

The City Council for the City of Junction City, met in regular session at 6:30 p.m. on Tuesday, November 8, 2022 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, Beverly Ficek; Council President, Ken Wells; Councilors Sandie Thomas, Sidney Washburne, Andrea Ceniga, John P. Gambia, and Karen Leach; City Administrator, Jason Knope; City Attorney, Carrie Connelly; Police Chief, Bob Morris; Public Works Director, Gary Kaping; Finance Director, Mike Crocker; Public Works Superintendent, Jeremy Tracer; and City Recorder, Kitty Vodrup .

1. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance

Mayor Ficek opened the meeting at 6:30 p.m., led the Pledge of Allegiance, and took roll call.

2. Changes to the Agenda. None.

3. Approval of Minutes – October 11 and 25, 2022

MOTION: Councilor Wells made a motion to approve the October 11, 2022 minutes. The motion was seconded by Councilor Washburne and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

MOTION: Councilor Thomas made a motion to approve the October 25, 2022 minutes. The motion was seconded by Councilor Ceniga and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

4. Public Comment on Items not Listed on the Agenda

A. Follow-up from Staff on Previous Comments. None.

B. New Comments from Public.

Roy Rowlett, 411 E. 2nd Avenue, Junction City, expressed concerns with two City employees, related to construction issues he was having with a contractor building behind his house.

Larry Weir, 424 E. 1st Avenue, Junction City, expressed problems with the contractor building behind his house, including drainage concerns and a damaged fence. He added concerns that the City had told him that the construction was within City ordinances.

Administrator Knope noted that the Council did not address personnel complaints, so a personnel complaint would not come to Council after it was filed; there was an internal process, per the City's Personnel Manual and union contracts. He added that if Mr. Rowlett wanted to file a complaint, he could get the appropriate paperwork from Recorder Vodrup at City Hall and it would work through the internal personnel complaint process.

5. Public Hearing – Comprehensive Plan Amendment/Rezone (CPA-22-23/RZ-22-24).

A. Public Hearing

Mayor Ficek opened the public hearing at 6:45 p.m. She asked if there were any Council members who had a conflict of interest or exparte contact/bias; there were none. Mayor Ficek read the required statements for the public hearing.

Staff Report

Gary Darnielle, Lane Council of Governments Principal Attorney, stated that the plan amendment and zone change were before the Council via an application for the Maple Springs First Addition Subdivision File 22-04. The subdivision was for 9 lots that were intended to be occupied by duplexes. In order to accomplish that, the property must be zoned R3 Multi-Family Residential and the Comprehensive Plan diagram changed accordingly. In reviewing this application, staff realized that about 35,000 square feet of the subject property was still zoned R1 and the plan diagram designated it as low density residential, which would not support what was proposed by the applicant, so the plan amendment and zone change was attempting to put all of the property that would support this subdivision in R3 zoning and multi-family residential development. Neither the comprehensive plan nor the code provided any specific standards for changing the plan diagram or the zoning map; however, the change needed to be consistent with applicable statutes, administrative rules, and any applicable policies in the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Darnielle continued that because this was a quasi-judicial action, 20 days notice had been given before the hearing. ORS 197.610(1) required changes to the comprehensive plan and zoning maps to be noticed to the Department of Land Conservation and Development, giving them 35 days notice to comment; that notice was provided, and no comments were received. ORS 197.175(2) required the comprehensive plan to be in compliance with the statewide

planning goals, and ORS 227.186(2) required all legislative acts pertaining to comprehensive plan or zoning be adopted by a city by ordinance.

