

The City Council for the City of Junction City, met in regular session at 6:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 27, 2024 in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 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, John P. Gambee and Ken Hancock; City Administrator, Jason Knope; City Attorney, Carrie Connelly; Police Chief, Mark Waddell; Superintendent Jeremy Tracer; and City Recorder, Kitty Vodrup.

1. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance

Mayor Wells opened the meeting at 6:30 p.m., led the Pledge of Allegiance, and took roll call. He noted that Item 5 Scandinavian Festival Association Street Closure Request would be moved to the March 12, 2024 Council meeting.

2. LRIG (Lane Radio Operability User Group) Agreement

Chief Waddell presented the LRIG agreement. This was an interagency agreement between all agencies in the county for use of the radio system. The Junction City Police Department (JCPD) had participated in this agreement for many years, and it was recently brought to JCPD’s attention that an updated contract that was currently in place had not been signed by Junction City. Attorney Connelly flagged some potential updates, and Chief Waddell would address those in the future.

MOTION: Councilor Washburne made a motion to approve the LRIG Agreement and authorize the City Administrator to sign the necessary documents. The motion was seconded by Councilor Leach and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

3. Jail Policy

Chief Waddell presented the updated Jail Policy, to use the jail as a Temporary Holding Facility. Currently the jail was in a suspended state because they did not have the staff to run it. Using the jail as a Temporary Holding Facility would allow an officer to use it for four hours to take care of processing. The subject in the cell would need to be observed every 15 minutes.

MOTION: Councilor Ceniga made a motion to approve JCPD Policy 901. The motion was seconded by Councilor Hancock and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

4. Utility Billing Clerk Job Description Update

Superintendent Tracer presented the updated Utility Billing Clerk job description. The position had been recently vacated, and staff reviewed the job description for potential updates. Administrator Knope noted that the salary range had been updated to put that in line with a recent compensation study. The position had been filled internally.

A. Resolution No. 1 – A Resolution to Update the Utility Billing Clerk Position pursuant to Personnel Policy 4(K) and Assigning a Range within the City’s Compensation Schedule.

MOTION: Councilor Washburne made a motion to approve Resolution No. 1. The motion was seconded by Councilor Thomas and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

5. Water Project Funding Discussion

Administrator Knope presented proposed funding for various water capital projects. Those projects included two new wells, rehab of the City’s existing wells, test wells, well upgrades, planning work, and project contingencies for a total of \$3,105,000. To fund that, staff was proposing the following:

Water Capital Project Fund (Current cash on hand)	\$1,345,000
USDA Rural Development Grant	\$1,000,000
Water SDC Fund	\$ 100,000
Internal Loan from Non-Departmental	\$ 250,000
Internal Loan from Revolving Loan Fund	\$ 350,000
State Revenue Sharing (Projects to be Determined)	\$ 60,000
Total Funding:	\$3,105,000

Administrator Knope reviewed that the Water Fund just finished paying off \$90,000 per year in annual payments for an interfund loan, so there would be no additional burden on the department to do these loans. The goal was to keep everything within the current rates.

Director Crocker had prepared a draft resolution that showed how this could be done through a supplemental budget. Also included in the packet was a summary of changes to the Water Fund. The intent was to try and take what they could out of the Water Capital Fund, without harming any current projects going on right now, like water meter replacements, etc. The internal loans would be for 10 years at 0% interest, and they were looking to get this done in this fiscal year.

Councilor Thomas asked where the cash on hand in the Water Capital Fund came from. Administrator Knope responded that was from the ARPA dollars that Council had directed be put in the Water Capital Fund for water projects of 1.2 million.

Councilor Leach expressed appreciation for the information and noted that they told the citizens that they would be addressing the water issues and this was moving that forward.

Mayor Wells asked if the USDA Rural Development grant would be for the Bailey Well. Administrator Knope responded that the one million dollar grant was for Raintree, and the City would be funding the Bailey Well with cash on hand. The only well they did not yet have funding sources for was the construction of the Alderdale Well.

Mayor Wells thanked Administrator Knope for the information and as Councilor Leach had said, the citizens could see this was front and center.

Administrator Knope stated that Director Crocker would advertise the supplemental budget, and this would be presented at the March 12th meeting for Council consideration.

