

The City Council for the City of Junction City, met in regular session at 6:30 p.m. on Tuesday, December 23, 2014, in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 680 Greenwood Street, Junction City, Oregon.

PRESENT: Mayor, David Brunscheon; Councilors Karen Leach, Bill DiMarco, Jim Leach, Randy Nelson, and Herb Christensen; Excused Absence: Councilor Hitchcock; City Attorney, Christy Monson; City Administrator, Melissa Bowers; Public Works Director, Jason Knope; Finance Director, Mike Crocker; City Planner, Jordan Cogburn; Community Services Director, Tom Boldon; and City Recorder, Kitty Vodrup.

I. CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mayor Brunscheon called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

Administrator Bowers shared that City employees have held a food drive competition between departments for the last four years, to collect donations for the Local Aid food pantry. This year over 645 pounds of food and \$300 in cash donations were collected. She presented this year's contest award to the Public Works Department, and Jessica Paull and Tiffany Shafer, who coordinated the food drive, accepted the award on behalf of Public Works.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Councilor Christensen made a motion to approve the minutes from October 14, 22, 28; November 12, 19, and 25; and December 9 and 17, 2014. The motion was seconded by Councilor Nelson and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT LISTED ON THE AGENDA

Mr. Jason Thiesfeld, 135 Birch Street, Junction City, stated that people were often asking him about the status of the Police Chief, and he felt it was a disservice to the people in the City to not address this and get the Police Department back in order.

Mayor Brunscheon assured Mr. Thiesfeld that this was being addressed.

V. PUBLIC HEARING – IVORY, LLC REZONE (RZ-14-03)

A. Public Hearing

Mayor Brunscheon opened the public hearing and asked if there were any ex parte contacts or conflicts of interest. There were none.

Staff Report

Planner Cogburn reviewed the request to rezone 40.6 acres of Lane County zoning Exclusive Farm Use to Junction City zoning of General Commercial. The site is at the southwest corner of Highways 99 and 36 and is currently vacant. The property was included in the Urban Growth Boundary Expansion in September of 2012 and annexed into the City in March of 2014. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on July 15th and recommended approval, contingent upon the submittal of a transportation impact analysis (TIA). The TIA was submitted and Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) had submitted comments on July 19th regarding this proposal and their recommendations for conditions on future development.

Planner Cogburn spoke with ODOT today and they said that there was no need to condition this particular proposal, but more so any future development of property because the use is currently unknown. There are no specific criteria for zone changes in the Junction City Municipal Code, other than following the policies of the Comprehensive Plan Map and Statewide Planning Goals; the proposal is consistent with both of those.

Applicant Testimony

Mr. Bill Kloos, spoke on behalf of the applicant and noted that he had submitted a letter and executive summary of the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) done by Kittelson and Associates. The TIA followed a methodology that was approved by ODOT, dated October 15, 2014.

Planner Cogburn noted that the City had a copy of that for the record.

Mr. Kloos encouraged the Council to tentatively approve the zoning and then staff, the applicant, and attorney could work on bringing findings at the next meeting. The proposed rezone was found not to have a significant affect under ODOT's rule on the transportation system, provided the recommended mitigation measures are phased and property constructed in conjunction with development.

Mr. William Boresek, 27948 Green Oaks Drive, Eugene, shared that they had been working on this for a long time, and he hoped this could go forward. He continued that this would move Junction City and him one step closer to development and this was important to the community. He added that he wanted to dig that corner for Junction City.

Opponent/Proponent Testimony

Mr. Jeff Haag, 27430 8th Street, Junction City, encouraged the Council to approve the rezone and stated that he was glad to see that ODOT removed their conditions, which could be addressed at the time of development.

Applicant Rebuttal

None.

Questions from the Council

Councilor DiMarco noted that he wanted to make sure that it was clear in the record that ODOT's suggested conditions were not to be considered at this time, but at the time of development.

