

CITY OF TROUTDALE

"Gateway to the Columbia River Gorge"

AGENDA

CITY COUNCIL – REGULAR MEETING

Troutdale Police Community Center – Kellogg Room
234 SW Kendall Court
Troutdale, OR 97060-2078

Tuesday, December 12, 2017 – 7:00PM

Mayor

Casey Ryan

City Council

David Ripma

Randy Lauer

Larry Morgan

Glenn White

Rich Allen

Zach Hudson

City Manager

Ray Young

1. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, ROLL CALL, AGENDA UPDATE.**
2. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** Public comment on non-agenda and consent agenda items is welcome at this time. *Public comment on agenda items will be taken at the time the item is considered. Public comments should be directed to the Presiding Officer, and limited to matters of community interest or related to matters which may, or could, come before Council. Each speaker shall be limited to 5 minutes for each agenda item unless a different amount of time is allowed by the Presiding Officer, with consent of the Council.*
3. **CONSENT AGENDA:**
 - 3.1 **MINUTES:** November 14, 2017 City Council Regular Meeting.
4. **MOTION:** A motion accepting the Selection Committee's recommendation for appointments to the Budget Committee, Citizens Advisory Committee, Historic Landmarks Commission, Parks Advisory Committee and Planning Commission.
Mayor Casey Ryan
5. **REPORT:** Multnomah County Sheriff's Office Public Safety Contract Performance Report Update.
Monte Reiser, Chief of Police/Commander, MCSO
6. **REPORT:** A report from the PAC regarding the Imagination Station II RFP.
Tim Seery, Parks & Facilities Director & Ryan McNaughton, PAC Chair

7. **PUBLIC HEARING / ORDINANCE (Introduced 11/14/17):** An Ordinance Adopting Comprehensive Land Use Plan Map and Zoning District Map Amendments on Approximately 143 Acres of Land in the Troutdale Reynolds Industrial Park.

Chris Damgen, Community Development Director

8. **RESOLUTION:** A Resolution adjusting the System Development Charges for Water and rescinding Resolution No. 2001.

Steve Gaschler, Public Works Director

9. **RESOLUTION:** A Resolution adjusting the System Development Charges for Sanitary Sewer and rescinding Resolution No. 2002.

Steve Gaschler, Public Works Director

10. **RESOLUTION:** A Resolution adjusting the System Development Charges for Transportation and rescinding Resolution No. 2003.

Steve Gaschler, Public Works Director


11. **RESOLUTION:** A Resolution adjusting the System Development Charges for Stormwater and rescinding Resolution No. 2004.

Steve Gaschler, Public Works Director

12. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

13. COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS

14. ADJOURNMENT



Casey Ryan, Mayor

Dated: 12/7/2017

City Council Regular Meetings will be replayed on Comcast Cable Channel 30 (HD Channel 330) and Frontier Communications Channel 38 on the weekend following the meeting - Friday at 4:00pm and Sunday at 9:00pm.

Further information and copies of agenda packets are available at: Troutdale City Hall, 219 E. Historic Columbia River Hwy. Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.; on our Web Page www.troutdaleoregon.gov or call Sarah Skroch, City Recorder at 503-674-7258.

The meeting location is wheelchair accessible. A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired or for other accommodations for persons with disabilities should be made at least 48 hours before the meeting to: Sarah Skroch, City Recorder 503-674-7258.

MINUTES
Troutdale City Council – Regular Meeting
Troutdale Police Community Center – Kellogg Room
234 SW Kendall Court
Troutdale, OR 97060

Tuesday, December 12, 2017 – 7:00PM

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, ROLL CALL, AGENDA UPDATE.

Council President Ripma called the meeting to order at 7:01pm.

PRESENT: Mayor Ryan (7:15pm), Councilor Ripma, Councilor Lauer, Councilor Morgan (by phone), Councilor White, Councilor Allen, and Councilor Hudson.

ABSENT: None.

STAFF: Ray Young, City Manager; Ed Trompke, City Attorney; Kenda Schlaht, Deputy City Recorder; Steve Gaschler, Public Works Director; Travis Hultin, Chief Engineer; Tim Seery, Parks and Facilities Superintendent and Chris Damgen, Community Development Director.

GUESTS: See Attached List.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT: Public comment is limited to comments on non-agenda items.

Paul Wilcox, Troutdale resident, stated at the last meeting a month ago I raised the issue of the candidates for re-election next year for Council wouldn't be permitted to publish in the Champion. That wasn't addressed in the meeting so I want to find out what the policy is. I got an email from Sarah saying that her understanding was that it applied to the Councilors that might possibly be running for re-election. I wanted to find out if the Councilors up for re-election will be allowed to publish in the Champion. Also, I understand there's supposed to be a work session next Tuesday. For anybody that's interested it's going to be covering some pretty serious charter amendment issues. Since that meeting isn't televised I would encourage anyone that's interested to come to the meeting.

Councilor Ripma stated the meeting starts at 6:00.

3. CONSENT AGENDA:

3.1 MINUTES: September 12, 2017 City Council Regular Meeting.

MOTION: Councilor White moved to approve the consent agenda. Seconded by Councilor Lauer.

VOTE: Mayor Ryan – Yes; Councilor White – Yes; Councilor Allen – Yes; Councilor Hudson – Yes; Councilor Ripma – Yes; and Councilor Lauer – Yes.

Motion passed 6-0.

Councilor Morgan participated via phone but there were technical difficulties and he did not vote on this item.

4. MOTION: A motion accepting the Selection Committee's recommendation for appointments to the Budget Committee, Citizens Advisory Committee, Historic Landmarks Commission, Parks Advisory Committee and Planning Commission.

MOTION: Councilor Allen moved to accept the nominations for Parks Advisory Committee position 7, Marilee Thompson; position 8, Brenda Austin; and position 9, Nell Simien. Seconded by Councilor White.

VOTE: Mayor Ryan – Yes; Councilor White – Yes; Councilor Allen – Yes; Councilor Hudson – Yes; Councilor Ripma – Yes; and Councilor Lauer – Yes.

Motion passed 6-0.

Councilor Morgan participated via phone but there were technical difficulties and he did not vote on this item.

MOTION: Councilor Allen moved to accept the nominations for Historic Landmarks Commission position 4, Donna Erwin; position 6, Jon Lowell; and position 7, LeAnn Stephan. Seconded by Councilor White.

