

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

Tuesday, June 27, 2006

1. ROLL CALL and AGENDA UPDATE

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

PRESENT: Mayor Thalhofer, Councilor Gorsek (left at 8:05pm), Councilor Ripma, Councilor Thomas, Councilor Canfield, Councilor Kyle, and Councilor Daoust.

ABSENT: None.

STAFF: John Anderson, City Administrator; Jim Galloway, Public Works Director; Rich Faith, Community Development Director; Kathy Leader, Finance Director; Marnie Allen, City Attorney; Debbie Stickney, City Recorder; and Terry Pinnell, HR Manager.

GUESTS: See Attached.

Mayor Thalhofer recessed the City Council Regular meeting at 7:05pm to convene the City Council Executive Session held under ORS 192.660(2)(i) – Performance Evaluation.

Mayor Thalhofer reconvened the City Council Regular meeting at 7:20pm.

MOTION: Councilor Daoust moved to add an item to the Consent Agenda, Item 2.9 - A motion to accept the annual performance evaluation of the City Administrator, John Anderson. Seconded by Councilor Kyle.

VOTE: Councilor Kyle – Yes; Councilor Daoust – Yes; Councilor Gorsek – Yes; Councilor Ripma – Yes; Councilor Thomas – Yes; Mayor Thalhofer – Yes; Councilor Canfield – Yes.

Motion Passed Unanimously.

2. CONSENT AGENDA:

2.1 ACCEPT MINUTES: March 28, 2006 Regular Meeting and Work Session.

2.2 RESOLUTION: A Resolution providing for budget transfers and making appropriation changes for Fiscal Year 2005-06.

- 2.3 RESOLUTION:** A Resolution consenting to the transfer of a lease at water reservoir #2 from Voice Stream PCS LLC to T-Mobile West Corporation.
- 2.4 RESOLUTION:** A Resolution entering into a license agreement to allow construction of a trash enclosure on City property.
- 2.5 RESOLUTION:** A Resolution granting a temporary, revocable license to DR Horton/JT Smith Companies for the temporary placement of a construction management office trailer adjacent to the Morgan Meadows water quality swale.
- 2.6 RESOLUTION:** A Resolution allowing Mayor Thalhafer to sign an Intergovernmental Agreement with the City of Gresham for Mediation Services.
- 2.7 RESOLUTION:** A Resolution approving an Intergovernmental Agreement with Multnomah County and the Sandy Drainage Improvement Company for a drainage improvement on NE Marine Drive.
- 2.8 RESOLUTION:** A Resolution authorizing the Mayor to enter into an Intergovernmental Agreement with Portland for the administration and enforcement of Troutdale's Payday Lending Ordinance.
- 2.9 MOTION:** A motion to accept the annual performance evaluation of the City Administrator, John K. Anderson as completed by the City Council and John Anderson on May 23, 2006.

MOTION: Councilor Kyle moved to accept the consent agenda. Seconded by Councilor Gorsek. Motion Passed Unanimously.

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

Jack Hanna, President of AFSCME #3132, stated our purpose is to update the Council on our current contract negotiations that we are involved in. Negotiations with the City have been ongoing for the past four months and there has been seven bargaining sessions. In these sessions negotiating for the Union has been two union members and our union representative, Ms. Kidney. Representing the City are two management staff and a city hired labor attorney. We are here to make the Council aware of where we are at in the negotiations. The main concerns we are negotiating for are: 1) adequate cost of living increase of 3.2%; 2) continued medical insurance premiums at their current level with no change. The City's proposal is to go from a 95/5 split to a 90/10 split for employees with Blue Cross (Kaiser and all dental would remain at the 95/5 split) which doubles the employees cost for the premiums; 3) allow part-time employees to have the same insurance coverage as full-time employees; 4) the City is proposing to eliminate the sick leave transfer program; we feel this is an important issue for the employees and employee morale; 5) we are proposing to eliminate the section of the contract called job families, very little progress is being made on this; 6) field employees identified in the contract are issued clothing which includes rain gear, boots, and identifiable City clothing. The building inspectors and code compliance officer are not included in the current contract as field employees, we are proposing to have these positions added as field employees. There has been some resistance from the City on this issue.

Dan Claussen, AFSCME member; Paula Goldie, AFSCME #3132 Vice President; and Debra McAllister, AFSCME #3132 Secretary/Treasurer spoke in support of the AFSCME President's statement to the Council.

