

The Budget Committee for the City of Junction City, met at 6:30 p.m. on Monday, May 4, 2026, at City Hall, 680 Greenwood Street and in a virtual meeting format, via internet and phone.

PRESENT: Council Members: Chair, Councilor Karen Leach; Mayor, Kenneth Wells; Councilors Sandie Thomas, Sidney Washburne, Andrea Ceniga, and Ken Hancock. **Citizen Members:** Co-Chair, Kara McDaniel, Travis Ducker, Doug Easterday, Jackie Pendergrass, Sharona Pong, Ciara Orozco, and Sandy Downey; **Staff:** City Administrator, Spencer Nebel; Finance Director, Christina Green; Public Works Director, Gary Kaping; Public Works Superintendent, Jeremy Tracer; and City Recorder, Kitty Vodrup.

1. Call to Order

Mayor Wells called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. He asked if any Budget Committee members had conflicts of interest to declare. Councilor Ceniga declared a potential conflict of interest, as her brother-in-law works at Public Works. Committee Member Downey declared a potential conflict of interest, as her daughter works at Public Works.

2. Introductions

Mayor Wells introduced Administrator Pro Tem Spencer Nebel and new Budget Committee members Ciara Orozco and Sandy Downey.

3. Nominate Chair

MOTION: Councilor Hancock nominated Councilor Leach to serve as Chair. The motion was seconded by Councilor Ceniga. The motion passed by unanimous vote of the Committee: Thomas, Washburne, Ceniga, Wells, Leach, Hancock, McDaniel, Ducker, Easterday, Pendergrass, Pong, Orozco, and Downey.

4. Approval of Minutes – April 17, 2025 and April 24, 2025

MOTION: Councilor Washburne made a motion to approve the April 17 and April 24, 2025 Budget Committee minutes. The motion was seconded by Councilor Thomas and passed by unanimous vote of the Committee: Thomas, Washburne, Ceniga, Wells, Leach, Hancock, McDaniel, Ducker, Easterday, Pendergrass, Pong, Orozco, and Downey.

5. Public Comment. None.

6. Presentation of Budget Message

Administrator Nebel presented the Budget Message. Full message in budget document:

Governmental Accounting

- The City budget included a variety of funds, with some funds having restrictions on use.
- The City of Junction City refined its fund structure by using the innovative approach of a “bucket” system in the General Fund. Departmental funds within the General Fund maintained their own balance, which discouraged “spend it or lose it” practices at the end of the fiscal year since any unused funds rolled over for the department’s future use at the beginning of the next fiscal year.

Budget Overview

- The proposed budget for Fiscal Year 2026-2027 had a combined operating and capital expenditure budget totaling \$21.8 million. This represented a tentative decrease from the

\$26.6 million budgeted in the current year; however, the refinement of capital expenditure budgets was expected to increase the budget amount over the current year budget. For example, the City received a loan of \$6 million for water improvements, of which \$3 million was forgivable. Staff would be bringing those numbers to the May 18, 2026 Budget Committee meeting.

- The Personnel Services budget for 2026-2027 was \$8,329,700. This was 8.4% or \$645,300 more than the current budget. Personnel Service's costs made up 88% of the General Fund budget.
- The total net Materials and Services (M and S) expenses for the proposed budget for the General Fund were \$1,783,600, a 15.17% increase from the current year budget.
- The proposed budget funded a total workforce of 49.95 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) positions, which was a slight decrease of 52.5 FTEs over the current year.
- The total Personnel Services costs were budgeted to increase 8.4% between the current budget and the proposed budget. Health insurance costs were budgeted to increase 20%, and PERS costs were 17.39% of all personnel costs.

