

**MINUTES**  
**Troutdale City Council – Regular Meeting**  
**Troutdale City Hall – Council Chambers**  
**219 E. Historic Columbia River Hwy.**  
**Troutdale, OR 97060-2078**

**Tuesday, February 10, 2015**

**1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Lead by Boy Scout Troop 174**

Mayor Daoust called the meeting to order at 7:01pm and asked for a representative from the Boy Scouts to lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

**2. ROLL CALL, AGENDA UPDATE**

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

**ABSENT:** None.

**STAFF:** Craig Ward, City Manager; Debbie Stickney, City Recorder; Ed Trompke, City Attorney; Erich Mueller, Finance Director; and John Morgan, Planning Director.

**CONSULTANT:** Doug MacCourt, Ater Wynne, LLP

**GUESTS:** See Attached.

Mayor Daoust requested that the work session scheduled to take place following this meeting be postponed.

No objections voiced by the Council.

**3. PROCLAMATION: Proclaiming February 2015 as Scout Month.**

Mayor Daoust read the Proclamation.

**4. PUBLIC COMMENT: Please restrict comments to non-agenda items at this time.**

Paul Wilcox, resident, stated at the January 27, 2015 Regular Council meeting the Council on a 4-2 vote, with one absent, approved proceeding with the Barney and Worth contract providing services to explore funding options in the form of taxes or fees for Troutdale street maintenance. Since that is a done deal, I have no further comments on that decision per se.

However, what I'd like to speak to is how that decision came about. On September 9, 2014, at a Council work session, the Public Works Director and a consultant gave a presentation on the condition of Troutdale streets. The gist of the message was that current income was inadequate to maintain streets in a satisfactory condition. The Council instructed the Public Works Director to come back to them with a plan to address the shortfall in available funds. Four months later, on January 13, 2015, another work session was held on the topic. This is when the Barney and Worth proposal was introduced. After considerable discussion, the Council opted to place approval of a contract with Barney and Worth on the consent agenda for the January 27 Regular Council meeting.

To those not familiar with a consent agenda, it basically amounts to a rubber stamp approval, intended for non-controversial actions, such as approval of minutes from previous meetings. At the January 27 Regular Meeting Councilor White expressed that he felt further discussion was warranted on the subject, and the resolution was moved to the regular agenda. This provided an opportunity for the public to observe the discussion that had not been previously available without attending a work session in person. We have now come full circle. With all of the above in mind, I'd like to point out some aspects of the entire process. **1.)** Work sessions are not video recorded. This may have the effect of denying some citizens the ability to observe their Council in action. Both of the above mentioned work sessions were preceded by regular council meetings, which are video-recorded. **2.)** Public comment is not invited at work sessions. **3.)** In this sequence of meetings, the January 13 work session was immediately followed by the January 27 Regular meeting, with no intervening meetings at which public comment would have been possible. In fact, tonight is the first opportunity that has been available. **4.)** A major decision was made at the January 13 work session, but since that meeting was not video-recorded, some citizens may have been denied access. Not everyone is comfortable listening to an audio recording of the proceedings, or even have the capability to do so. I'd also point out that the minutes published are not a verbatim transcription of everything that was said. Now, to the Council. I would strongly encourage you to incorporate agenda items that involve a potentially controversial decision to be addressed in a video-recorded regular meeting to maximize public exposure, rather than in a work session. I would also urge you to reserve the use of the consent agenda for routine items which do not call for a roll-call vote.

**5. PUBLIC HEARING / ORDINANCE (Introduced on 10/28/2014):** An ordinance approving the First Amendment to the Troutdale Riverfront Renewal Plan to extend Plan duration, and redevelopment assistance.

Erich Mueller, Finance Director, stated there have been a number of meetings related to this item providing the opportunity for the Council to discuss it. It began with a discussion with the Council back on June 17, 2014. There were additional discussions back in October with the Urban Renewal Agency (URA) Board. This ordinance itself was first introduced in October. There was a second hearing scheduled in November which was postponed until tonight so that we could have the opportunity to provide some more information to the public regarding the changes. There were articles published in the Champion Newsletter and an additional work session was held last night discussing the

key parts of the proposed amendment. This is an amendment that we have talked about for more than six months.

To clarify, this amendment is to extend the date by which we have to incur the maximum indebtedness under the Plan. It is intended to provide the URA more time to pursue implementation of the goals in the adopted Plan. It provides the benefit and flexibility for the URA to pursue those. It has not been requested by any particular private party. It was initiated as a result of reviewing our Plan with our urban renewal consultant and bond counsel to determine what options the City might have related to that deadline. It is not intended, nor is it specifically tied to any particular developer or any particular property owner in the Urban Renewal Area. With that summary I am happy to answer questions of the Council.

Mayor Daoust asked if Doug MacCourt could talk about what was discussed at the work session last night; extending the Plan duration and what that communicates to the development and financial communities that we are working with.

Doug MacCourt, Ater Wynne, stated I am on contract with the City of Troutdale as your Special Urban Renewal Agency Counsel. There are a couple of things to keep in mind as the Council makes this decision on extending the URA timeline in order for the benefits of the URA, in particular the tax increment financing, to be available to any party that meets the requirements set by the URA for the redevelopment area.

As we discussed last night, urban renewal is a long-term process. Any development project of this magnitude is a long-term process that involves multiple parties and multiple elements of financing. Those elements include bond debt, bank debt, investment by private parties or by the City in the form of support and entitlements, and state and federal tax considerations. All of those elements are looked at by any developer, whether it is the one that the City is currently talking to or another developer. They look at the landscape and the foundations for the URA, in particular the timeline for which they have to plan their financial package and structure. The longer that timeline can be, up to the limit imposed by Oregon State law, in this case 10 years, the better because it allows all of those different entities that will participate in the financing of the project to figure out at what point they can come into the deal. They are all in it to try and maximize their participation; they are doing it to make money and to help make the project a reality, but they don't all come in at once. Some may come in prior to construction and some may come in solely for construction. Even if the property is sold in the next six months construction won't occur for probably the next three years. Some will come in after the bond debt or to bring in bond debt after the bank debt is retired so they can get a lower interest rate; those people will be in 5 to 10 years. But they all need to look at the landscape for what the URA provides in order to plan their participation in the project at this point. That is a snap shot at how the private financing works.

