



# 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 22, 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 **MINUTES:** November 10, 2015 Regular Meeting.
  - 2.2 **RESOLUTION:** A resolution declaring a vacancy on the City Council and selecting a new Councilor to fill the vacancy.
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. **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*
5. **RESOLUTION:** A resolution declaring the need to acquire right of way easement on property for the purpose of constructing street improvements for NW 257<sup>th</sup> Way.  
*Ed Trompke, City Attorney*
6. **STAFF COMMUNICATIONS**
7. **COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS**
8. **ADJOURNMENT**

Doug Daoust, Mayor

Dated: 3/18/16

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](http://www.troutdaleoregon.gov) or call Debbie Stickney, City Recorder at 503-674-7237.

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: Debbie Stickney, City Recorder 503-674-7237.

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



**MINUTES**  
**Troutdale City Council – Regular Meeting**  
**Troutdale City Hall – Council Chambers**  
**219 E. Historic Columbia River Hwy.**  
**Troutdale, OR 97060**

**Tuesday, March 22, 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 Morgan (by phone), Councilor White, Councilor Allen and Councilor Wilson.

**ABSENT:** None

**STAFF:** Craig Ward, City Manager; Ed Trompke, City Attorney; Kenda Schlaht, Deputy City Recorder; Steve Gaschler; Public Works Director, Travis Hultin; Chief Engineer, Tanney Staffenson; Planning Commission.

**GUESTS:** See Attached List.

Mayor Daoust asks for any agenda updates.

Craig Ward states there were no amendments to the published agenda.

Councilor Anderson states I have a letter amending my previously filed letter of resignation to be now in effect to resign immediately following the conclusion of agenda item 5 tonight.

Mayor Daoust states that will be duly noted. We will have to make that change also on the resolution on item 2.2 consent agenda. While we're talking about that I'll go ahead and say that we need to pull the consent agenda 2.2 and discuss that. So we'll pull that and put it after the public comment period. The rest of the agenda I'll ask Councilor Ripma to read 2.1.

**2. CONSENT AGENDA:**

**2.1 MINUTES:** November 10, 2015 Regular Meeting.

~~**2.2 RESOLUTION:** A resolution declaring vacancy on the City Council and selecting a new Councilor to fill the vacancy.~~

*Pulled from the Consent Agenda and moved to the Regular Agenda immediately following this item.*

**MOTION:** Councilor Ripma moved to approve Consent Agenda 2.1 Minutes from November 10, 2016, Regular Meeting. Seconded by Councilor Wilson. The motion passed unanimously 7-0.

**2.2 RESOLUTION:** A resolution declaring vacancy on the City Council and selecting a new Councilor to fill the vacancy.

Mayor Daoust states we will move on then to 2.2 Resolution declaring a vacancy on the City Council and selecting a new Councilor to fill the vacancy.

Councilor White states I have a question about the point of order. When we did the interviewing we ended that meeting by stating that Brian Sheets name would be put on the consent agenda and there was no objections to that and that's what I expected to see here tonight in print. I'm wondering why that didn't occur.

Councilor Wilson states I did not agree with the selection. You can't say we all agreed.

Councilor White states the majority did agree. That's exactly how we left that meeting that night. Brian Sheets name was supposed to be in print on the consent agenda. He was declared winner that night. I know you didn't agree but nonetheless he won.

Councilor Wilson states he didn't win. Nobody was chosen that night.

Councilor White states that's what the Council agreed to. Why isn't his name listed?

Mayor Daoust states I can try and answer that. There was no vote as you know on the 14<sup>th</sup> when we did the interviews. What we did was we asked each Councilor for their top 3 people and we had a group of people that came up to the top.

Councilor White states my question is very specific.

Mayor Daoust states I'm going to answer you. I sat down and talked with Brian about this. After the meeting there was some comments that were made by Councilors. There were comments made by other people after the meeting that created a level of discomfort. We weren't getting anywhere that night so I did make the statement that, okay, we'll put Brian Sheets name on the consent agenda and we'll move forward with that. Because it was 10:30 at night and I decided we had talked about it enough and I agree that was the statement I made. After the meeting almost immediately there were some comments made by Councilors and other people and I woke up the next morning and was a little uncomfortable with the statement that I had made the night before. As time went on I started to hear more things that made me more uncomfortable. This is nothing against Brian Sheets. I love Brian Sheets. He's a good man. There were some comments made from other people on the imbalance in the Council that other people's perspectives were that it would create another imbalance in the Council. So I talked to Ed Trompke about it and Ed and I had a pretty candid conversation. I said I was feeling somewhat uncomfortable. I met with Brian Sheets and I talked with Brian about that. I didn't take his name off the consent agenda. I think it kind of happened as the consent agenda language was written at the last minute before it all got published. Actually I think Ed is the one who took his name off.

Ed Trompke states I will take responsibility for that. I'll also take responsibility for the couple of errors that are in it. There are times that are wrong and the date is wrong. It was prepared at the last minute because I wasn't really aware of all that had gone on and I don't know that I was fully aware that the decision was made to put it on the consent agenda even. I updated it from what it had been and Mr. Wilcox brought up a couple of dates and times that were wrong and I thank him for that. That's how it happened. I didn't know that there was any decision made by anybody other than my not knowing that it was consent agenda item with a name on it and I first sent it off to Sarah who was on vacation. It languished for a little while longer without anybody seeing it.

Councilor Allen states I've been out of town burying my mom and I was kind of surprised to see the change because it was clearly stated. We deliberated quite a bit. We ended the meeting with Brian Sheets. I think the correct procedure would be to have Brian Sheets name in there as we ended the meeting. I don't think anybody can change Council direction without meeting again. Therefore, the correct thing to do would be to pull it from the consent agenda and then deal with it.

Ed Trompke states the Charter says that the agenda is put together by the City Manager and the Mayor sets the items on it.

Councilor Allen states that may be true but I don't think you can change Council direction.

Mayor Daoust states I can. Because I changed my mind. Let me make a statement for the audience. I would like this meeting as much as possible to be orderly. And I know how hard it is to sit there and not say anything. But I don't want the meeting to be disruptive. I don't want there to be outbursts or applause or whatever type of verbal or whatever statements you feel like making I'd rather that not happen. So I would like to warn you all right now that if it happens again you'll be escorted out of the room. If you feel you can't sit and be quiet then I'm sorry but that's the way it's going to be. I just want it to be orderly. I would hope that the rest of the Council agrees with that and not make their own body language apparent.

Councilor White states there seems to be quite a double standard. People can't even applaud? That's ridiculous.

Councilor Allen states if I could continue with a legal question, I think legally we should continue with what Council direction is and at the next public meeting then we can pull it and change it and so forth.

Ed Trompke states the procedure is if something is taken off the consent agenda it's just moved down.

Councilor Allen states right and that would be the proper procedure. No one should unilaterally change Council direction. It needs to be done within the public meeting.

Mayor Daoust states let me clarify that a little because I think we're getting a little off base.

Councilor Allen states I'm thinking about our future. I'm talking about future things. Council direction needs to be Council direction until we meet and change it.

Mayor Daoust states let me keep going because I wasn't quite done with what I wanted to say. Because of my discomfort with comments that I had heard throughout the week. This is comments from the business people downtown, comments from Councilors themselves that put Brian Sheets in a rather awkward position. And I'll say it again, I have nothing against Brian. But he was put in an awkward position by other people and so I was pretty much the swing vote Monday night. I think you guys will all agree with that. It was me that made the conclusion statements and it was I that said put Brian's name on the page. I, based on the comments I heard from everybody in the last week, changed my mind. I have the right to change my mind because during Monday night's deliberations I think Councilor Ripma changed his mind.

Councilor Ripma states I misspoke. Councilor Wilson changed his mind.

Mayor Daoust states the truth is we had people during the night that changed their mind on who they supported.

Councilor Allen states we all have the right to change our mind but we need to change it at the next public meeting and not in the interim.

