

CITY OF ALBANY
CITY COUNCIL REGULAR SESSION
Municipal Court Room
Wednesday, July 8, 2015
7:15 p.m.

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Sharon Konopa called the meeting to order at 7:15 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Councilors present: Mayor Sharon Konopa and Councilors Rich Kellum, Bill Coburn, Ray Kopczynski, Dick Olsen, Bessie Johnson, and Floyd Collins.

Councilors absent: None.

SCHEDULED BUSINESS

Communication

Accepting resignation from Debbie Berg from the Human Relations Commission.

MOTION: Councilor Bessie Johnson moved to accept Debbie Berg's resignation from the Human Relations Commission and to send a letter of thanks. Councilor Ray Kopczynski seconded the motion and it passed 6-0.

Quasi-Judicial Public Hearing

CP-01-14 and ZC-100-14, amending Ordinance No. 4447, which adopted the City of Albany Comprehensive Plan Map; and amending Ordinance No. 4441, which adopted the City of Albany Zoning Map; adopting findings for property located at 241 Waverly Street SE; Linn County Assessor's Map No. 11S-3W-05DD, Tax Lot 400; and declaring an emergency.

Open: Konopa opened the public hearing at 7:17 p.m.

Konopa asked if any Councilors wished to declare a conflict of interest. None did.

No Councilors reported any *ex parte* contact.

Councilors Bill Coburn, Kopczynski, Rich Kellum, and Dick Olsen said they drove by the site, but didn't get out of their cars.

Konopa asked if any members wished to abstain from participating in the proceedings. None did.

Konopa asked if anyone wished to challenge the City Council's right to determine this matter or the participation of any Councilor in this hearing and decision. Michael Derusha, 2617 Fourth Avenue, asked whether Johnson's husband Larry's company had any part in the project. Johnson said no, his company is not involved. No one else wished to challenge the Council's right to determine the matter.

Konopa said for those wishing to testify there is a signup sheet at the table.

Konopa said, for those wishing to testify, please be aware that you must raise an issue with enough detail to afford the Council and parties an opportunity to respond to the issue if you later want to raise that same issue on appeal to the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA). Testimony and evidence must be directed towards the approval standards staff will describe or other criteria in the Comprehensive Plan or Development Code which you believe to apply to the decision. If additional documents or evidence are provided by any party, the City Council may allow a continuance or leave the record open to allow the parties a reasonable opportunity to respond. Any continuance or extension of the record requested by the applicant shall result in a corresponding extension to the 120-day limit. Failure of the applicant to raise constitutional or other issues relating to the proposed conditions of approval with enough detail to allow the local government or its designee to respond to the issue precludes an action for damages in Circuit Court.

Staff Report.

Planner III David Martineau said that R. J. Alldritt, represented by Rich Catlin of Reece & Associates, applied to change the Comprehensive Plan designation of a 1.38-acre lot from Low Density Residential and General Commercial to Medium Density Residential, together with a concurrent zoning map amendment that would change the zoning of the property from Residential Single Family (RS-6.5) and Community Commercial (CC) to Residential Medium Density (RM) (see agenda file). Alldritt's property is located at 241 Waverly Drive SE.

Martineau said the Planning Commission held a public hearing regarding the proposal on April 20, 2015. The Planning Commission found that the proposed comprehensive plan map and zoning map amendments are consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan policies, and the Albany Development Code review criteria. These criteria are addressed in detail in the staff report, included in the agenda packets. Based on these findings, the Planning Commission voted 6-2 to recommend that the City Council approve the proposed comprehensive plan map and zoning map amendment.

Martineau said the City Council considered the proposed amendment during a May 27, 2015, public hearing; however, there were not enough votes to make a decision on the draft ordinance that would approve the amendment. The ordinance was presented again for Council consideration and received a first reading at the June 10, 2015, Council meeting. Prior to taking action on the draft ordinance, a member of the public requested that City Council reopen the public hearing to consider new testimony prior to making a final decision. The City Council granted this request; therefore, staff is presenting the draft ordinance again for consideration at tonight's hearing.

