

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
TABLE OF CONTENTS FOR MINUTES  
February 19, 2019**

Call to Order .....	2
Council and Staff Attendance .....	2
Public Attendance .....	2
Agenda Changes .....	2
Public Comment.....	2
Consent Agenda.....	2
Old Business .....	2
Locust Street LID Assessments.....	2
2019 Street Maintenance Program.....	5
Ordinance No. 567-2019, Utility Discount Program .....	6
Utility Line Warranty Program .....	6
City Administrator Evaluation .....	7
New Business .....	7
Department Head Hiring .....	7
Council Concerns and Committee Reports.....	9
Mayor's Report.....	9
City Administrator's Report .....	10
Public Comment.....	11

**City of Dundee**  
**City Council Meeting Minutes**  
**February 19, 2019**

**Call to Order**

Mayor David Russ called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

**Council and Staff Attendance**

Present: Mayor David Russ; Council President Tim Weaver; Councilors Storr Nelson, Jeannette Adlong, Kristen Svicarovich, Patrick Kelly and Ted Crawford. Staff members: Rob Daykin, City Administrator; Dan Olsen, City Attorney; Melissa Lemen, Administrative Assistant;

**Public Attendance**

Ken & Linda Warren; Megan Carda, Joseph Jackson, Ethan Headley and Grant Williams, Trellis; Colleen Rollandi; James C. Rollandi; Jim Rollandi; Kim Gauntt; Michelle Von Letkemann; and Ken Von Letkemann.

**Agenda Changes**

Consent agenda item 5.3 Financial Report ending January 31, 2019 was provided to Council.

**Public Comment**

None.

**Consent Agenda**

A **motion** was made and seconded to approve Consent Agenda item 5.1 City Council Minutes, February 5, 2019; Item 5.2 OLCC Liquor License Application, Trellis Dundee LLC; and Item 5.3 Financial Report Ending January 31, 2019, **The motion** passed unanimously.

**Old Business**

**Locust Street LID Assessments**

C.E. Reid provided an overview of the events which have led up to the Locust Street LID Assessments. He discussed that Del Boca Vista planned to develop six lots along Locust Street, and as a part of that development they placed a water line and sewer line improvement prior to home construction. Del Boca Vista received SDC credits for the water line improvement; which included water service lines and meter boxes to each of the six lots. At that time, C.E. Reid explained, the LID was established to complete the Locust Street sidewalk and street improvements; Del Boca Vista disclosed the LID to prospective home buyers and funds were set aside in escrow to accommodate the preliminary assessment for the new property owners. Del Boca Vista completed construction of the six homes prior to the City's contractor starting the LID improvements and identified that the water meters hadn't been placed correctly and were further into the sidewalk area of the public right-of-way than could be accommodated. To further complicate the matter, Del Boca Vista had also installed all of the irrigation back check valves and controllers within the right-of-way as well and be in conflict with the new sidewalk. C.E. Reid explained that he reached out to Del Boca Vista and inquired as to whether they wanted to reach out to their contractor to try to resolve the situation. He noted that their response was that he should proceed with the City contractor since he was already on-site, but they would reinstall the irrigation equipment. The water meters were then relocated and the irrigation system was removed by the City's contractor. C.E. Reid discussed the actual construction costs came in pretty close for the six lots to what C.E. Reid had estimated (except for the additional work to

relocate the meters). C.E. Reid explained that when the LID final costs were calculated he approached Del Boca Vista to see if they would consider covering the additional costs of meter relocation; no clear response was received and so the additional costs were included into the final LID assessment. Additional detailed discussion ensued. C.E Reid noted that at one point during the construction of the water line Public Works employee Chuck Simpson recalled commenting to the developer's contractor that it didn't appear to him that the water meters were in the correct location. At that time there were no curbs in place and the street was all torn up; and the contractor said they were in the right location. As-builts were also received from the developer's engineer of record which reflected that the water meters were in the correct location per the approved plan. C.E. Reid discussed that it is not City policy to survey such improvements nor ask for survey's to be completed; instead rely on the as-built plans provided by the developer.

