



CITY OF TROUTDALE

"Gateway to the Columbia River Gorge"

AGENDA

CITY COUNCIL – REGULAR MEETING

Troutdale City Hall - Council Chambers
219 E. Historic Columbia River Hwy. (Lower Level, Rear Entrance)
Troutdale, OR 97060-2078

Tuesday, March 8, 2016 – 7:00PM

Mayor

Doug Daoust

City Council

David Ripma

Eric Anderson

Larry Morgan

Glenn White

Rich Allen

John Wilson

City Manager

Craig Ward

1. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, ROLL CALL, AGENDA UPDATE.**
2. **CONSENT AGENDA:**
 - 2.1 **RESOLUTION:** A resolution repealing the existing Public Art Acquisition Policy and authorizing the City Manager to Administer Public Art Acquisition
3. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** Public comment is limited to comments on non-agenda items. *Remarks shall be limited to 5 minutes for each speaker unless a different time is allowed by the Mayor. The Mayor and Council should avoid immediate and protracted response to citizen comments.*
4. **PUBLIC HEARING / ORDINANCE (Introduction):** An ordinance to withdraw those properties within the City Limits lying East of the Sandy River from Multnomah County Rural Fire Protection District 14 and declaring an emergency.
Ed Trompke, City Attorney
5. **MOTION TO RECONSIDER:** A resolution submitting to the Electors of the City the question of amending Section 27(A) of the 1994 Troutdale Charter to require Councilor to resign from Council to stand for Election to another office.
Councilor Anderson
6. **RESOLUTIONS:** Resolutions approving City financial statements and receiving Annual Audit Report:
 - 6.1 A resolution approving the City's financial statements and Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 2015.
 - 6.2 A resolution accepting the Report of Independent Certified Public Accountants on the audited financial statements of the City for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 2015, the Auditor's Communication to the Governing Body (SAS No. 114), and the OAR 162.10.000 required communication.
Erich Mueller, Finance Director

Visit us on the Web:

www.troutdaleoregon.gov

City Hall: 219 E. Hist. Columbia River Hwy., Troutdale, Oregon 97060-2078

(503) 665-5175 • Fax (503) 667-6403 • TTD/TEX Telephone Only (503) 666-7470

7. **RESOLUTION:** A resolution approving the use of not less than \$150,000 of the Lease Revenue from Multnomah County to reduce Property Tax Levy for the Police Facility Bonds. Erich Mueller, Finance Director

8. **PRESENTATION:** The Planning Commission's recommendations regarding the Capital Improvement Plan. Tanney Staffenson, Planning Commission Chair

9. **RESOLUTION:** A resolution adopting the Public Works Department Capital Improvement Plan, rescinding Resolutions 1995 and 2225, and rescinding the Parks Capital Improvement Plan adopted by Resolution 1941. Travis Hultin, Chief Engineer

10. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

11. COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS

12. ADJOURN



Doug Daoust, Mayor

Dated: 3/2/16

City Council Regular Meetings will be replayed on Comcast Cable Channel 30 and Frontier Communications Channel 38 on the weekend following the meeting - Saturday at 2:30pm 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 City Hall – Council Chambers
219 E. Historic Columbia River Hwy.
Troutdale, OR 97060

Tuesday, March 8, 2016 – 7:00PM

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

Mayor Daoust called the meeting to order at 7:00pm.

PRESENT: Mayor Daoust, Councilor Ripma, Councilor Anderson, Councilor White, Councilor Allen and Councilor Wilson.

ABSENT: Councilor Morgan (excused)

STAFF: Ed Trompke, City Attorney and Acting City Manager; Erich Mueller, Finance Director; and Sarah Skroch, City Recorder.

GUESTS: See Attached List.

Councilor Wilson states I would like to pull 2.1 off the consent agenda because some people have some questions as to why we would put it on the consent agenda without public comment.

Mayor Daoust asks is there an agenda update tonight?

Ed Trompke, Acting City Manager, states Item #5, a motion to reconsider, is being removed from the agenda. Item #9; the Resolution concerning Public Works Capital Improvement Plan, will be removed from the agenda and set over to March 22, 2016.

Councilor Anderson asks can I be excused after agenda item #7?

Mayor Daoust responds yes you may.

2. CONSENT AGENDA:

2.1 RESOLUTION: A resolution repealing the existing Public Art Acquisition Policy and authorizing the City Manager to Administer Public Art Acquisition.

Ed Trompke states as the City Attorney, when I saw the policies I had some serious concerns about the lawfulness of the content regulation that is throughout every one of the policies. Under Oregon's Constitution as well as the Federal Constitution there have been cases decided within the last year that really say cities cannot have their codes discuss the content of speech or expression. There has also been a case that came down in the Oregon Supreme Court which says that agents of the City may not be

covered by the Oregon Tort Claims Act and the immunities provided by that. There have been several cases. The most recent one was last week and it makes sense to have a thorough procedure of any changes to the policies if they're going to be considered or re-adopted in any way, shape or form. My suggestion is that it's being repealed in its entirety and that if it's going to be adopted it's going to be in a much more slim package than it is now. You can't talk about the content but I don't know how the City judges art or consideration if it's not going to be content based. Under the current said law it would be better not to have anything at all than to have what we have. Under the Community Enhancement Program (CEP) the City will be looking at some projects that may involve some art programs and the CEP system of evaluating projects doesn't follow that arts policy. It's better to repeal it now and then adopt something that is more compliant with both the CEP and new requirements we have.

MOTION: Councilor Anderson moved to adopt a resolution repealing (the existing Public Art Acquisition Policy and authorizing the City Manager to Administer Public Art Acquisition). Seconded by Councilor Wilson. The motion passed unanimously.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT:

Claude Cruz, Troutdale resident, states the Chamber has a Keep America Beautiful Grant, good for about \$10,000 a good portion which is intended to purchase cycling themed art. We have until mid-next month to have basically committed the money. This is probably a custom piece of art. I've been in discussion with various artists to come up with some possibilities. The missing link there is it would be a piece of art in a public park, Depot Park, so we need city approval. That turns up the heat a little bit with what our processes will be to approve placement of art. Another thing, I thought I heard something about a change of direction or decision of some sort on Halsey Corridor. As an interested citizen I would like your guidance as how to stay on top of what is happening in that arena. I know there were some 3 Mayor meeting discussions on it and if there's a major decision made on it I would like to be aware of it.

Councilor Anderson responds that agenda will be up on the 22nd. That was agenda #9 and it has been pulled and will be discussed on the 22nd and we'll review that.

Craig Gardner, Troutdale resident, states I don't see anything on the agenda tonight that deals with the reimbursement of the overpayment of property taxes. Is that going to be addressed at the same time?

Mayor Daoust asks you mean those property owners east of the Sandy River? That will be discussed under that agenda item.