When we talk about the public support for this project it includes the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). It includes the participation of a variety of state and federal natural resource agencies like the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife and the parties interested in the trail, which is part of the planning that the City has

engaged in during the first ten years of this project. It includes the Economic Development Department of the State of Oregon, now known as Business Oregon. All of these entities, when this original concept was being developed, looked at and knew that the URA authority of the City of Troutdale was a key component, and a key component of that was the tax increment financing and the ability for the URA with its benefits to attract private investment. This is a classic public-private partnership. All of those agencies I just mentioned are very eager to see the City take an action tonight that gives the maximum flexibility to anyone who may be interested in working with the City. That not only includes the primary sponsors on the development side, but all of the contractors, subcontractors, and all of the people in the City of Troutdale who can benefit from this. And that we believe is accomplished through extending the URA authority for the next ten years.

Councilor Wilson asked on the changes in the UR Plan, the wording in some of the sections, can you explain why those are necessary?

Erich Mueller stated the particular changes are attached to the ordinance. The change in Section 1 - Introduction is related to what the duration of the Plan is. Originally when the Plan was adopted it was for 10 years, this amendment would extend it to 20 years in total. Changes in Section II Goals and Section III Outline of Projects, makes it clear and explicit the ability of the URA to participate in the redevelopment efforts of property owners and developers to accomplish the goals of the Plan. It explicitly addresses the purchase of property, the financial assistance that the City can provide for redevelopment costs and other forms of assistance such as system development charges (SDC's), waivers or subsidies. That is also addressed in Section VI – Relationship to Local Objectives, to provide financial assistance for private redevelopment efforts. Section XI – Duration of Plan addresses the deadline for the indebtedness moving it from ten years to twenty years.

Councilor Wilson stated the changes will benefit all of the people that may become involved. It was written for a multitude of people not just...

Erich Mueller interrupted and stated it is not specific to any particular developer, private party, or property owner. It applies to anyone that would qualify, either currently or in the future, over the course of the duration that would participate with the URA with redevelopment efforts that are consistent with the goals of the Plan. That could be a current owner or a future owner.

Councilor Morgan stated in December this was tabled because the Council was going to do outreach; communicate with the public. A lot of folks weren't here yesterday to find out all of the nuances. In essence this is a lot of government talk. For the average citizen that voted for this nine years ago, what does doing this 10-year extension mean?

Doug MacCourt replied in a big picture sense what this extension will mean is that it lays a foundation to go from all of the planning, predevelopment, and preconstruction efforts that the City and a lot of other people have engaged in, to basically create the motivation for something to be done with the 20-acres of property that has sat foul for so long. We need to take it from a Brownfield site into something that produces revenue, something

that produces jobs. This extension essentially, in common language, allows a financing mechanism that creates another incentive. A property like this has obstacles and hurdles. We have tackled the environmental issues. We are almost on the verge of getting DEQ to approve the status of the property as clean and ready to build. Anything that you can do to provide incentives essentially lays the foundation for government to work with the private sector and for the parties to actually make this pencil out. The reason it has sat there for so long is that everyone that has looked at it has said there are too many obstacles; tax increment financing is great but we need to chip away at it. Now we have the ability to extend that out. Now that we are making progress, getting the environmental issues solved, bringing in excitement around what this vision might look like, engaging the community, talking to the City and the citizens, we are creating the ability and the timeframe for both the remaining preconstruction activities to take place, construction and starting to generate those tax revenues.

Councilor Morgan stated regardless of who we eventually come into a transaction with.

Doug MacCourt replied that is correct.

Councilor Morgan asked we are not doing this because of one person or another, we would be doing this regardless?

Doug MacCourt replied absolutely. That is clear if you look at the authority for the URA, and if you look at the planning that has been done. This doesn't have a particular persons finger prints on it. The other thing to think about is even if the primary sponsor who we are working with today continues in that role, it won't be one or two more years before they bring people in who may take majority positions in this project because very few developers and sponsors take out their checkbook and write a check for \$20 million and bankroll the whole thing. Very few businesses have that ability and this one is probably no different. That is the way business gets done; you bring in various partners who may be the new face of this project in two years. It may get sold. Businesses evolve and change. That is the reality of these kinds of projects.

Councilor Morgan stated we are on the Regional Solutions Board as a priority; there are state, local and other grants. What would happen if we don't do this tonight?

Doug MacCourt replied this project has been identified as one of the State's priority projects by the Governor's Regional Solutions Team. The Governor doesn't sit on that Board. It is comprised of people from a variety of different agencies and we participate actively on that. What they do is essentially they put their arms around all of the state agencies that may have a role, and reach out to federal agencies, and say lets move in the same direction so that we can get to the goal for the City of Troutdale. They know it takes a long time and that there are hurdles. We've encountered those and met those challenges, but they have also made it clear that they need to continue to see the City engaged and acting in the best interest of the citizens and on what we need to do to continue to keep that opportunity open for anybody who is ready to step up to the plate and help. That may continue to be the current partner that we are working with, that may be another entity. I appreciate you pointing that out. They have been very helpful and

have expressed their desire to continue to help us and continue to keep this on the top of their (State of Oregon) list with all of those agencies led by the Regional Solutions Team. But they need to see signs periodically from us that we are understanding the challenges and meeting those and responding in a way that continues to create that level playing field.

Councilor Anderson stated if I am looking at this there is one phrase that pops out throughout the entire amendment – financial assistance. It sounds like we are writing checks every way we possibly can. I don't believe that is the case, but I would like you to explain what financial assistance means, and what the process is for a potential developer who might enlist us for financial assistance; what they will have to go through.

Doug MacCourt asked are you talking primarily about the tax increment financing assistance?

Councilor Anderson replied I am looking throughout this entire document – support private development and redevelopment through assistance; plan also allows for financial assistance for private redevelopment; it is the intention of the Plan to stimulate. It is all the way through this.

Doug MacCourt stated the primary financial assistance here is to create the ability to allow the increment from the increased tax value to be shifted to the URA and used for the purpose of stimulating development here and to do the kinds of things that cities do like help build the infrastructure and the kind of public services that a development needs. The fascinating thing about tax increment financial assistance is, it is not the City writing a check. What it is, is based upon the increase in property values that result from the development that occurs and taking that increased value and putting it back into the system. Some cities use system development charges. Some cities use a variety of fees and other taxes. In this case, and there may be a variety of those types of things that come down road, but what we are talking about tonight is laying the groundwork and extending the authority for that tax increment finance to be this primary financial assistance. Did I misstate that Erich?