C.A. Daykin discussed the Locust Street LID Assessments and the process as outlined in his agenda report beginning on page 27.

Ken and Michelle Von Letkemann, 785 SE Locust Street, approached Council and Ken explained that this assessment has caught them completely off guard as they were told it had been taken care of when they purchased their home. Michelle discussed her opinion at length and shared her view that whatever errors were made aren't the fault of any of the new property owners; they should not be required to pay that cost difference. Additional detailed discussion ensued. Ken voiced frustration and pointed out that they (the property owners) had nothing to do with the mistakes that were made.

M. Russ voiced support of the property owners and indicated that much of the additional costs were the fault of the developer. C. Crawford offered clarification and explained that this LID was anticipated two years ago and should have been communicated by the developer that the property owners would be responsible for covering a portion of that street improvement. C. Nelson explained that property owners assumed responsibility when they made the purchase, though he is unsure at what point during the purchasing process this information is disclosed.

C.A. Olsen discussed that the basic premise behind an LID is not fault but rather benefit to the property with value; therefore, the property owner is responsible for all of the costs associated with obtaining that benefit regardless as to whether there was a cost overrun or someone made a mistake, or the developer misrepresented something. Additional discussion ensued. With regard to Notice, C.A. Olsen discussed that this is required to be provided by the Developer. He explained that there was a Deed Restriction Construction Deferral Agreement and Waiver of Rights to Remonstrate recorded against the property which would have been disclosed by the title company at the time of closing. Discussion ensued.

Kim Gauntt, 16585 NE Fairview Drive, approached Council and indicated that he is representing his son-in-law, Bram Davidson, who is the owner of the property at 727 SE Locust Street. Gauntt discussed that it is his understanding that his son-in-law had spoken with C.A. Daykin several times over the last couple of weeks as well as provided a letter to which C.A. Daykin indicated he has not received. A copy of the letter was provided for the record. Gauntt discussed his disappointment with the manner in which the issuance of the LID assessment has been handled by the City of Dundee, and questioned whether the Council is representing the residents of Dundee or the City. Additional discussion ensued. Gauntt empathized with the property owners and pointed out that that at closing it was unlikely known that there would be a mistake made or a cost overrun; he pointed out that the mistakes made were not the responsibility of the home owners and should have been identified and corrected by those involved in the project. Gauntt expressed his disappointment that the City would pass these costs on to the people and encouraged them to rethink their decision about who is responsible for the additional costs

incurred. He suggested that if the City believes the contractor is at fault they should go after their bond at the State. He stressed his opinion that the costs incurred are not the fault of the property owners.

James Rollandi, 797 SE Locust Street, approached Council with his wife, Colleen. He expressed disappointment in the amount of money they are being asked to pay. He inquired about the construction/development process, especially with regard to the water meters being inspected appropriately.

C.A. Daykin provided additional clarification. He explained that the Developer entered into an Agreement with the City for the installation of the water line. He explained the process by which the City reimbursed the Developer because they were installing in a new sewer main and a water line (the water line that had been there was substandard and had to be upgraded which was the responsibility of the City). C.A. Daykin discussed that the Developer moved forward through a permit process with a City Engineer review; all of the standards were met for the City review process including the final process where they present an as-built plan provided by their Engineer of Record. C.A. Daykin pointed out that this is the usual practice for the City in these type of circumstances; the City doesn't complete additional surveys to ensure that the water meters were placed per the approved plan. He also explained that when the City then hired a contractor to complete the street work a survey was conducted for this purpose and that is when the error was discovered – the water meters were placed in the wrong location by the Developer. Additional lengthy discussion ensued and questions were raised about whether the City has any recourse with the Developer for this error. C.A. Daykin discussed that there may be a timing issue as the water line was installed a year in advance of the street project.

Colleen Rollandi provided additional discussion and explained some of the reasons that she and James decided to settle in Dundee. She discussed her disappointment and that it seems very unethical and unfair. James Rollandi pointed out that it seems unfair that they are being asked to pay for an error that the developer is refusing to assume responsibility for. Colleen pointed out that when they signed their title they set aside funds in an escrow account for their street which is what they agreed to.