VOTE: Mayor Ryan – Yes; Councilor White – Yes; Councilor Allen – Yes; Councilor Hudson – Yes; Councilor Ripma – Yes; and Councilor Lauer – Yes.

Motion passed 6-0.

Councilor Morgan participated via phone but there were technical difficulties and he did not vote on this item.

MOTION: Councilor Allen moved to accept the nominations for Planning Commission alternate, Ryan Campbell. Seconded by Councilor White.

VOTE: Mayor Ryan – Yes; Councilor White – Yes; Councilor Allen – Yes; Councilor Hudson – Yes; Councilor Ripma – Yes; and Councilor Lauer – Yes.

Motion passed 6-0.

Councilor Morgan participated via phone but there were technical difficulties and he did not vote on this item.

MOTION: Councilor Allen moved to accept the nominations for Budget Committee position 1, Gene Bendt; position 6, Victoria Rizzo; and alternate, Jamie Kranz. Seconded by Councilor White.

VOTE: Mayor Ryan – Yes; Councilor White – Yes; Councilor Allen – Yes; Councilor Hudson – Yes; Councilor Ripma – Yes; and Councilor Lauer – Yes.

Motion passed 6-0.

Councilor Morgan participated via phone but there were technical difficulties and he did not vote on this item.

MOTION: Councilor Allen moved to accept the nominations for Citizens Advisory Committee position 6, Paul Wilcox; position 7, Jon Brown; position 8, Joseph Marquess; and alternate, Claude Cruz. Seconded by Councilor White.

VOTE: Mayor Ryan – Yes; Councilor White – Yes; Councilor Allen – Yes; Councilor Hudson – Yes; Councilor Ripma – Yes; and Councilor Lauer – Yes.

Motion passed 6-0.

Councilor Morgan participated via phone but there were technical difficulties and he did not vote on this item.

5. REPORT: Multnomah County Sheriff's Office Public Safety Contract Performance Report Update.

Commander Monte Reiser, Multnomah County Sheriff's Office, stated I'm here this evening with Lieutenant James Erickson who works in our training unit. He'll be talking about a project that he developed earlier this year. I would like to give a public safety update and I'll begin with the Eagle Creek fire that happened in the first part of September. Just a couple weeks ago on November 30th the fire was declared 100% contained. At the time in early September, the Eagle Creek fire was considered the nation's #1 priority wildfire. Early on, the fires movement towards Troutdale was a very significant concern. The Sheriff's Office was involved with early evacuation notifications in the communities of Warrendale, Dodson and Larch Mountain. They were also involved with the decisions to make evacuations and determine evacuation levels. During the early days of the fire we also had a 12 hour schedule for our deputies to maximize our patrol coverage. I wanted to thank the City of Troutdale's Public Works for what they did to assist us as well as the citizens that stopped by our command post to encourage first responders. The outpouring of community support was incredible. We recently participated in an after action exercise with the Multnomah County Office of Emergency Management and that report will be available very soon. I wanted to update the Council on a couple of higher profile pieces that occurred in the past few months in the City. We had a death investigation that occurred just a couple of weeks ago. This involved a deceased subject along I-84 at Milepost 17. The manner and cause of death in that investigation is still being determined by our crimes team. We do have a detective in Troutdale assigned to that case and working with the Oregon State Police as well. That area is actually a piece of ODOT's and the State's property where the person was located. We'll be making more releasable information available to the community as it comes available. On November 30th deputies responded to a report that a subject was threatening passengers on the Greyhound bus on I-84, just east of the Troutdale exit. When deputies arrived at the location they were able to locate and arrest a suspect as he was walking back towards Troutdale from the east end of the I-84 Bridge over the Sandy River. Two victims were transported to area hospitals with non-life threatening injuries. The suspect was arrested on attempted murder charges. One final investigation I wanted to brief the Council on is this past week on December 5th a deputy stopped a vehicle that was driving carelessly

on Frontage Road. After the vehicle stopped the deputy observed the driver switch seats with the passenger. When the deputy approached the vehicle the passenger, pretending to be the driver, fled on foot westbound through the businesses on Frontage Road. At that time the driver escaped custody and 3 other occupants in the vehicle were arrested after deputies found over a pound of marijuana and a firearm. Deputies were able to determine that the suspect had been involved in an earlier robbery and shooting in Portland and on the 8th of December they spotted the subject and male passenger in a car in Wood Village and stopped the vehicle and arrested the suspect. He was later charged with a multitude of charges. Last year we identified Frontage Road counting about 16% of all incidents and 12% of all offenses that occur in the City. Upon discovering this information I asked Lieutenant Erickson to conduct an assessment and take some steps to try to improve public safety in this area. I'll ask him to share what steps he took.

Lieutenant James Erickson, Multnomah County Sheriff's Office, stated in January of this year I looked at the area and because nobody lives on S. Frontage Road and there's roughly 12 or 13 businesses there, I reached out to all the businesses and all the people that work there and did a survey of what they perceived to be the issue. I did this around springtime so in the summer we could take all the data we got from the employees and come up with an enhance patrol mission during the summer. My goal was to do a post mission survey at the end of summer to see if what we did worked and what we could do to continue. We did a survey and 51% of all the employees actually completed the survey. They said their biggest issue was homelessness, graffiti and they wanted more police presence. During the whole summer we did an enhanced operation where we actually had the deputies be more visible. They did traffic missions and I had the Homeless Outreach and Program Engagement (HOPE) team out there making contact with everybody living in cars or tents and we did more visibility. We also got creative and parked a spare patrol car out there to kind of let people know we were there. At the end of summer we did another survey and we got 66% of the employees that responded to the post mission survey. 77% noticed an increase in police presence around the area, 68% felt safer after the mission was completed than before, 76% considered homelessness a serious problem before the mission and 66% after the mission. Before the mission, 74% felt the police were doing a good job and 85% post survey results. Just because we did enhanced patrol during the summer I don't want them to think that we stopped any enhanced patrol. We're coming up with some ideas. At a later date I can share all the details. We're going to request that a business watch be started, like a neighborhood watch for those businesses there. Also have community meetings and get to know each other and talk about what problems they're seeing. We have a liaison deputy assigned to Frontage Road.