Mayor Daoust states okay then I'm changing it now then. My whole intent with a name that's going to come up tonight, from me or whoever, is to have somebody that is neutral. The person that sits in Councilor Anderson's seat to be somebody that has no allegiance to either side of the Council. That's my goal. This is no offense to Brian. It's no offense to Josh. I would rather have somebody sitting there that is not swayed either way by the split Council that we have. The reason you all are sitting there tonight is you know that we have a split Council. So as Mayor I don't want to keep that going. Unfortunately, Brian was put in that position. He was put in that position by other people and the comments that they made. There will be another name brought forward tonight of a neutral person that is not persuaded by either side of the Council. I think that's the best for the City Council to go forward for the next 9 months. This is just a 9 month appointment, whoever is in that position has to choose whether they run again in November. Actually in 3 months or so they need to decide whether they're going to run. It's not a 4 year term it's just for the next 9 months. We need somebody that's neutral. I use that term loosely. I use it to describe somebody that is not preregistered. I don't know how to describe this but I think you guys know what I mean.

Audience responds no.

Mayor Daoust states we are going to go ahead and have nominations and people can nominate whoever they want to nominate actually. We'll have nominations for filling the position because we have to fill the position.

Councilor Allen states Mayor, regardless of this subject, I would be satisfied if in the future you would follow procedure. That would be fine with me.

Mayor Daoust responds I take that as good feedback but I think I am following procedure. Given the language that we have in front of us on the consent agenda. I'm going off the agenda and I'm talking about it tonight.

Ed Trompke states procedure would be any person, any Councilor, can take it off the consent agenda which the Mayor did. Any person can move to change any words in it including the name of a person. Councilor Allen you're absolutely right. It could have had his name in it but any person could've moved to change it.

Councilor Allen states right and that would have been the proper procedure. Through Council direction and pull it off.

Ed Trompke states I should have communicated better with getting direction on it. I did it without an awful lot of direction as to how to do it. That I take full responsibility.

Councilor Ripma states I think just in the faint hope that there's a way to short circuit this. I realize that you changed your mind this week. I thought we had decided, you disagree, and there's no use arguing about that. It even says in our resolution Council carefully deliberated and selected a person to fill the vacancy. Brian has assumed, and I checked with him tonight, that he was going to be appointed. I don't know whether he has resigned his seat on the Planning Commission or anything else but the assumption was there. I can't think of anybody more neutral. I agree with your aspiration to have somebody neutral. If you think Brian Sheets isn't neutral you are mistaken. I'm wondering what sort of comments you heard that we could discuss. Because that's what we did on Monday. We kind of kicked around the various pros and cons of people. But I could short circuit this if there's 3 other Councilors here that could agree to go ahead and vote for Brian Sheets on the Council. I'm talking about the ones who didn't support him on Monday. I know you did Doug and changed your mind but do you Councilor Anderson, Councilor Morgan, or Councilor Wilson can you see your way to supporting Brian? It's worth asking that question. Is there any of you 3 willing to do it?

Councilor Wilson states I would like to nominate Corey Brooks.

Councilor White states I chose Brian because he's been doing the work and he is, in my opinion, the most qualified.

Mayor Daoust states then nominate Brian.

Councilor White asks how do you explain to the voters that we didn't pick the most qualified candidate because the Council couldn't get along and agree and they were worried he might vote one way or he might go against what we're trying to do. Brian is an independent man. I don't always agree with Brian. You stated that you met with Brian. This question is to Ed. I thought there were rules about the people that applied. I thought there was a specific set of questions that we had to follow and go through and we weren't allowed to ask further questions.

Councilor Ripma responds there is nothing wrong with Doug meeting with Brian after we picked him. I just think that's a misplaced argument.

Councilor Wilson states one of the things you said that night to Councilor Morgan was that he knew how Brian was going to vote.

Councilor White states no, listen to the tape. I got cut off and you didn't hear me clearly. What you said though was more pointed when you said I have an objection to Brian even though you didn't vote for him. Your objection was that he pulled projects off the CIP list. That's not true Councilor Wilson. He didn't pull them because they were never on the CIP list.

Mayor Daoust states I don't think we should really get into all these juicy little details. That's the whole reason why I want someone different to be on the Council. This whole discussion we're having right now. It's just a perfect example of disagreements about a person. The reason Corey Brooks name is coming up is because Monday night it was both sides of the floor voted for Corey. Councilor Allen, Councilor Morgan, Councilor White, Councilor Wilson did and then I switched and I think Corey would be a neutral person that is not associated with either side. He has 5 votes right there on both sides of the aisle. Do you want to put Brian's name out there? Why don't you?

**Councilor Ripma states I'll put Brian's name out.**

**Mayor Daoust states let's just take a vote. The only reason Councilor Anderson can vote is if it was a tie. Otherwise let's move on with this and see where we end up. When you call the role between Corey Brooks and Brian Sheets.**

**Councilor Ripma states one more point of order tonight. Councilor Anderson, are you going to participate in this. I have to confess I don't want it to be a tie because that's exactly what Councilor Anderson predicted would happen. I have nothing against Corey Brooks. I would much rather have Brian Sheets but I'll vote for Corey Brooks too. Just to avoid the tie and you won't have to vote.**

**VOTE: Councilor Ripma – Corey Brooks; Councilor Morgan – Corey Brooks; Mayor Daoust – Corey Brooks; Councilor White – Brian Sheets; Councilor Allen – Brian Sheets and Councilor Wilson – Corey Brooks.**

**Corey Brooks 4 – 2.**

Mayor Daoust states that's 4 to 2 so Corey Brooks will replace Councilor Anderson on City Council. Congratulations Corey. Let me say again, I think this is the best move that we could make as a Council. Corey is a good man and he'll do a good job. All 9 applicants were good people. We had 9 good people apply and we had a hard time. We deliberated until 10:30 at night and started at 6 o'clock. For 4 ½ hours we held interviews and deliberated about who we wanted. It wasn't easy. This is not easy. I think it's the best thing that we can do as a divided Council.

Ed Trompke states because the resolution wasn't raised or voted on and because Councilor Anderson has submitted a resignation that is effective after item 5 on the agenda tonight. Corey Brooks could be sworn in as a new Councilor any time after agenda item #5 tonight under Section 28 of the charter.

Councilor Ripma states we usually have the judge do it.

Mayor Daoust states we do need to vote on the resolution.

Ed Trompke states you held a vote so I think this is redundant. I don't know that you need it.

Mayor Daoust states the only thing on the resolution is there needs to be some grammatical or editorial corrections made to the times that we held interviews.

Ed Trompke states under section finding #8 it says 5:30 on March 14<sup>th</sup> that should be 6:00. On section # 2 it says February 26<sup>th</sup> and it should be March 4<sup>th</sup>. Then on section #3 it says 5:30 it should be 6:00. Also on section #5 he could be sworn in any time after March 22<sup>nd</sup>.

Mayor Daoust states there's one other change. On the very first #1 it should be effective March 22<sup>nd</sup> rather than March 31<sup>st</sup>. People meet Corey Brooks.

Councilor Ripma states if I might suggest, why don't we do it at the beginning of the next Council meeting with a little more ceremony and have the judge here. I don't see any reason to do it tonight.

Councilor Allen states although I may not be comfortable with what happened in the interim while I was gone, that was a fair vote. I do believe in democracy and so I will support the appointee.

### **3. PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Josh Moriarty, Troutdale, Oregon, states I listened to the deliberations last week and first of all I just want to say I appreciate the opportunity to interview with you guys and the discussions. I just want to address one thing that came up because it was publicly called out and frankly, bothered me quite a bit. Councilor Ripma, you said if I was elected to Council it would be scandalous, you said it a couple times, because I had donations from Junki Yoshida and some other supporters. Taking it a step further like you did a year and a half ago implying that I had been bought. And I haven't been. There are people that you and I both know. We have common friends, I've lived in this town my whole life. I didn't know when I walked in the door that there are multiple people sitting behind me that have known for 20 and 30 years. I'm not going to bring up a bunch of character witnesses but I could. I vote on issues, I'm my own person. I really would appreciate it if you let it go. That's all I have to say.

Councilor Ripma responds Josh, what was scandalous wasn't you. I mean that. It isn't you. What I meant was if you were picked on a 4 to 3 vote with Councilor Anderson participating basically after Troutdale voters had voted me instead of you, that's what was scandalous.



It's not that you are. I don't think that. I never thought that and I take you at your word. I'm quite willing to forget the whole thing. I won't bring it up again.

