

**Troutdale City Council – Regular Meeting
Troutdale City Hall – Council Chambers
104 SE Kibling Avenue
Troutdale, OR 97060-2099**

Tuesday, September 23, 2008

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

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

PRESENT: Mayor Thalhofer, Councilor Kight, Councilor Ripma, Councilor Thomas, Councilor Canfield, Councilor Kyle, and Councilor Daoust.

ABSENT: None.

STAFF: David Nelson, Chief of Police; Rich Faith, Community Development Director; Jim Galloway, Public Works Director; David Ross, City Attorney; Andy Parks, Interim Finance Director; and Sarah Skroch, Deputy City Recorder.

GUESTS: See attached list.

David Nelson stated Item #6, the resolution for the Emergency Operations Management Plan, is going to be moved to a later date in October.

2. CONSENT AGENDA:

2.1 ACCEPT MINUTES: August 19, 2008 Work Session, August 26, 2008 Regular Meeting, and September 9, 2008 Regular Meeting.

2.2 RESOLUTION: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to request the consolidation of tax lots associated with the Well House No. 5 and Site Improvements project.

MOTION: Councilor Ripma moved to adopt the consent agenda. Seconded by Mayor Thalhofer. Motion Passed Unanimously.

3. PROCLAMATION: Fire Prevention Week – October 5-11, 2008

Mayor Thalhofer read the Proclamation (a copy of the proclamation is included in the packet).

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

Jim Davis, Troutdale Resident, stated I'm here regarding your consideration for speed humps on Hensley Road by Sunrise Park. I apologize for not being at the last meeting. I'm here to ask what the City Attorney's decision was on collecting the required signatures for the process. Are they going to be waived or do we still need to collect them by the end of the month? Was there some sort of fast track consideration to install the speed humps?

David Ross replied at the last meeting Council decided that they were going to stay with their previous decision of an expedited proceeding but they were not going to waive the requirement of the petition.

Jim Davis asked we will have to get those signatures to City Council by the end of this month?

David Nelson replied the petition needs to be completed by September 30th and submitted to Travis Hultin in the Public Works Department.

Jim Davis asked does that get the ball rolling on the speed counts that the Police Department has to do?

David Nelson replied the Public Works Department arranges for the speed counts.

Jim Davis asked if we get the signatures filed on time is there still time to do that this year?

Councilor Kight stated I'm not sure because the asphalt plants usually close down when it's 60 degrees or less outside because they can't pour.

Jim Galloway replied that's correct. There isn't a given date on the calendar but it's approaching.

Jim Davis stated I noticed about two weeks ago that the water volume in my house was low. I called the main City Hall number and was told that construction was going on at 257th that was necessitating the water flow to be reduced. I lived with that for about a week but while driving along 257th, I didn't see any construction. I called back again last Friday and spoke to the Public Works Secretary and she said that Well pump #3 had failed and we are in the process of repairing that which is why the water volume is low. When is it supposed to be back to normal?

Jim Galloway replied I apologize if the first message that you got was a little inaccurate. The second message was more accurate. We have a total of 6 wells in the City. The pump to Well #3 did fail and we adjusted the water zones to compensate for that well being out of service. That has reduced the water pressure in your area. We're hopeful of having that back in service next week.

5. PUBLIC HEARING / ORDINANCE (Introduction): An Ordinance creating Chapter 8.34 of the Troutdale Municipal Code pertaining to Graffiti.

David Nelson stated as you may recall back on January 29th the Council held a work session to discuss a spray can ordinance. The idea originated from Councilor Thomas. We had some parameters from the work session on the 29th and the Police Department and Legal Department started working on draft language. That language went forward to the Parks Advisory Committee (PAC) on June 17th. The feedback was that they liked the idea of focusing on doing some sort of enforcement action on people vandalizing property or being in possession of certain implements but they weren't interested in punishing the home owner or property owner. I took the same draft language to the Public Safety Advisory Committee (PSAC) on June 19th and got basically the same response. The City Attorney came up with an

