

MINUTES
Troutdale City Council – Work Session
Troutdale City Hall – Council Chambers
219 E. Historic Columbia River Hwy.
Troutdale, OR 97060-2078

Tuesday, May 21, 2013

1. Roll Call

Mayor Daoust called the meeting to order at 6:31pm.

PRESENT: Mayor Daoust, Councilor Ripma (6:37pm), Councilor Anderson, Councilor Thomas (via phone at 6:36pm), Councilor White, Councilor Allen and Councilor Wilson.

ABSENT: None.

STAFF: Craig Ward, City Manager; David Ross, City Attorney; Debbie Stickney, City Recorder; and Travis Hultin, Acting Public Works Director.

GUESTS: See Attached.

Mayor Daoust stated before we get started with our published agenda item I would like to invite Patricia Smith, Mayor of Wood Village to come forward and speak to the Council.

Mayor Smith suggested that the cities of Troutdale, Wood Village and Fairview work together to hire an economic development director. This position is needed by all three of our cities. Gresham has an economic development director but they are looking out for Gresham. Our three cities are totally different than Gresham and we ought to be selling ourselves differently. We have so much to offer in our cities.

Mayor Smith provided a handout to the Council outlining the costs associated with this position (copy included in the packet).

Councilor White asked how much inventory is left in Wood Village?

Mayor Smith replied the dog track is the big one, and we have a few other small parcels.

Councilor Anderson asked wouldn't it be in your best interest to hire somebody that would just market the dog track for you?

Mayor Smith replied the dog track has been looked at by two potential buyers and neither of them wanted to pay what the owner is asking. We can't afford to pay for a full-time economic development director.

Councilor Anderson stated you could hire this person on a project basis and that would be their job. The bulk of our developable land is in the TRIP property. We just asked Lise Glancy from the Port of Portland if there was anything we could do to help them, and she said that when they need our help they will call us.

Mayor Daoust stated I invited Mayor Smith to come talk to us so that we could all hear her proposal and receive the cost information.

2. Discussion: Discussion on the Parks Capital Improvement Project List

Mayor Daoust stated we will review the Capital Improvement Project (CIP) list one park at a time and I would like us to focus on the larger ticket items. Public comment will be limited to 3 to 5 minutes. As we review each of the parks I would like to get consensus from the Council for the changes proposed to the CIP list so that staff has clear direction.

Craig Ward, City Manager, stated I would like to remind the Council that Charlie Warren was the last person to present this. Travis has courageously stepped into the void to try and assist you with this discussion. In many respects I would have preferred to collapsed the project list for each park and only showed the total estimated cost of all projects for each park, but in some cases it is important to show all of the projects because not everything on the list is SDC eligible. There are assumptions that go into the improvements to all of these different parks, but not all of them equally affect the SDCs. As the Mayor already pointed out, it is not our goal to go through and deal with the itemized elements of the parks. We are just showing you them to be faithful to the information previously presented and the assumptions that went into those. Really what is important is to discuss the large elements of expense for any given park, for example the new caretakers house at Glenn Otto Park, if you want to take that out we can have that discussion. We recommend that you go through and find those major elements that you would like to take out with your goal to reduce SDCs. I would like to avoid going through this line item by line item if we can.

Travis Hultin, Acting Public Works Director, stated the parks CIP list, which was provided to you in your packet, essentially came from the 2006 Parks Master Plan which was a fairly involved process to develop the long-term vision for the City of Troutdale parks for the future. There are a couple of projects that may have been added to this list since 2006 which I will point out to you as we go through the list. I am not as familiar with the parks CIP as I am with some of the other utility plans, but I will do my best.

Travis Hultin reviewed the staff report (copy included in the packet).

Travis Hultin stated the current SDC rate is based on a Level of Service (LOS) methodology. What the Council is considering now is changing to what is being referred to as a Project Driven methodology. If you refer back to the original methodology report they used a different term for that methodology. In that report they provided information on the different types of methodologies that could be used. What we are calling a "Project Driven" methodology they referred to that as an "Improvement Based" methodology. They also provided information on a LOS methodology and some hybrid methodologies. What the Council is now considering is potentially changing to an Improvement Based methodology. For an Improvement Based methodology you identify all of the improvements that you think are needed to meet the current and future needs of the City and that becomes the basis for the SDC rate. The LOS methodology starts by determining the needed acres of parkland per capita for each type of park and compares that to what you have right now. Then it looks at what your population is going to be in the future and uses that method to determine how much more parkland you need, and then adds the improvements that are needed at each park.

Travis Hultin stated based on Council's previous work session discussions staff has removed all future land acquisitions from the CIP list. After the Council reviews and makes any changes to the CIP list tonight, the revised CIP list can form the basis of the calculation of the new maximum parks SDC rate under the Improvement Based methodology. Again, that is the maximum parks SDC rate. All that will tell you is what the maximum rate is that can be charged under state law, but the Council always has the option to impose a lower SDC rate than the maximum allowed rate. That would assume that the gap would be made up by using grants or funds other than SDCs.

Travis Hultin stated the current SDC rate is \$7,586. Another important assumption that is built into this model is the expected increase in housing units. Residential units are the only development that pays parks SDCs; commercial and industrial development does not pay parks SDCs. Based on our buildable lands inventory we are projecting that we will add 1,280 housing units before we reach buildout. When the maximum SDC rate is calculated that is basically the denominator. The total cost of the CIP is divided by that number of units and that essentially gives you the maximum SDC rate that can be charged per new residential unit.

Councilor Allen asked if there are three residential units on a piece of property and I tear those down and build four new residential units, do I just pay for one SDC?

Travis Hultin replied that is correct. You would pay the incremental SDC. That is true of all of our SDCs. Once you pay an SDC on a property that capacity that the property has purchased stays with that property. If you redevelop it you get credit for that previously purchased capacity.

Councilor Ripma stated since the 2006 Master Plan you mentioned that there were some capital improvement projects that have been added. Have any been deleted?

Travis Hultin replied not that I am aware of, other than those that have been completed.

Councilor Ripma stated the decision has not been made to switch from a LOS methodology to an Improvement Based methodology. It has only been discussed at work sessions. The assumption that this exercise is going to result in a lower parks SDC is not universal with this Council as you might well know. We haven't made that decision. I certainly favor the staff bringing forward this approach because we do need to assess it. The LOS methodology represents a quality of life methodology; it is to maintain our quality of life. I don't think we have heard from the public and I think we will hear from them if we start to shave that away ourselves, so we may have trouble reaching consensus tonight. If you take anything out of the CIP that will affect the quality of the service provided by that capacity for that park to handle the new residents that are coming in. If we take those out neighbors are going to be upset, or at least they will want their voice heard. I encourage us all to keep that in mind.

Mayor Daoust stated regardless of what methodology we use, we still have to go through the CIP list. Even if we decided to go back to the LOS, we would still need to review the project list, correct?

Travis Hultin replied it would be up to the Council as to whether you wanted to adopt the existing project list or revise it.

Councilor Ripma stated I would hope that you would invite the public to comment on this. We do have a Parks Advisory Committee (PAC) and we should at least run it through them. This is a major change in the philosophy since I have been on the Council. Since 1993 we have never taken a step like this to say we are not going to continue to emphasize parks, which has always been a Troutdale tradition and the citizens have supported it. The idea that we are just going to hack away at our parks without some opportunity for public comment concerns me. I would hope that all of you would be willing to at least refer the matter to the PAC first before we do anything. I know a lot of you have talked to developers. The citizens of Troutdale have also paid for the parks that we have. The improvements that SDCs represent are for the needed additional park capacity to handle the extra apartments and so on that will be coming in. It has had great support all along until now. I think you are not hearing from everybody.

Mayor Daoust stated we will now go through each of the parks.

Travis Hultin stated before you get started, for comparison purposes I would like to point out that because the land acquisitions were removed from the CIP list based on the Council's direction at the previous work sessions, it now reflects a much lower SDC rate. The SDC rate that we are currently charging is \$7,586. With the dollar amounts for all land acquisitions removed from this project list the maximum SDC rate that could be charged, under the Improvement Based methodology, is \$5,377.

Columbia Park

Council had no comments/questions on the projects for Columbia Park.

Sunrise Park

Councilor White stated I am looking at the number of trees and shrubs. The consultant that we hired for periodic review said not to plant any more trees at Sunrise Park. It has such a breath-taking view that they felt it would be counter-productive.

Councilor Allen stated those trees are likely to come free from people who need a place to plant a tree, right.

Councilor White replied yes, or through mitigation.

