

The City Council for the City of Junction City, met in regular session at 6:30 p.m. on Tuesday, August 22, 2023 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. Gambia, and Ken Hancock; City Administrator, Jason Knope; City Attorney, Carrie Connelly; Public Works Director, Gary Kaping; Public Works 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.

2. Water System Improvements Discussion

Administrator Knope presented a Power Point on the Water System. He introduced City Engineers Rob Henry and Jenny Borth from HBH Engineering. The presentation included:

Water System Overview

- System Components
 - 2 ground storage tanks – 3.65 million gallons of storage
 - 2 elevated storage tanks - 6 million gallons of storage
 - 4 main production wells – in total produce 2,200 gallons per minute. Wells were located at 13th and Elm, 11th and Elm, 8th and Deal, and 5th and Maple.
 - 1 emergency well at 3rd and Cedar. It produced roughly 300 gallons per minute.
 - 1 Water Treatment Plant – 6 filters that were able to do 400 gallons per minute each maximum. The primary purpose of the treatment plant was to remove iron and manganese.
- System Statistics (from 2018 Water System Master Plan)
 - Winter Average Flow was estimated would be 616,000 gallons per day (GPD). Actual winter average last year was between 700,000 to 750,000 GPD.
 - Summer Average was estimated would be 877,000 GPD. Actual summer average was closer to 1,000,000 GPD.
 - The Maximum Day was estimated would be 2,457,000 GPD or 1706 Gallons per Minute (GPM).
 - The total water rights that the City had were 3,375 GPM. All of those were in use, as far as the state was concerned.
 - 2,433 water accounts, as of today.

Water Production Issues

- 8th and Deal Well
 - Constructed in 1940
 - Permitted Water Use: 1,414 GPM, but the City ran it at 300 GPM. It was not uncommon to have extra water rights on a well, so they remained active.
 - Well Depth: 245 feet and Motor Size: 75 HP
 - Current Issues
 - Well pumping production was less than 100 GPM
 - Well had a high concentrate of sand being pumped
 - Well was redrilled in 1992, due to sand and production issues
 - No emergency power
- 5th and Maple Well
 - Constructed: 1967
 - Production Capacity: 500 GPM and Well Depth: 190 feet
 - Current Issues
 - Well pump production was 220 GPM
 - No emergency power
 - Limited space at the well for maintenance or expansion work
- 13th and Elm Well
 - Constructed in 1994
 - Permitted Water Use: 1001 GPM, but only used it to produce 300 GPM.
 - Well Depth: 262 feet
 - Current Issues
 - Well pumping production is 225 GPM
 - Well had started to show an increased amount of sand being pumped

- Well had been rehabilitated once before as part of the construction process in 2010 when the new pumping system was built.
 - Limited space/options to move the well
- 11th and Elm Well
 - Constructed: 2015
 - Permitted Water Use: 1445 GPM
 - Production Capacity: 1100 GPM
 - Well Depth: 250 feet and Motor Size: 100 HP
 - Current Issues
 - Well pumping production was 120 GPM
 - No emergency power

• Well Production Summary

	Previous Pumping Capacity	Current Pumping Capacity
○ 13 th and Elm	300 GPM	225 GPM
○ 11 th and Elm	1,100 GPM	120 GPM
○ 5 th and Maple	500 GPM	220 GPM
○ 8 th and Deal	300 GPM	75 GPM
Total:	2,200 GPM	Total: 640 GPM (Difference: -1,560 GPM)

Current Source Water Production Work

- Inspected all equipment above ground and did not see any issues.
- Worked with a hydrologist and Water Master for Lane County and the State to see if there were other new wells that could have been impacting our wells, and none were found.
- Started the process to pull and inspect the well casings, putting a camera down into the well casings, pulling apart the pumps and motors to make sure there was not an issue there. Had originally intended to have the 11th and Elm Well done this spring; unfortunately, due to the contractor’s schedule, were not able to get that done before the summer season. After summer was done and they were able to cycle wells off, that contracted work would be done.
- Next steps:
 - Pull and inspect the remaining wells to make sure all the down well equipment was in good condition, making sure the well screens and casings were good, and then look at rehabilitating our wells.