idea to address their concerns for the property owners by using the abatement process which would be similar to the nuisance abatement process. If the property owner has graffiti on their property and it's not remedied in a reasonable time period then they would go through the process of notification and ultimately if we needed to we could use the abatement process to clean it up. We wouldn't be citing the property owner for a violation. The ordinance looks at holding both adults and juveniles responsible if they're in possession of any kind of graffiti implements. Law enforcement has to have probable cause to take any kind of enforcement action on individuals if they are in possession of any kind of a graffiti implement. We added the ability to require restitution to the property owner. This would be considered as a violation instead of a misdemeanor. This is a little unique because typically restitution isn't awarded under a violation. We've also outlined a community service program but currently we don't have a formal program in place but it's something that is in our long range plan. Ultimately we'd like to have a program where offenders from our court go out and do some of the clean up and repainting. There are a couple of options the first being to approve the ordinance as it's written. The pros are that it would address some of the main ideas that the City Council raised back at the January 29th work session. The cons to this are that it may be a little bit stronger than what the citizen committees wanted in respect to the abatement process. The second option would be to make some recommendations to the proposed ordinance and then we'd bring back a modified version for the second reading. The fiscal impacts are really unknown at this time because it depends on what kind of a process we set up for the community service program. Staff recommends moving the ordinance forward to the second reading as written. The City Attorney noticed an error on page 3 of the ordinance, Section 8.34.070 Penalties, paragraph E Community Service which references a subsection in the first sentence. The subsection listed is A but should be changed to subsection C. We will correct that in the second reading.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked has an ordinance of this type been tested in court?

David Ross replied no.

Councilor Canfield asked did you write this or is it parts of ordinances from other cities?

David Ross replied it's a little of both.

Councilor Canfield stated concerning Section 8.34.080 Removal and Abatement Procedures, is that in other city ordinances?

David Ross replied it's an option in Gresham's ordinance. In their ordinance I believe failure to remove graffiti is a violation that the property owner is cited for and it can be part of the nuisance abatement procedure. We didn't include the violation for failure to remove graffiti from the property we just incorporated the provision that it may be declared a nuisance and abated under the existing nuisance code.

Councilor Canfield stated part of the ordinance refers to Section 8.28 of the Troutdale Municipal Code. Are any parts of the code going to be amended?

David Ross replied not as part of this.

Councilor Canfield asked could you describe the waiver of assessments? I'm trouble by the language that any penalty imposed by the Chief of Police may be waived if upon application it appears to the Chief that the applicant is What does that mean, it appears to the Chief? It's overly ambiguous. Some specific examples of what the Chief would be looking for other than what is listed in the ordinance would be helpful.

David Nelson replied I would look to see if they are on a fixed income, or if they are wheelchair bound or physically unable to get out and do the work. Those would be some examples that I'd be looking at if someone made an appeal.

Councilor Canfield asked what if they were a home owner that were hit once or twice a day and immediately went and cleaned up the graffiti and spent hundreds or thousands of dollars per year? Would that also be considered?

David Nelson replied if they lived next to a park or a school, were repeat victims, and brought in receipts or pictures then sure I'd look at that.

Councilor Kyle asked is this section saying that the homeowner has to make application for the waiver?

David Ross replied if it's declared to be a public nuisance then they would have to apply.

Councilor Daoust stated in Section 8.34.070 Penalties, paragraph C lists the fines that they may have to pay. Then in paragraph D it says they may be ordered to pay restitution to the injured property owner. Would they have to pay both a fine and restitution?

David Ross replied it could be both or the judge could decide it was one or the other. Some of that will be up to the judge.

Councilor Daoust stated when we first talked about this topic we discussed stores keeping spray paint cans in a secured location. I noticed that's not in here.

Councilor Thomas replied we talked about that but Council decided against it.

David Ross stated it is my understanding that Gresham is considering doing that which would mirror Portland's ordinance.

Councilor Daoust replied I think Gresham has done it. I went into Miller Paint in Gresham not long ago and asked where their spray paint cans were and they said they were in locked cabinets because Gresham requires them to do that. I asked them if they minded doing that and they said no it seems to be working ok.

Councilor Kight asked in regards to community service, do you have some idea of who will be supervising the workers and what the cost will be to the City to monitor it?

David Nelson replied we don't have an idea of the exact cost. When I worked for the Sheriff's Office the officers or deputies supervised the community service. It was pretty much a self sufficient operation where the individuals were paying to be on community service. That was a 7 day a week operation. It would be different here because we don't have that volume of people and perhaps don't have that much work for them to do. We want a law enforcement individual to be the supervisor, someone with arresting authority and also someone that can prepare reports and testify in court if needed regarding whether the individual has or has not completed their community service. We are looking at whether or not the supervisor can be a reserve officer or if it needs to be a full time officer. It will probably be 12 to 18 months before we broach that.

