

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

Tuesday, October 10, 2006

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, ROLL CALL, AGENDA UPDATE

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

PRESENT: Mayor Thalhofer, Councilor Gorsek, Councilor Thomas, Councilor Canfield, Councilor Kyle, Councilor Daoust and Councilor Ripma (7:15pm)

ABSENT: None.

STAFF: John Anderson, City Administrator; Rich Faith, Community Development Director; Kathy Leader, Finance Director; Marnie Allen, City Attorney; Debbie Stickney, City Recorder; Clyde Keebaugh, Parks and Facilities Supervisor David Nelson, Chief of Police and Pat Newton, Sergeant.

GUESTS: See Attached.

2. CONSENT AGENDA:

2.1 RESOLUTION: A resolution accepting a perpetual non-exclusive waterline easement from Hockert Homes Incorporated in SE Sandy Dell Road.

2.2 RESOLUTION: A resolution providing for budget transfers and making appropriation changes for fiscal year 2006-07.

MOTION: Councilor Daoust moved to adopt the consent agenda. Seconded by Councilor Kyle. Motion Passed Unanimously.

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

The Troutdale Hawkeye Football Team players, coaches and team mom introduced themselves to the Council.

4. REPORT: A report and recommendation on permitting alcohol consumption with use of the Sam Cox Building.

Clyde Keebaugh, Parks and Facilities Supervisor stated in November 2005 the City Council, at the request of the Parks Advisory Committee (PAC), imposed a moratorium on the use of alcohol for user groups in the Sam Cox Building. The PAC felt they needed more time to look into this issue because the frequency of groups using the building with alcohol was

increasing. Some groups using the building for parties involving alcohol has caused some serious issues regarding monitoring and controlling the group size. It was beginning to create some real concerns with our staff, in particular the police and the caretakers, regarding the safety of the folks using the building, the safety of the general public and the integrity of the building itself. We have been incurring some damage to the building and the landscaping due to the increased usage.

Clyde Keebaugh provided the Council with a handout that shows the number of times the building was rented prior to the moratorium and after the moratorium to get an idea of the affect the moratorium had on the rental of the building. As you can see it had very little affect on the number of rentals. The PAC's primary goal was to find some language that would allow for responsible use of the building but also have some way to control who used the building with alcohol that would not discriminate against any particular group of people. The PAC asked the City Attorney to draft some language that could speak to the PAC's concern. The City Attorney did respond with draft language that did speak to the PAC's concern and primary goal, however, there are still some concerns left with the actual implementation of the language. The PAC did feel that this was language that they could support and they wanted to forward it to the Council for comment, questions and revisions. If the Council should decide that this is language that you want to adopt we would like to know whether you want that adopted as part of the Troutdale Municipal Code or included in the Park Use Rules.

Councilor Canfield asked Marnie, in your memo you make reference to an alcohol monitor, what is considered to be an alcohol monitor?

Marnie Allen, City Attorney replied in my mind it was someone who had been through some form of training with OLCC. I have not been through that training so I don't know the details of it but generally what I understand is that they are trained to recognize when someone has had too much alcohol so that they can cut them off.

Councilor Canfield stated on Exhibit C, General Rules, number one lists different number of guests for different buildings. Who enforces those limits?

Clyde Keebaugh replied the full enforcement of that would be through the fire marshal, that is who set those limits.

Councilor Canfield stated number six says that with special permission, cleanup may be completed by noon the following day. Would the group be charged for use of the building while they were cleaning up their mess since we would not be able to rent out the building during that cleanup time?

Clyde Keebaugh replied essentially we would withhold a proportionate amount of their deposit.

Councilor Canfield stated item number ten talks about excessively loud conduct. How is it decided when it is too loud, is it complaint driven?

Clyde Keebaugh replied yes.

Councilor Kyle stated it doesn't look like the moratorium significantly affected the number of times the building was rented. Has the property been left in better condition this last year?

Clyde Keebaugh replied yes, we have had less calls for additional janitorial services and there has been less damage to the interior and exterior of the building.

Councilor Kyle asked are the caretakers safer on the premise with this change?

Clyde Keebaugh replied I would think so. They are in attendance tonight and can speak to that.