Mr. Kloos responded that ODOT's comments would be acknowledged in the staff report, but the proposed conditions did not need to be applied for the zone change. The zone change could be done based on the TIA, which reads that the use combined with the improvements to the road meets the Goal 12 standard. ODOT has noted that details would be worked out later in the form of a development agreement. He referred to a recent letter from ODOT and added that he would give a copy of ODOT's letter to Planner Cogburn for the record.

Councilor DiMarco asked if the City would be impacted down the road by acknowledging ODOT's comments.

Mr. Kloos responded that it would not. He continued that the City would be making a decision that complies with the Goal 12 rule and that decision would not be contingent upon any conditions.

Councilor Christensen referred to a December 19th letter that included four conditions. Mr. Kloos responded that the language in that letter had already been changed in discussions between ODOT and the traffic engineers at Kittelson. He added that what ODOT said in their most recent letter was to put the conditions aside and they did not have to be addressed in this rezoning land use decision.

Administrator Bowers noted that there were findings of fact attached to the proposed rezone ordinance and they did not include ODOT's conditions.

Mr. Kloos responded that he did not realize that findings had been included in the packet.

Administrator Bowers asked Planner Cogburn to read the finding related to Chapter 6 Transportation Element.

Planner Cogburn read, "The site borders Highway 99S, State Facilities, and Highway 36 to the north, a county roadway. Both are existing facilities. Because of this, no applicable City Comprehensive Plan Transportation Polices relate to this zone change request. Statewide Planning Goal Compliance for Transportation is addressed under Goal 12, Transportation Planning Rule, below."

Administrator Bowers asked for confirmation that there were no conditions. Planner Cogburn responded that there were not.

Staff Additional Comment/Summary

Administrator Bowers stated that it appeared that the applicant had not had an opportunity to review the findings and she did not know if he would like to have an opportunity to do so and have the ordinance considered at the next meeting.

Mr. Kloos briefly reviewed the findings and noted that they were acceptable. He added that they were fine with the Council proceeding tonight and asked that the date of November 2014 be inserted after the TIA submittal in the findings in the Goal 12 section.

Planner Cogburn noted for the record that the wording for the finding under Goal 12 would be, "ODOT required a Traffic Impact Analysis. The applicant submitted a TIA in November 2014 that evaluated potential impacts of the proposed zoning. The zoning does not significantly affect planned or existing transportation facilities and is stated as such, because there are currently no planned facilities."

The Council consensus was in favor of the revised language in the findings.

Mayor Brunscheon closed the public hearing.

Council Deliberation

The Council consensus was to proceed with the ordinance reading.

Attorney Monson noted that the Ordinance language in Section 2 would be amended to read, "...adopts the Findings of Fact, as amended and set forth in Exhibit B."

B. ORDINANCE No.1 – AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE CITY OF JUNCTION CITY OFFICIAL ZONING MAP TO REZONE TAX LOTS 700 & 400 OF T16S R04W S08 FROM LANE COUNTY EXCLUSIVE FARM USE TO JUNCTION CITY ZONING GENERAL COMMERCIAL (GC).

Planner Cogburn noted an amendment to the 1st Whereas, to change from Section 112 of the Zoning Ordinance to reference the corresponding Section in the Junction City Municipal Code.

Planner Cogburn read Ordinance No. 1 in full.

MOTION: Councilor K. Leach made a motion to read Ordinance No.1 by title only. The motion was seconded by Councilor DiMarco and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

Planner Cogburn read Ordinance No. 1 by title only.

MOTION: Councilor K. Leach made a motion to approve Ordinance No. 1. The motion was seconded by Councilor DiMarco and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

VI. TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN DRAFT REVIEW WITH OREGON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND DKS CONSULTANTS

Planner Cogburn provided the following review of the draft TSP process:

- July 16, 2014 - Council held a work session and posed a variety of questions for ODOT and DKS on the TSP draft.
- September 18, 2014 - Staff reviewed a memo of responses with the Council to questions from ODOT and DKS. The Council expressed disappointment in the responses and noted that they were not interested in approving a plan that did not reflect the City's interest. It was the Council consensus to have ODOT and DKS attend a Council meeting to discuss the unresolved questions.
- November 12, 2014 - The Council asked staff to hire a traffic engineer to provide an alternate perspective on the TSP; thus, the City entered into a contract with Sandow Engineering to review and provide comments on the TSP draft. Sandow's comments were not ready for this Council meeting.