Mayor Daoust stated or replacement of trees and shrubs that die.

Councilor White stated it is a small dollar amount so I don't want to get into the weeds. For that particular park we were instructed by the experts not to plant anymore trees there.

Mayor Daoust stated the Master Plan dictates tree and shrub replacement.

Travis Hultin stated it calls for them yes. Well, replacement of existing trees/shrubs wouldn't be SDC eligible.

Councilor Wilson stated I am fearful of this off-leash dog area only because not all dogs behave. I see a potential issue with dogs getting involved with each other or with people who are walking through the park. \$71,000 for a off-leash dog area is a lot of money.

Travis Hultin stated there were surveys of the community about this project when the 2006 Parks Master Plan was being worked on. Last September we conducted a survey for a potential off-leash dog park at Sunrise Park and we received a very positive response for a fenced off-lease area. In that same survey we asked about allowing dogs off-lease in the park in general and that received a very negative response.

Council discussed the project for an off-lease dog area in Sunrise Park, but ultimately left the project on the CIP list.

Councilor White stated I think we could do without the frisbee park. I am looking at this from a different approach. I don't think the public is aware that if we don't do something about this CIP list we are going to be facing a monthly park user fee that will be added on to their utility bill. We also learned at our budget meetings that our best way out of the financial situation that we are in is to grow development. The businesses in downtown need development and industry needs development. I really think this Council needs to take a hard look. I think if the public was aware that they may have to pay \$8.50 a month on their utility bill (for parks) they may not be so eager to say that they want a dog park or a frisbee park. There are frisbee parks in the area, for example Dabney State Park and Blue Lake Park. It is \$50,000.

Mayor Daoust asked how do you jump from this to a \$8.50 parks user fee?

Councilor White stated the parks SDC goes towards acquisition of more property, capacity enhancements. I think that we are at the point that if we have free land offered to us we would have to really consider whether we can afford to take it or not.

Councilor Wilson stated you are really talking about the maintenance after the SDC money is used to purchase the property.

Councilor White stated I am talking about the whole ball of wax, not just this one item. This is \$50,000 that we can save and not have to maintain down the road. I am more inclined to get facilities like restrooms and drinking fountains. I think there is already an abundance of frisbee parks in this area.

Councilor Allen asked are we talking about prioritization? We don't have enough money to do everything that we want to do. Do we prioritize?

Councilor Anderson stated I think that is what we are doing. We are going through each park and we are looking at the projects. John brought up \$71,000 for a off-leash dog park and Glenn brought up \$50,000 for a frisbee park, that is \$121,000 right there. I think when there are items of concern brought up we will discuss them.

Mayor Daoust stated that is what we are doing right now. As far as prioritizing the projects we are not doing that now. That will come later when we have a final list of projects, and if we keep the SDC rate at the maximum, then the prioritization will come in at that point where we determine what year we are going to do the project.

Councilor Allen stated if we have \$80,000 wouldn't the Parks Advisory Committee (PAC) sit down and decide which of the listed projects they want to do and then make that suggestion? How would this function? I am not so concerned about trimming down the list of projects as much as I think we are putting a stop on the development.

Mayor Daoust replied it would depend on how much money is in the SDC pot in any particular year. In a particular fiscal year we will know that we have collected so much money in the Parks Improvement Fund and at that point the parks department will determine what projects they want to do that year. If we cut the SDC rate below the maximum we are never going to have enough money to do quite a few of these projects. I see this as a yearly decision.

Travis Hultin stated there is a project programming process that our engineering group goes through where we look at what projects are in the various CIPs that need to be done and how much money we have in the various funds. In the case of the utility master plans we generally have the project at least roughly timed out as to when we think they are going to be needed so we look to that first. If our CIP says we need to upgrade a particular pump station this year then we take a look at it and see if that is really the case and if it is we check to see if we have enough money and if we do then we proceed. If it isn't needed yet or we don't have enough money then we push it further

out on the schedule. With the parks system it is a little bit different. We have to gauge it by what we think people really want and how much money we have, then we look at the list and see what projects rise to the surface. Certainly the Council can provide guidance on that as well. With parks it is a little more subjective than it is with the utility systems.

Councilor Wilson asked would you take CP Park that doesn't have any benches or trash cans and make that more of a priority?

Travis Hultin replied we might. I am not familiar with that situation. In this case we might talk with our operation staff who are out in the parks every day and ask them what they are hearing from people and what they perceive as a current need. This is an annual cycle that we go through. As we are starting to get ready for the budget process we go through this project planning process to determine which projects we are going to try and accomplish for the upcoming year.

Councilor Allen stated so what I am hearing is that the PAC comes up with the list and our parks department decides how they are going to spend the money.

Travis Hultin replied we come up with recommendations and a lot of times that will come from the PAC. We might not discuss a couple of park benches with the PAC, but if we were planning on building a off-leash dog area we would probably run that by the PAC to see what they think about it.

Councilor Allen asked how much do we have in our Parks Improvement Fund now?

Travis Hultin replied Erich Mueller provided a memo to you that was included in your packet that has all of that information for you. He has estimated that the Parks Improvement Fund net assets at the end of this fiscal year will be \$1.26 million.

Craig Ward stated I think you are beginning to see the difficulty that staff has. We have an adopted Master Plan that calls for capital improvements and identifies in detail what those improvements are and in a sense how they get paid for, at least the portion that is eligible for SDC money. On an annual basis we will go through and ask if the time is right for restrooms at Sunrise Park. It may or may not be, but if it isn't right that year all that means is that restrooms at Sunrise Park get put off to a subsequent year. They never disappear unless we amend this list and start taking things off; they remain on this list and they continue to be SDC eligible. It is very difficult to go through these one at a time and start revising this list. We can't do that. We can't say what do we like and don't like. You can do that because you are the policy makers. We are bound by these lists and this list says we want a frisbee park and the estimated cost is \$50,000. Then it is just a question of when do we do it. I know we may not have a consensus, taking Councilor Ripma's point to heart, but nevertheless, if you eliminate some of these projects off of the list then at the end of the discussion you can see the affect that has on the SDC rate. We are not making a decision here today; you are only testing the assumptions that go into how much the SDC's will generate potentially. It doesn't

change anything, but at least it may give you a sense of how much the SDCs could change if you drop the frisbee park and drop the dog off-lease area, etc. You can always go back and add them back in.

Councilor Allen stated the unit cost seems to be a bit of a SWAG. When was that last updated? What is a humpy lumpy lawn?

Travis Hultin replied my understanding from the Parks Master Plan is that a humpy lumpy lawn is the most basic, primitive play structure you can imagine. It is literally just what it sounds like; it is mounds and surface features in the landscape that kids can run around and play on. I know that Charlie updated the total costs for inflation since the 2006 Master Plan, Looking at the math I believe he did inflate the unit costs as well.

Councilor White stated this was done in 2006 and if we still had the same economy as we had in 2006 I probably wouldn't be questioning a \$50,000 line item, but we are definitely not in the same situation. I am really concerned about the possibility of a parks user fee for our public.

Councilor Ripma stated you have brought up the parks user fee a couple of times. The only person that brought up the parks user fee was Charlie Warren. None of us supported that. I do not want that dredged up; it isn't the issue that we are dealing with here. Take the frisbee park; it says it could be paid for out of the SDCs. If we eliminate it we are actually eliminating the source of money for it also. All of these new apartments that come in, the capacity that they require in parks, we are giving that up and we are also giving up the money to pay for the improvements that we need. What are we getting for that? We are getting a lower SDC that if we leave the capital improvement projects essentially the same the rest of the citizenry has to pay for them. That is the issue, not a parks user fee. The parks user fee is completely separate and I doubt that it would ever pass this Council. I wouldn't be supportive of it, although I did happen to vote for the Metro bond today that was on the ballot. I totally agree with you that what we need is business development. We need to increase our tax base; more stores and more businesses that build things and hire people. Those developments won't pay the parks SDCs; that is not relevant to this. The fact that we impose these SDCs does not discourage business. I contend that it actually increases our quality of life and encourages quality development and a quality of life for our citizens. I just think you are wrong on your analysis; you are missing the point.

Councilor White stated if we continue to add costly parks and increase purchasing land that we are taking off of the tax rolls for one thing, we will inevitably have a maintenance fee because we can barely handle what we currently have. I am not saying that is a bad thing. That is a good thing and we need to celebrate that; we have arrived. One thing you are forgetting is that those businesses need customers; industry needs workers. The housing comes first.

Councilor Ripma stated so we should pave over the parks to have more people live on them so that people can use businesses.

Councilor White stated of course not.