Councilor Kight stated you mentioned it was self sufficient. The individual that did the crime actually paid for the officer to monitor their activities?

David Nelson replied they paid an assessment per day to be in the program. It was paid to the court and the court reimbursed the Sheriff's Office.

Councilor Kight asked what is the timeline for getting private property owners to remove graffiti?

David Ross replied I think it was intentionally ambiguous because once it is kicked into the nuisance code, notice is given and they have 10 days to abate. There is some elasticity in the time that the property owner is asked to remove the graffiti and when it's kicked in, if at all, to the nuisance code.

Councilor Kight stated let's say there is a property owner with graffiti on their property. He hasn't removed it and there doesn't appear to be any reason that they physically can't remove it. What is the process, are they cited into court?

David Ross replied first it would be kicked into the nuisance code. Then there are 10 days to abate. Then there can be an option of either a monetary penalty or it can be cited into court as a nuisance abatement violation.

Councilor Kight stated but the penalty doesn't kick in until he's adjudicated, right?

David Ross replied right.

Councilor Kight asked what are we looking at cost wise if they are fined?

David Ross replied I would anticipate it would be somewhere in the neighborhood of what it would cost the City to abate the graffiti.

Councilor Kight asked what is going to happen if a kid is caught with a spray can but they aren't actually spraying anything?

David Nelson replied a little bit of it will be circumstances such as time of day, location, the amount of implements the individual has, some of it will be common sense, and whether the officer believes that the individual is out with the intent to spray graffiti. If someone is coming back from Home Depot to do a Cub Scout project common sense is going to be that they are in the process of doing a project and they won't be cited. If they are walking in a park at 2:00 in the morning and they have 3 cans of half used spray paint then they are probably going to be cited for it.

Councilor Kight asked did you find that most cities ordinances were restrictive as far as the source of purchase such as having spray cans locked up?

David Ross replied most of them in Oregon are like this one. Portland restricts access and Gresham over the summer was thinking about doing it and apparently may have done it. But most of them do it this way.

Councilor Kight asked do you know what the reason is behind locking them up versus not locking them up?

David Ross replied I don't but I'd guess that it would be resistance from the retailers. It may make some sense if the entire County is going to do it the same way. That would require Wood Village and Fairview to adopt similar ordinances.

Councilor Kight asked have you heard if the State of Oregon is considering implementing a State Law that applies to this particular situation?

David Ross replied there is a State graffiti Statute that says it doesn't supplement individual local communities passing their own graffiti related offenses.

Councilor Kight asked is it similar to what we're looking at tonight?

David Ross replied the State Statute talks in terms of unlawfully applying graffiti which is a class A violation. It goes on to say that nothing is intended to preempt local jurisdictions from passing their own graffiti abatement ordinances and certainly nothing is meant to prohibit a prosecution under the criminal mischief statute.

David Nelson stated that's only going to deal with individuals applying it or in possession of it. It doesn't give authority to do anything about the graffiti itself on the property.

Councilor Ripma asked do the other cities with ordinances similar to this proposal have the abatement provision the way we have it?

David Ross replied most of the ordinances actually make failure to remove the graffiti as a separate and distinct violation.

Councilor Ripma asked has anybody tried the abatement idea?

David Ross replied it was in Gresham's ordinance.

Councilor Ripma asked how is this working in other cities? Is there a track record of any kind?

David Ross replied I don't think so. My experience was in Salem where there was a Graffiti Abatement Division of Community Enforcement. If someone was caught applying graffiti and was convicted of it, they would be sentenced to graffiti abatement in the downtown area. There were dedicated Community Enforcement personnel who would supervise the program. It seems to me that were you to catch an offender in the process of applying graffiti then you have a lot more options open to you. This is trying to approach someone who is caught possessing the implements but you haven't actually caught them performing an illegal act.

Councilor Ripma asked how long has Gresham had their ordinance?

David Nelson replied I think it's been about a year perhaps a little longer.

Councilor Ripma asked do the police desire this ordinance? Would it be useful?