Paula Goldie, Troutdale, Oregon, states I wanted to talk a little about the recreation program that everybody seems to think is such a great idea and pushing forward. I know Craig Ward addressed it with staff here last week. I just wanted to remind everybody that your idea that it's all going to be online, it's going to be fabulous, and we won't have to see anybody in the office, it's so totally off base. There's people like me and perhaps older people too that may have grandchildren that they want to sign up. I need to tell you there's still a lot of people in the City that are older people that are not computer savvy. And when you pull in from Wood Village and Fairview as well you're still going to get the same sort of voter base. People that maybe aren't as tech savvy as we like. The other thing is I hope that you're thinking way far ahead as to staffing and workload. At the present time the ¾ time person if she's not here, Craig Ward handles the stuff. Any issues that come up like cancellations, adverse weather, etc it falls on Craig. If Craig is not here it falls on the cashier and the small staff. It's a small staff to handle all of this. If we're going to get these other places in then the conversation needs to be held of their question of the cost to run the programs because we say, and you've said many times, that it funds itself. It's not even close to 50% funding itself. So that means the citizens of Troutdale, we're subsidizing it. Somebody needs to pass those costs along and we need to have a really detailed look at what those costs actually are before we just steamroll them all through. Our lovely staff doesn't mind taking on extra work as long as it's well thought out.

**4. 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.

Councilor White states I have a question for Ed. When we heard the presentation on this from Planning there was concern that the numbers had changed and my thought is, shouldn't that go back to Planning with the corrected numbers? They clearly didn't get a look at the changes. They only saw the first draft instead of numbers. That was a request of the entire Council that it go through Planning.

Ed Trompke states I don't remember if it was the request but it is certainly something the Council can do.

Councilor White states we voted on it.

Mayor Daoust states is has already been through the Planning Commission. I'm not sure what you're saying.

Councilor White states Tanney is here, maybe he can elaborate. I was at that meeting and everything looked good but when Tanney gave his presentation he showed us where certain numbers had changed. Tanney could probably answer it better than I could because they were the ones that studied it. And he's here in the audience.

Mayor Daoust states we did have the Planning Commission review it and Tanney gave a presentation 2 weeks ago with what the Planning Commission came up with. So you guys know exactly what the Planning Commission came up with. And Tanney is here to answer questions or make comments on what the Planning Commission came up as recommendations but I think we have what we need in front of us because staff knows what the Planning Commission came up with and you have it right here.

Councilor White asks can I just get clarification since he's here for questions? My question is since the numbers got changed after you guys looked at it, is Planning willing to look at the revised numbers. Or do you think that's necessary?

Tanney Staffenson, Troutdale Planning Commission, responds there's been a couple of revisions or modifications to the plan since we reviewed it. If we did we look at it again it would be more comfortable with it because the numbers had changed, things have been added, things have been deleted since we made our initial recommendation.

Councilor Wilson asks can you specifically tell us what's been added? Whenever you tell us the specifics on this you've always talked in generalities that we have a wish list, things in blue being later, been talking to staff, these things have been in this list. You were going to send me what the \$100,000.00 is. You said the city was using on a parks population of 21,400 adopted boundaries at an 18,000 population which is far different from what Metro does. I'm finding a lot of inconsistencies that I can't help you with because I don't understand exactly what you're talking about because we're talking generalities whereas I need specifics from the City.

Tanney Staffenson responds I appreciate that. If we're talking about generalities. The Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) list that you originally looked at that was going to be approved had a number of items in there and the price tag was to be determined. I would call that a general thing, not a hard number. Some of those have changed since that time but that was the original CIP list. I would consider that to be as general as it gets. Whether it's an item that doesn't have a number attached to it.

Mayor Daoust states staff said that was what changed when they came up with better information which is what they did.

Tanney Staffenson responds correct, which has happened. The question was put to me specifically about general numbers and I would say that what we received had more general numbers in it than what we turned back in.

Councilor Wilson states to be determined is not a general number. It's waiting for a number to be a part of it.

Mayor Daoust states why don't we have staff go through their discussion because they're going to get into some of the changes that have been made to the projects or additions and subtractions based on the input they got from the Planning Commission. They're going to go through the projects and I hope explain to us what perspective is of which should stay in and what should come out and what should change. At the end we can decide whether it

has to go back to the Planning Commission or not. My gut feeling tells me it doesn't have to. The process we set up was that you guys would take a look at it, you would give your recommendations. Even though some of the numbers were missing. Even though some of the numbers had changed. I don't know that that matters at this point in time. You will by the end of tonight have a pretty solid look at what is going to be in the CIP plan. It will be pretty solid tonight. I'm a little confused as to why it would have to go back to the Planning Commission after tonight.

Taney Staffenson states I don't think it has to. The only thing I would say is when I came forward and said the Planning Commission recommended a downtown study from an overall concept and not just parking. We thought it would be an additional \$50,000.00 potentially. You were concerned about spending \$50,000.00.

Councilor Wilson states no I wasn't. I wanted to know exactly what you wanted the study to be about. You were going to get me that list before this meeting.

Taney Staffenson states right. And I would also say that since that time the numbers have changed one way or another in excess of \$2 billion.

Councilor Wilson states okay but that brings us back to the question I asked you, what do you want the extra \$50,000.00 to study downtown? You said Councilor Wilson I will get you that in a week.

Taney Staffenson responds I said I would get you that and I notice it is in the plan now. I didn't send it because I don't do planning studies. I'm not qualified.

Councilor White states I personally want to say I would feel more comfortable, with changes up to \$2.5 million dollars, having it go back for planning review and then we can bring this forward after that occurs and we'll have our neutral Council evaluate this at that time. That would be my preference.

Mayor Daoust states let's see why that number came up. I don't even know what you're talking about. Maybe staff can explain.

Travis Hultin, Chief Engineer, states so first I want to respond to the mention of endorsing projects that did not have cost figures at the time that the work session here with the Council and Planning Commission. I said quite clearly at the first work session it was a rough draft of the plan that the staff had prepared to obtain direction as we work towards finalization of the plan. So we didn't have some of those numbers at that point. As far as the differences in the cost figures most of those, almost all of them, are simply updating those cost figures for inflation. Or in some cases bringing them back in time. The rough draft that I submitted to both the Council and the Planning Commissions most of those numbers were the fully escalated cost. That was in the cost models we have we had projects around the future, we had inflation costs for the future and that was the number I reflected in the rough draft so everybody could see what these projects would normally cost way down the road. In the rough draft, the Planning Commission recommended that we involve cost figures and dollars. So in some cases the numbers were brought back in time, they were projected out

to the future, they were projects being brought forward from older plans and older numbers and they were escalated forward in time. The vast majority of those differences are just inflation adjustments.

Councilor Wilson asks would it be safe to say that page 2 the \$750,000.00 for the sewer fund and pump upgrade station would be the biggest change out of all the different changes you made?

Travis Hultin responds probably. I would have to go back and look to be sure but that's probably the case. I can't think of a bigger one off the top of my head.

Mayor Daoust states I thought you were going to address the \$2 million dollar figure that Tanney brought up. What is that?

Travis Hultin responds I don't know how Tanney arrived at that number so I'm not really sure. I can tell you that the vast majority of the differences are due to inflationary adjustments.

