

The City Council for the City of Junction City, met in regular session at 6:30 p.m. on Tuesday, December 10, 2019, in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 680 Greenwood Street, Junction City, Oregon.

**PRESENT:** Mayor, Mark Crenshaw; Councilors Sandie Thomas, Robert Stott, John Gambee, Dale Rowe, and Bill DiMarco; Excused Absence: Councilor Andrea Ceniga; City Administrator, Jason Knope; City Attorney, Ross Williamson; Police Chief, Bob Morris; Public Works Director, Gary Kaping; Finance Director, Mike Crocker; HR/Admin Services Manager, Stephanie Moran; and Planning Technician Tere Andrews.

**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**

Move Item 19 Ophelia's Place Facility Request after Agenda Item 9.

**3. Approval of Minutes – October 22 and November 12, 2019**

**MOTION:** Councilor Rowe made a motion to approve the October 22 and November 12, 2019 minutes. The motion was seconded by Councilor Stott and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

**4. Review of Previous Month's Expenditures**

Mayor Crenshaw asked if there were any Council comments or questions on the previous month's expenditures. There were none.

**5. Public Comment on Items not Listed on the Agenda**

None.

**6. Lifesaving Award Presentation**

Chief Morris presented a Lifesaving Award to Dispatcher Jeff Perkins, who administered CPR to a citizen who had been injured in a traffic accident on October 30, 2019.

**7. Moose Lodge Youth Awareness Program – Appreciation to Police Department**

Mr. Duane Edmondson presented a certificate of appreciation to Chief Morris and the Police Department for their support, participation, and superb presentations to the Moose Lodge Youth Awareness Program students.

**8. Audit Presentation – Isler and Company**

Mr. Gatlin Hawkins, Isler CPAs, presented the Fiscal Year 2018-2019 audit. He was pleased to report that there were no adjusting entries that were needed in order to bring the financial records into compliance with generally accepted accounting principles, and they did not have any significant difficulties or disagreements with management. Overall, the City's financial health had been improving largely due to the economy doing better, property values rising, development increasing, and other sources of revenue coming in.

**9. Public Hearing – Paddock Zone of Benefit**

Mayor Crenshaw opened the public hearing for the Paddock Zone of Benefit.

**Staff Report**

Director Kaping stated that this was a continuation from the November 12, 2019 Council meeting. Mr. Jamie Paddock developed the lots at the southeast corner of Oaklea Drive and West 6<sup>th</sup> and had requested a zone of benefit for the sanitary sewer extension that he constructed for that property. At the November 12<sup>th</sup> Council meeting, staff was asked to take this back to the Public Works Committee to look at other options. One option staff talked with legal counsel on was for the City to buy the rights to the zone of benefit from Mr. Paddock. Staff reached out to Mr. Paddock, who was open to the idea and to accepting a \$40,000 reduction off the total cost, which would be a cost of \$271,283 to the City. If the City purchased this, there would be a contract with Mr. Paddock that he could no longer go after a zone of benefit or SDC (System Development Charge) credits for that particular project. The Public Works Committee reviewed and recommended forwarding to Council for more discussion. Four options were before the Council, including approving the resolution to create the zone of benefit for Mr. Paddock, the City purchasing the zone of benefit rights, providing other direction to staff, or taking no action.

**Public Testimony**

Ms. Adele McCranie, 645 Vine Street, Junction City, stated that she did not know what it would mean for them if the City bought the rights and since no decision would be made tonight, she asked if they could have more information so they could try and figure out what was going on. Mayor Crenshaw responded that the intent was to take testimony and make a decision tonight.

Ms. A. McCranie stated that she felt this was incredibly unfair and they had no idea about the ramifications of this when Mr. Paddock built those homes. Had they known, they would have strenuously objected and done everything they could not to have those built.

Mr. Ron Edwards, 645 Vine Street, Junction City, stated that he did not know why Mr. Paddock was allowed to go down 6<sup>th</sup> Street when he could have hooked into High Pass but just did not want to pay fees to someone else. Mr. Edwards felt that was wrong and ridiculous, as Mr. Paddock was avoiding paying what he now wanted them to pay. The City should have let people know in advance when a proposed development might affect them, instead of letting it happen and then this happened. He felt it was wrong that a developer could do this.

