

MINUTES OF THE REEDSPORT CITY COUNCIL REGULAR SESSION MAY 4, 2015
7:00 P.M. CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS

PRESENT: Mayor Linda McCollum
Councilors Rich Patten, Frank Barth, Diane Essig, Leslee Collier, DeeDee Murphy and Debby Turner
City Manager, Jonathan Wright
City Attorney, Steve Miller

OTHERS PRESENT: Vera Koch, Deanna Schafer, John Stokes, Chief Duane Wisehart, Jessica Terra, Elle Keeland, Renee Rochan-Johnson, Donna Train, Nancy Lee, Dan Clark, Jennifer Clark, Daryl Ziolkowski, Bill Husko, Allen Teitzel, Debby McKinney, Leonia Svobada

CALL TO ORDER/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

1. CITIZEN COMMENTS

This time is reserved for citizens to comment on items that are not on the Agenda. Maximum of five minutes per item, please.

Mr. Daryl Ziolkowski came to the City Council because he is in dispute with the City of Reedsport concerning the water and sewer metered rates. He says that he knows that his water usage is not going down the sewer drains so he should not pay such a high sewer bill.

City Manager Jonathan Wright said that Mr. Daryl Ziolkowski is looking for reduction in his bill. He said that the City has been working with him for a while to identify if there is a problem with the meter. Mr. Ziolkowski appears to have been very proactive with maintenance items yet the water usage continues to go up and down. As a solution, the City has agreed to put in a new meter with smart read technology that will allow the City to monitor consumption hour by hour to help Mr. Ziolkowski potentially identify his issue.

Mr. Daryl Ziolkowski was directed to work with Jonathan to see what the results of this latest measure is.

2. PRESENTATIONS, PROCLAMATIONS, AWARDS

- A. Mayor Linda McCollum read a National Day of Prayer Proclamation.
- ~~B. Southern Oregon Sanitation transfer site fees.—This item was canceled.~~

3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Councilor Frank Barth motioned to approve the Agenda as amended.

Councilor Diane Essig seconded the motion.

MOTION:

that the City Council approve the Agenda as amended.

VOTE:

AYES 7 NAYES 0

(Mayor Linda McCollum, Councilors Barth, Essig, Patten, Collier, Murphy and Turner voted in favor of the motion.)

Mayor Linda McCollum declared the motion passed unanimously.

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Mayor McCollum read the outline of procedures the Council will be following for conducting Legislative Public Hearings.

A. Public Hearing to consider an appeal of a Planning Commission decision.

Shall the City Council affirm, reverse, or amend the Planning Commission decision to approve Planning Department File No. 15-002 a request from Karen Donnelly-Smith to vary from the fence height standard in order to construct a 6' fence along a street-side yard in the (R1) Single-Family Residential zone?

It was noted that the Councilors, as a whole, visited the site of the appeal hearing. There were no abstentions or conflicts of interest.

There were no challenges of Council Members on the appearance of bias or conflict of interest.

City Manager Jonathan Wright said that no additional information was received, as per procedures. All additional information would need to be introduced during the public hearing if the Council wishes to do so.

Public Hearing was opened at 7:17pm.

City Manager Jonathan provided the Council with Planning Commission file #15-002 to be received into the record.

He then said that in November 2014, City Hall received a concern from Donna Train, daughter of Leonia Svoboda who resides at 2950 Longwood Drive. Her concern was that a fence was being constructed that was view-obscuring and very tall. Also part of the report were concerns of too many dogs and foul odors at the location.

After the site visit, staff confirmed that the fence was in fact exceeding the height requirement for a fence along a street-side yard, as prescribed by the Reedsport Land Usage Ordinance (RLUO). The resident, Karen Donnelly-Smith (applicant) was contact and notified of the violation. The owner stated that she had contacted City Hall and been informed that fences are authorized up to 6' in height in a backyard. However, the property is considered a corner lot, which imposes additional restrictions on building along a street (the area the resident calls her backyard). The applicant explained her situation with a rescue dog that aggressively jumps and barks at the fence. The intent of the solid 6 foot fence is that it would block the visual component of the problem and making it less appealing to the dog, which is looking for reactions from pedestrians.

The applicant was informed by staff that if the fence were to stay, she would have to apply for and be granted a variance to the height standard. Staff advised that there would be no guarantee of success, but the Commission would make a decision on the request based on the applicant's ability to meet the variance criteria, as well as, any testimony received. The criteria for granting a variance is outlined in section 10.92.020 as follows:

A variance may be granted only in the event that all of the following circumstances are considered:

- A. Exceptional or extraordinary circumstances apply to the property which do not apply generally to other properties in the same zone or vicinity, and result from lot size or shape, topography or other circumstances over which the owners of property since enactment of the ordinance codified in this division have had no control.*
- B. The variance is necessary for the preservation of a property right of the applicant substantially the same as owners of other property in the same zone or vicinity possess.*
- C. The variance would not be materially detrimental to the purposes of this division, or to property in the same zone or vicinity in which the property is located, or otherwise conflict with the objectives of any city plan or policy.*
- D. The variance requested is the minimum variance which would alleviate the hardship.*
- E. The variance is not the result of a self-created hardship.*

Notice was provided to all property owners within 200' of the subject property, affected public districts, and governmental agencies. As of the writing of the staff report which

addresses the criteria for a variance, one comment was received from Ms. Train. Her comments were summarized in the staff report, which was provided at least 7 days prior to the Planning Commission meeting as required by the RLUO and as indicated in the original public hearing notice that was sent to all property owners. A copy of Train's entire letter with photos, was emailed to the Planning Commission, along with the meeting packet. Two additional comments came in right before the packets were emailed to the Commission and those comments were also included as separate attachments from the packet. Those comments were summarized at the meeting, since they were not summarized in the staff report.

On February 23, 2015, the Reedsport Planning Commission held a public hearing for the variance request. During the meeting the applicant, Karen Donnelly-Smith, stated she was in agreement with the staff report and explained her need for the variance and testimony was received from Ms. Train. That testimony can be found in the minutes of the February 23, 2015.

The hearing was closed and the Planning Commission deliberated to a decision. A motion was made and seconded to approve the variance, as presented by staff. The motion passed with a vote of 4-1. Chairman Teitzel voted against the request. The Findings of Fact were then made available at the Planning Commission meeting on March 23, 2015.

On April 6, 2015, Donna Train submitted her appeal of the Planning Commission's Decision, including a \$125.00 appeal fee. The appeal letter and supplemental documentation was presented in Exhibit A along with a complete copy of the Record of File No. 15-002. A notice of the appeal hearing was mailed to all parties, affected public districts, and governmental agencies on April 8, 2015.

