

The City Council for the City of Junction City, met in regular session at 6:30 p.m. on Tuesday, January 14, 2020, in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 680 Greenwood Street, Junction City, Oregon.

**PRESENT:** Mayor, Mark Crenshaw; Councilors Sandie Thomas, Robert Stott, Andrea Ceniga, Dale Rowe (via conference phone), and Bill DiMarco; Excused Absence: Councilor John Gambia; City Administrator, Jason Knope; City Attorney, Carrie Connelly; Police Chief, Bob Morris; Public Works Director, Gary Kaping; Finance Director, Mike Crocker; HR/Admin Services Manager, Stephanie Moran; and City Recorder, Kitty Vodrup.

**1. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance**

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

**2. State of the City Address**

Mayor Crenshaw presented the State of the City Address: "Economic conditions throughout the country continue to rise along with the longest bull market in our nations history, and Junction City has not been left behind. The growth in our population, fostered by a healthy amount of new homes, from high end custom to affordable housing, has attracted many new businesses. We can all see that the downtown store fronts are filling up and construction of new buildings are giving our citizens a greater variety of goods and services.

The Public Works Department made some marked improvements in the appearance of our streets with new paving and sidewalks. The pool project included renewing the shell, underwater deck lighting, and new exterior paint. The building at Founder's Park had the roof replaced, fencing fixed, and an overall face lift with pressure washing and paint.

Water quality became a particular challenge, a growing pain if you will, as the demand on the new system is a shadow of its capacity. This challenge was met by the ingenuity of our staff to come up with new methods of maintenance. Junction City received an Outstanding Performance Award from the State of Oregon for our Water System, and we continue to strive for improvement.

The Police Department continues to increase momentum in being visible in a positive light throughout the community. Not just in the bright white patrol cars, but through hosting and/or being active participants in public events that allow citizens to engage with the rest of the community in meaningful dialogue that promotes a safer environment and a stronger sense of caring between neighbors. From youth awareness to social gatherings to honoring heroes, our Chief and police officers have made themselves available and approachable.

Public Safety has also been enhanced by investments in better equipment from body cameras and tasers to reliable patrol cars, and from radios and dispatch equipment to the AlertSense emergency notification system which covers the needs of the entire City, including a customized segment specifically meeting the needs of the school district. We are also safer as a result of fostering partnerships with neighboring communities and their public safety agencies.

In the short time I've been your Mayor, I have become very used to Junction City being recognized for excellence in the accuracy and reporting of the City's finances, but now the bar has been set even higher in the fact that our budgeting process is receiving national recognition. Because our budget documents serve as a policy document, a financial plan, an operations guide, and a communication devise, we are able to maintain more efficient fiduciary responsibility. This year we also completed a five-year financial forecaster which encompasses all operations and is used by the Council, Budget Committee and staff to assist with effective fiscal planning. It also gauges the City's compliance with policies and makes it able to plan for future challenges.

I have been asked to make reference to the census coming up in April, as part of this address. I cannot stress enough how important it is for us all to be compliant and participate in the accuracy of completing this effort. Not only does accuracy give us the best information for planning, but there are also some positive financial impacts that will come from state and federal programs due to our population growth. The increasing population here in Junction City is due in part to the western movement of our nation, so it is very likely that Oregon get another vote in congress.

I cannot conclude without repeating my call to all who can that they find a way to serve their neighbors. Volunteerism still remains the key to the success of a small community. As we ride this roller coaster of challenges and triumphs, my hat is off to the citizens of our fair City who have already and continue to step up and give their most valuable resource, their time, to making Junction City such a great place to live.”

### 3. Changes to the Agenda

None.

### 4. Approval of Minutes – December 10, 2019

**MOTION:** Councilor Stott made a motion to approve the December 10, 2019 minutes. The motion was seconded by Councilor DiMarco and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

### 5. Review of Previous Month’s Expenditures

Mayor Crenshaw asked if there were any Council comments or questions on the previous month’s expenditures. Councilor Thomas asked about some expenditures and staff provided answers.

