance between how we use people and the most amount of data points is at our firefighter EMTs and our firefighter paramedics. You're going to find that role at every fire department from functionality standpoint. They're going to be used in similar ways on the emergency scene.

(01:31:49):

So if we are trying to address overall health of the pay plan, since we solved some of the structure issues last year and now we need to look, how do we keep this pay plan healthy against the market? That's the place to look. That's the place where there's the least nuance. You go down and you look at driver EMT, you're going to see 30% behind. Well, it's because there's some nuance to that conversation. So I'm, we're not going to bug you on the 30% the way we analyzed it last year kind of addressed those things, but we don't have a complete data set where it's not as apples to apples from department,

Speaker 16 (01:32:26):

Department,

Speaker 15 (01:32:27):

Department to department. So if we're looking for overall health against what we're doing, let's look at firefighter EMT and firefighter paramedic and you'll see that on the far right we're about 5% behind on average starting pay, about 10% behind on average ending pay for EMTs. Similar numbers for firefighter paramedics.

Speaker 16 ([01:32:49](#)):

There's also two columns and I want to make a note of in there. You'll see 'em kind of highlighted in yellow and that'd be independents, lenexa. So when we are gathering data for this, I just wanted to be aware that they did not have a 2025 pay plan in place for theirs yet. So the numbers I was able to find were 2024. So any increases they got in 2025 would actually adjust that number, that market higher up versus what we truly are. So just so you're aware, just to add a little bit of context in those everything else, we were able to get 2025 pay plans, but those two were still a year behind in their pay plan.

Speaker 15 ([01:33:26](#)):

So we didn't just do the mean averages, we did the meetings to, this is produced by city management. You've seen this in their presentation, the column on the far right, if those percentages were a hundred percent, you would be smack dab in the middle of the market. So you'll see that we are behind on all ranks, roughly 8% for EMTs, roughly 5% for paramedics. And yeah, well I'll just leave it at that. Now, when you're trying to come up with a plan for compensation, you have to have more information than just where am I against? Where are you today? You have to understand or at least have some sort of an educated guess on what you think the market is going to do tomorrow, the next day and a year from now. So traditionally we've looked back and queried what Colas and gwas have been for other cities.

([01:34:34](#)):

This is this course, the same list of agreed upon peer cities in a five-year lookback. There are also numbers going forward. That's because the significant number of our comparables are also unions who are bargaining and they are in multi-year agreements. So we can see what they're doing in two and three years from now. You'll see here that since COVID there has been some acceleration in this market. I'll admit that 4% average is faster than what I have been a part of in previous negotiations. So we are falling behind in a quick moving market. We were under a long-term plan up until last year or three year agreement that two had two and a half percent general wage adjustments and that was our best estimate of what the market was going to do and we were wrong. And that's okay to be wrong as long as there's a commitment to the next time you sit at the table to try and cover that gap.

([01:35:31](#)):

What our broader solution to us, of course, is a long-term deal. We came to negotiations discussions last year and asked to solve these issues over a long-term period to make it more affordable and to give us more wiggle room and ratification with our membership. And we did that same thing again this year. Hey, let's solve this over a multi-year deal. The city management has balked on that and indicated that well the four, well five of you would not be willing to support that under this certain budget situation. And really from our perspective, if the market is moving 4% and our medians are behind five or 7%, you're looking at at least 4% to prevent us from going backwards. And that's really the sticking point here.

([01:36:34](#)):

So fact finding report, as Ms. Dodge indicated, we did go to fact finding. FactFinder essentially indicated that the city's proposal 3% is too low for the reasons that I've discussed. But they were also fair in indicating that perhaps our proposal of 6% over the year was unrealistic against the budget. We're willing to accept that we're willing to be flexible and reasonable and take what a third party unbiased outlook on the situation has offered us here. There is a third bullet point here about the timing of the step raises. Past practice has to do this, do our step raises on the anniversary date of our hire going into fact finding and during discussion we opposed that idea and I want to get into that for a little while because we're not opposed to the idea and concept or philosophy. It absolutely makes sense to get everybody in the city on the same schedule to make the administration of these raises in the paperwork and all the stuff that needs to be done to be easier for our staff.

([01:37:48](#)):

However, maybe during a budget crisis and while we're behind is not the time to do it. Now I have in front of you a chart in which we presented during fact finding when our proposal was still to not deviate from current practice. And our thought on this, it was a creative solution to get to a larger GWA against our pay plan. According to the city's estimates, it's going to cost you all roughly \$113,000 to deviate from current practice on the timing of our step raises according to their own estimates, it also costs roughly \$130,000 to apply an additional 1% raise or cola GWA, whatever you want to call it, against the pay plan friends, that's a \$17,000 difference.

(01:38:43):

And honestly, you've already passed \$775,000 an additional money towards our pay plan. If you were to take that entire chunk of money and throw it at the pay plan, you're looking at a 3.8% GWA, you find \$17,000 more, you're at a 4% GW day and you're meeting the market movement. We are not against changing from current practice, but this is another reason why long-term agreements are better because both sides can make concessions in different years to get all our priorities done. One year deals, you can't do that. I can't get something ratified by my friends behind me when they know they're going to move backwards in the market on a one year deal.