The Reedsport City Council is now tasked with affirming, denying, or amending the decision of the Reedsport Planning Commission as outlined in section 10.104 of the Reedsport Land Usage Ordinance:

10.104.030 Scope of review.

- A. *Unless otherwise provided by the City Council, the review of the initial action shall be confined to the record of the proceeding below, which shall include:*
- 1. All materials, pleadings, memoranda, stipulations and motions submitted by any party to the proceeding and received or considered by the Planning Commission as evidence;*
 - 2. All materials submitted by the city staff with respect to the application;*
 - 3. The transcript of the hearing below;*
 - 4. The findings and action of the Planning Commission and the notice of review;*

5. *Argument by the parties or their legal representatives at the time of review before the City Council.*
- B. *The City Council may admit additional testimony and other evidence if it is satisfied that the testimony or other evidence could not have been presented upon initial hearing and action. In deciding such admission, the City Council shall consider:*
1. *Prejudice to parties;*
 2. *Convenience of location of the evidence at the time of initial hearing;*
 3. *Surprise to opposing parties;*
 3. *When notice was given to other parties as to the attempt to admit;*
 5. *The competency, relevancy and materiality of the proposed testimony or other evidence.*

10.104.040 Decision.

The City Council may affirm, reverse or amend the action of the Planning Commission and may reasonably grant approval subject to conditions necessary to carry out the comprehensive plan and ordinances. The council may also refer the matter back to the Planning Commission for additional information.

- A. *For all cases, the Council shall make finding based on the record before it and any testimony or other evidence received by it as justification for its actions.*
- B. *The Council shall state all orders upon the close of its hearing or upon continuance of the matter to a time certain.*

Applicant Karen Donnelly spoke on her own behalf. She gave an overview of her need to have the high sight-obscuring fence to contain a dog she currently owns. The dog has a habit of lunging and barking at passersby and other means of control have not been successful. She explained that when she originally approached the City she did not understand that the area she referred to as her “backyard” is actually a side yard because of her location on a corner lot.

She introduced a photo into the record of the yard in question and the dog.

The appellant Donna Train spoke of her disbelief that the planning commission approved a variance allowing this high site obscuring fence to be built. She stated that the fence that was there, a chain link, was originally attached to the fence separating her property from Ms. Donnelly-Smiths’, noting that there is now a gap in the fence. She introduced a photo into the record of the original fence and the gap now. She said that the new fence would totally obscure any line of site for the driveway. She noted that Bowman Road and the close proximity to Longwood Dr. causing cars to speed in that location.

Councilor Rich Patten said that his concern after viewing the site would be in trying to back out of that drive onto Bowman Rd. He asked whether there have been any near misses to date.

Ms. Train said that since the fence has not been completed, they are still able to see somewhat but if the fence is completed they will not be able to see at all.

Ms. Renee Rochan and Ms. Nancy Lee spoke on behalf of the appellant, they are both caregivers for Ms. Svovada, the occupant of the home. They both stated that they are concerned with the height of the solid fence.

Councilors Collier and Murphey agreed with Councilor Patten that safety is an issue with the location of the fence.

After discussing other options such as setbacks or shorter fencing the consensus was to send this issue back to the Planning Commission to address the sight distance with concerns to safety of backing out of the driveway.

Councilor Frank Barth motioned to close the public hearing and remand the Planning Commission's decision on Planning Department File No. 15-002 back to the Planning Commission to address the sight distance.

Councilor Diane Essig seconded the motion.

MOTION:

that the City Council close the public hearing and remand the Planning Commission's decision on Planning Department File No. 15-002 back to the Planning Commission to address the sight distance.

VOTE:

AYES 7 NAYES 0

(Mayor Linda McCollum, Councilors Barth, Essig, Patten, Collier, Murphy and Turner voted in favor of the motion.)

Mayor Linda McCollum declared the motion passed unanimously.

- B. A Public Hearing to consider a Planning Commission recommendation for a plan and zone map amendment.

Shall the City Council adopt an Ordinance amending the Reedsport Comprehensive Plan in order to re-designate a tract of land from Public/Semi-Public to Residential and

re-zoning the land from Public/Semi-Public to Rural Suburban Residential and assign 2015-1142 as the title?

It was noted that the Councilors, as a whole, visited the site of the hearing. There were no abstentions or conflicts of interest.

There were not speakers for or against the application to rezone the property.

City Assistant Planner Jessica Terra presented the following information:

Dan and Jennifer Clark, have recently purchased a tract of land which was previously designated as a park; however, it was never officially developed as such. The property was deemed surplus by the Reedsport City Council in 2007 and sold at a competitive bid. The Clarks subsequently bought the property from that bidder.

Now, the Clarks would like to construct a new single-family dwelling on the property. However, the property is zoned and designated as (PL) Public/Semi-Public by the Reedsport Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Maps, a zoning which does not authorize single-family dwellings as an outright use. The PL zoning conditionally allows single family dwellings, but they must be in conjunction with a permitted use of the PL zone. Permitted uses include: Churches, cemeteries, fairgrounds, golf courses, hospitals, and other similar public uses.

So, on January 9, 2015 Dan and Jennifer Clark requested a Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment in order to rezone the property from Public/Semi-Public to Residential, as well as, a Zone Change in order to rezone the property from (PL) Public/Semi-Public to (RA) Rural Suburban Residential. The subject property is identified as Tax Lots 500 & 600, in Sections 03BB & 34CC of T22S & T21S, R12W, W.M.; Property ID Nos. R69469 & R69462.

The RA zoning is a lower intensity zoning, which only authorizes up to two (2) dwellings per acre. In comparison to higher intensity residential zonings, such as Single-Family Residential and Multi-Family Residential, this reduces the number of dwellings which could potentially be developed on the 2.5 acre (approximate) property. In turn this also reduces the amount of potential increased traffic in the area. Additionally, the RA zoning is also more consistent with the existing development pattern, as most of the residences in that area are placed on double lots.

Development is further restricted due to wetlands and riparian buffers which are delineated on the property. The applicant is prohibited from development in the wetland and limited in the types of use, development, and work that can be had or done within a riparian area. If the applicants were to propose development within a riparian area, depending on the type and extent, the applicants would be subject to another hearings

process and coordination with other agencies, such as the Department of State Lands and the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. Since the applicant is further limited in development, due to the existence of wetlands, impact to the neighborhood is also further limited as it pertains to new housing and additional traffic in the area.

The Reedsport Land Usage Ordinance requires that any amendment to the Land Usage Ordinance, Comprehensive Plan, or other adopted document referenced in the Land Usage Ordinance or Comprehensive Plan be heard first before the Reedsport Planning Commission and then ratified by the City Council.

At least 45 days prior to the Reedsport Planning Commission meeting, a notice was sent to the Department of Land Conservation and Development. At least 20 days prior to the Reedsport Planning Commission's public hearing, a notice was sent to all property owners within 200 feet of the subject property, affected public districts, and governmental agencies. Notice was also published in the Umpqua Post. Three (3) written comments were received prior to the public hearing.

- The Reedsport Volunteer Fire Department responded, stating that they are not opposed to the request; however, prior to development of the property, the applicant will be required to coordinate the installation of a fire hydrant to serve the future development.
- Harvey & Allison Meyers and Jennifer Dunn responded, stating they support the request to build a new home and agree that the public/semi-public zoning is not appropriate for the neighborhood.
- Thomas Guevara, of ODOT, responded, stating the proposed project does not significantly affect state transportation facilities under the State Transportation Planning Rule or State Access management Rule.