### 6. Public Comment on Items not Listed on the Agenda

Ms. Adele McCranie, 645 Vine Street, Junction City, asked about the status of the Paddock Zone of Benefit. Director Kaping responded that the contract for the City to purchase the Zone of Benefit from Mr. Paddock was being finished. After that was signed by Mr. Paddock, Director Kaping would be coming back to the Council to see what they wanted to do with it. Ms. McCranie said that she appreciated everything staff and the Council had done for them.

Mr. Sid Washburne, 520 Timothy Street, Junction City, stated that if things were not nailed down in this town they were being stolen. He added that this was out of hand and something needed to be done.

### 7. Public Hearing – CPA-19-01/RZ-19-01 School District Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Rezone

Mayor Crenshaw opened the public hearing for CPA-19-01/RZ-19-01 School District Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Rezone at 6:43 p.m. He asked the Council if they had any conflicts of interest or ex-parte contacts; there were none. He read the required statements for the hearing, per state law.

#### Staff Report

Director Kaping stated that the proposed concurrent Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment and Rezone application was submitted by the Junction City School District on March 15, 2019. Per the applicant’s request, the public hearing was scheduled for the November 20, 2019 Planning Commission meeting. The Junction City School District initiated a Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment and concurrent Rezone for a district owned 1.44 acre vacant lot. The applicant proposed to re-designate the parcel from Public to Medium Density Residential and to concurrently rezone from Public Land to Duplex Family Residential (R2). There was no requested change to the existing Water Resource Overlay District along the eastern edge of the subject site and there were currently no plans to develop the property. Following testimony from interested parties at the November 20, 2019 Planning Commission meeting, the applicant supported amendment of the proposal to request a Plan Designation Map Amendment to Low Density Residential and rezone to Single Family Residential (R1); the Commission concurred with this amendment. At the standing November 20, 2019 Planning Commission meeting, the Planning Commission voted to recommend to the Council that the request be approved with modifications to re-designate the site to Low Density Residential and rezoned to Single Family Residential, based on the public and applicant testimony provided.

Mayor Crenshaw asked if there were any questions from the Council. Councilor DiMarco noted that he had some technical questions and asked why a City planner was not at the meeting. Director Kaping responded that she was sick.

#### Applicant Testimony

Ms. Teresa Bishow, 375 W. 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene, stated that she was speaking on behalf of the School District, and Superintendent Kathleen Rodden-Nord was available in the audience. She distributed supplemental information and gave a brief slide presentation. The

property was currently owned by the School District on Rose Street. When this went before the Planning Commission, there were two areas of concern. The first was did the School District really know that they would not need this property in the future, and did they look carefully at whether or not it was indeed surplus property. In response to that, the School District requested that the Planning Commission continue the public hearing to a later date, and they looked very closely at their long-term facilities plan, projected school enrollment, and age and condition of all the School District Facilities. The School Board reviewed this, with public input, and approved a long-term facilities plan. And as part of that process, the School District Board confirmed that the subject property that was before the Council was indeed surplus and they really did need it for the School District purposes.

Ms. Bishow continued that the second area of concern that was raised at the Planning Commission level was why was the School District seeking a medium density residential zone. That zoning classification was suggested by a former City Planner, because the belief was that there was a greater need in the community for medium density housing than low density, but after listening and carefully considering the public testimony, especially from neighbors living in the immediate area, the School District did verbally revise their request. She stated that she wanted to submit a letter into the record tonight that included two maps, which showed the existing zoning of public land and the proposed new zoning of R1 Single Family Residential. She stated that she wanted to put that in the record to make it very clear that the School District was supportive of that change.

Ms. Bishow stated that one of the key approval criteria for any plan amendment was will the change to the Comprehensive Plan be consistent with statewide planning goals. The four that they believed generated the most public discussion were Parks and Recreation, Housing, Public Facilities, and Natural Resources. With regard to Natural Resources, the surplus property contained no statewide Goal 5 Natural Resources, except for the wetland area along the canal. There were no proposed changes to the existing Wetland Resources Overlay District, and the work the City did to identify and decide how to protect Goal 5 Resources would not be changed, regardless of how the Council voted on the pending applications. The School District surplus property was not identified as needed for a City Park, did not appear in the City's Park Plan, and was not really going to impact the full and complete use of the ballfields or the gravel parking area adjacent to the property in question. With regard to housing, the plan amendment would add 1.44 acres of vacant low density residential land to the City's overall inventory, but that amount, given the whole community, was insignificant or not substantial so there was really no meaningful change to the inventory or conflict. The School Board listened and addressed the concern of the Planning Commission; the School Board approved an updated Long-Term Facilities Plan and reconfirmed that they did not need the surplus property.