C.A. Daykin pointed out that there were a number of different costs associated with the project that were not charged off to the homeowners including the street light, trees and other types of improvements. C.A. Daykin discussed that the City may want to continue using the LID financing tool and make it available for other neighborhoods, and noted that it may be helpful to foster some good will moving forward in the community.

M. Russ inquired about what legal rights the City may have moving forward. C.A. Olsen explained that he is not entirely familiar with the history and some research would need to be done, but discussed that the Developer is simply the Developer that is regulated by the City, and not the City's contractor; he suspects that there is no real contractual relationship present there. C.A. Olsen discussed that bonds are very difficult to go after; it may be that the buyers from the Developer may have more potential for recovery against the Developer if the Developer misrepresented the location of the water meters which ended up costing his customers money.

M. Russ pointed out that the City Council serves the citizens of Dundee and lengthy discussion ensued with regard to what he feels are some potential options moving forward. He expressed frustration that the homeowners have been left with the burden of extra costs and shared his opinion that Del Boca Vista should be required to pay those costs. C. Svicarovich pointed out that standard construction practice does not include going in and surveying water meter locations after they are installed. She provided additional detailed discussion regarding the development

process and voiced her belief that moving forward the City's standard practice should not be to take the step to survey because of the additional costs, which are not incurred by the majority of cities; she is unaware of any City which does that sort of inspection or survey. Additional detailed discussion ensued. C. Crawford voiced his opinion that the residents should not have to pay for the mistake made. C. Svicarovich voiced agreement with C. Crawford though noted that she also does not feel that the residents of the City of Dundee as a whole should have to pay for the mistake.

C.E. Reid noted that for Council's consideration he did review the maintenance bond and found that it is valid until May 1, 2019. C.A. Olsen discussed that the option of the bond holder meeting the City could be explored. He discussed that in his experience it is more difficult to get money out of a bond company than it is out of an insurance company, but there is that possibility. C.A. Olsen also explained that there is also the possibility that the Developer would not want to see their bond rating get dinged by a claim which may provide some leverage for the developer to step up. C.A. Olsen discussed that if the City chose to explore some of the possible options, Council could delay making a decision until more information could be obtained regarding what recourse there is under the bond. He discussed that another option could be to levy either the full assessment or split the assessment between the City and the property owners, or whatever Council decides to do as a policy matter. He explained that the City could then look at pursuing the bond and then, if there is a recovery, the City could apply that to the assessments which have been levied so that the property owners wouldn't have to pay that amount. Discussion ensued with regard to the pros and cons of pursuing the bond. C.A. Olsen discussed that Jordan Ramis, P.C. could take a look at all of the information and provide the City an idea of what they think it would take to pursue a claim with the bond company. He also noted that the Firm has a lot of specialists in construction contracts and they may have relationships with the bond company. Additional detailed discussion ensued.

C.A. Daykin pointed out that under the rules regarding the LID, this meeting was established where the owners could come and bring their objections to the City Council. He explained that the City has 60 days from this date to resolve those objections. C.E. Reid discussed that his concern that other than negotiating a change order with the LID contractor, he does not have survey documentation that the meters were improperly placed. C. Crawford pointed out that there are direct witnesses. C. Nelson discussed that because the City has 60 days, or until May for the bond, that he is not in favor of applying the assessments at this time. C.A. Daykin discussed that another potential option might be to move forward, pursue the bond action separately and therefore not be subject to that timeline. The property owners were encouraged to reach out to those they purchased their homes from and initiate this conversation with them as well. The consensus of Council was to investigate the options discussed before making any decisions.

C.A. Daykin suggested that at the next regular City Council business meeting on March 19, 2019 an update could be provided and noted on the agenda.

C. Svicarovich inquired as to which fund would be impacted if the City were to try to contribute towards the LID costs. C.A. Daykin discussed that monies would come from the Water CIP Fund as a water system improvement; there would be no impact to any imminent project that is underway right now.