Lee Moriarty, Developer of Gateway Estates Subdivision, states I have come to bring your attention to some problems with your Public Works. We just had a full set of plans completely approved in 2008. We submitted the plans September and October. John Bushard has had the plans for 90 days. He has reviewed the plans 3 times. Each time it's not a fault of the plan it's more requests. Most recently we had a meeting that involved

building a 20 unit apartment on this site. We had a meeting and he had 2 weeks notice from the meeting and Multnomah County came. Then he gave me a list. Here is a handout, please review it (a copy of the handout can be found in the meeting packet). In an hour and a half meeting with John and the rest of the offices, he now says I have to have approval from them. We could've asked Multnomah County then and there. He's had the plans for 90 days. I come to you as a developer of 40 years. I have worked in every city. I have developed 4,000 lots. I have built 1,970 houses. I do this for a living. You guys are screwed up and it's John Bushard. I do not want him to have repercussions. I need this subdivision. The problem is we're going to get down the road and the subdivision is going to get built and if he spends another 90 days to get it approved we are going to have a problem.

Mayor Daoust asks where is your development?

Lee Moriarty responds 257th just north of Cherry Park. The last item on the list was a post office box. Never before have we had to do this. I went to the Post Master and in 30 years as a Post Master he's never had to do it. In order to do a post office box you have addresses. I can't get addresses until it's a subdivision. As it turns out this is a dead end property. They want to be able to drive down the street and use a mailbox. It's not something I should have to have on a preliminary plat. It should not be a requirement to get a building permit in 90 days. This guy is out of control. I respectfully request a 3rd party inspector. I request that Travis takes over from now on for these plans.

Councilor Anderson asks can you give us a ballpark estimate how much this delay has cost you?

Lee Moriarty responds \$300 a day, \$31,000. We submitted plans on the 17th of December. They sat on the desk of the plans examiner for 12 days. We submitted them again. They sat on the desk for 2 days. Then she lied about when she received them. She has not returned any phone calls and I've made 3 attempts and I haven't even given my name. My engineer said John Bushard isn't returning phone calls. I had to go to his office and arrange a time for Bushard to talk to my engineer. You need a manager to run. I can't commend you enough on Chris Damgen. He has been outstanding.

Mayor Daoust states we hear you and we have 2 people taking notes as you're speaking and we will check into this. Thank you.

Councilor Allen states we need to direct our City Manager to look at this from an administrative standpoint and also our Planning Commission to look at it from their standpoint.

Councilor Anderson states this is not the first time that this has happened. This needs to be looked into. It needs to stop.

Jay Ellis, Gresham resident, states I didn't plan on speaking tonight but after hearing the last testimony I have to say that every single point he brought up in his frustration and his

anguish with staff members that he brought up, I am dealing with that same problem. Those same people mentioned in the previous comments have cost me a lot of time and money.

Paul Wilcox, Troutdale resident, states I thought this topic would be on the agenda tonight since the resolution has never been voted upon. I'm talking about replacing Eric Anderson as Councilor. I would like to continue on what Councilor White asked for the other day. The past practices since that night. I researched what you refer to as past practices. David Hartmann was the first choice of 4 of the 6 Council members among 10 candidates for position #1 that was vacated by Councilor Kight when he was elected Mayor in 2008. Councilor Hartmann was appointed in February 2009, resigned in May 2010 and the position was left vacant for the balance of 2010. City business did not grind to a halt during those 7 months. Council Matt Wand was elected to the Oregon House on November 2, 2010. At the November 9, 2010 Council meeting Councilor Wand stated "I will be here until I am sworn in on January 10th to make sure we have 6 people serving our citizens and so we have ample time for a proper process to find a successor." During staff communication on the November 23, 2010 Council meeting, City Manager Ward announced "the ads have been prepared and published in the Gresham Outlook for the Council vacancy that we have in January for position #2. December 10, 2010 is the deadline to turn in applications for that vacancy." Councilor Wand was excused from the December 14, 2010 Council meeting. The Work Session was held by the City Council on January 6, 2011 to interview applicants to be placed to Council position #2. Councilor Wand was not listed on the roster. January, 2011 City Council included newly elected Councilors Allen and Ripma. From among the 3 applicants Eric Anderson was the first choice of 4 of the 6 Council members. Eric Anderson was unanimously appointed to Council position #2 at the Council meeting on January 11, 2011. Oregon Revised Statute 236.325 in part reads the appointing authority required by law to fill a vacancy of public office may begin the process to fill the vacancy and select a successor prior to the effective date of resignation under this section. Section 9 of the City Charter states, the Council may consist of fewer members when there are vacancies in office. So the City Charter saying there is no legal requirement to fill the vacancy and further on in section 28 of the Charter is states, the vacancy in the office of Councilor shall be filled by appointment by a majority of the Council. The appointee's term of office runs from the time of appointment in qualification until expiration of the term of the predecessor who left the office vacant. That raises a question as to how can a sitting Councilor participate in appointing his own replacement while still in office without creating a situation where there are 2 holders of that same office. City Attorney Ed Trompke has suggested Brookings as an example of an expeditious method for appointing Councilor. I didn't see how that was any different than advertised interview and select by Council vote. The Brookings process is not initiated until the seat is vacant. Which means the resigning Councilor is no longer there. The City Charter then requires an appointment within 60 days of the vacancy. I, for one, would consider an appointee selected as a result of a 4-3 vote which included Councilor Anderson to be an illegitimate Councilor. I would feel the same way whichever side Councilor Anderson came down on. The Council is going to be tilted one way or the other as Fairview's has been. That decision should be left up to voters in November not by a few Council members. If nothing else comes out of this I would at least strongly

encourage the Council to establish an actual Charter review subcommittee apprised of Councilors, citizens and staff to address numerous election related issues.

4. PUBLIC HEARING / ORDINANCE (Introduction): An ordinance to withdraw those properties within the City Limits lying East of the Sandy River from Multnomah County Rural Fire Protection District 14 and declaring an emergency.