David Nelson replied the amount of individuals that we'd actually catch in possession is probably going to be fairly small but it's a tool that they can use if needed. I don't know the number of individuals that we've actually caught in the act but I think I could probably count them on one hand. I see this primarily being used in the park areas such as Columbia Park where there is heavy graffiti. It allows the officers to at least engage with people and speak about what they're doing, why they have that, and give them an opportunity to contain them if you will.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated the idea of community service appeals to me very much. There should be models in the state of Oregon to set up a community service program. Have you checked into that at all?

David Nelson replied there are a number of community service programs. We have to think of it like starting up a new business. There will be some start up costs such as staff and you won't start receiving revenues from the offenders for a period of time. The struggle we're having is who is going to supervise them. Currently we don't have the staff to do that without doing some major restructuring of the schedules and staff. We're discussing a few things such as will it only be on weekends or are we going to try weekdays and weekends. There are a number of models around the state with some running only on weekends and some running 7 days a week.

David Ross stated we've had some preliminary discussions with Multnomah County about contracting with their Department of Community Justice. Multnomah County cannot guarantee that the community service would be performed within the limits of the City of Troutdale but it will be performed within Multnomah County. The community service that is contemplated here would be to the extent possible specifically graffiti removal which is different from just a general community service program that is a sentencing option for the Municipal Court for a whole host of offenses that we don't currently have. We have more flexibility in the summer when we can

sentence people to perform community service and the Parks and Recreation Department can use them in the parks, picnic areas, and the beach to clean up. But starting in the fall through the following summer, those options start to shrink. We are looking at ways to expand on that.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated I have a real problem with Section 8.34.080 because I don't like making the owner of the property responsible for removing the graffiti and subjecting them to proceedings as provided by the nuisance ordinance. But on the other hand, who's going to clean it up? It doesn't set right with me that we make the property owner liable for something they have nothing to do with. Some property owners in certain areas could be out every day cleaning up at their own expense and time. They haven't done anything wrong, they are just victims.

David Nelson replied that is the same feeling that both the PAC and PSAC had.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked is there a way to soften this a little bit?

David Ross replied it would depend on what the purpose of the ordinance is. If the purpose is ultimately graffiti removal then there has to be some way to accomplish that.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked have you seen different provisions in other ordinances that tackle this issue in a different way?

David Nelson replied the only other way would be to cite the property owner into court for a municipal code violation like you would for a traffic ticket. That didn't appeal to the Council at the work session and it didn't appeal to the PAC or PSAC either. This was an option that we thought was perhaps a little less painful but still may not be palatable. If the policy decision is that the Council does not want to do that then we can remove it and perhaps stick with the State Statute that just talks about the enforcement piece of it and not worry about the removal and abatement piece.

Councilor Canfield stated let's say an owner has graffiti on their property, the graffiti is declared a nuisance and has gone into the abatement procedure, would any fines or fees incurred by the owner be included as restitution that the guilty party would have to pay?

David Ross replied I think if there were actually an offender then there would be a fine. If I understand your question of could the fine be directed toward the removal? If you could connect the dots then that's where the restitution would come in.

David Nelson stated about 90% or greater of the graffiti is going to go unsolved. So the property owner is going to be responsible. There won't be the ability to apply restitution to the 90% of cases that are unsolved. If you catch the person with the court process there's going to be a long lag of time. It will need to be cleaned up before then but the property owner could submit the reimbursement to the court for restitution and the amount would be up to the judge.

Councilor Canfield stated if the owner doesn't clean up the graffiti and due to the fact that there could be a long court delay, the property owner could still be cited or brought into the

abatement process according to the code. If that happens would the guilty party be responsible for paying that owner's fees for being dragged into the nuisance procedure?

David Nelson replied that would ultimately be up to the judge as to whether they are going to impose that, the answer would be maybe. The City Attorney's office could ask for that in restitution.

Councilor Canfield stated I'm not comfortable with any part of this section.

Councilor Kight stated let's talk about the 90% of the graffiti that goes unsolved. Have you found other areas, like Columbia Park, where they're striking over and over again?

David Nelson replied mostly parks, schools, utility boxes, and signs are the primary targets. Areas that individuals can walk by that are easily accessible such as public property or private property that is adjacent to public property.