Erich Mueller replied that is fine. The nature of the financial assistance is not at this point clear because there is not a clear more fully matured plan, so we couldn't point to anything specific that the Agency might expend money on. What I had mentioned in some of the previous work sessions that is commonly done in urban renewal agencies is there will be a development, it will incur significant impact on the infrastructure and there can be an agreement where the developer and the Agency share the costs to have the City install that infrastructure. There can be SDC's that are going to be due because of the impact on the utility services and an urban renewal agency can subsidize the cost of some of those SDC charges. Those are some of the more common choices. There is much more variety and flexibility available to an urban renewal agency in terms of how to spend the increment money to stimulate development in particular toward achieving the goals of the plan than there is for a standard city entity. Cities don't have that degree of flexibility. That is again part of the tool kit that an urban renewal agency entity has. I can't tell you

precisely what it might be spent on because we don't have a more mature development plan that we can point to.

Doug MacCourt stated one thing I would add, and this is a slightly different factor to get at your question, again it is not writing checks but it is capitalizing on the checks the City has already written. I used the term brownfield, which is just simply a classic commercial or industrial facility that is vacant or dramatically underused as this one is because of real or perceived problems. Based on all of the work that we have done environmentally so far, they've largely been perceived problems. The other thing that makes this a classic brownfield project, to get to your issue, is there is a lot of sunk capital that the City of Troutdale and all of its partners like ODOT and the County have already spent putting roads to this site, putting utilities in like storm drainage, sewer utilities, and power utilities that cross this site. That is the reason why this kind of development is becoming so attractive in the State of Oregon and really across the nation, because what they are finding at the end of the day when they run the budgets and balance sheets is they are taking advantage of the fact that millions of dollars were spent building those roads, putting those utilities in, and getting the private property owners to issue easements to the city. That will become a significant budget benefit from this site that greenfield sites simply don't have.

Councilor Ripma stated as I understand it, this set of amendments, particularly the ones that Erich was just talking about – supporting private development and so on, allows us to do it but doesn't require us to do anything.

Erich Mueller replied correct.

Councilor Ripma stated that is what I am understanding. It just amends the Plan to allow for it if it seems like a good idea when later we are presented with an opportunity along the lines you discussed, but it doesn't require us to do anything.

Erich Mueller replied it doesn't commit you to spend any money; you are not spending any money tonight.

Councilor Allen stated as we are speaking here this has two parts to it that are primarily the changes before us, and one is the ability to support financial assistance for private development. Do we have an idea of what is expected from us? Do we have a cap on how much money we spend on it?

Erich Mueller replied we spoke last night on the cap of resources available to the URA. The two primary sources that were outlined as part of the financial feasibility in the 2006 Report on the Plan were going to come from the sale of real estate and the \$7 million of maximum indebtedness of which we are simply extending the deadline under which to be able to access that. Those are the two primary sources. We don't have a hard number as to what those resources are necessarily going to be. What we would spend it on goes back to when we get a more fully developed development plan from either this partner or a subsequent partner that outlines what they plan to do. They will likely identify some of the areas where they would in particular like City participation. The Council is then going

to be confronted with how to allocate those resources. We don't have a hard number; there is not an infinite amount of resources available certainly.

Doug MacCourt stated I don't have numbers for you. We could go back through the financial forecasting that we did for roughly what we anticipated a \$20 million project to be. We know that there are going to be some significant infrastructure investment needs. I guess I would go back to something that Councilor Ripma identified when he asked the question, are we being forced to actually spend any money, the answer is no. Are we being forced to do anything in particular by this extension, the answer is no. The Council is in control of the negotiations for every item that would become a budgetary issue or impact to the City as we walk through and get more definition to the plan and we see what the purchase and sale agreement conditions are going to look like, how far we can push the private entities, how much money we can make them spend and where that breaking point is. And improvements that are traditionally a function of local government, how we can participate in funding those with the maximum participation of the private entity. With all of that the point of my comment is, the City Council and the URA is in control of that; that is going to be a subject of negotiation of the purchase and sale agreement, and this body with the input of the citizens of Troutdale gets to structure that deal. That deal is not on the table tonight; this is essentially the platform to allow those negotiations to go forward.

Councilor Allen stated since we don't have an amendment predefined, and we don't necessarily know what is expected of us, or what will be developed, do we have an idea of what our breakeven point will be? How many years out? Are we targeting 10 years, 15 years, 20 years?

Erich Mueller replied when you say breakeven, the tax increment is designed to collect the tax on the increased assessed value that results from the development that occurs. We are limited in the amount of that tax increment we can collect up to the point which we retire the maximum indebtedness. So the timeframe depends on the maturity of the bonds that we end up issuing, how much additional assessed value is created. Very simplistically presumably a \$50 million hotel addition to the assessed value would presumably cause us to collect the increment half as long as it would take for a \$25 million hotel addition to the assessed value. Either way we are only allowed to collect enough to repay the \$7 million of indebtedness plus the interest costs of financing that. Once that is collected and retired that is when it goes back to the larger picture of why all of the other taxing jurisdictions have to agree in the beginning to allow an urban renewal agency to go into place, because they don't get any of that tax revenue during that timeframe that we are collecting the increment on that increased value. The reason that other jurisdictions are supportive from a concept standpoint is the theory is that you're going to end up at the end of the timeframe with a greater development and larger tax base than would have happened if that development was not supported and stimulated through these development efforts. They have the tradeoff of being willing to forego collecting on the increased value to allow the debt to be repaid and at the end all of a sudden there is an increased value that goes onto the tax rolls and they see an increase in what they receive. The timeframe will depend on when we do it and how long the finance timeframe is.

Councilor Allen stated the money that we spend above the indebtedness we will not get back in the tax increment.

Erich Mueller replied correct.

Councilor Allen stated however, because the property is developed we will receive additional taxes normally that we don't have now and that would help pay or reimburse us, when I think of it that way, for an investment into this.

Erich Mueller replied the City of Troutdale is just like all of the other jurisdictions, the school district, county, etc. The City itself has a portion of the tax revenue it normally would receive diverted to the URA. Right now, because the development hasn't yet occurred, this year's tax increment collection is expected to be about \$180,000. Of that about \$39,000 is money that would have come to the City if the URA wasn't in place. It goes back to the discussion we had about the division of tax. It is money that the citizens would have paid anyway to us, but instead it is being diverted to the URA. Just like all of those other jurisdictions, once the project is over the City will see an increase in tax revenue.

Councilor Allen stated when you don't know how much money we are expected to put into it, or how much we will put into it, and we don't know what will be developed, the next best thing is to at least target at some point when you are going to break even.