Ed Trompke states this is a first hearing on an ordinance so no action will be taken by Council tonight. Action is supposed to be taken up at the next meeting on the 22nd. The reason for that was that this has been percolating over the last 6 – 9 months. March 31st is the last date on which the Fire District and the City can turn in their boundaries to the Department of Resident for Taxation for taxes to be assessed. If it's not in by March 31st then the people pay taxes for another year. Staff thought it was important to get it in front of Council as quickly we could. Otherwise we wouldn't be having this hearing tonight before the Fire District has its hearing tomorrow night. The Charter requires that all ordinances have 2 hearings. By way of background, in 1978 the City annexed land east of the Sandy River that is now within the city limits and at that time a decision was made, that I don't have any knowledge of, to leave the Fire District as the major service provider. Since that time the City has entered into an intergovernmental agreement a number of times with the City of Gresham to provide fire service. Not just for the part of the City that is west of the Sandy River but for the entire City. The City of Gresham does have the facilities and equipment to provide fire service on the east side of the Sandy which it's been doing for some number of years. This is a case where the people on the east side of the Sandy River have 2 sets of fire service. They see that as being double taxed. They are paying taxes both to the Fire District 14 and to the City of Troutdale and the City of Troutdale then pays money to the City of Gresham for the fire service east of the Sandy River. One way to resolve the problem would be to simply not have the City of Gresham serve east of the Sandy River but that would require somebody making a judgment call where that address is when a fire is called in and that could endanger lives. This also would stop the double taxation as the residents see it. The taxation isn't insignificant. Some of the people said they pay several hundred dollars a year to District 14 and then money to City of Troutdale. I do want to reiterate that as it's set out in the letter distributed tonight from Fire Chief Greg Mathews of Gresham, Gresham is prepared to offer a full range of fire services and under the existing intergovernmental agreement between District 14 and the City of Gresham mutual aid is offered. This was begun because the residents over there believe that they're paying too much in the way of taxes. My first response to this was 1 ½ years ago to investigate whether the City could reimburse the double taxation. I read the statutes on it and didn't think it was possible to do. It was hard to determine. I went to the Secretary of State's office and the Department of Revenue's office and they both offer help desks to local government. I asked them and it took many months to get an answer back because they had never been asked the question before and didn't know how to answer it. They in turn went to the Department of Justice (DOJ), the Attorney General's office, because they couldn't quite decide whether it was appropriate to give money back to the tax payers. Ultimately the DOJ recommended no, it can't be done and the rebates would be improper. I reported back to the City Council on that sometime back. It wasn't well received. Everybody is frustrated and people believe they are paying too much in the way of taxes. The State has no remedy other than this.

This process came about as a result of some recent legislation that was adopted in 2013 and became effective January 2014. I wasn't aware of it until 2015. This statutory change allows the City unilaterally to move boundary of a fire district so long as the City is providing the fire service either directly or through contract with another agency. In this case the City of Troutdale contracts with Gresham. You are allowed under this statute. This is the first time that the City has had the authority to make a change that we're making on this tax year. We want to get it done by March 31st to stop the double taxation of residents, if it's considered by Council. We want to hear from Fire District 14 but we won't hear anything until tomorrow. I apologize that we had to bring this forward tonight simply because we have to have 2 hearings on it.

Councilor Allen asks on the mutual aid in that area would Fire District 14 be the first mutual aid district called? Or would it be some other entity?

Ed Trompke responds they will be the first. I believe 911 handles those kind of issues and I'm sure Fire District 14 and Gresham Fire will race to be first on scene. I know there is pride in being first on scene. There is no other provider that would be able to offer mutual aid in the reasonable time span. That is all handled by the 911 sector.

Councilor Anderson states a gentlemen brought up earlier the subject of retribution. Would it be safe to assume that because this is being pushed through on such a tight timeline that to deal with that could jeopardize this from happening if we hadn't thrown that wrinkle in? If that is the case can we assure these people that would like to go down this road that that road would be available to go down once we get past this?

Ed Trompke responds I can't guarantee them that there is a statute, there's currently not one that would allow it. It would take a legislative change. You would have to go to the State legislator to get a statute allowing reimbursement for the taxes that have been paid over the years. I can't see any other way to do it. I believe the legislature has the authority. The question would be is there the political will to address a small number of people in a state like mind.

Councilor Anderson asks as a follow up could we make that happen when available to these folks in writing? With contact names and numbers?

Ed Trompke responds yes.

Mayor Daoust states both Fire Chiefs from Fire District 14 and Gresham are in the audience.

Mayor Daoust opens the public hearing 7:41pm.

Rene Schmidling, Troutdale, Oregon, my question is, 14 has a tanker, does Gresham Fire Department? We have no fire hydrants. We are in the trees.

Greg Mathews, Gresham Fire Department Fire Chief, replies Gresham Fire Department does not have a water tanker. That's where the mutual aid comes into play. Clackamas County and Corbett are in mutual aid. Your question Councilor Allen earlier about mutual aid, the system works in terms of next up and next in just like on the river. We partner with Corbett often in response to our citizens. Mutual aid would not change. We rely on each other.

David Flood, Fire District 14 Fire Chief, states I would like to assure everyone that Fire District 14 will always assist Gresham Fire when they request it or when it's automatically first up next up.

Dorcàs Woodin, Troutdale resident, states I have been a resident for 48 years. Do we have an estimate on how many people are in Troutdale east of the river?

Ed Trompke replies the names and addresses of all the properties were pulled from the tax rolls I believe.

Dorcàs Woodin asks when we talk about reimbursement are we talking prior year, 5 years, 10 years? Just to give you an example what I paid for District 14 last year was in excess of \$850. It is a big issue. I appreciate all your time and efforts for working on this.

Craig Gardner, Troutdale resident, states in regards to what Dorcas has said, I talked to Ed personally in the beginning of the year, you guys are looking at this one dimensionally about just changing the fire district. Some of us feel we want to stay in Fire District 14 and be removed from the City. I hate to say it but we've kind of been screwed over. A lot of people who are running for office, I talk to them about this years ago and it was going to get settled that year and it never got taken care of. You guys have been dragging your feet forever. Now you say you're not going to reimburse us? You guys are setting yourself up for a huge lawsuit and punitive damages. You are basically liable of indifference to the citizens and we're getting sick of it.

Tanney Staffenson, Troutdale resident, states thank you Mr. Trompke for your work on this and Mr. Ripma for your work on this and getting this done. Where we talk about how people feel they're being double charged. When you're being charged it kind of is more like a reality than it feels like. When you look on your tax statement there's not really a feeling of that. I think you're actually getting double charged. I have been told over the years that you're getting double covered. It's a very rare occasion that Gresham and Corbett both respond. One of them gets called off. The Chiefs may dispute that but from what you see down there is one gets called off and the other one responds. Although you're paying for both you don't really get the benefit of both. When you talk about lives being at stake I agree with you on that but when a fire engine rolls up in front of my house and I'm out in the street arguing with them about where they're supposed to go. If it's important to note that you come down here with your lights and siren and somebody that lives down there says you need to go up here and take a right, I think that's important. Some of the people down there are hard to find. On occasion they have trouble finding the address. I know there has been the issue of finding a home. There was a meeting in

this room not too long ago that Mr. Lewis stated there wasn't going to be mutual aid. That wouldn't be available and that's a real concern.

Dave Flood states we rely on Gresham Engine 75 to come out on weekdays while our volunteers are at work. We have an interdependent relationship. I can't imagine a situation where we would ever get crossed ways with Gresham Fire. As far as the water tenders go we will bring those down.

Tanney Staffenson states I appreciate the action and I wish it would have happened a long time ago.