(01:39:32):

With this slide, what I want to do is emphasize a point I was trying to make in the previous slide that we've continued to be flexible. We were flexible with our proposals last year and trying to fit it into the budget constraints. And you'll see when we speak of concepts like market-based, we are basing our proposals on what the data is saying and what we're able to collect here. We are suspicious that that's not going on from city management in a biggest indication there is that they were at 3% before we even collected data or agreed upon market comparables. How can you come with a market informed proposal if we haven't even defined our market yet? And you'll see our proposals have changed over the process. As I indicated, we were looking for a long-term deal trying to fit 15% adjustment over two to three years.

(01:40:34):

If you were to do a three-year deal with 15%, you're going to gain or close that gap by 1% a year essentially. And then you'll see our proposal at fact finding would've moved our pay plan 6%, but it would've done it at the cost of 5% because you're only doing 2% for half a year. So we are trying to find creative ways to get this done and move this pay plan in a cheaper way for you all and to fit it into budget. But it takes creativity on both sides. It takes flexibility on both sides. And right now we're being stonewalled and we don't have the confidence that there willing to work with us honestly. I mean to say it frankly.

(01:41:18):

So before I get into my conclusion points, I do want to address, I don't have a slide for it, but the concept of market-based compensation and employee equity friends, those are competing values. If you define those as the city's defining them, they can't exist together. Employee equity as the city defines it means everybody's getting the same race market. Comparable market compensation means you're compensating people based on the market of their defined job duties. That can't work, that can't exist In the same way all of the pay studies that we have done as a organization point to using different market comparables, police, fire, administrative personnel, and other groups choosing different peer cities and compensating them against those specific markets. If you are so hyper-focused on employee equity, what if our market moves 6% while sanitation moves 1%? How can you both be equitable and market-based? You can't.

(01:42:31):

What if ours doesn't move at all, but sanitation moves 10 Are we going to tell the guys in sanitation that they can't get raises because the firefighter market didn't move? No, you can't do both. And when we speak on equity, I thought we were moving away from this conversation just in context in our MOU discussions in 2021, we with Mr. McGuire over here, and to his credit, we got to an agreement, I think

two weeks before the impasse days, the fastest we've ever done it. But a sticking issue that we had was a favored nation's clause within our contract, a clause within our contract that said we were going to get the same raise that you were going to give to other employee groups. It was a guarantee of employee equity as the city defines it. And the city asked to have that removed and after some fierce discussion, we obliged and it was promised to us that this was going to be used so that we can make true market adjustments to different employee groups. After that was removed, you all went ahead and fixed the primary pay plan and made some big adjustments to different sectors. Great, that's awesome. But what a bait and switch we just fell under because now that's being used against us. That's not fair. And I don't know if that was the plan at the start. I highly doubt it was, but that's where we are now.

(01:44:01):

So in conclusion, friends, we are a fire department and an ambulance department and we are doing more things than the majority of the other agencies out there. There are no other fire departments out there that are also an ambulance department other than what we showed you tonight. They don't exist within the Kansas City, Topeka Blue Springs area, if you've seen 'em all now. So we are performing in the top 50% of the market, but we are being compensated in the bottom 50% of the market. That is not equitable. Compensation is moving fast in this market. There's a better way to spend that \$113,000 and our current proposal is aligned with a third party who came in here without biases and heard from both of us. So you guys have some opportunity in front of us. I apologize for, I tend to get a little too passionate during these discussions and I will take that criticism, but you guys do have some opportunity to validate some of our frustrations in these conversations over the last two years. I hope you guys can look at that fact finding report and put some stake in it. This is a group that has traditionally asked for help in analyzing what we're doing, everything from compensation to how we do our water treatment. Fact finding reports, the same thing. We're looking for some leadership too to push the D management back into getting in a groove with us again and sticking to that good foundation of building a common measuring stick moving forward. So that's all I have for you guys tonight. I'll stand for questions.

Speaker 1 (01:45:49):

Thank you. Shamus, any questions for Seamus at this point or for Simon? I don't see any. I think we're good for now.

Speaker 4 (01:45:58):

I have a quick question. Yes

Speaker 1 (01:46:00):

Ma'am.

Speaker 4 (01:46:02):

On your slide, it looks like it's our slide 44 you said about the markets and the different forecasting for certain spots.

Speaker 15 (01:46:11):

You're going to have to bring it up for me. I don't know what I'm doing here.

Speaker 16 (01:46:14):

Are you talking about how the market was moving?

Speaker 4 (01:46:16):

Yes. That

Speaker 16 ([01:46:16](#)):

Slide. Yes.

Speaker 4 ([01:46:18](#)):

So with some of the other municipalities that have started to span out, is that just a matter of that's how their negotiating agreements were and so they were able to build out their agreements and how does that compare to our negotiating agreements or our timeline of how we do that? I just want to understand

Speaker 16 ([01:46:37](#)):

You're talking about the ones that have forecasted forward?

Speaker 4 ([01:46:39](#)):

Yes. Yeah,

Speaker 16 ([01:46:40](#)):

So those numbers were pulled from MOUs that have been agreed upon with the cities that are multi-year agreements going forward.

Speaker 5 ([01:46:48](#)):

So

Speaker 16 ([01:46:49](#)):

Those are the percentages that have been agreed upon with the cities going forward. Anything that was any department that did not have an MOU or anything in place going forward, I wasn't going to grab any data from that. It was only anything I could get in writing, like written pay plans, written MOUs, anything like that was where I was going to grab, try to grab that data from.