Erich Mueller stated targeting a breakeven point depends on knowing what values you would put into that equation. Not knowing what we would spend, the timeframe over which the debt would run and not knowing what the additional assessed value would be, I could come up with forty-five different breakeven points any one of which could be just as valid as another. Until we have some of those numbers known there is no way to estimate that.

Councilor Morgan stated is it safe to say that in a way the purchase and sales agreement, everything is hypothetical.

Doug MacCourt replied well certainly the firm details of the deal are hypothetical. One thing I would add is unlike many urban renewal area projects that I have seen both in this state and in other states, the amount of planning that will define what goes out there that has been done by the City of Troutdale under the first nine years of this urban renewal authority is significantly greater than a lot of cities and counties engage in. The Sandy River Plan is an example. We are seeing elements already come together in conceptual discussions that blend all of that work that has been done by the City with the help of the citizens over the last nine years, to define some of those issues. I think it has more definition that will lead us in these discussions to the exact numbers. Remember we are also in the process of engaging a traffic study. One of the key components of this is traffic access, impact to the existing capacity of the facilities, and what may be needed to handle the additional trips. We are going to get that information very soon. All of the work that we have engaged in is helping to define and get at those answers. I think this project has more certainty and finality than a lot of urban renewal projects at this stage in the game.

When I first started working on this project, or hearing about it when we were working on the first phase of the Troutdale Reynolds Industrial Park with the Port of Portland, the conversation at that point was it was very difficult to get even the adjacent property owner interested in having a conversation about the future of that property. That is a classic brownfield thing as well. They are paying low property taxes so they can just let it sit; it is not causing them any headache to do nothing with it. In the short span of a couple of years that conversation has turned from essentially a lack of interest to the private property owner adjacent to the City's property interested in driving the entire deal. That is exactly what you want; you want to turn this from absentee and absent property owners to active participants. Again, those numbers will be flushed out. I am trying to give you a sense that this project has a lot more definition around the edges than a lot of projects at this stage.

Mayor Daoust opened the Public Hearing at 7:49pm and asked, is there anyone present that would like to speak to us on this subject?

Paul Wilcox, resident, stated I was at the work session last night and I totally agree that the 10-year extension should go forward. That seems to be the key critical element of this ordinance. Councilor Anderson actually noted the same items that I did. The sentence that first appears on Page 5 (of Exhibit A), "The Plan also allows for financial assistance for private redevelopment accomplishing the goals of the Plan". I think that exact same sentence appears three times in the document. On page 10, "The Agency, with funds available to it, is authorized to provide financial assistance for redevelopment costs, provide other forms of assistance, and provide such other forms of financial assistance to property owners as it may deem appropriate in order to achieve the objectives of this Plan". That sounds pretty open-ended to me. The timing of this new language related to financial assistance and incentives, why wasn't this put in years ago? Right now it is being inserted in the middle of your negotiations with a potential buyer. It seems like it kind of expands the negotiation in some way. For example, in the staff report it says the Agency could financially subsidize developers in SDC fees as a redevelopment incentive. A developer may see "could" and read that as "will". So I disagree with Councilor Ripma on that. That becomes an expectation. There is one item in the ordinance, it is not a change, it is anticipated that the property acquired will be sold to a developer to complete anticipated redevelopment activity on this site within 36 months of acquisition. I am wondering how strict that requirement is. Is that a request, suggestion or an actual legal requirement? There has been a point made that the extension doesn't affect the \$7 million credit line, that is what I refer to it as. The problem I see with that is in 2006 when this was passed there was a projection of what could be done with that \$7 million. There must have been certain projects in mind that the \$7 million would cover. My point is here we are going on nine years later and \$7 million isn't worth \$7 million anymore; it is more like \$5 million with inflation. So you have a loss there.

Bob Strebin, resident, stated there have been a lot of questions on this entire project published by NW Connection and there have never been any answers to those questions. They were good questions. There are a lot of questions about this project and there just seems to be so many pitfalls. I don't know why they couldn't be answered. There were a lot of words said that everything is going to be transparent. When published questions

come out but answers never appear that is a bad sign. I am also really concerned about this tax increment financing. The citizens of Troutdale are going to have to make up the difference from the money that is going into urban renewal, and the citizens are going to have to support the City whereas the development really should be. We are going to be subject to a lot of increase in taxes. Multnomah County wants to build a new courthouse and we are going to pay for that. Metro is going to be building a hotel and we are going to be paying for that. Reynolds wants to build two new schools and we are going to be paying for that. Then the fiasco with the police department, which we are going to be paying for for a long time, and now you want to contract that out. That puts a lot of questions in a lot of folk's minds. The City of Gresham is going to be building another fire department, so our fire charges are probably going to go up. I wonder if the citizens of Troutdale are not really going to be on the hook for this \$7 million because you're expecting a lot of really high end development out there and I don't really see how it is going to happen. They talk about boutique hotels, that is what McMenamins is and they are good. On this property you are going to be right next to a freeway and a railroad. No boutique is going to be near any of those places, so the chances of this project really producing like everybody thinks, I don't think has a real good possibility. The City land is already cleaned up, already has access. The City should just put it up for sale. It is the other property with the other owner that has all of the problems. Maybe that property owner ought to deal with his problems and then put that up for sale. There are all of these complications that I really worry about. And this extra money that can go in, I don't know, was that going to go to the City Council or will the URA just be able to write the check. I really would like to see answers to a lot of questions.

Mayor Daoust closed the Public Hearing at 8:00pm.

Councilor Allen stated I hear our budget is tight. There will be a gap between when we incur debt and when there is enough tax increment to cover the money borrowed. How are we planning on covering this period of time?

Erich Mueller replied the specifics are yet to be defined. I have presented in previous Budget Committee meetings the projection showing a difference between when we would borrow and when there would be sufficient increase assessed value to provide the increment for the debt service. The specifics of that depend on when that timing is and how quickly the increment will come onboard. Part of what has been portrayed as part of the possible approaches is whether we structure the financing in different manners, whether we take out the \$7 million in stages, or whether the project as it gets more fully developed is developed in stages allowing us to match that. Another option is how you structure the bonds, whether we do something like an interest only series of payments for a number of years before we start retiring the principle amount of the debt allowing the construction phase to occur, the assets to then be placed into service and go onto the tax rolls and start to generate the increment revenue. The specific timing and dollar magnitudes are things that I don't have any certainty of at this point and time. To answer the other part of your question, yes then the City is the one that is making up the difference between what that debt service payment is for that particular year and what we are able to collect through the increment from the URA. What the magnitude of that gap is, I can't tell you without knowing some of the values.