Councilor Ripma states I would like to mention I got involved when Tanney brought this up 1 ½ years ago. I looked in detail into how the people east of the Sandy River in Troutdale could pull out of Fire District 14. Until this recent legislation the only way to do it was an unbelievable petitioning process that required all the State and County agencies to buy off on the wording and the map attached to the petition and then the property owners would have to sign a petition to withdraw from Fire District 14. It was possible to do and I started down that road to do that because somebody had to do it. It's been a ridiculous problem. The citizens always have the option of pulling out, it was just an incredible process. The City couldn't initiate it until this recent legislation. I talked to a retired man that was on the boundary commission who is kind of the local regional expert. He got together with Ed Trompke at my urging, and they worked out that we could do this but it was not available to the City to initiate pulling out of Fire District 14 until just now. The citizens could have always done it by petition. We are going forward. The purpose of this ordinance, if we get it done this month the way it's written and have these 2 hearings, is to make sure that next November's tax bill won't have Fire District 14 on it for the people in Troutdale. I won't help address the prior years. It's the one thing the City can do and we're doing it now when we first can. Just understand that. I share your frustration. At least going forward you're not going to be double taxed.

Dorcas Woodin asks if that is the case, the fireman that is here from Corbett just said they're volunteer. We have to respect people who give up their free time to volunteer. What did my tax money go for? Equipment?

David Flood responds our budget from property taxes is about the \$425,000 a year. What that goes for is equipment, a full time district clerk, I'm the first part time paid Fire Chief, training fees, BOEC (911) fees, and station maintenance.

Councilor Allen states I thought it was important to add that we also have to lobby our representatives to make this change.

Councilor Anderson states we have been troubled over this for 5 years. It's unfair. The fact that we can do something about it now, while it doesn't right all of the wrongs, it is a quantifiable step forward and I want to join in and thank Councilor Ripma and thank everybody working together and getting us to this point. This is being rushed through but sometimes rushing things through is a good thing. Councilor White has been all over this

from day one. We all agree it's wrong. This is a beginning of a solution and this is a win. This is not the end.

Councilor White states you are our neighbors and we value you greatly. I'm worried we're going to leave a hole in your district without this funding coming your way.

Dave Flood states it's about 3% of our budget. We'll figure it out. We'll be able to get through this. Clearly it is the right and fair thing to do.

Mayor Daoust closes the public hearing at 8:04pm.

Mayor Daoust states we are holding a special council meeting next Tuesday night, March 15th at 7:00pm just for this so we can take care of it in March. If any of your neighbors have any questions, they can ask next Tuesday.

5. MOTION TO RECONSIDER: ~~A resolution submitting to the Electors of the City the question of amending Section 27(A) of the 1994 Troutdale Charter to require Councilor to resign from the Council to stand for Election to another office.~~

This item was removed from the agenda. See agenda update.

6. RESOLUTIONS:

- 6.1** A resolution approving the City's financial statements and Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 2015.
- 6.2** A resolution accepting the Report of Independent Certified Public Accountants on the audited financial statements of the City for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 2015, the Auditor's Communication to the Governing Body (SAS No. 114), and the OAR 162.10.000 required communication.

Erich Mueller, Finance Director, City of Troutdale, tonight is the annual process in which I bring forward to you the financial statements and the auditor's report. This is a routine process we do every year. There are 2 resolutions and the first one is for the Council to adopt the financial statements as the official financial statements of the City so the audit report is relevant and it is based on the official financial statements of the City. The staff report outlines this.

MOTION: Councilor Anderson moved to adopt the resolution approving the City's financial statements and Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 2015. Seconded by Councilor Wilson.

VOTE: Councilor Allen – Yes; Councilor Wilson – Yes; Councilor Ripma – Yes; Councilor Anderson – Yes; Mayor Daoust – Yes; and Councilor White – Yes.

Motion passed 6 – 0.

Erich Mueller states 6.2 is to address the 2 pages flagged in the financial statements. These are the pages and the documents that essentially belong to the auditors. They are the report from the professionals. Ultimately we don't approve or disapprove those pages because it is their professional opinion. We are going on record as recognizing them and receiving them. The important point on the first flag of that report on the bottom of the first page, we believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our audit opinions which basically recapping all of the steps they took place. On the top of page 2 is where they render their opinion and key the part of it is in their opinion the financial statements referred to above present fairly in all material respects. The financial position of the City as of close of business June 30, 2015 and are in accordance with the accounting principles generally accepted of United States. It is referred to as a clean audit opinion. No concerns and no issues. The other item that is attached in your packet is referred to as the communications to the governing body. This is referred to as management letters that have been involved in standard and terminology in county practice. It goes through and describes the various areas that it looks at on that document. They have no issues. They also indicate that there were no insignificant deficiencies and no control issues.

Mayor Daoust asks related to no significant deficiencies, they say it's a new recommendation which clarifies that the City Council is responsible for monitoring the accountability and oversight of the City's fiscal affairs. They have highlighted that as the best practice in your staff report. The second one they noted was they had a matter of concern that they had for several years of the City's lean staffing level in the Finance Department. Do you have any comments to that?

Erich Mueller responds that has been an issue since I started with the City in February of the year the audit of the prior year hadn't been completed yet. It was something that was a challenge because of the change in the Finance Director. It was an issue with that report from 2008 and has been an issue from every report since I have been here. Part of this is them going on record that they would like to see more staff. You could have more separation of duties, have more cross training, there's a lighter distribution of control. The issue there is that they're willing to go on record so that if in the future there is a problem they can point out that they recommended there be more staff. However, all the rest of their report doesn't indicate that there is any problem that needs to be corrected.

MOTION: Councilor Anderson moved to adopt the resolution accepting the Report of Independent Certified Public Accountants on the audited financial statements of the City for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 2015, the Auditor's Communication to the Governing Body (SAS No. 114), and the OAR 162.10.000 required communication. Seconded by Councilor Wilson.

VOTE: Councilor Allen – Yes; Councilor Wilson – Yes; Councilor Ripma – Yes; Councilor Anderson – Yes; Mayor Daoust – Yes; and Councilor White – Yes.

Motion passed 6 – 0.

7. RESOLUTION: A resolution approving the use of not less than \$175,000 of the Lease Revenue from Multnomah County to reduce Property Tax Levy for the Police Facility Bonds.

Erich Mueller states this is an item that was brought to the Council last June and the Council discussed somewhat at that point. At that stage they chose to table it at that time and requested it be brought back to have a further discussion. In this current fiscal year that we're in this was what was accomplished through the budget process. The levy on the Troutdale tax payers was \$150,000 less than it would have been because it was reduced by that amount. So the tax payers paid that much less this year for the debt service on the police facility. This is a policy statement and if the Council wants to make it they are welcome to do so. Ultimately the allocation of resources still falls to the Budget Committee and the Council can influence how the Budget Committee takes action.