- November 13, 2014 – Staff received word from ODOT that their contract with DKS would expire on December 31, 2014 and that ODOT did not intend to renew the contract. ODOT and DKS indicated that they were willing to meet with the Council, but that needed to occur before December 31st.

Planner Cogburn introduced Savannah Crawford from ODOT and John Bosket from DKS.

Questions, Comments, and Responses

Councilor K. Leach: What was the methodology used to determine that there would be a large volume of traffic heading north and not south from the state facilities. **Response:** Mr. Bosket responded that the distribution of those trips came from the impact study that was done in 2009 for the hospital and prison site. When they did the forecasting for the TSP, they used the new comprehensive plan with the Urban Growth Boundary expansion and took that land and the City's most current employment and housing estimates for that 20 year period; that's where the trip assumptions came from. Because there was a detailed impact study done for the hospital and prison site, they used that information, rather than starting over with general employment assumptions; thus, the amount of trips coming out of and the distribution of that would be very similar if not identical to the impact study, which was approved.

Councilor K. Leach: The TSP is supposed to support the UGB amendment and that was not what she was seeing. **Response:** Mr. Bosket responded that he would say that it does support the UGB amendment. The reason they did the TSP update was to bring the TSP in sync with the land use changes that occurred as a result of the comprehensive plan being amended and the UGB expansion and make sure that the City's planned transportation system reflected all the City's growth needs. The foundation for the TSP was to take the City's planned land use and include the UGB expansion and current comprehensive plan. So in that respect, the TSP draft does reflect the UGB expansion. He asked if there was something in particular that she did not feel reflected or supported the UGB expansion?

Councilor K. Leach: Main concern was amount of traffic going north, which she did not feel would be right. She was also concerned with the TSP draft giving ODOT access management and she wondered how that benefited Junction City. **Response:** Ms. Crawford responded that right now the City of Junction City has an access management plan that has been adopted for Highway 99, and it's very prescriptive, which means that it indicates when a property redevelops, what that access shall look like. So if a particular property along Highway 99 has three access points for example, it indicates which one should be consolidated, which one should be closed, or where it should be moved. So the TSP is essentially eliminating that current access management plan and has some language that provides flexibility. So instead of being prescriptive, it is actually providing the conversation between ODOT, the City, and the property owner to occur on a more flexible basis that is associated with the redevelopment of that site instead of being very prescriptive and saying this is what shall happen; it is providing some more flexibility than what is currently in your plan.

Councilor J. Leach: Why is the largest movement of traffic going north? Seemed like most would be going south from the Eugene area. **Response:** Mr. Bosket responded that they could look into this further and that the TSP did not need to be approved tonight or even this month or next month. Council members confirmed that the TSP would not be approved tonight. Mr. Bosket continued that there was time to dig in deeper and answer these questions that they could not answer to the Council's satisfaction in the time allotted tonight. What they had planned to do was take the TSP draft to the Citizen Advisory Committee for review to see if the TSP reflected what they had wanted. The next step would then be to hold a joint work session with the Council and Planning Commission, so both could get an opportunity to look at the TSP in detail and answer questions and review before getting into the hearing process. He added that hopefully this would smooth out the whole adoption process, so that was ahead of them.

Councilor K. Leach: She did not feel that ODOT and DKS had answered the questions that staff had prepared on behalf of the Council. **Response:** Mr. Bosket asked for

confirmation that the Council had seen the answers ODOT and DKS had provided. Councilors responded yes. Mr. Bosket continued that the specific question from the Council was what are the assumptions for traffic going north, as the prison site is likely not being built in the next 20 years and the hospital traffic is likely to go south. He added that looking back at the impact study that was done, the hospital was expected to generate approximately three times more trips than the prison site. So even if the prison site did not get built for the next 20 years, there would still be a lot of traffic coming out of that area.

