

City of Springfield
Work Session Meeting

MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION MEETING OF
THE SPRINGFIELD CITY COUNCIL HELD
MONDAY, JUNE 27, 2005.

The City of Springfield council met in a work session in the Jesse Maine Room, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon, on Monday, June 27, 2005 at 5:30 p.m., with Mayor Leiken presiding.

ATTENDANCE

Present were Mayor Leiken and Councilors Ballew, Ralston, Fitch, Lundberg, Woodrow and Pishioneri. Also present were City Manager Mike Kelly, Assistant City Manager Cynthia Pappas, City Attorney Joe Leahy, Administrative Assistant Julie Wilson and members of the staff.

1. Proposed Springfield Development Code (SDC) Housekeeping Amendments.

City Planner Gary Karp presented the staff report on this item. Since the SDC was adopted in 1986, several decisions have amended the document over 60 times. The last major SDC review and amendment was in 1993. The proposed “housekeeping” amendments generally involve the reformatting of articles, clarifications of text and compliance with recently adopted Oregon Revised Statutes amendments. The proposed amendments were based on two objectives: a) to produce a document that more clearly describes and expedites the application review process, based upon input from Planning and Public Works staff; and b) to streamline discretionary reviews, especially those that require Type III quasi-judicial public hearing approval from the Planning Commission and/or the Hearings Official, based upon input from the Planning Commission. SDC interpretations are an example of this category of applications. In addition, staff proposes two lesser review processes for applications that require Type IV legislative approval from the City Council. Vacation of public utility easements and Minor Annexations involving less than one acre of land that do not require an Annexation Agreement are examples of this category of applications. The Planning Commission held a Work Session on this topic on May 3. On May 17, 2005, staff presented the proposed SDC amendments to the Springfield Chamber Legislative Committee. Also on May 17, 2005, the Planning Commission held a second Work Session and a Public Hearing. Staff received written comments, but no one testified at the Public Hearing. The Planning Commission voted 7-0 to forward the proposed SDC “housekeeping” amendments to the City Council for their consideration. A Public Hearing is scheduled for July 18, 2005, before the City Council.

Mr. Karp presented staff with the proposed Springfield Development Code (SDC) Housekeeping Amendments. He gave a quick rundown of the changes in reducing some of the review processes from Type III public hearing before the Planning Commission and hearings official to Type II reviews done by staff. He gave a quick run through of the review process and the proposed changes in the SDC.

Councilor Fitch asked if staff would still handle the hearing process if an island annexation was less than an acre.

Staff responded that it would still need to be initiated by council.

Councilor Ballew stated that there wouldn't be an annexation without a council referral to the Boundary Commission.

Planning Supervisor Mel Oberst said that current policy stated that everything less than a subdivision would be brought before council. If land could be subdivided into four or more parcels and it was a commercial or residential development, under the commercial investor development it was brought to council. Anything smaller was directed to allow property owners to go directly to the Boundary Commission after they received a letter from the city staff attesting that all services were available for their site.

Councilor Ballew stated it was odd that council didn't have judgment on when Springfield did or did not expand its boundaries. She stated that any time the corporate boundaries of the city were being changed, it should be council's prerogative.

Mr. Oberst said that council did have the prerogative, except for the single family parcels. In some cases there were emergencies; therefore a process was developed to allow that to be expedited.

The length of the process with and without bringing the matter to the council versus sending it directly to the Boundary Commission was discussed. It was noted that only four to five of these types of annexations have taken place and only once or twice a year an emergency situation was handled.

Councilor Woodrow asked about Article 3 and the type of process used for RiverBend. It was stated that it was a Type IV and was important enough to warrant council making decisions. Discussion was held regarding vacations of public right-of-way with the homeowner compensating the city back and the types of vacations that go before council. Councilor Woodrow stated he agreed with Councilors Ballew and Lundberg that if there was going to be a change in the corporate boundary of the city, there should be some type of expedited process that the City Council would be aware.