A written staff report was provided at least 7 days prior to the first evidentiary hearing. In the report staff identified that the request was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, Reedsport Land Usage Ordinance, Transportation System Plan, and compatible with the existing surrounding uses.

On February 23, 2015, the Reedsport Planning Commission held a public hearing. The applicants stated that they were in agreement with the staff report and testimony was received from the following parties:

- Calvin Rose asked if the owners would be filling the wetlands and if they would have farm animals on the site.
 - ❖ No filling is proposed.
 - ❖ Under the new zoning, the Clarks could potentially have goats, horses, or sheep.
- Greg Johnson asked if the property would be fenced. He also asked if the applicants intended to divide and sell off any lots. Johnson expressed concern

over the wetlands being filled and trees being cut that are in or near the wetlands.

- ❖ The applicants intend to fence part of the property, but not the entire tract of land.
- ❖ The applicants state they do not intend to sell off the lots, but rather purchased the land in order to build a single-family residence to live in for many years to come.
- ❖ The Clarks do not intend to impact the wetlands.
- Eric Rose needed clarification on the maps. He wanted to verify that the applicant was not proposing to develop in the wetland. He would like to see that those wetlands remain.
 - ❖ The applicant's request was only for a zone change, at this time. At the time that development is proposed, the applicants are aware that construction will need to happen outside of the wetland and riparian areas.
 - ❖ Rose stated he was no longer in opposition.
- Kerrick Sarbacker said her concern was that if the property is rezoned people won't be able to utilize the property as a park. She also expressed concern over the potential impact on wetlands and the loss of habitats within those wetland and riparian areas. She also noted that there were many vacant buildings in downtown that could be rehabilitated.
 - ❖ The City Council surplused the property in 2007 and the property is now privately owned, so unless someone has the owner's permission they would technically be trespassing if they went onto the property.
 - ❖ Again, development is not being proposed in the wetland area.
 - ❖ The existing vacant lands in downtown are commercially zoned and the City's Buildable Lands Inventory requires the City to maintain a certain amount of commercial land.
- Dan Clark rebutted to the testimony:
 - ❖ Development will occur in the northeastern property corner, outside of the wetlands.
 - ❖ The Rural Suburban zoning would create less impact to the surrounding neighborhood, as it relates to home development and traffic, so that's why the applicants chose this particular zoning instead of the more common Single-Family Residential or Multi-Family Residential zonings.
 - ❖ The applicants have no plans for livestock, but they aren't ruling it out.
 - ❖ The applicants don't intend to harvest timber.
 - ❖ The wetland provides the applicants with comfort that development cannot happen right next to them. It creates a natural buffer between their future home and some of the residences in the area.

The Planning Commission voted, unanimously, to approve the request to rezone and re-designated the properties to Rural Suburban Residential, subject to two conditions:

1. Prior to issuance of a building permit for a dwelling, the applicant shall provide a

redevelopment plan that can later be used to re-plat the entire tract, taking into account the density standards of the Rural Suburban Residential Zone and meeting the applicable criteria of the Reedsport Land Usage Ordinance Section 10.24.020.

2. Prior to issuance of a building permit for a dwelling, the applicant shall coordinate the installation of a fire hydrant to serve the proposed and future development.

The Reedsport City Council must now hold a public hearing in which the Council shall approve, deny, or approve with conditions the request from Dan and Jennifer Clark to re-designate and rezone a tract of land from Public/Semi-Public to Rural Suburban Residential.

There are no direct costs to the City to amend the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Maps because the City has GIS capabilities to do the work in-house.

Councilor Frank Barth motioned to adopt Ordinance 2015-1142 to amend the Reedsport Comprehensive Plan in order to re-designate a tract of land from Public/Semi-Public to Residential and re-zoning the land from Public/Semi-Public to Rural Suburban Residential.

Councilor Diane Essig seconded the motion.

MOTION:

that the City Council adopt Ordinance 2015-1142 to amend the Reedsport Comprehensive Plan in order to re-designate a tract of land from Public/Semi-Public to Residential and re-zoning the land from Public/Semi-Public to Rural Suburban Residential.

VOTE:

AYES 7 NAYES 0

(Mayor Linda McCollum, Councilors Barth, Essig, Patten, Collier, Murphy and Turner voted in favor of the motion.)

Mayor Linda McCollum declared the motion passed unanimously.

- C. A Public Hearing to consider amendments to the Reedsport Land Usage Ordinance in response to State Regulation.

Shall the City Council adopt an Ordinance amending the Reedsport Land Usage Ordinance (RLUO) Chapters 10.64, 10.72, and 10.76 in order to implement time

and place standards for medical marijuana dispensaries and marijuana grow sites and assign 2015-1143 as the title?

Councilor Leslee Collier declared a conflict of interest in this item.

City Manager Jonathan Wright said that on March 19, 2014, Senate Bill 1531 was signed into law. SB 1531 gave local governments the ability to impose certain regulations and restrictions on the operations of medical marijuana dispensaries, including the ability to impose a moratorium for a period of time up until May 2015. Subsequently, the Reedsport City Council voted to impose a moratorium on medical marijuana dispensaries, giving the Reedsport Planning Commission ample time to develop standards for these uses.

On February 9, 2015 the Reedsport Planning Commission met to discuss and develop standards for medical marijuana facilities to be implemented prior to the expiration of the moratorium. The Commission developed definitions related to medical marijuana dispensaries and grow sites; identified appropriate zones in which each use could be allowed as either “uses permitted with standards” or “conditionally permitted uses”; and created a set of minimum standards for dispensaries.

The Reedsport Planning Commission initiated amendments to the RLUO and a notice of public hearing was sent to the Department of Land Conservation & Development, property owners owning property that is Commercially or Industrially designated as such by the Reedsport Comprehensive Plan, affected public districts, service providers, and governmental agencies.

On March 23, 2015 the Reedsport Planning Commission held a public hearing. At the hearing, the Commission voted to strike the word “medical” from the term “medical marijuana grow site(s)” in anticipation that new legislation will be coming out soon that may authorize the growing of marijuana for recreational use. The Commission took note that staff would only accept applications for *medical* marijuana grow sites, until such time as new laws were in place and recreational grow sites could be allowed. This change relieves the need for amending the Land Use Code again, when new rulings come out.

At the public hearing Tom Gibbons and Michelle Bellah spoke in favor of the amendments, while two parties spoke in opposition of the amendments. Concerns of the opponents were as follows:

- Linda Courtney representative of Jim Helta stated that her client owns property in the Commercial district and requested to be excluded from the proposal, as it may hinder the renting of his apartments.