Ms. Barbara McCranie, 634/645 Vine Street, Junction City, noted that she would like to have more background information, before she made a decision on something that would cost her thousands of dollars. Mayor Crenshaw responded that the Council was not asking citizens of Junction City to make a decision on this issue. The Council was hearing testimony so that the Council could make a decision on this issue. He noted that the Council had heard and fully understood the concerns. He noted that he was very supportive of how this would impact the individuals; however, the Council did need to consider the entirety of the situation.

**Council Questions or Comments**

Councilor Thomas asked which of the four options would work best for the citizens of Junction City. Director Kaping responded that it was a policy decision. If the Council was looking to provide some good will with its county neighbors, then the option for the City to buy the rights to the zone of benefit may benefit them more than putting on the zone of benefit from Mr. Paddock.

Councilor Gambee asked why Director Kaping said it would be better for the county neighbors. Director Kaping responded that if the Council chose to buy the rights, the contract would be finalized and then he would bring back to Committee and Council the question of what they wanted to do with the zone of benefit and if they would want to impose that zone of benefit; that would be a policy decision.

Councilor Gambee stated that his understanding of a zone of benefit was you did not have to pay anything unless you chose to connect to the pipe that the contractor put in the street. Director Kaping responded that was correct.

Mayor Crenshaw noted for clarification that if a property did not tap into that system within a 20-year period, there would be no fee to consider. Director Kaping responded that was correct.

Administrator Knope stated that one point of clarification that came up in the last meeting was that for the county property owners near that line that currently had a septic tank, if that tank failed the county would not issue a septic tank permit and the property owner would be forced to connect to that line. Director Kaping added that was correct and the county would not issue a permit for a property within 150 feet.

Mayor Crenshaw noted that the resolution showed an average of \$3,000 per dwelling unit. If a property had four potential dwelling units, it would be a total of \$12,000. He asked if a property owner who hooked up one dwelling would only pay for that one or if they would have to pay for the entire cost. Director Kaping responded that he and Administrator Knope had looked at the way the last zone of benefit was done, and once that property decided they were going to come in, the full zone of benefit would be applied to the property, not just for one dwelling.

Councilor Rowe stated that he had two points. The property owners on Vine Street were currently in the county and on septic and if their septic failed, they would be forced to tap into the City's sewer if they were within 150 feet. If the Council approved the zone of benefit and the owners had to connect, they would pay Mr. Paddock his portion and then would have to pay the City for hook up, so they would be dinged twice.

Councilor Rowe continued that his other point was the City had never said no to a zone of benefit, as far as he could tell, so they were in a little bit of a sticky situation if they turned Mr. Paddock down and would probably have to defend that. Even though the cost was fairly high, he thought the cost was probably more reasonable and fairer to the citizens of Junction City than a legal battle.

Councilor Gambie stated that there were probably two or three houses on both sides of Vine Street that were 150 feet away from the pipe. Administrator Knope responded that when the first house connected and the line was extended, it would then be a rolling 150 feet from where the line was extended to. It would eventually make its way down that particular segment of road, with the ripple effect.

Councilor Thomas asked if the City could set up some kind of "help me" fund like they were talking about for sidewalks, if the zone of benefit was formed for Mr. Paddock. Administrator Knope responded that the only time the City had done anything like that was during the Department of Corrections (DOC) project, when they extended water and sewer lines down to the prison and hospital. There was a limited window of time, based on construction, where the price was reduced. Director Kaping thought it was 365 days.

Administrator Knope continued that one point he wanted to throw out that came up in the last meeting was this line project was actually on the City's Capital Improvement Plan for the Wastewater System; therefore, a portion of every SDC that the City collected for sewer was saved towards this line as well. When looking at this price, they should keep in mind that the City already had saved some money towards this project. This was something that at some point in time the City was going to do itself anyway.

Councilor Stott asked if there was any way that the City could recoup some of the money when people hooked up. Director Kaping responded that would be a policy decision for the Council.

Mayor Crenshaw asked for clarification that option 2 for the City to purchase the zone of benefit right did not necessarily relieve anyone from a requirement to pay the fees as listed on the schedule. Director Kaping responded that it depended on what policy the Council came up with after the contract was approved.

Councilor DiMarco asked if this was the only zone of benefit structure that could have been proposed, in the way the assessments were broken down. Director Kaping responded that the assessments were broken down by dwelling unit and that was the way they had always been broken down.