Councilor Pishioneri said it appeared the changes were all based on trying to make things streamlined for council to do their jobs. He asked if the process was streamlined for the public or for the council and whether or not it saved time and money.

Discussion was held regarding the amount of time to process a Type II application, including time for the public hearing process, and the costs involved.

Council Pishioneri asked about additional costs when the property owner requested the expedited process.

There were no expedited fees for annexation, just extra forms that were to be completed and a different process which was not efficient. Some emergency situations come with Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) requirements to hook up to sewer and the Boundary Commission was receptive to working with the city in those situations. The property owner would pay to hook up to the sanitary sewer but there would be no additional encumbrances on the property owner.

Mayor Leiken stated that working with the DEQ could be lengthy and expensive and the city was much easier to work with comparatively.

Councilor Ballew stated that another option was for the property owner to replace their septic system instead of hooking up to the sewer system. She said it may not be the best choice but it was a possibility instead of the DEQ forcing the local agencies to take care of the problem.

Mayor Leiken stated that parts of Glenwood had been neglected for a period of time and had fallen in the city's lap, but the pump stations were not operational so they couldn't hook into a sewer system until next year. The DEQ may have to enter in if there is a situation such as that. He discussed whether or not those situations should all come before council or if council should rely on the expertise of the staff to come into an emergency situation and take care of specific situations.

Councilor Ballew said she felt that these matters, no matter how small, should all come before council.

Councilor Ralston asked about annexation and revising current text concerning zoning, notification of utilities and withdrawal from special service districts. He asked what an annexation had to do with withdrawal from a special service district. He asked for examples of the special service districts.

Mr. Karp said that Rainbow Water District was one of the special service districts. When a property in north Springfield was annexed into the city, withdrawal applications from the special service districts came before council the following calendar year. He explained the overlay zoning in the urbanizable area and how those automatically disappear once those properties are annexed into the city. Notification of utilities was just a notification that the property had been annexed.

Councilor Woodrow asked about that language in Section 3.090 which stated that the Planning Commission or hearing official's decision would be the city's final decision unless appealed. He asked if it was standard that the appeal was given fifteen days after the approval.

Mr. Karp stated that once the application was approved, the property owner could go on their own to start construction at their own risk, knowing that through the public hearing process there was an appeal period. That had been city policy for as long as he knew.

Mr. Karp referred to Attachment III included in the agenda packet, which included a discussion of some solar access standards. He said the city had three types of solar access standards. He described each. Staff contended that the solar protection for building height could be taken care of through the building permit process and staff was proposing to delete the land division solar standards.

Mr. Oberst added that the Planning Commission had a lengthy discussion on this and they could not come to an agreement on whether or not it should be adopted as a private housekeeping amendment on their motion. The Planning Commission chose to forward the housekeeping amendments to council because they were policy decisions.

Councilor Lundberg asked for clarification.

Mr. Karp stated that the other two solar access standards, the one on the building permits and the protection from the neighbor's tree, would still be in the code. This was only in the land division partitions and subdivisions and only applied to developers who develop subdivisions. This would relieve the property owner of having the burden of addressing this platting standard for solar and would give them more flexibility. The solar issue would be applied after the subdivision was approved and platted and the building permits came in. It would then be looked at regarding siting of the house so the walls of the house don't shade the neighbor's house leaving solar access.

Councilor Ralston commented that the taller the house the more problems it was going to have as far as shading. He discussed the direction of the shade.

Mayor Leiken stated this actually gave more choices and was better situated for a flat land development rather than a hillside.

Mr. Oberst said that this came up at the Planning Commission meeting. If council would like the Planning Commission to discuss and analyze this further, it could be brought back at a later date.

Councilor Ralston said he was not in favor of deleting the whole regulation.

Councilor Lundberg stated that it was only being deleted in one place, and was still in affect by the time it got to the building permit process. Even though it was out in terms of the permit, that same development was still going to have to meet the standards in some way, shape or form.

