

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

Tuesday, October 23, 2007

1. ROLL CALL

Mayor Thalhofer called the meeting to order at 7:46pm.

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

ABSENT: Councilor Ripma (excused) and Councilor Kyle (excused).

STAFF: John Anderson, City Administrator; Rich Faith, Community Development Director; David Ross, City Attorney; Debbie Stickney, City Recorder; Jim Galloway, Public Works Director; and Paul Hughes, Finance Director.

GUESTS: Chad Tippin, Troutdale Resident.

2. DISCUSSION: A discussion on an updated parks system development charge and capital improvement plan.
--

Rich Faith, Community Development Director, reviewed his staff report.

Councilor Daoust stated I have a question on page 2 of the Parks and Recreation System Development Charges (SDC) Methodology Report in Exhibit A, numbers 16 and 17. It talks about acquisition of the parks but yet it says we cannot use SDC's for that.

Rich Faith replied I was told that everything that's in our Parks Plan, whether it's something fundable by Parks SDC or not, should be reflected in the Parks Plan. We are already deficient so it's not a need based upon new growth so therefore we cannot apply SDC's of new growth to fill a deficiency.

Councilor Daoust asked we can't use SDC's to catch up to where we are now?

Rich Faith replied correct. You can't use it to acquire land that is identified as filling a deficiency in our current inventory.

Councilor Daoust asked how do you know it's catching up or new?

Rich Faith replied the way the table is set up is that in the beginning of this Capital Improvement Plan where we are acquiring property, those early acquisitions are not to fill a deficiency but to meet projected growth need. When we have taken care of our growth

needs in the future, then we still have a need to buy land to meet the deficiency. At that point is when we'd have to resort to something other than SDC's. What this shows us is a cost associated with buying the acreage to fill the deficiency but the dollars would not be SDC eligible. We are going to defer all acquisitions to fill deficiencies until after we've used SDC monies.

Councilor Kight stated on Exhibit B, in the column titled Non-Residential Parks, it was interesting that 11 Communities collect an SDC from a non-residential source. What is the nexus that these different communities make to include non-residential users and collecting SDC's from businesses?

Rich Faith replied they built a case that a certain number of employees that work in a city make use of parks, to a much more limited extent than the residents that live there, but they do use the parks and therefore it's justified to charge a rate to employees.

Councilor Kight stated I think you made a case for doing that within our own community.

Rich Faith replied I gave you information at the last work session that roughly tried to calculate that. It was a very small increment of our proportion that would be attributable to non-residential growth. It would have a very nominal effect on the overall rate for residential.

Councilor Kight stated you've identified approximately \$21 million worth of needs.

Rich Faith replied according to the approved Parks Plan that is correct.

Councilor Kight asked is it the consensus of the Council that we're not interested in collecting SDC's from businesses?

The Council confirmed that was correct.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated I think we should increase the Parks SDC's on residential. It ought to be increased by \$750 per year for 3 years until it reaches a total of \$5,850. We should take action on this at the next regular Council meeting.

Rich Faith stated we couldn't do it that quickly. Under State law we have to provide a 90 day notice to allow opportunity to comment, question, or challenge the methodology.

Councilor Canfield asked for a district such as Tualatin Valley Parks and Recreation District, who owns the parks within the district?

Rich Faith replied I'm not certain.

Councilor Canfield asked who is responsible for maintaining the parks?

Rich Faith replied the district.

Councilor Canfield asked is it safe to say that all the cities in the district do not have the cost to maintain these parks under their General Fund?

Rich Faith replied that would seem correct.

Councilor Canfield stated this list is almost as if we're doing a market survey for employee salaries. It doesn't work that way. Otherwise why would we need a methodology? Shouldn't it be based on what we need compared to what Gresham is charging?

Rich Faith replied what's important is what our needs are and what the methodology computes to in terms of what to collect to meet that need based upon our projected growth. I sensed from the Council a bit of trepidation in the figure of \$7,645. All I was trying to do was say there are other communities that are already charging a similar rate.