### **2019 Street Maintenance Program**

C.A. Daykin provided an overview of the information contained in his agenda report beginning on page 31. C. Nelson inquired about Cedar and Beech Streets to which C.A. Daykin explained that these streets are not in such terrible condition that they would likely be eligible for SCA money due to the way the SCA program works, prioritizing use of funds for the "worst of the

worst". The goal of City of Dundee's program, in contrast, is to catch things before they become very expensive to repair. Additional detailed discussion ensued. C.A. Daykin reviewed that SCA grant funds will be used to complete the Charles Street project; the City is waiting for the Agreement to come back from ODOT to begin work. Additionally, he explained that they would like to add Beech and Cedar Streets as these were highlighted in the Street Saver Program as overlay projects. C.E. Reid discussed that if this work is completed now it can be done with a 2 inch overlay rather than a full reconstruction later on.

With regard to Fifth Street, C.A. Daykin discussed that it will likely be a reconstruct the way it is being reviewed right now; eventually the street will be widened with curbs and sidewalks, which may be a more opportune time to plan for that type of work, and try to get by for the next 2-3 years with patch work. C.A. Daykin explained that though he initially thought it was only slurry seal which was lifting in the area, there is actually a thin lift over the original lift and so there are multiple layers which are peeling off near the Post Office. Discussion ensued.

C. Nelson voiced agreement in taking care of streets while they're in better condition than when they are not. He discussed that he is in favor of the described work and pointed out that it's also a nice opportunity to get some additional work done in addition to Charles Street. Discussion ensued and C.A. Daykin explained that he can provide an update on where the City stands on some of the financing aspects at the March 19, 2019 meeting; if it's included in the base bid the likelihood is that the City will get more competitive pricing for that additional work as opposed to being an alternative. C.E. Reid discussed that one could be included with the other added as an alternative, and then the City would be more likely to get the second project at the same pricing. C. Nelson voiced support of that strategy and noted that he walked the project as well.

C.E. Reid discussed potential options with regard to Viewmont Drive. C. Nelson voiced his belief that a chip seal wouldn't be the right way to go for this street. He explained that in his experience chip seal requires a stable base; a stable and structurally sound base do not appear present in this area. Though he has no personal experience utilizing the Cape Seal option, he explained that it will not add anything structurally to the project other than filling in some void space and provide some better run off; cosmetically it will be better and there will be a less rough surface. C. Nelson supported that some asphalt thickness would be best for Viewmont. Detailed discussion ensued with regard to the chip seal process and the type of roadways best suitable for this alternative. C.A. Daykin discussed that it is more of a matter of funding and how those funds can best be utilized. A **motion** was made and seconded to authorize the city administrator to sign the 2019 SCA agreement for Charles Street pending review and approval of the agreement by the city attorney. **The motion** passed unanimously.

#### **Ordinance No. 567-2019, Utility Discount Program**

C.A. Daykin pointed out that there was an error in the agenda packet and that the correct Ordinance number for the Utility Discount Program is 566-2019. A **motion** was made and seconded to adopt Ordinance No. 566-2019 as amended, an ordinance relating to a utility discount program and amending sections 13.08.020 and 13.08.040 of the Dundee Municipal Code. **The motion** passed unanimously.

#### **Utility Line Warranty Program**

C.A. Daykin explained that pricing for this type of program is based on the premise that if the home owner determines that there is a problem they are to notify the program that they need to have it fixed, as opposed to the City systematically going out and trying to find I&I problems. C.A. Daykin suggested that if the Council still wants to promote this program through the City website, logo and under City sponsorship it will need to be made very clear what it does and doesn't cover in the literature that goes to the residents who wish to sign up for it. M. Russ

inquired as to what the coverage would be if a resident randomly decided to run their own sewer scope. C.A. Daykin discussed that though he never raised that particular issue with them, they indicated it had to be something that the homeowner themselves would bring forward as opposed to a purchase sale arrangement where the prospective purchaser does that testing and locates a problem. M. Russ voiced support of the program as long as the literature would be inclusive of the appropriate information.

