

City of Springfield
Regular Meeting

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF
THE SPRINGFIELD CITY COUNCIL HELD
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2006

The City of Springfield Council met in regular session in the Council Meeting Room, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon, on Monday, February 6, 2006 at 7:00 p.m., with Mayor Leiken presiding.

ATTENDANCE

Present were Mayor Leiken and Councilors Ballew, Fitch, Ralston, Lundberg, Woodrow, and Pishioneri. Also present were Interim City Manager Cynthia Pappas, City Attorney Joe Leahy, Finance Director Bob Duey, City Recorder Amy Sowa and members of the staff.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Mayor Leiken.

SPRINGFIELD UPBEAT

1. Recognition of Valerie Warner for Fifteen Years of Service to the City of Springfield.

Interim City Manager Cynthia Pappas introduced Valerie Warner. Ms. Pappas discussed some of Ms. Warner's achievements over the last fifteen years and how the department had changed over that time period. She also discussed Ms. Warner's current educational pursuits. Ms. Pappas told of a humorous event during Ms. Warner's interview with the City and a Police chase through City Hall.

CONSENT CALENDAR

IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILOR WOODROW WITH A SECOND BY COUNCILOR LUNDBERG TO APPROVE THE CONSENT CALENDAR. THE MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 6 FOR AND 0 AGAINST.

1. Claims

- a. Adopt the 2004-2005 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report and Management Letter.
- b. Approval to Accept the Financial Reports for December 31, 2005.

2. Minutes

- a. January 9, 2006 – Work Session
- b. January 17, 2006 – Work Session
- c. January 17, 2006 – Regular Meeting
- d. January 23, 2006 – Work Session
- e. January 26, 2006 – Special Work Session

3. Resolutions

4. Ordinances

- a. ORDINANCE NO. 6153 – AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ARTICLE 40 OF THE SPRINGFIELD DEVELOPMENT CODE TO REMOVE POTENTIAL BARRIERS TO IMPLEMENTATION; AND ADOPTING A SEVERABILITY CLAUSE.
- b. ORDINANCE NO. 6154 – AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE SPRINGFIELD DEVELOPMENT CODE, ARTICLE 23 PLO PUBLIC LAND AND OPEN SPACE DISTRICT AND ADOPTING A SEVERABILITY CLAUSE.

5. Other Routine Matters

- a. Approval of Liquor License Endorsement for Red's Deli, Located at 4105 Main Street, Springfield, OR.
- b. Approval of Liquor License Endorsement for Courtyard by Marriott, Located at 3443 Hutton Street, Springfield, OR.
- c. Approval of the Purchase of Police Vehicles for Fiscal Year 2006.
- d. Approval of the Proposed Designation Agreement Between the Governments of Lane County and the Cities of Eugene and Springfield.

ITEMS REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT CALENDAR

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Annexation of Territory to the City of Springfield (Sebring Case Number LRP2005-00035).

RESOLUTION NO. 06-04 – A RESOLUTION INITIATING ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN TERRITORY TO THE CITY OF SPRINGFIELD AND REQUESTING THAT THE LANE COUNTY LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION APPROVES THE ANNEXATION BY EXPEDITED PROCESS.

City Planner Andy Limbird presented the staff report on this item. The owners have requested annexation of ±8,700 square feet of property located at 1140 Aspen Street. The site currently contains one residence. The purpose of the annexation is to facilitate connection of the existing house to City sewer in order to convert the existing residence into a duplex dwelling.

The City Council is authorized by ORS 199.490(2)(a)(B) to initiate annexation upon receiving consent in writing from a majority of the electors registered in the territory to be annexed and the owners of more than half of the land to be annexed. Consent from all the property owners, who are also the registered electors, has been given.