Steve Gaschler, Public Works Director, states I'm going to take a few minutes to go through some context and talk about what we can do with this plan and what we don't do with this plan. I would like to start off by saying in going through this process we learned from staff that this was a lot bigger project than we anticipated and a lot of that due to the time lapse over the period of when Council dealt with this and when staff has dealt with it. There's been a lot of changes. We kind of lost track of some of this stuff and you as a Council haven't seen a lot of this stuff for quite a long time. I want to apologize for that. I can see that it's our intent to bring this back to you on an annual basis so it's not such a big elephant to get down each year. That way at the end of the year we'll probably just be talking about some adjustments of inflation, adding a project or two based on what happened that year. And we might be taking a project or two off based on either being completed or whatever but it won't be such a big ordeal for us as staff and you as Council to deal with. I think it is our intent to bring this back annually and not make this such a big hurdle to get over. Next, the context and evolution plan, this thing is kind of based on the City having a Comprehensive Land Use Plan. That's required by the state to take a long term look at what your land use goals and objectives are for the City and come up with a plan and the City has done that. From that the City has put together various master plans for all these systems that we're talking about here. Parks, transportation, water, sewer and so forth and the Urban Renewal Agency plan. Each of those master plans are a lot more detailed when you look at what growth is going to occur over that period of time and what facilities it's going to take to serve that growth. They also look at your existing system what your current deficiencies are. That's mostly for water and sewer, storm sewer and some transportation. Parks are a little bit different. It all kind of evolves from comp plan down to the master plan. The majority of the projects in this list are from those master plans. Not all of them but the majority. They're a long term view of the capital project needs of the City. What is the plan used for? It serves as a master list of all the City's projects at one location. Instead of having these individual lists and all these plans it basically takes all those plans and incorporates them into one master list plan. It doesn't mean that every project from those plans have to be in that list. They don't have to be and that's Council's decision. That's what we're here to talk about tonight. It contains

projects that support the growth. It contains projects needed to replace existing systems that are at the end of their useful life. It's a replacement component used in cost of service rate setting. Those replacement projects in there we do look at those projects and those numbers and we've done that rate analysis. On the utilities funds you'll notice there was a rate component that dealt with replacing those systems and those costs. Those costs are pretty squishy numbers at this time. The Planning number is kind of an order of magnitude to get us in there because there's a lot of work to be done on those projects figuring out exactly what detail what they are and at that point those will be refined as we move towards doing them. For today this is the best information we have and we have to have something. The capacity enhancement piece of it is used in the System Development Charge of methodology calculations. Which is something that we'll be bringing the Council once we kind of settle on it. The next piece for us is to bring our methodology studies back into line with this and the numbers that shake out of this. The first thing when we do bring that back in is we'll bring the CIP and ask Council which of those projects do they want included in that methodology study because they don't all have to be in there. We'll have that discussion. So just because it's in here doesn't mean it needs to be in the SDC methodology study. It can be but it doesn't have to be. We can put it in or we can take it out. If you leave it in naturally the SDC is going to be higher. If you take it out it will be lower. We will not be accumulating any money to do that project down the road. At some point in time if you want to fund that project you will have to account for it. The need for it doesn't go away it's just an accounting exercise.

Mayor Daoust states I remember some CIP lists in the past that have had all the projects listed and then a couple columns of whether it qualified for SDC or did not qualify for SDC. Or if there was other funding that could be used for the project. So like in the middle of the spreadsheet there would be 3 small columns that would elaborate more on what type of funding could be used, SDCs or not on that particular project. Just because it could not or partially not be in the SDC formula didn't mean it was taken out completely. It showed on the same spreadsheet but it does not qualify for SDC. I remember seeing a list like that in the past.

Travis Hultin responds the way the previous Parks SDC methodology report was prepared it had a table that you talked about. The first part of the 2000's there's a way you can calculate the portion you can put into your SDC methodology. That is actually a little bit different than how much percentage you can spend from your SDC. There's different base years basically. That is something we'll want to show in a SDC methodology analysis. Because it's going to be very hard to follow if you don't. The percentages you see in here are not necessarily the percentages you can use in your SDC rate equation. The percentages you see in here are percentages you can spend on a project. Those can be 2 different numbers because you calculate them based on base years.

Mayor Daoust states maybe there needs to be more work done later. Maybe tonight we just need to decide which projects are in the list and which ones are not. Right?

Travis Hultin responds right, once we actually settle on what the CIP is then we can actually perform the methodology analysis.

Steve Gaschler states I've seen it that way. In some of the master plans, which basically have a CIP plan specific to that master plan, I think that's where you see how much is eligible and how much isn't. In the funding breakout sheet I think we do talk about how much is in each fund. The CIP is used by other jurisdictions for planning coordination. The project is not contained in one of the adopted master plans. Master plans serve as an official City approval for grant application eligibility. If it's a project that we don't include in this it would take a special action by Council to approve it and get it eligible for grant funding. They want to see that it's an approved plan adopted by the Council. So if it's in here we can use this CIP to document in those applications. It does not obligate the City to undertake the project or the time period or the cost. There is no obligation at this point whatsoever. It's just a list for everybody to work off of in one place and not scattered through all these different plans. We're just trying to consolidate it into one place for everybody for easy reference. Just for context item, we're talking about these \$2 million dollars and \$15 million dollars and \$20 million dollars if you take the value of all these systems and add them up together they're over \$100 million dollars. It's big numbers because we're dealing with big expensive systems. Especially when you add them all together. I'm trying to say don't let the zeros scare you. That's all I have to say. I'm just trying to tee it up a little better and make it easier for you. I can sympathize with you. I've had a time struggling with this thing for months and it's been very challenging and for Travis too. He's been working on this since last summer and our original estimation of getting this done was a lot sooner than now. It's turned into a lot bigger project.

Travis Hultin states a couple of the Councilors indicated they had a hard time following the progression of various master plans and CIP updates so I threw together a quick timeline that you can use for reference to show different master plans and CIP updates. The last time the CIP was fully updated back then didn't include Parks because Parks was in Public Works. That was in 2009. There was an update in 2012 which just covered storm and water. We had a couple of master plans completed in the interim so that's why you'll see this CIP has so many changes in it from the last CIP. Normally if you were doing this every year as Steve mentioned typically your changes are going to be a lot smaller and not doing so much at once. That's one of things in particular that makes the CIP update very challenging.

Mayor Daoust states the changes that are in the staff report on pages 3 to 5, I think those are the ones that are on the top of our list of things we want to nail down tonight. The major changes and we can discuss any changes that we want to discuss but those on 3 to 5 if you could go through those so we could discuss them.

Travis Hultin states what you see at the bottom of page 3 these are recommendations from the Planning Commission. Those are not actually in the plan yet. As my staff report indicates we received some recommendations from the Planning Commission and we received some recommendations from the Parks Advisory Committee. However I am helpless changing these back pending direction from the Council. They provided the recommendations to the Council and it's my feeling that Council should choose whether or not to accept those recommendations or incorporate them or not. I indicated what those recommendations are but I haven't put them in the draft document in front of you. What is proposed tonight does not currently incorporate those recommendations. As far as changes, the track changes copy you have, I've done my best to try to capture and mark every change that's occurred

since the work session that I held in front of you in October. That was an initial rough draft that I presented to you asking for direction. That went before the Planning Commission and the Parks Advisory Committee. All through that process I made changes whether they were based on things pointed out by those Committees that we fixed or things that we were updating and correcting. Those are all reflected in that track version that is attached to the staff report.

Mayor Daoust asks on the red changes in here, are the changes that you guys have made?

Travis Hultin states as far as the meter changes and projects, they are reflected in the track changes version. The two that come to mind particularly are in the storm drainage section. There's one project added which is the 14<sup>th</sup> Street drainage improvement project, which was based on things that were developing at the time we were first preparing the rough draft. It's a relatively small drainage project that we think is needed on 14<sup>th</sup> Street. Then the addition of the Visionary Park project which the Council by resolution wanted in the CIP months ago.

Mayor Daoust asks when you're referring to a project, give us what exhibit and which page it's on.

Travis Hultin states it's in the storm drain section, Exhibit B, on page 6.

Mayor Daoust asks you added that one?

Travis Hultin responds we added that one. That was a staff identified project. If you go to the Parks section at the markup version, Exhibit E, page 1, resolution 2306 that Council adopted a few months ago.

Councilor Anderson states I was going to put a motion on the floor in essence adopting these changes advised by Planning and Parks Advisory.

Mayor Daoust asks can we discuss it first.

Travis Hultin states the Planning Commission chair relayed their recommendations to you folks at the last meeting as I understand it. This is my best attempt to capture it from the actual notes and unfortunately we did have a technical malfunction with the recorder. The first recommendation was to adopt the transportation CIP substantially as presented, with the following changes: first was to expand the scope of the proposed downtown parking study. Which is project ST-090 to a comprehensive downtown plan and increase the estimated cost accordingly.

Mayor Daoust asks that's the one Councilor Wilson brought up. That was the discussion between you and Tanney. Let's talk about that. You don't have that in the markup because it's a Planning Commission suggestion. That would be an expansion of the downtown parking study. Do you know what this is all about?

