

MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION MEETING OF
THE SPRINGFIELD CITY COUNCIL HELD
MONDAY, JULY 11, 2005

The City of Springfield Council met in a work session in the Jesse Maine Room, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon, on Monday, July 11, 2005 at 5:30 p.m., with Council President Woodrow presiding.

ATTENDANCE

Present were Councilors Ballew, Ralston, Fitch, Lundberg, Woodrow and Pishioneri. Also present were City Manager Mike Kelly, Assistant City Manager Cynthia Pappas, City Attorney Joe Leahy, City Recorder Amy Sowa and members of the staff.

Mayor Leiken was absent (excused).

1. Library Services and Funding Discussion.

Library Director Bob Russell presented the staff report on this item. Since 1999, two citizens' committees have noted the need to stabilize and improve funding of library services. Both committees recommended the formation of a Library District as the means to achieving this goal. Since that time council has heard several updates from library staff, most recently in January of 2004.

At its goal-setting session on January 24, 2005, council expressed interest in pursuing an amendment to the Metro Plan, which would at least open the possibility of creating a Library District. At that same meeting, council also expressed some interest in improving library services through a serial levy.

The two most feasible options for improving and stabilizing library services are a serial levy, and the creation of a Library District.

A serial levy of \$.15/thousand would raise approximately \$380,000 per year, would allow the library to be open 50 hours per week, and would bring our budget for books and other materials within 15% of the state average. A rate of \$.21/thousand would raise approximately \$550,000 annually, and would enable Springfield Library to achieve Oregon Library Association "Adequate" standards for hours open to the public.

To ensure an adequate level of library service, a Library District would need to set a tax rate of between \$.65 and \$.70 per thousand. Currently, the library receives approximately \$.465 per thousand from City General Fund revenues. Creating a separate district would also free up approximately \$1.2 million dollars per year in General Fund revenues.

Staff estimates the costs involved in creating a district to be approximately \$50,000. There is the possibility of receiving grant funding to cover some of these costs.

Mr. Russell presented a power point presentation entitled Library Mission which included a summary of recommendations. He distributed a copy of the power point presentation to councilors and staff.

Mr. Russell's power point presentation highlighted the many services the Library provides for a diverse population. He said the main issues were the number of books the Library was able to purchase and the number of hours the Library was opened compared to other communities of similar size.

Mr. Russell reviewed the history of trying to address this issue as outlined in the power point presentation. He discussed the five options for increased revenues and the advantages and disadvantages of each option.

Mr. Russell said in his calculations the next available date for an election for a Library District would be May of 2008. He explained.

Mr. Kelly said staff did not need clear direction tonight, just guidance from the council.

Councilor Ballew said there was not enough money in the city to adequately finance Library services. She did not like to see the city give up the Library because it was very popular with taxpayers. She would like to go out for a modest and reasonable levy. If that did not work, a district may be considered. She discussed the opposition from Eugene to allow any districts that were not currently in the Metro Plan. She said the city had done all it could to try to manage and maintain services with a limited budget and it would have to be left up to the voters. She would encourage the schools to help support a levy.

Councilor Fitch discussed the challenge in trying to make any changes to the Metro Plan to allow special districts. She asked when the best time would be to go out for a levy.

Mr. Russell said a district could only go out only during an even numbered year.

Mr. Kelly said for a levy to pass there was a double majority requirement.

Discussion was held regarding timing to put a levy on the ballot. The police and fire levies would be up for renewal in November 2006.

Councilor Fitch discussed the county's Public Safety District. She asked about the status of that proposal.

Mr. Kelly discussed the meeting between twelve Oregon cities hosted by Eugene, Springfield and Lane County that was formulated following Eugene's defeat of the amendment to the Metro Plan. Five additional meetings were scheduled in the months ahead to see if agreement could be made to bring a proposal for a law enforcement levy forward in November 2006.

Councilor Fitch said she would support going out for a Library levy in May of 2006, but it may be difficult to get fifty percent of the vote.

Mr. Kelly said the Mayor's Task Force was looking into adequate funding for the jail operations. This committee would bring a recommendation to council in November of 2005. A possible option could be an election for jail funding in November 2006. He discussed the upcoming joint elected officials (JEO) meetings and the opportunity to bring up the subject of an amendment to the Metro Plan to allow a Library District.

Councilor Lundberg said she would like to look at the elected officials meeting to discuss amendments to the Metro Plan. She said the proposed levy amount for the Library was small enough that the voters could possibly approve it. She said she was not opposed to a four-year levy. She said the county would probably come forward with an amendment to the Metro Plan and a district. She said she could support putting a Library serial levy on the ballot in May of 2006, although it may be hard to get the necessary votes.

Councilor Fitch said it might be beneficial to go forward with a Metro Plan amendment. There may be a desire to have a district rather than having to go out for a levy each four years.

Councilor Ballew said even if a district was formed, the issue remained of the increase in cost outrunning the revenue.