Councilor DiMarco expressed his understanding and stated that instead of assessing all the dwelling units for a property at the same time, could the City modify the assessment if they purchased the zone of benefit right so that a property would only have to pay for one dwelling unit if hooking up one house. Administrator Knope responded that if the City purchased the rights, the City would have to go through the process again because the zone of benefit application would be withdrawn by the applicant. Then at that point, the City would have the ability to do nothing or propose its own zone of benefit with its own structure.

Councilor DiMarco asked what the City would be purchasing when purchasing the rights. Administrator Knope responded that right now, Mr. Paddock had the right to his zone of benefit and the City could purchase the rights to it.

Councilor DiMarco asked if this went through legal counsel. Administrator Knope responded that it did. Councilor DiMarco asked if Mr. Paddock was up against a deadline. Director Kaping responded no.

Councilor DiMarco asked if Mr. Paddock had more time to submit this. Administrator Knope responded that he could and there was not a deadline that the application had to be made, once the project was complete. Before Mr. Paddock started construction, he submitted notice to the City and that was all from a timeline standpoint that was required.

Councilor DiMarco asked for confirmation that there would be no sunset and Mr. Paddock could apply in 10 or 20 years, so that was why the City would want to solve this one way or the other. Administrator Knope confirmed that was correct. Director Kaping added that if the Council chose to purchase the rights, Mr. Paddock would have to sign a contract that he would never go after a zone of benefit or SDC credit for that particular project.

Councilor DiMarco noted that if the City took this zone in order to provide some relief for the folks on Vine Street, then the question to the constituents would become if the City was purchasing this and just going to write it off, why would all the taxpayers in town have to subsidize some of these property owners that were going to build multiple houses and not have to pay.

Administrator Knope stated that his response to that would be, there was the conflict between the zone of benefit and SDC. If the City chose to purchase the rights and not proceed forward with the zone of benefit, then in essence that would become an SDC based project. For an example, if you had someone on Vine Street that had one house on a property that could have 10; they connect their one house, they would pay the SDC for that one house. Later on down the road, if they split the property up and built 9 more houses, they would have to pay the SDCs for all of those. So, everybody would be paying their fair share that way and that's in the same vein of how SDC projects work. The difference from what the City would typically do in this case, was the contractor built the project for the City instead of it being a City run project, even though it was built to City standards.

Councilor DiMarco noted that just like with Parks SDCs, these SDCs went into a big pot and were not necessarily designated. Administrator Knope responded that was correct.

Councilor DiMarco stated that he thought they needed to consider a way to recoup reasonable costs for the taxpayers because there were other uses for those SDCs. He was just looking for an equitable deal both for the people in the county and for the taxpayers that were going to foot the bill if the City paid it off.

Administrator Knope stated that whether it was five years from now or whenever it said in the City's master plan that it was time to build that segment, then the City would have used the Sewer Fund anyway to build that segment and would not have went to the ratepayers to ask them to cough up more money for the project. One way you could look at this was that they have shifted timelines a little bit as part of project order and project priority. The other piece to keep in mind was the City would not have been able to build the same line for that price. If the Council purchased the rights to this, it did not mean the City would be committed to charging the full assessment amounts and could ask for a lesser amount.

Councilor DiMarco asked if the City could assess EDUs (Equivalent Dwelling Units) as they were built. Administrator Knope responded that if the City owned the rights to it, the City could propose that methodology. Attorney Williamson added that he thought the City's code allowed the City quite a bit of discretion.

Councilor DiMarco stated that he thought this discussion was maybe for the next meeting and they could get there by approving number two with a stated intent that the City would try and provide relief to everybody - the taxpayers and the people in the county.

Administrator Knope stated that by the City purchasing it, it stopped any kind of pressure or time block to move forward and let the Council approach this at its own pace, regardless of what it wanted to do.

Mayor Crenshaw asked the McCrainies and Mr. Edwards what their intent was for their property. Ms. A. McCranie responded to have it stay as it was right now. Mr. Edwards added that the assessment read that they had 7 houses they would have to pay for, when they only had 2 houses on there currently. He noted that paying for just the 2 and not the whole 7 seemed fair to him. He added that there would be no way they could build 7 homes on their property, and he was not sure how they came up with 7 EDUs. Mr. Edwards

continued that he did not have any plans to develop and did not think the area could be developed. Ms. B. McCranie noted that they had water in the back area. Ms. A. McCranie added that they had two major drains that ran from 6<sup>th</sup> Street into their back yard. The lower part filled up and took everybody's water from the area.