Mayor Leiken asked if staff had talked with the building development community that actually builds in Springfield and not surrounding communities. He asked if this was a suggestion from the building community.

Mr. Oberst said it hadn't been a suggestion that had been brought to the attention of the planning department by the building community.

Councilor Fitch suggested staff bring something back on Article 6 for council to review with the history for the last couple of years regarding what had been looked at regarding this standard. She did not want to hold up the housekeeping.

Councilor Pishioneri asked about lot density requirements.

Mr. Karp explained.

2. City Manager Recruitment Work Session with Bob Murray of Bob Murray & Associates.

Human Resources Director Bill Spiry presented the staff report on this item. During this work session Bob Murray will work with council to develop the profile desired for the next City Manager and discuss other aspects of the recruitment process.

This work session follows interviews between Bob Murray and individual Councilors regarding councilor desired expectations and characteristics for the next City Manager. Mr. Murray will review the results of these interviews, with the objective of reaching Council consensus regarding the key desired profile characteristics. The results of this work will establish the foundation upon

which the City Manager recruitment strategy will be designed and carried out by Bob Murray & Associates.

Other topics to be discussed with Mr. Murray during this session may include:

- Recruitment timeline and schedule, including duration of posting & advertising campaign, and targeted dates for interviews and selection;
- Council's wishes regarding review of applications;
- Selection criteria;
- Preliminary discussion regarding City Manager compensation and benefits.

Mr. Murray will also interview current City Manager Mike Kelly, and meet with members of the City's Executive Team for additional information relating to this search.

Following this on-site work Mr. Murray will complete drafts of the recruitment advertising materials and marketing brochure which will then be reviewed by council for final comment and approval. The formal recruitment campaign will then kick off sometime in early to mid July.

Mr. Spiry introduced Bob Murray. Mr. Murray thanked the council for his appointment as the search firm for the new City Manager.

Mr. Murray said he had the opportunity to meet with council members. Interviews conducted were to identify challenges, opportunities, personal challenges, background and other areas important in the selection process.

Mr. Murray discussed issues and opportunities. One of the things clear was the value council and residents place on quality of life in the community. The community was in transition from a small to a larger community, but did not want to sacrifice the small town feel as it grew. There was a need to insure quality of development that occurred. Controlled, intelligent growth was important, as well as family wage jobs. There were areas that needed attention and development.

Mr. Murray said the interviews also confirmed the importance and impact of the urban growth boundary (UGB), a positive working relationship with TEAM Springfield partners and intergovernmental relations. Springfield also faced fiscal constraints. The growing diversity in the community was important. Council leadership in the community was also important.

Mr. Murray noted that personal characteristics were important. The new City Manager needed to be an effective translator of council policy. The individual needed to be a skilled manager. As a leader, this person needed to earn respect and also have the ability to view the organization, its operations and improve suggestions on improvement. Change does not have to be made just for the sake of change. The person needed to be an effective listener and someone that had a collaborative style. They needed to have a sense of vision, not their vision but working with council to carry out and facilitate the council vision. The annual goal setting helped to identify council vision.

Mr. Murray discussed other important qualities of a new City Manager including a person accountable as well as thoughtful, a person that understood distinction between council role and staffs execution of duties, and an individual with strong experience in municipal government, budget, finance, economic development and capital projects. He said that someone with experience as a city manager or experience as a department head should be considered. He said

there was an expectation for a bachelor's degree. A master's degree was desirable but not required.

Compensation was also discussed. There could be some flexibility to pay a little less and have room for advancement. If a person was not already located here it was discussed that moving expenses could be considered. Severance pay was also discussed.

The above comments were a summary of discussion held with the Mayor and council during interviews.

Mr. Murray discussed the process. Mr. Murray said the draft recruitment brochure was the next item they would provide to council.