The area to be annexed contains a house that is served by several urban utilities but is not connected to City sewer. An existing sanitary sewer lateral was stubbed to the property line to facilitate future connection, pending annexation. The intent of this annexation is to allow the existing dwelling to connect with City sanitary sewer and to allow the property owner to apply for a duplex dwelling in accordance with provisions of the Springfield Development Code. The property to be annexed is located within the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB), and it is adjacent to

the Springfield City Limits. The site already has most city services, including SUB water and electricity. The site can be served with the minimum range of urban services including but not limited to police, fire protection, library, parks and recreation, and schools. The City Council Resolution will be forwarded to the Lane County Local Government Boundary Commission. The owners are requesting the Expedited Annexation procedure of the Boundary Commission.

Councilor Woodrow commended staff on the paperwork on this item.

Mayor Leiken opened the public hearing.

No one appeared to speak.

Mayor Leiken closed the public hearing.

IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILOR WOODROW WITH A SECOND BY COUNCILOR LUNDBERG TO ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. 06-04. THE MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 6 FOR AND 0 AGAINST.

2. Annexation of Territory to the City of Springfield (Isaksen Case Number LRP20005-00024).

RESOLUTION NO. 06-05 – A RESOLUTION INITIATING ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN TERRITORY TO THE CITY OF SPRINGFIELD AND REQUESTING THAT THE LANE COUNTY LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION APPROVE THE ANNEXATION BY EXPEDITED PROCESS.

City Planner Linda Pauly presented the staff report on this item. The Property Owners, George and Theresa Isaksen, have requested annexation of approximately 0.36 acres of property located at 4070 North Street, north of Jasper Road and west of Filbert Lane, within Springfield's UF-10 Urbanizable Fringe Overlay District. The subject territory is described as Assessor's Map Number, 18-02-06-11, Tax Lot 800 and more accurately described in Attachment 1, Exhibit A.

The applicants request annexation in order to seek development of additional single family residential uses, consistent with the standards of the Low Density Residential (LDR) zoning district. The proposed urban densities are not permitted in the Urbanizable Fringe Overlay District, thus annexation is required.

Article 6.030(2) of the Springfield Development Code requires that territories considered for annexation must be provided with "key urban facilities and services", as defined in Metro Plan Policy 8.a, Page II-B-4. Among these key urban services are water, sewer, storm water facilities, streets, electricity, parks, fire/emergency services, and schools. Staff finds, based on analysis, that all key urban services are available to serve the territory.

The City Council is authorized by ORS 199.490(2)(a)(B) to initiate annexation upon receiving consent in writing from a majority of the electors registered in the territory proposed to be annexed and written consent from owners of more than half the land in the territory proposed to be annexed. According to Lane County Elections, there are four registered electors currently residing within the territory proposed for annexation. Signatures from 100 percent of the property owners and all registered electors have been obtained.

With Council approval, this resolution will be forwarded to the Lane County Local Government Boundary Commission with the applicant's request for expedited processing by the Boundary Commission. The Owners request expedited processing in order to facilitate immediate development of the property with a two-lot partition. If a public hearing is requested on the annexation, it will be held at the April 6, 2006, Boundary Commission meeting.

According to the Lane County Regional Land Information database, the 2005 total assessed value of the subject property is \$77,756. Upon annexation, the property could be developed with low density residential land uses in accordance with SDC 16.020.

Ms. Pauly noted the map showing the location of the property on Attachment 3, page 1. She referred to Attachment 1, Exhibit A, which showed the description of the property. She referred to the vicinity map in Attachment 3, page 2, showing the relationship of this site to existing urban services. She noted the staff report on Attachment 2 included in the agenda packet.

Councilor Pishioneri referred to the map and asked if the City boundary was on the north end of the property. He asked if the properties to the east and west of the property were outside the city limits.

Ms. Pauly said that was correct. She described all surrounding properties. She said there was a sewer in North Street that was put in to serve the school when it was built. A stub was put into the subject property from that line, so immediate access to the sewer was available.

Councilor Pishioneri asked if there were homes on all the properties.

Ms. Pauly said it was an old subdivision from the County.

Councilor Ballew asked about Attachment 2, page 2. She asked for clarification on the 8" waterline because it seemed large.

Ms. Pauly said that was the information she received from Public Works. She said they may have oversized when putting in those extensions.