Mr. Bosket continued that from the impact study, all the mitigation that was done for approval and site design and was based on and reviewed by all the participating agencies, indicated that at least 40% of hospital trips were expected to go north. That's a significant amount and represented about 200 week day p.m. peak hour trips, but that could be handled by the transportation system. The state did make improvements to the transportation system to help mitigate that. After doing the impact study, they did a forecasting model for the area that used the information from the impact study and also reflected the comprehensive plan assumptions and the UGB expansion. They used the same trip generation potential for the hospital and prison from the TIA. One change was that they updated regional growth assumptions, so the distributions from the TIA changed slightly, but not massively.

Councilor K. Leach: Are you referring to the TIA that was done in 2009? **Response:** Mr. Bosket responded yes and the TSP. Based on what they were seeing in the TSP, they did not see massive congestion issues. If there were more trips going north or more trips going south, that would probably not change any of the recommendations in the TSP.

Councilor Christensen: When was the first study done? **Response:** Mr. Bosket responded in 2009. He added that they started their process in 2010.

Councilor Christensen: Was the hospital included in this study? **Response:** Mr. Bosket responded yes, the study accounted for both the prison and hospital.

Mr. Jeff Haag: This was the first he had heard of an impact study and asked if the Council had seen or heard of it. He added that it seemed like the TIA was used to build the TSP and he didn't remember it coming to the Citizen Advisory Committee. He asked where it came from and who produced it. **Response:** Ms. Crawford responded that the traffic impact study that was completed by the prison and hospital was a condition of approval, as part of their development and getting annexed into the City and the Urban Growth Boundary. So they were required for the Goal 12 analysis to make sure that they were going to do a 20 year horizon analysis for traffic impact. They did this in 2009, so it would have come before the Council at least with the zone change or annexation at that point in time. Since there was this information, they used that as part of the process since it was so recent.

Councilor DiMarco: When the impact study was done in 2009, the City had not yet done the bifurcation of taking another separate look at the commercial and residential land needs, which resulted in the UGB expansion that occurred in 2013; thus, he was wondering why the 2009 impact study figures were used. **Response:** Mr. Bosket responded that the core of what they took from the impact study was the trip generation potential from the hospital and prison site, because it had details on how many employees, beds, and number of trips that were likely to be generated based on other similar sites. That was far more detailed information than what they usually have when doing a citywide forecast. That was the information they used for the TSP and not all the assumptions about the UGB expansion.

Councilor DiMarco: In recent weeks, the City has had a 350 housing development proposal on a former Professional Technical site that was rezoned in the 2013 plan, so that was something that was unanticipated in 2009. He asked what the City's default TSP was and why it was so inadequate that they needed to start the TSP draft before the UGB process was concluded in 2013? **Response:** Ms. Crawford responded that when the City started going through the UGB expansion process, there was a part of the process that the City would have to update its transportation analysis. Because the City deferred that transportation analysis as part of the UGB expansion, the City had decided that moving forward with a wholesale transportation system plan update would be

necessary at that point in time. The City's current TSP does not incorporate or account for any of the properties that were expanded upon as part of the City's UGB and recent comprehensive plan update. So what this transportation plan does is incorporate all of those land uses for the comprehensive plan designations for a 20 year horizon and that is the key difference. It has updated population and employment forecast, based off of the City's UGB expansion process and comprehensive plan update.

Councilor DiMarco: What is the City's previous TSP document and what is the date of that? **Answer:** Ms. Crawford responded it was a 2000 TSP.

Councilor DiMarco: How many years was that planned for? **Response:** Ms. Crawford responded 20 years.

Councilor DiMarco: That would be 2020, so it sounded like it could have required an amendment, rather than a whole new TSP. **Response:** Mr. Crawford responded that the City could do an amendment to the existing TSP. Because it was part of the UGB expansion process, at the time it was decided that a wholesale update would be a good way to go, to create a clean sweep document. She added that technically this was an update, but they were doing a wholesale update as well.

