

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

Tuesday, June 25, 2013

1. ROLL CALL, AGENDA UPDATE

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

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

ABSENT: None.

STAFF: Craig Ward, City Manager; Debbie Stickney, City Recorder; Amy Pepper, Civil Engineer; and Erich Mueller, Finance Director.

GUESTS: See Attached.

Mayor Daoust asked are there any agenda updates?

Councilor Allen stated I would like to have the Council reconsider the vote on the Sanitary Sewer Master Plan with discussion and public input.

MOTION: Councilor Allen moved that we reconsider the vote on the Sanitary Sewer Master Plan with discussion and public comment on July 9, 2013. Seconded by Councilor Ripma.

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

Motion Passed 7 – 0.

2. CONSENT AGENDA:

2.1 RESOLUTION: A resolution authorizing the City Manager to execute an Intergovernmental Agreement with Multnomah County for the warranty of public improvements in S. Troutdale Road associated with College Nature Park at Beaver Creek.

MOTION: Councilor Thomas moved to adopt the consent agenda. Seconded by Councilor Wilson. Motion Passed Unanimously.

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

None.

4. RESOLUTION: A resolution adjusting the storm sewer utility fee and rescinding Resolution No. 2152. *(This resolution was considered by Council on June 11, 2013. There was a motion made to adopt this resolution which failed by a vote of 3-3. A subsequent motion was made by a councilor on the prevailing side to reconsider this resolution at the June 25, 2013 meeting, that motion passed by a vote of 4-2.)*

Amy Pepper, Civil Engineer, reviewed the staff report (copy included in the packet).

Council had no questions for staff.

Saul Pompeyo, owner of Ristorante Di Pompello, read a letter into the record (copy of the letter is attached as Exhibit A, the additional handouts from Mr. Pompeyo are included in the packet).

Mayor Daoust asked Mr. Mueller do you have a prospective on how these rate increases will affect the businesses?

Erich Mueller, Finance Director, stated I have some samples to share with you, and Mr. Pompello happens to be one the businesses that I used. The particular circumstance that Mr. Pompello was explaining is probably accurate numerically, but I think there are some other factors that caused the increase that may be useful for the Council to understand. In March of 2011, as part of the Business Incentive Program that the Council adopted, the City provided for the payment of system development charges (SDCs) for businesses that expanded in the downtown area. Mr. Pompello's restaurant went from having 3.72 equivalent residential units (ERUs) for sewer usage to 14.4 ERUs. That is what has created the large increase in his sewer bill. It isn't that the rate went up that amount it is the quantity of the ERUs that are charged due to the size increase and the seating capacity, which is how the SDCs are charged and how the ERUs are calculated. The other aspect which I didn't follow entirely, but I believe he was referring to was that his water usage over the last two years has gone from about 23,000 - 25,000 gallons a month to 59,000. He has been successful; he has grown his business. His water usage has more than doubled. Even if the water rates had stayed the same his water bill would have doubled. Restaurants tend to have a higher sewer charge simply because they tend to have a larger impact on the sewer infrastructure.

The email I sent to the Council (copy included in the packet) addressed the residential side. On the business side there are a wide variety of business types; there really isn't a typical business. I took a look at a restaurant and based on their last six months average water usage I have estimated that their water bill will increase \$5 per month,

the sewer would increase \$18 a month and the storm sewer would increase \$.13 per month if these rate increases are adopted. This particular restaurant has a very small footprint with regards to the impervious surface, which is what determines the storm sewer charge. Each business has a different exposure for the storm sewer fee. I took a look at a small accounting, legal, tax, administrative office business in the downtown area which has a lower water usage because it is not a restaurant. The estimate that I came up with is that their bill will go up \$.11 a month for water, \$1.27 a month for sewer and \$.04 per month for storm sewer for a total of \$1.42 a month. I looked at a retail establishment just down the street from here as a sample and looking at their last six months water usage it looks like they would have an increase of \$1.19 per month. While they may serve food they don't have a full restaurant, they are more of a retail business. The impact on their sewer would be an increase of \$1.49 a month and the storm sewer would be an increase of \$.21 a month. This equals a 4% increase, or \$2.89 per month for this business. I also looked at a national chain grocery store and the impact would be an increase of \$19.27 per month for water. For sewer, because this business has a higher ERU due to food preparation, it would increase \$7.43 a month. Amy had mentioned that the storm sewer would have a maximum increase of \$1.00. This particular business has 239,000 square feet of impervious surface, but they currently only pay the maximum rate of \$24.27 which is being proposed to increase by \$1.00 to \$25.27. There overall increase would be \$27.70 per month, or \$332.00 a year. I also looked at an international package delivery firm located in Troutdale and based on their last six months water usage I have estimated that their water fee would increase \$53.00 per month. They have 79 ERUs because of the size of the facility and staffing so their sewer would increase \$101.00 per month. They have 1,945,000 square feet of impervious surface, but their storm sewer will only increase by \$1.00 to \$25.27 per month. They are looking at about a \$155.80 per month increase, or \$1,869 per year (a 4% increase).