Mayor Leiken opened the public hearing.

No one appeared to speak.

Mayor Leiken closed the public hearing.

IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILOR WOODROW WITH A SECOND BY COUNCILOR LUNDBERG TO ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. 06-05. THE MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 6 FOR AND 0 AGAINST.

3. May 2006 Property Tax Levy for Municipal Jail Operations.

Finance Director Bob Duey presented the staff report on this item. At the Council's work session on January 23, 2006, staff was directed to proceed with the preparation for a May 2006 property tax levy for the operations funding of the planned municipal jail. Staff is presenting four options for the structure of the levy. A public hearing is scheduled to provide for citizen input. A second

public hearing and the adoption of the official ballot title and election resolution is scheduled for February 21, 2006. The deadline to file with Lane County Elections is March 09, 2006.

Mr. Duey said he would take some additional time to go through the Agenda Item Summary because a work session was not conducted on this issue. He discussed the Jail Funding Task Force and their recommendations to the Council to first consider a municipal income tax and secondly to consider property taxes. At the December 5 Council Goal Setting Session, staff was directed to look at the option of a May election and determine if it was feasible. During the January 23 Work Session, the four options for a May election were discussed. The information discussed during that Work Session was similar to the information noted on the bottom of Attachment A, page 1 in the agenda packet. He referred to the costs included in those options.

Mr. Duey said once the site options were available, staff looked at how to put the package together for a May election. He said staff took into consideration that construction would begin no later than late fourth quarter 2006 or the first quarter of 2007 and would take nearly two years to complete. He said not knowing which option was chosen did not allow them to know when the jail portion would be built or if it would be built. Construction time would need to be extended if the jail was built after the Police and Courts. Police would need staff four to six months before the actual jail was to open to allow time for state mandated and local training for the jail. Staff put together a cash flow on what would work no matter which of the four site options was chosen, recognizing that not everything would happen at the same time.

Mr. Duey referred to the spread sheet used for the options and which showed staffing levels and when they would need to be in place. He discussed some of the other offset costs that may or may not be in place once the jail was opened. An assumption was that the business license would be in place. He discussed the leasing options for jail beds. He discussed the timing of jail bed leasing. He said it would take about 18 months from the date of hire of officers to the time when the income would be available to offset costs. He reviewed the four levy options and noted that any of the options would help to fund the jail. He noted the pros and cons listed for each option.

Mayor Leiken said questions from Council would follow testimony.

Mayor Leiken opened the public hearing.

1. Jim Hale, 1715 Linnea Avenue, Eugene, OR. Mr. Hale said he was concerned this would harm the community. He said Eugene didn't always think about the broader community when decisions were made, act with an eye to the long term future, and frequently acted without regard to the valid interest of the broader community. He asked Springfield to stop acting like Eugene. He discussed the measure that passed for the justice center. He noted the number of voters who voted against this measure and discussed some of the reasons people voted one way or another. He discussed the partnership between the City of Springfield and Lane County and felt that Lane County should step up to help. He said some voters may have not wanted the new Police/Court Building, didn't like the location, didn't want more taxes or didn't want the City jail. He said those that voted no may have seen that it was the County's responsibility to run the jail and there was no good reason to duplicate County efforts. He discussed all aspects of operating a jail. He said maybe voters thought the City should spend money on Police and Fire and not a jail. He urged Council to cooperate with Lane County and make the County do what they needed to do. He said that would really be Springfield.