- ❖ Given the distancing requirements from other dispensaries, staff's calculation is that only one dispensary could potentially be located West of the Scholfield Bridge.
- Ellen Keeland expressed concern over the negative effects of marijuana and the youth.
 - ❖ Medical marijuana facilities are legal in the state of Oregon. The Commission's position was simply to develop standards for the regulation of those facilities, including distancing them from schools and parks.

The Commission unanimously voted to recommend approval of the modified proposal to the Reedsport City Council. The following summarizes the proposed amendments to the RLUC:

Section Related to Change	Action
10.64.030 Definitions	Added the following definitions related to medical marijuana facilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marijuana; • Medical marijuana; • Medical marijuana dispensary; • Marijuana grow facility; • Oregon medical marijuana program (OMMP); and • OMMP qualified patient. Added the following general definitions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drugstore; and • Pharmacy.
10.72.060 (C1) Commercial Transitional	Added medical marijuana dispensaries as a conditionally permitted use. (A minimum standard also applies.)
10.72.070 (C2) Commercial	Added medical marijuana dispensaries as a use permitted with standards.
10.72.085 (CMU) Commercial Mixed Use	Added medical marijuana dispensaries as a use permitted with standards; Added marijuana grow sites as a conditionally permitted use. (A minimum standard also applies.)

Section Related to Change (cont'd)	Action (continued)
10.72.090 (M1) Light Industrial	Added an exclusion, to preclude medical marijuana dispensaries from this zone.

	Added marijuana grow sites as a conditionally permitted use. (A minimum standard also applies.)
10.72.100 (M2) Heavy Industrial	Added marijuana grow sites as a conditionally permitted use. (A minimum standard also applies.)
10.76.035 Medical marijuana dispensaries	Minimum standards for authorizing medical marijuana dispensaries were added, including provisions for:
10.76.035 Medical marijuana dispensaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location; • Business hours of operation; • Outdoor storage; • Prohibition of use and consumption on site; • Prohibition of drive-thrus and mobile operations; • Location of primary entrances; • Ventilation and filtration systems; • Lighting; • Displays visible from the exterior; • Signage; • Facades; and • Proper disposal of wastes.

There are no direct costs to the City to amend the code. The amendments will create the need for a medical marijuana dispensary permit, which would provide additional revenue to the City for the cost of processing those types of applications. The fee for this permit will be adopted under Resolution 2015-012. Grow site applications will be processed as Conditional Use Permits, for which a fee of \$350.00 is already established.

Councilor Frank Barth motioned to adopt Ordinance 2015-1143 to amend the Reedsport Land Usage Ordinance (RLUO) Chapters 10.64, 10.72, and 10.76 in order to implement time and place standards for medical marijuana dispensaries and marijuana grow sites, declaring an emergency and assign 2015-1143 as the title.

Councilor DeeDee Murphy seconded the motion.

MOTION:

that the City Council adopt Ordinance 2015-1143 to amend the Reedsport Land Usage Ordinance (RLUO) Chapters 10.64, 10.72, and 10.76 in order to implement time and place standards for medical marijuana dispensaries and marijuana grow sites, declaring an emergency and assign 2015-1143 as the title.

VOTE:

AYES 6 NAYES 0 ABSTAIN 1

(Mayor Linda McCollum, Councilors Barth, Essig, Patten, Murphy and Turner voted in favor of the motion.)(Councilor Collier abstained from voting)

Mayor Linda McCollum declared the motion passed.

D. A Public Hearing to consider a re-zoning request.

Shall the City Council adopt an Ordinance amending the Reedsport Zoning Map in order to re-zone two lots from (C2) Commercial to (CMU) Commercial Mixed Use and assign 2015-1144 as the title?

It was noted that the Councilors, as a whole, visited the site of the appeal hearing. There were no abstentions or conflicts of interest.

City Planning Assistant Jessica Terra said that Ms. Ellen Keeland, the owner of two vacant lots in Old Town, between the Reedsport Car Wash and the Orca Gallery, has requested to start a chainsaw carving art gallery, in conjunction with chainsaw carving demonstrations. The current zoning of her property is (C2) Commercial, which authorizes uses such as retail sales and other general business types. However, the applicant's proposal includes chainsaw carving demonstrations, which staff feels is similar to a light manufacturing use. After holding a pre-application conference with Ms. Keeland, both staff and the applicant agreed that a zone change was a feasible option to pursue.

Given the applicant's mixed-use business proposal, mixed-use being the combination of commercial and light-industrial uses, the operations would be more suitable for the City's the (CMU) Commercial Mixed-Use zone. The CMU zone allows the following uses, outright:

- *Art shop—Gallery, studio, supplies.*
- *The manufacture, compounding, processing, packaging or treatment of such products as bakery goods, candy, cosmetics, dairy products, drugs, electronic and communications components and supplies, leather and leather products, lumber and wood products, building specialties, objects or specialty items, perfumes, toiletries, soft drinks, food products, except for fish, sauerkraut, vinegar, yeast and rendering of fats and oils.*

On February 20, 2015 Ms. Keeland applied for a zone change, to rezone two parcels, identified as Tax Lots 8800 & 8900, in Sections 35CB of T21S, R12W, W.M.; Property ID Nos. R73543 & R73536, from Commercial to Commercial Mixed Use. The Reedsport Land Usage Ordinance requires that any amendment to the Land Usage Ordinance, Comprehensive Plan, or other adopted document reference in the Land Usage Ordinance or Comprehensive Plan be heard first before the Reedsport Planning Commission and then ratified by the City Council.

At least 20 days prior to the Reedsport Planning Commission's public hearing, a notice was sent to all property owners within 200 feet of the subject property, affected public districts, and governmental agencies. Notice was also published in the Umpqua Post. No written comments were received prior to the hearing.

A written staff report was provided at least 7 days prior to the first evidentiary hearing. In the report staff identified that the request was consistent with the goals for the Reedsport Planning Commission, Comprehensive Plan, TSP, and compatible with the existing surrounding uses based on the following:

- the Reedsport Planning Commission supports new businesses and economic development in the downtown;
- the proposed use and zoning are consistent with activities in the area such as the Main Street Program, OTRMA Farmer's Market, the Oregon Divisional Chainsaw Sculpting Championships, and CDABA events, which all promote tourism in the downtown;
- Reedsport has been deemed the Chainsaw Carving Capital of Oregon and establishment of the new business provides an important connection to the entrance and theme of Old Town;
- the Reedsport Comprehensive Plan identifies the Old Town area as a "key area that could serve tourism-oriented commercial activity" and supports redevelopment of vacant lands in the area; and
- development of the vacant land is in the economic interest of the public by adding to the City's tax base and the Urban Renewal District fund.

On March 23, 2015, the Reedsport Planning Commission held a public hearing. The applicant and one other party, Michelle Bellah (owner of a building down the street), were in agreement with the staff report and in favor of the zone change. There was no opposition received. The Planning Commission voted, unanimously, to approve the request.

The Reedsport City Council must now hold a public hearing in which the Council shall approve, deny, or approve with conditions the request from Ellen Keeland to rezone two lots in the (C2) Commercial zone to (CMU) Commercial Mixed Use.