Mr. Darnielle reviewed the applicable statewide planning goals: Goal 2 provided for coordination amongst other agencies; referrals were sent out to Lane County and local special districts and comments were incorporated into the staff report. For Goal 5, no natural resources were found on the property. For Goal 7, no natural hazards, such as a 100-year flood hazard were observed. Goal 10 dealt with housing, and the City's Buildable Land Inventory estimated that 20% of the City's housing needed between 2011 and 2031 would be high density residential; the density proposed by this subdivision equaled the assumptions made by the plan for high density residential. Goal 11 dealt with the availability of public facilities such as water, sewer, and other facilities available to the subdivision. Goal 12 had to do with transportation and there were not any transportation goal related issues that were found because the change was fairly minor; however, the approval of this subdivision would allow the applicant to eventually dedicate land to create Farmington Drive, which would be necessary to support another subdivision proposal, Phases 3 through 6 of the Reserve, which staff was currently working on. Goal 14 had to do with the Urban Growth Boundary, and this zone change and plan amendment did not affect either the City limits or the Urban Growth Boundary. On September 21, 2022, the Planning Commission approved a recommendation that the Council approve the zone change and plan amendment. On October 19, 2022, the Planning Commission approved the subdivision on the condition that the Council approve the zone change and the plan amendment.

Councilor Gambie asked what the connecting street was to Farmington Drive. Director Kaping responded 10th Street and noted this would be the second exit out of the Reserve Phases 2 through 6.

Councilor Gambie asked if the 35,000 square feet included the entire 9 lots. Mr. Darnielle responded that the 35,000 was only a portion of the 9 lots and included 5 lots that were currently zoned R1.

Applicant Testimony. None.

Public Testimony – Those in Favor. None.

Public Testimony – Neutral Testimony. None.

Public Testimony – Those Opposed. None.

Staff Additional Comments – None.

Applicant Final Comments. None.

Further Questions from Council. None.

Mayor Ficek closed the public hearing and record at 6:58 p.m.

B. Ordinance No. 1 – An Ordinance Amending the City of Junction City Comprehensive Plan Map and Official Zoning Map for the Western 64-Foot on Lane County Assessor's Map 15-04-31-23, Tax Lot 05000 (Planning File Nos. CPA-22-23/RZ-22-24).

Administrator Knope read Ordinance No. 1 in full.

MOTION: Councilor Wells made a motion to read Ordinance No. 1 by title only. The motion was seconded by Councilor Washburne and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

Mayor Ficek read Ordinance No. 1 by title only.

MOTION: Councilor Wells made a motion to adopt Ordinance No. 1. The motion was seconded by Councilor Leach and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

6. School Resource Officer Contract Discussion

Administrator Knope stated that at the October 25, 2022 Work Session, the Council had asked that the School Resource Officer (SRO) contract and job description be brought back to this meeting.

Mayor Ficek asked for public comment.

Cindy Montgomery, 1215 Oak Street/1095 Ivy Street, Junction City, noted that her business had been vandalized four times in the last five years by middle school students, and she thought having a School Resource Officer would be beneficial in more effectively addressing these types of issues. She hoped the Council could find a way to compromise and have an SRO in the schools.

Sandy Sjoblom, 94399 Oaklea Drive, Junction City, expressed her support for having an SRO in the schools and hoped the Council would approve.

Mayor Ficek noted that both Administrator Knope and Chief Morris had said it would be possible to keep the City safe and have this SRO position.

Jedidiah Bartreau, 645 W. 6th Avenue, Junction City, expressed support for having an SRO. He thought it would be good to have a dedicated officer for the kids, and if the School would pay part of that, it would benefit the whole city.

Branden Esch, 980 Kaylee Avenue, Junction City, expressed support for having an SRO.

Alexandra Frankfurt, 29639 Dane Lane, Junction City, expressed support for having an SRO. She noted the money was already budgeted and there were resources available for this position.

Daniel Allred, 445 Timothy Street, Junction City, thanked the Council for bringing this back on the agenda. He noted that people were in favor of the program and they hoped to get it restarted so they could get all the fruits from the program.

Kevin Gordon, Principal, Laurel Elementary, noted there were 520 students at Laurel, and he expressed the benefits of having an SRO, including having someone in the building, establishing a positive connection between students and law enforcement, helping students make right decisions, etc. He hoped the Council would approve the contract tonight.

Teresa Rogers, 675 Cedar Street, Junction City, expressed support for having an SRO and hoped the Council approved tonight.

Brian Young, Principal of Oaklea Middle School, noted that there were 500 students at Oaklea, and 1700 citizens resided in the schools daily, so the partnership between the Junction City Police Department (JCPD) and the schools was very important. Having an officer in the schools allowed for the establishment of relationships with the students and it built trust in law enforcement, noting that some students never had a positive experience with someone in uniform. The School District called on JCPD time and time again and were very thankful for JCPD. The district was excited about this partnership and opportunity that it would bring for the kids, families, and the relationship between the city, schools, and JCPD.