Commander Reiser stated we'll be able to provide the Council with an update at our next Council update. I want to mention a few performance tables. These data points have occurred from July 1 through November 30, 2017 (a copy of the handout is attached to the minutes as Exhibit A). Our patrol unit averaged a response time of 4 minutes and 34 seconds for priority 1 and 2 calls. Our response for non-emergency calls averaged 8 minutes and 12 seconds. Deputies completed 1,103 traffic stops resulting in the issuance of 746 warnings and 243 non-criminal citations. Those stops resulted in 18 arrests and 17 citations in lieu of arrests. We also had total calls for service during this period of 4,773.

We also would like to seek to continue our efforts in developing community trust and partnership.

6. REPORT: A report from the PAC regarding the Imagination Station II RFP.

Tim Seery, Parks and Facilities Superintendent, stated 20 months and 3 days ago to the date an arsonist started a fire at Imagination Station. We've been working on recommendations from Council to come up with a selection.

Ryan McNaughton, Parks Advisory Committee Chair, stated we started the RFP process and had 5 submissions this time. We narrowed it down to 4 and those 4 came in and presented to us. They all did a great job and they all had great playgrounds to present to us and all unique in their own way. Ultimately we narrowed them down to the biggest factor of honoring what was there and the history of what was there. After deliberating we voted 7-1 on recommending Leathers to City Council. The primary factor is they were the company that built the first one. That gives them the experience and they really honor what was there.

Mayor Ryan asked, when do we actually take a vote?

Ray Young, City Manager, replied we are scheduled on January 9th at the Council meeting to make a decision on this issue. If you're able to make a decision on January 9th, staff believes there's plenty of time for a negotiated and executed contract with the winning proposal.

Ryan McNaughton stated you do have some time to go back and listen to our meeting with the presentations and deliberations. That would be a good source to see how we came to that recommendation.

7. PUBLIC HEARING / ORDINANCE (Introduced 11/14/17): An Ordinance adopting Comprehensive Land Use Plan Map and Zoning District Map Amendments on approximately 143 acres of land in the Troutdale Reynolds Industrial Park.

Chris Damgen, Community Development Director, stated this is the second reading of the ordinance in front of you. This is 7 parcels in Troutdale Reynolds Industrial Park. All 7 are owned by the Port of Portland however, the City of Troutdale is the applicant on this. The main reason for this application has to do with the City's participation in the community rating systems for the National Flood Insurance Program. The idea being that if you officially designate parcels with open space zoning and land use designations the ability to achieve a higher score in the Community Rating System (CRS) scoring system may at some point allow us to achieve a score where we can reduce insurance rates for property owners across the City, for those in the flood area and those outside the flood area. That is the main motivation of this application. The Port is in full support of this application. In the first hearing there was a question about access to these areas. The majority of the parcels are going to be set aside for conservation purposes. It should be off limits for the public however they do acknowledge that one of those parcels is the levy itself which has a recreational amenity on it as well as property along the Sandy River which folks do frequent. The Port has put up some signs to generally dissuade a homeless

or transient population from establishing settlements there. Beyond that there have been no other public testimonies or comments that have been received by staff. We continue to recommend approval from you all. The Planning Commission voted unanimously for that too. Before you vote please take into consideration the findings and facts that Planning Commission recommended to you.

Mayor Ryan opened the public hearing at 7:30pm.

Mayor Ryan closed the public hearing at 7:30pm.

MOTION: Councilor Ripma moved to adopt the ordinance adopting the Comprehensive Land Use Plan Map and Zoning District Map amendments on approximately 143 acres of land in the Troutdale Reynolds Industrial Park. Seconded by Councilor Lauer.

VOTE: Mayor Ryan – Yes; Councilor White – Yes; Councilor Allen – Yes; Councilor Hudson – Yes; Councilor Ripma – Yes and Councilor Lauer – Yes.

Motion passed 6-0.

Councilor Morgan participated via phone but there were technical difficulties and he did not vote on this item.

Mayor Ryan called for a break at 7:32pm.

Mayor Ryan called the meeting back to order at 7:39pm.

- 8. RESOLUTION:** A Resolution adjusting the System Development Charges for Water and rescinding Resolution No. 2001.
- 9. RESOLUTION:** A Resolution adjusting the System Development Charges for Sanitary Sewer and rescinding Resolution No. 2002.
- 10. RESOLUTION:** A resolution adjusting the System Development Charges for Transportation and rescinding Resolution No. 2003.
- 11. RESOLUTION:** A resolution adjusting the System Development Charges for Stormwater and rescinding Resolution No. 2004.

Mayor Ryan stated we're going to do agenda items 8, 9, 10 and 11 with a discussion then we'll go back and address each resolution individually.

Steve Gaschler, Public Works Director, stated back on September 26th we brought the methodology report to the Council and presented that. That started the clock for the 60 day waiting period by State Statute that we have to give before we do a hearing. We've had 60 days to consider this and I hope it's given the Council some time to give it their due consideration. We realize there are some substantial increases involved here from what they have been. Also note that it's been a fairly significant time since we've made any adjustments on the SDCs. Several of them are prior to 2005. We've been working for the last 2 years on the rates. Last spring you guys did a comprehensive utility rate increase over 5 years that was fairly significant also. In those rate increases we did not address the capital capacity projects. It's kind of the second leg to the utility rates. To fully

fund the utilities you need the rates to cover the operations and maintenance. You have 2 policy decisions. To date the City has taken the position that we're going to have the rates cover operations and maintenance and we're going to use SDCs to cover growth. Another piece along that line is the reimbursement piece. I'm going to have Travis run you through the projects again. There's really 4 projects that are driving the whole thing on capacity. Those 4 projects are roughly 90% of the money we're talking about.