Mayor Daoust stated thank you, we needed that perspective because Saul is saying how his bills have increased but the rates have only increased 4% per year roughly. The large increase for Saul was due to his expansion and success.

Councilor Anderson asked did anybody tell Saul before his expansion that we calculate sewer based on ERUs? Did we advise him that by expanding his restaurant as much as he did that his rate would go up, or was this a surprise?

Erich Mueller replied I can't speak definitively, but I would venture to say that the answer to your question is yes on both sides. That he was advised and that it appears to be a surprise to him. He was in the building department at the old city hall on multiple occasions attempting to go through the process for expansion. I know there were multiple meetings and some miscommunications and misunderstandings. I am sure that less than ideal communication was accomplished in both directions. I wasn't involved in those, I just know of them second hand.

Councilor White stated our increases annually have been similar to the proposed increases. At this rate how long would it take before these fees would double for any of our businesses? I am guessing around 13 years.

Erich Mueller replied without doing some calculations I can't give you a good number right now.

Councilor White stated if we were charging the full recommended rate it would be closer to 8 years.

Erich Mueller stated each of the master plans recommended an increase at a meaningfully higher annual increase than what has been proposed for the last few years because it was an attempt to balance between what the scientific expert analysis proposed and what the community economic impact can support.

Councilor Anderson stated Saul brought up a point about charging for usage based on how much you actually use as opposed to the ERU calculation. There are 8 to 12 hours when he has empty chairs and they aren't using the toilets or water. For the time he is busy, he has 3 hours of very high activity, he seems to be paying for it throughout the day. What would be the consequence to changing that calculation to charge for usage as opposed to the ERU?

Amy Pepper replied our sewer rates are based on ERUs and there are a number of factors based on usages. For restaurants it is based on the number of seats and that has a factor for the ERU. An ERU is 180 gallons per day. For someone that is in business like Saul where we have water records we could probably back calculate to determine a more accurate ERU of what he is discharging currently based on his water usage. For a new business we don't know their water usage history so we base it on an engineering estimate perhaps to correlate that to the 180 gallons per day.

Councilor Wilson asked how would Saul or another business contact the City to request a review of that?

Amy Pepper replied he could contact the public works department. I believe there is a process to look at that, but it may require an engineering study.

Councilor Allen asked in the paperwork that I am looking at there isn't actually enough data to make a good calculation. It does appear apparent to me that Saul's sewer rates are disproportionately higher than his water increase. The increase in the number of seats/customers that he has from expanding his business has ended in a disproportionate increase in his sewer rate. I am not sure that I am comfortable with the burden that we have put on him.

Councilor Thomas stated if memory serves, the two things that are based on ERU are sewer and storm water. Water is only based on usage. You really can't compare the two

because they are two different factors. To try and balance the two would be hard; you are not comparing apples to apples.

Councilor Allen stated that is a true statement. I am just considering toilet flushes to be a portion of total water usage, and that there is a relationship in the increased demand on our sewer system versus the amount of water that is actually being used.

Councilor Thomas stated the other side of the coin is who should bear the burden. If you reduce it somewhere somebody else has to pick it up otherwise we are back to the same quandary of how do we continue to keep the system running and keep it maintained; all of the issues that came up during the budget session.

Councilor Allen stated I am just considering that actual usage should be some factor in how much we increase rates, and that the people that are actually using the system are paying for the system.

