

The City Council for the City of Junction City, held a Work Session at 6:30 p.m. on Thursday, August 14, 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, Steven Hitchcock, and Herb Christensen; City Administrator, Melissa Bowers; Public Works Director, Jason Knope; City Planner, Jordan Cogburn; and City Recorder, Kitty Vodrup.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Brunscheon called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

II. ANNEXATION PROCESS REVIEW

Planner Cogburn stated that on May 27th the Council had directed staff to do research on annexation processes, including what other cities do, what the state requires, and what the City's current process is. He researched five cities: Florence, Creswell, Medford, Cottage Grove, and Eugene. Out of those five, only Creswell required an annexation agreement. It was noted that Creswell uses the same law firm as Junction City.

Planner Cogburn noted that the City of Eugene utilizes a Summary of Urban Service Provision, which outlines how services are going to be provided and whether or not the applicant is going to provide them. This imparts a basis for ultimate approval and essentially binds the applicant to follow through on any extension obligations. It also avoids the annexation agreement negotiations and if the applicant does not indicate that they will provide needed services, the City has a fair and adequate basis to deny the annexation all together

It was noted that cities vary as to when they address urban services, with some at the time of annexation and some closer to the development stage.

Director Knope stated that from a Public Works perspective, trying to nail down services at the annexation level could be difficult at times, as a final site plan may not be developed. He continued that this would be easier to do closer to development, instead of taking a shotgun approach at the time of annexation and trying to cover any potential scenario.

Administrator Bowers reviewed that an option for the City would be to review something like what the City of Eugene does with the Summary of Urban Service Provision. This attempts to address that the applicant is aware of the need for the relationship with urban services and that they will follow through on extension obligations if there are extension obligations. It is not an agreement requirement, but it still gives the applicants a voluntary opportunity to comply with whatever the requirements are for the provision of urban services. And if the applicant does not demonstrate the ability to connect to the needed services or provide access to the needed access, it could be a basis for denying an annexation.

Administrator Bowers continued that if the Council was interested in eliminating the annexation agreement, staff would suggest using something similar to Eugene's Summary of Urban Service Provision. To do this the City's annexation code would need to be amended, as it requires an annexation agreement, and Planner Cogburn would also need to review the City's development code to see if any amendments would need to occur there.

It was noted that applicants wanting to annex would have an idea up front of what types of services they may or may not need to provide and what types of issues might be on the table.

Council members expressed their desire to have the annexation process be simple, non-intimidating, and welcoming.

In response to a question on the City's current annexation agreement, Administrator Bowers stated that at the last annexation work session, staff had presented a four page annexation agreement, which was the simplest version staff could come up with that still met the test of the City's current annexation code in requiring an agreement. Tonight

Council was discussing the possibility of moving away from using the annexation agreement and looking at others options, such as what the City of Eugene does.

The Council consensus was to have Planner Cogburn work on the code amendments that would be necessary to the annexation and development codes to be able to implement something similar to a Summary of Urban Service Provision and to eliminate the City’s requirement of an annexation agreement. Staff will bring those findings and material back to the Council in regular session for discussion, public comment, and potential decision on whether or not the Council would like to make those revisions.

III. OTHER BUSINESS

School Resource Officer

Administrator Bowers reviewed a job description for the School Resource Officer (SRO); a Police Officer job description was used and the SRO duties added. The SRO’s primary assignment would be at the schools and he would be pulled for patrol duties only in emergencies or during the summer and on school breaks. Staff contacted the COPS program, where the grant funding is being received, and found out that a veteran officer already on the force could fill the SRO position and then the COPS grant could be used to backfill the 11th officer position for patrol.

Independent Review of Police Department

Administrator Bowers provided follow up from the July 30th Council meeting and said that she had found a potential candidate from the Oregon Association of Chiefs of Police Linebacker Program. At the June 19th meeting, the Council directed her to bring a scope of work for an independent review of the complete Police Department. She asked Local Government Personnel Institute (LGPI) for assistance with the scope and thought that the candidate from the Linebacker Program would be an excellent resource to do the independent review.

The Council consensus was in favor of this idea and having the Public Safety Committee to interview the candidate.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:12 p.m.

ATTEST:

APPROVED:

Kitty Vodrup, City Recorder

David S. Brunscheon, Mayor