Councilor Ripma stated of course not. That is just the inverse of your argument that we should somehow subsidize additional housing units in order to help the stores; that is going to be a very poor draw with only 1,200 units left to go. By not including the frisbee park or dog off-leash area, or whatever else it is that we eliminate, we are losing the money to build it when the time comes. The 2002 economy will come back some day. Yes, we are broke right now. In my opinion the way to go is to not give up the parks that we need to improve and acquire when we have a ready source for the money to do the improvements and acquisitions.

Councilor Allen stated I went to my hometown and one of my friends is a councilor there. I saw something different; I saw that there was development going on there. I am not seeing that here in Troutdale. When we contact other cities you find that they are also having development starting and it is not happening here. With the change in the economy what we are finding is that we are not a desirable place to build; it doesn't pencil out very well here in part because we have a very high SDC.

Councilor Ripma stated are you actually contending that knocking \$3,000 or so off of the SDC rate is going to, I don't know where your hometown is...

Councilor Allen interrupted and stated Washington.

Councilor Ripma stated their tax structure is quite different. If we were giving up \$3,000 in order to encourage quality development and we didn't have to give up something as important as our parks, I might agree. But I think you are looking at it from a very narrow perspective in talking to a councilor in your hometown.

Councilor Allen stated it is economics. If you have a high SDC rate and you are not getting any building you are really not making much in SDCs are you?

Councilor Ripma stated the SDCs are for the time when they do build. They don't have to be spent now; it is money in the pipeline. Simple economics, we don't have any parks SDC for businesses so you can hardly blame this SDC for that, and that is really what we need.

Councilor Allen stated that has more to do with the international trade laws beyond us here. I am just talking about home development.

Mayor Daoust stated we are jumping to the general discussion which I thought would take place at the end of the meeting. I think we should quickly go through the list of projects for each park. We have two items for Sunrise Park that have been mentioned - off-leash dog area for \$71,000 and the frisbee park for \$50,000. Can I see a show of hands for those in favor of dropping the frisbee park.

The majority (4 out of the 7) of the Council agreed to drop the frisbee park.

Councilor Ripma asked are we just dropping it from this analysis?

Mayor Daoust replied yes. I am assuming that if a majority of the Council wants the frisbee park off...

Councilor Ripma interrupted and stated for the purpose of the calculation.

Mayor Daoust continued and stated for the purpose of the calculation, but it's not going to go back on the list. I am assuming that we are developing a list of projects to take off also.

Councilor Ripma stated that brings up a fundamental issue then. If we are going to be making cost slashes to this then we need some public involvement. We should at least run it by the PAC.

Mayor Daoust stated we can come up with our list and then pass that on to the PAC.

Craig Ward stated you can't make decisions tonight anyway. This is just getting a Council consensus of a model as it stands tonight.

Councilor Ripma stated if it is going to the PAC along the lines that we would like them to look at possibly removing the frisbee park.

Councilor Thomas stated I am not willing to delete either one of the two items being discussed.

Mayor Daoust stated we already have four Councilors in favor of deleting the frisbee park.

Councilor Ripma asked could we at least make it clear that we are referring this to the PAC?

Councilor Allen replied whether it be the PAC or through a public meeting.

Councilor Anderson stated there will be time to get public input on this. I would never intend to just do this and say this is how it is.

Councilor Allen stated we want to see what the SDC would look like.

Councilor Anderson stated that is the purpose of this.

Councilor Ripma stated and for that I understand, it is just when you say that it is permanently deleted and it won't go back on.

Councilor White stated we don't have that authority in a work session.

Councilor Ripma stated I am asking if we can run it by the public before we say that it is going off of the list and won't go back on.

Mayor Daoust stated we will have to. I didn't mean to say that we are not going to run it by the public. This is a work session product that we are coming up with and this product will either go to the PAC first before we have a resolution, or it will go straight to a resolution in a public hearing without the PAC.

Councilor Allen stated we have everything we want, but more than we can afford so you have to make choices; what is the most important to you and what is the least important.

Councilor Anderson stated this is just an exercise so I don't think we need to have all of this debate on individual line items when we are just trying to get to what the end result will be and see if we are comfortable where we end up.

Mayor Daoust stated I don't want to take off the frisbee park if only two councilors want it taken off. I want it taken off because we have a consensus to take it off; that is why we are voting.

Councilor Ripma stated you may have a majority, but you don't have a consensus.

Mayor Daoust stated the frisbee park is...

Councilor Ripma interrupted and stated is off for the purpose of the calculation, right?

Mayor Daoust replied yes. The next item is a dog off-leash area for \$71,000. How many Councilors want to remove that from the list?

Councilor Allen stated I would like a less expensive one. \$71,000 is a lot. It is several times the amount of money I spent to fence off 21 acres.

Mayor Daoust stated we can change the cost, can't we.

Craig Ward stated sure. We won't know how to interpret that later.

Travis Hultin stated I would just caution you that anything that you do with the cost should have some basis.

Councilor Wilson stated if we reduce it to \$20,000 and then the actual cost is \$71,000 we then have a 70% increase in our cost from what we estimated. I would rather be more accurate in our estimate.

Mayor Daoust stated for now lets not dicker with what the dollar amount is on any of the items. Can I see a show of hands of those who want to remove the off-leash dog area from the CIP list?

There was not a majority of the Council in favor of removing the off-leash dog area at Sunrise Park from the project list.

Glenn Otto Park

Councilor Anderson asked what is mobilization (first item listed under Glenn Otto Park projects)?

Travis Hultin replied I believe these first three items (mobilization, site preparation and utilities) are overarching items to cover the costs associated with a variety of the improvements that are listed. Depending upon what happens with the list of projects those figures could be updated, but that is something we would probably have to do after the fact.

Councilor Wilson asked what is the definition of mobilization?

Travis Hultin replied that is all of the start-up costs when you are doing construction. It is the contractor getting all of their equipment, material, etc. to the site. Various other costs associated with getting the project rolling and managing the project.

Councilor White stated that cost could theoretically go down depending on what projects we keep or delete.

Travis Hultin replied it is more or less proportional to the size and complexity of the project.

Councilor Allen asked if we are going to do restrooms and a kiosk do we want them in Glenn Otto Park or do we want them closer to downtown?

Councilor Anderson stated we have them in both areas. Under other parks projects we have downtown restrooms listed at \$110,000 and a downtown kiosk for \$250,000.

Travis Hultin stated that is an example of a project that has been added since the 2006 Plan.

Mayor Daoust stated we already have restrooms in Glenn Otto Park, so what is this for?

Travis Hultin replied the description in the Glenn Otto Park Master Plan reads, "At the main pedestrian entrance, a kiosk provides information regarding community center and picnic shelter reservations and beach safety rules. Restrooms with foot washing facilities are provided at this location to serve beach users. From this point, trails lead into the park, to the community center, and to the beach." I believe this would be a

restroom that would be located near the top of the trail that goes down to the beach to be used by beach users.

Mayor Daoust asked did all of these projects come from the Master Plan for Glenn Otto Park that was done by a consultant?

Travis Hultin replied that is correct. Glenn Otto Park had its own Master Plan prepared in 2002 with the assistance of MIG, Inc. and DiBenedetto Thomson Livingstone Architects.

Mayor Daoust stated according to them this is what they thought was the extensive list for Glenn Otto Park, right.

Travis Hultin replied correct. This would have gone through the PAC at least. I am not familiar with the process that this went through at the time, but I am sure it was vetted through some sort of public process.

Mayor Daoust asked is there a question on the restrooms and kiosk?

Councilor Anderson replied yes, lets get rid of it.

Councilor Allen stated if we can't reduce it to a foot washing station and a billboard, then lets get rid of it.

Mayor Daoust asked for a show of hands of those in favor of eliminating the restrooms and kiosk at Glenn Otto Park from the CIP.

The majority (4 out of the 7) of the Council agreed to eliminate the restrooms and kiosk at \$180,000.

Councilor White asked what is permeable paving for \$177,000?

Travis Hultin replied according to the Master Plan it contemplates reconstructing and reconfiguring the parking lot which would include replacing the asphalt in the parking stalls with permeable asphalt to reduce storm water runoff.

Councilor Wilson asked the SDCs are supposed to be for new construction right?

Travis Hultin replied yes, for capacity enhancing.

Councilor Wilson asked since we already have an asphalt parking lot, how does that qualify for SDCs?

Councilor White stated it is a reconfiguration. I was involved in the Park Master Plan. It picks up 13 additional spaces, but that was prior to allowing the bus into the park, so we may have lost those spaces.