4. PRESENTATION: A presentation by Metro Councilor Rod Park regarding the Nature in Neighborhoods Grant Program.

Rod Park, Metro Councilor, provided the Council with a handout (copy included in the packet) identifying the grants from Metro that are designed to put nature back in the neighborhoods.

Rod Park gave the Council an overview of the grant program and reviewed the grant project that will take place in the Beaver Creek site.

Councilor Gorsek left the meeting at 8:05pm.

Mayor Thalhofer asked Mr. Park to update the Council on the open space bond measure that will be on the November ballot.

Rod Park stated there is a campaign underway. The bond measure request is for \$227.4 million. We are hoping to purchase approximately 5,000 acres with this money. 20% of the \$227.4 million will go to the local cities on a per capita basis to be used on projects in the cities. The original bond measure in 1995 was for \$136.6 million which Metro purchased approximately 8,300 acres. This bond measure has a grant program that is similar to the Nature in the Neighborhood program. If the bond measure passes there will be \$15 million for a grant program for non-profits, local governments, etc.

Councilor Kyle asked will you be notifying the residents in Beaver Creek about the Nature in the Neighborhood project?

Rob Park replied SOLV will be working with those folks and notifying them.

5. INFORMATION: Update on customer service.

Terry Pinnell, HR Manager and Chair of the City's Customer Service Committee stated Exhibit A in my report outlines the six phases of the customer service training plan. Currently we are on phase four which outlines the key areas that were identified by the Customer Service Committee as citywide issues. Those issues are: interpersonal communication, departmental communication and system communication. Departments are currently setting standards to meet citywide customer service goals. The second item is Exhibit B, which is a copy of a memo that was distributed to all employees regarding the goals and mechanics of the customer service card. With the employees' approval we are currently recognizing the positive customer service comments that we receive in the City Chatter (employee newsletter). Exhibit C is a copy of the customer service card which is available in the City Hall lobby and is available upon request. Exhibit D is used internally by departments and is an overview that shows action that has been taken on the customer service cards that we have received. The second page of Exhibit D is a summarized report that you will see on a quarterly basis showing both the positive and negative comments received. Exhibit E is a

summary of the top three customer service issues which departments are using as they develop and set departmental and citywide standards to be implemented. Exhibit F is a copy of the current workforce mission statement. The Committee, with the participation of all departments, is working on developing a new workforce mission statement that all city employees can embrace.

Councilor Kyle asked I am wondering if you put this form on-line will it be an option to leave their name off?

Terry Pinnell replied we are looking at putting the card on-line, that is an interesting question that we haven't talked about.

Councilor Thomas asked on Phase 4, is that on-going or is there a target date?

Terry Pinnell replied that is in process right now. They are looking at the areas the Committee has identified and they will come up with recommendations to be implemented by October 1st.

Councilor Thomas asked how do residents get the customer service cards?

Terry Pinnell replied they are available upon request from our city employees that are out in the field and in the lobby at City Hall.

Councilor Canfield stated when a field person is out conducting business with a citizen, you mentioned that the card is available upon request. Does this mean that the city employee voluntarily hands the customer one as a pro-active measure or does the customer have to know that the card exists and has to request one?

Terry Pinnell replied we encourage the employee to provide the card if it is a good compliment and we encourage them to complete a card. I haven't heard the opposite that if someone has complained that they give them a card.

Councilor Canfield stated I would encourage you to get this information on-line as soon as possible.

6. RESOLUTION: A Resolution authorizing the Mayor to enter into an Intergovernmental Agreement with Metro to collect and remit the Metro Construction Excise Tax.

Mayor Thalhoffer read the resolution title.