Speaker 5 ([01:47:12](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 15 ([01:47:13](#)):

Ms. Ellis, I would add that those percentage increases are just colas or general wage adjustments. They are not the step movement those, correct? Yeah, nearly all of 'em are on an explicit step as well. So they would be receiving step, whatever their step is, plus these percentages.

Speaker 16 ([01:47:30](#)):

Correct. Yeah, and that's an important point with this is yeah, this slide is just Colas, gwas, however you want to describe adjustments to the health of a pay plan.

Speaker 4 ([01:47:42](#)):

So

Speaker 16 ([01:47:42](#)):

Has nothing to do with step movement in that.

Speaker 4 ([01:47:44](#)):

Okay. And then on this list, the ones that are essentially comparable to us as it relates to EMS services is CJC. So

Speaker 16 ([01:47:55](#)):

Yeah, cj,

Speaker 4 ([01:47:56](#)):

KCK,

Speaker 16 ([01:47:57](#)):

K-C-K-K-C, MO or so K-C-F-D-S-E-A-C

Speaker 4 ([01:48:01](#)):

And

Speaker 16 ([01:48:01](#)):

Lee Summit.

Speaker 15 ([01:48:03](#)):

I would add an asterisk to C-J-C-F-P-D. So their COLA is actually 3% plus whatever CPI, I forget which CPI. So it's in addition, but we didn't, without knowing exactly which number they were going to use, I didn't think it was fair to put it in there.

Speaker 4 ([01:48:22](#)):

So theirs is a step plus 3% plus CPI

Speaker 15 ([01:48:26](#)):

Plus CPI. Yes, ma'am. For the year of this year.

Speaker 4 ([01:48:34](#)):

Thank you.

Speaker 1 ([01:48:36](#)):

Good. Thank you very much. There's no other questions for the presenters right now,

Speaker 4 ([01:48:45](#)):

Mayor, I just wanted to give staff the opportunity to, I had just my thoughts on slide 47, which was that the IAFF provided, I wanted to give staff just the opportunity to comment on that if they wanted to just said the language that was presented about the difference in the cost. And I mean you don't have to respond. I just didn't know if you had anything to respond to that in regards to their interpretation. 47? Yes, 47.

Speaker 12 ([01:49:17](#)):

Okay. Could we maybe pull that up for difference from yours or theirs? From the deck union? From our deck deck?

Speaker 4 ([01:49:25](#)):

Yeah, from your

Speaker 12 ([01:49:27](#)):

Presentation. Megan? No, the other one. Okay, thank you.

Speaker 4 ([01:49:34](#)):

I think that's it. Slide 47. Is it 10, 11, 12, 13? Look for slide 13. Okay. Thank you. That ain't it. Go back up and

Speaker 17 ([01:49:48](#)):

Next one.

Speaker 4 ([01:49:49](#)):

Yeah, no, the other way.

Speaker 12 ([01:49:51](#)):

Oh, okay.

Speaker 4 ([01:49:51](#)):

There you go.

Speaker 12 ([01:49:52](#)):

So this is looking at, hey, how much would it cost to, these are numbers that we used when we were talking about moving the timing of the step increase to January one versus current practice. So my understanding is so that 113,000, which is what we were estimating at that time, that would be like a one-time savings. I mean, we have a budget for the year. If we move the timing of the step increase earlier or change the timing of it, that's going to be a different amount for that year, but we still have to pay for that ongoing. So that would be like a one time cost savings. That's the layer I would add or my perspective that I would add to that slide. I don't know if Brandon or Zach have any, I think that's a good explanation.

Speaker 13 ([01:50:51](#)):

I would clarify just instead of cost savings, it's a cost to the city, so it's a one-time cost, but if you took that money and put it toward the pay plan as an extra percentage point or some extra general wage adjustment, that would be an ongoing cost. I think that's what Ms. Dodge was saying.

Speaker 4 ([01:51:13](#)):

So in comparison, IFF was saying that that one 13 could have been put into an ongoing GWA, which is with how they came up with 3.8 as opposed to a general fund, additional general fund expenditure of 113,000 for 2026.

Speaker 5 ([01:51:37](#)):

Right.

Speaker 4 ([01:51:38](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 1 ([01:51:45](#)):

Any other questions?

Speaker 4 ([01:51:48](#)):

Would that need to be, so then if it's saying that doing it on the anniversaries would, because we're not in contract negotiations right now, so I'm just what would lock in the 3.8%?

Speaker 13 ([01:52:08](#)):

How do we That would be the baseline for next year.

Speaker 4 ([01:52:15](#)):

That could potentially be extended to all staff, all employees. Okay.

Speaker 1 ([01:52:33](#)):

Anything else?

Speaker 4 ([01:52:36](#)):

No ma'am. Not at this time. Okay.

Speaker 1 ([01:52:40](#)):

I think at this point in time we're going to open up to public comment. So is there general public comment regarding our impasse hearing today?

Speaker 18 ([01:52:57](#)):

All right. Good evening. My name's Eric Lynch. I'm a member of local 50 96 executive board. I was a member of the negotiations team. I worked downtown at Fire Station number one, to be honest, shared my frustrations, sta frustrations with my coworkers here that we're having to be here tonight to talk to you guys about this. That we've reached impasse for the second year in a row and once again that we're having to plead with you guys about what we believe is fair and what we believe we deserve. We have a rising call volume in our city and not enough employees to satisfy it. We have a department budget that has been slashed drastically over the last two years, and now we're going to add an issue of recruitment and retention to that list. Our team and the city's team, we agreed to set metrics for the comparable cities and the results showed that we were behind the city, came with new metrics that we were not agreed upon, and they were still showing that we were behind. We had a third party fact finder prepare a report for us that looked at all the research he showed that we are behind. Yet here we are still not in agreement, and with the potential to put us further behind, I'd like to ask to not continue to add to our growing list of issues with public safety in our city.