Priorities and Issues

- The budget continued to focus on infrastructure investment and maintaining sufficient fund balances as its highest priority. Issues that impacted the budget:
 - Economic Conditions. The City would need to absorb continued inflationary costs during the next fiscal year.
 - Federal Funding for Local Projects. A number of grant programs at the federal and state levels had been frozen or eliminated, which would mean more reliance on local funding, bonds, fees, and rates to finance much needed infrastructure projects.
 - Mutual Agreement and Order (MAO). The City was under a MAO with Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), which required the City to meet certain requirements in its wastewater system moving forward. Costs would be \$50 million plus in infrastructure investment that would have to be secured by the City in future years.
 - Water and Sewer Rates.
 - It was essential that these rates minimally kept up with inflationary costs. By not increasing rates to keep up with inflation, the purchasing power of revenue collected became less at a time that Junction City needed to reinvest in infrastructure that had reached its useful life.
 - Water and Sewer rates had not been increased since July 1, 2023, when water rates were increased by 2% and wastewater by 5%.
 - Inflation over these past two years had been 2.71% in 2025 and 2.95% in 2024, and there was inflation coming up again for 2026. For the two years of 2024 and 2025, that was a loss of purchasing power of 5.66% since the last rate increase.
 - The Council also approved a labor contract with City employees for a three-year period, which provided comparable salary adjustments to other communities, and a 4% increase took effect July 1, 2024. The agreement also called for a 3% to 5% COLA increase in the 2nd and 3rd years.
 - To address the increase in operating costs to the City's utility systems, Administrator Nebel recommended that the Budget Committee and Council consider an 8% increase in water rates and a 5% increase in sewer rates, beginning July 1, 2026.
 - Staff compiled monthly water and sewer rates for comparable cities and Junction City was the lowest. Administrator Nebel recommended that the City review utility

rates each year and adjust them accordingly to meet the needs that were established in the budget. The problem with waiting was that you would have to do larger increases that were more of a shock, and incremental increases each year were essential to making sure that those funds were able to continue the services and make the improvements that people wanted to see in their utility systems.

Strategic Goals and Strategies

- Several key principles were used to develop this proposed budget:
 - Aligned with City Financial Policies
 - Continued the General Fund “Rainy Day Fund.” This was a fund that the City established in case there was a major economic downturn, and that fund would help bridge that gap going forward.

Organization Factors

- Staff had been working on the annual budget since January. The budget development was disrupted this year with the change in City Administration, coupled with the Finance Director working through the budget processes for the first time without the previous Finance Director. Administrator Nebel began employment with the City in March and had not had time to direct the budget development and work with departments on reviewing budgets. As a result, there would be some adjustments to the proposed budget between the 1st and 2nd Budget Committee meetings.
- Since it was anticipated that a new City Administrator would be hired in the Fall, they would have time to be involved in the next budget development. Administrator Nebel would be working with the Finance Director to discuss several tools that could better structure the submission of the requested budget, examine what worked and did not work, and build a budget calendar that would be based on the experiences from this year.

Conclusion

- It was important that Junction City continued to be a financially sound organization. The City relied on diverse revenue sources and had healthy fund balances in most of the operating funds. From his observation, staff did a good job in handling their respective department budgets and expenditures. Attention needed to be focused on the utility funds which would require significant reinvestment in coming years. It was his opinion that the proposed budget presented a spending plan that reflected the priorities and policies of the City. As he was reviewing the proposed budget with the Budget Committee and staff, he would recommend further adjustments and refinements for Budget Committee consideration.

7. Review of Proposed Budget Document

Administrator Nebel reviewed that the proposed budget should be considered a working document that would be subject to continued review and adjustments until it was approved by the Budget Committee. He and Director Green would be working with staff to address any modifications and present those to the Budget Committee at the May 18, 2026 meeting. Tonight, they would be focusing on Public Works, which covered half of the departments in the budget, including some that were in the General Fund. At the May 18, 2026 meeting, the Budget Committee would hear from the rest of the departments, including Police, Community Services, and Administration. After reviewing and making any modification to the budget, the

Budget Committee would be asked to approve the property tax rate and the budget for FY 2026-2027.

Administrator Nebel continued that from a process standpoint, he was proposing that Committee members identify any questions or changes to the proposed budget as they were going through the budget but that they not consider any changes to the budget until they had completed the entire review of the budget. If members had something they wanted to change, staff would prepare a list and bring back a report at the May 18th meeting.

Committee Member Downey asked if she could pass along any questions after the meeting. Administrator Nebel responded yes and Committee members could email questions to him and Director Green.

Councilor Thomas asked about getting updated budget sheets to a member not in attendance. Administrator Nebel responded that there would be some pages that would be replaced in the budget as they still included last year's numbers, and those along with other pages that had modifications would be provided to members as those pages were updated.

Committee Member Easterday noted that in the comparison of water/sewer rates for other cities, what was shown for Junction City was \$86.84 and that did not reflect his bill. Director Kaping responded that the City's bill also included sanitation and they based the comparisons to other cities off of 600 consumption units.