Erich Mueller stated related to the usage, one of the reasons that restaurants have a higher amount is both the traffic and toilet flushes, but there is also a great deal of water and sewer system usage in the process of food preparation, much of which will occur when you are not open and operating. There will be times in advance of customers arriving that they would be generating a load on the system because that is the nature of what they create. Restaurants are not the same as retail operations where folks are taking dry goods off of the shelf, they are cooking things and making use of sinks and dishwashers in the food preparation process. Not every business is the same in terms of how they impact the system.

Councilor Wilson asked are the sewer rates going to be the same for a restaurant that doesn't serve water like Saul's, as it would be for someone who does serve water?

Erich Mueller replied it is based on the number of seats. There is a calculation that is done, and a set of criteria that is used when the number of ERUs are established. If you had identical restaurants with identical number of seating across the street from each other and one served water and one didn't, in theory one has a greater impact on the system than the other but I would think it would be pretty marginal.

Councilor Allen stated if water usage would double in a situation and we have to handle that water in our sewer system then it wouldn't make sense to me that the sewer charges should be triple.

Mayor Daoust asked are you referring to Saul's restaurant?

Councilor Allen replied it would work with any restaurant.

Erich Mueller stated there was a specific change in his number of ERU's because of the expansion of his business. He went from having 3.72 ERUs to 14.4 ERUs. Even if the rate per ERU was unchanged his sewer bill was going to go up substantially. Not every

restaurant is going to have the experience that Saul did, unless every restaurant expanded to the extent that he did by adding that number of seats. It was the capacity change which drove the majority of that increase.

Councilor Allen stated the only time that water usage doesn't go into our sewer system is if it is used externally and goes through our storm drain. In a business like this the water usage is proportional to the amount of water that goes into our sewer system and therefore the rate should be proportional; the increase should be proportional.

Councilor Ripma stated you are over-analyzing it. Think of your house where you are charged a flat sewer rate. If you are proposing a complete revamp to measure sewer rates based on water usage; there are probably reasons why it isn't done that way. If you look at Saul's numbers in the last month before he expanded in April of 2011 he used \$53.55 of water. The last month on here, June is \$162.25; that is triple the usage. The sewer went up more than triple, but not a lot more. I am just saying that his own numbers aren't justifying something to radical. Councilor Wilson brought up that he could make an inquiry to the City about the charges. None of this has anything to do with the storm sewer rate increase we are looking at.

Councilor Wilson stated I think Saul needs to go talk to staff.

Councilor Ripma stated I am willing to revisit how we are calculating these charges. I have lived here for 25 years and the sewer rates have always been way higher than the water.

Councilor Allen stated they are different systems. They don't have to be the same, they should just be proportional.

Amy Pepper stated we have heard complaints over the years about our SDC factors and how they are different than other jurisdictions in the area. The rates/factors were adopted a long time ago. They change periodically but they haven't changed a lot. Staff wanted to better understand where these rates and factors came from so we had Brown and Caldwell (the consultant working on the master plan) provide a technical memo looking at these factors to help guide staff. I can provide that to Council. These factors, although they appear a little bit strange, they are actually from a engineering tech document about the typical discharge from these kinds of facilities.

MOTION: Councilor Ripma moved to adopt a resolution adjusting the storm sewer utility fee and rescinding Resolution No. 2152. Seconded by Councilor Thomas.

Councilor Wilson stated after we left the last meeting I asked staff to provide us with the rates for the last five years. In 2008 and 2009 we did not have any rate increases and the City didn't fall apart. In 2010 we raised the rates \$25 a year, and in 2011 we raised the rates \$25 a year, and again in 2012 we raised the rates \$25 a year for all three utilities. For the last 3 years we have actually increased the

water, sewer and storm sewer fees by 12%. If we increase them again we will have increased it 15%, and the water rates have gone up over \$100 for the typical household. At the rate we are going in another 3 to 4 years we will increase our rates by another \$100. I don't think this is sustainable for our citizens. I have been told that it is just a cup of coffee. It could be, but it is also equivalent to a family buying 15 one-gallon bottles of milk for their family, or 151 diaper changes on a new child, or a new pair of shoes needed for school, or school supplies. These are not trivial numbers; they are meaningful and they are getting larger. 24% of the kids in Oregon, which equates to about 1,000 families in Troutdale, live with under poverty wages, and now we are asking them to make a decision to either pay their utility bill or put food on the table. I just don't see that we need to have an increase every year of \$25. I know that I haven't received a 15% increase the last four years in my wages. I think we are putting an unfair burden on the residents. I would entertain cutting these rates in half. At the rate we are going we are going to be pushing people out of Troutdale.