([01:54:34](#)):

These people behind me are the hardest working people that I know. They see unimaginable things on a regular basis. They have to do unimaginable things on a daily basis, on a regular basis. What is fair and

competitive and is it too much to ask? Let's at least take a step towards progress when we have the chance, at the very least, pay our firefighters what they deserve. Thanks.

Speaker 5 ([01:55:01](#)):

Thank you. Eric.

Speaker 19 ([01:55:19](#)):

Mayors, commissioners. My name's Nathan Kaufman. I'm a captain with the Lawrence Douglas County Fire Medical, a prior executive board member of IFF Local 596, and a lifelong resident of Lawrence. I'm here this evening to respectfully ask that you make the men and women who protect the citizens of Lawrence a priority. You have the opportunity tonight to ensure that these dedicated public servants do not continue to fall further behind their peers. They're not asking for special treatment only to be compensated fairly for difficult and essential work. They perform every day and night. These firefighters are already doing more with fewer resources than they have in past years. Please do not ask them to do it for wages that fail to keep pace with the market, show them that their service matters, make them a priority. I urge you to vote in support of the Lawrence Professional Firefighters proposal. Thank you.

Speaker 9 ([01:56:34](#)):

Marcy Francisco 1101 Ohio, Lawrence, Kansas. You are not facing an easy decision, and I know there are lots of concerns about our budget, but this is the same issue that when I served on the commission 1979 to 1983, we were faced with an issue of looking at how we provide public safety for our citizens. I urge you to make public safety, sanitation, other city services a priority among other things we need to budget. Thank you.

Speaker 20 ([01:57:44](#)):

Good evening commissioners. Jack Dolan 6, 604, vice President of Local 1596. I want to show support. I was obviously part of this team as well, debated on even getting up here because I thought Simon and Seamus did a very good job of explaining the whole process. Not only over this year, but over the last two years. I hope that that was received. And I stand in solidarity with my brothers and sisters of Local 1596, and I urge you to support the local's proposal.

Speaker 5 ([01:58:22](#)):

Okay,

Speaker 20 ([01:58:22](#)):

Thank you. It's Jack.

Speaker 1 ([01:58:38](#)):

Anybody else in the room? Is there anybody waiting online?

Speaker 6 ([01:58:49](#)):

No one has raised their hand to indicate fair.

Speaker 5 ([01:58:55](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 1 ([01:59:03](#)):

And they still have You want to double check?

Speaker 9 ([01:59:06](#)):

Yeah.

Speaker 4 ([01:59:17](#)):

Sherry, while you're double checking, I do have a question for Simon or Seamus, please. Okay. I just need, it's more of a point of clarification. I just want to make sure I didn't miss anything with fuzzy math. Going back to the original slide 12, 13 I under, with the comparison of the city proposal to the IAFF proposal, you have the 4% general wage adjustment, which I track that math. Under that you have a 2% general wage adjustment to the pay plan at 130,000.

Speaker 16 ([01:59:54](#)):

If

Speaker 4 ([01:59:54](#)):

1% is 130,000, how is 2% a hundred?

Speaker 16 ([01:59:58](#)):

Yeah, so that was like you're talking about just real quick math, right? If that's done on the back half of your year, you're only doing that half the amount of time, right? So it's basically almost equivalent to a 1% adjustment, right? So I guess if you're doing 2%, it's \$260,000 for the entire year, right? So half of that 130,000,

Speaker 15 ([02:00:18](#)):

Right? And then that was meant to cover gap, some of that gap in the market without actually costing the city the amount of money that it would cost to get that percentage. At least for one year.

Speaker 16 ([02:00:34](#)):

It was us just trying to be able to work and make some sort of movement going forward without having to cost the city the full increase.

Speaker 15 ([02:00:44](#)):

Does that satisfy your question? Yes, it does. Thank you. Thank you.

Speaker 6 ([02:00:48](#)):

Mayor. No one has indicated that wish to speak. Sounds to say that that's all the comment.

Speaker 1 ([02:00:57](#)):

Alright, very good. So looks like that's the end of our public comment at this point. Commissioners,

Speaker 4 ([02:01:04](#)):

I was going to say, before we have the discussion, just ask if we could take at least a five minute break.

Speaker 1 ([02:01:09](#)):

Oh, sure. You want to take a five minute break? We will read adjourn. What is that? Seven 10. Seven 10.

Speaker 3 ([02:07:35](#)):

Alright, I think

Speaker 1 ([02:07:36](#)):

We're back. Gavel back in here. A little tension. Very well. So tonight, commissioners, we received comments from the public. We received comments from the city on presentation related to the negotiations thus far and appreciate all the efforts by ia, FF as well as city trying to come to terms and feels like we made a lot of progress. So commissioners, I don't know if you want me to ask you if you want any clarification comments or questions at this time or do you want to dive into any thoughts or comments you have?