Mayor Crenshaw noted that the reason he asked that question was to clarify as he heard their testimony that their fear about potentially accepting this zone of benefit was that when and if that unlucky day came when they had to do something with their septic, they could be looking at a potential \$22,000 bill with a little bit of market place interest, so it would be a larger amount if it were several years down the road. He noted that he wanted to get clarification on what they talked about last month on would the greater expense be replacing the septic system or tapping into this new system. Director Kaping responded that last time he checked with Lane County on a new installed septic system, it was somewhere north of \$15,000, because they required filtration.

Mayor Crenshaw stated that if the Council made the decision tonight to move forward as presented, the McCranies/Edwards would not really be hurt by the full \$22,000 but more like approximately \$7,000. So if they were to go down the road that Councilor DiMarco was talking about and potentially find a way to subsidize that, they could look for that middle ground that could subsidize the difference so that they were not necessarily taking advantage of the rest of the citizens of Junction City and getting them to pay for something that others would have been benefited by. You pay for your own benefits when you need to pay for your own benefits, but you are not taxed an additional amount based on that decision. He asked if that sounded like a fair middle.

Ms. A. McCranie responded that it did, but they would not have the option of ever replacing their septic as that had been taken away from them. Mayor Crenshaw responded that he did get that some things were no longer available, so they were basically down to the dollars and cents question.

Ms. A. McCranie stated that \$6,000 was a lot better than paying \$22,000 plus interest.

Director Kaping added that one thing to remember was there was also an SDC on top of it. Mayor Crenshaw stated that would be in addition to and he thought Administrator Knope had made some testimony last month and tonight that there would be a double ding and looking for another option to prevent that. He asked if that was staff's intention. Administrator Knope and Director Kaping responded correct.

Mayor Crenshaw asked if Administrator Knope was feeling like option number two of purchasing the zone of benefit was the answer to that double ding question or at least would give the City more potential to control that. Administrator Knope responded yes but no. He thought this was the first step, based on his concerns last time around. He thought that by the City purchasing it, it put the City in the driver's seat, not a developer. Even if the City did the full amount, it would be based on the \$271,000, not the \$300,000. His concern was that this happened to be a prime area where there were overlapping zones of benefit and the way the City's code was written, a zone of benefit was not a great tool.

Administrator Knope continued that the history was the City initiated the zone of benefit code for a City zone of benefit project in the early 1990's. When looking at the records at that time, it was based on a several thousand dollar City project, so he did not think a lot of thought was given to the ramifications where a person could buy a piece of property, try to build a house, and get hit with multiple zones of benefit plus SDCs.

Administrator Knope added that his long-term concern was he did not feel the zone of benefit was a great tool and never worked out right for the City, except maybe for the first time that it was done. If the zone of benefit was not available, Mr. Paddock could have put in that line and then requested an SDC credit based on the fact that it was in the City's Capital Improvement Plan and he would have been reimbursed based on that or the City could have chosen to use its SDC funds to build the line instead. Purchasing the right would give the City the time to start working through some of the maze of things that were supposed to be helpful that really at the end of the day were not. This would be the first step to give more time to look at how these tools work and does the City need to update the tool sets that were available.

Councilor Gambia noted that it was said that Mr. Paddock was asking for \$311,000, but he would be willing to take a discount to \$271,000. Director Kaping responded that was correct.

Councilor Gambia asked what the \$311,000 was based on. Director Kaping responded that the \$311,000 was based on the construction cost of the sewer line that was installed minus the properties that were already benefitting from them.

Councilor Gambia asked what Administrator Knope meant when he said it would cost the City more to build that line. Administrator Knope responded that one could easily tack on 20%, because of the public contracting rules and other requirements the City had for projects.

Councilor Gambia stated that there would be some benefit to having somebody who was not the City build some of these things and that it actually ended up saving money. Administrator Knope responded that was correct and that staff was working with another developer who was looking to build a street. There was a force main that would need to go through there and it would be more cost effective for the City to have the developer build that section of force main than if the City tried to do it. In the end, it would be built to the same construction standards, but the developer did not have some of the other requirements that the City was required to follow.

Councilor DiMarco noted that it saved the City money, as long as the City did not end up buying it back from them like they were talking about here. Administrator Knope responded that like in the case they were talking about with this developer, staff was looking at a way to either pay for it in advance or some kind of funding mechanism, but they approached that project going into it, knowing that was what they were going to do, versus now where they were here on the tail end after it was done.