Travis Hultin stated only the increase would be SDC eligible. If you were to keep this item we would probably need to go back and review the SDC eligible designation for this project.

Councilor Allen asked with the soft base that the parking lot has, do we need to do this?

Travis Hultin replied I don't have enough information to answer that question. We would need to do some infiltration testing and that sort of thing to make sure that it is suitable for a permeable pavement.

Mayor Daoust asked for a show of hand for those in favor of eliminating the permeable paving from the CIP list.

The majority (4 out of the 7) of the Council agreed to remove the permeable paving from the list at \$177,000.

Councilor Wilson when you come back with this maybe we can find out what portion of this is SDC eligible.

Councilor Wilson stated on the Boy Scout building remodel and expansion project, the Boy Scouts replaced all four of those walls on the building and actually expanded it to where there was already a cement footing. I guess I have always believed that since we were using that building that we would be responsible for the replacement. I don't know that we need this \$22,500.

Travis Hultin stated all I can tell you is what is reflected in the Master Plan, which says, "The Boy Scout Building has been expanded on the west side to accommodate the growing Troutdale troops. A scout outdoor area is defined by walkways and contains several picnic tables."

Mayor Daoust asked are you saying that this number shouldn't be included?

Councilor Wilson replied I don't think so.

Mayor Daoust asked for a show of hands of those who favor removing the Boy Scout Building remodel/expansion project from the CIP list.

The majority (4 out of the 7) of the Council agreed to remove the Boy Scout Building remodel/expansion project in the amount of \$22,500.

Councilor White asked could you read us the background on the concrete walkway for \$564,375?

Travis Hultin stated the Picnic and Play Area description in the Master Plan reads, "The play area has been expanded to accommodate a wider range of ages. It is arranged so

that toddlers play closest to the picnic shelter, young school-age children next to them, and older school-age children at the far edge. A wide sidewalk separates the children from the basketball hoop where older youth and adults play. Three park shelters and many picnic tables are placed throughout the park so that several groups at one time may enjoy the park. Benches are placed at the edge of the play area so that caregivers can comfortably and easily observe their children." Looking at the maps there is quite an extensive system of new walkways that are laid out for the park.

Councilor White stated as we learned from Drovers Trail, it has to be 10' wide to be eligible for any grant money. I personally wouldn't want to see any more paving than what we currently have. I would like to keep it more of a natural setting. I would be in favor of striking that project.

Mayor Daoust stated we have a recommendation to strike the concrete walkway for \$564,375. Can I see a show of hands of those in favor of striking this project?

Councilor Ripma stated can we wait just a second. You realize that you are proposing to change the character of the park. It is within your power if you have the votes. Glenn Otto Park is a heavily used park; it is not a natural area. It has buildings on it including a caretakers building. It is the kind of park that I think should be heavily used. I just don't think you are thinking this through. This doesn't have to be built for 25 years. But to just remove it from the plan, even theoretically, to artificially lower the number, you are not working in the best interest of the citizens.

Councilor Allen asked are you saying it has to be built in 25 years?

Councilor Ripma stated it doesn't have to be built, it could be 25 years.

Councilor Allen asked it could be never, right?

Councilor Ripma stated well it could be. The idea would be that it would be an improvement. What you are doing is you are just slashing away at the CIP to artificially reduce the number. I am very distressed at the thought of changing the character of Glenn Otto Park.

Mayor Daoust stated this is a new walkway not the existing one.

Councilor Ripma replied right. The park is being setup to eventually accommodate more use and more people, and for the people who live in apartments and don't have yards. If we don't do this through the SDC money the cost will get put onto the taxpayers. With the SDCs we are making a modest effort to have the reason for the need for the capacity to help pay for it. That is the idea.

Mayor Daoust stated I think part of your point is that if we take stuff off it is harder to add it back in later. We can periodically review the CIP list, but the chances of adding things back in are fairly slim.

Councilor Ripma stated if it ultimately gets adopted as a new master plan without it, yes. What we are doing tonight is just an exercise in reducing the SDC rate. That is why it is not a thoughtful approach.

Mayor Daoust asked would you be more satisfied if we left it on the list but took it out of the SDC eligible projects for awhile?

Councilor Ripma replied it either is or isn't SDC eligible. I am willing to take it off for the purpose of you guys being able to see the number because that is what you want. I just don't want it to sound like it is permanently off of the list. I am trying to raise your consciousness of what is going on here. The parking lot will have to be repaved someday and you took it out. We wouldn't have to build the bathrooms, or we could. With this approach you are just trying to reduce the number and I don't think we are doing it the right way.

Mayor Daoust asked for a show of hands of those Councilors who favor removing the concrete walkway for \$564,000.

There was not a majority of the Council (only 3 of the 7 favored this) in favor of removing the concrete walkway in Glenn Otto Park from the project list.

Mayor Daoust asked are there any other items for Glenn Otto Park?

Councilor White stated the caretaker cottage for \$160,000.

Mayor Daoust asked since we already have a caretaker house why is this on the list?

Travis Hultin stated in the Master Plan it states, "The Caretaker Cottage has been relocated to an area just east of the parking lot. The site selected is not within the vegetated buffer of Beaver Creek. The cottage has an attached garage that provides storage for ATV vehicles used for maintenance and for law enforcement. The refuse dumpster is located on the garage apron where it is easily accessible by maintenance staff and the garbage truck."

Councilor Wilson stated I don't know if any of you have ever been in that house, but I think that the caretaker deserves a more modern, safer, better sealed house. It is an ancient building and it has a lot of leaks.

Travis Hultin stated I question whether this is SDC eligible since it is replacing an existing facility. The maintenance garage for storing the ATVs would be an expansion, but the existing cottage I would question whether it is SDC eligible.

Mayor Daoust asked is it an option to keep it on the list but not include it in the SDC eligible costs? Some day we may entertain the idea of building a new caretaker cottage with grant funding or whatever.

Travis Hultin stated the Glenn Otto Park Master Plan will still be the Master Plan and those recommended projects are still in the Plan. When we go through the process of developing the CIPs for any of the systems we identify needed projects and some of them are not SDC eligible so we have to fund them some other way. This is one case where I would certainly question whether it is SDC eligible.

Mayor Daoust stated maybe we should take it off.

Councilor Anderson stated it shouldn't be part of the conversation.

Councilor Ripma asked can we find out if it is SDC eligible?

Councilor Anderson replied we can, but for the sake of the conversation we can take it out.

Travis Hultin stated it is a little bit harder to judge with parks then it is with a pipe where you know exactly what its capacity is. But generally speaking if you are replacing like with like that would not be SDC eligible. There may be some portion of it that is SDC eligible if it is a larger house, or if there was something about it that you could argue was an increase in its capacity. Much like the discussion we had about the parking lot, a good portion of it in my opinion would not be SDC eligible.

Councilor White stated the \$27,000 for a maintenance garage was probably needed with the old police station. I can't imagine there wouldn't be that capacity with the new police station.

Travis Hultin stated my reading of Master Plan is the intent would be to have the specialized vehicles on-site at Glenn Otto Park for use for beach patrol and for maintenance around the park.

Councilor Wilson asked don't they already have that?

Travis Hultin replied I don't have an answer to that.

Councilor White stated I think you are right.

Mayor Daoust stated I heard you say that the \$160,000 shouldn't be there.

Travis Hultin stated I really question whether it is SDC eligible.

Mayor Daoust stated let's take it off for now; we can always add it back in.

Councilor Ripma asked you are not taking it off the Master Plan, just out of the SDC eligible list?

Councilor Allen stated I don't think we are taking any of this off of the Master Plan.

Mayor Daoust replied no.

Mayor Daoust asked is there anything else for Glenn Otto Park?

Nothing further mentioned by the Council.

Sam Cox Community Center and Courtyard

Travis Hultin stated the Master Plan states, "Just north of the Cox Community Center, a courtyard with a gazebo and arbor replaces the current caretaker cottage. The courtyard provides a pleasant approach to the Cox Community Center. The arbor and Gazebo form an attractive backdrop for small receptions and photos."

Councilor Anderson stated if we don't know if we can move the caretaker cottage we probably should strike the courtyard for now; not changing the Master Plan.

Mayor Daoust stated some of these items are tied to the Sam Cox Building itself. It looks like maybe just the gazebo and arbor structure is what we are talking about.

Councilor Allen stated it seems like a nice idea to me.

Mayor Daoust asked is there anything else on Glenn Otto Park?

Councilor Wilson asked are the last four items on the second page specifically for Glenn Otto Park?

Travis Hultin replied yes.