Speaker 4 ([02:08:21](#)):

Where's my money people at? Did Rochelle leave? Oh no, Allie, you're here. I'm doing, I need you to do, help me with my fuzzy math again. So for this year, we said a mill was 1.57 million, but it's not a true 1.57 minus when we put things in through the different balances. And so that raw number is, can you fuzzy math that for me? Was it like 890,000? I feel like that keeps popping in my head. I'm sorry to put you on the spot. I'm sorry. Can you say your question one more time? Okay. I'm just trying to get the raw amount of a mill. I know when we were doing the mill discussions, we said that one mill was 1.57, but technically that's not the workable amount that we have because there's so much that goes into fund to the different reserves. So I was trying to remember, what is that number after everything gets divvied up? 890,000.

Speaker 1 ([02:09:27](#)):

The microphone

Speaker 4 ([02:09:27](#)):

Piece

Speaker 1 ([02:09:28](#)):

If you would. Thank you.

Speaker 4 ([02:09:29](#)):

Oh, I got to think of some math. Yeah, she got to math, right? Right. Yeah. Okay. I wish I could rattle it. That was pretty good. I believe in you, Allie. No, sorry, that's what I was trying to figure out was what is that? I thought, well, if it was 1.7 thought it was like 1.1 and I'm looking back in my notes to see if I can find it. I know I wrote it down. I know I did 1.01 or 1.008. So that was the 0.8 mil. The 0.8. The one mil would be about 1.1. 1.1, yeah. Okay. Extra cold stars for Allie and team.

Speaker 1 ([02:10:37](#)):

Okay, so any other questions? No, very much. Okay. Well, does anyone want to dive in on any comments then? Because we need to make a decision on this, whether we want to move forward with the current recommendation of three or the other recommendation from FactFinder or the amended recommendation from IAFF at this point in time

Speaker 4 ([02:11:15](#)):

May. I guess the question I would pose not to the body but to the governing body is where are we at as far as discussion? So I don't know if everyone is set in firm, I think that's where the conversation's going to go. And I think that's ripping the band off, ripping the band bandaid off if that's the direction that the commission wants to go is getting everybody's initial thoughts.

Speaker 1 ([02:11:46](#)):

Yeah, I think it's really just about whether or not we're willing to move off of the number at this point and where those funds would come from as well as how we would treat any additional changes we made as it relates to other increases in pay.

Speaker 4 ([02:12:01](#)):

Okay. I would start with this thought when we started this conversation back in July when we needed to discuss setting the revenue neutral rate. I understand that this conversation started in January of this year, and the idea is that many of the commissioners on the day said that they wanted to keep the budget neutral knowing that we will be going into discussions later on in the year around contract agreements. And I recognize that perhaps keeping it neutral, the thought process was whatever is the recommendation, we'll stick to it and that's it and we'll grind it out and that'll be what we need to do. Recognizing that we could try to make some headway this year or we would just put it all on the line and have that discussion next year. Now I'm not saying news that should be shocking to anyone, but there's a potential that several commissioners that are sitting right here today aren't going to be here next year to have those discussions.

([02:13:23](#)):

And so their input is driving what is going to be discussed and negotiated next year based on that. And that's what tonight's decision is going to impact. And so when we had those discussions, knowing that we had the discussions in July and we could have made a decision when we decided to exceed the revenue neutral rate to come up with a mill increase to address the very thing that we're talking about, and we chose a number which is a little lower than what I thought we would want to do. We have that wiggle room to do that. But we hamstrung ourselves with choosing a smaller number, which we then shrunk even more because we did not give ourselves proper latitude to have discussions knowing that these things were coming before us and that yes, it's about budget neutral for today, but the impact that that could have for this commission in the following year.

([02:14:38](#)):

And so when we have these discussions and when we have the community come before us and say, well, why doesn't the city do this? And the money, I mean just basic budget 1 0 1, we know that the city is ran by taxes and when we have these discussions and we've had 'em and folks have agreed with us and folks have disagreed with us. But the thing is is that we've heard a community speak through its strategic plan through our strategic plan and in front of us, they want public safety. And I've said it before, today's price is not yesterday's price and that we cannot continue to expect champagne taste on a tap water budget. Now we do have good tap water,

([02:15:21](#)):

Don't get me wrong, but it's not champagne. So knowing all of these things, we may see that as a competing value, but that's going back to the community and saying, if you want public safety, it's going to cost not just you, all of us because we all pay taxes. And so knowing that and being able to have messaging around that to tell the community, we have this coming up, we have these things to adjust if you want it and you're believing in the advocacy of what's being shared with you, it's going to have to come from you. It always comes from all of us. But because of whatever it is competing values, I'm losing my words saying I get so frustrated because it seems like for the four years that I've been on this

commission that I'm fighting for other people to give ourselves latitude, grace, and authority to do the things better than we do them. It's like we back ourselves into a corner year after year after year because we're afraid to do something because someone is going to be out in the community and say something bad about us. They're going to post something negative about us on social media. I can give a damn what someone says about me on social media because they're not doing this job.

(02:16:59):

And so I don't know what decision anybody's going to make today. I'm ready to go through scenarios one through 50 if you want to be here till 11 o'clock, but I don't know if you all have the appetite to do that. So with those words, let's start negotiating into deciding on a vote.

Speaker 1 (02:17:22):

Okay. Do you want to add anything, comments or,

Speaker 2 (02:17:31):

I think we've set a budget, the \$775,000 and that's what I would like to stick with. Now how we get there, the one slide that the IAFF has is, I thought it was a really good slide that showed that slide was a 47 whatever. Yeah, 47 a 50. And essentially how the way they presented their numbers, the 7 75, it comes pretty close if you leave off that 2% off the 2% general wage. So that's pretty close to what our budget is and that would be fine.