Councilor White stated this is being reconsidered because we had a tie vote and not all of the council was present, so we asked for more time to reconsider this. I am concerned about the long-term when we are going to be doubling these rates. It may not affect the people here in this room, but it does affect some people. There were 27 people with shut-off notices this month; that tends to be the average. There is really no other choice for people. They don't have another source for water, sewer and storm water. We have a great opportunity here with a new public works director coming on board soon. Lets slow it down for this year. I like the idea of compromising and only increasing the rate by half as much and give ourselves a little time. I am willing for a correction to occur when we have the new public works director. Give him some incentive. Tell him we are not comfortable with this 4.1% increase every year for the next twenty years. If I am not mistaken I believe we will double our rate within 13 years. Then you are talking about some real serious money for businesses. Saul can only charge so much for a plate of spaghetti and at some point his business is going to start going the other direction and I would hate to see that. I would like to see him continue to grow. He has become an anchor in our town. When I go there I see mostly locals. It is a tough argument, whether I flush my toilet at the restaurant or at my home it is the same load on the system. I think that is a fair compromise; I am suggesting that for all three of the increases. It is just like getting a second opinion from the doctor. We have an opportunity to do that. It is not a cut on our public works department; I know they work hard.

Councilor Thomas stated the 2008 number is when we chose not to do an increase. The reason for the big jump the next two years was to make up for the fact that we didn't have the increase in 2008 which put a larger burden on everyone. The cost of operations are going up. The recommended rate increase is 9% per year; we have cut that in half. Every year we see the charts. Whether you get a new public works director or not those charts probably aren't going to change. What you see is deficit coming sooner. The more we forestall that the

quicker it will hit us and then you are looking at a situation where you have to impose a 15% to 20% increase all at once. Sometimes we are mixing apples and oranges. The sewer rates are calculated totally different than water, and the storm water is a different ball game by itself. I understand that this is a fairly substantial increase for some people, but we have to maintain our system.

Councilor Allen stated I do look at fairness. We are talking about the storm sewer utility fees for this motion and when I look at this I look at what projects are projected to be done and how important they are to us. I also consider the burden that is put on the ratepayer. In this case I see Troutdale as a town that relies on well water and that has a river that is very important to it. Therefore, when I look at what the fee increase will cover and how important it is to Troutdale I am actually in favor of the storm sewer utility fee increase.

Mayor Daoust stated I try to put this whole thing into prospective. I don't like the increase any more than anybody else does. Saul's case may deserve a little more attention. My prospective is that this is just \$2.20 a month for the average household; that is what we are talking about and that is a cup of coffee. We are getting behind. We had a sewer failure just down the road here. How is that being paid for? When you put it in prospective, when paying for college education a prudent investor would pay a certain amount up until it is time for college and other people like me put it off and end up paying exorbitant amounts later for the same college. I see examples in here where we are already in trouble. It is not like it is something that is out in the future where we are just going to collect money now and do a lot of stuff in the future. We already have examples. In the last budget cycle the storm fund was unable to support its proportional share of the Vacon truck requiring an interfund loan from the sewer fund of \$132,000 which is being repaid in monthly installments. There is another example where in the last budget planning cycle staff deferred two other currently needed water projects due to insufficient funds. That tells me that we are already in a situation where we need more funding. As much as we don't like increasing fees for people, \$2.20 is not going to break people. I think a majority of citizens would agree to that. I think it is well within a reasonable rate increase especially since staff already decreased it. Some of our councilors want to decrease it even more. We are never going to catch up with the need that we have for our infrastructure. In my mind the infrastructure that we have in Troutdale is of the utmost importance. Whenever you come to a controversial issue like this where we are divided, I will always try to look for the greatest good for the greatest number of people over the long run and that is the side that I will always fall to. This is a perfect example of that; infrastructure is a prime example of that. Three years from now we don't want to have an exorbitant bill where we are looking at our budget trying to figure out how we are going to cover it. Lets take a little bite now and handle it.