Current New Production Well Work

- The City had drilled 2 test wells (Raintree Well -600 GPM) and (Alderdale Well – 400 GPM); this work began in 2021.
- About 5 months ago, the City started the process to transfer water rights to those 2 new test wells. As of last month, they were on schedule to have that work completed within the next month or two to get the water rights transferred.
- City was working with USDA Rural Development on a \$1 million grant for the Raintree Well. USDA Rural Development was looking to have that grant awarded to the City by October.
- Once the engineer got the okay from USDA Rural Development, the project would be ready to go out for bid a month or two after that. Typically, these types of projects once awarded took about 6 months to complete.
- It was anticipated that the project would cost approximately \$1.3 million to get the well drilled, developed and brought into the system. Between the grant and funds on hand, the City had the ability to pay for this project in its entirety. There was not funding identified yet for the Alderdale Well.

Future New Production Well Work

- It took two or three years to get a new well going, so staff was recommending identifying two more test well sites. Staff wanted to have plenty in reserve, as the City goes forward into the future.

Productions Well Recommendations

- Correct existing issues/or expand wells to restore the production capacity back to the 2,200 GPM.
- Develop and bring online the two current test wells (Reserve and Alderdale)
- Increase resiliency within the system by:
 - Adding an additional well above and beyond what the City needs, in addition to the City’s emergency well. That way, if there were issues and one well was needed to

be pulled offline in the summer, they were not putting the system in an emergency footing right off the bat.

- Add emergency power to the wells that did not have any.
- Purchase spare motors and parts on hand for the wells.
- Pull, inspect, and rehabilitate all the existing wells this winter.
- Identify two additional locations to drill test wells and begin process to develop these wells.

Administrator Knope stated that he would have the City Engineers comment on what it meant to rehabilitate a well. Mr. Henry reviewed that wells were a hole in the ground and at the level that there was water, there were slots/screens that allowed water to come into the hole and be pumped out. The idea behind the slots in the screens was to keep things like sand or other material from coming in from damaging the pump and the water system downstream from the pump. When it came to rehabilitating wells, the first thing they did was put a camera down the well to see what the problem was. Some problems could be taken care of just by pulling the pump. For example, the City had a lot of manganese, which when oxidized could cause a scale to form on the pump screens and not allow as much water through. They could also blow the sand back out through the well, which would clean the well and screen. Full rehabilitation would include re-drilling the well in place or moving it over a little bit. Until they knew what the problems were in the wells by getting the cameras down there, it was difficult to say which form of rehabilitation was best for the City's wells.

Production Well Recommended Work Summary

● Develop Raintree Well to Production Ready Status	\$ 1,300,000
● Inspect and Rehab the 4 productions Wells (\$50 K each)	\$ 200,000
● Spare Shaft and Motors for Wells	\$ 75,000
● Install Emergency Power at 3 Wells	\$ 750,000
● Develop Alderdale Well to Production Ready Status	\$1,300,000
● Identify and Develop 2 New Test Wells	\$ 100,000
Total:	\$3,725,000

Administrator Knope stated that as it stood today, the City had a little over \$2.4 million, with the grant funding and cash on hand.

Water Treatment Overview

- Right now staff was not recommending to add treatment plants to the two new proposed test wells, due to the cost. At some point, the City would have to address that, whether that was piping it back over to the existing facilities or doing spare sets over there.
- The 3rd and Cedar Well would continue to be used as the City's emergency well and at some point, could look at upgrading this well and connecting it to the treatment plant.

Councilor Leach asked why not put 3rd and Cedar into production now. Administrator Knope responded that it was still being used as an emergency well, but not as a primary well, and staff was recommending leaving it as an emergency well right now.

Water Distribution System Overview

- Administrator Knope reviewed the various sizes and material types of pipe in the system, which were listed in the 2018 Water System Master Plan.
- As part of the Master Plan, there had been a lot of distribution work that had been identified as needing to be done. The master plan broke out projects in a 1A, 1B, 2, and 3 priorities and it assigned a timeframe to each of those. 1A were the highest priority and they were supposed to be completed within the first five years of the master plan being adopted. 1B were within the first 10 years, priority 2 within 15 years and priority 3 by the end of 20 years which was the life of the master plan. Costs for each project were listed, based on the cost estimates in 2018.