Travis Hultin, Chief Engineer, stated I'm going to talk to you about 4 projects that are in the water, sewer and improvement fee cost basis. I'm not going to talk too much about any of the transportation or stormwater projects but my assumption is that those rates haven't really changed all that much. On the improvement fee cost basis on the water cost basis there's 2 projects that drive practically all of it. Those 2 projects are, first, Reservoir #5 with line to Zone 1 and the second is Well #9. Reservoir #5 is the project that's been planned by the City for many years. I think it's been in our Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) as long as I've been here. It came out of a previous Water Master Plan. Essentially that's to provide increased storage capacity for the City to meet our buildout demands for water storage. All reservoirs do is store water. It's pumped out of the ground and put into reservoirs and these reservoirs have dual purposes. They store water to equalize demands for emergency purposes and they also provide pressure that drives the system. In the 2012 Water Master Plan it was identified that that buildout would not have enough storage capacity to meet our desired storage capacity which would be based on 3 times our average daily demand. That's been our traditional standard for many years. We wouldn't meet that standard without building this additional reservoir. The other advantage of that reservoir is that we built it where we intend to site it to make it equalize with our Reservoir #2 which is our highest elevation reservoir and our most important reservoir because water from that reservoir can be supplied to anywhere in the City. It has enough height and with that elevation it can provide water all the way down through our lower zones and lower elevations anywhere in the City. Our other 3 reservoirs are lower elevations and they don't have that capability. Reservoir #5 in the current analysis in today's dollars is estimated at \$2 million and that's a big component of that improvement fee cost basis. The other one is Well #9 and this would be needed to meet our targets for capacity. In the water Master Plan one of the things we look at is what our well can deliver. There's a few different calculations that are done there. There's a theoretical capacity, which is if all of our wells that we currently have produced at the best rates they ever produced, this is how much water we could produce. That's kind of a pie in the sky number. It doesn't really mean anything in the real world. Then you have operational capacity. That's what our wells can actually produce right now with the actual capacities that they're pumping at right now. Then we have firm capacity. Firm capacity basically means we take the operational capacity and we subtract our best producing wells. That basically assumes the scenario where one of our wells is out of service and as an engineer we like to be conservative so we assume that our best well is out of service and we need dependency for that well. We base our targets on that firm capacity. There's a number that we need to hit for our maximum demands. The wells need to be able to hit that number and if our best well is out then we deal with the backup that's supplied from another well. That's essentially what the purpose of this Well #9 would be to provide that firm capacity for our buildout. That project's a little over \$2 million so between that and the reservoir project that's for all intents and purposes all the basis of the improvement

fee component of the maximum water SDC rate that was calculated. Now I'll be talking about the sanitary sewer system of Troutdale. We have an entirely separate sanitary sewer and storm services. This is the sanitary sewer collection. With the sewer system improvement fee cost basis you have 2 projects that essentially make up almost all of that basis. The first one is upgrade and replace Pump Station #1 and construct a new force main. Pump Station #1 is an aging pump station. It's projected to be under capacity with the development that will eventually build in the industrial area. We know that that pump station at the least will need to be upgraded for capacity. A lot of its equipment is outdated and will also need to be upgraded. The other component of that is the force main would need to be upgraded. A combined total for that project would be about \$1.3 million. Then finally the lower Beaver Creek/Troutdale Road main upsizing. This is another one that comes out of our Sanitary Sewer Master Plan which was completed 4 years ago. The analysis and modeling that was done for our sewer collection system in that Master Plan identified a number of segments along Troutdale Road essentially between Stark Street and Beaver Creek Lane and a number of segments along Beaver Creek Lane which is a major sewer that collects sanitary sewer from a large area in the south portion of the City. We still have a little bit of room for growth down in that area. Those future projections show that in the buildout condition or in the future those segments will be undersized. That line will need to be upsized. That's a particular concern along that Beaver Creek Lane area because the topography there has a lot of homes close to grade or below grade of the sanitary sewer main so if you get any surcharging you have potential for backups into private properties and homes along that area. We have a very limited tolerance for surcharging. Surcharging basically means backing up of the sewer line. The sewer line gets full and you actually get backups in the manholes. Those upsizes will be needed eventually with the growth in the southern part of town. That project is estimated at about \$1.2 million. Those are the big drivers in terms of the improvement fee costs basis.

Councilor Allen asked, how does this directly relate to capacity growth? It doesn't seem like it's all capacity enhancing.

Travis Hultin replied all 4 projects that I just mentioned are, or at least outdated equipment. I mentioned outdated equipment and we'll be under capacity in terms of pumping capacity. It will not be able to pump fast enough when we reach the buildout condition based on the growth.

Councilor Lauer asked, how far away are we from buildout of the City as far as water capacity?

Travis Hultin replied our Planners can probably answer that question better than I can. We run these plans out about 20 years when we do them and we assume that that buildout would happen within that 20 year period. We are getting close. Population wise I think the last numbers I saw were somewhere in the neighborhood of 1500 population or 1200 population. That really doesn't get us a very good picture of what's happening within the industry.

Ray Young stated just on residential issues, I'm fairly familiar with all the available land in Troutdale for residential. A lot of them are owned by individuals who up until now have

not really decided they wanted to develop. It could happen in 1 year or 10 years in terms of those residential developments. We just don't know. We have to be ready.

Steve Gaschler stated these numbers work whether it happens in 10 years or 30 years.

Councilor White stated to me it seems like we've always been told that we overbuild all of our infrastructure. Metro gave us a population estimated of 30,000 and that's what we're basing everything off of. I think our sewer is at 50% capacity currently. I don't think there's enough buildable land left in Troutdale to impact this like you guys are talking about. I feel like we're hearing this a little too late. We could've had a lot more players involved and the cost wouldn't be so impactful. This is a huge increase and I think it's going to shut development down. I've been through one recession already in Troutdale where we had to do an open for business plan where we actually capped the SDC's for our business in our downtown town at \$5,000.00. I think if you get this rate too high you're only going to attract the big shots like the Applebee's or the Olive Gardens. The small guy that kind of makes Troutdale charming and what it is today won't be able to afford this high of a rate. There are already constraints on the properties that are left. They either have a wetland, a slope district or a creek nearby and that's why they're still available. I also think there's other funding options available like a Local Improvement District (LID). I have a lot more questions.

Councilor Ripma stated Glenn knows I couldn't disagree more. The reason the rate increase looks so big is because we've had them so ridiculously low for so long. The public should realize that if we don't make new development pay for these infrastructure improvements the cost is distributed among the existing citizens of Troutdale. That's what happens. These SDC's were fairly calculated under stringent rules set by the State. We're not allowed to charge for anything but the growth, increase in capacity, and a few other things related to that growth buying into overbuilt infrastructure that was paid for by the regular ratepayer over the years. We need to make this correction. The regular ratepayers will be saddled with these costs if we don't charge the developers. That includes people who own a couple lots and want to develop it. They should have to take in their share. In my opinion these SDC's are fair. The increases look large only because we've left this too long. It's a hard thing to do but we have a chance now to right the balance and correct what I think has been a wrong. If the new development is unable to pay these increases, why should the rest of the citizens of Troutdale have to pick up the cost? This is something that is long overdue and it's not easy but our staff is doing the right thing. We're planning for the future.