Councilor Wilson states currently we are receiving approximately \$216,000 from Multnomah County Sheriff's Office for lease payments on the building. The citizens of Troutdale expected and expect us to use the moneys towards buying down our bond money. So they're getting a smaller refund for the lease of that building instead of just absorbing it. So at \$150,000 I still felt that was low. I met with Erich and we had a conversation about everything and from there I changed my mind on the \$216,000. I did look at the utilities and phone and copier lease we had in place before the sheriff's department moved in and the lease administration and all 3 of these items we were already paying for before the sheriff's department took over. That came to about \$172,000 and I rounded it up to \$175,000 and trying to find a way to help counter balance those 3 items. We are currently in our last year of the video camera lease, which we're paying \$24,700 for. I think this will more than offset the extra \$25,000. What I would like to see is \$175,000 go towards the bond debt instead of \$150,000.

Mayor Daoust asks you want to change the resolution and change the dollar amount?

Councilor Wilson responds change it to \$175,000.

Councilor Ripma asks how would this be implemented? Would the County go through and adjust everyone's payment?

Erich Mueller responds the mechanics are that each year, effectively our debt service changes each year because of the way the bonds are structured and the interest costs and principal being retired each year. Every year as part of the budget process one of those 3 motions that I have at the very end of the budget meeting is adopting what the levy is going to be for the general obligation bonds. In the past years, prior to this years, we had it set based on what the debt service cost was going to be. This year it was the debt service cost minus \$150,000 and that was what we approved. The County only assesses for the debt service based on what the jurisdiction submits. So we have to tell them how much to collect for debt service any particular year.

Councilor Ripma asks the current year we did \$150,000?

Erich Mueller responds yes. That was part of the adopted budget that we went through. That was part of why the Council when they considered this last June didn't take any action because it wasn't going to affect anything immediately.

Councilor Wilson states I would respectfully disagree with that because at that time some of the Councilors felt that they wanted to have the money free instead of having an earmark to buy down on the debt so that they could re-establish the police department. As our debt goes forward, our payments actually increase. Is that correct?

Erich Mueller responds the way municipal bonds are generally structured is that they generally tend to rise over time. The expectation is that a municipality's assessed value is going to go up over time so that it has a better capacity to pay debt without it being an increased burden per say.

Councilor Wilson states it's reversed as to how our house payments are. The more we can buy down our bond debt the lower our interest rates are and the more we're saving over a longer period of time.

Erich Mueller responds no it will only say how much is assessed to the taxpayer. The interest cost won't vary. It's not built like a mortgage. The bonds are fixed instruments. Assuming the Budget Committee would follow the policy statement that the Council would make if they have this. Ultimately it doesn't affect what we get adopted in the budget. The resolution doesn't change the budget but it is certainly a policy statement and again the Council makes up half the Budget Committee so they have a significant influence on what the Budget Committee chooses to do.

Mayor Daoust states this directly effects people's property tax bills.

Councilor Ripma states this tends to deal with Councilor Wilson's interjection in my question. You mentioned buying down the bond debt. This really is instead of the property tax payers paying off the bond we are allocating some of our general fund to pay it down. So we're not buying down the bond debt.

Councilor White states I was the Councilor wanting to save this money because I felt the voters approved the amount when they passed the bond. It didn't actually come from me initially. It came from a process that was brought up and discussed as a security measure if this thing didn't work out. I have a question about the lease. I know the contract is 10 one year contracts. Is that true for the lease of this building as well?

Erich Mueller states it is a 10 year lease. It isn't 10 one year contracts.

Councilor White asks so the first time we can make the adjustment is going to be 9 years from now?

Erich Mueller responds the 2 parties could enter into discussions and agree to modify the lease at any time. The lease as it is currently adopted runs for 10 years unless it's modified by the parties. There is a CPI adjustment to the rental rate. But that's documented as part of the existing lease agreement.

Councilor White asks do you know what the final payoff amount is if it goes full term? I know the station was roughly \$7.5 million.

Erich Mueller states the original debt when it was issued, which is what we have to pay off regardless of where we get the funds from, the total obligation is \$11,625,790. That is what we would pay in total over the entire term. Where that \$11 million comes from can be a variety of sources.

Councilor Allen states I don't expect this change that we're doing here tonight to have much real effect to my tax statement. However I do feel that the chances are that Multnomah County Sheriff's Office contract will become more expensive in the future or there will be the need to cut service in the future is highly likely. Therefore I was in favor of taking some of the money and putting it towards recovery of our officers should the contract become unfavorable in the future. I'm also concerned that during the bond I was hoping to have a Community Police Facility and what I have now is basically a Multnomah County Sheriff's Office with some space in it that we can use. I know I would not have approved the bond having known what was going to happen and this seems to be a token effort to me to try to mitigate a portion of that. I'm not sure how I'm going to vote in the next few minutes.

Councilor Wilson states through the whole process we talked about the lease moneys going back to help pay the bond back. I am here to say to the citizens I am trying to get you the most that I can towards that bond debt. That is what our citizens wanted and I think that's what we should give them by resolution and make it \$175,000.

Councilor Allen states that's what I'm wondering right now on my vote. Do I take what I can get even though I'm not satisfied that it's actually enough?

Councilor Wilson states we can change it next year.

Councilor Allen states I think it's very good work that you did. What are we going to do if this contract becomes unfavorable in the future?

Councilor Wilson states if you remember at our budget meeting we can't set money aside. We can choose not to spend money but we can't put it in a holding tank for that to happen.

Erich Mueller states the local budget law has limitations on the ways they hold state money.

Councilor White states if we did have a reserve fund I think it would be more of a target saying we can afford something we can't afford.

MOTION: Councilor Anderson moved to adopt the resolution approving the use of not less than \$175,000.00 of the Lease Revenue from Multnomah County to reduce the Property Tax Levy for the Police Facility Bonds. Seconded by Councilor Wilson.

VOTE: Councilor Allen – Yes; Councilor Wilson – Yes; Councilor Ripma – Yes; Councilor Anderson – Yes; Mayor Daoust – Yes; and Councilor White – Yes.

Motion Passed 6 – 0.

Mayor Daoust calls for a 10 minute break at 8:41pm and reconvenes the meeting at 8:53pm.