Applicant Testimony.

Rich Catlin of Reese & Associates spoke representing R. J. Aldritt. Within a 300-foot radius of the Aldritt property are 59 dwelling units on 6.5 acres, for a density of 9 units per acre, greater than the allowed density of a single-family zone. The Aldritt property is odd-shaped and difficult to develop as a single-family subdivision. RMA zoning would provide a more efficient way to develop the site. The RMA zone is considered a transition zone from commercial to residential. The property borders a commercial zone on Pacific Boulevard and a residential zone on the other side. The need for RMA zoning is demonstrated in the Albany housing needs analysis, which shows a shortage of RMA-zoned properties and a surplus of land zoned RS-6.5. A zone change here would be a step forward. A traffic impact analysis has been made for this application. ODOT and City staff have reviewed the analysis and determined that the application meets their requirements. This is a small project. It integrates into the neighborhood as an edge development, with residential on one side and commercial on the other. Catlin compared this project to the Woodwind Apartments on Salem Avenue. This project is half that size, but similarly situated.

Catlin showed slides of the project area to demonstrate its compatibility with the neighborhood. For a two-story residence in an RMA zone, the setback from the neighboring property line would be 32 feet. The setback for the current zoning (RS-6.5) would allow as little as eight feet between neighboring two-story residences. Albany Development Code design standards for apartments state that setback space between property lines and buildings cannot be used for parking, driveways, recreation, etc.

Catlin handed out paper copies of the slide show information (see agenda file) and a handout from Reese & Associates, Inc. titled "Albany Development Code" (see agenda file).

Konopa asked if anyone in the audience wished to speak in favor of the application. No one did.

There was a letter on the dais from Carolyn Duehn (see agenda file).

Public Testimony.

Konopa called for the first person on the Public Hearing signup sheet (see agenda file).

Kasey Tegner, 221 Waverly Drive SE, said she is concerned about the impact on the neighborhood, especially traffic and property value. The new zone is supposed to be a buffer zone, but it would overwhelm the neighborhood. It would allow building to double the number of units for three blocks and triple the number of units on Waverly Drive. The project is based on a study that hasn't been updated since 2007. A lot of multi-family housing has been built since then. This small lot isn't important proportionally. The applicant says they are proposing an efficient use, but efficient is not always in alignment with a peaceful enjoyment. Efficiency should not be the main concern. The neighborhood is turning around. People are moving in, buying foreclosures, and spending money to fix them up. The neighborhood has been there over 60 years just as it is, and the residents like it that way.

Cherrie Wellons, 300 Waverly Drive SE, said her main concern is traffic. She often rides the bus from the stop at Salem Avenue and Waverly Drive, and has observed the traffic, particularly in the morning commute. The idea of a potential apartment complex on that lot is scary from the standpoint of traffic alone. She lives across the street from the proposed project and is worried about more people parking in front of her house, which would interfere with garbage pickup, street sweeping, and visibility backing into the street from her driveway. Catlin's diagrams indicate that the property's driveway would be moved, likely directly across from her house. She's concerned about traffic in and out, especially during hours of darkness in winter months, when headlights will add to the disturbance to neighbors. The goals of the project are admirable but this is not the place to accomplish them. There are more suitable areas. Also, the added traffic will require more street maintenance, which is already a problem in the city.

Vanessa Derusha, 2617 Fourth Avenue SE, said her main concern is that the crime rate will go up with population increase. They used to live in the Wedgewood Apartments just south of the area. After their

apartment was broken into, they moved to this apartment to be safer. She feels safe here. She recognizes everyone that walks up and down the street, and that will change if the new apartment complex is built.

Michael Derusha, 2617 Fourth Avenue SE, said he has lived in Albany since 1970. He thinks that any more building here needs to be looked at very closely, especially in an open space. The property in question is like a park. There is plenty of space by Kmart, flat and already paved, so no habitat would be affected. There are about 57 properties in Albany offering rentals, so there isn't really a need for housing. Albany has about 3,200 businesses operating, so adding another source of income for an out-of-towner isn't in Albany's interest.