Tanney Staffenson states there was a downtown study done, I believe it was 1990 or 1998, I can't recall exactly which year. We felt that given the changes in the landscape of

downtown, businesses, and future development, we felt it would be in the City's best interest, the business community's best interest, and the taxpayer's best interest to do an overall look at the downtown system rather than just parking.

Councilor White states I thought at that meeting you guys also increased the area to the town center overlay. I could be mistaken though.

Tanney Staffenson responds yes. We felt it was in the best interest of all to look at all of downtown rather than just parking.

Councilor Anderson asks this assumes keeping the town center overlay as the zone or does this bring zoning into play?

Tanney Staffenson responds no, this would be a master plan study of the downtown.

Councilor Anderson asks based on town center overlay zoning?

Tanney Staffenson responds yes. I know I don't have any details but I also figured with already having \$700,000.00 in studies plugged in I didn't think expanding one study a little bit would kill us. We don't know the dollar amount. Staff would know better than we would. We thought it would probably cost an additional \$50,000.00.

Councilor Anderson asks if this goes through tonight, this is something that can be brought up as part of the SDC methodology. So there's going to be multiple bites at the apple here. In theory, I agree with Tanney 100% and the language. I think we should expand the scope.

Mayor Daoust states I'm not too sure what we're studying. That's my issue. That's a basic question Tanney. What would the study be studying in addition to parking?

Tanney Staffenson responds I'm not a staff person or elected official. I'm just a volunteer individual and I would say from my perspective that you would want to look at your downtown from not only parking but since you got it in transportation you would look at transportation, business climate, what you anticipate in the future of what downtown would look like as it develops. We haven't really done that. We haven't done it in a planned format in a long time and it has changed.

Councilor Allen states I want to point out it says right here, conduct a study to optimize existing parking in CBD and to identify and assess opportunities for additional public parking including ADA and bicycle parking. We hear it all the time, parking is a problem.

Mayor Daoust states we'll have to define that a little bit more because I still don't know what we're going to study.

Councilor White states I see problems too with the downtown area. I think it should be addressed. We have a rain run off problem for example and water in the downtown. Parking continues to plague us. How do we tie Drover's Trail that doesn't have a sidewalk or cross walk. We talked about tour bus parking for the museums.



Councilor Wilson states ST-090 is not for that area. Not for the Historical Society.

Tanney Staffenson states if it would please the Council we can pull that item and do some type of community fundraiser for it.

Mayor Daoust states it is okay to have it in there. It needs to be defined because it's still a little unclear about what the study would study. It's fine to leave it in there if the Council agrees to add. The price tag on the downtown parking study right now is \$51,000.00, are you saying it will go up \$101,000.00?

Tanney Staffenson responds that was just our estimation.

Mayor Daoust states if the Council agrees on defining it further and keeping it in there.

Craig Ward states staff would be happy to meet with the Planning Commission and try to refine this scope of work on a downtown study. That's what we're wrestling with here. We're not sure what it is. We just need to have further conversation about an appropriate scope of what should be studied and what we should be studying. I think it's perfectly fair to leave this item the way it is or to take the Planning Commission's proposal with the understanding that we need to refine this scope.

Mayor Daoust asks what does the Council want to do with this particular one?

Councilor Wilson states I vote to leave it in at \$51,000.00 and add to it later if needed.

Councilor White states it sounds like we're planning on voting on this tonight. Is that what I'm getting? There's quite a bit of discussion about getting Planning Commission's items in as another option to vote on and we decided not to do that after we were told we'd have 2 shots at this. I was hoping to take this in tonight, do some of my own research, and then vote on this.

Councilor Wilson states you've had 2 weeks. I took it home and worked on it for 2 weeks.

Councilor Allen states this seems much more refined than the last time I saw it. I don't see anything that's really all that controversial about it. However, I also don't see the rush at the moment. I'm fine if we want to vote on it at a second meeting.

Mayor Daoust states we can vote on it tonight too. We had the Planning Commission recommendation 2 weeks ago. The major ones here that we want to discuss we can discuss and decide what we want to do with them tonight.

Councilor Ripma states that's kind of what we're doing.

Mayor Daoust states if there's any other Planning Commission changes that you want included then bring those up tonight and we can include those too. So I understood the Council to say we'll leave ST-090 as it is with full intentions to define the scope of a

downtown study. And a possible increase whatever the cost would be to do a downtown study later. Once we find out how much that might go up.

Craig Ward states if I could put your mind at rest a little bit. This downtown study is shown as an element of the CIP because it deals with transportation. While what the Planning Commission is talking about has a transportation element to it, it's really a land use planning study. Therefore it's not a capital improvement and it doesn't need to be in here. It needs to be in our personal professional services component in the budget. There's no reason we cannot blend the money that's in the CIP for a parking study with the money that's in professional services for land use down the road. The planning study does not have to be in here from the land use standpoint.

Mayor Daoust states no it doesn't. That actually makes a lot more sense. You don't put a downtown study that would address businesses or other than transportation in the transportation CIP list. We'll still pursue it but we can do it under a study rather than a CIP. Okay Item 1.2 from the staff report, delete the Primary Access to Urban Renewal Area project ST-084, that's got a lot of discussion since that came up. My inclination would be to leave it in the CIP list rather than delete it. I know that the Planning Commission wanted to delete it. They wanted to move it into an Urban Renewal list, a whole different category. The reasons why it, from my perspective, should not be deleted from the CIP list is three fold. The primary access to the Urban Renewal Area (URA), that's the road through the outlet stores, that project can qualify for multiple types of funding. The TIF (Tax Increment Financing) funding from the URA is a major source of funding that could probably pay for that road. There are other sources of funding. SDCs could contribute if we figure out how to structure SDCs and possibly confine it to the URA. And grant money. Transportation funds from the federal government and transportation funds from the state government for transportation projects. To qualify for those it should be in the transportation CIP list. From my perspective it doesn't make any sense to take it out of the transportation CIP list when you have all those different kinds of funding that could apply to the same road. The URA category for capital improvement projects really is not a legitimate category as I understand it. Other people can describe that better than me.

Councilor Ripma states I understand that what the Planning Commission recommended was it be moved from the CIP list for the City and put in a CIP list for the URA. My understanding from talking to Ed is that there isn't a CIP list for the URA. This is a City project, it's going to be a City road. The fact that it can be repaid out of TIF funds is what makes it work. That's the only way we're ever going to be able to pay it back. You mentioned it just quickly but the idea of any SDCs collected to pay for this come from the URA only. It would mean the rest of the City would be saddled with paying the extra SDCs. It would just go on the URA and if that's doable I think that's a good deal.

Ed Trompke states it has to be structured that way but it is doable as you said.

Councilor Ripma asks could it be reflected in whatever we finally adopt?

Ed Trompke states at the moment it says it's entirely to be paid for by the URA. That's advisory until the Budget Committee decides how to start spending money. It doesn't really

need to be changed and it will be discussed in the right budget year when the Budget Committee gets it.

Councilor Ripma states I will also say I talked about this with Tanney and his concern was that it should be on the URA and not on the City as a whole. First of all, the project is not entirely SDC qualified. It's not really capacity enhancing. Maybe a little bit but probably not. Any SDC adjustments if it could be limited to the URA that relieves my concern and I hope it does Tanney's too.

Ed Trompke states eligibility is something the engineers have to work out with the finance people. It can be a complicated analysis that they look at. It's too early at this point to break it down into that until they get into an SDC analysis which they're going to get into.

Travis Hultin states I want to clarify a couple of things. One is that determining how much could be funded from SDCs will be how much could be proportioned to growth. That's the most difficult test. It's determining what the growth factor is eligible to apply to it. The second part would be Councilor Ripma suggested that the SDC would only be charged to the URA it really doesn't work that way. If you want to do something like that you typically do more like a local improvement district, work with the URA plan, and plan for it. So that would be a little redundant in my mind.

Ed Trompke states the timing and money can't be matched. It doesn't draw moneys from the rest of the City. Once the SDCs are computed for the URA that can be matched to the amounts that are actually expended on the plan on this particular road. It can be done but it's just not an easy calculation to make. We'll be matching it at the right time. It can be done.