Sandy Sjoblom noted that JCPD was doing amazing things for the community and it was great to see them building positive relationships with the schools. She thought it was vital to continue this and have an SRO.

Kristina Holton, 986 Unity Drive, Junction City, thanked the Council for bringing this back, as she thought it was an important matter. She thanked everyone who showed up to express support for this very important position and let the Council know what was important to them.

Cindy Montgomery noted that Section A(2) of the contract read that the City would provide \$66,000 annually and asked if that should read the School District would provide.

Discussion followed and the consensus of the Council was to amend A(2) to read, "Over the agreement period, the City will provide the difference annually toward salary and fringe benefits of the School Resource Officer over the amount the School District provides under B(1)."

Councilor Washburne noted that A(6) read that the Chief was responsible for supervision of the SRO, but the job description read that the Deputy Chief supervised the position.

Administrator Knope responded that he would recommend changing the job description to read that the Chief would be the supervisor.

Councilor Thomas asked if Territorial was one of the schools the SRO would work at. Administrator Knope responded yes.

John E. Gambie, 93998 Prairie Road, Junction City, asked if there would be one officer for all four schools and if they would be in uniform. Administrator Knope responded yes. Mayor Ficek added the SRO would divide their time between the four schools. Chief Morris added that traditionally the SRO worked in all four schools, and if there was a major investigation at Territorial, the county would do that and not JCPD.

Sandy Sjoblom expressed support for the SRO position and building positive relationships with the students. Chief Morris responded that over the last four months since Officer Janet Deckard had been dedicated to the schools, all students waved, smiled, and made eye contact with any officer driving down the street which had not happened before that.

Cindy Montgomery hoped that everyone could realize that we were one Junction City and that there needed to be bridges between the business community and the schools, schools and the City, and City and businesses and they needed to do what was right for all the citizens in Junction City. The Council needed to find a way to compromise with the school and JCPD so that they could be one community. She added that because it was in the budget, she thought they should be trying hard to approve it or at the very least find a compromise to get the position in the near future.

Mayor Ficek noted that there were 1940 students and staff at all four schools.

Jack Sumner, 1061 Quince Drive, Junction City, stated that he was on the Budget Committee and was in favor of the SRO position. He asked how they could authorize the SRO position without having the 10th police officer in place.

Administrator Knope responded that after the SRO contract was approved, he would give chief direction to start the 10th officer recruitment. He continued that the current officer assigned to schools would move into the SRO position, and the 10th officer could be hired to focus on traffic enforcement. He added that without the SRO contract being approved, the City would not have the \$66,000 from the School District and would not have funding available to hire the 10th officer.

MOTION: Councilor Gambie made a motion to approve the Intergovernmental Agreement with the Junction City School District for a School Resource Officer as amended and authorize the City Administrator to sign the necessary documents. The motion was seconded by Councilor Wells.

Councilor Wells asked for confirmation that the adopted budget included 7 police officers, Chief, Deputy Chief, plus the School Resource officer. Administrator Knope responded that was correct.

Councilor Wells noted that the change they made to the draft budget was \$121,100, and the school would be putting in \$66,000 with the City making up the difference. Administrator Knope responded that the budget included the anticipated \$66,000 in police revenue from the School District, but without that revenue, the Police Department would not be able to fund the 10th officer position of \$121,100, as it would be \$66,000 short and there were not other resources to cover that.

Councilor Wells stated that he wanted the audience to know that there were 9 officers on staff right now, but 3 of them were new, in training, and could not work alone. He wanted everyone to understand what would be given up in coverage to make this work. He added that it had been said that they needed to learn to give and take and he wanted everyone to understand the whole picture.

Mayor Ficek noted that the Police Department was already spending much of its time at the schools, but without this contract, the City would not receive the \$66,000 from the School District. She expressed her support and importance of the position.