Councilor Kight stated the reason I bring that up is because in our mail we received a letter from a company that monitors that type of activity through cameras. Is there any consideration in addition to this in catching these people?

David Nelson replied we did look at some security cameras for Columbia Park. I put something in the Police budget which was cut but I don't know if the Parks Department has any money for video cameras.

Councilor Kight asked do we have any idea the cost to the City for graffiti removal overall throughout the City?

David Nelson replied I don't have the answer to that. Most of the clean up at Columbia Park has been done through the Multnomah County work crew which I believe costs \$400 to \$450 per day. I think they've been there 3 to 5 days this summer.

Councilor Canfield stated you mentioned that you catch approximately 10% of these cases.

David Nelson replied that may be a generous figure.

Councilor Canfield stated ok. When a perpetrator is caught in the act now, what penalty do they receive and what would it be if we enacted this ordinance?

David Nelson replied if they were caught in the act whether this was imposed or not, they would most likely be charged with Criminal Mischief or Attempted Criminal Mischief if they weren't successful. This ordinance would allow us to address either pre or post graffiti but not in the act of doing it.

Councilor Canfield asked would it be possible for a property owner to get restitution from a perpetrator if we do not enact this ordinance?

David Ross replied we routinely ask for restitution for people that are convicted of Criminal Mischief in Municipal Court.

David Nelson stated also through the Circuit Court there is Crime Victims Assistance for graffiti or other crimes.

Councilor Canfield stated so there are mechanisms in place to get restitution from people who are caught doing graffiti.

David Ross replied they'd actually have to be caught applying the graffiti to the property.

Councilor Canfield stated the only difference between what lies in place now and what this ordinance is proposing is to force the property owner to clean up the graffiti. Is that correct?

David Nelson replied there is also the possession of implements. It gives law enforcement that tool. If they are in possession of any kind of implement and they were not applying it. So there is an enforcement action that's on top of just catching them in the act.

Councilor Canfield asked how often are you going to be able to use that?

David Nelson replied I have no data to say how many times we'd be able to do it because we don't have that tool to enforce now.

Councilor Canfield asked how often do your officers pull someone over on a traffic stop or catch someone walking away from a place where graffiti has been known to be done and actually witnessed people in possession of these implements?

David Nelson replied I know it happens but I couldn't tell you how often or give you a specific number. That's where this ordinance would come into play, what you've just talked about.

Mayor Thalhofler opened the public hearing at 8:02pm.

Mayor Thalhofler asked is there anyone here that would like to speak to us?

There was none.

Mayor Thalhofler closed the public hearing at 8:03pm.

Mayor Thalhofler stated this will be discussed again next month at the next regular Council Meeting. In the mean time, can you do something about making the building owner responsible for the graffiti when he, she, or the corporation have no part in applying the graffiti? If you can think of any way to soften it so it comes out a little more fair.

Councilor Ripma asked could it be brought back for consideration with the removal of the abatement provisions, 8.34.080 and 8.34.090?

Councilor Kyle stated if it comes back the same way I won't support it. If a property owner has been victimized, I don't think we should further penalize them for it. There are a small percentage of folks that do graffiti that are ever caught. I support the tools that this ordinance gives to our Police Department. If it comes back with the same penalty for property owners, I won't support it.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated maybe we should establish a community service program. Anyone that participates in the program can be sentenced to graffiti removal. Then we would have a tool for removing graffiti.

Councilor Thomas stated part of having the graffiti removal piece in there is to get it off. It makes the city ugly when there is graffiti all over the place. One of the things that brought it to my mind is when there was the incident at the high school and they were showing pictures of the park and there wasn't a natural colored thing back there, every rock was painted. Studies show, from my understanding, that when graffiti is present it attracts more. If you want to clean up the City and you want to get rid of graffiti, you have to have the means to get rid of it. We have some things to consider on how to get the graffiti away so people aren't retagging over where it's already been tagged, especially gang graffiti. There are some issues that go beyond asking the property owner to remove it. I don't want to penalize the property owner but somehow we have to find a way as a City to get rid of the graffiti so that it doesn't keep coming back and getting worse and worse.

Councilor Daoust stated I'd be ok if at the next Council meeting you came back with the ordinance the way it is and then with 8.34.080 and 8.34.090 taken out.