There are no direct costs to the City to amend the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Maps because the City has GIS capabilities to do the work in-house.

Councilor Frank Barth motioned to adopt Ordinance 2015-1144 amending the Reedsport Zoning Map in order to re-zone two lots from (C2) Commercial to (CMU) Commercial Mixed Use.

Councilor Diane Essig seconded the motion.

MOTION:

that the City Council adopt Ordinance 2015-1144 amending the Reedsport Zoning Map in order to re-zone two lots from (C2) Commercial to (CMU) Commercial Mixed Use.

VOTE:

AYES 7 NAYES 0

(Mayor Linda McCollum, Councilors Barth, Essig, Patten, Collier, Murphy and Turner voted in favor of the motion.)

Mayor Linda McCollum declared the motion passed unanimously.

- E. A Public Hearing to considering adding regulation for marijuana dispensaries and producers.

Shall the City Council adopt an Ordinance imposing regulations on the agents and operators of medical marijuana dispensaries and marijuana producers, in addition to the time and place standards set out in the Reedsport Land Usage Ordinance, and assign 2015-1145 as the title?

Councilor Leslee Collier declared a conflict of interest in this item.

Mr. Kirk Collier, 100 River Bend Rd, Reedsport spoke in favor of the permitting of medical marijuana dispensaries and marijuana producers. He acknowledged that the subject is a very emotional but whether a person is for it or against it there is a lot of marijuana that will be sold and having the regulations and permits in place.

City Manager Jonathan Wright stated that on March 19, 2014, Senate Bill 1531 was signed into law giving local governments the ability to impose certain regulations and restrictions on the operation of medical marijuana dispensaries, including the ability to impose a moratorium for up to one year. The one year moratorium is almost over and the City must now incorporate provisions for medical marijuana dispensaries and marijuana grow facilities into the Business Regulations of the Reedsport Municipal Code.

The City's current business license provisions do not permit those uses that are not lawful under federal regulations; however, medical marijuana has been legalized by the state and the City is being required to make reasonable provisions to accommodate this use despite the outstanding federal regulations. Staff finds that it is in the interest of the public health, safety, and welfare to create a licensing and permitting program distinct

from the City's current Business License Regulations. These provisions will help ensure safe access to the recipients of marijuana and to verify compliance with all State and Local laws pertaining to marijuana facilities.

These regulations will also hold harmless the City, its officers, elected officials, employees, volunteers, and agents from any and all liabilities that result from arrest or prosecution of a marijuana facility owner, operator, agent, employee, volunteer, client or customer for violation of any law, including federal law. Further, the operators and agents of a marijuana facility shall indemnify and hold harmless the City, its officers, elected officials, employees, volunteers and agents, insurers and self-insurance pool against all liability, claims and demands on account of any injury, loss or damage, including, without limitation, claims arising from bodily injury, personal injury, sickness, disease, death, property loss or damage, or any other loss of any kind whatsoever arising out of or in any manner connected with the operation of the marijuana facility that is the subject of the license or permit.

There is no fiscal impact.

Councilor Frank Barth motioned to adopt an Ordinance amending Chapter 7.30 of the Municipal Code, declaring an emergency and assign 2015-1145 as the title.

Councilor Dee Dee Murphy seconded the motion.

MOTION:

that the City Council adopt an Ordinance amending Chapter 7.30 of the Municipal Code, declaring an emergency and assign 2015-1145 as the title.

VOTE:

AYES 6 NAYES 0 ABSTAIN 1

(Mayor Linda McCollum, Councilors Barth, Essig, Patten, Murphy and Turner voted in favor of the motion.)(Councilor Collier abstained from voting)

Mayor Linda McCollum declared the motion passed.

F. A Public Hearing to accept State Revenue Sharing funds.

Shall the City Council adopt Resolution 2015-010 electing to receive State Revenue Distributions in Fiscal Year 2015 / 016?

Finance Director Vera Koch said that in order to receive state revenues apportioned among cities within the state, the City Council is required by Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) to establish a process for annually electing to receive the distributions. At the

regular City Council meeting of May 21, 2001, the Council adopted Ordinance 2001-1022 establishing a process for electing to receive annual state revenue distributions. The Ordinance provides for hearings before the Budget Committee and the City Council to consider possible uses of state revenue sharing distributions, including offset against property tax levies by the City. The Ordinance also provides for adoption of a Resolution certifying the process and that the City has levied a property tax for the year preceding the year in which revenue sharing is due to occur.

The approved Fiscal Year 2015 / 2016 operating budget includes the following estimated state collected and distributed revenues, as an offset against property tax levies by the City:

1. General Fund (#001)
 - a. Liquor Tax \$55,000
 - b. Cigarette Tax \$4,000
 - c. State Revenue Sharing \$40,000
 - Subtotal \$99,000

2. Street Fund (#002) (Gas Tax)
 - a. State Gasoline Tax \$225,000

3. Bicycle / Footpath Fund (#007)
 - a. State Gasoline Tax \$2,250

The Budget Committee conducted a hearing to discuss the possible uses of state revenue funds at the regular meeting of April 13th. With completion of the hearing by the City Council to accept state revenue distributions, the Council could adopt a Resolution electing to receive the revenue distributions.

A proposed Resolution has been drafted providing the required certification and election to receive state revenue distributions.

With the adoption of this Resolution, it is expected the City will receive approximately \$326,250 in gas, liquor and cigarette taxes for fiscal year 2015 - 2016. These funds contribute to the operations in General Fund and Street Fund.

Councilor Frank Barth motioned to adopt a Resolution electing to receive state revenue distributions for the Fiscal Year 2015 - 2016, certifying compliance with the Oregon Revised Statutes; and assign Resolution number 2015-010 as the title.

Councilor Diane Essig seconded the motion.

MOTION:

that the City Council approve the Agenda as amended.

VOTE:

AYES 7 NAYES 0

(Mayor Linda McCollum, Councilors Barth, Essig, Patten, Collier, Murphy and Turner voted in favor of the motion.)

Mayor Linda McCollum declared the motion passed unanimously.

5. CONSENT AGENDA

Routine items of business that require a vote but are not expected to require discussion by the Council are placed on the Consent Calendar and voted upon as one item. In the event that a Councilor or citizen requests that an item be discussed, it will be removed from the Consent Calendar and placed under General Business.

- A. Approve minutes of the work session of April 6, 2015.
- B. Approve minutes of the regular session of April 6, 2015.
- C. City Council review of the annual renewals for liquor licenses.

Reedsport Municipal Code Chapter 7.28 states that the City Council must review all annual renewal applications for liquor licenses.

The Council was presented with a letter from OLCC listing the business locations currently holding liquor licenses within the City of Reedsport. Noted on the list (crossed off) were licenses that no longer exist and will not be renewed in June, the remainders of these licenses renew on July 1, 2015. This list was been reviewed by the Chief of Police.

An annual \$35.00 renewal fee for each applicant is charged during the renewal process.