Mayor Daoust asked Mr. MacCourt, do you have any replies to the public comments made?

Doug MacCourt stated I think you just actually addressed in part one of the key comments from the last speaker about will the citizens be required to pick-up the difference. Erich explained what that difference might be in debt service if there is a debt anticipated, or projected deficiency, or deficiency from the projections. Erich did a good job with that.

One thing that the first commenter asked about, and I am not sure what document he was pointing to when he was discussing the 36 months development period, but what I thought the question was going to was something that we have talked about quite a bit which is how long is this going to take. Is there a way to make sure that it stays on track and keeps moving? The answer is absolutely yes. The URA, through the Oregon Statutes has the ability to set a reasonable timeframe for development to occur once the purchase takes place. That could be 36 months, it could less or more. That is subject to when we see the elements of the deal come together and that purchase take place.

I think Erich addressed the credit line question, or characterized it.

I have empathy with the first commenter, some developers do try to raise their expectations. I think Erich in his staff report had to say accurately that the City has the authority or could support certain types of subsidy, they don't have to but they could. I know a lot of developers will look at that and take every opportunity to say well you said you could do it so can you please do it. That is always a subject of negotiation. I know from my time with this Council that they are going to be very attentive to making sure that those same questions are being asked back to the developer whoever that is; not only can you do it but will you do it. I would agree, in the response we gave to Councilor Ripma, there are no requirements to spend any money at this time; that is a certainty and that answer is black and white. Will people have different expectations? Sure they will and it is our job to manage those.

Erich Mueller stated I would add to that aspect of it urban renewal agencies have been around for quite a few decades in lots of locations in Oregon. The flexibility and the creativity that they have exhibited in terms of how they use money to leverage and incentivize development are far broader than even some of what we have mentioned here. The aspect of mentioning something like system development charge subsidies is not something that is going to be news to the development community. They are well aware that this is something that occurs in urban renewal agencies. They also know that in negotiations there are all kinds of chips on the table and they are going to be moved around depending on the nature of the deal.

The other aspect that was commented on earlier about the text in the language, we had one consultant who was involved when the Plan was initially developed, and we had an attorney involved when it was initially developed and both of those folks have gone into retirement and are no longer in the practice of this. As we reviewed the documents with our current URA Consultant they feel the language enhances what is already is in the

document and simply makes explicit and clear the ability to do so. It occurs in multiple places because there are multiple places where we talk about goals or land uses or accomplishing of policies or the project descriptions. That is some of why it is there. The language is repeated simply to try and be consistent each time it is referenced rather than being unique each time.

Doug MacCourt stated what I am hearing you ask regarding the language is are we adding a lot of things right in the middle of property negotiations that might be seen as enticements or something like that, or was this already in the Plan? I understand the answer as being that we are restating things that were essentially key parts of the Plan from the beginning.

Erich Mueller replied they were key parts of the Plan and what was expected, and in some cases they were assumed or implied so we are trying to make it clear and explicit. They are all specific in terms of what is allowed for under the statute. We are simply trying to make the Plan clear that these capabilities are there. This all started, again not from the request of any particular private party, developer or property owner at all, this was stimulated from a review done by our UR Consultant and Bond Counsel that we engaged as we looked at what the options were in dealing with the 10-year extension. None of these changes have come from anywhere outside of city staff, and city staff consulted resources.

Doug MacCourt stated these concepts were in the original Plan, they have been flushed out and they are important to where we started and where we are going.

**MOTION: Councilor Anderson moved to adopt an ordinance approving the First Amendment to the Troutdale Riverfront Renewal Plan, to extend the Plan duration, and redevelopment assistance. Seconded by Councilor Wilson.**

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

**Motion Passed 6-1.**

Councilor Morgan stated though that passed, I just hope that Council listens to what Paul said at the onset and what Mr. Strebin said as well. We promised the citizens that we would reach out to them. A few articles in a couple of papers to me doesn't suffice the questions and the confusion that is still out there. To quote you, you used the words "misinformation" and "outreach" as two things to do to clear the air. I just hope that the Council is willing to uphold what they said in December and do so.

Mayor Daoust stated we will talk about an example of how to do that under council communications tonight.

## **6. DISCUSSION: Urban Agriculture Troutdale Development Code updates.**

John Morgan, Planning Director, stated you have a public hearing coming up on this proposed code amendment at your next meeting. I just want to brief you on the changes and what to expect. You will recall that this matter came before you late last year with a request from McMenamins Inc. to initiate this amendment. This ordinance will amend the Town Center Overlay Zone. It is not specific to the McMenamins' property, it affects every property that is zoned Town Center even though it was initiated by McMenamins. The intent is to amend the code to allow agriculture as an allowed use in that zone. It is not allowed now; you couldn't create a commercial farm in this zone. There are three changes that are in the proposed amendment as forwarded to you and recommended to you by the Planning Commission (PC) who did hold a hearing on this last month.

I want to briefly review each of the changes. I first want to talk about the second one which is an amendment to the purpose statement. This was not part of the initial work, it is one that was proposed by a Planning Commissioner and it was passed by the PC. The amendment to the purpose statement removes, "*consistent with the Metro 2040 Growth Concept for town centers*". There was some sense from the PC that this language wasn't necessary and it should come out of the zone.

Going back to the particular intent of the amendment, two things are being proposed. One is amending the definition section of the Code by adding a definition of urban agriculture, which is called "*local food production use*". It is a fairly lengthy definition of what local food production use means. The PC did add the last sentence which reads, "*Food does not include any substances regulated by the Controlled Substances Act enacted by the United States Congress.*" You can understand where they were coming from with that. That was probably a good preemptive move on their part.

The next amendment is to the list of permitted uses in that zone and it adds "*local food production uses on lots or parcels one acre in size or larger, provided no poultry or livestock, other than household pets, shall be housed within 100 feet of any residence other than a residence on the same lot*".

This says that in the TC Overlay Zone urban agriculture is allowed, which is any crop but it also allows a limited allowance for livestock. There is a pretty good chance at the staff level we will offer some language that might define that better. There was some concern raised by the PC about allowing livestock. They couldn't come to an agreement. They did make a Findings of Facts and they are concerned and they want you to pay some attention to it. There was some public testimony that raised questions about it. I will probably come back to you with recommendations for ways to better define what a small scale livestock operation is, which is really what McMenamins' intent is if they ever do livestock. That will probably be the most controversial part of the discussion that you might have. When this is adopted it will allow McMenamins to do what they wish on their property. They are targeting the piece of property on Halsey across from their facility, but it does allow this kind of use to happen anywhere in the TC Overlay.