Councilor Gambia expressed agreement with Councilor Wells that give and take was much needed. He commended Chief Morris for putting an officer in the schools and noted that the School District was making a generous offer to help pay for this position which was a win/win for the City, School, and taxpayers. If the Council did not approve this contract, the School District would need to hire someone else, which would come out of the taxpayers pocket and the City would not be able to hire the 10th police officer to help the police force grow. He had heard from 63 people in favor of this position and no citizens in opposition.

Councilor Ceniga stated that there was not one person on the Council who was not in favor of the SRO position. Her concerns were current staffing, with 3 new officers in training for 16 weeks and only having 6 officers to cover the entire City. She cited current traffic concerns with people running red lights, JCPD staff not being able to address things quickly because of staffing, the hardships of officers being spread too thin, officers working alone, etc. She added that she wanted to continue to work with the School District and make something happen that worked for JCPD, the schools, and for the City so that everybody was getting their needs met.

Councilor Gambia noted that at some point they needed to let staff and the City Administrator do their jobs and give them the ability to hire a 10th officer which they could do tonight; the 10th officer would help address the traffic enforcement, staff shortage, and back up concerns.

Councilor Leach stated that Councilor Ceniga's comments came from her heart, as she served in law enforcement. She continued that she would love to see an SRO again and to discuss this again in February or March after the 3 new officers had completed training. She expressed her concerns with being short on officers, including officers having to work alone. She wanted to discuss this again on what worked best for the School District and the City and agreed with Ms. Montgomery that there needed to be give and take.

Mayor Ficek reminded the Council that if they put this off that did not mean the School District would wait.

Councilor Thomas expressed her support for the SRO position and noted that she was a long-time resident who loved this City and came from a family of police officers. She expressed concerns on the impacts of the current staffing level and noted that it would be important to have the 3 new officers trained and on the ground before approving this.

NOTE: The motion to approve the SRO contract failed by a vote of 4 to 2, with Councilors Thomas, Washburne, Ceniga, and Leach voting against and Councilors Wells and Gambia voting in favor.

7. Light Parade Street Closure Request

Director Kaping presented the Tri-County Chamber of Commerce request to close specific streets for the annual Light Parade.

MOTION: Councilor Ceniga made a motion to approve the street closure request for the Light Parade in Junction on December 2, 2022 as conditioned in Attachment B with the nonexclusive use of City streets for street closure from 6:45 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. The use of City streets will apply to the route shown in Attachment A. The motion was seconded by Councilor Leach and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

8. Moose Lodge Street Closure Request

Director Kaping presented the request from the Moose Lodge to close Front Street from 4th to 6th for the Drive by Santa event.

MOTION: Councilor Leach made a motion to approve the street closure request for the Moose Lodge Drive by Santa on December 17, 2022 as conditioned in Attachment B with the nonexclusive use of City streets for street closure from 12:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. The use of City streets will apply to the section of Front Street between 4th and 6th Street. The motion was seconded by Councilor Wells and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

9. Reader Board Purchase

Director Kaping presented the request to buy an electronic reader board. This would be placed in the location of the current reader board and would be funded from Rural Tourism Marketing funds. Staff reached out to three vendors and received one bid from Stewart Signs. The Community Development Committee reviewed on November 2, 2022 and recommended approval.

MOTION: Councilor Ceniga made a motion to approve the purchase of a reader board from Stewart Signs in the amount not to exceed \$21,138 and authorize the Public Works Director to sign the necessary documents. The motion was seconded by Councilor Washburne and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

10. Pool Fence Extension

Superintendent Tracer presented the request to extend the fence to enclose the mounded area to the south and west of the pool and to open more deck space in the pool area. Staff reached out to three vendors and received one bid from Island Fence in the amount of \$22,950. The Community Services Committee reviewed on October 4, 2022 and recommended approval.

MOTION: Councilor Washburne made a motion to approve the bid from Island Fence and authorize the Public Works Superintendent to sign the necessary documents. The motion was seconded by Councilor Wells and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

11. Alderdale Park Playground Installation

Superintendent Tracer presented the request for a vendor to install the playground equipment at Alderdale Park, which included pouring of concrete. Staff reached out to three vendors and one response was received from Outdoor Play and Amenities in the amount of \$18,825.

