

The City Council for the City of Junction City, met for a regular session and work session at 6:30 p.m. on Tuesday, September 25, 2018, in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 680 Greenwood Street, Junction City, Oregon.

PRESENT: Mayor, Mark Crenshaw; Councilors Kara McDaniel; Robert Stott, Jack Sumner, John Gambee, Dale Rowe (via phone), and Bill DiMarco; City Administrator, Jason Knope; Public Works Director, Gary Kaping; Finance Director, Mike Crocker; and City Recorder, Kitty Vodrup.

REGULAR SESSION

1. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance

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

2. Changes to the Agenda.

None.

3. JCHS Noise Parade Street Closure Request

Director Kaping presented the request for the October 3, 2018 Junction City High School Noise Parade. Same request as in previous years, and staff recommended approval.

MOTION: Councilor McDaniel made a motion to approve the street closure request for the Noise Parade on October 3, 2018 as conditioned in Attachment B with the nonexclusive use of City Streets for street closure from 6:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. The use of City streets will apply to the route described in Attachment A, contingent upon approval from the Oregon Department of Transportation. The motion was seconded by Councilor DiMarco and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

4. Budget Resolution for Police

Director Crocker stated that this was a follow up item from the July 10, 2018, where the Council approved the Police ODOT electronic citation grant and the expenditure of those funds. This was not anticipated in the budget, and equipment appropriations in the amount of the grant (\$67,000) would be increased in the Police Capital Funds.

Councilor DiMarco noted for the record that this was not a matter of spending taxpayer money but was housekeeping so the City could spend a grant.

A. Resolution No. 1 – An Appropriation Resolution for the Fiscal Year Commencing July 1, 2018 and Ending June 30, 2019 and Making Appropriations within the Police Capital Projects Fund.

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

5. Other Business.

None.

6. Adjournment. Regular Session was adjourned at 6:38 p.m.

WORK SESSION

1. Call to Order

Mayor Crenshaw called the Work Session to order at 6:38 p.m.

2. Water Tower Discussion

- Director Kaping reviewed that the Public Works Committee had forwarded the discussion on the Old Water Tower to the full Council. The Committee asked him to get updated bids from Preferred Tank and Tower.
- On August 23, 2018, revised bids were received from Preferred Tank and Tower. Restoration = \$150,000. Demolition = \$135,000 but did not include moving power lines or concrete bases.
- The bids were received from Preferred Tank and Tower as an estimate of costs for discussion purposes only. Because of the dollar amounts, the City would need to go through a formal bid process, per state procurement rules.

- The Water Tower was no longer used for water services, since the building of the two new water towers; however, it was being used for:
 - T-Mobile leased space on the tower and on the ground. This contract was established in 2006 for 30 years. Current annual lease payment was approximately \$17,000 and increased each year by 3%. Per contract, if the tower came down, the City would need to provide another location for T-Mobile's equipment.
 - Unwiredonline (Sold to McMinnville Access Company) provides broadband access to the schools. They also provide free wireless access to the City's satellite locations, such as the pool and senior center and also provide a secondary internet connection for the City, in lieu of fees. If the City were to pay for these costs, it would cost around \$1,500 per month.
 - The City has back up antennas for the Police Department and Fire Department, as well as back up equipment for Public Works radios and SCADA.
 - The old Fire Siren is on the tower and has been repurposed as part of the emergency response plan for community notification.
- The City Code does not allow erecting a cell tower within the City limits. Staff was talking about the possibility of putting up a new tower at the wastewater treatment site to relocate City equipment, due to safety concerns in having emergency services being located adjacent to a railroad.
- The cost of a new cell tower could range between \$25,000 and \$150,000.
- Ms. JoAnne Perkins, 1012 Green Meadows, Junction City, stated that she had spoken to someone from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and found out that the Water Tower was eligible to be on the historic registry, but was not actually on it. SHPO said they had come out to Junction City in 2001 to check out something and had noticed the Water Tower, but nothing had been filed. SHPO said they would be reviewing the information and would get back to her and Director Kaping on if they even think the City should pursue it further. She noted that she hoped the Council could make a decision on what to do with the tower, either for demolition or restoration.
- Ms. Perkins asked about if funds could be set aside for either scenario. Administrator Knope responded that money could be earmarked in the Water Capital Fund for the demolition or preservation of the tower and then those could be clearly delineated in the next budget preparation. In addition, the T-Mobile lease payments could be set aside in their own reserve fund for future maintenance needs.
- Mr. Doug Welsh, 805 Oak Street, Junction City, stated that many of his friends wanted to see the tower stay, as it was definitely a landmark. He asked if the tower could be used for a backup reserve for the fire department. Director Kaping responded that it could not be, as it was too short and using it would cause the water pressure in town to drop, with the two new towers.
- Mr. Welsh asked if more communication equipment could be added to the tower. Director Kaping responded that they would need to run a structural analysis to see if the tower could hold more weight. It was noted that other communities had put so much equipment on their towers that they were not recognizable. Ms. Perkins noted that the tower looked good right now.
- Mr. Welsh asked about the metal being recycled, if demoed. Director Kaping responded that would be included in the bid price, as the contractor would take the metal.
- It was noted that the City owned the entire block where the tower was located and it would be important to find out if the tower could be brought to current seismic codes, if restored, and how that might impact the ability to do any future building on that site.