C. Svicarovich discussed that her only concern is with regard to the City potentially invalidating someone's warranty program; if the City completed an I&I investigation on a residential street where someone has bought into the warrant program after it having been promoted by the City. She voiced concern that this is not the appropriate time to implement such a program based on where things stand with the I&I work that the City is trying to accomplish. Though C. Nelson voiced support of the program, he also agreed that the timing of the program is wrong right now while the City is in the middle of I&I investigations and improvements. C.A. Daykin reviewed that whatever information is provided to prospective customers must first pass City review. C. Kelly discussed that he is concerned about the City logo being sent out on mailers and the possible confusion which could result for residents; this could be especially concerning given the coverage limitations. C.A. Daykin reviewed that at the last Council meeting it was explained that this is a program which has the endorsement and sponsorship of the National League of Cities; the program has a stellar type of reputation in areas where they have been doing business up to this point, though C.A. Daykin does understand where those miscommunications could happen and lead to expectations not being satisfied.

C. Svicarovich voiced concern as well about the timing not being ideal and noted that if other cities in Yamhill County become involved then maybe Council could review things a year from now; at that time the City may have a better idea if there will be more I&I investigations. C.A. Daykin discussed that Newberg only began the program last fall; it may be of interest to check back with them a year from now to see if they have received any complaints or had any issues come up. C. Nelson pointed out that keeping local citizens apprised of Council's intentions with regard to the program would be a good idea. C. Crawford inquired as to whether or not citizens can obtain the insurance themselves to which C.A. Daykin explained that this particular program won't be offered unless it has the City's endorsement and participation. Additional discussion ensued. The consensus of Council was to table the program for one year and then reevaluate.

### **City Administrator Evaluation**

C.A. Daykin reviewed the information contained in his agenda report on page 61. Brief discussion ensued. C.A. Daykin discussed that if Council wishes to move forward with the special council meeting on April 2, 2019, then he will notify the COG who will then be sending emails out to all of the City Councilors; the evaluation can be completed online. **A motion** was made and seconded to set a special council meeting on April 2, 2019 at 6:00 pm for the purpose of conducting a performance review of the city administrator in executive session. **The motion** passed unanimously.

## **New Business**

### **Department Head Hiring**

It was noted that both the Fire Chief and Public Works Supervisor have been in their positions since prior to C.A. Daykin being hired as the City Administrator; brief discussion ensued. C.A. Daykin discussed the fact that the Dundee Municipal Code (DMC) contains a very unusual provision (2.12.030) that provides Council the exclusive authority for hiring department directors. He pointed out that this is not a political decision and noted that he is not aware of any City that utilizes a similar process. C.A. Daykin voiced his opinion that the city administrator or city manager should have the ability to choose the staff that they are going to be responsible for and

select persons that would best fit the situation and has the experience and the qualifications necessary for the job. C. Nelson discussed his belief that the checks and balances the provision provides he is in favor of, though discussed the importance of consideration which would be given to whomever C.A. Daykin recommended. C.A. discussed that a year ago Sean O'Day had suggested that Council might want to consider taking actions to step his position up to the next level of a city manager position with greater authority; he suggested that this wouldn't be a desirable provision if Council were going to recruit a city manager to come into the City of Dundee; that person would want to be able to recruit and hire their own department heads. C.A. Daykin pointed out that a good city administrator/city manager would advise Council of what was going on with the position, and pointed out that if they were unhappy or the wrong decision was made the burden falls on the city administrator/city manager. C.A. Daykin voiced his opinion that if Council feels it is important to retain the provision, he would definitely recommend some changes to the language present, including defining what a "department head" is and potentially amending the language "council retains exclusive control," which seems more than just advising City Council and asking for approval. Additional thoughts and ideas were shared by Council members. C. Nelson voiced support of potentially changing or softening the verbiage though noted that he is not interested in micromanaging the process; he supported the checks and balances the provision provides. C. Svicarovich expressed a potential concern for candidates who may not want to be disclosed; how would their privacy be maintained while going through a public hiring process such as this. C.A. Olsen confirmed that this discussion and evaluation could be done during executive session. Discussion ensued with regard to the verbiage contained in the provision and the fact that it may be unclear.

