

The City Council for the City of Junction City, met in regular session at 6:30 p.m. on Tuesday, May 27, 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, Steven Hitchcock; and Herb Christensen; (Excused Absence: Councilor Randy Nelson); City Attorney, Carrie Connelly; City Administrator, Melissa Bowers; Police Chief, Mark Chase; Public Works Director, Jason Knope; Finance Director, Mike Crocker; and Secretary, Tere Andrews.

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

Mayor Brunscheon added City Administrator Evaluation after Mayor's Comments.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT LISTED ON THE AGENDA

None.

IV. EMPLOYEE RECOGNITION

Mayor Brunscheon presented Mr. Chuck Salsbury with a plaque to recognize him for 17 years of service. Mr. Salsbury began his service as a Reserve Police Officer in May of 1997 and began employment as a Police Officer in July of 1998. He ended his service as a Sergeant on April of 2014.

V. DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT

Director Knope reviewed the final amendment #9 between the City and Department of Corrections, which closes out the projects.

MOTION: Councilor K. Leach made a motion to approve IGA Amendment #9 and authorize the Mayor to sign the necessary documents. The motion was seconded by Councilor Hitchcock and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

VI. VISTA DALE LOCAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

Director Knope reviewed that in 1999 the Vista Dale Subdivision was on an independent water system that was declared a health hazard by the state. The subdivision was then annexed into the City and connected to the City's water system, with the understanding that the rest of the subdivision would be brought up to City standards; however, these improvements were never done. The Sewer and Street Committee has been working on finishing this project, and the biggest struggle is how to bring the subdivision to some form of City standard but minimize the impact to the residents that live there.

Director Knope continued that the next official step would be for the Council to initiate the City engineer's report on this project.

MOTION: Councilor Christensen made a motion to direct the engineer to make a survey and draft a report for the Vista Dale Subdivision and file both with the City Recorder. The motion was seconded by Councilor K. Leach and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

Director Knope presented the engineer's report on the Vista Dale Local Improvement District. The report outlined the costs for street, sidewalks, storm drain, water, and sewer improvements, with a total project cost of \$570,458. The proposal would have streets at the narrower range of City standards, finish connecting residences to new water meters in front of their homes (all homes currently share a water meter off an old 2 inch waterline and divide the monthly consumption units by the number of homes).

Council members expressed concerns on what the property owners understood about these improvements and what their understanding was at the time of annexation. Director Knope responded that at the time of annexation, the owners were notified, but there had been a lot of turnover in property owners since that time.

Mr. Mike Bonner, 1462 W. 12th, Junction City, stated that he owned a rental in the Vista Dale Subdivision and had been unaware that these improvements were needed when he

purchased the property as an investment in 2007. He expressed concerns on the high cost of the \$18,000 improvements that could be imposed on this property.

In response to how assessments work, Attorney Connelly stated that a Local Improvement District (LID) with assessments would be established by Council resolution and property owners could pay in one lump sum or request installment payments with terms of no less than 10 years and no more than 30 years. The assessment would become a lien against the property.

In response to questions on the project improvements being done in phases, Director Knope stated that it could be done in phases, and Public Works could possibly do some of the project work in house to assist with reducing costs. The sewer and streets were in fair condition, so both could be phased in later. The streets and sidewalk work was a large portion of the total project cost. From a staff perspective, the only thing of concern was the water and abandoning the 2 inch waterline, which is the least expensive part of the total project.

Councilor DiMarco asked if there was a way to adopt a master plan approach, without triggering the need to bring everything up to City standards, just because this area came into the City under hardship. Director Knope responded that one approach would be to take whatever piece the Council was comfortable with moving forward and modifying the LID proposal to reflect just that piece. The other elements of the proposal could be put on the Public Works Capital Improvement Plan, which is basically a list of projects. That way, none of the work would be lost.

In response to questions on the assessment for water only, Director Knope stated that the total water project cost for the subdivision would be \$17,250 (\$750 per lot), which included the work being contracted out. The work could be done this summer, after the process and public meeting were completed.

Mr. Jack Sumner, 1061 Quince Drive, Junction City, asked if the customer would be responsible to connect the water meter to their house. Director Knope responded that this would be completed as part of the LID. Most of the houses are connected to the water in the back of their properties, and this would connect them around front to the new water main and the new water meter.

Mr. Bonner asked if the homeowner could do the work of connecting the waterline to the house. Director Knope responded that he did not see why that would not be an option. The work would have to pass all inspections and there would be a timeframe for when the work needed to be completed.

Mr. Jeff Haag, 27340 8th Street, Junction City, asked what the advantage was of rerouting the water, if all the properties were currently being served by the City. Director Knope responded that the residents all share one meter and some retired residents have complained that they should not have to pay the same amount as a family with children who use more water. Also the pressure is reduced because of the failing 2 inch line pipe.