Councilor Gambia noted that his point was not about the buying back and he could see Councilor DiMarco's point. What he was saying was it literally cost less money to have a private person build the thing. Even if the City bought it back, it still would cost 20% less than if the City would have gone out and built that same thing. Administrator Knope responded that was true if the City would have had that contracted out.

Councilor Gambia continued that if the City went out and built it, it would be \$400,000 that had to get taken by the taxpayers. If this guy went out and built it, it was \$311,000. They were saving \$80,000 to \$90,000, because the City did not contract to have it done, so there was some benefit out there. He really liked the idea that Councilor DiMarco brought up tonight about not charging them for 7 units if they were only connecting 1 or 2. He added that he was concerned with the other zones of benefit. If the City said zones of benefit were a bad thing, he had 10 people on his street that would be here next month saying great, zones of benefit are going away and we do not have to pay them anymore; we are ready to develop and when is the City buying this zone of benefit. He noted that he liked a lot of the things that had been said, especially what staff was talking about in tools and making it more applicable, but at the end of the day it cost money to put that line in the street that people could hook up to, whether the developer, City, or whomever was paid. He was not ready to take everybody off the hook from that yet, as he did not know the implications or how many zones of benefits were already in place.

Councilor Thomas asked if the City could afford to buy it and not hurt the City. Administrator Knope responded yes and that there were funds available within the Sewer Fund that they could make this purchase.

Mayor Crenshaw stated that when you combine the question from Councilor Thomas and Councilor Gambia's point of how many times could the City afford to do that repeatedly every time the discussion came up, the conversation would get a little bigger.

Councilor DiMarco said that he thought he had an answer to that. He noted that they did discuss this to some degree at the Public Works Committee. The City could make sure that it never had another zone of benefit again as a starter and he would let staff elaborate on that. To Administrator Knope's point about poor tools, the discussion was about rescinding the zone of benefit ordinance all together in the future.

Administrator Knope responded that was correct and from staff's standpoint, what they were recommending from this point forward was that a zone of benefit no longer be a tool and that the City look at a different option to get to the same ends and just leave everything where it was today.

Administrator Knope continued that he had two points. During the DOC work, the City did make agreements with property owners along the line that locked in their fee, so to speak, based on what they had currently developed. The agreement said that as long as they did not develop, they could pay "x" fee, but then at some point down the road if they developed, additional fees would apply. There were a number of folks that had bigger parcels but had a home on it and did not want to pay that whole thing, so that was that middle ground that was reached.

Mayor Crenshaw asked if that was a zone of benefit. Administrator Knope responded yes and it was for DOC.

Mayor Crenshaw stated that mechanism was not written into this one, at least at this point. Administrator Knope responded that was correct. That was one of the biggest problems with the City's code that it was so minimalistic and did not provide good guidance. Councilor DiMarco noted that if the City bought the zone of benefit rights, they could rewrite it to include that.

Administrator Knope continued that his second point was keeping in mind Councilor Gambia's comment about the existing zones of benefit. If the City bought this zone of benefit, they would not be changing the precedence of a zone. It was just now the City was choosing not to fully implement it, which any developer had the same option. The City would not be reversing it on these other folks, so it would not open up that door for them to come in and say get rid of our zone of benefit because all the City was saying was the City had precedence and had done it in the past of buying the rights to a zone of benefit and then doing whatever it wanted to with it.

Councilor DiMarco stated that the Westsiders that had one house on a big chunk of land did not have to pay for all the potential EDUs. Administrator Knope responded that was correct; they paid just for what they had at that point in time. He added that those were done in specific contract language, because of the partner agency at the time.

Councilor Gambia stated that there was also a time value associated with these because 20 years seemed like forever, but he bet the numbers on the zones of benefit had never been 100% collected. So, the right to a zone of benefit, if \$271,000 was the current value, he did not think was good negotiation if they were saying they were going to pay the whole thing because 100% of the people would never connect within that time period. Administrator Knope responded that was part of the reason it went from \$311,000 to \$271,000.

Councilor Gambia said that was like a 10% discount, but he bet the number would not support 90% of the people over the 20-year period. Administrator Knope responded that the City ran between 85 to 90% collection on the zones of benefit; the only one that was less than 80% was the one the City bought.

Mr. Edwards asked why Mr. Paddock was not asked to go to High Pass and allowed to build the line down 6<sup>th</sup> Street. Director Kaping responded there were a few obstacles there. One, they could not get some of the rights of way from some property owners that they needed to put the line back down the road to High Pass. The line coming out of High Pass was a pressure main and you could not tie into that. With the pressure main in there, it made putting that gravity sewer really tight, so there was not enough space.