Councilor Daoust stated part of the definition of a responsible party would be to require them to obtain insurance and provide us with a certificate of the insurance. It seems like requiring them to obtain special insurance would limit the parties or individuals who want to rent the building for weddings or similar events, wouldn't it?

Clyde Keebaugh replied it would.

Councilor Daoust stated just that in of itself would limit the number of people that would want to use alcohol if we required that.

Clyde Keebaugh stated Exhibit D is a draft event permit application form that was put together by Kathy Leader, which is intended to be used primarily for community events.

Councilor Thomas asked do we need to approve the permit process or is that just being provided for informational purposes?

Marnie Allen replied staff implements the park rules and procedures, however, if you don't like how staff is implementing it you can give us direction to do it a different way.

Kathleen Leader, Finance Director stated this past year staff has been looking at the risks to the City with some of the different community events and special events that we hold on City property. We have put together this draft permit process that does two things. One, it makes sure that all of the different issues that come up during planning an event are addressed such as road closures. This also lets the organizer know that there are certain permits and other agencies that they have to work with when they are putting together an event. There are also some sections in this document that address insurance requirements that are needed when they are on City property. We are working towards finalizing this draft before the end of the year and sending it out to the organizations that we frequently work with on these events such as the Chamber.

Councilor Ripma asked will this be used for folks who are going to be renting the Sam Cox Building?

Kathleen Leader replied this application will be for those folks wanting to hold a community event, special event or event of citywide interest on city property. So that could be in the Sam Cox Building or on city park property.

Councilor Thomas stated my only concern is that throughout the document you do a good job of naming the departments versus people directly with the exception of Rita. Just because people come and go, I am wondering if we want to have all the contact information changed to refer to the department instead of a person and also change the email to a generic email.

Kathleen Leader replied that can be changed.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked do you need to have two types of liability insurance?

Kathleen Leader replied the type of insurance that is required is dependent on the type of event that is being held. For instance an event that is selling liquor requires a different type of insurance than an event where liquor is being served.

John Anderson asked in the past have the major event sponsors, like the Chamber, been providing this type of insurance so they would be familiar with this and it won't be something new for them?

Kathleen Leader replied the Chamber has not provided a certificate listing the City as an additional insured. Coordination of that has not been very successful in the past. We have had other organizations that have been providing this.

Freda Emmons, Caretaker at Glenn Otto Park, provided the Council with some pictures of the Sam Cox Building after an event that involved alcohol (copies are included in the packet).

Freda Emmons read her letter addressed to the Council: As caretakers of Glenn Otto Community Park, we want to share with you our observations of the park use with and without the use of alcohol at the Sam Cox Building. With alcohol use, our job was much more difficult, requiring us to interact with groups that miss-use the privilege and became drunk, belligerent, unwilling to stop their party, unable to clean, and have even had to return the next day to clean the building. As we became more aware of what to expect from potential problem groups, we tried to prepare ourselves by taking naps, resting as much as possible the day of an alcohol event and yet we were still exhausted physically and emotionally after such events. Without alcohol use, our job has been much more pleasant; the groups are willing to follow the rules, stop at the appropriate time and are willing and able to clean up after themselves. We find ourselves tired because the building is often used from 9am to 10pm with clean-up until 11pm, however, we are not exhausted physically or emotionally. We would prefer to have the ban on alcohol remain in place. Even with construction this year, the building has been very busy. The ban on alcohol has not decreased anything except the hassle of dealing with individuals who are inebriated, the deterioration of the building from alcohol miss-use and the safety concerns from alcohol miss-use such as drunk driving, broken glass in the park and alcohol related violence. If, however, you choose to allow alcohol, we would request that you do so with the limitations that the

Parks Advisory Committee recommends. To open unrestricted alcohol use in the Sam Cox Building would, in our opinion, be extremely detrimental to the park and its users.

Councilor Canfield asked when you had events where the groups were using alcohol, how did you feel about having to be the security guard and having to enforce the size of the event and the behavior of those people/groups that were not abiding by the rules?

Freda Emmons replied we found ourselves feeling very uncomfortable. It puts us in situations that we were not prepared for, nor was it a part of the job that we applied for and accepted. We had two situations where miscommunications took place and there was not a police officer on-site. We tried to call and let someone know but no officer came. As the night went on the situation became more serious to the point we had to call 9-1-1 and we still got no response. Later we talked to Clyde about our discomfort.