Councilor K. Leach: Who decided that would be a good idea? **Response:** Ms. Crawford responded that there were conversations with the City Planner and Administrator at that time and then they had approval from the City Council. She added that the Council at that time also reviewed the scope of work from DKS to ensure that they were comfortable with moving forward with this process.

Councilor DiMarco: A lot of good work went into the Highway 99 Refinement Plan and asked why that was discarded in the TSP update. **Response:** Mr. Bosket responded that he remembered working with Councilor DiMarco on the Highway 99 Refinement Plan, and he fully expected to see that (Ivy/Juniper couplet) included in the TSP update and be the core of the improvements. In addition to the City's comprehensive plan amendment and UGB expansion, something else that happened between 2000 and 2010 was the recession, which changed a lot of things for everybody in every city. What they saw across the state were traffic volumes instantly dropped 10 to 15%. Junction City was hit even harder than that, primarily because at the time when they did the study in 2006-2007, Country Coach was still in operation and was the focal point of the traffic bottleneck and part of the reason for doing the couplet. He fully expected to see the couplet included in the TSP update, but after looking at the UGB and updated land use, the level of congestion had changed so dramatically because of the recession and loss of an employer in the middle of the city that Junction City's traffic volumes took a dip, at least out until the year 2035; thus, the couplet was no longer needed. They did not want to lose all the work that was done on the Highway 99 Refinement Plan, because maybe the next time the City updates the TSP and the growth projections hopefully keep going up, the City may need those again. He also remembered a lot of people being involved in that process and supporting the couplet idea. The couplet is not in the TSP because it is not needed for the City's demand over the next 20 years, but the Highway 99 Refinement Plan was kept as an appendix of the TSP and has been acknowledged, because they don't want to lose it. The acknowledgement indicates that it would be a project for the next TSP, so it should be preserved. He noted that if they needed to reference it more strongly, they could do that and could talk more about that to make sure that it is not lost.

Councilor DiMarco: If the City is doing a brand new TSP, which he wasn't convinced was needed over just doing an update that is current to the UGB expansion, did the TSP assume the recession would last 20 years and not look at Junction City being the fastest growing city in Lane County. **Response:** Mr. Bosket responded that Junction City was still growing and the TSP did include growth assumptions.

Councilor DiMarco: Country Coach would probably be going back into production and there would be other businesses coming into town within five years. **Response:** Mr. Bosket responded that would be great. When they looked out for the growth assumptions, they took the population, housing, and employment projects that were coordinated at the state and county levels and parsed out for Junction City through that 20 years; this became their control total. Then they looked at the zoning and the buildable land in the City, including the UGB expansion area and hopefully the 350 unit housing

development was in there too. They worked with staff to figure out appropriate allocation areas. They do have a new commercial use at the Country Coach site assumed in the TSP for an average sized development. If something bigger were to come in that was more impactful, the TSP could be modified to replan an area or identify a new project to meet that need.

Councilor Christensen: You took the figures from 2009, more or less, and made a best guess for what was going to happen in the future, but things did not work out that way so it was correction time? **Response:** Mr. Bosket responded that more or less always happens. Most cities update their TSP probably no more than 10 years apart. It's a 20 year plan, but depending on how much growth or change you've had, some cities have done it five years later.

Councilor DiMarco: This was not an update, but a whole new plan which was throwing out access management and the Highway 99 Refinement Plan. He asked if there was anything wrong with the 2000 TSP, other than updating it to fit the UGB expansion. **Response:** Mr. Bosket responded that the assumptions for growth and the base land use would not fit, because there was no UGB expansion, and there's new zoning in the City that wasn't there before. So from that respect the City would definitely want to recalibrate that and look and see where your traffic demands were going to be. If there are things that the Council really liked about the 2000 plan that they think has been lost, they could certainly talk about that.