Councilor Wilson stated shouldn't that be part of the cost that is listed above?

Travis Hultin replied a lot of times the way they develop these unit costs are based on raw costs like what a contractor would estimated it at when he is preparing his bid. But then what the contractor does at the end is adds on his overhead for the project. We also have a factor in here for design and engineering of the projects. Those are just the construction costs. If you want to get the real cost you also have to consider how much it is going to cost you to have plans prepared, specifications prepared, and those types of things. There is also a contingency factor which is typical at a conceptual level planning stage because that is basically the uncertainty. These are rough estimates but the projects haven't been designed in detail so you have to include a contingency factor to allow for that uncertainty.

Councilor Wilson stated we are talking about another \$1 million just in those four items. Who are we paying an administration fee to?

Travis Hultin stated the administration is the other types of soft costs like permitting and things like that.

Councilor Anderson stated so those numbers are going to go down a certain percentage.

Mayor Daoust called for a break at 8:08pm and reconvened at 8:20pm.

Mayor Daoust asked are there any other items to discuss for Glenn Otto Park?

Councilor Allen stated it was suggested that we are just slashing and not thinking. I just wanted to point out that for the \$500,000 plus for the concrete walkway in Glenn Otto Park, you could just about make every improvement in all of the other parks in the city and get a lot more value for a lot more people for that same cost.

Councilor Ripma stated you would lose the value at Glenn Otto Park.

Councilor Allen stated I like parks; I want them useful. A lot of the people I talk to want them useful but there is only so much money, where are you going to put it?

Councilor Ripma stated you put it down the road.

Mayor Daoust stated we may have a second iteration once we see what the affect is on the SDC rate is.

Travis Hultin stated this is all just background work for potential future action. You will have time between now and then to review the Glenn Otto Park Master Plan in more detail and get a better idea of what these projects are about. That goes for the Parks Master Plan as well.

Mayor Daoust stated we discussed the concrete walkway but we aren't really sure where that walkway is.

Travis Hultin stated it goes all throughout the park; it is quite extensive.

Mayor Daoust stated if there are no further questions about Glenn Otto Park we can move on to the neighborhood parks.

There were no further comments or questions for Glenn Otto Park.

Helen Althaus Park

There were no comments on the projects for Helen Althaus Park.

Kiku Park

There were no comments on the projects for Kiku Park.

Lewellyn Park

There were no comments on the projects for Lewellyn Park.

Sandee Palisades Park

There were no comments on the projects for Sandee Palisades Park.

Weedin Park

There were no comments on the projects for Weedin Park.

Councilor Allen stated we have the watershed district where people like to watch birds. Is that adjacent to any existing park? I know it is part of our natural area.

Craig Ward asked are you thinking of Beaver Creek Canyon?

Councilor Allen replied yes.

Travis Hultin stated the City owns that.

Craig Ward asked what are the costs for maintaining those trails?

Travis Hultin stated maintaining the trails would not be reflected in the CIP.

Craig Ward replied right, I meant improvements.

Councilor Allen stated I don't think people want their natural areas developed. I think they might enjoy a restroom.

Mayor Daoust stated if there are no further comments on the neighborhood parks we can move on to the special use parks.

Depot Park

There were no comments on the projects for Depot Park.

Harlow House

There were no comments on the projects for Harlow House Park.

Mayors Square

Councilor Anderson stated there has been an idea for Mayors Square that might have some merit but we don't have to get into it tonight. With the pending demolition of the old police facility there has been an idea generated by two staff members and I think it is a pretty good one so I took it up and down the street. That idea is to expand Mayors Square to use it as a performance center that could enhance First Fridays. It could also be the location for the kiosk for downtown that we have discussed. If you just think about First Fridays, the Tree Lighting Ceremony, SummerFest and the activities that we

have downtown, I would love to have a discussion about a performance center in the area of Mayors Square.

Mayor Daoust asked how would we deal with something that is not on the CIP list that we may want to add.

Travis Hultin stated for the purpose of the exercise tonight we would have to come up with an estimate of how much money you think would be needed for this project and plug it into the CIP.

Councilor Wilson asked would the property have to be designated as a park?

Councilor Anderson asked how would that happen David?

David Ross replied I don't know that we would have to do anything.

Craig Ward stated in my view you are talking about a capital improvement to Mayors Square. The fact that it happens to be on city owned property, a parking lot at the moment, is sort of irrelevant. If we have to go through a re-designation of a portion of the land to make it a park so be it. Your intent is to make it a park if I understand your concept.

Councilor Anderson stated I think that has some merit. For the sake of the argument, I would have to think that there would be some grant funds available. Put \$30,000 in just for the sake of coming up with a number.

Travis Hultin asked are you thinking that would be a match for a grant?

Councilor Anderson replied yes.

Councilor Allen asked are you thinking about the whole lot becoming a park or just a portion?

Councilor Anderson replied just where we are going to demo the police facility extending onto the southwest corner of Mayors Square, the northeast corner of the police facility property.

Councilor Allen asked all the way, or just a portion?

Councilor Anderson replied a portion, not the entire thing but enough to put in an amphitheater or seating for concerts in the summer.

Councilor Allen stated the only reason I ask is because I like that idea, but I also like the idea of more parking for downtown.

Councilor Anderson stated I am the farthest thing from an engineer so I don't know. I don't anticipate it being that much because I am sensitive to our parking issues as well.

Councilor Allen stated I think we should look into it.

Mayor Daoust stated we will have an opportunity to discuss this as part of the visioning workshop for the downtown. I am not sure we should add it to this list right now.

Councilor Anderson asked wouldn't it be SDC eligible?

Travis Hultin replied if you expanded Mayors Square it would be SDC eligible.

Councilor Thomas stated we have spent the last two hours chopping stuff all over the place and now we want to add stuff back in without any knowledge if it even qualifies for SDC funds. Secondly, we all campaigned on livability and livability is more than just the downtown Troutdale area. (Inaudible) I think this is something that the PAC should look at (inaudible).

Councilor Anderson stated I beg to differ because we haven't cut anything from neighborhood parks throughout this entire exercise. I share your concern about downtown, but I can also envision a scenario with a well-promoted, bigger and better First Friday getting even more people from the top of the hill down to the bottom of the hill.

Mayor Daoust stated we can add something in here and refer it to the PAC after we are done with our recommendations tonight and have the PAC go through our cuts and additions and get their input. We will have future opportunities to decide what we want to do with that property.

Travis Hultin stated if something is just in the conceptual stages, if you were actually going to adopt a CIP you might not be ready to put it in there. You would have the opportunity to add it to the CIP at a later date when it became more solid.

Councilor Anderson asked would you recommend that we put a number in tonight or not?

Travis Hultin replied I wouldn't make a recommendation either way. It kind of depends on how you want to use the results of this exercise.

Mayor Daoust stated it may be too early to add it to the CIP list.

Councilor Allen stated that kind of goes along the lines of what I said earlier about Beaver Creek and maybe wanting something there, but I don't really need that in the SDC rates because I think that can be done with private funding.

Travis Hultin stated even if you ultimately decide that you want to fund something from SDCs and it is SDC eligible, you have the opportunity next year, the year after, or anytime you want to go back and amend the CIP list. We do that with the utility systems. We have a master plan for 20 years, but five years down the road we realize that there is a project that wasn't conceived in that master plan that is really needed and we come to the Council and ask to add the project to the CIP list.

Councilor White stated one of our council goals is to look at doing a kiosk and public restrooms downtown.

Mayor Daoust stated we are going to leave Mayors Square at \$0 for now and we will move on to the mini parks.

CP Park

There were no comments on the projects for CP Park.

Sweetbriar Park

There were no comments on the projects for Sweetbriar Park.

Urban Renewal Park

Mayor Daoust stated this has \$3 million listed as SDC eligible for the waterfront parkway along the Sandy River.

Councilor Anderson asked do we need \$4 million for a urban renewal park based on where we are today?

Craig Ward stated we could use every dime of that. It depends on what we ultimately want and what the developer wants. We have a 2 acre area that is in the Urban Renewal Plan to be used as public park. You can do a lot with 2 acres. It is presumed to be an urban park so it isn't going to be grass. As you can see with the sidewalks in Glenn Otto those numbers can add up in a hurry. I don't know exactly what this amount of money reflects, but if we build a trail and an urban park, and potentially build fishing platforms or other public access to the river, and if that is all done on our dime then I don't think \$4 million is unreasonable. We can scale that back if we feel the need.

Councilor Anderson asked is there a potential for some of that to come from Metro in terms of the open space bond money?