2. Fred Simmons, 312 S. 52nd Place, Springfield, OR Mr. Simmons said he supported the jail, but did not support the levy. He noted his involvement in the process and referred to a letter from the Police Planning Task Force with recommendations that spoke to the broader base. He said he had found there were more people in the community wanting to work on the funding process in a way that brought the expense of the process to those that would use it. He said the City should start the process as soon as possible of acknowledging the fact the jail would be built and operated, and begin implementing the fees along with the business license registration. He said the Council, the staff and interested citizens should immediately begin the fees and charges and deposit them into a designated jail operations fund. The educational foundation would then be in place if the City wanted to come back in November with the need for jail funding. He said Council needed to acknowledge that the jail need was there and that the construction process move forward with the most reasonable cost. He said he felt there was a legitimate way to fund the jail.
3. Curtiss Greer, 357 55th Street, Springfield, OR Mr. Greer said if Council was willing to adopt the recommendations created by the citizen group, adding also reduction in pension payments, severance packages and time off for doing the job chosen, he would be able to back the full amount. Any larger request and he would be opposed.
4. Gery VanderMeer, 2604 J Street, Springfield, OR Mr. VanderMeer thanked the Mayor and Council for the opportunity to speak before them. He distributed a document with suggestions for jail funding that would not include business licenses. He said he opposed the business fee and his proposal would eliminate the need for any business licensing fee. He said the information he provided was supplemental information to that which was already received which showed an additional \$483,000 in revenue. He said a good portion of that amount was from savings on costs the City was currently incurring. He discussed some of the expenditures the City paid when dealing with prosecuting criminals. He said there were savings documented in the citizens Public Safety Coordinating Council in 2004 which showed the City of Springfield was expending \$1.2M for failure to appear. He said he was concerned the jail would not be built because funding would not be attainable. He discussed revenues that could be available to support the jail. He urged Council to keep faith with the citizens who voted to build a jail by building a jail. He proposed the City operate the jail with a cap of \$1.8M for the first two years. He said that would allow the City to take funding that was already in hand and use it to pay for the jail while looking at definitive numbers and keep faith with the citizens who said they wanted the Council to address the problems with crime in the City. He said he would be available for further questions.
5. Roxie Cuellar, 729 South 70th Street, Springfield, OR Ms. Cuellar said she was attending on behalf of the Police Planning Task Force. She said the task force met on Thursday night and discussed the May ballot measure. The task force had concerns regarding the lack of time for an effective campaign if the measure went on the May ballot and that the measure would not be successful. She distributed a letter from the task force and discussed the recommendations from the task force for revenue for the jail. She noted that eight of the nine proposals came from law enforcement activities and should not affect the General Fund. She noted one of the recommendations was to move \$300,000 into the Police levy that would go to voters in May. She discussed the indirect costs and the business license. She said the Chamber may not be as opposed to a business license as many had thought. She said there was a lot of contribution from the business community when the Public Safety Facility went to the ballot. She said the voters did support the jail. She said when the task force met, they had ideas and concerns that some might generate complaints from citizens. She said it was time to decide if a jail was to be built or not. She felt most residents would rather have a jail even if it generated some complaints, than to have the crime problem continue. She said the PPTF

agreed that the City should implement as many of the fees and charges as possible and designate them to a jail reserve fund.

Mayor Leiken closed the public hearing.

Councilor Ralston asked Ms. Cuellar if the General Fund would absorb the indirects if the Justice Center did not pay them.

Ms. Cuellar said her understanding was that departments that received their funding from the General Fund did not pay indirects.

Ms. Pappas said fees include indirects which pay for Information Technology, Human Resources and Finance. There were indirects that were funded by the Public Works Department, Development Services Department and other departments.

Councilor Ralston asked if indirects were figured into the deficit.

Ms. Cuellar said it was included.

Councilor Ralston asked about the Police levy positions proposed.

Ms. Cuellar said the Police levy would be increased by \$300,000 (.10 per thousand) that could staff two officer positions for jail operations.

Councilor Ballew discussed the work sheet from the PPTF. She said overhead had to be paid by the City whether it went to the Police or not. She said costs went up when the size of the organization was increased. She said police had to be charged the indirects just as the other departments. She said businesses felt support of the jail needed to be spread out and that businesses did not need to be the primary supporters. She said she supported the business license fee if it was for the support of a service. She did not feel that money should go to jail funding. She felt moving the \$300,000 would be hiding what the real purpose was for that money. She appreciated the committee taking the time and effort to come up with the suggestions, but she did not agree with all of them. She asked if something had been done regarding the business license fee yet.

Mr. Duey said nothing had been done yet, but it would be coming to Council in a few weeks.