Councilor DiMarco: Where are we trying to get to tonight, as the DKS contract expires soon? **Response:** Administrator Bowers responded that her understanding was the ODOT's contract with DKS would expire in December and ODOT did not anticipate renewing it. Ms. Crawford added that at the time they had the conversation with City staff, they did indicate that the contract expired on December 31, 2014. Based upon the fact that the City has a lot on its plate, there hasn't been movement on the TSP, and the Council wanted to speak with them, ODOT did have the option of extending the contract for a few months with DKS if the Council wanted to continue the TSP process update; otherwise, they could just let the contract expire on December 31st and provide all the documentation to the City.

Councilor DiMarco: Is that news to City staff? **Response:** Administrator Bowers responded yes.

Mayor Brunscheon: Can you explain what TAZ 79 means in the proposed TSP? **Response:** Mr. Bosket responded it was the Transportation Analysis Zone. When they do forecasting for future traffic, they segment the City up into Transportation Analysis Zones which are areas that they try to fit around pockets of consistent zoning. That's where they allocate the housing and employment assumptions that generate the trips. He couldn't remember which one was 79 without looking at a specific map, but it would be a certain area of the City where they have allocated population and employment.

Mayor Brunscheon: Are you assuming a trip cap through that? **Response:** Mr. Bosket responded no, it does not create a trip cap for anybody. When they are doing the 20 year projection, they are making a best estimate at what kinds of trips are going to come in and out in places in the City and where it would go. When they have a control total, the amount of employment growth and the amount of population, those are coordinated numbers with the state and county, and they determine what Junction City's allocation is. They look at that and look at where it could possibly go in the City, given where the buildable land is and what it's zoned for and they parse that out or allocate it by working with staff. This process takes a while and is trial and error until they are happy with it. What they usually find, especially because you don't know what's going to develop in any given property, is they have kind of average growth assumptions for most of the City, unless they know of something coming up. So no, the future development is not held to what is in there. It is a long range planning tool.

Mayor Brunscheon: Does the TSP have to be finished with a certain amount of time? **Response:** Mr. Bosket responded yes and no.

Mayor Brunscheon: Especially since we've started it? **Response:** Mr. Bosket responded that there was not a regulatory date within this must be adopted. The yes part

was that the City did not want to continue this indefinitely. There was no hard and fast date as set by which it must be adopted.

Councilor DiMarco: If the TSP draft had not been started and the UGB expansion had been done, was it correct to say that Traffic Impact Analysis would just need to be done for development of land in the new UGB area? **Response:** Ms. Crawford shook her head yes.

Councilor DiMarco: We want to be a City that participates in the planning and that hadn't been the case in an effective way, but that was not meant as criticism of ODOT or DKS's work or professionalism. The prison would more than likely not come in over the next 20 years, and it seemed unlikely that 200 of the 500 hospital employees would be traveling north. It seemed like they were at a place to reset and he did not see anything that compelled them to do an entire new plan. The good work of the Highway 99 Refinement Plan was left out, and he agreed with Councilor K. Leach that the City should have its own access management plan. If needed, they could update the City's access management plan to be less prescriptive. **Response:** Mr. Bosket responded that regarding access management, one of the first things he was told by the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) and from the City was how much trouble the current access management plan had caused. There was one development that was difficult to get in and out of, because the use of the alley that was required. This was a hot button issue with the Committee and they held a special field trip and formed an Access Management Subcommittee, which was part of the CAC members and some of the local business owners in the corridor. They went out with ODOT and the City to look at specific issues and acknowledged the challenges that had been created. Given that, regardless of what the Council decided to do with access management planning, they brought ODOT access control back to the group and he believed they were happy with it because it was a lot more reasonable for development. If the Council decided not to go in that direction, he would urge them to check back with that group and with the business owners, because he believed the current situation was a problem for them that the City would want to resolve in some way fairly quick.

Councilor DiMarco: So we need an update to our access management plan? **Response:** Mr. Bosket responded minimally, yes.

Mr. Jason Thiesfeld: He was part of the Citizen's Advisory Committee and the reason the TSP was put off originally was so the City could finish the UGB and once it was finished, the committee was supposed to be reconvened, revisit the TSP, and put in all the assumptions from the UGB expansion. He has waited two years and the committee has not met yet to review. **Response:** Mr. Bosket responded that the CAC met four or five times and had one more meeting coming. This project was spread over several years and part of that delay was because of the land use assumptions with the UGB expansion and the Comp Plan Amendment, which are the foundation of the TSP.