Projects by Priority

- 1A-1 Water Treatment Plant Phase II had been completed when the Council authorized purchase of additional filters for plant a few years ago.
- 1A and 1B were projects to improve fire flow in town.
- 1B-7 Galvanized Steel and Asbestos Concrete Pipe Replacement Program. This project was intended to tackle replacement of pipes.
- Priority 2 Projects. These projects were of concern but were not as high of concern as 1A and 1B.
- Priority 3 Projects. More growth driven and would need to be addressed in the future.

Distribution System Recommendations

- Contracted Work
 - Priority 1A-2 through 1A-5 projects (North Greenwood Street Mainline Update, North Downtown Mainline Update, South Greenwood Street and Third Street Mainlines Update, and High School Waterline Update).
 - Priority 1B-2 through 1B-7 projects (Elm Street and Deal Street Mainlines Update, South Downtown Waterlines Update, Northeast Residential Waterlines Update, Industrial Mainlines Update, 99W Waterlines Update, and Galvanized Steel and Asbestos Concrete Pipe Replacement Program).
 - Above contracted work totals were \$15,496,000 in 2018 cost estimates
- In-house Work
 - Fully fund more for the Fire Hydrant Replacement and Expansion Program. This was for community fire safety.
 - Fully fund Valve Exercising and Replacement Program. Needed to be done for mainline cleaning.
 - Fully fund Mainline Cleaning Program. This would help improve water quality.
 - Fully fund Leak Detection Program
 - Above In-house totals: \$200,000 annually. City currently funded \$80,000 annually.

Administrator Knope reviewed four maps that were included in the packet that showed pipe location and material, distribution priority projects, and existing and proposed fire hydrants.

Administrative Related Work Recommendations

- Consultant Work
 - Update the Water Master Plan
 - Update the Water Conservation and Management Plan
 - Implement a Source Water Protection Plan
 - Review the current rates and rate structure
 - Update the City's Water System Development Charges. The Water SDC had not been updated since Administrator Knope had started working for the City in 2006.
- In-House Program Development
 - Develop maintenance programs for hydrants, valves, and mainline flushing that were similar in nature to the City's Capital Expenditure Plan (CEP). Include milestones and annual goals that were reportable back to Council to determine the effectiveness of the programs.
 - Develop expanded conservation program and communication elements for the department.

Recommended Next Steps

1. Continue to bring Raintree Well online as soon as they could.
2. Bid the inspection and rehabilitation work for all existing wells and schedule for this fall.
3. Identify funding for the development of Alderdale Well.
4. Contract the City's Engineer to perform work on the planning documents as needed.
5. Contract with a consultant to analyze the City's rates and model scenarios to determine impacts to the City's rate structure.
6. Contract with the City Engineer to begin design work for adding emergency power to the various wells that do not have backup power.

Mayor Wells invited Councilor questions.

Councilor Thomas noted that Administrator Knope talked about wells and sand. She asked if the wells would need to be drilled deeper and if sand was a sign that the well was going dry. Administrator Knope responded that the location of sand varied, and you could move 50 feet and get no sand or move 50 feet and end up with more sand. He continued that this was not necessarily a sign that a well was going dry, but more that sand was getting into the well and they needed to figure out a better way to keep more sand out.

Councilor Washburne asked why emergency power was not put in at all of the wells. Administrator Knope responded that was a great question that he did not have the answer to. He noted that in the early 2000's, there was more grant funding and priority focus on wastewater, and he thought it was intended at some point that the City look at this for water.

Councilor Washburne asked if they could use money in the Revolving Loan Fund to do some of this work. Administrator Knope responded yes, and the Revolving Loan Fund had loaned

money to the Water Fund in the past and that could be done again if the Council wanted to do so.

Councilor Ceniga asked if the 2.4 million dollars the City had on hand included the 1 million dollar grant. Administrator Knope responded yes.

Councilor Ceniga asked how long it had been since the wells had not been pumping the amount of water needed. Administrator Knope responded that staff started noticing that in 2020-2021, which was when they came to Council to start drilling the test wells. The test wells took longer than normal because the contractor broke their equipment in 2021 and the test wells were not able to be completed until 2022.

Councilor Ceniga noted that the Water SDCs (System Development Charges) had not been updated since before 2006 and asked why this had not been brought up and talked about. Administrator Knope responded it was brought up, and DOC (Department of Corrections) ran the show at the time and told the City not to update it. He continued that at that time, it was the intent to update the Master Plan to be able to update the SDCs, and that unfortunately did not get accomplished and fell off the radar in 2019/2020.