*1. Review of annual renewals for liquor licenses and accept staff recommendations.

- D. Shall the City Council adopt Resolution 2015-011 certifying provisions of municipal services for determination of eligibility to receive revenues for cigarette, gas and liquor taxes?

ORS 221.760 provides that cities located within a county having more than 100,000 inhabitants, according to the most recent decennial census (2010), must provide four or more of the following municipal services in order to be eligible to receive state revenue sharing funds:

1. Police protection,
2. Fire protection,
3. Street construction, maintenance, and lighting,
4. Sanitary sewers,
5. Storm sewers,
6. Planning, zoning, and subdivision control,
7. Water utility services,

The Oregon Department of Administrative Services (DAS), Office of Business Administration (OBA) has advised that Douglas County has more than 100,000 residents and those municipalities desiring to receive state revenue sharing funds must certify that at least four municipal services are provided.

With the adoption of this Resolution, it is expected the City will receive approximately \$326,250 in gas tax, liquor tax, and cigarette tax for fiscal year 2015 / 016.

- *1. Adopt a Resolution certifying provision of municipal services, in order to establish eligibility to receive state revenue funds for the fiscal year 2015 / 016; and assign Resolution 2015-011 as the title.

- E. Shall the City Council renew a lease for the Sr. Center to Douglas County Health and Social Services for the purposes of preparing and serving meals for seniors?

Each year the City of Reedsport and Douglas County Health & Social Services Department enter into a contractual agreement for use of the Senior Center kitchen and dining area to serve meals to Senior Citizens. This is a shared lease with the food contractor Compass USA dba Bateman Food Services.

An increase of 2% a month was negotiated for the 2015/2016 fiscal year. The current rate for Douglas County would be \$333.00 per month. Combined with the lease payment of \$306.00 per month from Compass USA, this is a comparable rental amount for dining site leases in Douglas County. Attached is a copy of the proposed lease.

General Fund revenue in the amount of \$3996.00.

- *1. Renew a lease for the Sr. Center to Douglas County Health and Social Services for the purposes of preparing and serving meals for seniors.

- F. Shall the City Council renew a lease for the Compass USA for the purposes of preparing and serving meals for seniors?

Each year the City of Reedsport and Compass USA dba Bateman Food Services enter into a contractual agreement for use of the Senior Center kitchen and dining area to prepare meals for Senior Citizens by amendment to the original contract. This is a shared lease with the Douglas County Health & Social Services Department. Staff is proposing the rate include a 2% increase at \$306.00 per month for the fiscal year 2014/2015.

It should be noted that this is half of the amount received for the kitchen lease. Douglas County also pays a portion of the rent. The City Council will also be asked to consider a lease with Douglas County in the amount of \$333.00 a month. This has included a cost adjustment the last three years.

The current lease agreement was negotiated by the City Attorney in August of 2010. There are no proposed changes to the lease.

General Fund revenue in the amount of \$3,672.00.

- *1. Approve an amendment to the lease for the Senior Center to Compass USA for the purpose of preparing and serving meals for seniors and the Meals-on-Wheels program and authorize.

- G. Shall the City Council approve an application for a new liquor license?

In June of 2012, during the annual review of current liquor licenses, Council requested that all new liquor license applications be presented at a Regular meeting of the City Council for approval. The City has the right to review the application and submit a recommendation to the Oregon Liquor Control Commission (OLCC).

A new license has been applied for by David Larsen for DnD Deli Mart LLC at 1050 Hwy 101, Reedsport. This is a new building location and has never held an active license. A \$100 fee was submitted to the City to cover the costs of the application review.

City Manager Jonathan Wright has reviewed the application.

There is no fiscal impact of issuing a license to sell alcohol at this location beyond the normal application and renewal fees.

- *1. Grant a liquor license to David Larsen for DnD Deli Mart LLC at 1050 Hwy 101, Reedsport.

- H. Motion to approve the Consent Calendar.

Councilor Frank Barth motioned to approve the Agenda.

Councilor Debby Turner seconded the motion.

MOTION:

that the City Council approve the Agenda.

VOTE:

AYES 7 NAYES 0

(Mayor Linda McCollum, Councilors Barth, Essig, Patten, Collier, Murphy and Turner voted in favor of the motion.)

Mayor Linda McCollum declared the motion passed unanimously.

6. GENERAL BUSINESS

- A. Shall the City Council adopt a Resolution establishing fees for the processing of marijuana facility operator's licenses, marijuana facility agent's permits, and medical marijuana dispensary licenses and assign 2015-012 as the title?

Councilor Leslee Collier declared a conflict of interest in this item.

City Manager Jonathan Wright said that Ordinance 2015-1142 and Ordinance 2015-1145 have been adopted by the Reedsport City Council. These ordinances created time and place standards for marijuana facilities, minimum standards for medical marijuana dispensaries, regulations for marijuana facility operators, and regulations for marijuana facility agents. Applications for marijuana facility operator's licenses and marijuana facility agent's permits are renewable annually, necessitating a review for compliance, each year.

The provisions for those Ordinances will require staff to:

- Perform site visits (where applicable);
- Perform code enforcement and inspections (as needed);
- Register and track all permits and licenses;
- Review and approve permits and licenses (Planning, Police, Fire & Public Works Depts.);
- Process background checks on each individual associated with a marijuana facility;
- Send renewal notifications for expiring licenses and permits;
- Mail licenses, permits, or associated documents upon issuance; and
- Purchase materials (e.g., envelopes, postage, certificate paper, ink, etc.).

A \$35.00 fee should be assessed at the time of application for a medical marijuana dispensary placement permit and is consistent with existing fees that are charged for Planning Department reviews. This fee will cover administrative costs associated with processing the permit.

A \$100.00 fee should be assessed at the time of initial application or renewal of a marijuana facility operator's license or a marijuana facility agent's permit and will cover the administrative costs associated with review and processing those licenses and permits.

The cost associated with a medical marijuana dispensary placement permit will provide revenue to the Planning Department Fund, in order to recoup processing costs, such as staff time, mailings, and materials required to administer the Ordinance.

The fees that are taken in for medical marijuana facility operator's licenses and agent's permits will provide revenue to the General Fund, which will be used to recoup staff's time spent to process an application, including running background checks, code enforcement, mailings, and materials associated with administering the Ordinance.

Councilor Frank Barth motioned to adopt a Resolution establishing fees and assign 2015-012 as the title.

Councilor Diane Essig seconded the motion.

MOTION:

that the City Council adopt a Resolution establishing fees and assign 2015-012 as the title.

VOTE:

AYES 7 NAYES 0

(Mayor Linda McCollum, Councilors Barth, Essig, Patten, Murphy and Turner voted in favor of the motion.) (Councilor Collier abstained from voting)

Mayor Linda McCollum declared the motion passed unanimously.

B. Shall the City Council adopt an Ordinance authorizing the sale of bonds to the Department of Environmental Quality and assign 2015-1146 as the title?