Ms. Bishow continued that she wanted to take a moment to share how a public agency demonstrated fiscally wise use of taxpayer money. When there was a facility or resource that was not needed, it was best to look at alternate uses and sell or transfer the property so that it could be fully used. That was what they were trying to do and make wise decisions regarding the resources available to the School District. The School District did identify and wanted to try and maintain in better condition the gravel parking area that served the Laurel ballfields as well as met some overflow parking needs of the Middle School. The School District goals were to create a safe and motivating school environment and to improve school sites to meet accessibility needs while also providing safe entrances and controlling motor vehicle access. The location of the subject property was not ideal for classroom space, given the distance from the main school buildings and it also did not have good site lines for being able to monitor outdoor education programs or something of that sort. This was a piece of property the School District acquired, primarily because the subdivision that was developed adjacent to it never quite completed.

Ms. Bishow stated that to address how the zone change would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, upon the approval of the plan amendment the zone change would be consistent. The Comprehensive Plan encouraged compatible integration with different land uses and cost effective infrastructure. The site was located in the City limits and could be fully served. With regard to transportation, the existing bike/pedestrian path, which was widely used and appreciated and enjoyed, would be retained; it was not within the subject property boundary. Once this property was developed, it would need to comply with any transportation system improvements, such as putting in a public sidewalk along that

segment of the street. So, there would actually be enhanced improvements for pedestrians at least.

Ms. Bishow stated that in closing, the Junction City School District's mission was to maintain and enhance district facilities to support the district goals, enhance safety, and promote community involvement. They really appreciated all the extensive time that Director Kaping, Planning Technician Andrews, and Attorney Connelly had spent, and they respectfully requested that the City Council approve the revised request. She and Superintendent Rodden-Nord were available for any questions.

Mayor Crenshaw asked if the Council had any questions. Councilor Ceniga asked for confirmation that the original proposal was for medium density and was now for low density. Director Kaping responded that was correct and was now for R1 Single Family Homes.

Councilor Ceniga asked how many homes would be able to fit in that area. Director Kaping responded it could be between 5 to 7, depending on what a developer wanted to do and how it was laid out.

Councilor Ceniga noted that there was no water and sewer and asked if that would be easy to continue through there. Director Kaping responded yes and there was an easement through there for a pressure sewer line and a sewer line. That easement would be encompassed in whatever was the requirement of the setback.

**Public Testimony – Those in Favor**

None.

**Public Testimony – Neutral Testimony**

None.

**Public Testimony – Those Opposed**

None.

**Additional Staff Comments**

None.

Mayor Crenshaw asked if Councilors had questions for staff.

Councilor DiMarco stated that at the Planning Commission meeting, there was talk about the Transportation State Goal and that it was not necessary to do a traffic analysis. He thought that the R1 designation made sense and did not have any problem with that proposal. He was concerned about pre-existing conditions that were a background for this in terms of traffic safety and some situations that were involved with that property that were not ready for prime time as far as being ready to support this application. He stated that this was more on the City than the district and none of this was in opposition to the goal that they had here. When it was said that a traffic study was not needed, they were ignoring the fact that there was a parking lot there. When it came to this final level, part of the statewide goals was the overall appropriateness and livability of things and certainly safety factored into that. There was a parking lot there for a considerable time of the year where there could be up to a couple hundred cars using the walking path as a driveway. He had lived in that neighborhood for over 11 years and did not ride his bicycle through there in the summer, as it was very hazardous. He did not know if there ever had been an approved driveway there, if that was a fire access, or how that existed on the City's records. He had a part, with staff's advocacy, of getting the two crossings put in there, but felt that the traffic safety issues around the parking lot really needed to be addressed.