Councilor Canfield asked have you also noticed a difference between events with and without alcohol with regards to the amount of trash and damage to the facility?

Freda Emmons replied yes. There is a tremendous amount of trash when you have an event with alcohol. We had to physically show people how to clean because they would be so drunk that they couldn't figure it out and we would have to work with them. For the events without alcohol we are able to tell people what needs to be done and we only have to do a minimal amount and they do the work because they are not drunk.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated in your letter to us you mentioned that if we choose to allow alcohol you would request that we do so with the limitations that the Parks Advisory Committee recommends. Do you think that would improve matters?

Freda Emmons replied I am not sure. I think it would limit some groups. The more serious groups would want to go through the proper steps to meet the requirements. However, even in that situation we could still end up with groups that are too large, with too much alcohol consumption happening, and with too little police or security present. I am not sure that these limitations would actually improve it enough. That would have to be addressed or looked into as those issues arise.

Rita Correy stated I am the planning technician for the City of Troutdale and I process the building rental applications for the Sam Cox Building, the City Conference Building and the picnic shelters. I wanted to give you my perspective regarding the use of alcohol in the Sam Cox Building. I support the total ban of alcohol usage. Most of the groups that used alcohol last year created numerous problems for the caretakers, police officers on duty and the parks staff. I had a report from one of the police officers that was on duty at an event where there were only supposed to be 200 people present. The officer's incident report states: there were significantly more than 200 people present and extreme amounts of alcohol; one person was taken to detox by a patrol officer; one verbal dispute had to be broken up by an officer; and the caretakers were still trying to get the folks out of the building at 11:45pm. This event was held on Saturday night and that was when we had the Discovery Church using the building every Sunday morning. More than once the Discovery Church had to come in early to clean

the building so that they could hold their service on Sunday morning. Once the Discovery Church no longer was using the building Clyde and I discussed what we wanted to do about these situations because the groups using the building on Saturday nights were leaving it such a mess that if we rented the building out for use on Sunday mornings it would smell from alcohol use from the prior evening and it wouldn't be sufficiently cleaned to rent it out. We decided to start having the janitorial service come on Sunday mornings so that the building would be clean to rent out on Sunday afternoons. That has worked out except for those situations when a church or other group wants to use the building on Sunday morning it is no longer available. This creates a loss of income for the city because we have had to turn away requests to use the building on Sunday mornings. Some of the things that I am concerned about if the moratorium on alcohol is lifted are: How you would determine what a responsible user is. Many of these groups are very large and they could send in a different person each time to rent the building and I would have no idea they are affiliated with a group that previously caused problems or did not abide by the rules. I also have a concern putting a limitation on the number of people. Who is going to be responsible for counting the number of people that show up to one of these functions and what are they going to do about it if there are too many people? If there is no officer present, which is the City Attorney's recommendation, then you are leaving it to the caretakers to deal with these issues. I think that is a real dangerous situation for them. I think there are still too many questions and potential problems if the ban is lifted. However, if you decide that you really want to allow someone to have alcohol at a function I think it should be strictly limited to those functions that are community events, special events and events of citywide interest.

Councilor Ripma asked under the current moratorium are community events allowed to have alcohol?

Rita Correy replied in the park not in the building.

Councilor Ripma stated and that hasn't been a problem. The way it is now, under the current moratorium it hasn't been a problem.

Rita Correy replied correct because right now there is no alcohol allowed at all in the building.

Councilor Ripma asked and your preference is that we continue that.

Rita Correy replied yes.

Councilor Ripma asked so when you mention community events, you are advocating a continuation of the same moratorium that we have right now?

Rita Correy replied yes.

Councilor Thomas stated I was under the impression that the only place that we allowed alcohol today was in the Sam Cox Building.

Rita Correy replied we have a moratorium right now, so we don't allow it anywhere. The only community event that I am aware of that has alcohol in a park is SummerFest which has a beer garden in the park.

Councilor Thomas stated what I was really asking was prior to the moratorium I thought that the only place that we actually allowed alcohol was in the Sam Cox Building and there was special consideration for the Lions Club or SummerFest.