Councilor Lundberg asked if the districts were under the same union. Some were and some weren't. She said the wages could be different. If it was contracted back to the city, however, the wages and benefits would be the same as the city.

Discussion was held regarding serial levies versus formation of a district.

Councilor Woodrow asked if staff could get prepared for the levies for the May 2006 election and continue to look forward to a district.

Mr. Kelly said that could be done. Staff would bring this back to council with proposals. They could also put it on the agenda this fall during the JEO meeting. He said the Library had a more difficult time sustaining their services than some of the other departments. At this time, public safety was the top priority of the community. Once the public safety issue was solved, or concurrent with it being solved, the Library would receive that attention. Serial levies had the obstacle of going up against other levies, not only from the city but from other agencies in our community. He also discussed the disadvantages of a district and how it would affect all other agencies. The Library needed attention.

Councilor Ralston said he was not in support of another district. He said the citizens were going to have to decide what they wanted and didn't want. He said public safety was most important at this time.

Councilor Fitch said she truly hoped there could be a way to find a way to provide adequate funding for the Library.

Councilor Pishioneri asked about the amount per thousand per household as noted in the power point presentation for a serial levy versus a district. He asked what the cost per thousand would be for status quo to the Library with the district.

Mr. Russell said it would be about fifty-five cents per thousand.

Councilor Pishioneri said he agreed with Councilor Ralston and Councilor Fitch. He agreed that it was up to council to empower the voters and educate them to make the choices. Timing would be important. He supported looking at it in two tracts.

Councilor Woodrow said council consensus was for staff to move forward with a plan to put a levy on the May 2006 ballot, but also keep checking in with the county and Eugene regarding the amendment to the Metro Plan and district formation.

Mr. Kelly said he would also remain in touch with the other agencies to see about putting the Library District idea on the agenda for the September 2005 joint elected officials (JEO) meeting.

2. Surface Transportation Program (STP) Funding.

Transportation Manager Nick Arnis presented the staff report on this item. The Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) directed the Transportation Planning Commission (TPC) staff to conduct an application process and make a recommendation to MPC about how to disperse 2006 unallocated STP funds.

Staff met with the City Council on April 25, 2005 and recommended the city apply for the following STP projects for 2006: Franklin Boulevard Planning \$200,000; Gateway/Beltline Project Development \$200,000; and 5th Street Preservation \$600,000. Upon reviewing the preservation needs of current city projects, and the timeline constraints for spending the STP funds in 2006, staff submitted an application to fund the 21st Street preservation project instead of the 5th Street preservation project. 21st Street is currently in final design and ready for construction in 2006 and is estimated to cost more money than previously anticipated.

MPC decided on May 12, 2005 to distribute about \$1.3 million in previously unallocated 2006 STP funds. During the review of metro applications at TPC, Lane Council of Governments (LCOG), in consultation with ODOT in Salem, concluded the total amount of unallocated STP funds for 2006 was \$1,721,000 rather than the \$1.3 million anticipated in May. MPC will act on recommendations to allocate this amount at the July 14 meeting.

On June 23, TPC recommended the following City of Springfield projects be funded with the \$1.7 million unallocated STP funds:

- Franklin Boulevard Planning \$150,000 (Modernization/Planning Category)
- Gateway/Beltline Project Development \$125,000 (Modernization/Planning Category)
- 21st Street \$100,000 (Preservation)

In addition, because the FY 2004 allocation of funds did not occur until April, Springfield did not spend about \$65 thousand of funds allocated to planning work. TPC will recommend to MPC that this money be reallocated to Franklin Boulevard Planning (\$25,000) and to Gateway/Beltline Project Development (\$40,000), bringing those projects to \$175,000 and \$165,000, respectively.

Lane Transit District (LTD) is proposing to contribute \$25,000 to fund a portion of the Franklin Boulevard Planning and \$25,000 toward the Gateway/Beltline Project Development work. This may occur outside of the STP process. If this occurs, there will be a total of \$200,000 for Franklin Boulevard and \$190,000 for the Gateway/Beltline intersection.

Mr. Arnis said there was a match for this money at about eleven and a half percent, which would come from the street fund or system development charge fund. He discussed the point system used for leveraging money when the agencies apply for these funds. Typically, a current project was used for leverage to get higher points. He said the MPC meeting was to be held on Thursday evening, July 14.

Councilor Fitch thanked Councilor Ballew for chairing the MPC. She asked about allocation of the rest of the funds.

Mr. Arnis said Springfield would get about twenty-eight percent, Eugene about thirty-eight percent (about \$663,000), Lane Transit District about eighteen percent (about \$314,000), Lane County about eleven percent (about \$240,000) and Commuter Solutions about seven percent (about \$130,000).

Councilor Fitch asked about the scoring.