Mayor Ryan stated tell me how the ratepayers will pay.

Steve Gaschler stated we did the rate analysis. We took our operation and maintenance costs and our capital costs that were mostly replacement and didn't have anything to do with capacity. That was our big number and we divided by the number of users and that's how we came up with our rate. It did not include any of these capacity issues or SDC's because we already currently had SDC's and we knew that we were going to do the methodology study and come back and address that component with these. If you decide

not to change the rates then in the next rate analysis we will take those projects, plug them in there and that will drive those rates up.

Ed Trompke, City Attorney, stated I'm going to go a different direction in response to what a couple of the Councilors are saying. Residential SDC's only get paid when the building permits are issued. If somebody has a current house they don't pay the fee. If they change into a restaurant then they would pay an SDC for a restaurant. The median sale price for a house last year was \$310,000.00. If you look at the SDC for a median new house price it's about 6%. That doesn't stop somebody from developing a new house. 6% is actually very reasonable and the homebuilders can accommodate that. The percentage for business SDC's is computed slightly different. It's somewhere around the same like 6, 7 or 8%. It's not that high and it can be billed in as fixed costs and variable costs. It's really a very limited charge and it really does shift the burden of cost to new development. New development pays for it and buys into the existing system and pays for the capacity increases. It really is a fair way to do this. One of the things Councilor White mentioned was an LID. LID's can work for funding stuff but they have a bad effect. If you have 5 lots in a row on a street and you form the LID to put in the sewer and water and the transportation, the LID fees get imposed the moment the project is complete. When it's complete everybody pays. Whoever owns those house lots pays whether or not they're developed today or in 10 years. It adds in substantial burden on the existing person who may have owned those lots for 10 years and hopes to retire by dividing it up. If it's an SDC they pay when the permits are issued. It's a much more fair and measured way to impose. It provides a good, well thought out way to pay for infrastructure that's needed. It really works in a fair and balanced way.

Mayor Ryan asked, what happens if we don't do the 2 big projects?

Travis Hultin replied then at some point, based on the projections, we will say we can't allow people to develop because we don't have the capacity to serve you. The alternative would be if you had a developer that was willing to just go ahead and pay for the projects. Either they can't develop a site because we're at capacity or they can pay for the upgraded pump station.

Councilor Allen stated when we're talking about raising the fees I think it takes us out of the market. I think developers will go to other cities.

Travis Hultin stated what really drives that market is the quality of the location and the quality of the infrastructure. That's what really makes the TRIP property attractive.

Councilor Allen stated if you overcharge it won't happen. I'm looking at the costs here and it's concerning to me. This is a really bad time for us to kill development. Can we get costs down to where it is still doable? I don't want to kill development and then run into the next recession.

Travis Hultin replied the statement about killing development is speculative.

Councilor Lauer stated it's kind of like a double edged sword. There's always that chance where rates get raised to a point where it's unattractive to some people and maybe some developers will go to a neighboring city but if we let the system continue to go the way it's going and we don't have the capacity to bring in anyone then all of those developers are going to go somewhere else. Other places will have capacity where we don't.

Councilor Ripma stated we're not overcharging. The increase in the SDC's is done with the agreed methodology and it is fully defensible. If we do anything other than adopt the amount we're allowed to increase we're shifting more and more of the burden on the ratepayers of the City. The ratepayers of the City currently don't pay these SDC's and won't pay them. If we do anything less than the recommended amount the ratepayers will be burdened. We will all end up having to pay if development occurs because it will not be paying its fair share. Whether people build a house here or in West Linn is not determined by the SDC's. There's so many other factors involved in location and where the jobs are and how much the lot and house is. Nobody wants to raise the rates which is why we kept them so low so long. The fact is I wish we would have done it sooner too. But that's no reason not to do it now. This is long overdue. We'll be doing a disservice to Troutdale and the ratepayers if we don't do this.

Councilor Allen stated just for clarification, a portion of this is a reimbursement for our ratepayers.

Ed Trompke stated this is a good SDC study and really well written. It's a capital reimbursement. The statutes don't allow a check to be written to every current ratepayer. However, they get it indirectly. It's a subsidy of the rates that would otherwise be higher because if there's a million dollar project out there and one of the existing reservoirs cost \$1 million and there's 1000 ratepayers then each one of them has to pay \$1000.00 for it. The new people pay into SDC's which reimburse part of that cost and keeps the rates lower for the next reservoir and the next pipe that has to be built.

Councilor Allen asked, what are we going to use the money for?

Ed Trompke replied for something else that needs to be built or replaced.

Mayor Ryan opens the public hearing at 8:37pm.

David Wheaton, Troutdale resident, stated generally I support the idea of SDC's. I suppose from a Council's point of view you have to decide about what you think the methodology should be so when you make the capital improvements who gets the benefit and who pays. I was shocked to hear that we had SDC's before and we arbitrarily decided only to charge half. Because that means the ratepayers are subsidizing the new development. I would discourage that in the future. The CIP's are in my mind important. I generally definitely want to support the reservoirs and water improvement. I don't support development for developments sake. I think development will happen regardless of the pricing.

Carey Sheldon, Troutdale landowner and builder/developer, asked, is the reservoir really needed? Are there other options for some of these items that Council needs to look at? I hear the pump station needs replaced. It sounds like wear and tear from the citizens that's been using it the last how many years. Maybe the Council should explore alternative ideas. Maybe consider putting these items out for public bids so you know what the costs are. Wait for the down time of the economy. I would like the Council to consider all of its different options as well as think about all the contractors that have work in progress. If these fees hit and they've already got budgets they're going to be in the hole before they even start a project. Do it over a period of time. Give an announcement of 6 months.