Councilor Ripma asked is this limited strictly to the TC Overlay?

John Morgan replied yes.

Councilor Ripma asked and it doesn't affect agriculture, Fujii's farming operations?

John Morgan replied none whatsoever. Nor does it apply to the General Commercial Zone in any other location in the community. It is only in the TC where this applies.

Councilor Anderson asked what was the vote of the PC on this?

John Morgan replied I think with the amendments it ended up being unanimous. The vote to amend the purpose statement, I don't think that was unanimous, but the final vote on the entire package was unanimous.

Councilor Wilson asked the URA is in the TC Overlay and it could be changed into farming, correct?

John Morgan replied yes. I think it is important to realize that this allows it. One of the things that the PC talked about was that it probably will only happen if it makes economic sense as part of a larger use. Because in of itself you are not going to use a commercial parcel with its value to grow corn. But you might if it is part of a restaurant operation or something like that; an adjunct use.

Councilor Wilson stated when we originally went into negotiations with the County on this property, I understand the intent was to build a hotel and turn this into a retail center. That was part of why everybody was so interested in selling it at that time to McMenamins. Then once the transaction got completed it is like they decided they wanted to do this. I am not real sure that is the best use for that property.

Mayor Daoust stated Councilor Wilson is right with some of the components of it, but they've always talked about farming, a vineyard and producing food on what used to be called the "pig farm".

John Morgan stated our understanding, and I can't speak for them other than what I hear, is it's a 13 acre parcel and they are not going to use all 13 acres for agriculture. Agriculture just becomes an adjunct to other things that might occur on the property. They have talked about a farm to table in one place kind of operation, so the idea of a hotel and restaurant down there where you can pick your own cabbage and have it cooked at the table and that kind of thing. It is part of an experiential thing that McMenamins is interested in. We have asked that they be present at the hearing, so your question might be better answered by them next week.

Councilor White asked so this won't affect any tax base, it is just adding an additional use for the property?

John Morgan replied right.

Councilor Wilson stated I feel the tax base would be different if it was used for farming than it would be if they built retail stores.

John Morgan replied the value might be impacted. But again this is adjunct to a larger commercial operation. We are not experts on how it would be assessed.

Ed Trompke stated the assessment for farm deferral is easy outside of an urban growth boundary, but inside an urban growth boundary it would be unlikely to get an agricultural deferral for this kind of a property especially where it is a commercial property. We are told that McMenamins is intending to develop other non-agricultural uses on the property, and this is an accessory or adjunct to their main purpose of having the property. I think they said it may get farmed for a year to three years while they are planning what they actually do, but it would become an adjunct use. Their intention is not to turn this into a farm, it is to be something else with a farm adjunct to it. The assessor's office has pretty strict rules for getting a farm deferral inside an urban growth boundary. It is pretty hard to do.

Councilor White asked how was the Multnomah County CROPS program able to do agriculture on that property without this in place?

Craig Ward replied I talked to somebody from the CROPS program today and that has been an interim use that has been permitted on an annual basis. It is my understanding that McMenamins intends to continue to have the CROPS program on the property even after they do this. We need to address that and determine whether or not an annual permit for CROPS will still be necessary once this is presumably approved.

## **7. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS**

Craig Ward, City Manager, stated we have a franchise with Waste Management that expires at the end of this calendar year. The franchise allows for an extension of up to two additional years. Staff needs Council direction on whether you prefer to just renew the existing franchise or go out for competitive bids. If we are going to go out for competitive bids we need to start the process soon, which is my purpose of bringing it forward tonight.

Councilor Wilson stated I don't think it would hurt to reach out.

Councilor White asked how much time do we have?

Craig Ward replied until the end of this calendar year.

Mayor Daoust stated when you say get competitive bids...

Craig Ward stated it means we have to prepare a Request for Proposals, prepare a detailed scope of work to go with that. We would have to follow our bid procedures, which is why we need direction soon because it takes quite some time. Once we go through that process to select the firm that we feel is best qualified, we then have to negotiate a

contract with them and that has to be in place in time for them to have the capacity to provide the service by this time next year.

Mayor Daoust asked we have had Waste Management for years and we are at this point right now because?

Craig Ward replied because the franchise is expiring.

Councilor Wilson stated I think our due diligence would be to just reach out and see if there is something else out there. If it was me that is what I would do personally, and I think that is what the City should do to see if there is something else out there that would be better for our citizens.

Councilor Anderson stated this is something that has come up in conversation between us individually for years. I think it would be very wise of us to go out and solicit other purveyors. No disrespect to Waste Management, but we have to exercise all of our options.

Councilor Morgan stated I agree.

***Craig Ward stated there is Council consensus on that I gather.***

Craig Ward stated as you will recall the County made a presentation to you not long ago regarding e-cigarettes and explained the dangers of these relatively unregulated products. The County is proposing an ordinance that would strengthen regulations on the sale of tobacco, particularly to minors. Under our Home Rule ordinance we have three choices: **1)** ignore the County code when and if they adopt it, which makes it non-effective within our city limits; **2)** we could adopt it by reference, concurring that the County ordinance will be in effect within our city limits; or **3)** take the County ordinance as a model ordinance and consider adopting our own ordinance.

Councilor Ripma asked has the County adopted something?

Craig Ward replied not yet.

Councilor White stated we've got into some trouble in the past with county ordinances and we stood up for home rule and I think we should continue down that approach, but I don't want to create extra work. Is there a balance there?

Ed Trompke stated the home rule ordinance that you adopted restated the general understanding of what home rule was before Multnomah County, and I think Lane County, took the position that home rule meant something different. I have seen some ordinances that were adopted, 15 to 20 years ago, which concur that a County ordinance should apply in the City because that is just the way things used to be done before home rule sort of got turned on its head. In terms of simply concurring, the home rule ordinance says the city council can concur that the County's ordinance should apply in the City. That is an easy way to do it. You could adopt the ordinance and then it would become effective

in the City but it would still be the County's ordinance. Or you could look at it, modify it and adopt a different version.

Councilor White stated to be consistent we are going to have to look at their ordinance and make it our own.

Councilor Anderson stated lets do that.

Councilor Morgan stated great.

Mayor Daoust stated the Council wants to write our own ordinance. Is that what I am hearing?

Councilor Allen stated I want to look at the County's ordinance,

Councilor Anderson stated lets look at what they have because we don't even know what they have.

Mayor Daoust stated when we look at their ordinance we may decide to just concur with it.