Kathleen Leader, Finance Director stated I want to give you a brief background on the Construction Excise Tax. Cities and counties that have land that is brought into the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) are required to provide planning for development in those areas within a set time period. Over 6,000 acres of the 2002 and 2004 UGB expansion areas have yet to be planned. In talking to local jurisdictions one of the main obstacles has been the funding. Metro put together a committee to evaluate the options to provide funding for these areas to complete the planning so that development can occur in the UGB. The committee

included members from the local jurisdictions and the development community. It was the recommendation of that committee that Metro establish a Construction Excise Tax that would be applied against building permits based on the value of the improvement occurring on development in the Metro region. The Metro Council adopted an ordinance establishing the Metro Construction Excise Tax (CET) in March of 2006, a copy of the ordinance is attached as Exhibit A to my staff report. The tax was set at 0.12% of the value of the improvements for which a permit is sought. The ordinance provided for the local jurisdictions issuing those permits to collect that tax and remit it to Metro. The tax would then be used to provide grant funding to jurisdictions who qualify to perform the planning in the UGB areas. The tax is effective July 1, 2006. It is a temporary tax that would expire once all of the jurisdictions in the Metro area have collected \$6.3 million. In compensation to the local jurisdictions for administering this program we would retain 5% of CET collected. The resolution before you would authorize the Mayor to approve the Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) and the City of Troutdale would then begin collecting those payments at the point the permit is being pulled and would remit those payments quarterly to Metro. We did include language in the IGA that states we would not begin collecting the money until over 70% of the jurisdictions, or about 15, agreed to participate in the program. It is the recommendation of staff that you approve this resolution. I feel that we have adequate systems and staff in place to handle the administrative portion of this IGA. It would promote cooperation between the jurisdictions and facilitate the collection of the tax for the main purpose of granting it to the cities and counties for the planning and development in the UGB. Collection of the tax at the point when the permits are being issued is the most efficient and effective means to administer the tax.

Councilor Daoust asked since we haven't had any land brought into the UGB, is that tax collected just from projects on additional UGB land or on any projects?

Kathleen Leader replied any development that occurs in the Metro region, but it is only on construction valued over \$100,000 and there is a cap on the tax of up to \$12,000 per structure.

Councilor Daoust asked so even though we wouldn't get any grants from Metro we would have a slight benefit by retaining 5% of the tax for administration?

Kathleen Leader replied yes.

Councilor Ripma stated Councilor Daoust raised a point that since we aren't expanding our UGB, we don't have much prospective for receiving a grant here. There is another piece of history that you may not be aware of. As alternate on the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) I spoke against this excise tax because it requires us, Troutdale, to subsidize the addition of land in Hillsboro, Gresham or other areas that are actually to our detriment because we are trying to develop our industrial lands and Metro is adding industrial land. Mayor Becker of Gresham moved to amend the ordinance that was before MPAC to include a payback for previously spent money by cities to reimburse them, like for Springwater, that passed at MPAC. Do you know if the Metro Council included a payback as a source of money for cities like Hillsboro, Gresham and others that already spent money to expand?

Rod Park replied I think it is important to realize that this is a Metro tax that has been approved by the Metro Council at the request of a variety of jurisdictions and developers and others across the region. It is an attempt to fulfill the state requirement to plan these areas. This is a regional tax that is being paid by the regional citizens. It is similar to what we do on our solid waste system and similar to what you do when you require a franchise in terms of asking them to collect and remit back to the city. In this case we are asking the city to be the collector because you have the permit counters which Metro does not have. If the city chooses not to then we would be requiring the developer to come down to Metro to fill out the form and pay the tax. We were trying to come up with a way to make it easier for the developers to do this. To answer Councilor Ripma's question, Metro Council did pass this and any planning for development after 2002, the land brought in after 2002 and 2004, would be eligible for grant funds. The reason for that is you had some entities that were willing to step up and they spent money from their general fund as well as borrowed funds from the state in order to move ahead. Other entities chose to just sit back and not do anything much to the frustration of the land owners who have found themselves inside the boundary but still not able to tell anyone what was going to be done with the land. Therefore, we didn't want to reward entities that were not being progressive and we didn't want to penalize those who were. 19 of the 22 jurisdictions have passed this. It is on Portland's consent agenda tomorrow. Troutdale and Clackamas County are the other two jurisdictions. I understand the concern, but this is not a tax on Troutdale. This is a regional tax on the citizens in order to fulfill a regional goal and state goal of making sure that we have well-planned communities.