Councilor Ceniga asked if the DOC had say over what the City could do. Administrator Knope responded yes at that time they did. Councilor Ceniga asked how long ago that had been. Administrator Knope responded from 2009 to 2011.

Councilor Ceniga stated that DOC was going to build a prison and now had a hospital and asked if they still had say over what the City could do. Administrator Knope responded that the hospital was a different entity than the DOC and were like any other commercial customer. They did not have regulatory authority to dictate to the City what it did with their utility system, but DOC did have that with its supersiting authority.

Councilor Ceniga noted that DOC did not follow through with putting the prison in. Administrator Knope responded that was correct, and it left the City with a mixed bag of trying to figure out how to move forward. He continued that unfortunately, the focus stayed on sewer because of the City's Mutual Agreement and Order with DEQ (Department of Environmental Quality) that had been in place since the mid-90s.

Councilor Gambie thanked Administrator Knope for the presentation and noted that it was good to see all the information. He remembered when they talked about the declining production from the wells a few years ago, which prompted the test wells. He was grateful that this work had been started a few years ago and asked what the current SDCs were. Director Kaping responded that the total SDCs were around \$10,000, with sewer around \$8,000, water around \$1,000, streets calculated by trip rate, and parks set at a standard calculation.

Councilor Gambie noted that if 100 people came into town, they were contributing 1 million dollars that would be allocated to the various SDC funds. Director Kaping responded that was correct.

Councilor Leach stated that she was disappointed that this did not happen a long time ago and disappointed the money had not been set aside to take care of this. She thought it had been in the works in 2015 when she had been on the Council to get the two wells taken care of, but it fell by the wayside and here they were today. She thought they should do the two wells and figure out how to fund the 2nd well or they would be right back where they started this summer. Refurbishing the wells was great, and the most important thing right now was to get enough water to take care of the City's people and take care of the new building that was going on off of Oaklea. They had been on water curtailment for three years and she found paperwork from 2015 where the City had been in Stage 2 Water Curtailment. She added that the City had dropped the ball and needed to take care of this.

Councilor Hancock stated that he thought they should focus on the future as opposed to the past, because he believed this was a problem that had been very slow in developing and went back probably even decades. Now they simply had a problem to solve, so he wanted to look forward at solutions. If they looked at the production well recommended work, they were about \$1,000,000 shy of doing all the recommended work. He asked if the City would have adequate production capacity and not have to implement water curtailment, if all those recommended projects were completed. Administrator Knope responded that if they were able to do

everything on the list and everything came out like they felt it should, then yes they would be fine.

Councilor Hancock asked if that would be for our residents now. Administrator Knope responded yes and for the growth that they currently had going on to the west of town. That would include a 2nd well and working on the production capacity of the existing wells.

Councilor Hancock expressed agreement that the Council needed to review Ordinance No. 1231, which governed the water curtailment and noted that it was difficult to talk to citizens that had received letters threatening fines when all they were doing was turning on their water. He noted that Administrator Knope had brought forth a lot of information and now they needed to digest that, but the most important thing would be to keep moving forward rapidly, formulate a plan, prioritize issues, and work together to come up with solutions and what they were going to do.

Mayor Wells stated that they could not change history but what they could do was not repeat it. He thought Administrator Knope had given an excellent presentation with numbers, explanations, and options. The City was working on trying to get funding and looking ahead; he and Administrator Knope had met with Dan Waylen from Representative Hoyle's office and with Courtney Flathers, the South Valley/Coast Regional Solutions Coordinator from the Governor's office. They would be setting up a meeting in October to review what the City needs and look at county, state, and federal funding sources.

Councilor Leach expressed appreciation to Administrator Knope for the information.

Mayor Wells stated that the plan was to receive and discuss this information tonight; this would be a work in progress, but they would continue to move forward.

Administrator Knope responded that staff would continue to move forward with the Raintree Well grant process, and design process to keep that moving. They would continue to look for other funding and would be bringing back information through the Public Works Committee as far as engineering and other pieces to keep that moving. After this, he would group back up with everybody and plan in the very near future another work session with more information, as they continued to flush things out.