MOTION: Councilor Wells made a motion to approve the bid from Outdoor Play and Amenities and authorize the Public Works Superintendent to sign the necessary documents. The motion was seconded by Councilor Leach and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

12. Council Agenda Forecaster

Administrator Knope presented the forecaster. Councilor Wells had submitted an Agenda Item Request to plan and present a City Administrator evaluation. The Council consensus was to put this on the December 13, 2022 agenda. Also on that agenda would be an Executive Session for the Council to review the investigation report on complaints against the Police Chief, where Administrator Knope would then ask the Council if they would like to waive the attorney/client privileged document so it could be released to the public.

13. Committee Reports

Public Works Committee. (November 7, 2022). Councilor Washburne reported:

- Discussed Water System Follow up. Staff was working on necessary steps, including getting water rights to get a new well put in.
- Public Works had accomplished quite a few things this year, including taking care of the major potholes near Dane Lane, doing the pool expansion, etc., which were beneficial to the citizens of Junction City. He thanked Public Works for their hard work.

Community Development Committee. (November 2, 2022). Councilor Ceniga reported:

- Discussed the electronic reader board, Light Parade, and Drive by Santa street closures.

Public Safety Committee. (October 27, 2022). Councilor Gambie reported:

- Reviewed data report from the new speed warning trailers. On a daily average, almost 1,000 cars came in and out of the Reserve on Oaklea Drive. The Comp Plan Amendment they approved tonight would help relieve some of that by creating some connectivity to the Reserve and not forcing all traffic through 15th.
- Police Department was doing a great job of handling hundreds of calls each month.

14. Staff Reports

Director Crocker reported: The Lane County tax levy summary for Junction City was \$3,333,000, and the City had budgeted receiving \$3,332,000. He added that Lane County had a high collection rate. Staff was busy with the Tyler software installation, and the next City utility bill would be from this new software.

Director Kaping reported: The Utility bill statement would include direction on using the new payment system and he encouraged everyone to review.

Chief Morris reported: The traffic reader boards were providing good information and showed statistical data on speeding, slowed down speeders, and helped the Police Department identify where they needed to deploy officers. The call volume at the Police Department was still high, including a high volume of activity at the schools.

Attorney Connelly reported: The chicken ordinance amendments and 2022 Public Contracting Rules ordinance had been drafted and sent to staff, to work through Committees and then come to Council.

15. Previous Month’s Expenditures.

Councilor Thomas asked about an expenditure for the City’s 150th birthday. Administrator Knope responded that was for the food at the Community Barbeque.

Councilor Thomas asked why a local vendor, such as the Moose Lodge, was not used. Staff responded that the same vendor was used who served at Burgers with Bob.

16. Councilor Comments/Questions

Councilor Wells noted that this had been a long meeting where they covered a lot. He thanked the audience for attending the meeting and providing their input.

Councilor Leach expressed appreciation to everyone who attended the meeting and provided their input, as that was important to the Council. She continued that it was important for everyone on both sides to discuss and understand each other. She thanked staff for their work and expressed appreciation for the new reader board. She added that the SRO discussion was tough tonight, but the School District, Police Department, and City needed to go forward and work together.

Councilor Gambie stated that he was tired of the rhetoric that we all needed to work together to accomplish something when they had spent 8 months working together and the Council’s inability to compromise or negotiate resulted in the City losing \$66,000 this year and potentially every year and inhibited their ability to hire a 10th officer.

Councilor Thomas thanked everyone for attending the meeting. She noted that the SRO was a hard decision for the Council, but she cared for all citizens and they needed to continue moving forward.

17. Mayor’s Comments

Mayor Ficek shared that she had a conversation with Vidal Francis, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Region 2, Area 5 Manager on the Council’s letter on Highway 99 traffic concerns that they had received. Mr. Francis and his staff would be attending the December 13, 2022 Council meeting to talk to the Council about these concerns and share ODOT project updates. Mayor Ficek wished everyone a good and blessed Thanksgiving.

18. Adjournment

As there was no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:02 p.m.

ATTEST:

APPROVED:

Kitty Vodrup, City Recorder

Beverly A. Ficek, Mayor