Craig Ward stated we will schedule a work session and bring it to you and then you can decide what action you want to take.

Craig Ward stated the Council recommended that one of our residents, Tanney Staffenson, serve as a member of the Sandy Drainage Improvement Co. Board of Directors. We were not aware at that time that in order to be on the Board of Directors each Director has to have property within the Sandy Drainage Improvement Co. District. Mr. Staffenson does not. However, the City could, by concurring tonight, make it clear that Mr. Staffenson is serving as an agent of the City; we do own property within the District. I am making you aware of it and asking for your preference.

***Council all agreed to clarify to the Sandy Drainage District that Tanney Staffenson is serving as an agent of the City.***

## **8. COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS**

Councilor Ripma stated on Sunday, February 15 at 2pm in the Sam Cox Building the Troutdale Historical Society is having another presentation. The presenter is Dodi Davies from the East County Historical Organization, formerly Fairview Historical Society. She will be talking about the Zimmerman House.

Councilor Anderson stated I previously mentioned that the Mayor made some great appointments to serve on the various advisory committees to work through these issues that are facing us. The one that excites me the most is the fire committee that Councilor Morgan and Councilor White are on. I have talked to both of them individually and they are working on some solutions as to how we can as opposed to why we can't. It is very

refreshing to hear the level of work that they are doing, the level of details going into it and the level of knowledge going into it. I don't know that it is going to bear fruit; I actually think that it is though. I would like to ask Craig or staff to give these guys every available minute that we have that they need of staff time and support to listen to what they have to say in regards to our fire, life, and safety issue here in Troutdale.

Craig Ward replied yes.

Councilor Morgan stated the Mayor and I visited Deane's Graphics in Vancouver a couple of weeks ago. They worked with me during my campaign. This was an information gathering trip, which we committed to the citizens to do throughout this project but we have currently piecemealed it or it's been hap-hazard. Out of due diligence to make sure we are doing the best we can and supporting Craig and staff to make sure we get the best product out, we thought this might be a good process to go forward with as a discussion point.

Mayor Daoust stated I handed this out last night, which outlines their proposal (a copy of the proposal is included in the packet). There are components of this that we can pick and choose. Basically they are talking about what they call the Urban Redevelopment Project Area. Developing a brand logo, doing some research, and development of a marketing plan. They do that in terms of dollars per hour so there is not a bottom-line dollar amount here. The first two subjects are about \$1,200. Then press releases and additional posts either monthly or bi-monthly are just in terms of how much we want to do. This is just that little added extra increment of public outreach because we felt we really needed it for the urban renewal area. You guys know that there are a lot of questions out there on the urban renewal area. Even though we had two people talk tonight, we know that there are more folks that probably have comments and concerns. What Councilor Morgan and I are looking for is just a green light for Craig or staff to start working with Deane's Graphics to determine what exactly we would like them to do. Councilor Morgan and I could help with that.

Councilor Morgan stated if memory serves, I am of the belief that some of this could or might be able to be paid for through some of our grants. I could be completely off base on that.

Craig Ward replied if it can we will certainly make sure that happens.

Councilor Anderson stated I am completely in favor of this.

Councilor Ripma asked is this going to start after we finally reach an agreement with someone? I worry about doing it while we are still struggling to put together a deal.

Councilor Morgan stated the real question is do we wait until we have a purchase and sales agreement before we answer people's questions in a format on our Facebook page, web page, and in press releases to help supplement some of that to make sure that we have it in a professional, thorough, well vetted process, which staff is struggling with right now with the eighteen other things we are throwing at them.

Councilor Wilson stated my feeling is that there is still a lot of outreach that needs to be done from tonight, and there are questions that we need to get answered as we move forward. I just feel we need to get some of the questions that people like Bob and Paul have clarified as best we can within the rules of what we are doing.

Councilor Ripma stated I guess my concern is spending public money looking like we are promoting the current negotiations going forward. I am not saying that is the plan, I am just worried about it looking like that because I think the Champion articles did look like that. Mayor, even though I know you did your level best to make it neutral, it did look like it was promoting the deal.

Councilor Wilson stated that is exactly why we need a professional company.

Councilor Anderson stated Councilor Ripma I agree with you. I think a third party will help in that regard. I think we are all sensitive to that.

Councilor Ripma stated if we are going to spend a little money to put something together, could we see it before it goes out. I actually just need to get a feel for what you are talking about.

Councilor Morgan stated the biggest thing is we just extended something for 10 years that the citizens voted for nine years ago and in many ways there is no clarity as to what that means, what the impact is, or what tax increment financing means. We owe it to the citizens to do an outreach like we said in December we were going to do. We have years of documents on our website for urban renewal. They are able to compile that, clarify it, condense it down into laymen's terms and easily disseminate it. That is the premise. It is objective on our city website though it might not be read or understood.

Councilor Allen stated I would like to understand what the checks and balances are to keep this from being a political message.

Councilor Wilson stated all we are doing is explaining what urban renewal is. We are not promoting a company.

Councilor Allen stated it is probably going to be used beyond urban renewal.

Councilor Wilson stated right now we need to explain what urban renewal is, and as Councilor Morgan mentioned, tax increment financing and where we are in the process with our piece of property. We don't have to promote anybody, just what the benefit is of urban renewal in the long run for the citizens.

Mayor Daoust stated it is not meant to be any political message and we promise it won't be.

Councilor Morgan stated there are 9 years of documents in urban renewal, and EPA and DEQ, and people might want an update about what has gone on. Or what no further

action from the State means, or what Regional Solutions is doing. We owe it to them because they voted for it and we haven't done anything for 9 years. If for no other purpose I think we should clarify what we are actually doing. They are our employer.

Councilor Ripma stated I am willing to give it a try. I do want to see it.

Councilor Wilson stated that is a fair request; that before anything gets printed we get to look at it.

Mayor Daoust stated we made the agreements that all of the political statements in the newspaper will come to a stop and we won't have to read some of the stuff that has been put in the papers before, which was not appreciated. This is not intended to be that. This is just public outreach and education. Like Councilor Morgan said, in December we promised we would do this. We will have to work with Craig to see exactly what we are going to have them do.

Councilor White stated we have a new business in town, The Troutdale Art Center. I was at the ribbon-cutting where the Mayor was the Master of Ceremonies. There are nine local artists working out of there and my wife happens to be one of them. They will be having a second Grand Opening because Rip Caswell and the owner Allison Brown were out of town.