Craig Ward replied yes.

Councilor Thomas stated I think we have already received the Metro bond money.

Craig Ward stated we have. There is another measure that is out there but I understand that may just be for maintenance. I interpreted the question as could grant money support this and clearly there is money from the Fish and Wildlife that we have already applied for once and it will require a match. Those facilities to provide public access to

the river on what is now fairly steep banks would be expensive. Obviously we would have to discuss with the developer how much of that is for their development and how much of it is for public use. I don't know how they came up with the \$4 million and I don't have a good way to estimate how much grant money may assist in that process. Even with grant money you could spend \$4 million in a hurry.

Councilor Allen asked does that include a fishing area for handicapped folks?

Craig Ward replied the grant we applied for but did not get did include fishing platforms for the handicapped.

Councilor White asked what was promised to the voters for that area?

Craig Ward replied 2 acres and a trail is what I understand.

Councilor Anderson stated for the sake of this discussion I would like to cut this in half down to \$2 million. I have a feeling that we are not going to need \$4 million. We could also just take it all out and then put it back, I would be fine with that as well. I am not sure that would be realistic at this point. I think that a \$2 million budget for the CIP, at this point, based on where we are in the urban renewal process, might be a little more realistic.

Councilor Thomas stated I would leave it alone for right now.

Councilor Ripma stated this isn't for now, it is for when we actually get a buyer and something is built. It is a modest enough figure.

Mayor Daoust stated we have it envisioned that it is just a strip along the river, but it may include the public square also.

Councilor White stated there are two ways we can look at it. We don't have to do the maximum SDC fee approach so that is one way we could build a cushion in. I tend to agree with Councilor Anderson's line of thinking because just the interest that we have received from Metro and ODFW, I view that area as more of a regional type of park similar to Chinook Landing. I think we are going to see some dollars coming in to support a project down there.

Mayor Daoust stated that could be. Usually Metro buys land. If Metro were interested in that the landowners would have to agree to sell it to Metro.

Councilor Ripma stated we are spending money we don't have. We might be able to get some money for it. If we are going to have a quality development in the urban renewal area, which everybody wants, a waterfront development can't be left a pile of rocks. It is a modest enough number. It will attract quality development if we do something nice and will go the other way if we don't. There is no reason to cut it

Mayor Daoust stated we can add it as a question mark and come back to it later.

Councilor White stated the problem I have is I don't think it is fair to saddle the last remaining property owners in Troutdale with that full expense. I don't think it is realistic.

Councilor Ripma stated they aren't being saddled with the full expense. It is a capacity enhancing addition to the parks in Troutdale. The stores and businesses that go in down there won't pay it but if there are dwelling units they will pay it. What you are saying applies to all the SDCs. This would be a new expansion to our parks and that is exactly what SDCs are designed to help fund.

Councilor White stated that would be true if there were no other way to fund a park other than SDC fees. There are plenty of other ways.

Councilor Ripma stated yes, we can tax the taxpayers. Honestly that isn't fair. The taxpayers aren't creating the need for the additional capacity; it is the new growth.

Councilor White stated grants.

Councilor Anderson stated we are going to do urban renewal whether we grow by one person or one hundred.

Councilor Ripma stated and if we are going to do a quality park there...

Councilor Wilson interrupted and stated it will be years before we can even get to that point.

Councilor Ripma stated it is not like it will be spent right away.

Councilor Anderson stated we have \$1.2 million in the fund now. Even at \$3 million we will have to come up with \$1.8 million and I don't see, with the development climate being what it is, how we are going to come up with \$1.8 between now and when urban renewal happens. I think there will be other funding sources out there.

Councilor Ripma stated lets leave it alone until the other funding sources occur. You are just saying lets reduce it because we might be able to find more money.

Councilor Anderson stated we are not going to have the money to do the \$3 million. We only have \$1.2 million now.

Councilor Ripma stated when the development occurs money will be allocated to making these improvements. I am not sure how it works, but it is not like we have to have \$1.2 million sitting there.

Councilor Anderson stated help me out here. How are we going to build a \$3 million urban renewal park out of SDC funds when we don't have \$3 million of SDC funds?

Councilor Ripma stated SDC funds come in.

Councilor Allen stated I see urban renewal as bound to happen. We have to do it. The clock is ticking. We have until 2016 and it is 2013 now. We have \$1.2 million right now. I suggest we be conservative with the \$1.2 million that we have right now until we know how this is going to happen. We are likely going to be able to get grants. But the same experience that tells me \$71,000 is a lot of money for a dog area tells me that \$3 million for this type of project goes fast. I am a little concerned about taking it off, although I also don't believe in putting it all in SDCs.

Mayor Daoust stated I am concerned about taking it off because it was part of the master plan with the urban renewal area. If Paul Thalhofer were here he would say you mean to tell me you are messing with my riverside trail. He was adamant that the park along the river was part of what the public voted on and part of what is going to be built down there. Since this is the master plan number that was used for that park I am hesitant to take it out or reduce it.

Councilor Wilson stated I agree with Paul because I sat on that committee to help get that voted in.

Councilor Allen asked can we be conservative with the \$1.2 million that we have now?

Councilor Ripma stated that isn't the way it works. We are being conservative with the money that we have right now, aren't we? I think we are.

Councilor Allen stated the way it is right now that \$1.2 million can be spent next month and it is out of our hands. That is the way it is right now unless you provide direction.

Travis Hultin stated let me point out that staff can't spend money just because it is in the improvement fund, it still has to be appropriated through the budget process.

Councilor White stated I think the sooner we get to a realistic figure the sooner money will start coming in to this fund.

Mayor Daoust asked for a show of hands of the Councilors in support of reducing the amount in the CIP for the Urban Renewal Park from the \$3 million that is SDC eligible to \$1.5 million.

There was not a majority (only 2 of the 7 favored this) of the Council in favor of reducing the amount of SDC eligible funds for the Urban Renewal Park from \$3 million to \$1.5 million.

Mayor Daoust stated I have a question on the park that is on the west side of Troutdale that is surrounded by houses. Do you know which park I am talking about?

Travis Hultin replied Woodale Park.

Woodale Park

Mayor Daoust asked where is that in the CIP list? Can we just sell that park?

Councilor Thomas stated we looked at doing that in the past and because of the way we acquired the park we can't sell it.

Travis Hultin replied my understanding is that we received that park as a tax foreclosure. It was owned by the homeowners association for that subdivision and they did not pay the taxes on it and eventually had to give it up and the city took it over. That park has no access; the only people that have access to it are those that surround it. When that subdivision was constructed it was not intended to be a public park; it was intended to be a openspace.

Mayor Daoust stated I think there is one access trail to it between homes.

Travis Hultin read the section of the Parks Master Plan that pertains to Woodale Park. "Woodale Park is a 2.50 acre undeveloped park. The site is located off of 242nd Avenue near the western edge of the City limit. The land was acquired through a tax foreclosure after the Woodale Subdivision Homeowners Association declined to pay taxes. The site is encircled by homes preventing both visual and physical access. The lack of access has been the primary obstacle preventing the park's development. Currently, the site serves almost exclusively as open space for the surrounding homeowners. The Parks Advisory Committee recommends exploring options to relieve the City of park maintenance responsibilities. Among the options that should be evaluated is retaining ownership of the park but transferring its maintenance to a private homeowners association, and selling the property but offering it first to surrounding property owners for purchase. If the property is sold, the money from the sale should be used for park acquisition, improvements, and/or a maintenance trust fund."

Mayor Daoust stated if there are no further comments on Woodale Park we can move on to the next category.

Other Parks Projects

Mayor Daoust stated I didn't think there was any funds included for land acquisition, but there is \$2 million listed for Strebin Trust.

Travis Hultin stated that is for improvements to that property.

Councilor Anderson stated I have it on pretty good authority that the Strebin Trust is locked as farmland for as far as the eye can see. Why are we budgeting \$4 million for improvements for something that probably won't be improved until my great grandchildren can use it.

Mayor Daoust stated maybe there is more than one tax lot.

Councilor Ripma stated it is based on the life of a person, the beneficiary, and that could be tomorrow, next week or years from now. It is budgeted at a realistic level for the improvements required when they are eventually needed. That is the way this plan works; it is not for now.

Councilor Anderson stated we are paying on \$4 million now. I have lived here for 16 years and it has been a farmland for that long. We are paying SDCs on \$3 million worth of SDC eligible improvements for something that I haven't seen improved for 17 years.