Councilor Leach noted that this was information that they had only gotten in the last month or month and a half and it was important for the Council to further discuss.

Mayor Wells stated that for those in the audience who did not have the opportunity or time to come to the Council meetings or see it online, the City would do a better job in communication to citizens, as Administrator Knope had mentioned.

Administrator Knope stated that he would keep tonight's presentation up on the City's website where people could look at the documents. He would also make sure that the Water Curtailment Plan and Water System Master Plan were available online as well.

3. Moratorium Information

Attorney Connelly stated that her goal was not to make policy choices for the Council, but to let them know the tools that were available and what was involved. She reviewed a memo she had prepared on Public Facility Moratoriums in Oregon. Moratoriums were strictly regulated by Oregon State Statutes and were highly disfavored by the legislature. She outlined the stringent requirements on initiating a moratorium, with specified noticing periods/requirements, adopting findings that demonstrated the need for a moratorium, and public hearing requirements. Within 60 days after the effective date of the moratorium based on shortage of public facilities, the City would be required to adopt a "Corrective Program" to correct the problem creating the moratorium, which would be subject to a public hearing. She reviewed the moratorium timeframes as outlined in her memo, including requirements for durations and extensions.

Attorney Connelly continued that you never issued a moratorium in a vacuum, but always first considered the factors that Administrator Knope previously talked about like Water Curtailment, rates, SDCs, facility plans, and master plans. A moratorium was just one tool in the tool belt, and a City should not rely exclusively on a moratorium to try and solve a problem and just kick the can down the road. She encouraged cities to look at all the other tools and how they were fixing issues and addressing use, growth, and revenue. A City should always work closely with their staff, engineers, consultants, and attorneys to make sure the processes

and facts were examined and done properly, as that was what would be looked at most closely and challenged if the City were to end up having to defend it to LUBA (Land Use Board of Appeals).

Councilor Gambia said it was referenced that the City was providing 100 gallons per person per day, but what if someone wanted to use 250 gallons per person per day. He asked how that term was defined and what was the actual standard for what the City was required to provide per person per day. Mr. Henry responded that number was spelled out in the City's enabling ordinance and was what gave the City the right to provide water to citizens, charge a fee, and control how that was done. Typically, there was not a maximum allowed and that was usually controlled through rates and the way the rates were set up. The City did not have a maximum amount a house could use, and most cities did not.

Attorney Connelly added that she did not know that it was how much they could use but was a policy choice for how much they should use. As Mr. Henry pointed out, the City could set a graduated rate where users who wanted to use more water would pay a higher fee.

Director Kaping stated that the Public Works Design Standards specified 100 gallons per person per day and that was how they would typically look at a design of what they needed to provide for a subdivision.

Councilor Gambia asked if that was based on a winter or summertime rate, as different amounts were used in the two seasons. Director Kaping responded it was just a rate that was used, and he could not answer if that were summer or winter.

Councilor Gambia asked if the City were liable for telling someone they could not use more than 100 gallons per person per day. Attorney Connelly responded that the liability, if there were going to be any, would be if the Council determined they were going to provide "x" gallons a day, month, etc., and if the Council did not do anything to be able to provide that and acted negligently or some other way caused harm because of your inability and your mistakes in order to meet the standard that you set. In a vacuum without those elements, there was no liability but there could be political fallout.

Councilor Leach noted that there were only water issues during the summer and asked if you could place limits on the amount of building permits a year. Attorney Connelly responded yes, but calculations would need to be in place, such having an allocation system and examining current users, looking at curtailment measures that were or were not going to be imposed, looking at what it was expected that current users would reduce their use, which would leave a volume that could be spread across anticipated new users, etc.

Councilor Hancock thanked Attorney Connelly for her presentation and noted that her memo was easy to read and straightforward. He asked when the SDCs were last updated. Administrator Knope responded that sewer SDCS were updated 2009/2010. The structure of the water was updated at that point, but the amount in which it was based off of was not, so the last time the water dollar amount was updated was somewhere around late 1999 to 2001.

Councilor Hancock asked if it were normal for most cities to have old pipes in the ground. Administrator Knope responded yes.

Councilor Hancock asked if they were using the calculation of 100 gallons per person per day. Administrator Knope responded that he would encourage not getting fixated on that design number, as they were looking at what was actually being used in reality.