Speaker 1 (02:18:11):

And within the budget we have now. Yeah.

Speaker 2 (02:18:13):

So

Speaker 1 (02:18:13):

No additional increase. Okay.

Speaker 11 (02:18:20):

Well yeah, I'm of the mind to kind of adhere to what we had within the scope of our budget and originally proposed. And I would add that we have already tentatively settled with the other labor organizations at that percentage price and at the 3% that is kind of the expectation going in. And I'm a little hesitant because with this budget being at a deficit, we asked everybody to make sacrifices. Everyone and everyone did. They cut into their department, they cut into what they had to do to go ahead and make the number and this was a part of it. So to say that now that after all of this process and all of this hard work that we're kind of changing the deal, I dunno, I'm a little bit hesitant on that.

(02:19:22):

So I mean that's kind where I'm at right now. You'd be comfortable with staying at the current rate of 3% you feel like? Yeah. Yes, because we raised them up, the average was 8.5% last year. Along with that, we have a compensation study coming along here in a little bit, which will be out in the spring. And then that'll give us an opportunity to go ahead and reevaluate and then see where we need to move further. In addition to that, it's not like we haven't shown that we value and that we support the IAFF, especially with addressing staff to go ahead and look up and see if we can add an additional fire station. So I know that was a part of it. And also to go ahead and make sure that we made sure that everybody was employed

with the fire department as well as police, so as much as possible. So I think we're doing our due diligence in that regard.

Speaker 4 ([02:20:31](#)):

Okay. I have a quick question for staff. It's another math problem and I'm doing 'em with you. So I'm just using you all to check my answers on the slide that we've kind of been focusing on that slide 47 13, whichever one, based on our slide deck, it's slide 47 where it's mentioned that it says the city could fund a 3.8 GWA with current monies for L-D-C-F-M compensation approved with the 2026 budget one. Is that number true? And what would that number look like? What would the difference look like unbudgeted if we applied to 3.8 to all employees? While you're pontificating on that, commissioner Larson yet made a point that said that minus the one 30 in the IAFF proposal, that it would be comparable to the city's proposal. It's close, which is yes, it is very close to Seamus point. He stated that in his presentation it was a difference of \$17,000. So with that being the difference, I'm assuming you don't have an appetite to account for that.

Speaker 2 ([02:21:52](#)):

Yeah, I want to stick to the 7 75. Okay. Once we can, I really do. And as Commissioner Littlejohn said last year there were eight and a half and the rest of the staff was at 1%.

Speaker 4 ([02:22:03](#)):

Yeah, we chose to give staff 1%.

Speaker 2 ([02:22:05](#)):

I did

Speaker 4 ([02:22:06](#)):

After we should have advocated and I asked for us to advocate. So I want that to be noted in this conversation that we could have given staff 3%, but we created this distention by telling other staff that you only get 1%, but I don't disagree with your statement, but we did vote on one, but that was not a consensus.

Speaker 1 ([02:22:36](#)):

Didn't that eight and a half percent manifest itself based on us rearranging all of the pay situations rather than some overt act by the city commission? I mean, just to make sure that's clear, I don't recall

Speaker 17 ([02:22:54](#)):

Megan would be better to respond to this, but it was the result of the negotiated pay plan with the IFF.

Speaker 1 ([02:23:03](#)):

So that was a reorganization of a new pay plan based on Correct. Okay. Where we're at today using these numbers today. Okay. Correct.

Speaker 4 ([02:23:12](#)):

Yeah. And I was going to say, mayor, I will note I don't have last year's notebook in front of me, but similar to this, when we did make the agreement on the increase for IAFF, we did have to take that money

out of the general fund because again, when we decided to exceed the revenue neutral rate and several options were proposed for us to increase the mill, we chose not to.

(02:23:50):

So as a result of that, we had to pull money from the general fund instead of assessing it to the community writ large. And so now that deficit from last year, and staff can correct me if I'm wrong, that the reason why we needed to do the 2 million this year with the deficit was to kind of get us back on track. So the thing is we're pulling from the reserve coffers when we have the ability to do it on the front end instead of the back end before the last few years, and perhaps even tonight, whatever is decided is going to be, if it is something that is decided different from what is proposed tonight, we would be pulling it also from the back end and not on the front end. So I'm just showing the pattern of, while I understand to commissioner little John's point that we asked everyone to make sacrifices to the point that was made tonight, equity is not equality.

(02:25:05):

And that's why when the staff presented the budget to us, they showed us how different departments had different percentage budgets. Knowing that in hearing what we hear from the community, yes, they're competing values, but like I share with community members, staff is making cuts. You want more safety. So are you willing to pay for that in your property taxes for that safety? If they say no, then I'm informed by that. If they say yes, I'm also informed by that. So just because departments were asked to make cuts, yes, we could have left it there and said, your deficit is your deficit and we'll catch it up on the back end. Or we could have heard from the community and we heard from the community and said, all right, well you can make up that gap. Do you want to make up that gap? So I think some of the sticking tonight is because we don't ask those questions as commissioners. I don't know if it's because we're afraid identity politics, I don't know. But we hamstringing ourselves so much because we don't utilize the tools and the authority that we have bestowed upon us. So sorry, staff numbers.