Mr. Edwards asked if Mr. Paddock was also looking at more cost by going to High Pass. Director Kaping responded that it probably would not have been more cost if Mr. Paddock could have gotten the property owners to give him the property for the easement, but it would have definitely been a little more difficult project for him.

Mr. Edwards said that somebody had said that if they had to tap into the sewer line it started the ripple effect, and he asked if they would get the tap fee from the other property owners that had to connect. Administrator Knope responded no.

There were no additional comments, so Mayor Crenshaw closed the public hearing.

**MOTION:** Councilor Rowe made a motion to approve the purchase of the rights to the Paddock Zone of Benefit for a price not to exceed \$271,283 and to authorize the Public Works Director to sign the necessary documents. The motion was seconded by Councilor Stott.

Mayor Crenshaw stated that he was in the same line of thinking as Councilor Gambie when he asked about value and even though it may very well be likely that 80% of the cost recovery happened over 20 years, there would be some value in getting money now versus waiting that 20 years. He added that he was inclined to ask staff to go back and negotiate a better deal for the City for this right; as a result, if there was a tie, he would vote no.

Councilor Gambie stated that he liked the direction they were headed and rearranging the CIP money to pay for the rights and lower the taxes on the citizens in town, but he did think they could get a better deal. He noted that he was not going to vote right now at this price because he thought there was some value in time, especially if only 90% was going to be collected over 20 years.

**VOTE:** The motion passed by a vote of 4 to 1, with Councilors Thomas, Stott, Rowe, and DiMarco voting in favor and Councilor Gambie voting against.

Mayor Crenshaw said to Ms. A and Ms. B. McCranie and Mr. Edwards that he thought they got the resolution they were seeking this evening; however, there was still more to come as he forewarned them earlier, so they were not necessarily off the hook. They were going to have to have more discussion on how they were going to move forward with this right and how they were actually going to work towards cost recovery for the rest of the citizens of Junction City on this expenditure.

Councilor Rowe asked when this was going to be on the Public Works Committee agenda. Director Kaping responded that he would work with legal counsel on the contract with Mr. Paddock and would bring that back in a month or two.

Councilor Rowe invited the McCranies and Mr. Edwards to check with him or Director Kaping on when this would be going to the Public Works Committee. He added that the City welcomed and appreciated their input.

#### **10. Ophelia's Place Facility Request**

Manager Moran presented the request from Ophelia's Place for the City to install a heating/air conditioning unit in the space they were leasing at Dutch's Field. The Community Services Committee reviewed bids on November 5, 2019 and recommended purchase from Beymer Heating. Replacement of the furnace in this building was on the schedule for next year, and funding would come from the Parks Capital Project Fund.

Ms. Verna Wise Matthews, Ophelia's Place, thanked the City for their support.

**MOTION:** Councilor Stott made a motion to award the bid to Beymer Heating and Metal Co. in the amount of \$6,719.00 and authorize the City Administrator to sign the necessary documents. The motion was seconded by Councilor DiMarco and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

#### **11. GFOA's Distinguished Budget Presentation Award**

Director Crocker shared that the City had received the Distinguished Budget Presentation Award from the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA). Improvements made to the City's budget included the balanced budget concept or "The Rowe Doctrine", revenue allocations, Capital Expenditure Plan, five-year forecast, and fiscal policies. He thanked staff, Council, and Budget Committee for their hard work.

#### **12. Budget Officer Appointment**

Director Crocker stated that each year the Council appointed the Budget Officer.

**MOTION:** Councilor Rowe made a motion to appoint and designate the City Administrator to be the Budget Officer for the Fiscal Year 2020-2021 budget year. The motion was seconded by Councilor Stott and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

**13. Budget Committee Appointments**

Director Crocker reviewed that there were three vacant positions on the Budget Committee and three applications had been received.

**MOTION:** Councilor Rowe made a motion to appoint Sid Washburne to Position No. 2. The motion was seconded by Councilor Thomas and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

**MOTION:** Councilor Gambie made a motion to appoint Beverly Ficek to Position No. 6. The motion was seconded by Councilor Rowe and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

**MOTION:** Councilor Stott made a motion to appoint Travis Ducker to Position No. 7. The motion was seconded by Councilor Rowe and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

**14. Budget Calendar Fiscal Year 2020/2021**

Director Crocker presented the Fiscal Year 2020-2021 budget calendar.