Councilor Ripma stated I think Mayor Hugues of Hillsboro mentioned, and it certainly is our experience here in Troutdale, that development that is going to occur that is market driven is going to pay its way on planning. The actual potential here is that we will end up, as a region, subsidizing areas that don't currently have any market driven development. To me a perfect example of why the rest of us are being forced to subsidize areas that should not be planned out and added to the boundary in this way is the Springwater area because we are trying to market our industrial land and we have a lot of vacant land. The other cities that I represent on MPAC are in the same boat and we are being asked to pay for Gresham's last two to three years of planning for the Springwater area which is competition to our area. It reduces the value of our land and increases the cost to our developers. The resolution before us is to have Troutdale help bury this as a charge to developers who come in by increasing our building permit cost and passing on the money to Metro. The Greenspaces program and the Nature in the Neighborhood, those are the great things that Metro does, this is one of the really bad things that Metro does for Troutdale and we don't get listened to. To explain just one aspect of this, and this was Mayor Hughes' argument, when a piece of property is ready to be developed and there is a market buyer and someone who is actually going to do the construction, that is when development planning should take place and they will pay for it. All they are doing by having a program to plan areas that have no buyers and no developers is planning for areas that aren't marketable at the time. In my opinion it is just a waste. To me the most egregious thing is that cities like Gresham that spent money to plan areas that they want to bring in are going to be paid back by this tax and we will be subsidizing it to our own detriment. Just on the issue of whether we should collect the tax, which is really all that is before us, I don't think we ought to take part in burying it. I think

people ought to have to go to Metro and know that Metro is the one that is adding this excise tax, not Troutdale.

Rod Park stated I would assume that on the form it will say Metro. As to what its purpose is, I think you have it in the wrong context. The fact is it is a regional tax that we are asking the local jurisdictions to collect to avoid having the developer have to come down to Metro to do this. This is kind of the reverse of some of the other things we do on a regional basis. For example those who are doing landscaping and construction work can come to Metro to get a business license that covers the Metro area and the money collected is portioned back out to the local jurisdictions. We do this because it saves the business from having to go to twenty-eight jurisdictions across the region. We are asking for this tax to be done the other way since you have the permitting counter.

Councilor Thomas stated it doesn't appear that there is any way for us to not pay this tax in Troutdale.

Rod Park replied there is not a way for the citizens to not pay the tax, that is correct.

Councilor Thomas stated if my math is correct it is about \$120 per \$100,000 in construction value. I would assume that there is very little that actually gets built in Troutdale that falls under the \$100,000 value.

Rich Faith replied very little, if any, new construction would fall under \$100,000, but you could have remodeling under \$100,000.

Councilor Thomas stated the 5% administrative cost doesn't seem to pay for our cost.

Kathleen Leader replied a portion of the data needed to compute this tax is already being generated as part of the overall permit process.

Councilor Thomas asked can we increase the 5%?

Rod Park stated 19 of the 22 jurisdictions have agreed to the 5%.

Mayor Thalhofer stated this is a situation where those that have will get bigger with our money. We won't get anything out of this because we are not going to be expanding the UGB. For the cities of Troutdale, Wood Village and Fairview this is really not fair, but it is something we probably have to do. In exchange for us going along with this, what I would like from you is when we reach buildout and we don't have any more money coming in from construction we need a mechanism where those that have can help those of us who don't have by paying some kind of a tax to help us operate our cities when we don't have any income to do that.

Rod Park asked are you suggesting a regional tax base sharing of some sort?

Mayor Thalhofer replied yes, for the cities that reach buildout and have nowhere to go.

Rod Park replied the only thing I can promise you is that we can look at it. As I understand it, from what research has been done so far, it would require a constitutional change because of the way that Ballot Measure 5 works and a variety of other things.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated we will be pushing for a revenue tax base sharing and we will try to get some allies to help us so that we can get some of the money back.

Councilor Canfield stated I have great respect for you Councilor Park, but I have great disrespect for a lot of things that Metro is trying to do, specifically taking away local control from the local jurisdictions and I think this tax is one of them. I thank Councilor Ripma for pointing out a different point of view of this tax. The tax itself is absolutely not in the best interest of Troutdale, it is counterproductive for Troutdale. I have no desire to collect this tax for Metro.

Marnie Allen, City Attorney stated the proposed agreement does not have a termination clause. If you approve the agreement and we begin collecting the tax, it can only be amended to stop collecting the tax if both parties agree or when the \$6.3 million is reached.

Councilor Kyle asked should we add language in for a review clause?