Speaker 6 (02:26:30):

So we would estimate that 3.8% for all employees would impact the general fund by about \$610,000.

Speaker 4 (02:26:38):

Okay. Thank you, Allie. Thank you. Allie. And team.

Speaker 1 (02:26:44):

Okay. Thank you very much, Allie, for that quick math,

Speaker 4 (02:26:48):

Which I will note. Mayor, I'm sorry to talk so much, but I feel like I deserve it. I'm a commissioner just like you all. I just choose to talk more than you all do. I will note that that 610,000 is the difference in what was the initial proposal that I made back in July when I wanted us to exceed the revenue neutral rate. So with what I proposed in July, we could have at least negotiated three and a half or 3.8% across the board.

Speaker 1 (02:27:27):

Okay. Anything else to add? I'm going to, I really appreciate a level of energy that goes into these processes and I know the fact finder had a lot of decisions to make based on the data that he received or they received. What's important to me though is that the fact finder does not have fiduciary or financial concerns to be taken into consideration as it relates to being an elected official or any budgetary constraints whatsoever. And the fact that the Finder came to the agreement that he did or she did on this

issue makes it clear to me that there's a gap. And I acknowledge there's a gap. And I'm sorry there's a gap. I really want our firefighters to be paid as well as we can possibly afford. And Lawrence has a budget and we have to adhere to it. And we asked everyone to cut this year.

(02:28:26):

And the reason why we are sticking to these 3% raises is because A, excuse me, 3% cost of living increases because A, that's what we can afford, and B, that's what we can afford. It's not that we don't want to do more. I'd love to ask for more from the community, but I think next year is going to be when we're asking a lot from our community for public safety. I brought this up the other day. I would think multiple mill, percent mill levy increases for public safety, for new fire stations, new equipment, new firefighters. We're going to be raising the mill levy specifically for this purpose in the future. It's coming. There's no way we can do it with, we can't find any more coins in the cushion. We need to come to the terms to the table and realize that we need more money for this.

(02:29:10):

And we're willing to all do that for you. But what we're not willing to do is raise, increase everyone's salary equally. And I think these commissioners have made that choice in the past that if we're going to give people these raises, we're going to try to do it evenly. I don't want to use the word equitable, I don't want to be equally, I just want to say fairly. And I think it's fair to everyone to ask for the same thing. And the 3% increase in today's situation with the city, I feel like is fair even. And it's what everyone seems to be getting. And for me, I'd love to have more money to give away, but unfortunately since I've been on the commission, we've done nothing but have to cut. And that's not any fun. And it's no good for you and it's no good for the community.

(02:29:54):

And so for us to be here to make hard decisions, to be the ones that don't want to give what I think many of your group feel is fair wage increase, I'm sorry for that. I don't want to commit any other commissioners to any more increases for the future. And as you know, there'll be two new commissioners coming here to make these decisions next year, whether it's Commissioner Littlejohn or two other new ones, there's going to be at least one new face on this. And they're all going to have hard decisions raising taxes for this community to pay for all these services we're talking about. And yet we take this time and we are talking about a small amount of money and I feel badly that this is not a million dollars. This is not a large seven figure deficit. But as we add on the other employees in this community who may or not be equal to you, but they have similar importance, then we need to take into account that greater increase.

(02:30:52):

And for us to reach your wage adjustment, the increases that we'd have to give the other people in our organization is more than we can afford. And it's more than even Commissioner sellers pointed out if we went to 4%. So for me, I really believe that I want to stick to this and I'm sorry that we can't do better. I want to do better and we're going to do better for you next year. I know it, but right now this is all we can do and we have a budget to adhere to. And I want stick to it

Speaker 4 (02:31:22):

Point of clarity. One, I didn't suggest 4%, I suggested some numbers for us to pass.

Speaker 1 (02:31:29):

No, I didn't say you said 4%.

Speaker 4 (02:31:31):

Well you did. You said commissioner seller suggested 4%. You just said it, but I'm not saying,

Speaker 1 ([02:31:35](#)):

But that's okay. Okay.

Speaker 4 ([02:31:36](#)):

Well not here to argue. My initial point of clarity was I just want to clean up a little language. You talked about us giving money away. We don't necessarily give money away, we appropriate funds. So I just want to distribute, make, distribute funds

Speaker 5 ([02:31:52](#)):

Appropriate.

Speaker 4 ([02:31:52](#)):

Appropriate. We don't give it away. We appropriate. Thank you Mayor.

Speaker 1 ([02:31:57](#)):

Words matter. You're right. Thanks.

Speaker 11 ([02:32:00](#)):

Yeah, I'll just add a tail end on that. I know this is all hard and this is all difficult and I want to thank you Shamus and your group for your part in negotiations. I know those couldn't have been easy and as well as Brandon, our city members for being a part of that as well. And as the mayor said, I believe next year we'll have a little bit more latitude to go ahead and address some of these problems. But this year it's just going to be awful difficult. But I did want to express the appreciation and respect that I have for the work that you guys all do and that all of our city staff does. And I appreciate you all and I think coming up this next budget year, we'll be able to go ahead and have some solutions to these, as you said, ongoing problems that we currently have. So,

Speaker 1 ([02:32:54](#)):

Alright, so at this point in time with this public hearing, we need to make a decision. Is there a motion of some sort?

