

The City Council for the City of Junction City, met in regular session and work session at 6:30 p.m. on Tuesday, January 27, 2026, in the Council Chambers, 680 Greenwood Street, Junction City, Oregon and in a virtual meeting format via internet and phone.

PRESENT: Mayor, Kenneth Wells; Council President, Karen Leach; Councilors Sandie Thomas, Sidney Washburne; Andrea Ceniga, Ken Jamieson, and Ken Hancock; City Administrator, Jason Knope; City Attorney, Carrie Connelly; Police Chief, Mark Waddell; Public Works Director, Gary Kaping; Finance Director, Christina Green; and City Recorder, Kitty Vodrup.

REGULAR SESSION

1. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance

Mayor Wells opened regular session at 6:30 p.m., led the Pledge of Allegiance, and took roll call.

2. Drone Donation Acceptance

Jon Edwards, on behalf of the Junction City Police Foundation (Foundation), presented three drones to the Junction City Police Department. Mr. Edwards continued that Chief Waddell had said that having a drone program was at the top of the department's list, and after seeing a drone demonstration from Lane County, the Foundation was excited to be a part of this. Mike Cahill, Foundation member, applied for a grant through Oregon Community Credit Union. That grant was received and with that funding and big contributions from Shannon and Marty Nill, the Foundation was able to make this happen. Barry Schweigert, Foundation member, added that the Foundation was excited that they got the money so quickly so they could get the drones. He added that everyone had been very supportive, and they were excited to see the drones in action.

Chief Waddell expressed appreciation for the hard work and generosity of the Foundation and the community for this donation. The department had two officers who had passed their tests to be drone pilots, and the department was very excited to have the drones. The drones would enhance officer and community safety and would be a great tool for search and rescue, locating suspects, etc. One of the drones had infrared capabilities, and the drones had lights and speakers, so officers could communicate through them.

The Council expressed appreciation to the Junction City Police Foundation, to Marty and Shannon Nill, and to all involved in this generous donation, which would be of great benefit to the Police Department and the community.

MOTION: Councilor Hancock made a motion to accept the donation of drone equipment from the Junction City Police Foundation, in accordance with the City's Gift Acceptance Policy. The motion was seconded by Councilor Washburne and passed by unanimous vote of the Council: Thomas, Washburne, Ceniga, Leach, Jamieson, and Hancock.

3. Raintree Water Treatment Plant Design.

Director Kaping stated that the City issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) for design of the Water Treatment Plant at Raintree, and three proposals were received. Staff reviewed and scored the proposals and recommended using HBH Engineering to do this work, based on their knowledge of design work for water treatment plants and that they did the facilities plan up front, so they were well acquainted with what the City wanted to design and how to do it. It was noted that HBH Engineering had also designed the City's original water treatment plant. Funding for this work would come from the \$996,000 grant that the City received to do this design work. Staff would check on what other projects might be able to be done with the remainder of the grant funding.

MOTION: Councilor Thomas made a motion to authorize HBH Engineering to do the design of the Raintree Water Treatment Plant in the amount not to exceed \$571,976 and authorize the Public Works Director to sign the necessary documents. The motion was seconded by Councilor Leach and passed by unanimous vote of the Council: Thomas, Washburne, Ceniga, Leach, Jamieson, and Hancock.

4. Adjournment of Regular Session

As there was no further business, regular session was adjourned at 6:48 p.m.

WORK SESSION**1. Call to Order**

Mayor Wells opened the work session at 6:49 p.m.

2. Budget Questions Follow-up

Administrator Knope shared budget information, to answer some questions that were raised at the last Council Work Session.