M. Russ discussed that during his career he has had extensive experience with the hiring process and voiced that he values input from others regarding those decisions. He also voiced support of Council's participation in that final decision making process with the city administrator. M. Russ voiced appreciation for Council's wide breadth of knowledge and experience which he believes to be very helpful in this type of decision making. Additional discussion ensued. C. Svicarovich voiced support of potentially establishing something like a hiring committee where Council members who want to be involved in this process could do so. She voiced her belief that it doesn't seem that Council should be hiring staff for someone who isn't being managed by Council on a day to day basis. C. Svicarovich voiced support of amending the language in Section 2.12.030 as well as the city administrator having control over hiring "department heads," though supported that this needs to be defined. Detailed discussion ensued with regard to several of the current staff job descriptions and responsibilities.

C.A. Daykin discussed that what precipitated his concern with regard to Section 2.12.030 is that Alan Mustain, Public Works Supervisor, is nearing retirement. Though Mustain hasn't yet provided his decision in writing, he has indicated he will retire in July or August of this year. C.A. Daykin discussed that staff have been working with Chuck Simpson, Utility Worker III, to step up his skill set; he has been taking some management related supervisory courses and stepping up in his certification. He pointed out that he finds Simpson very capable, intelligent, diligent, and ideal for that type of position; his intent was to elevate him to Public Works Supervisor, which means he would then also need to recruit someone else to fill Simpson's position. He inquired if Council would be favorable to the plan he has presented of using Simpson to replace Mustain, and then recruiting Simpson's replacement. C. Nelson voiced that he has had good dealings with Simpson and pointed out that he is someone with a lot of experience as long-time Dundee public works employee. Discussion ensued. M. Russ voiced that he personally doesn't have a lot of experience directly with Simpson and cannot offer his full support at this time. He also indicated that he is aware that C. Adlong is highly opposed to this proposition though he is unsure of the reasoning. M. Russ discussed that while he agrees that bringing in someone who has experience in the City and knowledge is important, he pointed out

that there are a lot more aspects to supervising a maintenance crew than that. Discussion ensued. C. Kelly volunteered that he is not very familiar with Simpson and cannot offer guidance on this issue. C. Crawford shared that though he is aware that Simpson is a hard worker, he is unfamiliar with his management abilities. M. Russ voiced that over the years he has received complaints from residents occasionally, and C.A. Daykin encouraged that any complaints about City employees be brought to him in the future. C.A. Daykin pointed out that the decision to hire or not hire Simpson for the position should be a city manager or city administrator decision.

Additional discussion ensued and M. Russ suggested that at a bare minimum there should be a proper process completed to provide the City the opportunity to hire someone even better than what C.A. Daykin may think is best because the City deserves that. C. Nelson suggested that defining what a "department head" is would be a good first step moving forward to determine who has control over hiring. C. Svicarovich discussed that she has no background expertise or interest in being involved with the hiring of a Municipal Court Judge, and that without knowledge of the day to day workings it would be difficult for her to voice her opinion even with regard to the office manager position. She discussed her belief that the City has operated successfully for a very long time with where things stand as a City and doesn't feel that Council should retain exclusive control over hiring of department heads.

C.A. Daykin indicated that he will try to put together an amended Section 2.12.030 that could be discussed further. C. Crawford voiced his opinion that the city administrator position should be changed to be more of a manager rather than an administrator position, and provide the city administrator more authority to manage the City and personnel while Council focuses on policy. C.A. Daykin explained prior to the establishment of the city administrator position the City Council did hire staff directly and performed administrative functions; and when the Council hired the first city administrator to replace the city recorder position the rules adopted for the city administrator at that time retained the authority to hire department directors.

### **Council Concerns and Committee Reports**

C. Svicarovich inquired as to whom on the Council will be in attendance for the City-County Dinner to be held at the Dundee Fire Department this Thursday, February 21, 2019. It was noted that Mayor Russ, C. Crawford, C. Svicarovich and C.A. Daykin will plan to attend.