Councilor Lundberg said her first choice would be to work with County, but they had tried that and it hadn't worked. She wanted more specific numbers regarding when and if certain fees could be charged to the prisoners. She said she didn't mind putting the \$300,000 with the Police Levy because discussion had been held regarding combining or moving positions to provide the safety of citizens. Moving around the positions would be a legitimate request of the voters. She said the numbers were there, but not the information to back it up. She wanted to see more of that information.

Councilor Woodrow thanked the committee for putting this list together and their work. Regarding the vote, he noted that the Council liked all of its citizens, but followed what the majority told Council. He asked staff for the viability of some of the figures from the PPTF list before Council met again. Council owed it to the citizens to look at every possible option before

going out for a levy. He said Council wanted to fund the jail operations, but not necessarily through a levy.

Councilor Pishioneri said by statute the City could charge per diem and for housing. He said he liked the numbers on the list provided by the PPTF. He said looking for three additional positions on the Police levy was a good idea. He said he would like to look for additional savings by shifting two or three positions from the current allotment on the levy. He said the numbers were good, but was concerned about counting money when the City hadn't had the experience of running a jail. He referred to leasing the beds. He said he did not like the idea of a levy to fund jail operations.

Councilor Fitch said she was not in support of a levy for operations of the jail. She thanked the PPTF for what they had started. She noted that this list needed more time and refinement. She liked the idea of starting a jail reserve fund now to show citizens where the money was going. She said if one tenth or other minimal amount of the cost of operating the jail should come from a levy, it would be much more manageable. She said there was a long way to go to convince people the weight of the funding was not being placed on one group. She said she couldn't support not paying indirects because it meant cutting in other departments.

Councilor Ralston said Council needed to trust in what the voters said at the election to build a jail. He agreed with Mr. Simmons and said the City should be emphatic about building the jail. He felt the City should initiate fees immediately. He said a ballot measure in May was risky and he would support anything else that would eliminate that. He agreed this was a good start and brought funding close enough to move forward.

Councilor Ballew said the reluctance to ask voters if they would pay for jail operations sounded like there was no confidence the citizens would support it. If people wanted the jail, they needed to vote to fund it. Operating the jail without adequate funds would require other cuts and she did not support that.

Mayor Leiken thanked Mr. Hale for speaking to Council and thanked Springfield speakers as well. He said he felt Springfield was trying to be partners with Lane County. The District Attorney had noted that the County was about 500 beds short and that deficit would only continue to grow as the population grew. Not enough was being done to help the situation. He said he was glad to see that Lane County was taking on this issue, but they did not have much success at the polls. He said Springfield had a good solid record. He said that Sheriff Burger had said the Springfield municipal jail would be important for the system and he had been supportive of the 100 bed municipal jail. He said the jail was important, not only because Springfield citizens voted on it, but because of the need. He said Springfield had talked about economic development being part of quality of life. He noted the many companies that that would generate nearly \$2.5M in property taxes over the next five years. He said based on proposals brought forward tonight, there was a good chance to fund the jail and allocate other dollars to other parts of the City where needed.

Ms. Pappas said staff would take the submittal from the PPTF and go through the numbers to see if they were realistic. She asked if Council wanted staff to look at when those revenue streams would take place and determine whether or not those would coincide with the opening of the jail.

Councilor Ralston said he would like to see how fast the fees could be implemented.

Mayor Leiken noted the figures submitted by Gary VanderMeer and asked to have those figures examined also.

Councilor Lundberg said she would like the fees/charges put in two columns: 1) those charged to people who had been cited or in jail and 2) taxpayer based fees, including indirects.

Councilor Ballew referred to Mr. VanderMeer's document and asked about the savings he noted. She asked if those were real savings or if there were other costs involved.

Ms. Pappas said if a Police Officer was not waiting in court, he was out on the street on patrol. She said the indigent representation was a real fee. She said staff would separate how much went out the door and how much was a transfer.