- **Rate Increases.** It had been mentioned that the City had not been doing rates increases for a while and it was asked when the Projects Crew was created. In October of 2018, SCS Engineering did a rate study for the City, which specifically considered the Projects Crew, along with future sewer projects at that time. The Council held three meetings, including a couple of public hearings on those rates, and the Council put those rates into effect in 2019. The City annually increased rates, per the recommended increases in the rate study through Fiscal Year (FY) 2023-2024. At the end of that study, staff brought back to Council to begin looking at the next rate study. At that time, there were a bunch of utility things that came due and Council gave direction to include some of that work, which fed into the work that they were doing today.
- **Public Works Staffing.** Administrator Knope included a spreadsheet in the packet, which showed the wages and number of Public Works staff over the last 10 year period. The key point he wanted to make sure that everyone understood was when looking at this spreadsheet and in the budget, you had adopted budget versus actual budget. Those two things would be different and could be significantly different, based on a variety of things. Previously, the way the City had budgeted was to try to carry a 10% cushion in personnel services, so there was always at least a 10% difference. The line he wanted to point out was the number of employees. The five employees for the Projects Crew were added in FY 19-20, based on the rate study. In FY 24-25, Public Works added two positions, an additional Sanitation Work and the Regulatory Compliance Specialist.

Councilor Jamieson asked how they would solve the employee funding problem at Public Works. Administrator Knope responded that Director Kaping would be bringing back information at the February Work Session.

Councilor Hancock noted that the discussion on Public Works employees began two weeks before Christmas and there were people living day to day not knowing what was going to happen, which he felt terrible about. He noted that they needed to bring this to closure, one way or the other, and had to come to an answer. Administrator Knope responded absolutely.

Councilor Thomas shared that it was hard for small towns to keep sanitation. Director Kaping responded that it was always tough to compete with the big companies, but right now Junction City was holding its own.

Mayor Wells thanked Administrator Knope for preparing the spreadsheet and giving them something they could use for reference for further discussions on this topic.

3. RV Park Ordinance

Administrator Knope presented the draft ordinance to create the RV Park at Lyle Day Park. By taking code language from the City of Lebanon and combining with Junction City's code, Attorney Connelly prepared this draft ordinance and had a number of policy questions for the Council:

- Section 1(B) Question: Would the City like to keep the terms "shelter-half" and "other temporary shelter" as shown in draft, to broaden these prohibitions. Council consensus yes, to make clear that camping was not allowed in other parks.
- Section 1(B) Question: Would the City like to use the term recreational vehicle or motor home. Council consensus was to use the term recreational vehicle, as that was the language in the City's current code.
- Section 1 (C) Does the Council want the permitting system to be the responsibility of the director or administrator. Council consensus was Public Works Director or designee.
- Section 1 (D) Question: Should they require that campers, trailers or recreational vehicles be self-contained. Council consensus was yes. Director Kaping noted that if the City did not require self-contained units, the City would have to provide restroom and shower facilities.
- Section 1 (D)(1) This described the area where overnight sleeping would be allowed. The language was straightforward and sufficient.

- Section 1 (D)(2) Draft language read, “Overnight sleeping was on a first come, first serve basis. No reservations will be taken or allowed.” Council consensus to modify this to reflect taking reservations through the online reservations system on the City’s website.
- Section 1 (D)(3) This said how many people you could put in a spot, which was 8. Could try this and if needed, modify in the future.
- Section 1 (D)(4) Draft read no alcohol allowed in the designated sites, as currently alcohol was not allowed in any City Park. Council consensus was to modify this section that alcohol would be allowed only in the designated site that they had reserved.
- Section 1 (D)(5) Draft read that Lyle Day Park was smoke free, and smoking was allowed in designated smoking areas only.
- Section 1 (D)(6) Draft read that stays within Lyle Day Park were limited to a maximum of 10 nights in any four-week period, unless a permit was issued under Subsection C of this Section. Council consensus to remove, “unless a permit was issued under Subsection C of this Section.”
 - It was noted that the City would need to set how far in advance a person could make a reservation. 90 days in advance was discussed.
 - Also noted was how to address if someone wanted to make a cancellation. It was noted that the City could include a cancellation fee at some point, if they thought that was necessary.
- Section 1 (D)(7) Used “permittee” instead of “camper”, to make things cleaner for the City to enforce its own rules. Amend draft language that Permittee would pay for the reservation through the City’s online reservation system and not at a pay station.
- Section 1 (D)(9) Quiet hours of 10 p.m. to 7 a.m. came from Lebanon code. Council consensus was good with these hours.
- Section 1 (D)(10) Draft read that the area designated for overnight sleeping would be closed annually during the Scandinavian Festival, as that was the current practice with the area being used for designated parking for downtown businesses. Council consensus was to remove this language, as they wanted this RV Parking to be open and available during the festival.
- Section 1 (D)(11) Draft read permittees were responsible for clearing their area of litter from their designated site. If this became a problem in the future, the City could consider charging a deposit, like what was done for the Laurel Park Rentals.