Marnie Allen stated that may have been the City's practice because it may have been the only place that organizations have applied for permission to serve alcohol. But I believe that the language in the ordinance just refers to buildings or parks. If the intent is to just limit this to one building then you would want to discuss making changes to the ordinance.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated the staff report states that staff agrees with the recommendation of the Parks Advisory Committee, so far the staff that has testified is against that recommendation.

Councilor Canfield asked before the moratorium which community event, special event or events of citywide interest were requesting to have alcohol?

Rita Correy replied the Shriners.

Councilor Canfield stated so this only really affects one group.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked didn't the Parks Advisory Committee studied this issue for quite some time before they made this recommendation?

Clyde Keebaugh replied yes. They tried to find a solution that would allow for the responsible user. As pointed out, that is tough to determine. The language drafted by the City Attorney came as close to touching on that as they could find. Under the options outlined in the staff report there are pros and cons to every option and this option does have its share of places where it could go sideways. They came to a decision that the language drafted by the City Attorney best spoke to the goal that they were looking for. They wanted to forward their recommendation to the Council for your input, direction and recommendation on the drafted language.

Councilor Kyle asked do you think that parks would prefer not to have alcohol allowed in the park?

Clyde Keebaugh replied speaking from a parks maintenance view, we would encounter less maintenance both in the building and in the park. Since the ban has been in place we have seen far less issues to deal with in the building and the park.

Councilor Canfield asked would you feel that it would be safer for the caretakers if the ban remained in place?

Clyde Keebaugh replied from the past experiences and conversations that I have had with the caretakers after some of the larger events, there was quite a bit of concern on their part having to deal with large groups of strangers that are inebriated on a late Saturday night. That was not part of their job description.

Councilor Canfield asked even if a group did purchase the required insurance and went through all of the other steps, do you think that the facility would remain safe and that the users of the park and the caretakers would remain safe?

Clyde Keebaugh replied the insurance would just protect the city from liabilities, it doesn't guarantee that the building itself is not going to sustain some damage. In the past we have taken a fairly large deposit from these groups and at times have had to retain a good portion, if not the full amount, to cover the cost to clean and repair the building.

Mayor Thalhofer asked wouldn't the liability insurance that is required assist the city with any damage that is done to the building?

Marnie Allen replied yes. It is intended to provide a mechanism for the city to get the money to repair the damage to the building or to pay for an injury to folks. It doesn't prevent the damage or injury on the front end, which is the policy decision that the Council has to make.

Rita Correy asked would the liability insurance cover the cost of what we would lose in rental fees for folks that have already reserved the building for a function that would be requesting a refund if the building was unusable?

Marnie Allen replied no. It would be difficult to require insurance for every possible situation, but you can do things such as requiring a larger deposit.

Sergeant Newton stated Chief Nelson asked that I attend tonight because I have first-hand experienced being at some of these events that have gone bad because of alcohol consumption.

Councilor Canfield asked do you recall how many people were at the functions that have been out of control?

Sergeant Newton replied I don't have an exact number. The number of people would tend to grow throughout the evening.

Councilor Canfield asked were you the only officer there?

Sergeant Newton replied yes.

Councilor Canfield asked if you were to deem it necessary to shut down the event, would you be able to do that by yourself?

Sergeant Newton replied no.

Councilor Canfield asked how many officers would it take to shut an event like that down?

Sergeant Newton replied that is difficult to estimate, but probably as many as I could get. The problem is that the event may start out at 5pm and everything is fine until maybe 9:30 when you have a bunch of inebriated people, so what might have been easy to shut down at 7pm or 8pm could be very difficult to shut down at 9:30.

Councilor Canfield asked so these other officers would be pulled off of patrol?

Sergeant Newton replied yes.

Councilor Kyle asked are there usually children at these events?

Sergeant Newton replied yes.

Councilor Daoust asked you are not talking about any community events, you are referring to private parties?

Sergeant Newton replied to my knowledge these are private parties.

Councilor Ripma asked are the concerns of the caretakers and Rita well justified?

Sergeant Newton replied yes.

MOTION: Councilor Ripma moved to make the moratorium that we have been under permanent. Seconded by Councilor Canfield.