Councilor Hancock stated that his point was they had been doing calculations for development and for how many wells were needed, but it seemed like no matter what, they were a little bit short. So he wondered if those calculations were off somewhere and if they needed to reevaluate what they were doing in terms of how many wells they were putting in. Administrator Knope responded that staff was suggesting redefining the traditional slogan of being one well ahead, which did not help as much as it should. In his presentation, he noted they wanted to be at 2200 gallons per minute, so they would want an extra 600 gallons per minute well. From staff's standpoint, that would be addressing what they were saying about getting out ahead for that growth and give a little more reaction time instead of slamming into the City's emergency well.

Councilor Ceniga thanked Attorney Connelly for her presentation. She noted that at the last meeting, she 100% supported a moratorium but could see it would be a band aid. As a City, they were obligated to provide sewer, streets, and healthy water. It was helpful and concerning to see the amount of pipes that needed replacement that they had known about for a long time. Everything came down to money in the end, but she was glad to hear there were options and looking at funding to address these things. She asked why the water SDCs had not been updated since before 2006 and noted that was a little bit of a problem. She was in her 5th year on the Council and did not know about issues that she needed to fight for unless they were brought to her attention. They needed to meet the needs of the people who lived in town and she thanked those who had limited their water use with the current curtailment, as they had been part of the solution. She added that she wanted to address these issues and was not a person to go into debt, but they needed to do whatever was necessary to provide healthy, safe water for citizens without needing to go into curtailment, as well as provide other necessary services.

Councilor Washburne shared that they had a ton of work to catch up on. He appreciated the citizens coming to the meeting and noted that they had a long ways to go. Like the Mayor said, they would appreciate citizens coming to the meetings and sharing their opinions, as it was their City too and the Council wanted to hear from them.

Councilor Thomas asked if they took out a moratorium for 26 months and then fixed everything in 6 to 9 months if they could discontinue the moratorium. Attorney Connelly responded yes, and they would just repeal the moratorium.

Councilor Thomas stated that she thought they needed to take care of the citizens and taxpayers they had now. She noted that she had an old house, but her water was good. She thanked the public for attending the meeting and thanked everyone who worked on this.

Mayor Wells thanked Attorney Connelly for her presentation and agreed with Councilor Hancock that it was well written. He thought they needed to look at this as just one tool in the tool chest and not as a solution to anybody's problem. They needed to look at the options and suggestions first. A moratorium would have a detriment on the growth of the City. There were two sides to every story, and they needed to be wise enough to look and listen to both sides of what was presented to them. They needed to look at all options, not kick the can down the road, but find choices, make changes, and go forward. This would occur one step at a time and would not happen all at once. That was why they had a plan for projects that needed to be done within 2, 5, 10, or 20 years. As Administrator Knope pointed out, the City had funding and were in the step by step process of putting in one well.

Attorney Connelly asked about follow-up, if any. The Council consensus was that they would discuss all the information staff presented tonight at a future Work Session. If there was any follow up, the Council would provide direction to Administrator Knope who would work with Attorney Connelly.

4. Public Comment

Mayor Wells opened the floor for public comment.

Frank Bishop, 1182 Breckenridge Drive, Junction City, expressed appreciation for the presentations. He asked if it was possible to tap into the Willamette River instead of using ground water. He continued that if they wanted reserves for fire hazards, they could put in another million gallon storage tank which could be filled up in the winter and then they would not have to use pump capacity. He asked what percentage of property taxes came back to the City of Junction City, because the City's infrastructure was inadequate, and the City needed support to build the infrastructure and water system.

Judi Robinson, 923 Tamarack Street, Junction City, stated that she was a new resident since 2018 and had been increasingly stressed because of the lack of water to care for her lawn, which she took great pride in. She noted that the 100 gallons per person per day did not seem like a fair calculation when she had a single person household, whereas a family of six with the same size lot and home square footage could use a lot more water with 600 gallons per day. She agreed with the suggestion of getting water from the Willamette River.

Paul Barnett, 1416 Farmington Drive, Junction City, asked about the emergency 3rd and Cedar Well. Administrator Knope responded that it was used when the other four wells could not keep up with the water in the tanks; it was turned on to provide additional water to the system.