Terry Emmert, Troutdale resident, stated I recently purchased property and moved into the community. I look at the increase with a little bit of surprise. These SDC's were a big surprise. I had consultants come out and talk to staff and this was never mentioned. That's a big change. We've built a few projects around. With Amazon coming in we saw opportunity for people to locate to this community and be part of the community so it can expand. I did notice your rates on the sewer and the residents pay a reasonable sewer rate in comparison to other places. The cost of subdividing and developing property today is extremely high compared to what it was 7 or 8 years ago. We came out here because we felt this is a great community. Clackamas did LID's in their area and gave people multi-family zoning or industrial zoning and the economy crashed and there was no building going on and all those people lost their property. I thought I heard Councilor White say we're only operating at 50% capacity for the system. If you annex more property then maybe that's the time you raise your SDC's because the people that have lived here and that have paid all these bills all through the years really should have the right to be able to retire and move on instead of holding their property and not being able to develop it for another 10 years. You can't compare the area out here to West Linn. West Linn is out of control. The area where I had my original home I paid all the increases in the sewer and the SDC's were passed onto the builders but they were at a fair rate. The thing is when you come in and you get that price it's like you're going to buy a car and they say it's going to be \$35,000.00 and when you get there a week later and they say it's \$55,000.00 now. It's going to kill sales. I'm sure there are homebuilders that have already signed contracts and made commitments to develop property and if you add that much on, builders don't work with that much of a margin.

Alex Mauck, owner of Goodman Sanitation, stated my family is one of the old time Troutdale families. We moved here in 1948. My company will be 70 years old and family owned for 3 generations. I did the most recent subdivision in the City which was Gateway Estates. It's a 16 lot subdivision with a 1 lot apartment lot. Back in 2007 or 2008 when we were going to make that development lots were \$140,000.00 each. Cost of development back then was \$350,000.00. You move the clock forward 10 years and cost of development is \$800,000.00. So the median is \$310 or \$330 and you add another \$10,000.00 to this and they can't absorb the cost. It's just a matter of doing business. I'm not sure Troutdale is a community that can support \$500,000.00 houses yet. We need to look at that. Are there other things we can look at to cut costs in the City before we start stacking it on the developers? We need to keep Troutdale affordable.

Ryan McNaughton, Troutdale resident, stated my family has also been here a long time. I just had a big development go in right next door and there was a lot of challenges with that. Developers do come in but once they're done they're gone. And any burden is left to the residents. I think that the builders take for granted what they get. You have to have water and the City provides water. The developer can't provide the water or the sewer. You have to do something about it.

Paul Wilcox, Troutdale resident, stated I have a comment on the staff report. On page 3 under pros and cons, the first line says "lowers monthly utility rates to all customers". I think that's probably poorly worded. I think that needs to be re-worded.

James Adkins, Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Portland, stated at this point there's not much that I can say that hasn't already been said. As far as the pump, the portion that's eligible for SDC's is strictly the portion that increases capacity and I'm trying to find in the methodology where that might have been addressed. The other thing I want to point out is that the Council has the option to adopt any number to choose however they choose to approach the methodology. We did deliver a letter earlier asking for a phased in rate. I concur with what other landowners and builders have said about if you have a project it is going to be a large shock. It's not an unreasonable number and it's certainly something that needs to be addressed but just phasing it over a certain amount of time and not all at once can be really beneficial for deals that are already in line and financing has already been secured. I have a proposal for Council if you're looking at other options. They're looking at growth over 20 years for Troutdale in the methodology. One option may be to look at the list of infrastructure improvements in the CIP, don't necessarily remove anything from it but look at what could be built in the next 10 years feasibly. Take that number and then use that as the increase. Not the 20 year overall full list but something that looks at a reasonable timeline of 10 years on that project improvement list and go with that number. That way if you maintain projects on the CIP if a developer has the capacity and they're building a large amount of project they can do that on behalf of the City as part of the SDC's and receive the credit back to what they're doing. That way you're paying as you go for the needed infrastructure increases not looking at it all at once for what may or may not happen in 20 years. I think that might be an equitable compromise and something maybe to consider.

Mayor Ryan closes the public hearing at 9:08pm.

Councilor Morgan asked, Steve Gaschler, do you think this is going to have a detrimental effect on development or new development in the future?

Steve Gaschler replied I think it will have an effect. You can't raise something up in price and say that it's not going to have an effect. It may delay some projects and it may even kill some projects. When you look around the region though the areas with the highest SDC's are the areas that are growing fastest. The areas with the lowest SDC's are the areas growing the least. So what's the relationship between SDC's and growth? To say that SDC's kill growth, I don't think you can make a blanket statement like that.

Councilor Morgan stated my next question is to Councilor Lauer. He's in this industry as it relates to public works day in and day out. Is this in the mainstream as it relates to infrastructure and maintenance costs? These rates or proposed rate changes or the conversation around the SDC's.

Councilor Lauer replied I think SDC's is always a conversation in any city that you're in. It doesn't matter if you're here or over at the city next door. SDC's is always going to be a hot topic just because it has the potential to affect every outcome. I think we can be a city as long as our water flows and our toilets flush. We can't be a city if we don't have drinking water coming out of the tap and if we don't have the sanitary sewer leaving your home. Taking anything less than a 20 year outlook would be doing a great disservice to the citizens in this city. I was very happy when Troutdale said that it's a 20 year outlook because that means that we're planning ahead. We're not leaving the people that are going to be here after we're gone or the people that are left to service the infrastructure when we're gone in the lurch because we put it off for years. I think if we go the route of putting our infrastructure first I think we're doing a great service to this city.

Councilor Allen stated I'm concerned that when we go to extremes that the impact is going to be too negative. What is the right number for the best overall quality of life for the average person in Troutdale? That's what I'm concerned about. I have to be concerned with who is able to buy a home in Troutdale.

Councilor Ripma stated the staff recommended numbers are right. They're defensible, legal and fair in my mind. If we don't make the development that burdens the system pay its way, the rest of the citizens are going to have to pick up the cost. By doing quick math and saying it's spread over a lot of people doesn't make it fair. Subsidizing development by the rest of the ratepayers, subsidizing development for developments sake, isn't a recipe for increased quality of life or even keeping it what it is.

Councilor Allen stated I would agree with that statement.

Councilor Ripma stated we need to charge what is fair. These numbers are fair. While I do value development I have to admit I don't value it more than the citizen ratepayers. I want it fair. If we do anything but charge these calculations it is unfair to our citizens and ratepayers. I understand the developers don't like it. They never like SDC's. Phasing it in or doing it over a period of years is burdening the ratepayers in Troutdale with the difference. These improvements need to be done. Not doing them is not an option.