Councilor DiMarco asked about the unfinished sidewalk between the last house on Quince and the LDS Church. Director Kaping responded that the installation of sidewalks was triggered by development so when the house on the corner of Quince was built, the City required them to put in a sidewalk. If the School District property sold, the developer would be required to put in a sidewalk there. He added that he was working with Lane County on a partnered grant for the rest of the sidewalk on the east side.

Councilor DiMarco said that he was not arguing with the grant, but noted that in applying for the grant, they acknowledged that they did not think it was safe right now.

Councilor Ceniga noted that she was a little confused and asked if they were talking about another area other than then School District property that was marked off on the map.

Mayor Crenshaw responded that they should only be talking about the highlighted area. He continued that the comments relative to the adjacent piece of property may be acceptable in this hearing; however, unless they were going to impose a condition upon this piece of property, then it was simply only a comment or an observation at this time. So, it may or may not impact the decision making about whether or not the Council approves this proposal.

Councilor DiMarco stated that his concern was that a traffic study was not done on putting this potential development in and if this property was actually developed, it would remove some of the parking that was currently being used and alter the configuration of traffic. It would certainly make the situation a little bit worse, so he was contesting the fact that there was no traffic study done to support this proposal.

Councilor Thomas asked for clarification on the School District selling the property and plans for development. Director Kaping responded that currently there were no plans for development of that property, but that did not mean that the District couldn't do that in the future or sell to a developer who could submit a development proposal in the future.

### **Applicant's Final Comments**

Ms. Bishow stated that she wanted to reiterate that the decision before the Council was whether or not to amend the Comprehensive Plan and zoning to allow future low-density residential use. It was not approving a specific development proposal and at such time in the future that a subdivision for single family homes might be submitted, then the City staff would look at the City's code and determine whether a traffic study was needed and what mitigation measures might be required or transportation system improvements needed. The School District did want to make the best use if its available resources and it voluntarily contracted with Junction City Athletics to use the ballfields, which in turn resulted in the high demand for parking in the summer months. The district did that because they believed there was a broad community objective, but if the City of Junction City did not want the ballfields used in that way, they would certainly go a different direction.

Ms. Bishow continued that she wanted to really encourage the Council to stay focused on what was before them. It was how do they best enable land that was currently designated public land that was not needed by a public agency, how do they allow that particular 1.44 acre parcel to be freed up and put to a different use. They know that it was not desired industrial or commercial, so the question was what type of residential use and they believed low density was the appropriate designation and zoning and they encouraged the Council to act favorably. She thought it would also send a signal to the School District that the City wanted to work collaboratively on these types of project with the community interests in mind.

### **Council Questions or Comments**

None.

Mayor Crenshaw closed the public hearing and record at 7:15 p.m.

Mayor Crenshaw asked the Council if they wished to consider Ordinance No. 1 and asked for reading of the ordinance.

B. Ordinance No. 1 – An Ordinance Amending the City of Junction City Comprehensive Plan Map and Official Zoning Map for Lane County Tax Assessor's Map 15-04-31-11, Tax Lot 05902.

Attorney Connelly read Ordinance No. 1 in full.

**MOTION:** Councilor Stott made a motion to read Ordinance No. 1 by title only. The motion was seconded by Councilor Ceniga.

Mayor Crenshaw asked if there was any Council discussion. Councilor DiMarco noted that there had been questions from the Council but they had not deliberated. Mayor Crenshaw responded that there would be a chance to deliberate on the ordinance, after it was read by

title only. Councilor DiMarco noted that if read by title only they could vote to pass the ordinance tonight and he would like people to have an opportunity in the community to think about this for at least 30 days, so he would vote no on the motion.

**VOTE:** The vote was 4 to 1, with Councilors Thomas, Stott, Ceniga, and Rowe in favor and Councilor DiMarco against.

Mayor Crenshaw stated that since the vote was not unanimous, the ordinance would be read by title only and considered at the next regular meeting in February. At that time, they would deliberate on the actual ordinance.

#### **8. Ophelia's Place Lease Agreement**

Manager Moran reviewed that Ophelia's Place had requested a three-year extension on their lease. The current lease expires on February 1, 2020 and allowed for a one-year extension. The Community Services Committee reviewed on November 5, 2019 and recommended approval.