City Finance Director Vera Koch said that the Reedsport City Council directed staff at the December 2014 regular City Council to begin the process with Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) for refinancing the 2011 wastewater loan. Staff was advised in March by DEQ personnel that the interest rate was most likely at its lowest point and issuing a bond sale by June 30th would be advantageous for the City. Upon the direction to begin the refinance process, staff hired the bond counsel firm of Hawkins, Delafield & Wood LLP to draft the ordinance and revenue bond form.

Attached for your approval is the Bond Purchase Agreement No. R08710 between Oregon DEQ and the City of Reedsport. The Bond Agreement is for \$10,334,358, an interest rate of 1.4% per annum with a repayment period of thirty years from the wastewater treatment project completion and twenty six (26) years from the bond issuance date. An annual fee of 0.5% of the outstanding amount is due annually. Final debt payment shall be made no later than February 1, 2041. A reserve of \$236,687 is required to be set aside until the debt is retired. There is no penalty for early payoff.

When compared to the City's current loan, the new loan and hybrid repayment method should save the community around \$500,000 in interest and loan fees.

Councilor Frank Barth motioned to adopt an Ordinance authorizing the sale of bonds to the Department of Environmental Quality and assign 2015-1146 as the title?

Councilor Diane Essig seconded the motion.

MOTION:

that the City Council adopt an Ordinance authorizing the sale of bonds to the Department of Environmental Quality and assign 2015-1146 as the title?

VOTE:

AYES 7 NAYES 0

(Mayor Linda McCollum, Councilors Barth, Essig, Patten, Collier, Murphy and Turner voted in favor of the motion.)

Mayor Linda McCollum declared the motion passed unanimously.

- C. Shall the City Council approve an amended lease between Douglas County Housing Authority and the City of Reedsport for the Senior Center?

City Manager Jonathan Wright said that the Lower Umpqua Senior Center facility was completed in 1989. This was a collaborated effort between the City of Reedsport, Douglas County Housing Authority and Lower Umpqua Community Center, Inc.(501c3).

Douglas County Housing Authority owns the land the building was placed on, therefore they retain legal ownership. A lease agreement was negotiated in 1999 in which no money exchanges hands but the City and the Housing Authority agreed to some shared maintenance and uses. In exchange for some costs associated with the uses and senior oriented activities the City was allowed to negotiate sub-leases and rent the building during non-open hours for group rentals or social functions. This lease is an auto-renewal lease and renews every 5 years.

The building is currently sub-leased to Douglas County Health & Social Services and Compass, USA for the purpose of preparing and serving meals to area seniors.

In 2009 the City approached the Housing Authority to discuss updating the lease agreement language and eliminating a clause in the lease that prohibited the use and sale of alcohol on the premises. The intention was to try to generate more uses of the building for events such as wedding receptions or class reunions. A draft lease was created, however, for various reasons it was not executed.

The city staff and the Housing Authority have now agreed to the amendments to the lease and would like to have it ratified by the City Council.

Attached is a copy of the proposed lease and it has been reviewed by the City Attorney.

There is no measurable fiscal impact. Potentially there may be more rental income.

Councilor Frank Barth motioned to approve an amended lease for the Sr. Center with Douglas County Housing Authority for the use of the building.

Councilor Diane Essig seconded the motion.

MOTION:

that the City Council approve an amended lease for the Sr. Center with Douglas County Housing Authority for the use of the building.

VOTE:

AYES 7 NAYES 0

(Mayor Linda McCollum, Councilors Barth, Essig, Patten, Collier, Murphy and Turner voted in favor of the motion.)

Mayor Linda McCollum declared the motion passed unanimously.

- D. Shall the City Council approve the Professional Services Contract, Phase 1, for the firm Anderson Perry & Associates, Inc. (AP) for the City Levee Certification project and authorize staff to proceed with issuing one or more task orders?

Public Works Director John Stokes said that at the November 3, 2014 City Council meeting, the Council authorized staff to proceed with the Request for Qualification (RFQ) process in order to identify and ultimately obtain a Levee Certification consultant. Once the Statements of Qualification (SOQ) were received, Staff formed a review and ranking panel where the SOQ's were distributed, discussed and ranked accordingly, with AP being ranked the highest. On February 4, 2015, the City Council then approved the selection of AP and authorized Staff to collaborate with AP to develop a Proposal to determine the scope and costs associated with the components of the Levee Certification project.

The Proposal has been generated and a contract produced that identifies three Phases of the Certification process. Phase 1, currently before the Council today, identifies 7 subtasks of data collection, meetings and required services which are estimated to take between 4 and 6 months to complete. Phase 2 which covers assessment, formulation and production of certification options, is referenced, but will not be acted upon until Phase 1 is completed and a final estimate of professional services is produced as a result of the Phase 1 data collection, and then formal City Council approval is obtained.

Regarding the current Phase 1 contract, Staff will only issue one of multiple task orders to AP upon formal Council approval.

The total for all 7 subtasks for Phase 1 is \$195,000. It has been determined that \$84,622 funding is available from the 2014/'15 Stormwater fund for subtasks 1, 2 and 3 prior to the end of this current fiscal year. The remaining 4 subtasks total \$110,598 has been budgeted and will be funded from the 2015/'16 Stormwater fund after the start of the new fiscal year on July 1, 2015.

Note: Funding for the future Phase 2 is contingent on the current HUD funding, IFA grants or loans, etc. that will be determined by the Federal Government and State Legislature within the next few months. If for some reason neither of these sources are realized, financial options will need to be identified and reviewed with Council in order to continue to proceed. AP has been advised of the funding availability and current issues and has indicated that they are more than willing to work with the City to accommodate.

Councilor Rich Patten motioned to approve Anderson Perry & Associates proposal for Phase 1 and authorize staff to issue one or more task orders to proceed with the Levee Certification.

Councilor Leslee Collier seconded the motion.

MOTION:

that the City Council approve Anderson Perry & Associates proposal for Phase 1 and authorize staff to issue one or more task orders to proceed with the Levee Certification.

VOTE:

AYES 7 NAYES 0

(Mayor Linda McCollum, Councilors Barth, Essig, Patten, Collier, Murphy and Turner voted in favor of the motion.)

Mayor Linda McCollum declared the motion passed unanimously.

E. Receive Quarterly Financial Report.

City Finance Director Vera Koch presented the following financial report.