Monica Weber, 210 Fulton Street SE, thanked the Council for giving the neighbors another chance to express their concerns. Her major concern about rezoning for higher density is increased traffic. Semi trucks barrel down Fulton Street daily. They choose Fulton Street instead of Waverly Drive to avoid the traffic light or the tight turn. Others also use Fulton to avoid the intersection at Waverly Drive and Pacific Boulevard. Adding a large number of residential units to the neighborhood will make it worse. Because it's hard to turn left onto Pacific Boulevard safely, she turns left on Fourth Avenue and then right on Waverly Drive so she can turn onto Pacific Boulevard at the light, but traffic is backed up on Waverly Drive so it's hard to turn either right or left. It will be worse with a large apartment complex added on Waverly Drive. They knew when they moved into the neighborhood that there would be some traffic, but they didn't anticipate a zone change that would dramatically increase traffic noise and pollution. She is not a no-growth advocate; she is for smart growth. She asked the Council to consider the Waverly Drive, Fulton Street, and Lake Street residents before approving the zone change.

Carol Williams, 240 Waverly Drive SE, said she lives almost directly across from the proposed zone change. She has lived there almost 40 years. She thought this project had been defeated twice before. Waverly Drive is a very small street here, between two major streets. Increased traffic would be unbearable. It's already difficult to get in and out of driveways.

Velma Johnston, 2415 Waverly Drive SE, said traffic is already difficult on Waverly Drive. She drives a truck and has to slow down and veer to the right to get through the intersection. She is the only resident in her apartment complex that has two parking spaces. The extra parking for new apartments would be on Waverly Drive or Fourth Avenue.

Tom Gloude, 2045 36th Avenue SE, said he has a rental at 139 Waverly Drive SE, north of the Tegners. Traffic will be a problem. Traffic from the City shops and Wah Chang both travel down Waverly Drive. He has lost tenants because they can't get out of the driveway. He has mentioned the project to a couple of developers, who said it would be spot zoning. One realtor he talked to wants it to pass so he can also do spot zoning for several projects.

Janice Schmidtke, 230 Waverly Drive SE, said she bought her house about six years ago, for the sole purpose of quiet. She lives directly across the street from the property in question. She has almost been rear-ended a number of times backing out of her driveway. She has seen traffic travelling from Salem Avenue to Pacific Boulevard at 45 miles per hour.

Pam Briggs, 197 Lake Street SE, said she lives behind the property in question. The proposed zone change would have negative impacts on all in the surrounding area. She can't see any positive impact. The neighborhood is mostly one-story single-family homes, with a few duplexes and small one-story apartments. There are very few two-story homes. Changing the zoning on the property from low-density to medium-density will have a significant negative impact on the neighborhood. The site plan indicates 25 to 35 two or three-story apartments. This would be totally out of character for the neighborhood. Apartment residents would be looking out their windows into the yards of nearby homes. The lot has lots of trees. Putting in that many apartments means most if not all of the trees would be lost. She can see the back of the property from her front window. She regularly sees great blue herons, osprey, red-tail hawks, and bald eagles in the trees. If the project is approved, she would see, instead, multiple two and three-story apartments looking into her yard and her neighbors' yards.

Briggs said the traffic impact would also be huge on Lake Street too. Traffic on Waverly Drive is so bad, she avoids driving on it. Adding 35-60 additional cars on Waverly Drive twice daily will make it even more congested. Traffic on Salem Avenue will also increase, making it harder and more dangerous to enter and exit Lake Street. The property in question is a buffer as it is. If zoning is changed, it will turn into an encroachment into the quiet single-family neighborhood. She is opposed to changing the zoning, but not opposed to development. Keeping development on the property low-density would complement the neighborhood, not detract from it.

Paulette Buffington, 185 Lake Street SE, had nothing to add.

Ruth Dwier, 129 Lake Street SE, had nothing to add.