Mr. Barnett encouraged the Council to look at other cities that might be in the same situation to see what they were doing or had done. He was worried about the moratorium talk and if the homes that were being built around him would be able to be finished if there was a moratorium or would they have to lay off all those workers. He added that as the community increased, the tax base increased as well which could fund a lot of this.

Randy Fletcher, 250 Yellowwood, Junction City, stated that he had submitted some written remarks to the Council prior to the meeting. He thanked the Council for their service and thanked Administrator Knope for a great presentation, which caused his confidence in government to go much higher. He found some plans on the City's website that were not mentioned tonight: 2003 Junction City Master Plan, focused on the downtown area, projected population in 2020 was 8,130 people; 2010 Junction City Parks Plan, 2030 population projection of 10,268, which he thought Junction City was on track to hit. 2001 Oaklea Plan Amendment, which talked about the need for additional housing and identified land west of Oaklea Drive. He stated that he was against the moratorium and was concerned about the message it would send. The City identified need for housing growth 20 years ago, and the developers did not show up one night and start to build houses; they owned the land, the land was zoned residential, and the current subdivisions under construction were approved in 2017. Building permits had been issued and they had spent millions of dollars in investments, infrastructure, and fees. He thought a moratorium would be much more complicated than they thought, and the City would run a real risk of drawing some expensive litigation. He did not live in the Reserve, but these were their neighbors and the City should be welcoming them; they each paid \$10,000 per house towards the City's infrastructure and were shopping locally and using local services, which downtown needed. He saw a mission statement on the City's website for the City Water Department: "Our mission is to provide safe, clean water to all the residents of the city. We will continuously strive to improve the water system and ourselves to ensure the city has a safe and plentiful water supply for now in the future as well." He added that was exactly what they needed to do.

Martha Bronson, 280 Crona Street, Junction City, asked about receiving notifications on where they were at on the water restrictions. She had received a door notice and a mailing, which she thought was redundant. She did not have a smart phone but went to the Library for information on occasion. She said the City needed to let people know about the restriction status and when it would end. She was very conservative with her water usage, but because of the way the rates were structured, it made little difference in her bill and she would prefer to be charged for what she actually used. Her cats and plants did not like the City water and sometimes it had a very strong chlorine smell. She knew Director Kaping and other staff were working hard to improve the water quality, and she hoped it would improve.

Serge Serdsev, Pacific National Development, PO Box 3550, Salem, stated that they were a development company that owned a development off of Oaklea Drive and wanted to know how this was going to impact them. They had invested millions of dollars in purchasing land, offsite improvements, and development costs. They still had future phases of 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. They were in the red, as Phase 1 had not paid everything off yet, so they were depending on future phases to be positive in their investment. He asked if they would be able to move forward and noted that he was against a moratorium.

Jackie Stichler, 395 SW Juniper, Junction City, asked where they were at with the water restrictions. She said they had talked about more communication, and she was hoping they could see something on the City's website on the current levels of the water and how the conservation was going.

Attorney Connelly noted that it came up a couple of times on who does a moratorium affect and when does it cut off development. The common way would be to cease issuance of building permits, so anyone currently in construction that held a building permit would be able to finish. Anyone who had an approved land use approval or tentative subdivision but did not have building permits yet, would be an area for the Council to consider what they wanted to do. She highly recommended to any community to work with ongoing developments and figure out what worked for them and for the City to avoid the kinds of challenges that one gentleman mentioned.

Mayor Wells thanked everyone for their comments.

5. Contract for Backup Dispatch Services

Administrator Knope presented the request from Chief Waddell to put in place a contract with Lane County to temporarily help provide dispatching services. The City was currently short on dispatchers, with 3 dispatchers on duty and 1 on maternity leave, for a total of 4 (6 positions were in the budget). The City was in the middle of the recruitment process, and this temporary agreement would cover half a day and sunset in six months, to give time to hire and train. Oakridge was aware of the situation, and they had not been cut over yet for the City to dispatch for them.

MOTION: Councilor Hancock made a motion to approve a temporary agreement with Lane County Sheriff's Office on the terms presented and authorize the City Administrator to finalize an intergovernmental agreement with LSCO incorporating those terms and to execute it and any other associated documents. The motion was seconded by Councilor Leach and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

6. Adjournment

As there was no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:32 p.m.

ATTEST:

APPROVED:

Kitty Vodrup, City Recorder

Kenneth Wells, Mayor