2014 / 2015 Financial Report
Presented **May 04, 2015**

target % received/spent
by end of 9th month of
budget Target %
year

THIRD Quarter of fiscal year 2014/2015
For period ending MARCH 2015

75%

General Fund 001

	Budget	Actual		
Beginning Fund Balance	\$751,555	\$994,498	132.33	
			%	
Revenue	\$2,207,505	\$1,872,650	84.83%	Received
*Expenditures	\$2,649,060	\$1,595,359	60.22%	Expended
*(less unappropriated expenditures)				

Street Fund 002

	Budget	Actual		
Beginning Fund Balance	\$80,000	\$85,265	106.58	
			%	
Revenue	\$274,900	\$211,970	77.11%	Received
*Expenditures	\$354,900	\$220,378	62.10%	Expended
*(less unappropriated expenditures)				

Water Utility Fund 003

	Budget	Actual		
Beginning Fund Balance	\$250,000	\$290,685	116.27	
			%	
Revenue	\$822,000	\$615,484	74.88%	Received

*Expenditures	\$1,072,000	\$742,694	69.28%	Expended
*(less unappropriated expenditures)				

Wastewater Utility 004

	Budget	Actual		
Beginning Fund Balance	\$360,000	\$376,361	104.54%	
Revenue	\$1,939,500	\$1,374,120	70.85%	Received
*Expenditures	\$2,299,500	\$1,420,576	61.78%	Expended
*(less unappropriated expenditures)				

Stormwater Utility Fund 005

	Budget	Actual		
Beginning Fund Balance	\$16,000	\$41,200	257.50%	
Revenue	\$93,450	\$70,361	75.29%	Received
*Expenditures	\$109,450	\$64,901	59.30%	Expended
*(less unappropriated expenditures)				

Bicycle/footpath Fund 007

	Budget	Actual		
Beginning Fund Balance	\$38,000	\$37,859	99.63%	
Revenue	\$2,400	\$1,887	78.63%	Received
*Expenditures	\$40,400	\$4,134	10.23%	Expended

Water SPWF Loan Debt Fund 010

	Budget	Actual		
Beginning Fund Balance	\$81,800	\$81,850	100.06%	
Revenue	\$22,700	\$19,624	86.45%	Received
*Expenditures	\$104,500	\$20,602	19.71%	Expended
*(less unappropriated expenditures)				

Water Filtration Debt/Reserve Fund 011

	Budget	Actual		
Beginning Fund Balance	\$11,225	\$11,224	99.99%	
Revenue	\$116,510	\$116,506	100.00%	Received
*Expenditures	\$127,735	\$127,730	100.00%	Expended
*(less unappropriated expenditures)				

Wastewater DEQ Loan Debt Fund 012

	Budget	Actual		
Beginning Fund Balance	\$527,000	\$527,821	100.16%	
Revenue	\$824,000	\$618,539	75.07%	Received
*Expenditures	\$821,700	\$410,848	50.00%	Expended
*(less unappropriated expenditures)				

Wastewater OECDD Loan Debt Fund 013

	Budget	Actual		
Beginning Fund Balance	\$100,600	\$100,668	100.07%	

Revenue	\$154,500	\$115,957	75.05%	Received
*Expenditures	\$154,250	\$154,247	100.00%	Expended

*(less unappropriated expenditures)

Fire Equipment Fund 014

	Budget	Actual		
Beginning Fund Balance	\$126,000	\$130,351	103.45%	
Revenue	\$27,190	\$20,702	76.14%	Received
*Expenditures	\$153,190	\$20,600	13.45%	Expended

*(less unappropriated expenditures)

Dunes NRA Fund 016

	Budget	Actual		
Beginning Fund Balance	\$101,000	\$101,538	100.53%	
Revenue	\$100,810	\$78,536	77.90%	Received
*Expenditures	\$201,810	\$71,526	35.44%	Expended

*(less unappropriated expenditures)

Riverfront Fund 017

	Budget	Actual		
Beginning Fund Balance	\$36,130	\$41,358	114.47%	
Revenue	\$118,235	\$90,063	76.17%	Received
*Expenditures	\$154,365	\$87,091	56.42%	Expended

Library Renovation Fund 018

	Budget	Actual		
Beginning Fund Balance	\$42,000	\$32,298	76.90%	
Revenue	\$0	\$5	100.00%	Received
*Expenditures	\$42,000	\$24,608	58.59%	Expended

Sys. Development Fund Water 020

		Actual		
Beginning Fund Balance	\$70,480	\$70,485	100.01%	
Revenue	\$300	\$1,002	334.00%	Received
*Expenditures	\$70,780	\$0	0.00%	Expended

Sys. Development Fund Wastewater 021

	Budget	Actual		
Beginning Fund Balance	\$132,800	\$132,806	100.00%	
Revenue	\$500	\$419	83.80%	Received
*Expenditures	\$133,300	\$0	0.00%	Expended

System Development Fund Stormwater 022

	Budget	Actual		
Beginning Fund Balance	\$6,020	\$6,029	100.15 %	
Revenue	\$20	\$19	95.00%	Received
*Expenditures	\$6,040	\$0	0.00%	Expended

Enterprise Cap. Improve. Fund -Sewer 024

	Budget	Actual		
Beginning Fund Balance	\$1,440,000	\$1,440,371	100.03 %	
Revenue	\$272,950	\$206,209	75.55%	Received
*Expenditures	\$1,712,950	\$9,375	0.55%	Expended

General Capital Improve. Fund 025

	Budget	Actual		
Beginning Fund Balance	\$230,000	\$237,879	103.43 %	
Revenue	\$138,050	\$112,540	81.52%	Received
*Expenditures	\$308,050	\$76,636	24.88%	Expended
*(less unappropriated expenditures)				

Street Capital Fund 026

	Budget	Actual		
Beginning Fund Balance	\$418,000	\$418,232	100.06 %	
Revenue	\$172,150	\$142,138	82.57%	Received
*Expenditures	\$590,150	\$132,356	22.43%	Expended
*(less unappropriated expenditures)				

Storm Capital Fund 027

	Budget	Actual		
Beginning Fund Balance	\$130,000	\$132,079	101.60 %	
Revenue	\$31,125	\$23,756	76.32%	Received
*Expenditures	\$161,125	\$158	0.10%	Expended
*(less unappropriated expenditures)				

Water Enterprise Capital Improvement Fund 029

	Budget	Actual		
Beginning Fund Balance	\$1,350,000	\$1,363,556	101.00 %	
Revenue	\$254,690	\$181,680	71.33%	Received
*Expenditures	\$1,604,690	\$14,395	0.90%	Expended
*(less unappropriated expenditures)				

Reedsport Urban Renewal District. Fund 150

	Budget	Actual		
Beginning Fund Balance	\$274,000	\$308,849	112.72 %	
Revenue	\$83,825	\$77,573	92.54%	Received
Expenditures	\$357,825	\$25,581	7.15%	Expended

URD MainStreet Fund 151

	Budget	Actual
--	---------------	---------------

Beginning Fund Balance	\$0	\$0	0.00%	
Revenue	\$68,000	\$36,594	53.81%	Received
Expenditures	\$68,000	\$17,222	25.33%	Expended

7. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

Diane Essig listed Memorial Day Weekend events.

Councilor Frank Barth noted that he is working on the Chainsaw Carving Festival coordination.

The next business after hours event will be Wednesday

Noted that four Councilors will be attending the Small Cities meeting in Gold Beach.

The Main Street Façade Improvement Program is now accepting applications for Façade Improvement Grants. The deadline for the first wave of applications will be May 15th.

ADJOURN

Linda McCollum, Mayor

ATTEST:

Deanna Schafer, City Recorder