Ray Dwier, 129 Lake Street SE, had nothing to add.

Mike Briggs, 197 Lake Street SE, had nothing to add.

Dane Campbell, 286 Casting Street, had nothing to add.

Lola Alfter, 215 Fulton Street SE, said in addition to increased traffic, she is concerned about possible negative effects on property values. She has talked to appraisers who said there could be negative effects. She just bought her house two years ago. She would like the Council to consider property values in making a decision.

Konopa asked if anyone who did not sign up wished to testify. No one did.

She asked if anyone who neither favored nor opposed the project wished to testify. No one did.

Applicant Rebuttal.

Catlin said the unanimous opinion is that there will be a lot of traffic. He called attention to the Traffic Impact Analysis in the agenda packet. On page 2 is a trip generation comparison. Apartments generate fewer trips per day than a single-family home. Traffic engineers usually study the p.m. peak hour, 5:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. During the peak hour, a six-lot subdivision would generate six trips. A 35-unit apartment complex would generate 22 trips. The difference is 16 trips, or one approximately every three minutes, which should allow traffic to clear completely between trips. The proposed project would be required to have onsite parking. Residents might choose to park on the street, but ample onsite parking would be available. He said there is no specific development plan yet, just a requested zone change. Any 1.3 acre property with one house on it will have a lot of open space. The trees are a good question. They are large trees, and the owner would not have arbitrary discretion to remove them. The Development Code has standards for when trees may be removed. That would be reviewed with a site plan review.

The question of spot zoning is fair, since this is the only property being proposed for the zone. The counter-argument is that the proposed zone type is between two types of zoning already in the neighborhood: commercial and RS-6.5. His conclusion is that it is not spot zoning.

Johnson asked how many parking spaces would be required to keep apartment residents from parking on the street. Martineau said that parking for apartments or multi-family residential is calculated in different ways. He listed the requirements from the Development Code. Multi-family development requires one space for each studio or one-bedroom apartment, plus one visitor space for every four units. Two-bedroom units require 1.5 spaces per unit plus one visitor space for every four units. Three-bedroom units require two spaces per unit, plus one visitor space for every four units. So, 15 two-bedroom units need 22.5 spaces plus visitor spaces to total 26. The required spaces would all be off-street parking, on the development property. The amount of space required for development and parking and required open space will limit how many units can be put on a site.

Closed: Konopa declared the hearing closed at 8:00 p.m.

Coburn complimented Pam Briggs on her testimony. He had a list of questions and she answered them all as she spoke.

City Attorney Jim Delapoer read the Ordinance for the second time in title only: AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE 4441, WHICH ADOPTED THE CITY OF ALBANY ZONING MAP; ADOPTING FINDINGS FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 241 WAVERLY STREET SE; LINN COUNTY ASSESSORS'S MAP NO. 11S-3W-05DD, TAX LOT 400; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

MOTION: Kopczyński moved to adopt the Ordinance. Councilor Floyd Collins seconded the motion for discussion.

Kellum said when people buy a place they have expectations based on what it was when they bought. Residents here bought into a single-family area with a single-family area next to them. When they move into an area, people have a right to know what could be developed there. He would like to deny the request for that reason, and also because no one knows what development on the property would look like.

Johnson said she understands the traffic issues. She agrees with Kellum that with no specific development planned, the Council doesn't know what they are deciding on. Until we know what the development will look like she is also inclined to vote no. Konopa said the Council used to be able to do a single hearing for both a zone change and a development proposal, but the process was changed to do the zone change separately. If the Council wants to change the process they should look at it. Johnson thinks this process isn't fair to Catlin, because he can't present a development proposal, and not fair to the neighbors because they don't know what is going to be proposed.

Delapoer said the Council must make its decision based on the criteria in the staff report. They cannot lawfully deny the request based on the lack of an accompanying plan. Zoning was originally done to set parameters for the type of development that could happen in an area. So when an applicant doesn't present a development plan, the Council should look at all allowable uses for the zone and consider the full range of what is eligible. Also, even if an applicant does apply for site plan approval at the same time as a zone change, they could then choose to develop a different site plan. The Council is only allowed to look at the application before it, and only on its own merits.