The closing date for the recruitment could be August 31. At that time resumes should have been received. Mr. Murray said within one and a half weeks of closing, resumes could be provided to council.

In terms of the final recruitment process, there was a recommendation that the community be hosted to meet and greet with the council to share any expectations they might have of the next City Manager. This would be helpful to the council.

The opportunity for residents to meet candidates or participate in the process was discussed. The council should interview the short list of finalist and narrow that group to two or three individuals. A week or so following that process, council could host a reception for a meet and greet of the two or three candidates. Comment cards could be completed by those that attend the meet and greet.

Council could invite community members to participate on the interview panel. Council could possibly select nine to ten individuals. This group could provide the strengths and weaknesses they see in the potential candidates. A good fit for the community was also important.

The logistics and profile were summarized and the Mayor and council were asked if there were any questions.

A councilor asked about definition of the community forum and which portions were included in Mr. Murray's scope of responsibility.

Mr. Murray said he would work with Human Resources. Community panel assistance was something Mr. Murray would assist with and for the times when Mr. Murray was not on site, he would be coordinating with Human Resources.

Mr. Spiry said the contract provided that Mr. Murray be on site for a specific number of sessions.

The various schedules to have candidates on site were discussed. For example, if some candidates were already on site, they may have appointments scheduled during the day and possibly later that evening or on two consecutive days.

Discussion was held regarding site visits in case one of the final candidates was not internal. An offer of employment could be made contingent upon a site visit. By conducting site visits the

word gets out that the candidate is a top candidate in the process. Preliminary reference work or onsite visits might be conducted at the point council may consider a strong finalist candidate.

Mr. Murray said he would conduct some background checks on the top final candidates.

A councilor said because this was an important process, it was important to identify very qualified people. Decisions do not need to be made quickly, and options should remain open. It was important to take time to make this important decision.

A councilor suggested some onsite employees, such as Community Development Manager John Tamulonis, be available to host or provide community tours of the area to these individuals. These things will help the potential candidate become more familiar with the community.

The idea of having interview panels including community groups, department heads, council, and unions would provide a wide range of feedback. TEAM Springfield would be a good participant also. The Mayor and council agreed upon TEAM Springfield representatives including the chief administrative officer (CAO) or chief elected official (CEO), not the entire TEAM Springfield group. Discussion was held regarding including the Springfield Chamber of Commerce and Lane Transit District (LTD) because council would be looking for additional feedback from other groups. Inviting some of these individuals to a more informal session might work well.

An informal comment card scenario could work well. Possibly meet and greet and complete comment cards.

Discussion was held regarding the process depending on the number of applicants

Mr. Murray said it was typical to receive fifty applicants.

Councilor Ralston shared information regarding the process for the Lane Regional Air Pollution Authority (LRAPA) recruitment. Approximately fifteen applicants were received and it was narrowed down quickly.

Mayor Leiken said receiving fifty applicants for this position seemed on target.

Mr. Spiry said information will be provided to council on July 11.

Mr. Murray said depending on the deadline dates for the publication, the council may not see the advertisement in final form on July 11 but it would contain all the information and characteristics noted by council.

Mr. Spiry said the information could be emailed for distribution. It was suggested that the subcommittee review the brochure. It could then be brought before council for a final approval. A subcommittee meeting was schedule on July 5 for this purpose.

Mr. Spiry said he and Mr. Murray would work with the subcommittee to draft the panel information and other directives. During an executive session, council would see a list of candidates.

Mr. Murray would report back to the council regarding recommendations in early October. Interviews could be set around October 14 and 21. Council asked for a draft outline of the schedule discussed today along with details, understanding dates may change slightly.

Councilor Fitch may have a conflict with a possible executive session scheduled. If possible she may participate via conference call.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:50 pm.

Minutes Recorders –Trudy Borrevik and Julie Wilson

Sidney W. Leiken
Mayor

Attest:

Amy Sowa
City Recorder