Councilor DiMarco: What progress has Planner Cogburn made with the other traffic engineer? **Response:** Planner Cogburn responded that they had provided materials, but they were not ready for tonight's packet, so he would be presenting at the next Council meeting.

Administrator Bowers clarified that in the fall of 2013, the Council was notified by the current planner at the time that the TSP was near ready for adoption and the Council decided that they wanted to become more familiar with the TSP first, before sending to the CAC. At that time, an email notification was sent to CAC members. For the purpose of tonight's meeting, staff has not had an opportunity to consider the additional extension of time. There were a number of factors to consider, including whom that work would be assigned to moving forward, given the City's current staffing situation. She noted that she appreciated ODOT's offer to extend the contract with DKS and suggested that this item come back to the Council at their next meeting, after staff had the opportunity to review the comments from Sandow Engineering and evaluate how staff would respond and continue work on the TSP.

The Council consensus was in favor of moving discussing to the next Council meeting, as suggested by Administrator Bowers.

Ms. Crawford responded that ODOT would do a short extension with DKS to keep them on contract, until the Council makes a decision at their next meeting on how they would like to proceed.

VII. UPDATED ON ANNEXATION PROCESS

Planner Cogburn reviewed that the attorney firm for Garvey, Shubert, and Barer had provided a memorandum on November 30th outlining areas of the Junction City Municipal Code annexation agreement language that they believed could use revision, in order to mitigate potential financial and legal impacts to the City.

The Council consensus was to have Planner Cogburn incorporate these changes into a draft ordinance for Council review at the next meeting.

VIII. PRECISE BUDGETING - COMPARISONS

Director Crocker reviewed that staff and the Finance and Judiciary Committee had begun work on the Precise Budgeting item, which was part of the City's adopted Long Range Financial Plan. He reviewed a chart that showed comparable budget techniques from other cities. He noted that other cities put more into their contingencies and that is something the City might want to consider doing, as well as provide direction on how to access contingency funds (possibly a fiscal policy).

IX. WATER TOWER NOTICE UPDATE

Administrator Bowers and Director Knope presented draft letters of secondary notice (1st notice was mailed April 8, 2014) to Unwiredonline and T-Mobile which read that the City was preparing to remove the old water tower during the summer of 2015 and it was requested that they remove their equipment on the tower no later than July 13, 2015.

The Council consensus was in favor of staff sending the letters out right away.

X. PROCESS AND TIMELINE FOR HIRING A CITY ADMINISTRATOR

Administrator Bowers presented materials and reviewed follow up information from the December 17th Council meeting on topic and noted that she had submitted her resignation at the December 9th Council meeting.

MOTION: Councilor Nelson made a motion to accept the resignation of the City Administrator with her last day being February 13, 2015. The motion was seconded by Councilor K. Leach and passed by a vote of 4 to 1, with Councilors K. Leach, J. Leach, Nelson, and Christensen voting in favor and Councilor DiMarco voting against.

The Council discussed the City Administrator (CA) hiring process and their consensus was to do the following:

- Have Director Knope serve as Pro Tem City Administrator and to have Mayor Elect Cahill, Director Knope, and legal staff negotiate the agreement.
- Use Mike Kelly for City Administrator recruitment services and to allow Administrator Bowers to prepare and negotiate the agreement, not to exceed \$6,900. It was noted that Mr. Kelly had said he would be happy to be available to Director Knope as a consultant, free of charge. It was suggested that this language be put in the agreement with Mr. Kelly.
- Revise the CA job description, revised CA advertisement flyer, and revised CA Selection process timeline. Internal posting would begin on December 24th and external posting on December 29th.

XI. CONTRACTS ORDINANCE

Administrator Bowers reviewed the Contracts ordinance draft, which specifies that City contracts will go to the Council for approval.