He said if the majority of the Council wants to deny the application, they should use the motion to tentatively deny and ask staff to bring back findings to support denial. It is helpful for staff to know what the Council's concerns with the application are. The concerns have to be lawfully relevant to the criteria. There is no 120-day limitation on decisions about Comprehensive Plan designations.

Olsen described zoning historically. There are many more zones now. The requested zoning seems specific to apartments. For that reason, he is opposed to the motion.

VOTE: A vote was taken on the motion to adopt the ordinance and it failed 2-4, with Olsen, Johnson, Kellum and Coburn voting no.

MOTION: Kellum moved to tentatively deny the ordinance and direct staff to prepare findings to support the decision and Johnson seconded it.

Coburn said he is unsure whether it is reasonable to express concerns to staff, who have heard the same testimony as the Council. He has concerns related to Great Neighborhoods, but doesn't believe Great Neighborhoods is applicable to the criteria for approval.

Delapoer directed the Council's attention to the Comprehensive Plan criteria, on page 12 of the agenda. He referred to the first criterion, which allows the Council to find that the proposed zone change is not "more supportive of the Comprehensive Plan as a whole than the old designation."

Kopczynski asked if the Council would be asking staff to find a reason for denial even though there may not be one.

Konopa said the last update of the Comprehensive Plan map used the Buildable Lands Inventory, which projected housing needs over 20 years. Since then, the city has seen a lot of multi-family housing built, including a similar zone change for a large apartment complex. Putting more multi-family zoning into one area of town is not the intent of the Plan. This may be something to consider when asking staff to bring back findings.

Delapoer, in answer to Kopczynski's question, said that in a Comprehensive Plan application, the burden of proof is on the applicant. From the previous discussion, he thinks a majority of the Council feel that the applicant has not met the burden of proving that the first criterion has been satisfied.

VOTE: A vote was taken on the motion to tentatively deny the ordinance and direct staff to prepare findings to support the decision and it passed 4-2, with Collins and Kopczynski voting no.

Delapoer explained the next step in the process. He reminded the Council that they cannot make a final decision without findings of fact. Once they have those, they can formally deny the application. He also reminded them and the audience that the public hearing is closed, and the Council may not talk further to the public about this issue.

Collins gave some history about why they contemplated transition zoning.

Business from the Public

Tom Cordier, 2240 NW Park Terrace, said that the memo in the agenda packet regarding franchise fees says, "The increase was recommended by the Budget Officer and approved by the Budget Committee to offset property tax lost to compression." He asked, who is the Budget Officer? Did the Budget Officer recommend any items to reduce the cost of City government? Konopa said the review is part of the budget process. City Manager Wes Hare proposes the budget and works with the Finance Director and department staff to prepare the proposed budget. Cordier said that didn't answer his question and repeated the question. Konopa began to respond. Cordier repeated his question again. Konopa began to respond again. Cordier said he would "take that as a no." Cordier said that he thinks that if such a recommendation was made, he would have read about it in the *Democrat-Herald* and in Hasso Hering's blog and it would be public knowledge.

Cordier said the City receives \$2.329 million annually in "the sales tax called a privilege tax" for electric power. Cordier listed other utility franchise revenue totals that were provided to him by Taylor. He said, that doesn't include transient lodging taxes. He said, apparently the City isn't satisfied with \$4.2 million and now wants another \$930,000. He thinks this is unbelievable. He objects to the new "sales tax" increase. Electricity is a requirement of life, not a privilege. He said this proposal increases taxes that are regressive, which he defines as hurting those people who are less able to afford it. He suggested that the Council did not look for ways to reduce the cost of government, only to increase the revenue. He also objects to the emergency clause. He encouraged the Council to vote no.

First Reading of Ordinance

Amending Albany Municipal Code (AMC) Chapter 3.04, Privilege Tax – Electrical Power and Light Business; granting an electric utility franchise and general utility easement to PacifiCorp; and declaring an emergency.