Councilor Ceniga asked if they should include any language to address recreational vehicles, trailers, etc. that were in poor condition, so that people did not park and then leave them. Chief Waddell noted that disposal fees for recreational vehicles could range between \$4,800 to \$5,200, which the City would have to pay. He added that enforcement measures for someone abandoning their recreational vehicle could include Theft of Services or Trespassing. Administrator Knope stated that they could put something in the rental agreement to cover the City. He added that Public Works and Police Department staff would be notified of rentals and have access to the rental calendar and agreements.

Administrator Knope stated that he would share the changes with Attorney Connelly and try to have the updated ordinance back to Council at the February regular Council meeting.

4. Future RV Park Discussion

Director Kaping stated that this was for Council to review and discuss the future steps for the RV Park project. Staff was asked to investigate the cost of doing the RV Park, and the total cost to get seven spots up and running was \$89,927.35. Was looking for Council consensus on if staff should move forward. Administrator Knope added that the big driver on this cost was the electronic gate, which was a worthwhile expenditure as it made everything work as far as the online reservation system and having less staff involvement.

Councilor Hancock noted that there was \$900,000 in Parks System Development Charges, which could be used for the RV Park development and this would be the only park that generated revenue and put money back into parks.

Councilor Washburne asked how long it would take to get the money back to make this worthwhile. Director Kaping responded that it would take a bit, depending on how much was charged and how many people booked.

Councilor Washburne said that he thought the other parks needed things versus opening an RV Park. He did not think they should spend this kind of money on something that they were unsure of whether it would be feasible to run it. It would cost them money in the long run to

have staff make sure it was clean and everything was done. He added that he was not sold on putting an RV park in Junction City.

Councilor Thomas stated that she thought this little start of the RV park would be something good.

Councilor Leach shared that she was all for it and thought it would be a good idea. It would give the City a chance to get some money back for parks. That land had been donated to the City for parks, and this plan looked good and hopefully would not require a lot of work from staff.

Councilor Thomas added that the Parks SDC money was designated for parks and could not be spent on personnel costs.

Mayor Wells noted that in the last couple of years, they had done a lot of work at other parks, by installing new equipment and developing the pickleball and basketball courts at Bailey Park.

Councilor Hancock noted that those did not generate money though. Mayor Wells continued that he just wanted to show that it was not like they had not done work at other parks. He agreed that this was an opportunity for revenue, although it would not be immediate.

Councilor Leach shared the old saying, "it takes money to make money" and that was how she felt about this.

Councilor Jamieson stated that in the long run, it would benefit the City and should more than pay for itself.

Councilor Hancock added that it was something they could be proud of.

Administrator Knope pointed out that the Parks SDCs could be used for expansion or additional capacity to a park. Things like rebuilding Tequendama Park was not SDC eligible, as they did not add capacity. This was one of those few times where the stars aligned and it gave the ability to add capacity and revenue at the same time.

Councilor Ceniga noted that they had not talked about how much they were going to charge per night and asked how long it would take realistically to make that money back. She had concerns and noted that there were pros and cons. The location was close to downtown businesses, but she was concerned that it was also close to railroad tracks and that people might not want to come back and stay. She was leaning towards yes but was concerned that the City would put a lot of money into this and then have to put a bunch of money into it down the road to do something else with it.

Councilor Hancock noted that with a name like Junction City, one should expect that there would be tracks somewhere. The land was donated to the City, and nothing had been done with it. They had an opportunity to use this very narrow focused money to develop it and it would begin to generate revenue over time. \$89,000 was a lot of money, but at the same time, the City just spent \$40,000 for a new website. He appreciated the deliberation and thought this would be around long term. He asked if the money generated could be used to assist with Parks personnel wages. Administrator Knope responded that it could be used for anything within parks.