Committee Member Pendergrass asked who came up with the percentage rate for the increase. Administrator Nebel responded that was his recommendation, based on an earlier rate study that had been done.

Committee Member Pendergrass asked how much the bills would increase. Director Kaping responded that for a 5% and 8% rate increase, the average residential bill would see less than a \$3.00 monthly increase. **TO BE PROVIDED**. Administrator Nebel added that staff would put together some examples of what the rate impacts would be for the next meeting.

8. Review of Public Works Budget

Director Kaping reviewed:

Building Department, Page 92

- Lines 1 – 13: Revenue came from building permits. Estimates were same as current year, even though the City would be able to build more houses with more EDUs (Equivalent Dwelling Units) available.
- Personnel Costs: Would decrease, as Building Inspector was working 4 days instead of 5.
- **TO BE CHANGED:** Line 52 Transfer to Capital Projects Fund = \$14,800; however, Line 65 in the Building Department Capital Projects Fund on Page 94 read \$10,000. Those two lines needed to match.

Mayor Wells noted that with the moratorium last year, they knew the revenue would be decreased in this fund. Director Kaping responded yes and he had reduced revenue and was being conservative again this year, even though they could build more houses.

Committee Member Easterday asked why the City could build more houses this year. Director Kaping responded that the MOU stipulated that the City could receive a certain amount of additional EDUs when completing necessary projects. The City started with 20 EDUs and now had 92. The City was looking at connecting its sewer to MWMC (Metropolitan Wastewater Management Commission) instead of building its own wastewater treatment plant, as it would drastically reduce fees charged to customers, and all treatment responsibility would be removed from the City.

Committee Member Pong asked if it was certain that the City would connect to MWMC. Director Kaping responded that the City was working towards that and Creswell and Goshen were also in process of connecting. Administrator Nebel added that agreements would need approval from the cities of Springfield, Eugene, Creswell, and Junction City, as well as Lane County and MWMC.

Swimming Pool, Page 128

- Budget was prepared with last year's rates, but those rates would be increased, so revenue could be better than in the budget, depending on usage. Pool rates were increased last year by 25 cents, and before that had not been increased since 2010. Rates would be increased this year from \$2.25 entry fee to \$4.00.
- Personnel: Increased a bit. No major changes to M and S.
- Line 56: Transfer to Community Services Capital Fund = \$8,000.

Pool Capital Projects, Page 138

- Line 45 Transfer from Swimming Pool Fund = \$8,000.
- Line 49 CEP projects. \$10,800. Interior painting of the pool, lane lines, flooring.
- Line 53 Building Projects. \$85,000. Needed to replace the pump at the pool and do some filter work, which was estimated at around \$40,000.

Committee Member McDaniel noted that last year the pool was closed for a time, due to work that needed to be done, and she asked how that impacted revenue. Director Kaping responded that it was way low because the pool was not open until July. Committee Member McDaniel noted that the pool had been missed when closed last year.

Councilor Thomas noted that when the rates were recently increased, there was support from the community to do that. Mayor Wells added that Director Kaping and his staff did their homework on comparable rates to other cities.

Councilor Washburne asked if Line 31 Chemicals would be enough. Director Kaping responded yes, as they had developed an automated and more efficient procedure in using chemicals at the pool.

Parks and Open Spaces, Page 147

- Line 2 Building Rental. Decreased as no longer had a tenant at Dutch's Field building.
- Line 3 Parks Rentals. Budgeted same amount as last year.
- Personnel Services. Wages increased a little bit. No change to M and S.
- Line 57 Transfer to Capital Fund. \$123,000.

Director Kaping noted that for all the funds he was presenting, the Ending Fund Balances were the same as the Beginning Fund Balance or within the range for what percentage they needed to have, per fiscal policy.

Parks Capital Projects, Page 139

- Line 65 Transfer from Parks. \$123,000.
- Line 71 CEP Projects. \$17,000 for CEP projects.
- Line 72 Capital Outlay Projects. \$150,000 to replace a play structure or facility if damaged. They completely rebuilt two parks last year, partly funded from this fund and SDCs.

Committee Member Easterday expressed concern that the fuel line item had not been raised. Director Kaping responded that fuel prices had increased after they prepared this budget. He noted that if a line item was overspent in M and S, it would be fine as long as some other things were under, as it was the bottom-line number in that category that they looked at.