**MOTION:** Councilor Stott made a motion to approve the budget calendar as presented by staff. The motion was seconded by Councilor DiMarco and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

**15. CEP Additions**

Director Kaping presented the request to modify the Public Works Capital Expenditure Plan (CEP). The CEP was reviewed every five years; Public Works staff took an in depth look and made 93 changes to the CEP for Water, Sewer, Streets, and Sanitation. The Public Works Committee reviewed on December 2, 2019 and recommended sending to Council for final approval.

**MOTION:** Councilor Rowe made a motion to approve the updated Capital Expenditure Plan. The motion was seconded by Councilor Stott and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

**16. Tractor Supply Easements**

Director Kaping presented the water, storm, sewer, and street easements for the Tractor Supply Store.

**MOTION:** Councilor Stott made a motion to approve the easements for Tractor Supply and authorize the City Recorder to sign the necessary documents. The motion was seconded by Councilor Rowe and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

**17. Utility Work I and II Job Descriptions Update**

Director Kaping presented the updated job descriptions for Utility Work I and II positions, to reflect the current duties of both positions. He distributed copies of an updated resolution which changed the wording from "create" to "update" these positions.

A. Resolution No. 2 – A Resolution to Update the Positions of Utility Worker I and Utility Worker II Pursuant to Personnel Policy Section 4.2 and Assigning a Range Within the City's Compensation Schedule.

**MOTION:** Councilor Stott made a motion to approve Resolution No. 2. The motion was seconded by Councilor Rowe and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

**18. Maintenance and Project Team Supervisor Job Descriptions**

Director Kaping presented the job descriptions for two new positions of Maintenance Team Supervisor and Project Team Supervisor. Positions were in the budget and no additional staff would be added. The Public Works Committee reviewed on December 2, 2019 and recommended approval.

A. Resolution No. 3 – A Resolution to Create the Positions of Project Team Supervisor and Maintenance Team Supervisor Pursuant to City Personnel Policy Section 4.2 and Assigning a Range within the City's Compensation Schedule.

**MOTION:** Councilor Rowe made a motion to approve Resolution No. 3. The motion was seconded by Councilor DiMarco and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

**19. Judge Pro Tem Appointment**

Director Crocker presented Judge Wiese's recommendation for appointments as Judge Pro Tem. This was an annual occurrence, per the City's contract with the municipal judge.

Mayor Crenshaw appointed Jessica Saydack and Lindsay Wostmann to serve as Judges Pro tem.

**MOTION:** Councilor DiMarco made a motion to approve the Mayor's appointments for Municipal Judge Pro Tem. The motion was seconded by Councilor Stott and passed by unanimous vote of the Council.

## **20. Body Camera and Taser Purchase Options**

Chief Morris presented the request to purchase body cameras and tasers. Buying in a package deal would be more cost effective and include benefits that would not be received by purchasing separately; the discounted prices would be good through December 31, 2019. There were two packages: one for 13 cameras/tasers and one for 10 cameras/tasers. Payment options were provided to the Council. The Axon equipment provided superior quality and features over the donated and failing equipment the department was currently using. This package included receiving brand new replacements cameras at years 2 ½ and 5. In addition, the City would receive brand new batteries for the tasers and a sufficient supply of training cartridges for recertification of officers each year. This purchase would fall under ORS 279B.075 D Sole Source Purchasing, as Axon was the only company that had this package and integration between the camera and the electrical stun gun with automatic uploading of data to cloud storage.

Discussion followed and included conversations about the equipment and funding options; funding options included making a down payment out of State Shared Revenue and then making payments from the Police Capital Fund and paying the full amount out of State Shared Revenue. It was noted that the Council could make two separate motions: one on whether to purchase the equipment and then the other on how to fund it.

**MOTION:** Councilor Rowe made a motion to approve an expenditure of \$139,507 for the purchase of 13 cameras and tasers from the Axon Company and authorize Chief Morris to sign the necessary documents. The motion was seconded by Councilor Stott and passed by a vote of 4 to 1 with Councilors Stott, Gambia, Rowe and DiMarco voting in favor and Councilor Thomas against.

It was asked whether the vendor might give an additional discount if paid in full. Chief Morris responded that he would need to contact the vendor. Mayor Crenshaw stated that he would suspend discussion on this item, to give Chief Morris an opportunity to call the vendor. Chief Morris left the meeting to make the phone call.