Councilor Ripma stated we decided to try a moratorium to see what would happen and it worked. I think that everything that we have heard tonight and over the course of the year has demonstrated that the moratorium did work to reduce damage to the property and make the park a more viable place to rent. I am very sorry that a few bad groups have had to spoil what has been a long tradition of responsible use of alcohol by certain groups. Unfortunately though, this is City property and we are representing the citizens who own this property, and I think we are not in a good position as a City to define responsible person as much as I admire the attempt by our City Attorney. I haven't heard any reason tonight why we should reverse the ban. All of the evidence is in favor of continuing the ban the way we have it now. It would still allow SummerFest, outdoor alcohol sales under the current rules. That has been a good tradition.

Councilor Canfield stated I also think that the moratorium is going to solve the problems fairly cleanly. I think the City's first concern should be the safety of the public and the caretakers. It is not in our best interest to put the police and the caretakers in harms way. Even if we were to require insurance or require alcohol monitors, any remedy would be after the horse left the barn. It would be to pay for

damages to the property or persons and that would not actually stop the conduct when it takes place. It just makes sense to me to continue the ban on alcohol. It is the cleanest solution and it is the best thing for the City.

Councilor Daoust asked to clarify, under community events, special events, and events of citywide interest we would still allow alcohol to be served in a park, just not in the Sam Cox Building, is that correct?

Marnie Allen replied that is correct.

Councilor Daoust stated okay. I was concerned that there may be a citywide event like the Brews and Blues Festival or a wine tasting event where they may want to use a park. As long as we can continue to do that I will support this motion.

Councilor Thomas stated I also support this motion for all of the reasons mentioned. My underline concern here is the safety of our employees and also the risk to the City. In addition there is a possibility of having to bring in officers from outside our City to try and control an event, which then leaves the rest of the city uncovered.

Mayor Thalsofer stated I guess I am the only descending vote here. We are allowing some rowdy people to defy some law-abiding folks to serve alcohol at their event. I am very concerned about the safety of our employees and the integrity of our property. It seems to me that the Parks Advisory Committee, and I have a lot of faith and trust in our advisory committees, took a hard long look at what is going on and this is something that they decided we should try and I agree with them. I am not sure that anyone on the staff is really recommending this. The insurance is going to be a deterrent for a lot of groups. You can increase the deposit to take care of the damage. What we are doing is taking groups that have used the park and building in a very responsible way and kicking them out, for example the Shriners. I think that the Parks Advisory Committee's recommendation is worth giving a try.

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

Motion Passed 6 - 1.

5. DISCUSSION: Three Cities Fire Service Committee

John Anderson, City Administrator stated the purpose of this item is to ask each of the three cities if they wish to establish a Three City Committee to pursue the formation of a Three City Fire Service District. Those three cities would be Fairview, Wood Village and Troutdale. This is follow-up to the Three City Fire Service Committee that met in September 2005 (a copy of the minutes to that meeting are included in the packet). At the meeting the Committee took action recommending that each of the three cities accept a 10-year fire service contract with Gresham. The Committee also recommended that the three cities also proceed with the

establishment of a committee to pursue forming a fire service district. We haven't taken immediate action because there was some intervening action on the part of two citizens from Lake Oswego who were proposing a Greyhound Track Casino and they had talked about providing some additional money and location for a fire station. As most of you know they did not get the required number of petition signatures so it is not on the ballot. I have outlined three options in my staff report. 1) Continue receiving fire service through our contract with the City of Gresham as we are now. 2) The Three Cities could enter into an intergovernmental agreement for the purpose of establishing a Three City Fire Department. 3) The Three Cities could create a fire service district. Wood Village is in favor of Option 3 and Fairview has not taken an official vote yet, but their staff thinks they may be opposed to Option 3 and are satisfied with the current contract with Gresham. If you favor Option 3, creating a fire service district with a tax base, we would need to start sooner rather than later because we would want to target November 2008 for an election.

Councilor Canfield stated I don't have any questions. I favor pursuing a fire service district.

Councilor Daoust stated this makes it sound like we would be covering the cost by the amount we give Gresham now, but the start-up costs for a Three City Fire Department would be substantial. Where would that money come from?

John Anderson replied actually the start-up cost estimates that we received from the consultants that prepared the report are summarized in Option 3, were included in that. Part of the dilemma is there will be overlap as we are setting up. We would have to figure out a mechanism to handle the cost during that overlap period, which could take a year. While we are trying to build the department we would also be paying Gresham for fire protection.