Delapoer read the Ordinance for the first time in title only: AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ALBANY MUNICIPAL CODE (AMC) CHAPTER 3.04, PRIVILEGE TAX – ELECTRICAL POWER AND LIGHT BUSINESS; GRANTING AN ELECTRIC UTILITY FRANCHISE AND GENERAL UTILITY EASEMENT TO PACIFICORP; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

MOTION: Johnson moved to read the Ordinance for a second time in title only. Kopczynski seconded the motion and it failed 5-1, with Kellum voting no. It takes a unanimous vote of the Council for a second reading in the same meeting. This item will come back to the next Council meeting.

Delapoer introduced Deputy City Attorney Sean Kidd, who worked with Assistant Public Works Director/City Engineer Jeff Blaine to work out the details of the public utility issues in the franchise agreement.

Kidd thanked Blaine and Taylor for their work. Kidd and Taylor spent time working on the financial element (indemnification, timing, duration, and compensation). Kidd then worked with Blaine to work out details regarding public works that hadn't been considered in the past. They spent about a week and a half negotiating with PacifiCorp on the public works portion, which put the City in a much stronger position than before.

Kellum said he has issue with the emergency clause. He said it is used often but many times no emergency exists. He said they should consider the intent of the emergency clause. Delapoer said the emergency clause is used for this particular ordinance to avoid lost revenue. Delaying approval for two weeks will cost the City \$37,000 that would otherwise be available for the General Fund. The ordinance was intended to take effect before July 1, 2015, but when concerns arose about how the agreement would work with public works functions, staff worked out those details with PacifiCorp. Each delay is worth \$75,000 a month. The budget assumes the City would receive this revenue. That is the emergency in this particular case. The original purpose of the emergency clause is to give citizens a chance to refer the matter to election. In Delapoer's opinion, this ordinance is not subject to referendum because it is an administrative matter. So, there is nothing lost by using the emergency clause in this case, and what is gained is \$75,000 for the General Fund.

Discussion followed about the use of an emergency clause for this ordinance. Delapoer urged the Council to ask staff to justify an emergency clause in an ordinance before they vote if there is a concern about it. If the Council is not satisfied with the reason to act promptly, then they can amend the ordinance to remove the emergency clause, and it would become effective 30 days later. There is nothing wrong with using that scenario. Kopczynski pointed out that the Council could have done that at the Work Session.

Konopa explained that franchise fees are charged to a utility for use of the public right-of-way (ROW). The public ROW is the property of the people of Albany. This charges the business a fee for using the people's property. Some of the franchise fees have been in place many years without being raised, so the City has been absorbing cost increases over the years. Some franchise fees are declining, such as the telephone franchise fee, since fewer people have landlines. Almost every city in the state is facing the same issue with their franchise fees. Konopa said that 100% of property taxes only partially covers Police and Fire services. Franchise fees are a big piece of funding for the Library, pools, parks, etc. She reminded the Council that they adopted the budget which included this franchise fee increase, as approved by the Budget Committee.

Johnson asked if the increase in franchise fees was already in the budget when the Budget Committee reviewed it. Several on the dais recalled discussion of the issue. Konopa said the Budget Committee first discussed it in November 2014, and then at subsequent Budget Committee meetings.

This item will come back to the July 22, 2015, Council meeting.

Adoption of Resolution

Approving the vehicle lease contracts with Wire Works, LLC.

MOTION: Collins moved to adopt the resolution and Kellum seconded it. The motion passed 6-0 and was designated Resolution No. 6441.

Adoption of Consent Calendar

- 1) Approval of Minutes
 - a) May 27, 2015, City Council Regular Session.
- 2) Approving the limited off-premises sales, change of ownership liquor license application for Arsh, Inc., d/b/a Tri Valley Food Mart, located at 628 Ellsworth Street SW.
- 3) Approving annual liquor license renewals.

MOTION: Kellum moved to adopt the Consent Calendar as presented. Kopczynski seconded the motion and it passed 6-0.