Councilor Ripma stated that land is clearly developable. Some of it will be residential. When that land is developed with residential units the park will become additional capacity for the citizens who live there. This is exactly what SDCs are for. When and if that farmland gets developed a modest SDC from each homeowner toward the cost of the expansion of a park is exactly the right thing to do.

Councilor Anderson asked is the Strebin Trust zoning included in the 1,200 buildable lots?

Travis Hultin replied I believe so.

Mayor Daoust stated it is probably the best place for a future park if we ever were to put one in the City of Troutdale.

Councilor Ripma stated and the surrounding homes that are built near it, each one would contribute toward the new infrastructure that is needed to support the park.

Councilor Anderson asked would they contribute 100% of it?

Councilor Ripma replied no. It looks like there is \$4 million in improvements with \$2 million of it from SDCs, so it is half. That is very reasonable because those new residents will probably constitute half of the users of the park. It is one of the clearer examples of a good use of SDCs.

Councilor Anderson stated so there is \$3 million that is in there now for something that hasn't happened that may happen, that probably won't happen in the near future. Is that \$3 million being paid by people who are building homes today?

Councilor Ripma stated it is \$2 million.

Mayor Daoust asked are you talking about the Strebin Trust?

Councilor Anderson replied yes.

Mayor Daoust stated it is \$2 million.

Councilor Anderson stated yes \$2 million. Is that being paid by people building today?

Craig Ward replied yes.

Councilor Ripma stated for use on capacity enhancing improvements to the parks. If we don't pay them and the projects are needed the rest of the city will have to pay it. Is that fair? Is it fair that the new builders who bring in new people aren't going to contribute something?

Councilor Anderson asked what is wrong with using a parks levy.

Councilor Ripma stated you can promote that if you want. I believe SDCs have a fundamental fairness in that the activity that causes the need for more park capacity contributes to it. If you don't have SDCs then they don't contribute and the capacity need is still there and the rest of the citizens have to pay for it. Parks SDCs are very popular with the voters, they are not popular with the developers. The people who are causing the need are contributing to it, they are not paying for it all.

Councilor White stated I want to remind Council that across the street is the 88 acre College Nature Park. How much more parkland do they need in that corner of the city? If we keep going at the rate that Councilor Ripma wants us to go we will definitely be seeing a parks maintenance fee on our utility bills. There is no way around it. It is reality and we need to be a little more responsible.

Councilor Ripma stated the 88 acre park along Beaver Creek Canyon is an undeveloped park; there is a trail through it.

Councilor White stated that is usually the preferred type of park that people in this area like.

Councilor Ripma stated there is a need for all different kinds of parks.

Councilor Allen stated I would like to see a ball field there because I would like to see people in that area to help out the stores that are nearby. The other side of the coin here is that I have been house hunting with other people who want to buy homes in Troutdale and they are looking at the cost of a home and what their mortgage payment, electricity bill, and taxes will be, and SDCs play into that. I have seen people who say that is \$15 outside my range, or \$20 outside my range. So having a high SDC is a factor on whether or not they build a place. Although I would personally like to see a ball field there, I just don't like to see the SDC at the level that we have it now because it is preventing growth.

Councilor Ripma stated whereas I would like people to come who want to contribute to the parks.

Councilor Allen stated if they can afford it. Young people don't necessarily have the money.

Councilor Ripma stated that is understandable. They will eventually. Do you just want to build trailer parks or something? The purpose isn't just to pack as many people into Troutdale as we can get.

Councilor Allen stated what is happening right now is we are not building and people are not coming. That is the reality of our SDC.

Councilor Ripma stated and if we end up having a lower quality of life all of Troutdale will suffer. You are very short-sided to limit that. The economy is what it is...

Councilor Allen interrupted and stated I would like to see a portion of our future property taxes, which makes up half of the money that comes into the city, put into parks. I just don't want to see it all come from SDCs.

Mayor Daoust stated in Troutdale we already have one of the lowest average cost for houses in the Metro region.

Councilor Allen stated you are talking about existing structures.

Mayor Daoust replied yes.

Councilor Allen stated I am talking about future housing.

Mayor Daoust stated so there is a question on the table about the Strebin Trust \$2 million. What is the question?

Councilor Anderson replied get rid of it.

Mayor Daoust asked for a show of hands of all those in favor of eliminating \$2 million for the Strebin Trust improvements.

There was not a majority (only 2 of the 7 favored this) of the Council in favor of eliminating the \$2 million SDC eligible funds for the Strebin Trust improvements.

Councilor Anderson stated we have a skate park listed for \$1 million (\$250,000 is SDC eligible).

Councilor Ripma stated Paul Thalhoffer would be outraged if we eliminated this.

Mayor Daoust stated we have talked about a skate park for years.

Mayor Daoust asked for a show of hands of those in favor of eliminating the \$1 million for a skate park.

The majority (4 out of the 7) of the Council agreed to remove the skate park in the amount of \$1 million.

Mayor Daoust stated if there are no further questions we could look at how the changes we made to the CIP list affected the SDC rate.

Travis Hultin stated as the list stands right now the maximum SDC rate would be \$4,794.

Councilor White asked about the MTIP Fairview to Troutdale trail for \$75,000.

Travis Hultin stated this project is actually in our current budget. The \$75,000 is our share of the cost.

Councilor Anderson asked is this on the dike through the TRIP property?

Travis Hultin replied yes, basically extending that to the west.

Mayor Daoust stated with all of the changes we made to the CIP list the SDC rate dropped from \$5,377 to \$4,794.

Mayor Daoust asked is there anyone in the audience that has any questions?

Neil Handy asked has there been an estimate on the expense of the operational maintenance side on a yearly basis if all of these projects are done? When these projects are completed what affect does that have as far as maintenance and operation and other expenses?

Councilor White stated where we are now without adding any of these new parks or facilities in these parks, Charlie was saying we were facing an \$8.50 per resident parks maintenance fee per month. We would be looking at maybe a \$30 per month parks maintenance fee if all of these projects were done. I am not using that to scare anyone. Troutdale is one big park right now. We have more parks than any other city. I am not saying that is a bad thing, but I think we have arrived; we are there. If not we better come up with a way to fund it.

Councilor Anderson stated if I am reading your worksheet correctly the grand total of the projects in the CIP is \$12,179,316.

Travis Hultin replied correct.

Councilor Anderson asked and that is capacity enhancing?

Travis Hultin replied no, that is the total of all of the projects from the Master Plan, and these additional other parks projects. Right now out of \$12 million in total parks projects about \$7 million would be SDC eligible.

Councilor Anderson asked and capacity enhancing means more people right?

Travis Hultin replied generally, yes.

Councilor Anderson stated from 2013-14 to 2035, at our estimated full buildout, we are going to grow by 3,084 people and we are going to spend \$7 million to get there. Job well done boys. I think that is ridiculous. \$25,000 a person is what we are spending.

Councilor Ripma stated if we don't do this we are still going to have to spend the \$12 million.

Councilor Anderson asked we are?

Councilor Ripma replied yes, if we are going to keep our quality of life. The business of maintenance, out of the general fund we have to allocate money to maintain the parks and they are suffering right now and they will suffer more, but that is not a reason not to build more park capacity for our increased population. With that kind of reasoning we would never do anything. If the city didn't grow at all we are still going to want to improve our parks a little bit. I do not share the view that we are to green, that we are one big park. That is hardly the case. At least I don't agree and I don't think most people in Troutdale think that.

Councilor Allen stated we made it over 100 years without any of this stuff.

Councilor Ripma asked how do you think we got the parks that we have?

Councilor Allen stated and it will be another 100 years before we have this stuff.

Councilor Ripma stated the reason we have the parks that we have now is the citizens paid for them. When new development occurred there wasn't a contribution for the increased capacity.

Councilor Wilson asked when did the SDCs start?

Councilor Ripma stated in the 90s. That was just a way to get a contribution from the builders for the additional capacity, which is why they are popular with the public. I challenge that you think houses are going to be cheaper. If we got rid of the SDCs the price of the house is still determined by the market; how much it is worth and how much people are willing to pay, the neighborhood it is in, etc.

Councilor Allen stated that is because if it doesn't pencil out they just don't build it, which is happening now.

Councilor Ripma stated in the end that isn't a reason to abandoned asking for the contribution.

Councilor Allen stated you are asking us to spend more money on the last 1,280 units then we have through the entire 100 year history of Troutdale.

Councilor Ripma stated if we end up needing more park capacity in some years to come it will cost more than it does now.

Councilor Allen asked so you don't think we have enough parks now?