Mayor Wells asked if staff had a consensus. Administrator Knope responded yes.

Director Kaping added that there was some work that Public Works could do internally to start sooner than later. Councilor Hancock asked if that would save some money on the estimate that was given. Director Kaping responded no, as he did not include Public Works wages in that estimate.

5. Max Strauss Pool Rates Discussion

Director Kaping stated that at the last Work Session, Council asked staff to look at what the fees would need to be for the pool to be self-sustaining. To cover operational and personnel services costs, the daily admission fee would need to be \$18. That would not include covering the \$186,000 that came from the General Fund. Staff reviewed what other similar sized outdoor pools charged and recommended that the daily admission fee be increased from \$2.25 to \$4.00.

Mayor Wells noted that in the comparisons to other cities, Junction City had been behind and well under what other pools charged. This would not be a huge increase but was higher than what was being charged now.

Councilor Ceniga noted that she would like to see the City review these fees every year, even if fees were not increased, so they kept up on cost of living increases, etc. and did not wait so long to do needed fee increases. Director Kaping responded that the fees could be tied to the CPI index, which was what he would be recommending with the water and sewer rates.

The Council consensus was for Director Kaping to bring back a resolution to amend the pool fees.

6. Lieutenant Job Description

Chief Waddell presented the Lieutenant job description, for Council review and input. The Council had discussed at previous meetings that the current Deputy Chief would be retiring in October of 2026. The original plan was not to refill that position but to create an Administrative Sergeant's position, that would be at a lower salary and then use the remainder of funding left for other department needs. The Council reviewed that job description at their last Work Session and provided input that they would like to see that position be a Lieutenant. A Lieutenant's pay scale would be a 5% increase over the top Sergeant's position that they originally talked about and so they would not see the savings that they had originally discussed. It was noted that when the current Sergeant's wage scale was set to be competitive with the City of Springfield for retention purposes, that created compaction on the upper end of the scale, and the Deputy Chief's pay scale would be less than a Lieutenant at the top of their salary range.

It was asked if the Lieutenant position would put one more person on the streets. Chief Waddell responded no, but he had some potential plans in his mind to take some responsibilities off the Deputy Chief position to take a little more active role on the patrol side.

The Council consensus was to have staff bring back a resolution to approve this job description.

7. Supplemental Police Funding Discussion

Chief Waddell distributed a JCPD Supplemental Funding document and shared that Administrator Knope had asked him to research what other cities did for supplemental police funding. He researched over 30 cities, and many cities added a fee amount to the City Utility Bill and a few submitted a levy to the voters. It was noted that the City of North Bend asked their voters if they would be in favor of a \$15 fee added to their Utility Bill and that had been approved.

Chief Waddell continued that the City had the same number of officers that it did 10 years ago, yet the City was growing, society was changing, and their jobs were becoming more difficult. The budget was tight, and his goal was to be able to have two officers on at all times, which the City currently did not have during the night.

Councilor Thomas shared about a recent discussion she had with local citizens on their police experience, and noted that the Police Department was doing a great job. She added that they all wanted the officers to be safe. If the Council had their way, Public Safety and Public Works would have everything the City could possibly give, but the money was not there.

Councilor Leach noted people seeing a patrol car on 6th really slowed down the traffic, and people appreciated seeing the officers on the streets.

Councilor Hancock stated this was an interesting discourse on supplemental funding. He shared that he would not be able to support adding a fee to the Utility Bill for the Police Department, when they had so much with water and sewer coming up that would be impacting the ratepayers.

Councilor Leach noted that she liked how North Bend let the people vote on that. Councilor Hancock agreed that was a good approach.

Councilor Thomas stated that the rate increase that would be coming because of sewer would be a pretty good increase, and the City would have no choice in that.

Mayor Wells asked how much a \$5 fee like the City of Florence charged on their Utility Bills would generate. Chief Waddell responded \$150,000 annually.