Jack Sumner, 1061 Quince Drive, Junction City, asked what the City was doing about repairing old water lines and finding out how much water they were losing through leaks. Administrator Knope responded that Public Works had an outside company to do leak detection each year or every other year along with meter calibration to get that water loss number and part of the planning document would be to take those findings and develop a plan for Council to consider for repairing older water lines in town. In addition, the City's Engineer was working on an update to the Water Master Plan that would incorporate those things for Council consideration.

Mr. Sumner asked how much money had been requested from the state/federal fund for water and street repair. Administrator Knope responded 1.2 million was received from ARPA dollars and the City has a one million dollar grant request to USDA Rural Development.

Councilor Hancock noted that they were looking at an interfund loan from General Fund in the amount of \$250,000 and thought that money was going to be used to buy a sanitation truck. He expressed concerns with using General Fund dollars in a number of directions if the General Fund had needs. He asked if they would be seeing other loan proposals from the General Fund for water, sanitation, etc. in the upcoming budget. Administrator Knope responded that he had not seen all the department proposals, but there were no interfund loans planned at this point. Staff was looking at external sources for sanitation. He added that there were a lot of things coming down the pike, and staff's approach was trying to keep the most flexibility that they could.

6. New City Hall Funding Request

Administrator Knope presented the request to get the City Hall project finished. Staff knew coming into this budget year that they would not have quite enough to get the project done and had received bids for carpeting (\$6,100.15), installing tile flooring (\$14,700), and for the remainder of office furniture needed. Once these things were done, it would be ready for staff to move in. Long term, they would need to figure out what to do with the gravel and outside areas, but nothing that would impact use of the building. He suggested paying for these remaining items from State Shared Revenue, Projects to be Determined. Even with using this line item for this project and some water project funding, there would still be \$30,000 left in this line item.

Councilor Gambie asked what the total cost of the new City Hall was. Administrator Knope responded around \$240,000/\$245,000, including purchase, moving, and remodeling.

Mayor Wells asked what the current City Hall would be used for. Administrator Knope responded that there was not a long-term plan for its use, and his intent was to start discussions with the Council to see what the Council would like to see happen in this space.

Councilor Gambie noted that getting a 2100 square foot building and all the improvements for \$240,000 was a very good price.

Councilor Leach added that using State Revenue Sharing for these kinds of one-time projects was exactly what it was for.

MOTION: Councilor Leach made a motion to award the purchase and installation of office furniture for the new City Hall Project to Office World in the amount of \$25,834.04. The motion was seconded by Councilor Hancock and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

7. Dispatch Contract not Being Executed Discussion

Councilor Hancock stated that they had discussed this at the Public Safety Committee a few months ago that the revenue for the dispatch section of the Police Department (PD) had been overestimated because contracts had not been executed. He noted that with the "bucket system", if they did not right size the PD, they would end up short of the revenue that they were supposed to have in their Ending Fund Balance by \$214,000, while at the same time transferring \$175,000 to the court system. He was aware that there could be an argument that the PD budget was fine overall because of the position vacancies, but that would not address the need to support additional people going into the future. With property taxes coming in well, he felt they should right size the department so they would have their full cash carryover.

Administrator Knope responded that he had spoken to Councilor Hancock a few times on this and did not disagree with anything he had said. The police budget included \$100,000 in revenue for the Oakridge Contract, but that part was a wash because they did not hire the additional dispatcher for that contract. He continued that there would be \$145,000 they would need to watch, and the vacancies would chip away at that. He asked Director Crocker to hold off on the \$175,000 transfer to court. What staff was intending to do was make up the difference with the amount transferred to court, to make sure the PD budget was not upside down. Example, if the PD budget was upside down by \$50,000, the court transfer would be \$125,000 instead of \$175,000. If they reduced the court transfer, they were going to have to make adjustments on the court side to get it back on the right path, and staff was discussing various position change ideas, such as reducing court hours, combining duties, etc.

Councilor Hancock noted that it sounded like staff had thought this through and figured out how to keep the PD from losing money. Administrator Knope responded yes and also how to deal with the ripple effect.

Councilor Leach shared that the Finance and Judiciary Committee had a long discussion about court and the possibility of reducing hours.

Councilor Thomas added there was a lot to look at and work on.

Mayor Wells noted the court had been the last department budget they had to work on, so there were challenges already there. It may not happen as fast as they wanted, but they needed to get court going forward instead of going backwards.