8. PRESENTATION: The Planning Commission's recommendations regarding the Capital Improvement Plan.

Tanney Staffenson, Planning Commission Chair, states at the City Council meeting on November 17th the Capital Improvement Project (CIP) list was referred to both Planning Commission and the Budget Committee. At the time the CIP list was described to Council as essentially done. The same document that was presented to Council is a document that was reviewed for purposes of consistency. The Budget Committee was unable to schedule a meeting to review the CIP and forwarded their review to the Planning Commission which resulted in the Planning Commission conducting a more comprehensive review of the CIP. The Planning Commission held a meeting on December 16, 2015 and a second special meeting on January 6, 2016 to complete our review. The Planning and Public Works staff were present and participated in the review process. The plans reviewed included transportation, sewer, storm water, water, and parks. On observations, I did look at the staff report and the CIP list that is item #9 in your packet. The staff report references the CIP list was reviewed by the Budget Committee and I don't believe they were given a copy of the CIP list at any time. In a previous meeting it was stated that the seismic study and 2 storm water projects were pulled from the 2015-2016 fiscal year budget and that was not the case. When we reviewed the plans some of the plans used today's dollars and some forecast construction year dollars. This was inconsistent and confusing thus we highly recommend the methodology be changed so all plans use current year dollars and be updated annually to reflect changes. There appeared to be a large variance between dollars forecast in the 2014 CIP that was adopted with the Public Facility Plan in May 2014. It appeared that a number of these cost estimates have been updated by staff post our review. That resulted in an overall cost change of a reduction of about \$2.3 million compared to the present plan. Although this has been partially addressed our recommendation would be to review these estimates annually. There are cost factors for all items in the plan although they are collected at different levels the developer is charged in many cases if a project is moved forward and not fully funded. The difference is often made up by the rate payers. One thing I want to say about these is I heard this be called a "wish list" and we need to leave things on there and something I found interesting was in the transportation plan alone,

we updated that plan in 2014. Thirteen of the twenty projects that are on this year's CIP list were not on last year's CIP list, just in transportation.

Taney Staffenson provides the Council with a handout titled Troutdale Planning Commission, Capital Improvement Review and Recommendations. A copy of the handout can be found in the meeting packet.

Taney Staffenson states the blue items on your handout are items that were not on last year's CIP list. The first column is the Planning Commission's recommendation for that item and the next column is the dollar the staff came up with after our meeting on January 6th. The third column is the proposed amount that was in the CIP that was given to the Planning Commission. The next column is a description of the fund where the money is coming from and then the term such as immediate, short or long. As far as transportation goes, we are recommending 2 things. ADA upgrades were listed at \$7,500 a year and \$25,000 for ADA per year. We elected to put a 10 year horizon on those. We are proposing to remove item #3 which is the Town Center Parking Study and add a Town Center Study which would not be just parking but would look at the overall Town Center since that plan is quite updated. We are recommending something more comprehensive than a parking study. We feel a parking study is not going to address all of the problems with downtown. We are upping the staff's recommendation by another \$50,000 and increased the area as well.

Mayor Daoust states all of these projects in the CIP have what the problem is, what the proposed solution is and we need to know exactly what is going to be done.

Taney Staffenson responds we can get that information for you. Item #6 primary access we took off. Which there has been some legislation passed since that time. That was the primary access to the URA.

Councilor Wilson asks how do you come up with the number that they adjusted for inflation?

Taney Staffenson responds staff adjusted their number for \$2.6 million to \$3.197 million after January 6th. We recommended the item be pulled. Our reason for that was the public purchasing land to provide private access to a private development. We felt there was an unknown cost factor there.

Councilor Wilson states to pull it and make it zero doesn't make any sense.

Mayor Daoust states it doesn't to me either. Maybe the reason you did it was because TIF (Tax Increment Financing) money would be used.

Taney Staffenson responds right. We were also asked about the Halsey Corridor Plan and that was an item that we did not pull. That was an item that staff had taken off of their list. The next one that we did pull was #16 the pedestrian bridge. The reason that was

pulled is when you look at the Urban Renewal plan item #1 is funding access which is addressed in #6. We looked at the Urban Renewal plan and were trying to prioritize.

Councilor Wilson states for the Halsey Corridor Project we have sufficient information to keep it in at this time. The Director indicated that the scope and the City's participation in that project is still being determined and therefore wasn't quite ready to go onto the CIP. The expectation is that after this scoping and cost sharing it will be in the next CIP update.

Councilor White states I'm concerned when I see Councilors using cellular devices. Are we going to start allowing that?

Ed Trompke states I think what the Councilor is referring to is that by accessing emails or text messages the specific message is made part of the public record. In this case I think this email was on the City Council distribution list because I got it. It is already part of the public record. The question can come up whether that makes other emails part of the public record if they're sent to an email address. What the courts are doing with the public record laws right now are unpredictable.

Taney Staffenson states we did also pull item #16 which is the pedestrian bridge and that item increased after January 6th by \$574,000. We've already invested a substantial amount in Drover's Trail. With it being #9 on the priority list for the URA we were having trouble justifying 2 pedestrian access points to the Urban Renewal site. The other thing that caused us to take this action was the 3 projects identified for URA for \$10.2 million and we have \$6.2 million in funds available.

Councilor Wilson states you and I had conversations and we both came up with \$7.7 million based on the \$1.5 million when we sold the property. There is other funding that we don't have that we don't know about that we may be able to get. Which would be grant funding, matching dollars from Metro. Maybe Metro wants to build the path to the 40 Mile Loop. There are a lot of questions that aren't answered yet so to start pulling things out of the Urban Renewal Plan before we know where we're at is premature.

Mayor Daoust states good point and we'll discuss it 2 weeks from now when we have everybody here. This is just Taney's presentation here.

Taney Staffenson states we're recommending pulling it from the transportation plan. The next plan is the water plan. We're recommending moving the Seismic Study from short term to immediate #1 and we're also recommending moving #9, the Seismic Upgrades, to short term from long term. Moving on to Sewer, item #4, 8 of the 13 items were not on the last CIP list. Many of these are new projects. Item #4 on-site water recycling for the Waste Treatment Plan the staff did not have a dollar figure for that. We recommended a cap of \$100,000 and staff countered with \$150,000. There was no number given to us and when we met with staff, staff didn't know how much it was going to cost to put this system in. They estimated that it would be about \$100,000 so we said not to exceed \$100,000 because we didn't know if it was going to be \$100,000 or \$500,000. We recommend the Water Pollution Control Facility Upgrade to \$750,000 be pulled.

Councilor Wilson states to pull something completely out doesn't make sense.

Taney Staffenson responds respectfully, Councilor Wilson, if there was something where by 2020 you had to have x, y and z done it would've made more sense to us rather than saying we might need something.

Mayor Daoust states it raises questions with these longer term projects that are going to occur 10 or 12 years from now. Somehow staff has determined over the long term maybe 12 years from now that they're going to have to do that and I think what Councilor Wilson is saying why not start collecting SDCs for it now rather than 10 years from now. What do you do with longer term projects that are going to occur way out there? Do you leave them in or take them out?