Mayor Wells stated that the City did not support fire, as they had their own base, and Junction City Rural Fire Protection would be presenting a new levy to the voters, as their current levy was expiring. He thanked Chief Waddell for the information on what other cities were doing, as that was something they could learn from.

Councilor Ceniga noted that if they were to add a fee to the Utility Bill, it would be important to communicate to the citizens what services they would receive as a result and what they would not receive without that funding. They could start small at \$5 and see how that went and could use the funding for an officer position, equipment, or vehicles.

8. Administrator Projects Update

Administrator Knope provided the following update:

- At the February 10th Council meeting, the League of Oregon Cities (LOC) would be doing the Lobbying training at the beginning of the Council meeting and would also be sending someone to chat with the Council to go over resources that LOC has.

9. Public Works Projects Update

Director Kaping provided the following updates:

- Draft facility plan had been completed and DEQ was reviewing that currently.
- An error was discovered on the Smoke Testing report, but it ended up being in the City's favor.
- Staff continued to work on the MWMC (Metropolitan Wastewater Management Commission) connection.
- Staff would soon be putting together a report to DEQ (Department of Environmental Quality). The report was due March 1st, but would be submitted in February.

Administrator Knope added that regarding MWMC, he was working on a draft letter to Lane County Board of Commissioners to request that Lane County sponsor Junction City and start the code text amendment for the Metro Plan. Staff received the finalized scope of work for the SDC consultant that the City would need. Junction City would begin to participate in the quarterly meetings with the current MWMC Work Group and would work with Eugene and Springfield on the planning side. He would be contacting the Creswell City Administrator to work on an IGA (Intergovernmental Agreement) to use their City planner to assist Junction City with the planning pieces.

10. Police Department Projects Update

Chief Waddell provided the following updates:

- Replacement Badges. The department was working on a redesign of their badges, to better align with what the department believed and held true to be honorable.
- Challenge Coins. Detective Tim Ware gave Challenge Coins to each Council member and reviewed the history and purpose of Challenge Coins. Chief Waddell added that each officer would be given a coin to give to someone that they witnessed doing something in the community that was above and beyond. When an officer gave one out, they were to share the specifics of that with Chief and then Chief would give them another coin that could be given to another community member. This was a great way to recognize the positive things that were happening in the community.
- Drones. The department would put the drones to work, as soon as they could.
- EIS/CAD. Still working to fix bugs in the system.
- Lane County Regional Training Committee. Met with 6 small agencies in Lane County to coordinate and share training opportunities amongst the agencies, which would be a benefit to each agency.
- Comfort Wellness K-9 Dog. Administrator Knope approved the Police Department getting a dog and hoped to have the dog by the end of the month. The dog would provide tremendous value of comfort to officers and victims of abuse, as well as be a drawing point at events. The dog would reside with one of the officers.
- Armory. Chief was working on having a safe and secure place for officers to store guns.
- Accreditation. Should have this completed soon.
- Peer Support Team. The department wanted to start such a team and program, to offer support to others in the department when needed.

11. Other Business

Mayor Wells noted that a card was received from Kids First and addressed to Mayor Wells, Recorder Vodrup, and the Junction City Council and he wanted to read it, "Thank you so much for reading your Human Trafficking Prevention Month proclamation at the City Council meeting earlier this week. It takes an entire community working together to combat an issue that needs our attention. Thank you for helping to raise awareness. We appreciate your support", signed by Teri Conklin, Marlene, and Katie. Mayor Wells added that the Council took the time to say a few words, but it meant so much to them.

Councilor Ceniga shared that she had spoken to the representatives from Kids First the next day after the proclamation was read, and they said that most cities do not read the proclamation at all, so they were very happy that Junction City did and that the Council took the time to acknowledge because this was something that was important. She thanked Mayor Wells for doing that.

Mayor Wells responded that just like everything else, it was all of us working together.

12. Adjournment

As there was no further business, the work session was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

ATTEST:

APPROVED:

Kitty Vodrup, City Recorder

Kenneth Wells, Mayor