VOTE: Mayor Daoust – Yes; Councilor White – No; Councilor Allen – Yes; Councilor Wilson – No; Councilor Thomas – Yes; Councilor Ripma – Yes; Councilor Anderson – Yes.

Motion Passed 5 – 2.

5. RESOLUTION: A resolution adjusting the sanitary sewer utility fee, confirming the average flow rate for an equivalent residential unit and rescinding Resolution No. 2153.

Amy Pepper, Civil Engineer, reviewed the staff report (copy included in the packet).

Councilor White asked how much of the 4% will go towards operation and how much will go towards capital improvement projects?

Amy Pepper replied I would have to look at the budget to see the balance between materials and services versus the capital improvement projects.

Councilor Anderson asked do you plan to increase 5.25% each of the four years following this one?

Amy Pepper replied the Sanitary Sewer Master Plan included a financial analysis and that was the recommended rate increase for the next 4 years. After that point there would be no rate increase proposed assuming things track that financial analysis.

Councilor Wilson asked what is the reason for not having an increase after the next 4 years?

Amy Pepper replied essentially the bond payment would be done so that incremental portion that comes from the sewer utility fund would go away.

Councilor Allen stated this one is not so clear cut for me. It is not just whether or not we are proportionately being fair, but when I look at the projects that we want to do and how important they are to Troutdale and whether not we are being good stewards of the taxpayers money, I have some concerns on this one. I am not in favor of this increase at this time, but would like to wait until we hire someone who can take a look at it and give us a recommendation.

MOTION: Councilor Ripma moved to adopt a resolution adjusting the sanitary sewer utility fee, confirming the average flow rate for an equivalent residential unit and rescinding Resolution No. 2153. Seconded by Councilor Thomas.

Councilor Ripma stated I would just like to say that this rate increase is in the budget that we adopted.

Councilor White asked would you consider a friendly amendment of going with half of the rate?

Councilor Ripma replied no. We budgeted this modest rate increase. For all of the reasons that we discussed I favor this modest increase now or we will get ourselves in trouble down the road, and very quickly. I think it would be short-sided to cut it any further.

VOTE: Mayor Daoust – Yes; Councilor White – No; Councilor Allen – No; Councilor Wilson – No; Councilor Thomas – Yes; Councilor Ripma – Yes; Councilor Anderson – Yes.

Motion Passed 4 – 3.

6. RESOLUTION: A resolution adjusting the water commodity fee, confirming other water related fees and rescinding Resolution No. 2154.

Amy Pepper, Civil Engineer, reviewed the staff report (copy included in the packet).

Councilor Allen stated when I look at the water fund I see projects that we should have been doing three years ago like the inside coating of the water towers and that concerns me. I also believe that we should not artificially keep rates low today to end up paying a larger increase later. In this particular case I am in favor.

Jay Ellis, Beaverton, Oregon, stated we might not agree with each other but we understand where everybody is coming from. Most of us in this room are very fortunate and a few dollars won't affect us a lot. There are people who it will affect and I think we are being appreciative of that. I don't think it is bad to have other folks who are more professional than us, like the new public works director, look at these numbers. I realize we are going with a 4% increase and I think at the last meeting Councilor Anderson had said that 4% was about the rate of inflation. I am not an economist, but I think the CPI is closer to 2%. I don't think it is unreasonable to expect the City to raise their rates at a rate similar to the rate increase of social security or the CPI. I would like that to be an important factor when you look at future increases. We are all in this together and the more people that are in the game that can add to the fees and help pay for the systems will be a benefit to all of us in decreased costs. I think barrier of entry can be a real cost and a preventative factor for a lot of people to come to this beautiful city of ours. While you are looking at increasing these fees for a greater output or long-term decrease of cost for everybody, also realize that decreasing the barrier of entry, i.e. system development fees, could enable more people to enjoy this beautiful city. We are competing with other areas to get business to come here and having a beautiful city with a lot of amenities and inexpensive water and sewer rates is a very good feather to have in your cap.

Mayor Daoust stated the statistics agree with you; we have one of the cheapest water rates.

Councilor Allen stated I see basically two things that can get us in trouble. One is not doing projects we should be doing and the other is wasting money unnecessarily. In the

case of the water it is the first. I feel that the water projects that this increase will pay for are necessary and we will be held accountable if we don't do it.