Council members expressed their desire to hold a public meeting with the Vista Dale property owners and share not only the water improvements, but the entire project and get their feedback. Residents could also provide comments on phasing in projects or doing all at once.

In response to a question from Mayor Brunscheon on the public hearing process, Attorney Connelly stated that after the Council has approved the modified report, the public hearing would be held. The Council would hear what the property owners had to say and then the City could go out for bid to get the hard costs for the project. Even after the Council adopts the assessment resolution and it is recorded against the properties, if the Council decided they wanted to pull off a project, that could be done any time prior to the final completion of the improvements.

Mayor Brunscheon asked if there was an annexation agreement or some agreement on the water service. Director Knope responded that he had never seen one, but could not say for sure if there was one or not. Mayor Brunscheon added that was something that they needed to find out and look at.

The Council consensus was to have Director Knope contact the City Engineer to modify the report to include water only. In addition, Director Knope was directed to see if there was an annexation agreement for Vista Dale and bring both items back to the next Council meeting.

VII. STANDARD ANNEXATION AGREEMENT

Administrator Bowers reviewed that the Finance and Judiciary Committee reviewed the standard annexation agreement at their May meeting and forwarded to Council with a recommendation to review the City's annexation code, research how other cities in the region process annexations, and research what the state requirements are on annexations. Given that an annexation application has been submitted to the City, the Committee recommended looking at forming a standard annexation agreement in the interim, given the City's current code language.

After discussion, the Council consensus was to have staff prepare a proposed annexation agreement for the current annexation application and to hold a work session to discuss that. A separate work session would be held to review the entire annexation process, what other cities do, what the state requires, and the City's current process.

VIII. COBURG CONTRACT UPDATE

Administrator Bowers stated that the Council had previously authorized contract signature, conditioned upon a March 31, 2014 deadline. Coburg approved the contract on April 8th, so approval was needed for her to sign the contract.

MOTION: Councilor DiMarco made a motion to approve the Intergovernmental Agreement as presented and direct the City Administrator to sign the necessary documents. The motion was seconded by Councilor K. Leach and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

IX. STAFF REPORTS

Chief Chase reported that he was reviewing the Transportation System Plan draft and noted that there were a number of streets that should be evaluated for speed limits, in response to resident complaints on speeding. A citizen who is usually critical of police officers complimented Officers Rankin and Markell on their professionalism and politeness on a recent stop. A suspect in a recent vehicle accident ran from the scene, but Officer Nicol and other officers were able to capture him.

X. COUNCILOR COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

Councilor Hitchcock thanked staff and the Council for all their hard work, which made his decisions easier. He thanked Chief Chase and the Police Department for all their great work.

Councilor DiMarco asked when staff and legal counsel were required to inform the Council on personnel issues, given that the Council does have involvement in some personnel issues per the City Personnel Manual.

After discussion, the Council consensus was to have Attorney Monson follow up with Administrator Bowers on this question.

Councilor K. Leach reminded everyone about the Function 4 Junction on Saturday and thanked the Police Department in advance for their work at the event. She noted that the Pet Parade had been a success, and she enjoyed seeing the City of Springfield's K-9 participation. She thanked staff for their hard work.

XI. MAYOR'S COMMENTS

Mayor Brunscheon initiated discussion on the signing of City contracts and noted that previous City Administrators had sometimes signed contracts, without approval of the Council. Mayor Brunscheon wanted to create a written procedure that would ensure that all future City Administrators bring all contracts before the Council for approval and delegation of authority.

The Council consensus was to proceed with Mayor Brunscheon's suggestion, and Administrator Bowers was directed to bring back the existing requirements on contracts and options for approving a written procedure.

Mayor Brunscheon thanked staff for all their hard work and stated that the Council was supportive of each department in the City.

XII. CITY ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION

Mayor Brunscheon asked for Council input on how they would like to proceed with the City Administrator's one year evaluation.

The Council consensus was to hold an Executive Session on June 4, 2014 at 6:30 p.m. to begin the evaluation.

XIII. OTHER COUNCIL BUSINESS

Mr. Jeff Haag asked if the Council would be reviewing the current annexation application agreement. Mayor Brunscheon responded that it would occur in one of two Council Work Sessions on annexation.

Mr. Jason Thiesfeld, Planning Commission Chair, asked if the Council wanted Planning Commissioners to attend the annexation work sessions. Mayor Brunscheon responded that the work sessions would be public meetings, and the Planning Commissioners were welcomed to attend. No decisions would be made in a work session, and any public comment could be given when the annexation was discussed at a regular meeting.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:43 p.m.

ATTEST:

APPROVED:

Kitty Vodrup, City Recorder

David S. Brunscheon, Mayor