Mr. Duey noted that the figure was the 'failure to appear' for both Circuit Court and Municipal Court. The operation of the Municipal Jail would not cut down on the FTE's for the Circuit Court. He asked if Council wanted staff to go forward with preparation on a levy. He said the ballot title and four options were currently before Council.

Councilor Lundberg said Council would like to go forward, but would also like the additional information from the proposals presented tonight.

Council consensus was to keep the levy option as an alternative, using Option 3.

Mr. Duey suggested Option 3 and 4 with variations.

Council agreed.

BUSINESS FROM THE AUDIENCE

1. Fred Simmons, 312 South 52nd Place, Springfield, OR. Mr. Simmons said he hoped the committee could come forward for Council's next meeting with the additional information requested by Council. He said that package should also include the potential revenue sources in the list and how long it would take to adopt those. He noted the discussion held by the PPTF regarding the per diem. He asked Council if they wanted to build a jail. He said he felt it was important to move forward to build the jail. He said the PPTF recommended site plan number two for the Public Safety Facility, but agreed input was needed by the Washburne neighbors. He said Council's responsibility was to represent the community and drive forward whatever financial options made sense.
2. Curtiss Greer, 357 55th Street, Springfield, OR. Mr. Greer distributed fliers from Kezar Hearing Centers. Mr. Greer noted his hearing loss and hoped the fliers would assist the Council. He said he wished to address cancerous conditions growing in Springfield that were destroying the citizen's liberty. Any suggestion with regard to lowering the cost of providing services was rejected without discussion or consideration. He gave several examples including: no action taken with regard to having private competition for staffing the jail facility; attempts by staff and others to keep citizen input from Council; changing regulations after allowing business to set up and operate when exempting the City from the same regulations; spending money on a flawed survey and keeping the draft from the committees until it had to go out in its flawed manner; no action taken to require the state to do the job

they collect taxes for and suggesting citizens should pay for it again; and consulting with a person who disapproved of an operation that was accepted nationwide by state, federal and private firms and using this persons recommendations. He discussed his Social Security benefits and the amount the City approved for pensions. He discussed the high cost to the rate payers for the hiring of a new employee. He said the actions of staff and Council show a disregard for the liberty of local citizens. He asked Council to look at what was going on and stop these destructive actions. He noted the salaries of seven employees, each over \$100,000 per year. He said he had retained counsel and was in the process of preparing a class action suit.

3. Tony Mills, 855 A Street, #5, Springfield, OR Mr. Mills said he lived in Springfield for about 20 years, was gone 7 years and recently returned. He said upon his return he noticed that Main Street was nearly dead. He said he then heard a new Courthouse and Jail was being built in downtown. He said he lived and worked in Salem for a number of years. He mentioned things that had happened in Springfield by Police officers. He said the City needed to focus on downtown rather than build something to victimize the citizens of the City more. He said he had sold a house in Springfield to get away from the Police due to the treatment he received. He felt the Public Safety Facility was being built for revenue enhancement. He gave an example. He discussed the expense of not showing up for trials. On behalf of a friend that owned a business on A Street, he asked a question regarding signage on her building.

Ms. Pappas said she would meet with Mr. Mills after the meeting to address his questions.

COUNCIL RESPONSE

CORRESPONDENCE AND PETITIONS

1. Correspondence from Nick Shevchynski, 2445 Skyline Blvd., Eugene, OR Regarding Noxious Fumes from Burning Material.
2. Correspondence from Nick Shevchynski, 2445 Skyline Blvd., Eugene, OR Regarding Debris Dumped in His Yard.
3. Correspondence from C. Sinclair, 6825 F Street, Springfield, OR Regarding Council's Decision on the Mandatory Rabies Reporting Ordinance.
4. Correspondence from David Sonnichsen, Chair, Citizen Planning Committee for the Whilamut Natural Area of Alton Baker Park Regarding Bridges Crossing the Willamette River.
5. Correspondence from James Daubenspeck, Springfield, OR Regarding Jail Operations Funding Suggestions.
6. Correspondence from Larry E. Reed, Principal, Land Use Planner, JRH, 4765 Village Plaza Loop, Suite 201, Eugene, OR to Mayor Piercy of the City of Eugene Regarding the West Eugene Parkway.

IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILOR WOODROW WITH A SECOND BY COUNCILOR LUNDBERG TO ACCEPT THE CORRESPONDENCE FOR FILING. THE MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 6 FOR AND 0 AGAINST.

BIDS

ORDINANCES

BUSINESS FROM THE CITY COUNCIL

1. Committee Appointments

a. Police Planning Task Force (PPTF) Appointments.

Police Chief Jerry Smith presented the staff report on this item. There are four existing vacancies on the Police Planning Task Force. One is the School District representative, two are business representative positions and one is a citizen-at-large position. Six candidates have applied.

The Police Planning Task Force received a total of six applications to fill current vacancies. Applications were received from Donald Moloney (a current member eligible for a second term as either a business or at-large position), Ralph Jacobson, Mark Molina, Gerald Brown and Rhonda Swanson. In addition, Mindy Stinson was recommended by the Springfield School District as the School District representative.

Candidates were interviewed on January 12, 2006. The task force recommends that Mindy Stinson be appointed to represent the Springfield School District, that Donald Moloney and Mark Molina be appointed as business representatives, and that Ralph Jacobson be appointed as a citizen-at-large member.

Councilor Fitch said although it would not affect her vote, she was the sister of one of the applicants and would abstain from the vote.

IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILOR WOODROW WITH A SECOND BY COUNCILOR LUNDBERG TO APPOINT MINDY STINSON, DONALD MOLONEY, MARK MOLINA AND RALPH (DAVE) JACOBSON TO THE POLICE PLANNING TASK FORCE (PPTF). THE MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5 FOR AND 0 AGAINST (1 ABSTENTION – FITCH).

b. Community Development Advisory Committee (CDAC) Appointment.

Housing Manager Kevin Ko presented the staff report on this item. One of six at-large positions on the CDAC is vacant. The term for the available position will begin upon appointment by the Springfield City Council and will continue through December 31, 2009.

The CDAC consists of six at-large positions from the community, one representative from the City Council and one representative from the Planning Commission. The CDAC advises the City Council on all matters related to the City's housing and community development activities which are funded annually by Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds and HOME Investment Partnership Program (HOME) funds received from HUD. Applications are encouraged from lower income earners, residents of lower income neighborhoods, racial and ethnic minorities, senior citizens, disabled individuals and female heads of households. All applicants must live within the city limits of Springfield.

Three at-large positions were available as a result of the term expirations of Stuart "Corky" Gourley, Patricia Scarci and Elizabeth Stubbs on December 31, 2005. Two of the positions

were filled by citizens Andrea Adams and Erin Lynch. The remaining vacancy was re-posted and citizen Diana Garcia submitted an application to serve on the CDAC. At a work session on January 23, 2006, Council reviewed the application of Ms. Garcia and approved her for appointment to the CDAC. Staff is requesting that Council appoint Ms. Garcia to fill the current vacant position on the CDAC.

IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILOR WOODROW WITH A SECOND BY COUNCILOR LUNDBERG TO APPOINT DIANA GARCIA TO THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CDAC) WITH A TERM TO EXPIRE DECEMBER 31, 2009. THE MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 6 FOR AND 0 AGAINST.

2. Business from Council

a. Committee Reports

1. Councilor Ballew reported on the League of Oregon Cities (LOC) Finance and Taxation Committee. She said there was a recommendation by Corvallis relating to insurance taxes in support of fire departments. She said she learned that in state law it was only a benefit for the State Fire Marshal. She also learned that cities were not required to provide services for properties that were tax exempt since they didn't pay. In the future the City may want to ask for contributions from those properties for service.
2. Councilor Ralston said he had been chair of the Human Services Commission for the last year and now Chris Pryor was the Chair. He said Rita Castillo, a member of the Springfield Budget Committee, was now Vice Chair.
3. Councilor Ralston reported on Lane Regional Air Pollution Authority (LRAPA). He said he had also been Chair for LRAPA for the last year and the board approved keeping him on as Chair for the next year. They were able to convince Vice Chair, Faye Stewart, to remain Vice Chair. That means Commissioner Stewart will be Chair of both LRAPA and Chair of the Lane County Commission next year. He noted that LRAPA issued permits as a regulatory commission. He said LRAPA Board Member Betty Taylor wanted to hold future talks regarding reducing the allowable pollution levels below the medically healthy rather than the legally allowed levels.
4. Councilors Ralston and Pishioneri served on the Oregon Highway 126 Committee. Councilor Ralston said there were a lot of variations for intersections and Council could ask them any questions.

