



**Location:** City Hall – Council Chambers  
**Date:** July 02, 2025  
**Time:** 12:00 PM

## Special City Council Meeting Agenda

Mayor Jason Beebe, Council Members Steve Uffelman, Janet Hutchison, Shane Howard, Jerry Brummer, Scott Smith, Marv Sumner and City Manager Steve Forrester

Attend telephonically by calling 346-248-7799 Meeting ID 947 5839 2608 Passcode: 123456

### Call to Order

### Flag Salute

### Additions to Agenda

### Council Business

1. Formal Response to a Grievance Filed with City Council on June 26, 2025 - Jered Reid
2. Consideration to Cancel July 8th, 2025 Regular Council Meeting

### Adjourn

***Agenda items may be added or removed as necessary after the publication deadline***

Individuals needing special accommodations such as sign language, foreign language interpreters or equipment for the hearing impaired must request such services at least 48 hours prior to the City Council meeting. To make your request, please contact the City Recorder at 541-447-5627 (voice), or by e-mail to [recorder@cityofprineville.com](mailto:recorder@cityofprineville.com)

# PRINEVILLE REVIEW

June 26th, 2025

**Via email to [jbeebe@cityofprineville.com](mailto:jbeebe@cityofprineville.com) & [lmorgan@cityofprineville.com](mailto:lmorgan@cityofprineville.com)**

City of Prineville  
City Council & Unnamed Subcommittee  
387 NE 3rd Street  
Prineville, OR 97754

**Subject: Formal Grievance under Oregon Public Meetings Law (ORS 192.705 / HB 2805)**

Dear City of Prineville Council & unknown subcommittee,

Please consider this a formal grievance pursuant to Oregon HB 2805 and the process laid out in Oregon Public Meetings Law ("OPML"). The City of Prineville ("City") is an Oregon municipality and its council and subcommittees are a "governing body" as defined in ORS 192.610(3) and subject to the provisions of the OPML. Pursuant to ORS 192.705, the Prineville Review hereby requests a response from the City for the following alleged violations of ORS 192.610 to 192.705 within 21 days of this notice:

**1) Untitled subcommittee related to republic rate proposal**

On June 10th, 2025, this untitled subcommittee made a recommendation to the council related to a requested rate increase by Republic Services, a recommendation presented by the City's finance director. Based on agenda information, Mr. Forrester's, who is believed to have been part of this subcommittee, was originally the one set to make the recommendation on May 27th, before the council voted to postpone after concerns of compliance with notice under ORS 192.640 were raised by the *Prineville Review*. The City took the recommendation under advisement, and on June 24th, 2025, made a final decision based on that recommendation.

Numerous public documents and communications make it clear that the recommendation made was not that of a single public official, and thus a collective body which makes it subject to the provisions of the OPML. This was clearly not a recommendation by a single public official who formed a committee to advise them and in which they held discretion on how to handle any fact finding or recommendations, and that was made even more clear after the subsequent meeting passed from being an agenda item from Mr. Forrester at the earlier meeting to the City's finance director at the June 10th meeting. Thus the untitled subcommittee violated nearly all provisions and requirements of the OPML for public meetings and executive sessions. The discussions that would have taken place would not have qualified for executive session even if notice had been provided, but such meetings constitute executive session since they were not open to the public (as well as noticed).

**2) Notice for May 27th meeting did not provide reasonable notice**

The notice for May 27th, 2025, public meeting of the Council was not provided until Friday May 23rd, 2025. While this does comply with the requirements under administrative rule for 48-notice which would create a simple prima facie case of violation, it does not comply with the expectations under ORS 192.640(1). Considering that May 26th was a federal holiday (Memorial Day), the City provided notice to the public and even the media only one (1) business day prior to its meeting, a meeting which included a public hearing on a local waste services rate increase that has previously and currently been a matter of significant public interest and controversy, including our publications past rep[redacted] in 2024 and again now.

This notice clearly denied the ability for members of the press to provide meaningful reporting and notice to the public, which upon even our last minute prompt reporting on May 27th just a couple hours before the meeting, appears to have caused the Council to delay at least the public hearing portion related portion to a future date, although it claimed the reasons were for other reasons related to attendance by City Council members.

City staff told the Prineville Review that it had noticed the public hearing which was set to take place during the May 27th public meeting on Monday May 19th, 2025. However, this does not cover the requirements for notice of the entire meeting itself, and if only make clear the City's delay of the actual May 27th meeting notice is questionable, having known a controversial public hearing would take place at least five days prior to it sending out its first notice and likely at least some other agenda topics.

The Oregon Attorney General's guidance on this matter is at least 7 days before, and considering the council has admitted it knew at least by Monday May 19th that it would hold a public hearing during its May 27th public meeting, makes clear it unreasonably delayed providing timely notice of the entire meeting. Nothing prevents a public body from making timely notice and later sending amended notices of changes in principle subjects anticipated to be discussed, but it should have made earlier notice with the items it clearly knew would be presented and then amended notices as needed. It should be noted that it should include "anticipated" subjects, even if they do not ultimately materialize, so this further shows why any argument for last minute notice based potentially on firm confirmation of principle topics cannot be reasonable.

---

As I could not locate the required notice on your website as required by Oregon Administrative Rules to submit a grievance, I am sending a copy to the Mayor (Council Chair) as well as the City Recorder

Respectfully,

/s/ Justin Alderman

**Justin Alderman**, *Managing Editor*

(541) 241-2074 | [jalderman@prinevillereview.com](mailto:jalderman@prinevillereview.com)

Prineville Review | [prinevillereview.com](http://prinevillereview.com)

*A publication of Western Media Group*

JERED REID  
jeredwreid@gmail.com

LAUREN KAUFFMAN  
lkauffmanlaw@gmail.com



**Madras Office**  
35 SE C Street, Suite D  
Madras, OR 97741  
541.475.1111

**Prineville Office**  
545 NE 7<sup>th</sup> Street  
Prineville, Oregon 97754  
541.447.3910

July 2, 2025

Justin Alderman  
Prineville Review  
jalderman@prinevillereview.com

**RE: City of Prineville  
Grievance under Oregon Public Meetings Law (ORS 192.705/HB 2805)**

Dear Mr. Alderman:

This office represents the City of Prineville ("City"). On behalf the City of Prineville ("City"), the following is the City's written response to your June 26, 2025 grievance per ORS 192.705.

The City denies the allegations that a sub-committee violated Oregon public meetings law. The City does not have such a sub-committee. When Republic Services makes a requested rate increase, it is customary for City staff to evaluate the financial request from the company to determine the financial impacts to the city's budget and the validity of the request. This is typically done by the City Manager, or his delegees.

The City denies that Notice for the May 27, 2025 regular meeting was unreasonable. The agenda and all material were published on the City's website on May 23, 2025. Moreover, public notice for the public hearing was published on the City's website and provided to subscribers of public notices on May 20, 2025.

Jered Reid  
Attorney at Law

cc: Client  
Oregon Government Ethics Commission