Mayor Wells shared that every month the Council and department could see where they were at year to date on finances, and Director Green did a great job with that report. Director Kaping responded that report was vital to him and Superintendent Tracer in monitoring their budgets.

Committee Member Orozco thanked Public Works for the new parks. She asked what the \$800,000 on Line 7 Park System Expansion in the Parks System Development Fund would be used for. Director Kaping responded that this fund could only be used for park expansion projects, as the Parks SDCs were paid by building permits. It was more of a placeholder, but it was planned that a small percentage would be used this year for irrigation at some parks. Administrator Nebel added that SDC funds were collected so there were funds to expand services to meet the demands from the addition of homes.

Committee Member Easterday commended staff on the great job on the park close to his house. Director Kaping responded that credit for that belonged to Public Works Foreman Shamen Johnson who mostly took care of Parks and Open Spaces and Superintendent Tracer who took care of the Public Works crew.

Committee Member McDaniel asked what the plans were for park expansion. Director Kaping responded that they only had a few smaller irrigation projects planned for the coming year. He added the CIP list for parks projects could be seen on page 142. Staff planned on doing some larger park projects in FY 27-28.

Water Fund, Page 160

- Line 3 Water Revenue (User Fees). This included the 8% rate increase. Projected rates for this year were \$1,727,000 and the FY 26-27 budget was \$1,865,160.
- Personnel: Increased a little with step increases, COLA.
- Line 34 Operating Materials and Supplies. \$40,000, as costs had gone up.
- Line 41 Travel and Training. Increased from \$5000 to \$7000. Majority of Public Works staff had to relicense every two years.
- Line 48 Transfer to Water Capital Fund. \$234,000.

Water Capital Projects Fund, Page 162

- Line 6 Transfer from Water Fund. Where part of the \$234,000 was located. That transfer was broken up into multiple line items in the Capital Plan.
- Line 21 Master Plan Projects. \$50,000. For Public Works Projects Crew picking off a water line or two that was in the City's Master Plan.
- Line 39 Capital Expenditure Plan Projects.
- Line 54 Meter and Services Projects. For meter replacement, repair, or install.

Administrator Nebel noted that the FY 25-26 adopted budget showed projected revenue as 1.9 million which was an anomaly and he was not sure if they thought an increase would be made that year and then it was not done. Director Kaping added they had talked about being able to have more water and maybe a rate increase, but that did not happen.

Committee Member McDaniel asked if there was a reason that no property taxes were allocated to water. Administrator Nebel responded that typically utility funds were self-supported by rates. To allocate property taxes to utilities would take away funding for police, parks, and other City services, as there was not an unlimited resource in General Fund.

Committee Member Easterday asked if the 1.8 plus million for water revenue assumed the same usage. Director Kaping responded yes.

Administrator Nebel pointed out that Line 69 showed the Unappropriated Ending Fund Balance and you could look at previous years and see that the number had continued to drop. With the rate increase, it would help build back some of that fund balance, because if the City had a major issue/emergency with the water system, this was a fairly low balance to have for a water utility. Director Kaping added they needed to build that back up, as they had nearly wiped out the capital fund when they rehabbed every well and just finished up the Bailey Well.

Committee Member Orozco asked if Bailey Well was completed, as there were still boards/cones there. Superintendent Tracer responded that the well was finished and they were working on irrigation and some other things at the park.

Water System Development Fund, Page 164

- Line 7 Water System Expansion. \$100,000. Placeholder. No plans to spend this year.
- **TO BE CHANGED:** Add 6 million dollar loan and the 1 million dollar grant for Raintree Water Treatment Plant, so there would be a line item for money in and a line for money out.

Director Kaping shared that the City had some old waterlines that needed to be replaced and applied for and received a \$6 million dollar loan. If the City finished the program on time, 3 million dollars would be forgiven. The \$6 million would not replace every old waterline but it would do a good chunk of them. Currently, the City's engineer was doing the design work for this project.

Committee Member Easterday asked if that work would be done in house. Director Kaping responded that the work had to be contracted out.

Committee Member Pendergrass asked what the timeframe was. Director Kaping responded they had until January 1, 2029.

Committee Member McDaniel asked if this project would help improve the water quality. Director Kaping responded yes. He added that the water quality coming out of the plant was crystal clear, and it picked up iron and other from the older pipes, which should have been replaced a long time ago.