Mr. Arnis said Lane County's projects scored in the middle. He discussed the scoring and issues related. He discussed other options that could be considered in future years, such as one agency going first and getting funding for a whole project. He said that the City of Eugene would most likely come in with a Federal Courthouse improvement request, which would be about \$800,000-\$900,000.

Councilor Ballew discussed maintenance, preservation, modernization and planning. The City of Eugene had a larger list of preservation projects than Springfield and did not seem to want to spend money on modernization. She said it did not seem balanced. She discussed how points were scored and how an entity that could put in a higher match could get more points. It did not seem fair and she asked if this could be changed to make it a more level playing field.

Mr. Arnis said Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) wanted to change the application and the scoring. MPC would be able to see that before going out over the next three years. He discussed the difficulties with the current point system.

Councilor Lundberg asked about the Commuter Solutions group and where they fit into this. She asked if they were in charge of the I-105 preservation project.

Mr. Arnis said they were in charge of the I-105 preservation project. They were housed in LTD with about two and a half staff people. They used to receive money from the state through the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) process. With the Federal STIP funding, the state was looking to the metro area to fund this program. It came out of a policy realm of a transplant of trying to reduce reliance on the automobile by getting people to use bikes or walk, use carpools or public transportation. Their relationship with the I-105 project was that ODOT hired LCOG to put together the program of how to get the word out to people. He believed LCOG hired Commuter Solutions to help with that outreach. They received a percentage based on what MPC wanted them to receive. There was a recommendation to 2003 to fund them about ten percent. MPC could change that.

Councilor Fitch said staff did a good job of applying for these funds.

3. City Manager Recruitment Profile Brochure Review – Murray and Associates.

Human Resources Director Bill Spiry presented the staff report on this item. During this work session Council will review and finalize the final draft of the recruitment profile and brochure for the position of City Manager.

This work session follows Bob Murray's work with council on June 27, at which time Mr. Murray received council direction regarding desired expectations and characteristics for the next

City Manager. From that work Mr. Murray has developed the attached draft recruitment marketing brochure which includes the City Manager profile based upon key desired profile characteristics. This draft has been reviewed by the Council Recruitment Committee and their input has been integrated into this draft for council consideration. Council is asked to review and discuss this draft and approve its use for the recruitment. Upon council approval, the draft will be prepared for publication in the form of a color brochure for distribution. Once completed, the published brochure will be mailed to an extensive audience from which likely candidates may emerge.

Bob Murray & Associates have kicked off the recruitment for City Manager starting on July 7. Mr. Murray's marketing campaign is focusing on professional journals that are specifically suited to the City Manager search, and will include advertisements in Western City Magazine, ICMA newsletter, Jobs Available and with the League of Oregon Cities.

Councilor Lundberg noted that Councilor Ballew had reviewed this brochure carefully and made some suggested changes which were reflected in this brochure.

Councilor Pishioneri suggested adding "hunting" to the list of recreation opportunities in our area.

Councilor Fitch discussed the salary and that a specific number should be included.

Discussion was held regarding the salary and the advantages and disadvantages of including a salary amount.

Councilor Woodrow said he agreed that Mr. Murray would use his expertise to present the information regarding the salary to applicants.

Councilor Ballew discussed relocation expenses.

Mr. Spiry said that would be expected, but had not been determined.

Councilor Lundberg said she agreed with the consultant that the lower salary number should be given with the stipulation of an increase according to qualifications. She discussed salary range and the fact that Springfield had a separate administrator for the parks and recreation.

Councilor Fitch asked if photos would be included in the brochure.

Mr. Spiry said photos would be included and the brochure would be a full color, glossy brochure.

Councilor Fitch discussed the cost of housing and how important that information would be to someone who might be considering relocating to Springfield. She asked if that could be included in the brochure.

Mr. Spiry said that could be added. Often applicants would know where to go for that information, but he would have it added.

Councilor Ralston said he would like the City Manager to live within the city.

City Attorney Joe Leahy said the Charter required the City Manager to live within the city limits.

Mr. Kelly discussed the situation that caused him to move outside the city limits several years ago. It required approval from all councilors.

Councilor Pishioneri said the section in the brochure that discussed demographics may be better suited under Community rather than Issues, Challenges and Opportunities. It may be important to note that our community had over fifty percent owner occupied homes.

Discussion was held regarding whether or not to include that information. It was determined that percentage of home ownership would not be included in the brochure, but would be used as a question of the applicants.

Councilor Lundberg said part of not including too much information was to see how much homework the applicants had done before applying.

Mr. Leahy announced that a suit had been filed against the Springfield City Council, Matt Cox, Kent Mortimore and the State of Oregon by Nick Schevchynski, Curt Deatherage, and Mike Newman. The petitioners claimed they had been denied access to public records. Mr. Leahy wanted council to know in case they were served personally.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:50 pm.

Minutes Recorder – Amy Sowa

Sidney W. Leiken
Mayor

Attest:

Amy Sowa
City Recorder