Marnie Allen replied you could do that or you could adopt the resolution approving the IGA with the addition of a clause that gives the City a right to terminate the IGA with a 30-day advance notice to Metro so that if it ends up costing more than 5% to administer or if you receive a lot of negative feedback from developers in Troutdale you could notify Metro and 30 days later stop our obligation to collect the tax.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked is there anyone here that would like to speak to us on this issue?

No testimony received.

MOTION: Councilor Daoust moved to adopt the resolution authorizing the Mayor to enter into an Intergovernmental Agreement with Metro to collect and remit the Metro Construction Excise Tax. Seconded by Mayor Thalhoffer.

Councilor Daoust stated I really see this as a simple collection agreement that is easy for staff to do. We just got done talking about customer service and I don't really want to put the city in a position of having to tell people that come to our city to pull a permit that they have to go down to Metro to finish what they started here. I think people would see that as a Troutdale requirement that they have to run down to Metro. They would misinterpret that and we would get negative feedback from that misinterpretation even though we would tell them that it is a Metro tax. Just the fact that we would make them go to Metro, if we didn't collect this, is bad customer service. We will make money off of this by collecting the 5% administrative fee. We don't have any expenditures because we aren't doing any planning for new areas brought into the UGB, the only expenses we have are staff expenses. Kathleen Leader said that they

can handle it. If you look at a \$300,000 or \$500,000 permit and calculate what that 5% would be, I think it would cover our staff costs. I am not concerned about the 5% not covering our staff costs. I really don't see a reason why we can't just be a regional partner and get on with this like the other nineteen jurisdictions have decided to do.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated I agree. I don't like the tax but I think it is something we are going to have to do. If we send people down to Metro to pay this tax that are coming in to our counter they are going to think we are out of our mind. We talked about customer service earlier, we need to give our customers the service they should have. We don't like the tax but it is going to happen and in return we should push for the revenue tax base sharing and when the time comes that we need help we should have help and Councilor Park will help us make sure that happens.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: Councilor Thomas asked if Councilor Daoust would accept a Friendly Amendment to include language to allow us to terminate the agreement with a 30-day notice to Metro.

Councilor Daoust did not accept the Friendly Amendment. It is clearly written in the IGA that Metro will continue to impose the tax until the funds collected for all jurisdictions total \$6.3 million. There is an end point that is determined by Metro. I don't think we need to have a second end point for the option of opting out when everybody else is paying.

Councilor Kyle stated I am going to support this. I don't think we should be throwing a temper-tantrum at the expense of our builders. Just because we may not like the tax doesn't mean we should send them some place else to pay it. That doesn't make sense to me.

Councilor Ripma stated people have to go to other jurisdictions to get permits all the time. Lots of construction happens that requires a permit from the city, state, and the county. I think on its merits you can support this as being a good way for Metro to collect the tax. I think that is always the way these Metro measures are couched, they slowly chip away at our rights and flexibility one thing at a time. This happens to be a rare one where we could say no and allow Metro to take whatever heat there is for this excise tax, otherwise we are just facilitating what I think is an outrage. The development community did favor this tax. Of course they did because they don't pay it, it is passed on. It also helps to increase the areas in competition with our own developable land, thereby reducing the value of our own developable land. The reason developers favored this is because they have a solid good business reason for doing it and we should have a solid good business reason for our own land owners in our own city for opposing it, because we don't stand to gain. Only the cities that are expanding in competition with our industrial areas gain. We would like to have development in our industrial area but it all tends to go to the west side. One way that we are going to be able to compete is as areas fill up, infill occurs, that is happening in Portland it just isn't happening here, not for industrial land. I challenge the notion that Portland is the biggest loser, we are the biggest loser. Troutdale, Fairview, and Wood Village have the

most available industrial land undeveloped and we are not looking at adding anything to the area so we will not benefit from this excise tax. It will not be misunderstood by the developer who comes to our counter to get a permit unless it is misrepresented to them. This is a chance for us to stand up and say that we are being treated unfairly here and we are not going to facilitate it. Mayor, you are supporting this but you would like a quid pro quo in the way of revenue sharing. If you were willing to add that to this motion that would be fine, but to just support this like all of the density requirements, population requirements and all the things that Metro imposes on us one at a time and say that maybe some day they are going to come back and share revenue with us, I want to see it in writing. This is simply requiring Metro to collect its own excise tax. I encourage the Council to vote against the motion. Councilor Thomas, your motion to amend was to have it sunset. Just to clarify what Marnie Allen mentioned was to have a 30-day right to terminate by noticing Metro. The way this is written now is we can't pull out unless Metro jointly agrees with us so we are locking ourselves in for years. Was it your intention to give Troutdale the right to give Metro a 30-day notice if we chose to terminate.