Councilor Gorsek asked if we agree to go with Option 3, do you think that Fairview will change their mind?

John Anderson replied I don't know.

Councilor Ripma asked are you asking us to take an official position tonight?

John Anderson replied yes.

Councilor Ripma asked when is Fairview going to take up this issue?

John Anderson replied I am not sure.

Councilor Ripma asked if Fairview says no, is there a Two City option?

John Anderson replied there is a two city option and a one city option. There are many cities with 15,000 population that have their own fire department.

Councilor Ripma stated I now there is a one city option but the way the geography of the district works out, Fairview is further away from us so it could work as a two city option.

Councilor Thomas stated one of the concerns of the Committee was the opener in year 5 of the contract so our costs could increase substantially in year 6 of the contract. The concern we had was how can we protect long-term fire service for Troutdale and keep the cost similar to what we pay today. One option is to have our own fire department or a two or three city fire district. I think it is worth looking into.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated I think we should study it some more. I hate to say lets go do it because I think a lot of people, even some of the people on the committee, were optimistic. I don't think the start-up costs are realistic. It is going to be very expensive.

Councilor Canfield stated I am not sure I am interested in a one city option. If Fairview says no I would want to reconsider moving forward.

Councilor Daoust asked do we need to discuss who would be our representative on the committee.

Mayor Thalhoffer replied yes. I was chair of the committee but I am not going to be involved in that committee this time.

Councilor Daoust asked if Councilor Kyle and Councilor Thomas were interested in serving on the committee again?

Councilor Kyle replied yes.

Councilor Thomas replied yes.

MOTION: Councilor Daoust nominated Councilor Thomas and Councilor Kyle to represent the City of Troutdale on the new Fire Service Committee. Seconded by Councilor Canfield.

Councilor Ripma asked is there a committee established yet? I was under the impression that we were just deciding on whether to go forward or not tonight. I am in favor of the two nominees.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated that is true.

MOTION WITHDRAWN: Councilor Daoust withdrew his motion.

MOTION: Councilor Thomas moved to become a part of the Fire Service Committee. Seconded by Councilor Kyle.

John Anderson, City Administrator asked for clarification, is the intent of your motion to explore Option 3 outlined in the staff report?

Councilor Thomas replied correct.

(Option 3 reads: The Three Cities could create a fire service district with or without an initial fire service district property tax levy (tax base). If the district were created without a tax base it could operate through an IGA utilizing revenues currently paid to Gresham or utilizing operating levies if one or more of the cities voters approved a levy. The current total payment to Gresham by the Three Cities for fire service for 2006-07 amounts to \$2,169,000. The GEL report of 9/24/04 estimated our costs to operate our own department in 2006-07 at \$2.07 million (low estimate), \$2.4 million (average estimate), and \$2.7 million (high estimate). The Tedisch report estimated the cost of the department at \$1.97 million in 2006-07.)

Councilor Kyle stated I think this is important because I think the Committee really needs to reconvene and see where we are.

Councilor Ripma stated I am in support of this. I like Councilor Canfield's suggestion that once Fairview makes their decision we should at least think about where things stand. I think the motion allows for either a two or three city district.

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

Motion Passed 7 - 0.

MOTION: Councilor Daoust nominated Councilor Thomas and Councilor Kyle to the Fire Service Committee, they can determine who will be the main representative and who will be the alternate if that determination is needed. Seconded by Councilor Canfield.

Mayor Thalhofer stated can we include the appointment of John Anderson as the staff member.

MOTION TO AMEND: Councilor Daoust amended his motion to include the appointment of John Anderson to the committee. Seconded by Councilor Canfield.

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

Motion Passed 7 - 0.

6. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

None.

7. COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS

Councilor Thomas asked if the council needed to take action on withdrawing from the Gresham Fire Advisory Committee.

Council directed staff to schedule this item for a future agenda and to contact John Doolittle, Troutdale's representative so he can be present at the meeting.

8. ADJOURNMENT:

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

Meeting adjourned at 8:40pm.

Paul Thalhofer, Mayor

Approved February 13, 2007

ATTEST:

Debbie Stickney, City Recorder