An amendment to Section 6. Signature and Spending Authority was noted. Change second sentence, "The appropriate signature authority is dependent on the type of contract and its value, as outlined by Resolution No. 1004 and as attached in Exhibit A" to "The appropriate signature authority is dependent on the type of contract and its value, as established by Council resolution, as attached in Exhibit A."

A. ORDINANCE No. 2 – AN ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING A CONTRACT REVIEW AND APPROVAL PROCESS FOR THE CITY OF JUNCTION CITY.

Attorney Monson read Ordinance No. 2 in full.

MOTION: Councilor Nelson made a motion to read Ordinance No. 2 by title only. The motion was seconded by Councilor K. Leach and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

Attorney Monson read Ordinance No. 2 by title only.

MOTION: Councilor DiMarco made a motion to approve Ordinance No. 2. The motion was seconded by Councilor K. Leach and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

XII. STAFF REPORTS

Director Crocker presented two charts: One that showed court revenue over the last few years and the other that showed legal costs over the last 10 years and broken out by department or function.

Planner Cogburn reported that the Auto Zone development application had been processed and was ready for pickup. He wished everyone happy holidays.

Director Boldon reported that the Parks Committee would be mailing out a parks survey in January 2015 on the undeveloped park land at 18th and Oaklea. An open house would be held in April 2015. Breakfast with Santa went well at the Senior Center and today was their holiday lunch. He thanked the Mayor and Councilors for all their hard work and wished everyone happy holidays.

Administrator Bowers reported that she would provide an update on the HR/Risk Manager position at the next Council meeting and wished everyone happy holidays.

XIII. COUNCILOR COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

Councilor Christensen wished everyone a blessed holiday and Merry Christmas.

Councilor K. Leach wished everyone a Merry Christmas and reviewed Mayor Brunscheon’s service to the City:

Governing Body	Year	Total
Planning Commission	1988 to 2002	15 years
City Councilor	2003 to 2011	12 years
Mayor	2011 to 2014	4 years
Budget Committee	2003 to 2014	12 years
Public Safety Committee Chair	2004 to 2010	7 years
Leisure Services Committee Chair	2003 to 2004	2 years
Water/Sewer/Street Committee	2004-06 to 09-10	5 years
Community Development Committee	03, 05-09	6 years
Finance and Judiciary Committee	03, 07-10	5 years
Downtown Advisory Committee	2003	1 year
Revolving Loan Fund Committee	2011 to 2013	3 years
Lane Area Commission on Transportation	2011 to 2014	4 years
LCOG Board of Directors	2011 to 2014	4 years

Councilor K. Leach noted that the City owed Mayor Brunscheon a huge thank you for all his years of service and that she had appreciated being on the Council with him as Mayor.

Councilor DiMarco expressed agreement with Councilor K. Leach’s comments and noted that progress was made tonight in finding out that the City’s last TSP was in 2000 and that a Traffic Impact Study had been done in 2009. He wished everyone a Merry Christmas.

Councilor J. Leach wished everyone a Merry Christmas.

Council President Randy Nelson presented Mayor Brunscheon with a plaque of appreciation for devoted and outstanding service to the City, on behalf of the Council, Committees, staff, and the City. He noted that it had been an honor to work with Mayor Brunscheon.

XIV. MAYOR'S COMMENTS

Mayor Brunscheon shared that it had been an honor to work and be a part of the City. He thanked everyone and wished all a Merry Christmas and Happy New Year.

XV. EXECUTIVE SESSION PER ORS 19*2.660(2)(F) TO CONSIDER INFORMATION OR RECORDS THAT ARE EXEMPT BY LAW FROM PUBLIC INSPECTION, SPECIFICALLY TO DISCUSS WRITTEN ADVICE FROM THE CITY'S ATTORNEY REGARDING THE CITY'S CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATIONS.

Mayor Brunscheon called Executive Session at 8:55 p.m. Regular session reconvened at 9:29 p.m.

XVI. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

XVII. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

ATTEST:

APPROVED:

Kitty Vodrup, City Recorder

Michael J. Cahill, Mayor