Committee Member McDaniel asked if it would also improve the color of the water. Director Kaping responded the City received far less complaints on water clarity but had been receiving complaints on the odor with the Bailey Well with hydrogen sulfide. They had a plan to address that but had to find more money.

Councilor Thomas noted that sometimes people had issues with the lines on their property. Director Kaping responded yes with some of the older homes, and Public Works was always happy to answer any concerns from homeowners.

Sewer Fund, Page 176

- Line 3 Sewer Use Charges. \$2,415,000 which includes the 5% increase. \$2,300,000 estimated actual for this year
- Personnel. Wages. Decreased because they moved some allocations for his crew from sewer and put them into streets. Somewhere along the line this allocation had been dropped to 1% when it should have been 5%, so corrected that this year.
- Line 32 Legal Counsel. Increased to \$10,000. With MWMC project, wanted to make sure there was enough money in there in case needed for land litigation.
- Line 47 Travel and Training. Increased every 2 years for required certifications.
- Line 48 Treatment Chemicals. Increased from \$170,000 to \$180,000.

Sewer Capital Projects Fund, Page 178

- **TO BE CHANGED.** Line 34 Contract Services. Currently listed as \$113,500 but should be updated to \$600,000.
- **TO BE CHANGED.** Line 37 CEP Projects. Currently listed as \$600,000 but should be updated to \$113,500.
- **TO BE CHANGED.** Would add an additional line item for a transfer to the Public Works Administration Fund to cover part of the wage of the new Project Manager position. That position would be funded from Sewer Capital Projects Fund, Water Operating Fund, and General Fund.

Committee Member McDaniel asked if they were budgeting transfers to pay off the 3 million dollars loan. Director Kaping responded not out of this budget. That would be something they would need to talk about in the future, and it would come out of the Water Fund.

Sewer System Development Fund, Page 180

- **TO BE CHANGED.** Line 7 Sewer System Expansion currently listed as \$200,000 and should be \$4,000,000. Last year was budgeted at 4 million and wanted to make sure there was enough money in there to keep the sewer projects rolling.

Sanitation Fund, Page 186

- Personnel. Increased a bit for COLA. Everything else status quo.

Councilor Ceniga asked if staff had heard anything more from Harrisburg about Junction City providing sanitation services for them. Director Kaping responded that Harrisburg still had three years on their contract with their current provider. He thought it would be beneficial to review the numbers again and meet with Harrisburg to make sure everyone was still on the same page.

Committee Member Easterday noted that Line 40 Vehicle and Equipment Maintenance increased from \$50,000 to \$110,000. Director Kaping responded that he wanted enough to cover garbage truck repair. Every time a truck went in it was between \$700 and \$7,000. A Transmission was \$15,000. The current fleet was aging, and they were trying to get a truck every 10 years. The City was currently under a 7-year lease with low interest for two trucks, which was affordable. A new truck was ½ million dollars.

Sanitation Capital Projects Fund, Page 188

- Line 3 Transfer from Sanitation Fund. \$200,000.
- Line 13 System Improvements. \$40,000
- Line 16 Equipment Acquisition. \$50,000. Containers, dumpsters.
- Line 20 Loan Repayment. \$135,100. Payment for the two trucks.

Committee Member Orozco asked if they could have a separate fund for trucks. Administrator Nebel responded that the City could try and prefund an account for trucks, but the City would need to raise rates in order to generate the additional revenue to do that. Director Kaping added that one of the ways they tried to keep the rate down was to finance trucks.

Committee Member Orozco asked if as the population grew, if prefunding an account would be something the City could consider. Director Kaping responded yes and that would be a Council policy decision.

Councilor Ceniga noted that if anything happened to these daily drivers, it could become more of an urgent need. If they did not have the money saved, a loan was the best way to go because they needed it right now than in 10 years. Director Kaping added that a few years ago a garbage truck was in an accident. They had money set aside to purchase another truck, but that got used to replace the truck in the accident.

Streets Fund, Page 198

- Line 10 Wages. Went from \$36,200 to \$89,800, as it was realized that the allocation for Superintendent Tracer's salary had not been included in this fund.
- Line 40 Vehicle and Equipment Maintenance Charges. Budgeted \$30,000 and increased to \$45,000 because that was what the City was going to spend this year.
- **TO BE CHANGED.** Line 44 Transfers to Bike Path Reserve. Listed as \$1,000 but should read \$10,000.
- Line 45 Transfer to Streets Capital Projects. \$220,000.