Councilor Thomas stated I like that scenario of having an option to opt out.

Councilor Ripma asked Councilor Daoust, you don't favor that?

Councilor Daoust replied that is correct. I prefer to leave it the way it is.

Councilor Ripma stated I would encourage the Council to add that option into a new motion.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated you can make a motion to amend.

MOTION TO AMEND: Councilor Ripma moved to amend the Motion to add a clause to the IGA allowing Troutdale to re-evaluate and withdraw from the obligation to collect and remit the tax to Metro with a 30-day notice to Metro. Motion Seconded by Councilor Thomas.

Councilor Daoust asked for clarification, if Metro has already implemented this tax can we opt out?

Marnie Allen replied not in opposition of the tax, but you can opt out of collecting it.

Councilor Daoust asked so you are saying to opt out of collecting the tax?

Councilor Ripma replied yes.

Councilor Kyle stated if the cost to administer it exceeds more than 5%, is that correct?

Councilor Ripma replied I wasn't specifying the grounds, but that we could opt out if we decided that it wasn't in our interest to continue collecting it.

Councilor Thomas stated I like the idea because it gives us an option if the costs do exceed the 5% we have the option to say we aren't going to collect the tax any longer and that way the city is not being burdened with those extra costs.

Mayor Thalhofer stated the motion to amend is not specific to the 5%.

Councilor Thomas stated the motion states re-evaluation, that would be a part of the re-evaluation.

Councilor Ripma stated the language is not tied to anything specific.

Mayor Thalhofer stated I am not going to support the amendment. We are simply collecting this tax and we need to make it as convenient as possible to the people who have to pay it.

Councilor Canfield stated I am against the amendment and the main motion. Sure it is all about whether or not we are going to collect the tax, but it is transparency. If somebody has to drive to Metro or mail a check to Metro instead of to the City of Troutdale it is not the fault of the City of Troutdale, it will be the responsibility of Metro. They are the one who caused this. This will not affect our customer service one bit. The developers will know exactly why this tax is in affect because they supported it and they will know why they have to make the trip or write the check to Metro. I can't in good conscious vote to allow the City of Troutdale to collect a tax that is not in our best interest.

Councilor Kyle stated I am not going to support the amendment.

Councilor Daoust stated I am not going to support the amendment either because there is no criteria for opting out. I don't want political reasons to be the criteria for opting out and I don't want how the council feels at the time to be a reason to opt out. If the criteria that is in the back of your mind is that it might cost us more, I don't think that will be the case so I still wouldn't support it.

Vote on Motion to Amend:

VOTE: Councilor Kyle – No; Councilor Daoust – No; Councilor Ripma – Yes; Councilor Thomas – Yes; Mayor Thalhofer – No; Councilor Canfield – No.

Motion Failed 2 - 4.

Vote on the Main Motion

VOTE: Councilor Kyle – Yes; Councilor Daoust – Yes; Councilor Ripma – No; Councilor Thomas – No; Mayor Thalhofer – Yes; Councilor Canfield – No.

Motion Failed 3 -3.

7. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

None.

8. COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS

Councilor Daoust expressed his appreciation for the Lifeguard Program at Glenn Otto Park and the great job the lifeguards are doing.

Councilor Ripma stated he received a call from a concerned citizen about the new Fiber-Optic service that is being proposed to be installed in the City and the possible damage that may happen to the street, sidewalks, driveways and yards as a result of the installation. Councilor Ripma asked if the Council would agree to have staff make a short presentation to the Council on what the requirements are for utilities companies who install new service and what recourse a citizen would have if the utility company fails to return the street, sidewalk, driveway or yard to its original condition. Council agreed.

Councilor Ripma reminded folks of the Corbett 4th of July parade.

Councilor Kyle stated on July 22nd the Troutdale Bite and Bluegrass will be holding their first event which benefits the River Rescue Program.

9. ADJOURNMENT:

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

Meeting adjourned at 9:46pm.

Paul Thalhofer, Mayor

Approved September 12, 2006

ATTEST:

Debbie Stickney, City Recorder