Councilor Allen states the thing that I struggle with here is that we told the voters that we were going to do an access way through the Outlet Mall. They know that. But we told them we were going to use funds from the Sewer Treatment Plant (STP) and we're not exactly getting what we thought we were going to get from that and it's insufficient. Specifically we told the voters that we would use funds from the sale of the STP site and developer contributions to pay for this access way. I get a little nervous when we start mixing in City funds with what should be supported by that and an alternative would probably be to use TIF money to do a payback in 16 years. At least according to what we told the voters.

Ed Trompke states using the amounts of the SDCs funds that are generated by the developer of the URA is coming out of the pocket of the developer of your renewal district. It's not using SDC funds that come from the rest of the City. The Council needs to be directing the staff to limit the SDC contributions and that will have to be respected and honored as the process moves along.

Councilor Allen asks can we limit this to those SDCs into the TIF funds.

Ed responds you can't today because when the money gets spent it goes through Budget Committee. The Budget Committee will have to be advised on it at that time and the Budget Committee makes the planning decision on it. We're all aware of this now and that will be brought up at the right time and at the right presentations. When budgets get put together

they will reflect the intention of Council at this point. But Council can always override your intention today. I can't promise you what your successors in office 5 years from now will do.

Councilor Allen states I'm all for supporting what we told the voters and sticking with that.

Ed Trompke states I think we can live with that and make sure it gets brought up properly.

Mayor Daoust states I think items 1.2 and 1.3 could be handled the same. We're talking about Urban Renewal Area access and so 1.3 falls in the same rationale and reasoning as 1.2 does. Let me add one more statement. When I was at the airport meeting Bobby Lee came up to me, he's the Governor's regional solutions guy for the Portland Metro area, he specifically told me that they're working on funding loans for the URA access road. That's good news folks. Bobby Lee's group is working on it. I think the point of bringing that up is we may have other funds of money we can use for that road. If we indeed get a reasonable loan from the State of Oregon for a public road we may not have to use as much TIF funding. We can play it by ear as to what type of money we can use on that so we're all comfortable with what types of money we're spending.

Councilor Allen states I think it's a good idea as long as we don't start dipping into the City funds.

Councilor White states I'm thinking it kind of makes sense to the downtown plan to wait until we actually see what that looks like before we add it in.

Mayor Daoust states that's what we agreed to.

Councilor Wilson states once we get a scope of the study, but it would go under land use not transportation.

Travis states the cost shown for those projects are just the costs from the Urban Renewal Plan.

Councilor Allen asks what do we do if some of the grant funding or other sources don't come into play. We could easily go over budget. Is that something we're just going to handle at the budgetary process?

Travis Hultin responds I want to refer back to the first paragraph of the background statement of my staff report. I want to make sure everyone remembers that nothing in here is written in stone. Nothing in here commits Council or the City to do anything. The Council can change the CIP pretty much at any time it chooses to. If different funding streams come in line they can update the CIP at their discretion whenever they like to. These are available as the best information we have right now. It also doesn't pre-approve a project. It still has to go through the budget process and it has to go through all the normal processes that any City project would have to go through to get funded and approved. Nothing in here is guaranteed is what I'm saying.

Councilor White states I think the problem lies in the fact that it's harder to remove stuff from the CIP than it is to add it. It also becomes a driver for staffing levels and rate increases. We get that argument thrown at us so that's why we try to be really careful of what we have or don't have.

**MOTION: Councilor Anderson moved to adopt items 1.4 through 3.2 of the Planning Commission's recommendations and adopt items 1 and 2 of the Parks Advisory Commission recommendations.**

Councilor Wilson states at this point I would like to add to the Parks CIP.

Councilor Anderson states okay I'll withdraw that motion.

**MOTION: Councilor Anderson moved to adopt items 1.4 through 3.2 of Planning Commission recommendation. Seconded by Councilor Wilson.**

Councilor Anderson states the reason I say this is because of what Travis just said. This has got to go through so many different hoops. I get what Councilor White says. It's hard to pull things off but the Planning Commission studied this long and hard.

**AMENDED MOTION: Councilor Anderson moved to amend the motion to adopt items 1.4 to 5.2. Seconded Councilor White.**

Mayor Daoust states so that's been moved and seconded to adopt 1.4 to 5.2. Further discussion on that.

Councilor Ripma asks Councilor Anderson you want to delete that?

Councilor Anderson responds no, I want to add it. I want to add everything back into Urban Renewal like we have to do.

Councilor Wilson states Councilor Anderson is stating don't delete anything. Just leave it and when we get there we'll make a decision.

Travis Hultin states just to clarify, none of these recommendations have been incorporated with the draft that has been presented to you. So if you adopt the proposed CIP that was attached to the Resolution you don't need to. You don't want to accept the Planning Commission's recommendations at this time you can just adopt the proposed plan because those have not been incorporated.

Mayor Daoust states I'm having a little problem since we're discussing the motion.

Councilor Wilson states I withdraw the second.

Mayor Daoust states I have a little problem removing the Special Use Park Development project if that's the riverfront project in the URA. Is that a correct statement?

**Travis Hultin responds that is correct. That's the park that's the URA.**

**Councilor Anderson states because it is grant funded and everything else, we'll keep that in. Ideally it's the same as 1.2 and 1.3, correct?**

**Mayor Daoust states yes it is so given your motion it would be deleted.**

**Councilor Anderson states I will withdraw that motion. We discussed everything URA related and we were going to table that for another time.**

Councilor Wilson states I guess the correct thing to do would be to vote to approve staff's recommendations.

**Mayor Daoust states I think there's some Planning Commission things that are okay to approve. We're uncomfortable with 3.1. We're not going to go for 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3. Those are going to stay in the plan. The rest of them we're comfortable with. We're not comfortable with 3.1. I don't know why we would want to take that park out of the Urban Renewal district. And the rest of them 3.2 to 5.2 does anybody have any problems with those?**

Councilor Ripma states 3.1 was taken out of the City CIP list and put in the recommended Urban Renewal CIP list and it turns out that doesn't exist. I agree with you totally but that's why it was done. It was worth discussing.

Mayor Daoust asks does anybody have any problems with the rest of the Planning Commission's major changes?

Steve Gaschler states on 5.1 which is to limit the cost of Onsite Water Recycling System at the Waste Water Treatment Plant that's something that is in the proposed budget currently. It's moved forward whether it be approved or not. Our estimate on that is \$150,000.00. It is just an estimate and if we can't do it for \$100,000.00 we're going to spend \$80,000.00 out there on treated water. If we can do it even at \$150,000.00 it will pay itself back in 2 years. Instead of using treated water we're going to re-plumb the system out there and bring the effluent back in and use it as processed water. Right now we're spending \$80,000.00 a year for the water department to buy water. To me it's a no brainer project that we should be doing. I would hate to see it put on there as an artificially lower number and not be able to go forward with that.

Mayor Daoust asks Tanney why was that limit put on there? Staff is uncomfortable with 5.1 on the Water Recycling System.

Tanney Staffenson responds at the time that we reviewed the plan there was no amount in there for the water recycling. We had made a determination of a not to exceed amount so there was a number in there. Staff did not have a number. We asked what they thought it might be and then we came up with a number so we had something to put in the plan. It wasn't to handcuff anybody.

Mayor Daoust states it sounds kind of arbitrary.

Councilor White states a part of this was we had potential customers with effluent water and it didn't make sense to do that.

**Mayor Daoust states I'm more comfortable with staff coming up with the cost of that than an arbitrary number. What do you want to do with 5.1?**

**Steve Gaschler responds we would like to leave it in as \$150,000.00. We got that number by talking to another jurisdiction that just recently went through that process.**

**The Council concurred.**

Councilor Ripma states I did have one other thing if we're thinking of moving forward with the whole plan. We had a question raised the last time about Exhibit B of the markup page 4. It's a water loop system on NE Harlow and why the developer was assigned 90% of the cost. I just wondered if that got dealt with in any way. I remember Rip Caswell bringing it up as to why and I never heard an answer why it's 10% URA and 90% developer. Is there an explanation for that?