## **21. Council Agenda Forecaster**

Administrator Knope presented the forecaster. No changes.

## **22. Staff Reports**

Director Kaping reported: Update on burned out building on Ivy Street included that Director Kaping reached out to the attorney that was representing the person holding the note on the property and to the owner of the building. They confirmed that they were doing arbitration at the beginning of January to see if they could get the insurance company to come to a conclusion on the building. Public Works staff had worked hard to get all the holiday decorations installed downtown and on Ivy Street and had won Judge's Choice Award for their Water Tower float at the Light Parade. The department was continuing to pick up leaves throughout town.

Attorney Williamson reported: Their office was working on the Szerlip litigation, where the City was being sued by someone that thought the City had bought their property when that had not occurred. A motion for summary judgement was filed in Lane County Circuit Court and an oral argument would occur on Monday. Attorneys Mark Wolf and Carrie Connelly would be representing the City at oral argument and they expected a ruling from the court anywhere from two weeks to two months after oral argument.

## **23. Councilor Comments/Questions**

Councilor Thomas commended Director Kaping and Public Works staff on the holiday decorations downtown and stated that people were commenting on how nice the decorations looked.

Mayor Crenshaw noted that there was a new decoration of a Christmas Tree and lights on top of the new water tower. Director Kaping responded that his staff did an incredible job on this and it was planned that this would be a new annual tradition.

Councilor Gambée noted that it could be difficult to juggle the challenges that came up in life, but he was impressed with seeing how the Council, Committees, staff, and others continued to perform at a high level, despite those challenges. He thanked everyone for their good work all year long.

Chief Morris returned to the meeting.

Councilor DiMarco thanked the Police Department for their recent work in finding a missing teenager. He noted that Junction City had been named the safest City in the state based on 2016-2017 crime statistics but that could change as arrests had doubled for adults and tripled for juveniles. He commended the Police Department for all their hard work in addressing issues that had not been focused on in the past, such as domestic violence, child abuse, and sexual abuse cases and in partnering with DHS (Department of Human Services) on these matters.

Councilor DiMarco continued that the timing of the cameras/tasers was good, in light of recent events where officers had been injured in the line of duty. He noted that even though it was a large expenditure, the City had done other large projects out of State Revenue Sharing, such as appropriating \$140,000 to refurbish the pool.

**Body Cameras and Taser Purchase – Continued**

Mayor Crenshaw asked Chief Morris if he was able to find out if an additional discount would be given, if the City paid in one lump sum. Chief Morris responded that the representative was not able to confirm until tomorrow morning but thought there could maybe be a \$7,000 to \$10,000 discount.

**MOTION:** Councilor Rowe made a motion to authorize the expenditure of up to \$130,000 coming out of State Revenue Sharing for the one time purchase of 13 tasers and cameras from Axon or \$70,000 down on the payment of \$17,376.86 over four years for a grand total of \$139,507.42 and authorize the Chief to sign the necessary documents. The motion was seconded by Councilor Gambée and passed by a vote of 4 to 1, with Councilors Stott, Gambée, Rowe, and DiMarco voting in favor and Councilor Thomas abstaining.

Mayor Crenshaw gave Chief Morris an opportunity to provide a staff report.

Chief Morris reported: Officers had recently been injured in three very serious events where deadly force would have been justified but was not used. Chief Morris noted that he was very impressed with the Police Department staff.

Mayor Crenshaw asked if Chief Morris had a plan in place for adding Reserves. Chief Morris responded yes, and the department was currently taking applications and had some people in background checks. Mayor Crenshaw responded that was excellent, and the community had definitely been asking for the department to get back to incorporating a Reserve Program. He thanked Chief Morris for making that happen.

**24. Mayor’s Comments**

Mayor Crenshaw stated that he was really impressed with the community this evening. The fact that citizens were feeling more comfortable and provided testimony, made a difference here tonight in helping the Council to see a better route for the City of Junction City. He expressed kudos to those citizens for stepping up and letting their voices be heard. That was the reason he continually encouraged citizens to provide testimony, and he thanked those who participated. He added that even though it might not be popular with some public officials, he pledged that he would make sure that everyone had an opportunity to give testimony on decisions that the Council made.

**25. Adjournment**

As there was no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:46 p.m.

ATTEST:

APPROVED:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kitty Vodrup, City Recorder

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark Crenshaw, Mayor