Councilor Wilson asked Ed, in regards to having city councilors testify or make comments at the Planning Commission meetings, or any of the other committee meetings, what are our council rules on that, and how should we move forward with that?

Ed Trompke replied there are two rules that the Council adopted back in 1994. The first one says that council members must note whether they speak for themselves or for the council in written and oral communications to other officials, the public and the news media. People should identify themselves and say whether they are there authorized by the Council to speak or whether they are there on their own speaking on their personal relationship. There is a second rule that sort of contradicts that one that is stricter. Troutdale Municipal Code 2.08.250 – Relationships with committee and commissions – councilors have the right to attend meetings of city committees, commissions and task forces but should not become involved in discussions of those groups unless they are the liaison members of those bodies. So there is some restriction on the involvement of city councilors when appearing in front of a committee, commission or task force. Unless you have been appointed as a liaison by the council you shouldn't be involved in a discussion. But you can listen, and I am not sure how much you can speak because I don't know what the intention of "involved in a discussion" means. That is your rule and ultimately you will have to interpret what it means so I don't want to put my spin on that, but there is some restriction there and maybe you ought to discuss what that means.

Mayor Daoust stated I just recall the years I have been on the council with Paul Thalhofer (former Mayor), our interpretation of that was that we could attend the meetings but we should not speak, period. That was our interpretation of what you just read.

Councilor Wilson stated to move forward with this, the Councilor that was speaking said that they represented themselves but as their statement went on it was referring to codes and that some of them are garbage because there is so much in it. At the end of the statement they said this is why the Council has voted to ask the Commission to work on this. The way they started out I think they are speaking for themselves but in the end I felt they were representing the rest of the Council. I just feel that there has been a lot of times this last year that things have happened that shouldn't happen. Maybe it is with the best of intent, but if the rule is good for one of us it is good for all of us. I would just say that going to the committee/commission meetings that we need to sit and listen and lend our support by being there, but anything that we have to say to any of those people in council comments or at work sessions or anything else that we need to bring it up here so that we are all aware of what their concerns are. That was the only reason I brought it up, so that we all know what the rules are and what my feeling was about that meeting.

Mayor Daoust stated we all need to be reminded of the rules. I would suggest that we interpret it the same way that historically this Council has interpreted it in that you can attend those meetings but you should not speak, unless we decide to designate liaisons to every committee which we have not done so far.

Councilor White stated so if they are meeting on something that personally affects your residence, you are saying that if you are a Councilor you can't go in and represent yourself as a private citizen in that arena.

Councilor Wilson stated there is a legislative part of it, but I think the part that he talked about would be different wouldn't it?

Ed Trompke stated stepping outside of what the council rules in the City code says, generally in state law its allowed for an elected official to testify at any commission on legislative matters, but probably not on any quasi-judicial matters because the City Council sits as a court of appeal, if you will, where you might sit as a quasi-judge and if you do go and testify about something or participate in the hearings below you might be disqualifying yourself from sitting in a quasi-judicial capacity later. That is a more general state level, but at the city council level different rules apply. Maybe if the Council is interpreting the rules, if your personal property is affected maybe you should send an email to Council that says you would like to go speak and unless you hear otherwise you plan to because this does affect you. But just make sure that you follow the other rule that says I am here in my individual capacity and not as a councilor. That would require the Council to say that is an acceptable interpretation of this rule. That is just my suggestion as a possibility. I don't know that you want to adopt that right now, I think you ought to think about it. There may be other things that you want to say are inside or outside the rules and intent.

Mayor Daoust stated all of you will be receiving phone calls from Barney & Worth, the company that is doing the public outreach on the street funding. They want to interview each of us.

I have been designated the Vice-Chair of East Multnomah County Transportation Committee (EMCTC), and I am also the alternate for the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT). The first meeting of JPACT that I will be attending is this Thursday. They will be discussing post big earthquake infrastructure predictions. At the EMCTC meeting yesterday they decided on the Regional Transportation Option (RTO) grants and the Gresham Area Chamber of Commerce (GACC) and the West Columbia Gorge Chamber of Commerce (WCGCC) each will receive \$50,000 for their bicycle initiatives and bicycle hub program for all four cities.

February 26<sup>th</sup> is City Day at the Capitol. This is a day for us to go to the Capitol and talk with our Legislators. I haven't heard from Councilors if they want to go. Craig has already scheduled appointments with Representative Chris Gorsek and Senator Laurie Monnes Anderson, which are the two people we would visit with. Registration is due by 5pm on February 18<sup>th</sup>.

Councilor Allen and Councilor Morgan stated they would like to go.

Craig Ward asked is it the Council's intention that the expenses be borne out of your stipends, or that the City pick up the direct expenses for those of you attending? There is a small registration fee and incidental meals.

***Council agreed that the City would pay for these expenses.***

Mayor Daoust stated on March 12, 2015 we decided that we would have a volunteer recognition event at the Sam Cox Building. We started out only recognizing 5 volunteers and in talking with staff I would like to recognize all of the volunteers. To hold an hour meeting right before our regular council meeting to only recognize five people doesn't seem like it was recognizing our volunteers very well. We are planning on having a big event where all of the volunteers are invited, recognized and celebrated. In conjunction with this I tagged on the State of the City Address. There will be food and drinks. I would also like to have music. I have asked Frank Grande and his band if they were available to play that night and he said yes. I asked him how much he would charge and he said \$100 would give \$20 to each of the band members. I am asking for permission to pay Frank's band \$100 as part of the cost for this.

Councilor Morgan asked and the beverages will be non-alcoholic?

Mayor Daoust replied yes.

Councilor White stated my only concern about this when you first brought it up was that it wouldn't be televised. Are there any arrangements for that?

Mayor Daoust replied that will be arranged for.

***Council agreed to pay \$100 to Frank's band.***

Mayor Daoust stated I attended the Open House at Troutdale Elementary School and the Reynolds School Board was there talking about their \$125 million bond measure that they are going to put on the ballot for the May election. The purpose of the bond will be for safety and security issues in 13 schools. If the bond passes they are planning on replacing 3 elementary schools – Fairview Elementary, Wilkes Elementary and Troutdale Elementary. They will do some renovations and add new classrooms at Reynolds High School.

Councilor Wilson reminded the Council that there is a WCGCC meeting at Wood Village City Hall on Thursday at 7pm. Urban Renewal is one of the topics that will be discussed.

## **9. ADJOURNMENT:**

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

Meeting adjourned at 9:05pm.

**Doug Daoust, Mayor**

**Approved March 24, 2015**

**ATTEST:**

**Debbie Stickney, City Recorder**