Taney Staffenson responds there is a lot of long term projects and most of them are quantifiable due to development or a pipe is going to have to be increased by X size. That is quantifiable. You know that you're going to have to do it and it's going to take this much to do it. This was more we might have to do this. Storm, we did not make any changes to that. You'll see that there is 4 new projects on that list. We move on to Parks. With the number of these plans we have issues with the population numbers. Several of them are working off a forecast in excess of 20,000. Parks in particular assumes a population of 21,400. In the CIP it makes multiple references to the level of service for Parks. The ratio is calculated on a population of 21,400 the metro population 17,035. In the CIP it cites the level of service from Parks as the driver for parks land acquisition. Based on these numbers we would acquire a somewhat substantial amount of land going forward. This deficit is pretty substantial. We basically have a 28 acre deficit for community parks, 16 acre deficit for neighborhood parks and then we have many parks with overage. If you take the same ratio that you've been using, so for neighborhood parks, 1.8 acres per 1,000 of population you would end up with a shortage of 8.86, community parks at 3.3 acres per 1,000 and end up with a shortage of 14.1. What that is doing is taking the same ratio that you're using and adjusting it for the current population number.

Councilor Wilson states I emailed Travis Hultin today and his recommendation even with this project is that we send that Park to be readjusted to 17,000 and come up with a new CIP list. My question to him was why do anything with it now until we make that adjustment. His response was not approve that part of it and focus on the others. So they are looking at making an adjustment down to 17,000 and some change with the population. These numbers will get adjusted based on that downgrade from 21,000 to 17,000.

Taney Staffenson states if we revise the Parks Master Plan that's usually close to a 2 year process. From the time that we start revision until we get the CIP list.

Councilor Ripma states in the meantime it's not doing any harm leaving it the way it is because the SDC rate was set by Council. It wasn't set based on these numbers.

Councilor Wilson states that's why we lower the SDC rate but we didn't make any adjustments to the Master Plan because most of it wasn't going to happen anyway in the near future.

Taney Staffenson states I would say that the sooner you can use realistic numbers the better. If I was a developer and I was paying several thousand dollars per unit per Parks SDC I might disagree.

Councilor Wilson states we lowered it to \$2,500 from where it was around \$7,800. The relationship between what we have on our CIP list and the amount of money is this far apart. The reason that we lowered this was because we weren't using because we don't have the need of growth. We reduced SDCs because lack of growth.

Councilor Allen states the points being brought up here are good points but I can't predict what a future council will do. I would suggest coming up with plans that are based on likely numbers because we have a tendency to drive to these plans. I'd rather have plans that reflect reality.

Taney Staffenson states I know you're not collecting money for them this year but I think I showed that we're capable of adding a substantial amount of projects from one year to the next. But we're very reluctant to reduce any projects.

Councilor Wilson states it came from Travis at his recommendation that we redo the whole Parks Master Plan. The City is aware of it. He knows what he needs to adjust it to and then all we have to do is approve the methodology of how we're going to fund what projects we want.

Taney Staffenson states I respect that. We were reviewing the document that we were given which had these in it. If staff has since determined that they're going to do something different is a different conversation.

Mayor Daoust states I understand your rationale for red lining some of these. You're just taking out community parks and neighborhood parks because the level of the service numbers aren't right according to the population. I understand that and you did a good job with that. On the other hand I'm hearing the level of service standard could change when we redo the Parks Master Plan. Not only the population could change but when we redo the Master Plan there may be other things that change that add back in more community park, more neighborhood parks, we just don't know that right now. I think what Councilor Ripma and Councilor Wilson are saying do we take them out now or leave them the way it is. I understand what you did here but I'm not going to draw any conclusions tonight. We'll talk about it more in 2 weeks.

Taney Staffenson states I understand that. I want to be clear that the resolution issue know that was going to be before tonight did not take into account any of our recommendations. So based on those population numbers the park acreage and improvements we would be spending \$18 million dollars and that ended up being \$17,800

for every new resident that comes in between now and 2035. Again we used the same ratio, put in the other population numbers and came up with this. Where that brings us to is we would recommend that we take the URA projects and create a Urban Renewal Agency CIP list.

Mayor Daoust asks with all the staff recommendations?

Taney Staffenson states take them out of the individual plans and then have a separate list for the URA.

Mayor Daoust states I'm going to have to think about that. I'm not sure how that revolves around SDCs or other types of funding that we may get or that we want to put into. If you take it out of that special fund, that's where the SDCs are distributed. I'm not saying we're going to use SDCs for the main Urban Renewal road but we may need it in a transportation plot of money in order to possibly qualify for a transportation grant. It wouldn't necessarily qualify for a federal or state transportation grant if it was not going to be matched or in our SDC fund where we could contribute matching dollars somehow. That is my reservation with what you've done here.

Taney Staffenson states my understanding was that it wouldn't effect matching dollars. It would still be a transportation project but it would be on the Urban Renewal list.

Mayor Daoust states another reason for putting it off 2 weeks was that I think Councilor Morgan and Craig are going to come back from Washington D.C. with some brand new information on grant funding for Urban Renewal Areas. It may add to the discussion 2 weeks from now. Why do you want to put it in a separate category?

Taney Staffenson responds because we have a funding source for that already. We can take grant funding. We can take other funding sources in through that. We can expense through that. The URA could take charge of that.

Ed Trompke states legally the CIP are adopted by Cities. I'm not aware of any statute that allows an URA to take over the duties of the City in adopting a CIP. The Cities are required to have CIPs not URAs. I think the state budget law and planning laws require the City to do it not the Urban Renewal Agency.

Councilor Allen states Mayor you're saying it needs to be on the CIP list in order to qualify for any kind of grant funding and you're concerned that this possibly if it's in the regular CIP list and there is not grant money for it then it's getting money from regular SDCs from all over the City.

Mayor Daoust states just recalling the CIP list from before we put everything in for example the transportation CIP list, and we just designate whether it qualifies for SDCs or not. That does not mean that every project will generate SDCs or get funded by SDCs but it is still in there. And it may be just TIF that pays for that main access road. But it's still in the transportation plan.

Taney Staffenson states we know that through the budget process if they get on the list they can come forward.

Mayor Daoust states if it doesn't qualify for SDC funding then it won't be part of the SDC increment.

Councilor Allen asks how are we going to control whether SDC money is used or not? I think doing grant funding is a valid argument but how do we prevent SDCs from the general City being used to fund it?

Mayor Daoust states as far as I know that would fall under the rules of SDCs, what type of project and what part of that project would qualify for SDCs. We don't make that up. It's part of the rules that Travis and Steve Gaschler follow for every project.

Councilor White states another concern I have is it becomes a driver to increase the SDCs by having a high CIP. It may or may not get done.

Councilor Allen states I've noticed the CIP generally is reflected in the proposed rates that we get before us then it's hard to minus out things.

Taney Staffenson states one of the reasons that we're doing this now is this effects the budget.

Councilor White states it also effects staffing levels. It's important to get these right and it's easier to add to it down the road than it is to take it away.

Councilor Allen states as long as it's there at the end of year that you plan on actually pulling the trigger.

Taney Staffenson states if you're looking at these annually that would be very prudent on our part to review them, make cost adjustments and make recommendations to the plan. On each of these plans we voted on them independently and all of them except one were 6-0 and one of them was 5-1.