Steve Gaschler responds when this came out of the master plan when the master plan was developed there was no connection out there at that end of the system. The 2 terminus points were at that corner, Harlow Place on the north side of the freeway which is about 900 feet north of the freeway currently. The terminus on the south side of the freeway is the old Waste Water Treatment Plant side and that 155 in there represented the cost to do that connection clear across there from those 2 points. When ODOT was doing the bridge they came to us and said they had received some more money and were able to put the trail underneath the bridge and wanted to know if they were going to put the trail in if we wanted to get our waterline in before they put the trail in so that we wouldn't have to come back and tear the trail up to get the waterline. So the City went in there 2 years ago with our own forces and put a little over 300 feet of waterline in underneath that trail. It's not being used right now because it's not connected on either end. We could've connected it on the south end but not knowing what was going to happen in the URA area and it wasn't serving anybody on the other side we didn't want to make that connection because we thought it might get changed in the future anyway. But now subsequently we have a development opportunity on the other side and that line is now going to be used by people developing that property. So the developers pay for their portion of the public facilities that go across their property frontage. The remaining portion will now go under the developer.

Councilor Ripma asks so that's a normal way we would assess a cost for something like this? If a new line is being built in front of a development they pay.

Steve Gaschler responds yes if it's to serve that property.

Councilor Allen states from an engineering standpoint the loop makes sense. The reason I flagged this particular page amongst others was that it seems like everybody on that loop

benefits from it happening and being done. I was wondering if we're putting too much of a burden on the developer in that particular area for something that may benefit multiple properties. I wondered if it was such a burden that it might actually prevent that area from being developed.

Travis Hultin responds this question has come before. We have subdivisions and projects where there may be some underdeveloped properties and they have to get the water line all the way to their property. As it has been for many years it's the developer's responsibility to bring utilities to their property. The City Council many years ago created what's called a late comers agreement process. The term and the code is reimbursement district. If a developer does have to extend a line across the frontage of others and their going to benefit from that the developer has an opportunity to form a reimbursement district. Those properties when they develop and connect would have to pay a reimbursement for their piece of it. That's how the Council addressed that problem in the past.

Councilor Allen asks for clarity we would be asking for them to pay the portion to get the utility to their property, not necessarily for the entire loop?

Travis Hultin responds correct.

Steve Gaschler states in this particular case the City has already paid to get the waterline at 300 feet and the most difficult part of it underneath that bridge. That line there doesn't serve any property, the freeway doesn't need water.

Mayor Daoust asks does staff have any problems with any of the other major Planning Commission recommendations?

Travis Hultin responds I wouldn't say problems but I could name a couple of recommendations on 3.2 and 3.3 of the staff report. I think the Planning Commission's intent there was to deflect the fact that there is the amount of Park Plan Acquisition for growth in the Parks Master Plan was based on an entire buildout population estimate. I think the Planning Commission felt that now that the population is lower, we didn't need all those projects. Based on the current population projections the Planning Commission was correct in that we would not need as much neighborhood park site acquisition if you were to recalculate based on the population figures. However my analysis does indicate that it's just different phases of those projects that you would delete if you wanted to get that in line with the current population projections. If the Council agrees to the principal of the Planning Commission's recommendation there then really to bring in line to the current population projections you would delete Neighborhood Park Site Acquisition Phase II PA008, PA012 which is the development of neighborhood parks phase II. If you want to implement the recommendation then I would suggest that instead of neighborhood parks Phase I and development project of that you delete phase II.

**Mayor Daoust states so 3.2 we would leave in because that is phase I. so what you're saying is delete PA008 and PA012 instead.**

**Travis Hultin responds that is correct.**



**Mayor Daoust asks does Council have an issue with that.**

**The Council had no comments.**

**Mayor Daoust states so we will go with that. PA008 and PA012 will be dropped.**

Travis Hultin states my analysis agreed with the Planning Commission on 3.3.

Councilor Wilson states about a year ago we had approved Exhibit A, page 2. Is that going to be done this year? I thought it was going to get done last year.

Steve Gaschler responds we've been working on it for years. We don't seem to be making any progress. I tried to get our in house staff to do it but they're just too busy with day to day operations. It wasn't getting done so I went outside to see if I could find an engineer to do it. I can find them but I can't afford them. I'm trying to get back to staff getting carved out to do it.

Councilor Wilson asks are we out of compliance?

Craig Ward responds I wouldn't like to answer that on the record.

Councilor Wilson states parks has recommended a skate park for \$455,000.00. How do we go about getting that added in to this list? I would like to see it done. I think the amount is low. The skate park in Oregon City spent over a million dollars on that so this would be substantially smaller. I think it would be good for the kids. I think this would give them an outlet to having fun.

Councilor Allen states I agree with what the parks committee is suggesting here.

Councilor Anderson states I like it for those reasons and I like it for the fact that the Parks Advisory Committee brought it forward.

**Mayor Daoust states I think it's a great idea. We're okay with including that.**

Councilor White states we've been talking about this and Craig Ward even says it doesn't pass the test and that's College Park. It is 88 acres that isn't counted in our inventory. I'd like to see an effort to actually call it what it is. It's a park and the City owns it. I think it would be along the lines of getting population numbers correct. It would also get our park inventory correct.

Travis Hultin states in a way I guess you could say that's in our proposal because the proposed CIP has an updated Parks Master Plan. That would be an opportunity to do that. The difficulty with implementing that just tonight I don't know exactly what to change.

Councilor Wilson states let's do it in the Parks Master Plan and then we can move it.

Mayor Daoust states we agree to that, Councilor White, we want that included as a park.

Travis Hultin states there is one thing I want to point out. All of the cost figures for the other systems transportation, water/sewer and storm were updated based on inflation. The easy way to correct that is with your permission I would change that cost basis \$2008.00. That will all kind of come out in the wash anyway when you update the parks master plan.

Mayor Daoust states good point. We're okay with that.

**Mayor Daoust calls for a break at 9:06pm and reconvenes the meeting at 9:12pm.**

Mayor Daoust states we've noted some changes we want to make. The most recent one was to add a skateboard park at Columbia Park for \$455,000.00. Any last notes before we take up the resolution?

Travis Hultin states the Planning Commission recommend that we delete the 5.2 project and my concern is that it's not a real specific project. We put it in there because we anticipate that there's a good chance that as regulations continue to tighten that we may well have to add additional components to the sewer plant. We don't know exactly what that upgrade is going to be at this time. We expect that it will be pretty expensive. It's best to start planning for that now.

Mayor Daoust states I always struggled with how late in the game to add a project up close to the construction phase to add it back in.

Travis Hultin states small projects will come up. If it's a 10 or 15 thousand dollar project we can do that in a short time. A big project, it would be better to start planning for that now.

Councilor Wilson states you don't really see these things because they're all underground practically. I sent an email out to everybody in regards to where a lot of other cities are getting at with their infrastructure. I believe we should start putting money away now.

Travis Hultin states a couple things I would plan would be sewer funds. You wouldn't be able to spend SDCs on that. If there's concern about what affect it might have on the SDC rate, we don't proceed that way. Additionally when we go through the rate setting process, if the Council's not comfortable with the effect this has on rates we don't have to approve it at that time.

Mayor Daoust states I'm okay with staff's recommendations to leave 5.2 in and not be deleted. What does the Council feel?

**The Council concurred.**

Councilor White states I just want to hear from Tanney. If we could just hear a comment or two from him before we vote.

Tanney Staffenson states I have a couple comments. We, the Planning Commission, appreciates the opportunity to look at the CIP list and we appreciate that you've deliberated all the recommendations. I know that we've gone with most of these but Councilor Wilson you brought up the population for parks and I was confused with that because you were saying something like 18,000 and we had 21,000. So this is based on 18,000. I get something different for 4 acres but that's okay. The other thing is the water pollution control facility upgrades, we did elect to pull that and one of the reasons was not that we feel it wasn't important. It was stated in here that it may be required. It wasn't required and we felt that voting on error to the tune of 3 and a quarter million dollars. I know this might be coming but we wanted to kind of okay this is what's required and this is what's going to happen because most of that would be funded probably out of user's rates. A couple of other comments was we did ask to have this all in 2016 dollars and we highly recommend that it just be updated annually. This process wouldn't take so many nights and meetings if we just went through and added in what we needed each year. Updating those cost figures would be easier for everyone. There is one recommendation that I failed to bring up in my last presentation was with parks acquisition we wanted to go on the record and state we would like to have underserved areas at first consideration for parks acquisition plan.