Jack Sumner stated that over the last 21 years he had been involved with the City, they had used the lack of PD personnel to fill the budget void and had never had full PD staffing. He felt they should do what was needed to get PD fully staffed, and the Council was elected to do what was best for Junction City. He recommended having an outside engineering firm evaluate the water system and how much water was being lost underground. He added that he felt departments spent too much money on buying vehicles that were not needed.

Councilor Leach responded that the Council was working really hard to support Chief Waddell in all of those things. She continued that Chief Waddell was doing an excellent job but it would take some time to fill the positions. Councilor Thomas added that the Council was there for no other reason than to do what was right for the people of Junction City.

8. Municipal Judge, City Engineer, City Prosecutor, City Public Defender, and City Attorney Contracts Discussion

Councilor Hancock referred to various City Charter sections and read Section 12:

"Additional officers of the city shall be a municipal judge, city administrator, and such other officers the council deems necessary. Each of these officers shall be appointed and may be removed by the mayor with the consent of the majority of the council. The council may

combine any two or more appointive city offices. The council may designate any appointive officer to supervise any other appointive officer; except the municipal judge, who shall be supervised by the mayor, except in the exercise of the judicial functions.”

Councilor Hancock continued that the only position that was 100% identified in the Charter as to who would supervise was the Mayor supervising the judge, but there was really not a clear definition of what supervision was. Section 26 of the Charter referred to the Municipal Judge and there were many responsibilities that position had that were important. Junction City Municipal Code Chapter 2.28 was approved by the Council in 2019 and listed the additional City Officers of City Engineer, City Prosecutor, City Public Defender, and City Attorney. It referenced that appointment and evaluation procedures shall be established by Section 12 of the Charter, which again, did not provide a clear definition of what that supervision would be.

Councilor Hancock shared that as Mayor Wells has said communication was 90% of all success, and Councilor Hancock felt they needed to facilitate that with the people that the Council hired. He recommended two things and was interested in Council feedback:

1. Develop a feedback form that Council members could complete.
2. Do in person interviews of the additional officers before they were hired. He thought this was especially important for the Municipal Judge, because of the authority of that position and because the judge needed to reflect the values of the community.

Councilor Thomas thought those were good suggestions.

Councilor Washburne agreed and did not think the court system was running the way it should, so it would be good to have Council input.

Councilor Ceniga stated that she agreed with everything Councilor Hancock had said. She liked the idea of feedback forms and putting some checks and balances in place to make sure everyone was doing their job.

Councilor Gambia noted that in 2019 when the changes were made, he remembered that part of why that amendment was done was to give the Council more interaction with some of these contracted positions. He remembered that they did do in person interviews when they hired the judge. He thought this was a great topic and appreciated how Councilor Hancock had researched this. He thought it would be good to continue discussion and have staff bring back those documents, see what contracts they had with these appointed positions, when the contracts expire, what the current process was, etc.

Councilor Leach agreed with what Councilor Hancock had said and thought this was definitely important and worthy of discussion. She expressed concerns with court operations, impacts to the PD, and the court philosophy in sentencing. She felt they needed to keep this on the agenda and especially since court was a top issue right now.

Mayor Wells asked if Attorney Connelly had any input. Attorney Connelly responded that she agreed with Councilor Gambia that the goal in setting up the identified positions as Council Appointees was to take back that authority to the Council and institute some level of oversight that the Council wanted at the time. She continued that each of the contracts set out exactly what the oversight was, so if the Council wanted more, that was their prerogative. The level of oversight varied from Council to Council and how many administrative duties the Council wanted to perform, which could shift over time. She thought this was a great topic for discussion.

Mayor Wells noted that Councilor Hancock brought up two points, feedback and in person interviews. He expressed the importance of communication, including both of those areas, and agreed that further discussion should be held.

Administrator Knope suggested that the Council create two written policies. One policy would be on how RFPs were handled for Council Appointees, including frequency of issue, what the contract would include like annual reports, and creating a standardized template for the RFP. The second policy would then lay out how the Council would want to interact with any of those appointees. The supervision language could be included in a policy, resolution, or code change so that was clear to everyone. He added that Recorder Vodrup kept a list of contracts that she sent out renewal reminders internally to staff, and she could bring back a list of

Council Appointee contracts and their terms. He recommended bringing this back to a Council Work session.

The Council consensus was in favor of discussing this further at a future Council Work Session.

9. Adjournment

As there was no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:38 p.m.

ATTEST:

APPROVED:

Kitty Vodrup, City Recorder

Kenneth Wells, Mayor