Councilor Ripma stated I am a fan of parks. I am willing to consider something about increasing park purchasing. If we were discussing that I might be willing to compromise, but to just slash away at our Parks Master Plan like we are doing just for the purposes of lowering SDCs you are not representing the public well here. You are just representing the builders.

Councilor Allen stated I think I will get your support on spending future general fund dollars towards parks. I don't want to do that right now because the budget is too tight, but someday we will be able to. I just see that we are really hindering development right now and it isn't good because we either increase our income from property tax or we reduce the size of the city and I don't think we should do that anymore.

Mayor Daoust stated the valid point that I am starting to see is the maintaining everything. If everything on the CIP list was added to our parks system there would be a rather large increase of maintenance.

Councilor Ripma stated but that will be over many years before this \$12 million worth of projects is built.

Councilor White stated but it stops development today. In our recent budget meetings we saw the optimistic projections and the Mayor even mentioned a super optimistic projection which means attracting development. We all agreed that was the best way out of the financial situation that we are currently in. Dave, to quote you, you said you are willing to do whatever it takes to see development happen.

Councilor Ripma stated of course I am talking about the job creating business development; I have never agreed to subsidizing just houses and apartments. That is what you are talking about.

Councilor White stated that is a zoning issue. We are not talking about changing the zoning. You can only build those in certain areas that are already preapproved for that.

Councilor Ripma stated these SDCs only apply to dwelling units. I don't think we have an argument about wanting to develop Troutdale for our tax base...

Councilor White interrupted and stated the fact of the matter is that business needs those homes, and industry follows those rooftops, not the other way around.

Jay Ellis, Beaverton, stated I took some graduate classes at PSU and I am working on my degree in real estate development. I did a 10-page paper on SDC fees. The state enabled the cities recently to allow SDC fees and there were some general principals and guidelines that went into that rationale and it wasn't just for the cities to create a wish list of things you might want to do for the city. The general purpose was for equalization of relative financial burden. Right now you want new development to pay for half of all of the future capacity when new development at 1,200 units with 2 people per unit is 2,400 people in a city of about 17,000. The charges or fees imposed on new development should be no more than all capitalized proportionate share of the local governments costs of the new facilities needed to serve such new development. What I am saying is that I can't imagine 4 acres of brand new concrete - I don't know that anyone has ever called the city and said because there is not a concrete path to where ever at Glenn Otto Park I can't enjoy my time down there. Why are we spending this. It's not just the \$560,000 for the sidewalk; the contractor is putting on almost 20%, the city is putting on 15% in administrative cost and then you have a 10% contingency. All of those soft costs push that to almost \$1 million. No one wants to see the urban renewal district and the beautiful park there more than I do; I think that would be great. You can look at this list every year. I think we want to spur growth now and if we see things happening it gives you a chance to readjust them latter. However, the new development coming into Troutdale, if you want to be proportionate, most of it is single-family on 5,000 to 10,000 square foot lots. The future development with families in them; at Beaver Creek Cottages there is not one kid living there. There are different ways you can look at proportionate; you can look at per unit based on the total units in Troutdale, or you can look at it per unit as an apartment which usually has 1.5 persons per unit and a house is 3. There are different ways to look at proportionality. All I know is that 50% of SDC fees on the total budget isn't proportional no matter how you look at it.

Mayor Daoust stated I can see a lot of these projects never getting done. This is a moving target. We started out looking at 1,280 units, but it could be that we are only talking about 600 units until we reach buildout if some apartment zoning gets changed to single-family housing. The moving target is the denominator. If we look at this in two years and we say it's not 1,280 anymore it is only 700, that will jack the SDC rate up through the roof.

Councilor Ripma stated that is when we revisit it.

Mayor Daoust stated we can revisit this every year. I think we should get to the point where we are discussing the SDC rate. Now that we know what the rate is with the cuts we have made, how is the Council feeling?

Councilor Wilson stated even if we added all the projects back into the CIP list we could still just charge the \$4,794 and not change anything. As things happen and if we are

able to develop it then we just go ahead and develop it, but that will just mean that something else wouldn't get developed.

Mayor Daoust stated that is an option.

Councilor Anderson asked don't we have the ability to give staff direction to bring this forward in a resolution that says we can reduce the SDC to charge up to \$4,794?

Councilor Ripma stated if we amend the LOS methodology.

Craig Ward stated Councilor Ripma just mentioned the LOS methodology. That is the basis on which our SDCs have been calculated today. In this analysis you are proposing to change the SDC based on a list of projects. If the Council chooses to adopt that list of projects and charge the full amount based on the CIP list as you amended it tonight then the maximum SDC would be \$4,794. We have to adopt the CIP list in order to justify that SDC rate.

David Ross stated and change the methodology.

Councilor Ripma stated we should run this by the PAC.

Mayor Daoust stated I think so too.

Councilor Allen stated the problem I see is if these 1,280 units were expensive homes I think you could easily get away with \$5,000, but they are not. Most of these 1,280 units here are apartments or they are small homes on 4,000 square foot lots and I just don't see you getting \$4,794 and getting somebody wanting to develop. It needs to be about half of that.

Mayor Daoust asked does the Council have any desire to go back through the list.

No one expressed an interest in doing that.

Mayor Daoust stated now we are just down to discussing the SDC rate and deciding whether we are going to send this to the PAC or not.

Councilor Wilson stated I would favor the PAC reviewing it to make sure that we are not just looking at cutting things, but understanding what the maintenance is going to be in the long run for all of these additions.

Councilor Thomas (inaudible).

Councilor White stated I think we all realize that a lot of these projects may never see the light of day. We didn't calculate in any grant money. We tasked the PAC to look at other ways to create funding. I think there are a lot of ideas to get dollars; if there is a big demand for frisbee golf what is to stop volunteers from putting together a project like

we did with the community garden. We could do this at a grassroots level. The most important thing is to get development happening in our town. As Councilor Allen points out all the time we are an edge town. When I look in the room and I see the gentlemen that are here tonight, they have been part of Troutdale longer than a lot of us that are on the Council and to say that they haven't paid their share for the parks already. I want to remind you that due to regulations we have trimmed their lot sizes in some cases by more than half. I think they deserve some credit for what they have already given. I really feel this is too high. I am proposing that we look at a reduced rate and treat it like we did the open for business plan so we have some control over it. Let's try a reduced rate for a year and see how much development that generates. That would be a good test for where we are at on this thing. When you talk about us being low already you are comparing us to cities like West Linn where they are building \$750,000 homes, they are not building blue collar, first-time owner homes. The people that are attracted to this area are usually younger and this is their first home. Another problem we are not looking at is when you have to pay \$15,000 per unit up front, there is only a handful of people who can afford to do that. Your raw land isn't worth very much because there are only a handful of people who can actually afford to purchase it and they network together and they know each other. It puts a big detriment on selling property. I think we could come up with a reduced rate for one year.

Councilor Allen stated I would agree with that.

Councilor White stated I am willing to throw out a caveat. We have about 800 acres left to the south of Troutdale that we can develop. I am for leaving the rate at that once that area becomes urban reserve. Let the people that truly are coming fresh into the city pay a share that is fair for that area. SDC fees in 1992 were \$0; you didn't even have to pay them. It is a fairly new concept. If we started off at \$1,000 per house we wouldn't have any problems here. But it is not fair to say that these people in this room haven't paid anything towards those parks.

Councilor Ripma stated nobody said that.

Councilor White stated my proposal is to keep the \$4,794 rate for the 800 acres to the south once that land becomes available.

David Ross stated there is a statutory formula that you have to follow that first establishes a methodology and then establishes a rate.

Council discussed whether or not this topic should be referred to the PAC to review, and if so what direction they wanted to give to the PAC.

Council agreed to refer the following to the PAC:

- ***the modified version of the CIP list that was generated tonight to obtain their feedback on the Council's recommended changes;***
- ***get any recommendations they may have on additional changes to the CIP list;***

- *they should consider future maintenance costs in reviewing the CIP list;*
- *make them aware of the potential change in the methodology from a LOS methodology to a Improvement Based methodology;*
- *get their reaction to reducing the SDC rate in half for a short period of maybe a year to stimulate development (reducing it from the adjusted rate based on the revised CIP and the Improvement Based methodology of \$4,794 to \$2,400 or less).*

Councilor White stated I thought there was a consensus for direction to look into the 4 miles of paved area in Glenn Otto Park to get a better picture of that.

Craig Ward stated we understood that you requested that information. We will try to get that to you. That is not part of the direction for the PAC.

3. Adjourn:

Meeting adjourned at 9:44pm.

Doug Daoust, Mayor

Approved June 11, 2013

ATTEST:

Debbie Stickney, City Recorder