Speaker 4 ([02:33:12](#)):

I mean, what are y'all agreeing to? So we can go ahead and do the motion and vote to keep the 3%, is that where we're at? So you want to go with staff's recommendation? So someone needs to make a motion to

Speaker 11 ([02:33:40](#)):

What, since the hearing is a part of it and the decision a little bit help on the motion itself. Sherry, would it be like we agree with staff's recommendation to clear the impasse regarding the city and the international association?

Speaker 17 ([02:33:58](#)):

Mayor? I think Zach can word a motion.

Speaker 11 ([02:34:00](#)):

Okay, cool.

Speaker 13 ([02:34:01](#)):

Mayor, I think it would be appropriate if that's the direction you're taking to have a motion to in the impasse between the city and the IFF by accepting a 3% general wage adjustment in step for members in the 2026 budget year. And then I think that would also include moving the step plan to the beginning of the year.

Speaker 1 ([02:34:28](#)):

So motion to end the impasse

Speaker 13 ([02:34:33](#)):

By adopting a 3% general wage adjustment. First pay period,

Speaker 1 ([02:34:38](#)):

Movement of the

Speaker 13 ([02:34:39](#)):

Step progression to the first pay period of the year. Alright.

Speaker 15 ([02:34:48](#)):

But I add that we would deed language about an opener if that's the direction

Speaker 13 ([02:34:53](#)):

That's correct. And we will have a language about an opener in the agreement that comes before you for your final approval. I think that's agreed upon at this point. So that's not at impasse.

Speaker 1 ([02:35:04](#)):

Okay. Okay. So would one of you two like to regurgitate those words for me so I can do so if you need to,

Speaker 2 ([02:35:16](#)):

I will make a motion, a move that we in the impasse and accept the city's proposal of a 3% general wage increase and starting the timing of the step increase to be the first pay period of the year.

Speaker 1 ([02:35:32](#)):

I think that says it all.

Speaker 13 ([02:35:34](#)):

I think that covers it.

Speaker 1 ([02:35:35](#)):

Correct. Okay. There's a motion by Larson second. Okay. There's a motion by Larson is second by Littlejohn. All in favor say aye.

Speaker 4 ([02:35:43](#)):

Aye.

Speaker 1 ([02:35:44](#)):

Aye was opposed.

Speaker 4 ([02:35:45](#)):

Nay. Okay,

Speaker 1 ([02:35:46](#)):

The motion passes three to one. Okay. Our next item on the agenda is commission items. Commissioners, do you have anything to bring up this evening?

Speaker 4 ([02:36:05](#)):

I have one thing. It's more of something for us to watch or have our city manager's office watch. I know that the university is currently in discussions with the administration as it relates to compact language. I do believe it's their compact for academic excellence in higher education. There are aspects of the compact that could potentially impact relationships that we have with the university. So I just would like to make, just keep that in mind for us as commissioners, but also to have the city manager's office keep a watchful eye of that. I will have some follow up to that depending on how the university decides to go with that. So that was my only area.

Speaker 1 ([02:36:57](#)):

Gido. Anything else? Alright. And then the future agenda items. Looks like our next meeting,

Speaker 6 ([02:37:14](#)):

We do have a meeting on the fourth. It's just not listed. We don't have a regular agenda. There'll just be consent items and calendar things like that since we have it's election night.

Speaker 1 ([02:37:29](#)):

Oh, that's election night, right? Sorry. That's the reason why I was missing.

Speaker 6 ([02:37:33](#)):

Yeah, so you will meet, we just typically just put bigger items on here, not our

Speaker 1 ([02:37:38](#)):

Items

Speaker 6 ([02:37:38](#)):

And we won't have any of those that night. And then the final meeting's not on here just because we don't have, I'm sure we will, but we don't have any regular agenda items scheduled at this point for that meeting either.

Speaker 1 ([02:37:52](#)):

Very good. Alright, Brandon, would you like to comment on the city manager's report?

Speaker 17 ([02:38:03](#)):

No real comments from me other than just to point out there are three reports including on the city manager's report report on our long-term rental licensing program, inspection data from that program over the past several years. And then also a report following up on a request from the commission about the use of affordable housing trust funds going towards utility assistance programs and then our utility billing report monthly.

Speaker 1 ([02:38:32](#)):

Very good. Very interesting report on the long-term rental registration. I appreciate that. Update. The additional information. It gives a lot of clarity on what's happening and it looks like staff's doing a good job on that. It's

Speaker 5 ([02:38:44](#)):

Very thorough.

Speaker 1 ([02:38:44](#)):

Yes it is. Yes it is. All right. Any other questions or comments? Any public comment on the city manager's report?

Speaker 4 ([02:38:58](#)):

No. I just want to make a note that I'll probably bring some of this up during the strong and welcoming neighborhood outcome meeting.

Speaker 1 ([02:39:04](#)):

Sure. When's that going to be? You think?

Speaker 6 ([02:39:08](#)):

It

Speaker 4 ([02:39:08](#)):

Looks like it's the 11th.

Speaker 1 ([02:39:09](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 6 ([02:39:12](#)):

There's no public comment online,

Speaker 1 ([02:39:14](#)):

No public comment. Online's for the city manager's report?

Speaker 6 ([02:39:16](#)):

That's right. None

Speaker 1 ([02:39:17](#)):

This transcript was exported on Oct 24, 2025 - view latest version [here](#).

Any in the room. Okay. Let's talk about the commission calendar, if there's anything I Nothing to comment. Okay.