Councilor Canfield stated I recommend Option D, don't raise the SDC's at all.

Councilor Daoust asked are the Capital Improvement Plans a certain fixed year period for most cities?

Rich Faith replied usually they're based on, for example, a Parks Master Plan. Ours is in effect until 2015.

Councilor Daoust stated last time we increased SDC's we started from a medium number then increased, we didn't start from where we currently were.

Councilor Thomas stated the Home Builders Association (HBA) told us as, part of our agreement with them, that they would help us with a levy and we've never taken advantage of it. We've never even approached the issue. My other concern is that SCD's are based on new development. We want all of this acreage but by the time all the properties are developed, we'll have money but no place to spend it. When we built the plan that talks about all the buildable lands, does that include space for parks?

Rich Faith replied the buildable lands inventory that we do each year is supposed to build in a factor of so much land that is taken out of the overall inventory to account for schools, parks, and churches. There is a basic acknowledgement that as your population increases, you also have these other needs.

Councilor Kight stated I would ramp up the SDC's to the maximum that you can possibly get. By the time you get enough money to buy anything, there might not be any property to buy.

Councilor Canfield stated I'd object to ramping it up to the maximum. That is blatant greed on the part of the City, it's not needed. Our budget is constrained every year on maintaining what we have.

Councilor Daoust stated the SDC's do more than just purchasing land. I'm falling in the arena with Councilor Kight to increase the rate to the level that's calculated. It's not a matter

of greed it's a matter of meeting the Capital Improvement Plan which took a lot of time and energy to put together.

Councilor Thomas stated the Capital Improvement Plan is what we'd like to have. My concern is that you're putting the majority of the burden on the home owner that's not even here yet. As soon as he buys that property, he picks up a \$7,000 bill times 3 for a total of \$21,000 to pay off on a 30 year mortgage for something that's for the whole community. It should really be something that the community pays for.

Councilor Kight asked Rich, could you share some things that SDC's cover besides land acquisition?

Rich Faith replied they cover land acquisition; development costs of the land acquired; and upgrades to our existing parks to meet growth needs including picnic tables, shelters, and a number of other things. Number 2 on the Capital Improvement Plan is trying to recognize that we'll probably need to look at making upgrades and improvements to our existing parks in the beginning.

Councilor Canfield stated the big dollar figures for these proposed projects are all for park acquisitions. If we're going to have parks SDC's, my preference would be to improve existing parks before we get new land acquisition even if it means going out for a levy.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated we need to schedule this as soon as we can when we have the full Council present and vote on it.

Rich Faith asked would it help if I were to go ahead and send the notice to the HBA and the others that are on our list that have indicated a desire to be notified if we do a revision to our methodology? I could go ahead and give them that notice with a copy of the methodology report and they'd have 90 days to comment. When we set up the notice, do we have to specify the rate that is going to be considered for adoption or can we say up to a maximum?

Jim Galloway, Public Works Director, replied the notice doesn't have to specify a rate. However, you have to make the documents you'll be acting on available for public review, I believe, 60 days prior to the meeting.

John Anderson, City Administrator, stated at this point I think you'd put in the Parks Advisory Committee's recommended number. Then the Council can deliberate about how much of that number they want to go after.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked Rich, do you have our direction?

Rich Faith replied I intend to send out the 90 day notice to the HBA and any other interested parties including the methodology report. In January we'll set a date to bring this before you. If I have to, I'll draft up a Resolution and will note that the Council is not yet fixed on this number and it will be open to discussion.

3. DISCUSSION: A discussion regarding the disposition of Well #4.

Jim Galloway, Public Works Director, reviewed his staff report.

The Council's consensus was to repair Well #4 for backup use.

4. ADJOURN

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

Meeting adjourned at 8:46pm.

Paul Thalhofer, Mayor

Approved: January 22, 2008

ATTEST:

Sarah Skroch, Deputy City Recorder