David Ross asked as a point of clarification, don't you want to leave 8.34.090, paragraph A in the ordinance? This allows removal of graffiti from public and private property with a written letter of consent.

Councilor Daoust asked are the property owners charged for the abatement at cost?

David Ross replied I don't think so.

Councilor Canfield asked do you ask for their permission?

David Ross replied they have to ask us and give us a letter of permission to do it.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated then I'm not sure that we want to get rid of 8.34.090 paragraph A.

The Council wanted to leave 8.34.090 A in the ordinance.

David Nelson stated to clarify we are going to bring back the same draft that we have here now and then a second draft that would eliminate 8.34.080 and 8.34.090 B.

The Council agreed.

6. RESOLUTION: A resolution approving the City Emergency Operations Management Plan.

This item was pulled from the agenda.

7. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

David Nelson stated at your places I put a bound bond book for the Police Facility. As the public asks you questions about the upcoming bond measure you'll have some accurate data to answer questions. The second thing is that I'm not sure if you have met Andy Parks. He's here in the audience tonight and he's our interim Finance Director and will be here every Tuesday working until the position has been filled. He won't be attending Council meetings unless there is a financial issue.

Mayor Thalsofer asked Mr. Parks would you come up and give us a little information on your background?

Andy Parks replied professionally speaking I have about 25 plus years of experience in local government working as a CPA, Finance Director, CFO, Assistant City Manager, and City Administrator all here in the State of Oregon. I'm currently working in the City of West Linn and the City of Prineville as an out-sourced Finance Director. The work in West Linn is wrapping up as they have just hired a full time Finance Director. I look forward to working with you and assisting you in the next month or so to get you through to a new Finance Director.

8. COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS

Councilor Thomas stated last Monday we held a public hearing in regards to the proposed Verizon cable franchise. We offered the Mt. Hood Cable Regulatory Commission's side and also Verizon's. There were roughly 50 people that came and talked to us and gave their opinions. The meeting went 5 ½ hours. All in all I think it came out really well. We had some very positive comments. Hopefully we can work through some of the issues that still remain outstanding with Verizon. Staff did meet with Verizon yesterday and solved several issues and have another meeting scheduled for next week. We are planning to have a vote on what we would consider the recommended franchise to go forward to the Cities to consider on October 2nd.

Mayor Thalsofer stated the Cable Regulatory Commission is an outstanding group. Councilor Thomas, you did a nice job of chairing that meeting and I think the Cable Commission over the years has done a wonderful job for all of us.

Councilor Daoust stated I've learned about the real estate market lately and how it affects East County. I was talking to a realtor friend of mine and he said that roughly 25% of the homes that are for sale now are either foreclosures or short sales where the people owe more on the house than they are trying to sell it for. It brought home to me how these economic times are hitting us too. We're not immune to it in the Portland metro area.

Councilor Kight stated any title company will give you a list of foreclosures for each County which is updated on a daily basis. The list gets longer and longer. There are buying and

investing opportunities for folks that are trying to get into being first time home buyers. There are still a lot of programs and mortgages available for first time home buyers. As I was going door to door campaigning I talked to a couple that was renting a house while looking for their first home. There's a lot to choose from. For some people it may be distress and for others it's a buying opportunity. I am wondering if I can get an update from Chief Nelson on where we're at in the process for the new Police Chief.

David Nelson replied the position closed on Friday, September 12th. We received 12 applications including 2 internal candidates and 10 external candidates. We are scheduling interviews for the first portion of October.

Councilor Kight asked who will be part of the selection committee?

David Nelson replied there will be 3 panels that the candidates will be run through. There will be an executive law enforcement panel made up of Chief's and command staff in the East County area. There will be a panel made up of citizens. Then a panel made up of Police Department staff. Ultimately the decision will be given to John Anderson if he's still here or to myself depending on the timing.

Councilor Ripma stated there is still room on the bus to join the Troutdale Historical Society's day trek to Wasco County on October 4th. It's an entertaining day led by Sharon Nesbit. We'll visit the Gorge Discovery Center, The Dalles, and Wasco.

9. ADJOURNMENT

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

Meeting adjourned at 8:25pm.

Paul Thalhofer, Mayor

Approved October 14, 2008

ATTEST:

Sarah Skroch, Deputy City Recorder