- It was noted that the City could look at stabilizing the tower for safety concerns, without committing to the whole thing and providing more time to consider how to fund maintenance with the community. The cost for stabilization could be around \$50,000.
- It was asked if the other two water towers could serve as communication towers, and staff responded that they could not as they were not designed to hold equipment.
- The cost to maintain the tower, if it were to be restored, would be \$150,000 every 10 years, for painting the inside and outside, as well as having a little extra for miscellaneous repairs.
- Director Kaping noted that in the 1970s, all the inside and outside paint was blasted off and repainted. Tank inspections were held five or six years later, but then stopped. After Administrator Knope was hired, another tank inspection was done. There were some chunks of rust in the bowl and since the new towers were erected in 2010, nothing has been done.
- It was asked if there would be others interested in putting equipment on a tower, if the city built one at the lagoon site. Administrator Knope responded that he was not sure if there would or would not be demand. He added that it was unknown whether Unwiredonline's equipment could be moved to the lagoon site or not.
- It was noted that from a safety standpoint because of the proximity to the railroad tracks, it would be beneficial to move the City's backup equipment to another site, but that would not mean the Water Tower would need to be taken down; in fact, that could be an enhancement to the historical preservation of the tower to have some equipment removed from it.
- Administrator Knope stated that a tower for Police Department and Public Works backup emergency operations would be much less of a tower, compared to what was needed for something a cell company would need in height. There would also be a higher likelihood of getting a new tower grant funded for that purpose, versus a multi-use tower.
- Director Kaping noted that the estimated \$50,000 for structural was something that was recommended by a structural engineer, if the tower were to remain up. Administrator Knope added that if the Council wanted to do some structural work to buy some time, in addition to the structural he would recommend doing an interior coating of the bowl, which would be another \$30,000.
- In response to timelines, Director Kaping responded that if he put bids out soon, work could probably be scheduled in the spring. Administrator Knope added that there was a limited window of spring and fall, due to the festival.
- It was noted that the equipment on the tower brings in revenue as well as serving local community groups. By keeping the water tower there, the City would still be making money and could pay for the tower's maintenance.
- Administrator Knope noted that this whole process began when an engineer had said it would take a minimum of \$300,000 to restore the tower and cost nothing to take it down. Director Kaping noted that was why he chose Preferred Tank and Tower, as they were in Kentucky and could provide a neutral opinion.
- It was noted that it would be beneficial in making a decision to have the actual bid costs on demolition or restoration.

The Council consensus was to have staff have a different structural engineering firm put together a Request for Proposal (RFP) for demolition, which would include needing to provide the costs for moving power, etc. and a RFP for restoration, which would include a sub part for the seismic upgrade work. Both bids would include language that the City could reject all bids at any given time, so the City could maintain flexibility and would not be committed to any one path.

Councilor McDaniel noted that the City was getting approximately \$30,000 in revenue or benefits for rental revenue plus an added incentive and she did not feel it should be up to community members to try and save the tower or donate towards maintenance, as the City would be making about \$540,000 over the next 18 years by keeping the tower up. She felt it should be up to the City to maintain it and not to other groups.

3. Adjournment. The Work Session was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

ATTEST:

APPROVED:

Kitty Vodrup, City Recorder

Mark Crenshaw, Mayor