Councilor White states I had the privilege of attending that meeting and I thought you guys did a really good job and you had sound reasoning behind your decisions. You were told to do this on the fly and rush through it. I'm disappointed that you guys could've taken 2 months to do this project because it has just now made the agenda and its being postponed. I wanted to apologize on behalf of this Council for asking you guys to rush something and it didn't materialize.

Mayor Daoust states I think the timing is perfect with the way it's working out. Taney originally asked me to come before the Council 2 weeks before the CIP list was even discussed. So this fits with what you wanted to do. There were numerous reasons why it's being delayed 2 weeks. And Taney didn't have to get delayed.

Councilor Allen states I believe that Rip Caswell has some prudent information to this subject.

Rip Caswell, Caswell Galleries, states on page #4, the water improvement, #4 the URA and Harlow Place Loop, originally had source funding as water improvement fund and most of all these are water improvement fund but this one was changed to developer 90% and the URA 10%. This is part of the property that I'll be trying to build my foundry on. There is only 3 tax lots there and the \$155,000 would be a tremendous burden on those 3 tax lots there. The City will probably own the other side. The whole thing would fall on those 3 developers. I'm wondering why it was changed from the water improvement plan over to the developer. Is that anything that can be remedied?

Mayor Daoust states I don't quite understand the question, Rip. Because it's still on the plan. Can we get that clarified in the next 2 weeks? What do we need to do to clarify that?

Councilor Wilson states I would recommend that you get your question answered by Travis Hultin or Steve Gaschler. I think if you ask them the question directly it would be better than me trying to interpret it to you. I understand your concern.

Councilor Allen asks Mayor, would you be willing to work with Rip and staff on this one?

Mayor Daoust states most definitely.

Taney Staffenson states just a point of clarification, that item #4, in the plan that we looked at and the plan that you saw it was listed water improvement plan developer and URA. What came in after that was the percentages. I apologize. Staff has changed that.

Claude Cruz, Troutdale resident, stated on the transportation item on the Gorge Hub can you clarify where that \$85,000 came from? Is that a staff estimate.

Taney Staffenson responds that is a staff estimate.

Claude Cruz states I didn't see any mention of improvements to the Depot Museum. Council's prior discussion had said whether that ends up being a home to the Chamber or not that upgrades to the property would be done for a viable tenant to be in there. If I remember right it was \$150,000 estimate to do upgrades.

Mayor Daoust states it was. That falls more into facility rather than one of these special funds.

Taney Staffenson asks what will our role be in 2 weeks?

Mayor Daoust states since you did the presentation tonight you won't have to redo it. It's not going to be on the agenda again. But you should be there to talk to us.

Councilor Ripma states if we could have in 2 weeks, both the resolution with staff recommended details and another one, option B with the Planning Commission recommended numbers. I was thinking that the resolutions would be adjusted to include the Planning Commission's recommendations. If it isn't too much trouble. An option A and option B.

Councilor White states since you're also our Budget Committee chair would it be a preference to run this through budget as well?

Tanney Staffenson states it was determined in January that we couldn't run this through budget prior to April. So Planning took a broader scope when they looked at it to try to cover the budget aspect as well.

Mayor Daoust states the question is whether it's easy to work from one resolution or easier to work from two resolutions. I'm not really clear that working from 2 bases is easier. I think what we're going to end up doing is going through each one and agreeing or not with staff which is what the resolution talks about right now. If we disagree with staff and go with what the Planning Commission is recommending we can still do that with one resolution.

Councilor Allen states I'm thinking we asked for the Planning Commission's recommendation it should be considered as an option. We're going to hear from what staff wants.

Councilor Ripma states I think that if we liked the Planning recommendation that would eliminate having to go through them one by one.

Councilor Wilson states I think there's good points and poor points to both sides. I would rather go through, if we have to go through each item. There are certain things in here that I don't agree with and there are some things I do agree with. I'd rather not be choice A or B because neither one of them are 100% what they need to be.

Councilor Allen asks are you asking for no resolution at all?

Councilor Wilson responds no. I am asking to go through line by line.

Mayor Daoust states another point is it's not the Planning Commission that would come up with the other resolution. It would be staff. Staff would have to redo or add to their report with a second resolution that staff put together. It falls back on staff to develop a second resolution.

Councilor Ripma states the numbers are all there.

Councilor Wilson states I honestly think we would come to a better agreeance with each other if we go through them line by line.

Mayor Daoust states let me elaborate on my point. If staff has one page on each project that is staffed with the other, granted things have changed since council has looked at it, they have one page on each project. Now with the new changes that the Planning Commission has put forth here we don't necessarily have that for each one. Staff is going to have to put that together. If Planning Commission has a change in dollar amount or if they have any kind of change like that. Staff would have to write a page for each item.

Councilor Ripma states most of the changes are zeros. If we don't have it in a resolution form we'll have to try to draft something 2 weeks from now?

Ed Trompke states what the Mayor was saying is that the resolution adopts the document. If the document changes then staff has to go back and revise it and bring it back for the final vote. If you make any changes to it you're not going to adopt it at the next meeting. It's going to be at a following meeting. Because the procedure of Council has always been that you adopt the final document not a hand written version.

Councilor Ripma states I withdraw my suggestion.

Councilor Wilson states on the Parks, I don't agree with either of the numbers at this time because the City's is too far apart and I would rather it get closer together until I make a decision. Pull Parks CIP for now.

Councilor White states I was trying to avoid having to re-write at a public meeting and I think with the work Planning did we should have a work session and get it all a little closer and tighter and then go forward.

Mayor Daoust states I think you guys did great work. And I think we can provide direction to staff in 2 weeks what we want to do. We will decide in 2 weeks.

9. RESOLUTION: A resolution adopting the Public Works Department Capital Improvement Plan, rescinding Resolutions 1995 and 2225, and rescinding the Parks Capital Improvement Plan adopted by Resolution 1941.

This item was removed from the agenda and set over to March 22, 2016. See agenda update.

10. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

11. COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS:

Mayor Daoust states on the 27th we had the great Trout Sculpture dedication. There was quite a crowd there. The State of the City Address went really well and it will be replayed on Metro East Media and it is on the City's website for those that missed it. We have Council interviews next Monday night, March 14th. We had 9 candidates applying for Councilor Anderson's vacant position. They will start at 6:00pm next Monday night the 14th. Next Tuesday is our special meeting on Fire District 14.

Councilor White states I want to put in the plug for the TV series Grimm. They filmed an episode in Troutdale featuring Glenn Otto Park and that airs August 8th at 9:00pm.

12. ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION: Councilor White moved to adjourn. Seconded by Councilor Ripma. The motion passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned 10:03pm.



Doug Daoist, Mayor

Dated: 6/15/16

ATTEST:



Kenda Schlaht, Deputy City Recorder