Approval of Agreement

Approving an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with Linn County for transient lodging tax funds to be used to assist with the costs related to a new outside sales contractor for the Linn County Fair and Expo Center.

Economic Development and Urban Renewal Director Kate Porsche said this is the finalized IGA with Linn County for a new contractor position to market the Expo Center. The draft IGA was based on recommendations from the Council. It was reviewed by the City Attorney, the City Manager, and Linn County. Porsche drew the Council's attention to the Budget Impact section of her memo, which describes where funding for the position could come from. The ad-hoc TLT Committee had recommended that the flat salary amount could come from the Collaborative Tourism line item, and if there are any commissions paid out, it could come from a reduction in the Reserve line item.

Konopa said the Council had been concerned about performance measures and metrics in earlier discussions. She asked, what measures have been written into the agreement? Porsche said the agreement doesn't outline specific goals like that, but the Council will get a quarterly review. This is a one-year agreement, renewable at the Council's discretion.

Konopa wondered how the Council can measure their performance without comparables. Coburn said he thinks it may be somewhat subjective and it may be difficult to establish a matrix of performance, which is part of the problem. He too has concerns, but is willing to vote yes and try it for a year. He said, if we don't like it, we cancel it.

Johnson asked when the position starts. Porsche said it started May 19, 2015.

MOTION: Kellum moved to approve the Intergovernmental Agreement with Linn County for use of transient lodging tax funds. Collins seconded the motion and it passed 6-0.

Appointments

Appointing Kim Brown and Anne Taleff to the Library Board.

MOTION: Olsen moved to approve the appointments as presented and Kopczynski seconded it. The motion passed 6-0.

Reports

Initiating street vacation proceedings for a portion of Sixth Avenue SE for the proposed Fire Station and a portion of Willetta Street SW for the proposed Police Station.

Planning Division Manager Bob Richardson asked the Council to initiate street vacations for the new Police and Fire Stations. City staff is working with Mackenzie Architects on land-use applications for both stations. Both require conditional use and replat approval and vacations of ROWs. Initiating the street vacations would allow coordination with the replat and conditional use applications. Staff recommends that any future approval of the vacations be contingent on approval of the conditional use applications.

Kellum asked why the City isn't vacating all of Willetta Street on the property. Martineau said the notch preserves the ability to use some of the ROW for a cul-de-sac. Discussion followed.

Richardson showed slides depicting Willetta Street, Sixth Avenue, the Fire Station Site Plan, and the Police Station Site Plan (see agenda file).

MOTION: Collins moved to initiate street vacation proceedings and direct staff to prepare street vacation applications for a portion of Willetta Street SW for the proposed Police Station and a portion of Sixth Street for the proposed Fire Station. Kopczynski seconded the motion and it passed 6-0.

BUSINESS FROM THE COUNCIL

Kopczynski said there will be a Human Relations Commission candidate on the agenda at the next Council meeting.

Collins said the construction on North Albany Road is moving right along. He appreciates the efforts of Albany Police in enforcing the speed limit, and appreciates Benton County temporarily reducing the speed on Springhill Drive to allow easier access for traffic on the side streets. He has heard that a lot of citizens like the dual left-turn lanes from Springhill onto Highway 20. He encouraged staff to talk to ODOT to try to keep those permanently.

Assistant City Manager/Chief Information Officer Jorge Salinas said he met with the new director of Council of Governments. They are very interested in the City's new transparency expenditure application and they are very interested in having a demonstration of the program at their monthly meeting.

Albany City Council Work Session
July 8, 2015

Blaine said he got a call from City of Lebanon staff. Their City Manager was not able to attend their City Council meeting tonight, so their Council will be discussing the canal issue on July 22, 2015, instead of tonight. Staff will report back when they hear more.

NEXT MEETING DATE: Work Session: July 20, 2015
 Regular Session: July 22, 2015

ADJOURNMENT

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Reviewed by,

Mary A. Dibble, MMC
City Clerk

Stewart Taylor
Finance Director