Mayor Ryan stated there was an article that was in the Oregonian about the top 15 neighborhoods and Troutdale was #2. If you look at that I believe Troutdale is #2 because it was the most affordable out of the 15. No offense to Reynolds High School but if I look at West Linn, Wilsonville and Oregon City, people move there because they want their kids in those schools. Nobody is moving out here because they say they have to have their kid in Reynolds School District. The reason why people are moving out here is because it's still affordable and probably the most affordable part of the Metro area. I'm very sensitive to that price point on adding these to residential. I get it. My house backs right up to Alex Mauck's place and I don't think all those lots are sold yet. I think 2 or 3

years ago I read an article that talked about Troutdale was the #1 place for young families to get started because it's affordable. You can live in a place with a nice home and it's affordable. This is a tough decision because I agree with Councilor Ripma and I believe in infrastructure but I also believe that we have a niche right now at being an affordable community to live in. We need to stay that way. If it gets to be about \$15,000.00 or \$20,000.00 difference I may go to another city. We do need to have the development of the houses, we need the property taxes and we need that for our community. I have trouble saying it's all or nothing. Anytime I've dealt in life the extremes are never right. There's always something in the middle. I think we can be more creative. We went up 78%. It seems like a big grasp. I get it that the projects need to be done. But we also need to honor the people who have land here. I encourage another number. A phase in number. It's not a black and white issue to me. I'm supportive of a phase in number. We don't know what 20 or 30 years will look like anyway. We're also getting ready to take a big leap on the Urban Renewal. It's been far overdue that we've let that property sit down there. I don't think raising SDC's to this amount is going to help that cause.

Councilor Ripma stated as I said in the beginning, I think the reason these numbers are so big is that we didn't do it over all these years. People chose to kick the can down the road and not take the action that's needed. If we invent a number that's less than the amount we are justifying we're kicking the can down the road at the expense of the citizens of Troutdale. Please keep that in mind. As far as the price point it's always going to be too much. I realize you're trying to find something as a compromise but Casey, it's a bad one. It's a mistake in this case. We should have done this years before. We should do it more regularly so it won't come to this.

Councilor White stated they're at record high right now. I think the permit for a single family home is at \$16,500.00 and it's going to go up to \$28,500.00 with this proposal. For 3 years you can go back in our budgets and we were building 3 houses a year. That was it. That was the only development happening. We have a building department that was smaller than our current one and the budget for our building department to build those 3 houses a year was \$330,000.00 a year. I don't think that's a good deal. You talk about costs in a city, you have to look at that one. Another cost on that \$5 million loan over the course of 10 years we're going to pay \$1.64 million in interest alone. Why would we shoot ourselves in the foot at this critical time when there's so little left? The town is really done. It's not going to change.

Councilor Ripma stated Glenn, these things need to be built. If we were only building 3 houses a year we wouldn't need to build these improvements. That isn't the point. The point is when the development that is planned and occurring starts burdening the system we're going to need to build these improvements to have safe water, enough water and enough sewer capacity. By not charging the development as it occurs that triggers the need, we're shortchanging the rest of the citizens.

Councilor White stated the average bill is \$58.00 for water and sewer. If that person is paying 10% too much according to Dave, that would be \$5.00 a month. Compare that to the \$28,500.00 that a new person is going to have to pay to build a house in Troutdale. How long does it take you to pay that back? We're at buildout. We're all in this together.

I have heard nothing but good about our infrastructure. As far as I know Troutdale is the A student. I think we haven't studied this thoroughly enough to come up with that number. I think it's a mistake. I think we're doing great. I think we're doing gangbusters and that's why this kind of came out of left field and caught me off guard. We're looking at 20 years and you have to assume that we're probably going to get some of that 800 acres brought into the city. So aren't we adding the number of buildings that can go on there to help offset this number?

Ray Young stated I've talked to Chris Damgen about this and the problem is, when we go through the process of trying to annex acreage to the south, Metro and the State looks at us and asks if we have the funds to put the infrastructure into this property and do you have the funds to put the money into the infrastructure that you have. When I look at our current percentage of funding of less than 2% on water SDC's and sewer SDC's, Chris is very concerned that if Metro looks at us and we ask them if we can expand to the south they would say how dare you even ask because you don't have any money in your SDC's. We haven't put in the roads, the sewer, more pump stations, more water reserve and if we don't have that infrastructure in, that's the concern Chris had if we don't deal with this issue.

Councilor Hudson stated to get a better sense of a potential counter proposal, there are a couple of different ways to disagree with the proposal. We could increase ratepayers' rates to make up the difference. We could use something out of the General Fund budget so the ratepayer rates don't go up. We just need to find the money somewhere in our budget. Or we do less projects.

Councilor White stated or use LID's. Because like Travis said, Amazon didn't bat an eye at writing a million dollar check.

Ed Trompke stated the other issue with an LID is the entire project has to be within the LID. So that means you have to pick up all of the adjacent properties. And if you're talking about a reservoir it has to be all of the people who use the reservoir.

Councilor White stated when I first moved to Troutdale Tad's needed a sewer line and they built a pressured step system and it goes in front of my house and ends at the end of my property right at Beaver Creek. Everyone had to pay into that line and it was a lot of money at the time. I'm even unable to hook up to that line because it is a pressured line. So it really didn't do me any good at all or other property owners as well. It's a fair way to do it because no one else in the city is ever going to use that line either. Just like this large capacity pipe that we need for the TRIP property. Let those people that use it do it on an LID like I had to do back in 1990.

Councilor Hudson asked, wouldn't that be increasing the cost to developers anyway?

Councilor Ripma replied yes. It's the same people that end up paying it as SDC's. It gets paid for by the same people with far less flexibility and I would say far less fairness.

Councilor Hudson stated maybe it would be helpful to first establish if we think the projects should go forward. If they do, can we do a phase in option?

Mayor Ryan stated I would like more information before we decide on the number and come back with a different approach. We can't come up with something tonight.

Councilor Hudson stated one could move to table the motions.

Mayor Ryan stated we could table the motions or we could vote on it another night.

Councilor White stated at the first meeting I suggested running this by Planning. They're willing to do it.

Mayor Ryan stated I don't want to get caught up and kicking this down the road and sending this to a committee. We have to make a decision and these SDC's have to go up at some point. I need more information.

Ed Trompke stated you have an ordinance that says a motion to table is not debatable, it precludes all amendments. If the motion prevails the matter may be taken from the table only by adding to the agenda of the next regular meeting at which time discussion will continue. So you would have to do it at the next meeting.