Mayor Daoust states I did hear staff agree to update annually.

Travis Hultin states if I could clarify on the population assessment. You go back and look through the Parks Master Plan. That was prepared in 2006 with the population at 21,400. When the parks SDC methodology report CIP were adopted in 2008 the population was improvised to 19,000. All those numbers in the current parks CIP are based on 19,000. The changes they you all just elected to make today would line up with 17,038.

Councilor Allen states I do have a question on ST-064, Exhibit A, page 12. You have \$20,000 listed there. How many access ways does that buy us?

Travis Hultin responds it depends on the length. The previous CIP carried forward. I can tell you what those projects are is particularly in some of the older subdivisions, the developers were often required to dedicated those tracks in between the neighborhoods. Some of them are approved already but there are some around the City that are not.

**MOTION: Councilor Anderson moves to approve a resolution for the Public Works Department Capital Improvement Plan, rescinding Resolutions 1995 and 2225, and rescinding the Parks Capital Improvement Plan adopted by Resolution 1941, in addition to adopting the \*amended changes made by Council tonight. Seconded by Mayor Daoust.**

*\*(The amended changes include accepting the following recommendation that were listed in the Staff Report: 1.4, 2.1, 3.2 – remove PA-008 & PA-012, 3.3, and include the PAC's recommendation of adding a project to construct a Skateboard Park at Columbia Park)*

**VOTE: Councilor Ripma – Yes; Councilor Anderson – Yes; Councilor Morgan – Yes; Mayor Daoust – Yes; Councilor White – No; Councilor Allen – No; and Councilor Wilson – Yes.**

**Motion Passed 5 – 2:**

**5. RESOLUTION: A resolution declaring the need to acquire right of way easement on property for the purpose of constructing street improvements for NW 257<sup>th</sup> Way.**

Ed Trompke, City Attorney, states this is a resolution to continue the work that we started to condemn the right-of-way. I think that there may have been a forwarding unit in the prior February resolution to carry into effect the letter of intent that binds the City to sell property in the URA area to buy it. In order to condemn the property there are certain things that have to be approved. A lot of those are made easier by having resolutions adopted by the City Council. It makes it so the litigation is easier, faster and more economical to the City. I don't know that it's absolutely necessary for the authority to proceed but after the findings it does make life a lot easier. And it also directs that we talk to the buyers of the mall. They said that they're not particularly interested at this time in giving up the right-of-way so we're going to have to work at this. It's going to take a little talking and negotiating.

Mayor Daoust asks we need to do this in your opinion?

Ed Trompke states in my opinion yes it moves the ball forward and makes my life a lot easier in getting the condemnation file. It's time consuming to do. This would be a good idea to do. I need this.

Councilor Allen states we have a binding agreement that says the City is going to pay for this right-of-way. Can you clarify?

Ed Trompke responds if we do a condemnation that means that we have to pay for it in some way, shape or form. We also had meetings with Bobby Lee and ODOT who have a loan program. We are proceeding with that as ways to fund the acquisition and pay for it out of the TIF. We also are beginning the conversations with bond Council and Urban Renewal Agency bond but we're nowhere near ready to say those thoughts have gotten anywhere. That also is a way to finance it directly with TIF and so that is how we intend to pay for it at this point in time. Depending on what the number is and what the time frame is if we're able to negotiate a purchase it may take a completely different form from a judge's order saying as of next Tuesday this property now belongs to the City.

Councilor Allen asks so this resolution doesn't say how payment is going to be done?

Ed Trompke responds no it doesn't at this point in time because we don't know how the payments will be made. It contemplates that it's going to be made through the TIF primarily if I recall.

Councilor Allen states we told the voters that we were going to use the sale of the property and developer contributions. If we use TIF money then I'm less concerned. As long as we meet our obligations and we do have a return on investment in 16 years.

Ed Trompke states we're really trying to keep this as conservative as we can as far as finances. It isn't me making all those decisions. It's the City Manager and the Finance Officer are looking at all of these things.

**MOTION:** Councilor Wilson moved to approve a resolution declaring the need to acquire right of way easement on property for the purpose of constructing street improvements for NW 257<sup>th</sup> Way. Seconded by Councilor Anderson.

**VOTE:** Councilor Ripma – Yes; Councilor Anderson – Yes; Councilor Morgan – Yes; Mayor Daoust – Yes; Councilor White – No; Councilor Allen – No; and Councilor Wilson – Yes.

**Motion Passed 5 – 2.**

**6. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:**

None.

**7. COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS:**

Mayor Daoust states the only thing I'll mention out of my list is the Troutdale Airport Advisory Committee is progressing along very nicely. The Port of Portland agreed to go along with advisory committee recommendation to keep the runway length at the longer length. So the runway length will be 4500 feet which was a very pleasant surprise to find out that the Port of Portland is going to agree to that. The additional discussion with the Port they would like to enter into an IGA with the City which we'll have to develop the bones behind that skeleton a little more as time goes on.

Councilor White states the mail we got from the post office apparently we're still in their sights. I don't know how serious that is or isn't but it did concern me so maybe we can get some feedback from staff on that at a future date.

Craig Ward states if I could address that briefly, I did follow up with staff and the PDC in particular and however polite that letter is they have moved ahead with purchasing a different property and they are not negotiating with us in any form anymore.

Councilor White states I saw a request for Councilors for an Ad Hoc Committee for looking at a 3 city recreation program and I thought that was a little concerning because we haven't even got any results back from parks.

Craig Ward states I too was surprised at that email today which I forwarded onto you. We don't, as far as I know, have the approved minutes from the Parks Advisory Committee which you referred that issue to. I don't know how the Council will choose to respond to that.

Councilor Allen states that is good news about the airport however it does concern me with the projected growth in the Portland area and the amount of business traffic we're expecting to get in the near future. It just seems like we should be friendlier to business jets and possibly expanding that runway instead of reducing it.

Mayor Daoust responds good point. That was discussed in length. A lot of pilots showed up and said leave the runway the way it is.

Councilor Wilson states this Saturday is the BSA Troop 174's annual pancake breakfast at Glenn Otto Park and also the Troutdale Lions annual Easter egg hunt at 10:00. The other thing that I have is that there was a recent Facebook page by one of the citizens of Gresham being very critical about Councilor Anderson and the rest of the Council and I would suggest to that person that they do their homework before they make accusations or be that critical because they are way off base and the information was incorrect.

**8. ADJOURNMENT:**

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

Meeting adjourned at 9:38pm.



**Doug Daoust, Mayor**

**Dated: 5/26/16**

**ATTEST:**



**Kenda Schlaht, Deputy City Recorder**

**CITY OF TROUTDALE**  
 City Council – Regular Meeting  
 7:00PM

**Monday, March 22, 2016**  
**PLEASE SIGN IN**

Name – Please Print	Address	Phone #
Carol Cusum	103 Normans St. Golden	80403 3036388870
Sharon Ezell	1737 SE Sandy Ct	503-666-7366
Bria Shurt + Ryan Shurt + Kyle Shurt	715 SW 28th St	503 830 1448
W. Bruce Wynn	TROUTDALE	503-661-1042
Rsb. Canfield	Troutdale	503-945-5271
Michael J. Chusick	26729 SE Stark	514-488-3021 1093
Paula & Dick Goldie	Troutdale (503)	665-5175
Steve Scott	401 SE 12th St Troutdale	871-285-7862
Kathryn Knebel	401 SE 12th St	503-915-2104
Susan Auer	2550 SW Indian Mary	503-667-4462
Brad Hummer	"	"
Claude & Penny Cruz	1097 E. Hist. Col. Riv. Hwy #123	503-705-7157
PAUL WILCOX	TROUTDALE	
Donna Morrison	TROUTDALE	
Zach Hudson	Troutdale	503-665-5439
Sandy Glantz	"	
Diane Coffey	Troutdale "May God Bless us all"	503-888-149
LARRY STATIONSON	TROUTDALE	503-319-7732
Shirley Prickett	Troutdale	503-667-5412