### **Mayor's Report**

M. Russ raised the topic of the area between Newberg and Dundee. He shared that residents both of Dundee and Newberg have communicated their desire that this area not be developed in an effort to maintain the separation between the Cities. He explained that given the recent conversations with regard to the need for additional school space and potentially even park space, he began thinking these could potentially be spacious answers to help fill that gap between the two Cities, as he believes that area will eventually develop at some point anyway. Discussion ensued. M. Russ discussed that he spoke with Newberg Mayor Rogers and indicated that they will try to initiate discussions at the County in the future. C. Svicarovich pointed out that she doesn't feel there will ever be a lot of development south of Highway 99W as long as the railroad is present. M. Russ indicated that he will continue to communicate with Mayor Rogers and try to build that relationship stronger.

C.A. Daykin discussed that he had a conversation today with the City Engineer with regard to at what point will the City be in a position of looking at urban growth boundary adjustments. He noted that it will depend upon how quickly the Riverside area develops. C.A. Daykin explained that if development starts taking place and buildable land area starts diminishing, the City has an obligation to start planning for the next 20 years. C.A. Daykin informed that this will require a new Comp Plan, a very extensive and expensive process. He discussed that the challenge will be

whether the resources will be available to complete the process as he explained that the State has pretty much declined to fund Cities under a certain size for that type of work. Discussion ensued with regard to how quickly development is happening in other nearby areas, and the anticipation is that once the Riverside area is ready, development may happen quickly in our area as well.

### **City Administrator's Report**

C.A. Daykin discussed that tomorrow evening Planning Commission will hold another continuation of the public hearing process for the Riverside District zoning code amendments. He explained that it looks like they won't complete their recommendations; a lot of issues have come up since the last meeting that the City is trying to address with the Committee and the developers. C.A. Daykin discussed that this will be a bit of a conflict for the City because there are two joint training sessions for City Council and Planning Commission in March. Training Session 1 will be held at 6:00 pm on March 5, 2019 and Training Session 2 will be March 20<sup>th</sup> (the regular meeting date for Planning Commission). He pointed out that some issues have been raised which will likely prompt a workshop meeting be planned for City Council once the recommendation is received from the Planning Commission, as opposed to immediately going to hearing mode with the City Council. Additional detailed discussion ensued.

C.A. Daykin reviewed that at the last Council meeting the ESCI Proposal was provided. He explained that he and Chief Stock did have a follow up discussion with the consultant. C.A. Daykin explained that the take away from the meeting, which the consultant was also fine with, was to have Chief Stock determine what his staff needs are in an attempt to complete a staffing evaluation. Additional explanation and discussion ensued, and Chief Stock will move forward with preparation of a report stating his needs along with costs. This information will be provided as part of the budget process.

C.A. Daykin provided discussion about the civil case against the City known as the Morehouse suit. He reviewed that this was in regard to a gentleman who was struck while in the highway crosswalk at Tenth Street. C.A. Daykin explained that the case was going to trial next month but it recently settled and now he is waiting for the final papers to come through; the nominal final payment will be split between the City's representatives (CIS) and the State. C. Svicarovich raised the notion if that lawsuit being in process was part of the reason for the delays in the downtown area, and ODOT not wanting to make the improvements which would perhaps have had an impact. C.A. Daykin affirmed that ODOT is aware of that and have gone on the record with regard to the Seventh Street improvements. He discussed that they are proposing a pedestrian island there with a crosswalk where the crosswalk was on the Ponzi side (north leg). Additionally, he explained that ODOT won't authorize it without the pedestrian island because it was included in the record that it needs to have an island to be safe; ODOT won't authorize it without the island and they're not going to put the island in at this time, which is part of the problem in that area.

C.A. Daykin informed that the Beech Street sewer main was recently successfully repaired. The final aspect of the project was a video scope inspection to ensure that the work was done properly. C.A. Daykin explained that the City took advantage of that mobilization and got a good unit price and ended up video scoping the entire sewer main on the Highway. He discussed that some of that information is being reviewed right now, but some problem areas have been discovered which the City will likely want to address this summer.

C.A. Daykin informed that he will not be present at the first joint training session with Planning Commission on March 5, 2019.

**Public Comment**

None.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 P.M.



\_\_\_\_\_  
David Russ, Mayor

Attest:



\_\_\_\_\_  
Rob Daykin, City Administrator/Recorder