Councilor White asked why aren't we charging the nearly 10% increase on all three utilities? Why did you choose to go with the lower percentage of increase?

Amy Pepper replied staff has been hearing what the Council has been saying the last few years about keeping the rate increases marginal.

Craig Ward stated I have every intention of asking the new public works director exactly that question. We really need to look at the sustainability of these funds over the long-term.

MOTION: Councilor Ripma moved to adopt a resolution adjusting the water commodity fee, confirming other water related fees and rescinding Resolution No. 2154. Seconded by Councilor Thomas.

Councilor Anderson stated when you buy a home you open an escrow account and you put away a little money each month to pay your property taxes or insurance so that you are not stuck with a big bill in October or November when it comes due. We have that option to either pay a little now or pay a lot when it's not there. The former is better than the later. Infrastructure is critical. We just had a pump station that was expected to last twenty years and it only made it eighteen years. We need to fix that; that is our job. I don't want to go down to Beaver Creek and have someone ask me why did this happen. If we could have funded it and prevented it from happening it is incumbent upon us to do it. That said, I agree with Councilor White and Craig Ward that we need to have our new public works director look at these. I intend to vote in favor of this resolution as I did for the prior two resolutions, but next year I want a review to make sure we are on the right path.

VOTE: Mayor Daoust – Yes; Councilor White – No; Councilor Allen – Yes; Councilor Wilson – No; Councilor Thomas – Yes; Councilor Ripma – Yes; Councilor Anderson – Yes.

Motion Passed 5 – 2.

Councilor Ripma stated I just want to say that I also favor having the new public works director review the rates equally as much as everyone else does.

7. RESOLUTION: A resolution providing for current FY 2012-13 Budget transfers and appropriation changes.

Erich Mueller, Finance Director, stated this is the customary resolution that I bring forward at the final council meeting of the fiscal year to attempt to align up the appropriations that we have where expenditures have occurred to address items that

were not anticipated when the budget was developed for this fiscal year. Mr. Mueller briefly reviewed the proposed transfers outlined in the staff report and resolution (copy included in the packet).

MOTION: Councilor Ripma moved to adopt a resolution providing for current FY 2012-13 Budget transfers and appropriation changes. Seconded by Councilor Anderson.

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

Motion Passed 7 – 0.

8. DISCUSSION: A discussion regarding membership in Greater Portland, Inc.

Mayor Daoust stated at the last meeting we discussed becoming a member of Greater Portland, Inc. (GPI) and at that time Councilor White expressed a desire to have additional questions answered. Since then Councilor White has been satisfied and he is willing to move forward.

Councilor White stated my questions were answered. I appreciate the Council providing me the time I needed to do some research. We currently have EMEA representing us and they do have a relationship with GPI. I think that is enough coverage. We are really hard on our volunteers, when SummerFest or when someone comes in for the Cruise-In asking for money. Just to be prudent I am not going to be in favor of joining this organization.

Mayor Daoust stated the Port of Portland also works with GPI and they also have an association with EMEA. We would be on the outside of all of that with all of our partners working with GPI. I feel as though we should not be on the outside of a relationship like that where people are doing work for us and we are not paying into the organization at all. All of the other cities in the Portland Metro area are members of GPI. We have partners doing work for us and we have people that are looking out for us and I am sure they would look out for us more if we were members. We need outreach. We need some marketing. We need people out there that are doing that kind of thing for us because we don't do it. We don't market Troutdale. The Port of Portland is doing that for us on the industrial land, but guess who they are working with? GPI. The Port of Portland is looking at us wondering why we are not members. EMEA is looking at us wondering why we are not members. I think there is certain multiple levels of marketing and outreach that we need to do to reach the right people and GPI fits that level of the Metro area that we are not covered in yet. That is why I propose that we become a member of GPI.

MOTION: Councilor Wilson moved to become members of Greater Portland, Inc. Seconded by Councilor Ripma.

VOTE: Mayor Daoust – Yes; Councilor White – No; Councilor Allen – No; Councilor Wilson – Yes; Councilor Thomas – Yes; Councilor Ripma – No; Councilor Anderson – Yes.

Motion Passed 4 – 3.

Mayor Daoust stated the membership is \$2,500 a year and starts July 1st.

Councilor Ripma stated I look forward to seeing what we get for it.

9. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

Craig Ward, City Manager, stated we have become aware that there is funding available through a grant for the East Multnomah Gang Enforcement Team (EMGET). This is a team that we have not participated in for a couple of years largely because the funding was limited to one year and we would have to hire another police officer and we didn't want to put that new hire in jeopardy because of the fluctuating funding. This is a two-year grant and the Chief feels strongly, and I endorse his position. We will assign a more senior officer to the EMGET and backfill with a new hire.

Craig Ward stated the Historical Landmarks Commission (HLC) has a meeting coming up. In a prior meeting they discussed the possible designation of at least one property. Our current rules state that if they want to apply for a historic landmark designation that will require a Type III hearing and the fee for that is \$600. If you want to volunteer to have your property put on the list it will cost you \$600. I want to ask if the Council would like to rescind that \$600 fee removing the barrier for someone who would like their property put on the Historic Landmark list.

Councilor Ripma stated I would favor allowing them to apply for this Type III hearing without the fee.

Mayor Daoust stated that is what we are talking about, right. We are not talking about the city paying the fee, we are just talking about rescinding the fee.

Craig Ward replied that is correct. I don't believe the city needs to pay the fee, we will simply waive the fee for this specific hearing.

Councilor Thomas stated the only difference is that we will eat the cost of the public hearing.

Craig Ward stated we would eat the cost. There are notification costs and obviously some staffing cost.

Councilor Ripma asked who holds the public hearing? Is it the Historic Landmarks Commission?

Craig Ward replied yes.

Councilor Thomas stated which has city staff so there are costs incurred. We might want to look into that rather than just waiving the entire fee.

Craig Ward stated I would be happy to bring back a staff report to address that if that is what the Council wants.

The majority of the Council agreed with Councilor Thomas' statement.

Craig Ward stated we will identify the incremental cost of conducting a public hearing and bring that forward in a staff report with a recommendation.

Craig Ward stated I have a couple of scheduling items for the Council:

- The executive sessions have been scheduled for 7pm on July 30th and July 31st to conduct performance evaluations of myself, the city attorney and the municipal court judge.
- City Hall will be closed on July 4th.

10. COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS

Councilor White stated I received an email from Jed Roberts updating us on the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) study. That reminded me that we still have not heard back from FEMA as to whether or not the flood plain was accidentally increased when they changed the datum. I have a concern because they are approaching the final map in October and I would still like to get an answer back from FEMA as to what happened.

Mayor Daoust asked Craig Ward to follow-up with FEMA.

Councilor Allen stated it was pretty obvious tonight that I have concerns about sanitary sewer but I must say on the Beaver Creek lift station I was very impressed with the way our crews and our management handled that. I am sure that we will review what happened and how we can avoid it in the future, but as far as ingenuity and responsiveness I was impressed with our people.

Councilor Thomas stated please express my thanks and gratitude for the quick work in getting that resolved.

Councilor Anderson stated I am glad to hear about the EMGET grant because a couple of residents have approached me about graffiti along Troutdale Road. Hopefully in the interim we can be on the lookout and stop that before it starts, but that is very encouraging to hear. The tourism committee that came out of the Mayor's Town Hall meeting has been meeting regularly. They have broken out into subcommittees. The

Chamber is going to make a presentation to the Council on July 9th. Claude Cruz has been elected President of the Chamber and he is going to give us an update on the tourism committee's work thus far.

Mayor Daoust stated I am glad to hear there is progress on the tourism committee. Yesterday I was at a 3-Mayor's meeting with Fairview, Wood Village and Shirley Craddick from Metro talking about Climate Smart Communities. It is a state mandate for the State of Oregon to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. There is some analysis being done this summer and I asked Shirley to make a presentation to us in the fall when they do some of their modeling. There are a lot of ideas on how you can reduce the use of cars and light trucks to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Some of those ideas will filter to Troutdale and we will talk about it later.

Today there was a Mayors Forum with the four mayors that was sponsored by the Gresham Chamber of Commerce and East Metro Economic Alliance. They had a room full of people at Persimmon. It was a good opportunity for Shane, Pat and myself to get up and talk about our cities.

11. ADJOURNMENT:

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

Meeting adjourned at 8:28pm.

Doug Daoust, Mayor

Approved August 27, 2013

ATTEST:

Debbie Stickney, City Recorder