Councilor Ripma stated before we go that way, whenever we get to this decision it's going to be just as hard as it is tonight. We did the 60 day notice. Are we under any timeline at this point to adopt?

Ed Trompke replied you could continue it to another meeting, yes, without killing it.

Councilor Ripma stated in the end we're still going to be split.

Mayor Ryan stated I don't know about that. You've been doing this a long time and up until today a lot of this information was brand new to me. I need to understand it better. I need to be able to look people in the eye and say I understood my vote, I understood why I did it and feel good about it. I can't do that tonight. I'm not saying it should go full board. I don't know yet. That's the problem. I don't need 6 months either.

Councilor Ripma asked, when is the next Council meeting?

Ray Young replied January 9th.

Mayor Ryan states that's a little soon. This is going to take a little time.

Ray Young stated January 23rd has a fair amount of time on the schedule. The only caution I will add is a couple things. Number one is you need to give specific directions to staff as to exactly what you want to know. Second of all, if anybody asks, what will the impact be on development? The answer is we will have no idea. There is no magic ball or magic tipping point as to what we will know. That is not an answer we can give you. If

you have other specific information that you want to know please let us know what that is so we can get staff working on it now. That's the best you can do for staff.

Councilor Ripma asked Mayor Ryan, would that satisfy you?

Mayor Ryan replied yes.

Councilor Ripma stated I can sense that we're not going to be unanimous on this no matter what. I would go along with a continuance of this to the 23rd of January.

MOTION: Councilor Hudson moved to postpone the current motions, 8 through 11, to the January 23rd meeting. Seconded by Councilor Ripma.

VOTE: Mayor Ryan – Yes; Councilor White – Yes; Councilor Allen – Yes; Councilor Hudson – Yes; Councilor Ripma – Yes; Councilor Lauer – Yes and Councilor Morgan – Yes.

Motion passed 7-0.

Ray Young stated the reason we set the SDC's for now is because it's allowed time for the builders to plan for the spring construction season. The sooner it gets done the better they can plan.

12. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

Ray Young stated I would ask each of you to send me an email or voice message about what more information you would like from staff on the SDC issue. Next week at 6:00pm is the Work Session. You will get a packet on Thursday to help prep you for the issues we'll have. Second, our next Council meeting is on January 9th. The only other thing that might happen is that in the process of Urban Renewal purchase and the LOI, there may be need for an Executive Session before January 9th if a sale comes in. We will be closed on Monday, December 25th and Monday, January 1st.

13. COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS

Councilor White stated I want to wish everyone a Merry Christmas, Happy Hanukkah and Happy New Year.

Councilor Hudson stated thank you to all our volunteers and Happy Holidays to everyone.

Councilor Ripma stated Happy Holidays, Merry Christmas and Happy New Year.


Councilor Lauer stated I think this is a decision that we all are capable of making. Merry Christmas.

Councilor Morgan stated Merry Christmas, Happy Hanukkah and Happy Holidays.

14. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Councilor Ripma moved to adjourn. Seconded by Councilor Lauer.
Motion passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 9:47pm.



Casey Ryan, Mayor
Dated: 1-25-2018

ATTEST:



Kenda Schlaht, Deputy City Recorder

CITY OF TROUTDALE

City Council – Regular Meeting
7:00PM

Tuesday, December 12, 2017

PLEASE SIGN IN

Name – Please Print	Address	Phone #
David Wheaton	2075 SW Sunrise Cir.	503-310-4106
JAY MARQUESS	1036 SW 17 th WAY	503 465-9761
PAUL WILCOX	TROUTDALE	
MATEO STONG	DANIELA	503-748-9309
Ryan McNaughton	2013 Cherry Park	
Brenda Cuss	Sandy Palisade	
Dahir Karim	Harry Valley	503-380-5959
Anthony Karim	Harry Valley	503-453-7446
Carol Allen	Troutdale	
Charles Foss	1646 SW Spence Troutdale	
Diana White Castillo	1205 E HISTORIC	503 888-1405
James Adams	1555 SW Broadway L.O.	503-428-2618
SPINO SASSALOS	30564 SE HALL	503-793-7271
Alex Mavell	931 NE Holsey	503 3202847
Caley Sheldon	23765 SE Highway 22	503 805 8741
Terry		

Exhibit A

December 12, 2017 Council Meeting Minutes

Law Enforcement Activity Reporting

IGA between MCSO & City of Troutdale

For Contract Law Enforcement Services

July - November 2017

A. Response Time (from dispatched to arriving on scene):

	July	August	September	October	November	5-Month Avg.
Emergency (Priority 1 and 2):	3:56	4:45	4:49	5:25	3:55	4:34
Non-Emergency (Priority 3 to 7):	8:02	7:36	7:42	9:04	8:35	8:12

B. Detective Case Activity:

NEW TROUTDALE CASES ASSIGNED TO DETECTIVES						
	July	August	September	October	November	5-Month Totals
Property Crime	3	0	2	1	2	8
Person Crime	2	2	3	5	10	22
Cases Disposed	1	0	0	0	3	4

C. Traffic Stops made in the City of Troutdale:

Disposition	July	August	September	October	November	5-Month Totals
WARNING ISSUED	164	156	139	121	166	746
CITATION ISSUED (NON-CRIMINAL)	55	54	42	46	46	243
ASSIGNMENT COMPLETED	14	17	9	10	7	57
ARREST (PHYSICAL)	5	4	4	2	3	18
ARREST (CITE-IN-LIEU)	2	6	4	1	4	17
NO CLEARANCE CODE GIVEN (DISPATCH ONLY)	2	0	3	1	2	8
REPORT WRITTEN (NO ARREST)	2	5	0	2	2	11
UNABLE TO LOCATE PERSON OR LOCATION	1	0	1	1	0	3
Totals	245	242	202	184	230	1,103

D. Other Deputy Activity Reporting Summary:

	July	August	September	October	November	5-Month Totals
Calls for Service	1,042	1,087	910	899	835	4,773
Time Spent on Calls (hrs:mins)	431:14	512:36	756:52	468:57	324:39	2,494:18
Avg. Time Spent per Call (mins:secs)	25:44	29:20	51:36	32:38	24:04	32:40
Dispatched Calls for Service	543	494	436	443	381	2,297
Self-Initiated Calls for Service	499	593	474	456	454	2,476
Traffic Stops	245	242	202	184	230	1,103
Subject Stops	72	91	45	51	39	298