**MOTION:** Councilor Stott made a motion to approve the three-year lease extension for Ophelia's Place and authorize the City Administrator to sign the lease agreement. The motion was seconded by Councilor DiMarco and passed by a vote of 4 to 1, with Councilors Stott, Ceniga, Rowe, and DiMarco voting in favor and Councilor Thomas voting against.

#### **9. Winnebago License Agreement**

Manager Moran presented the lease agreement for Winnebago to continue using some parking spaces at Lyle Day Park. The Community Services Committee reviewed on November 5, 2019 and recommended approval. It was noted that lease payments went into park revenue and the lease payment was \$400 per month.

**MOTION:** Councilor Stott made a motion to approve the two-year license for Winnebago and authorize the City Administrator to sign the license agreement. The motion was seconded by Councilor Ceniga and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

#### **10. Council Agenda Forecaster**

Administrator Knope presented the forecaster. PERS Reserve discussion on January 28<sup>th</sup> Work Session agenda; add Code Enforcement Discussion to this agenda.

#### **11. Staff Reports**

Chief Morris: In response to questions from Councilor Thomas, Chief Morris stated that the department was in process of hiring reserves and dispatchers.

Director Kaping: Provided an update on the burned-out building on Ivy Street – Attorney for the property owner said the record now showed that the Huntley's were the owners of that building and Director Kaping would reach out to them tomorrow. Public Works was moving forward with the addition of two water filters and with the Water Quality Project. Staff was working on the budget, and Roselyn Baker was hired as the new Building/Planning receptionist. He would be bringing some nuisance code amendments to the February Public Works Committee.

In response to a question on if the code amendments would have made enforcement faster on the Ivy Street building, Attorney Connelly stated that she did not think the code was the problem; it was the facts that were the problem and lack of a definitive owner and not wanting to violate constitutional property rights without providing the appropriate notice.

Director Crocker: Staff was deep in the middle of budget. The Budget Committee would meet this Thursday and would be talking about 5-year trends.

Manager Moran: She was busy assisting departments with recruitment.

Attorney Connelly: Szerlip Breach of Contract claim update – Summary judgement found material fact and the case was in discovery, with trial set for October. Attorney Christy Monson was working on formally addressing the School District complaint that was issued last summer.

**12. Councilor Comments/Questions**

Councilor Ceniga noted that the nutria population near the high school was really bad and she asked for a staff update on this issue. Director Kaping responded that the City had hired a contractor to trap at the lagoons, but few were captured. He added that the City could only trap on City property, per vote of the City Council.

Councilor Ceniga asked about the status of the U of O (University of Oregon) contract. Chief Morris responded that some revisions were being made and the contract could come to Council next month.

Councilor Ceniga asked about the status of the Police Department surplus vehicles. Chief Morris responded that 6 or 7 had been sold or were in the process of being sold at auction.

Councilor Thomas asked if the Police Department got new vehicles. Chief Morris responded that they did not.

Councilor Thomas expressed her appreciation to everyone who showed up at the meeting and took an interest in what was going on.

Councilor DiMarco noted that former City Councilor Lance Stoddard passed away in December and his service was scheduled for the end of March. He noted that Councilor Stoddard was a great man, who was very conscientious and did a great job. Councilor DiMarco would work with Recorder Vodrup on something more formal to observe his service that the Mayor could present to Mrs. Stoddard at a future Council meeting.

**13. Mayor's Comments**

Mayor Crenshaw stated that it was wonderful to see the seats filled at Council meetings and that had doubled over what was the norm in year's prior. One common testimony he heard was, "nobody ever told me what was happening." He noted that in government, things were often talked about over and over and it was up to the citizens to come and observe these discussions. He expressed kudos to those at the meeting and to those in the community who stepped up to volunteer.

**14. Executive Session per ORS 192.660(2)(h) to Consult with Legal Counsel Concerning Legal Rights and Duties Concerning Current Litigation or Litigation Likely to be Filed.**

Mayor Crenshaw called Executive Session at 7:59 p.m. Regular session reconvened at 8:44 p.m.

**15. Adjournment**

As there was no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:44 p.m.

ATTEST:

APPROVED:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kitty Vodrup, City Recorder

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark Crenshaw, Mayor