BUSINESS FROM THE CITY MANAGER

1. Lane Transit District (LTD) and City of Eugene Connect Oregon Grant Requests from City Council.

Transportation Manager Nick Arnis presented the staff report on this item. Connect Oregon is a \$100 million grant program created by the 2005 Oregon Legislature using lottery bond proceeds. The Connect Oregon program provides grants and loans to improve air, marine, rail and public transit facilities and systems. The applications are submitted to Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) mode committees (rail, air, freight, transit committees) for evaluation.

The \$100 million is allocated among ODOT's five regions at \$15 million a region (Region 2 consists of the Willamette Valley that includes Eugene-Springfield, Corvallis, and Salem metro areas and mid to northern coastal communities) while \$25 million will be set aside to fund projects of statewide significance.

LTD is proposing to apply for \$7.6 million to pay for improvements on the Pioneer Parkway EmX facility in the RiverBend hospital corridor and the Connect Oregon funds will be used as match for federal funds. LTD has requested the City to co-sponsor their Connect Oregon application. Co-sponsorship does not obligate the City to funding any part of the BRT project or for providing any match for the Connect Oregon grant. In addition, the City Council will still have the opportunity to review and approve the entire Pioneer Parkway EmX corridor alternatives later this year when LTD releases the environmental document for the project that includes a public involvement phase.

The City of Eugene has also requested support from the City for their \$4.337 million Connect Oregon application to improve the Eugene Airport. Eugene is not seeking co-sponsorship for their application, only a letter for support from the Mayor.

Mr. Arnis discussed the two requests.

Councilor Ballew said the Eugene Airport request was exactly what the air freight was about, but she said she was not sure why LTD wanted the City as a co-sponsor for the LTD EMX. She said that project didn't seem to fit the Connect Oregon criteria and she asked if it would have a chance for success.

Mr. Arnis introduced Steph Viggiano from LTD.

Mr. Viggiano said having a co-applicant strengthened their application by showing there was a partnership between LTD and the City promoting and building the project. LTD was not asking for any financial commitment. He said LTD thought they had a good shot at receiving funding. During the Legislative Session there was discussion whether transit should be eligible for funds and it was determined that transit was eligible. There had been a favorable response to this project among legislators they spoke with. He said there would probably not be a lot of transit applications submitted statewide.

IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILOR WOODROW WITH A SECOND BY COUNCILOR LUNDBERG TO APPROVE LETTER OF SUPPORT AND CO-SPONSORSHIP FROM CITY FOR LTD CONNECT OREGON APPLICATION FOR ELEMENTS OF THE PIONEER PARKWAY EMX PROJECT. THE MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 6 FOR AND 0 AGAINST.

IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILOR WOODROW WITH A SECOND BY COUNCILOR LUNDBERG TO APPROVE LETTER OF SUPPORT FROM CITY FOR CITY OF EUGENE CONNECT OREGON APPLICATION FOR EUGENE AIRPORT IMPROVEMENTS. THE MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 6 FOR AND 0 AGAINST.

Mayor Leiken suggested Council members look at a copy of the memo from Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) that Nick Arnis had received regarding I-5/Franklin Intersection.

Councilor Lundberg asked for a copy of the memo.

Mr. Arnis said he could make copies and put them in Council boxes.

BUSINESS FROM THE CITY ATTORNEY

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Minutes Recorder Amy Sowa

Sidney W. Leiken
Mayor

Attest:

City Recorder