Streets Capital Projects Fund, Page 200

- Line 3 Transfer from Streets Fund. \$220,000.
- Line 13 Sidewalk Improvement Program. Decreased from \$110,000 to \$25,000. Was higher before because the City was partnering with Lane County on a Safe Routes to School Grant and the \$110,000 would have been the City's match. Grant was not received.

Streets System Development Fund, Page 201

- Line 7 Street System Expansion. \$100,000. Placeholder. Nothing planned.

Bike Path Reserve, Page 202

- Line 3 Transfer from Street Fund. \$10,000.
- Line 8 System Improvement. Decreased from \$50,000 to \$44,000 because repairs were made to bike paths. Planned for this year: lighting project along path in Tequendama.

Committee Member McDaniel asked if there had been talk of doing a bike path on Oaklea Drive. Director Kaping responded that Oaklea Drive was a county road and they would have to widen that road to put in bike paths. The County would be putting in a couple of school crossings on Oaklea Drive this spring.

Prairie Road Street Improvement Fund, Page 203

- This fund was created when Raintree and Prairie Meadows were constructed. The developer was supposed to put in sidewalks for the length of the subdivisions, but it would have been a sidewalk to nowhere, so the City had the developer pay \$218,000 which would have been the cost at that time to put in sidewalks.
- Line 6 Street Improvements. \$218,000. Allocated each year, but no plans for any sidewalk construction until more development occurred in that area in the future.

Committee Member Pendergrass noted that at the Reserve, there was a bike path that went to nowhere. Director Kaping responded that there would eventually be sidewalk, as a developer had 19 lots and would be building.

Committee Member Pendergrass asked if there was enough water for the new homes that would be built. Director Kaping responded yes. The City had received a one million dollar grant for the design of Alderdale Well in the Reserve, which was currently in process. The grant would only cover the design, so 2 million dollars would need to be found to construct the well.

Public Works Administration Fund, Page 209

- Every Public Works department paid into this fund.
- **TO BE CHANGED**. Would see a line item added to transfer money into this fund to pay for part of the Project Manager's wage. The Project Manager was a new position, currently filled by the previous City Administrator to do project management for MWMC. It was a three-year contract and then the position would end.

Public Works Administration Fund for Planning, Page 209

- Line 155 Contract Services. Increased by \$5,000 in contract services, as the LCOG contract planner would be doing additional work on MWMC.

Utility Assistance Fund, Page 212

- This was put into place during COVID. With what was coming in sewer, staff decided to leave this fund in place to offer assistance to lower income folks.

Committee Member Pong asked if there was a balance sheet or statement of financial position in the budget. She asked about the assets the City owned, in terms of property, equipment,

etc. Administrator Nebel responded that those things showed up in the annual audit financial statements.

Committee Member McDaniel noted that in the past, they usually went over the budget summary, as far as how the City finished last budget season and what they anticipated for this season. She thought maybe that would be helpful.

Committee Member Pong added showing the big picture. Director Kaping responded that there was a Budget Summary on page 27. Administrator Nebel added that those pages needed to be updated, as they were from last year.

TO BE PROVIDED. Administrator Nebel responded that those sheets would be provided at the May 18th meeting, as they were not available when the draft budget went out. Those showed all the funds and spending as a City across the board.

Committee Member Easterday asked if the City had shopped at all, with the cost of insurance going up. Administrator Nebel responded yes, as the City’s agent of record provided that service to the City. There were few options for government health insurance plans.

Chair Leach thanked Director Kaping for doing a great job on his presentations.

9. Future Meeting Dates

Next meeting: Monday, May 18, 2025 at 6:30 p.m. Future meeting date after that if needed, Monday, June 1, 2026 at 6:30 p.m.

10. Other Business

Chair Leach asked if the Budget Committee would like to appoint a co-chair.

NOMINATION: Councilor Thomas nominated Kara McDaniel to serve as co-chair. The motion was seconded by Councilor Ceniga and passed by unanimous vote of the Budget Committee: Thomas, Washburne, Ceniga, Wells, Leach, Hancock, McDaniel, Ducker, Easterday, Pendergrass, Pong, Orozco, and Downey.

11. Recess

Chair Leach thanked everyone for attending the meeting.

As there was no further business, the meeting was recessed at 8:30 p.m.

ATTEST:

APPROVED:

Kitty Vodrup, City Recorder

Karen Leach, Chair