

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

Tuesday, July 26, 2005

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, ROLL CALL, AGENDA UPDATE

Mayor Thalhofer called the meeting to order at 7:05pm.

PRESENT: Mayor Thalhofer, Councilor Gorsek, Councilor Thomas (by phone), Councilor Canfield (7:10pm), and Councilor Kyle.

ABSENT: Councilor Ripma (un-excused) and Councilor Daoust (excused).

STAFF: John Anderson, City Administrator; Jim Galloway, Public Works Director; Rich Faith, Community Development Director; Marnie Allen, City Attorney; Debbie Stickney, City Recorder.

GUESTS: See Attached.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

Lynn Nelson requested that we have better entertainment at SummerFest next year. The entertainment at the park chased many citizens away this year.

Lynn Nelson requested a new ordinance prohibiting persons from soliciting when you have a "No Solicitation" sign at your home. I think that Lake Oswego has a great ordinance. I would like some direction on how to get this on your agenda.

Mayor Thalhofer stated we will refer that to Mr. Anderson.

3. INFORMATION: An announcement on a Metro Open Spaces Celebration.

Rod Park, Metro Councilor, provided two handouts to the Council (copies included in the packet) and informed the Council of the 10-Year Anniversary of the 1995 Open Spaces and Streams Bond Measure.

Rod Park stated we are going to have a series of celebrations starting in September. The Bond Measure approved by the voters was in the amount of \$135.6 million with the promise that Metro made that we would purchase 6,000 acres of open spaces land for future generations. To date, with some purchases still outstanding, the \$135.6 million has purchased over 8,100 acres of open spaces. 1,024 acres is along the Sandy River out by Oxbow Park. There have also been pieces purchased along the Beaver Creek Canyon

target area of approximately 110 acres. The most recent acquisition was 62.6 acres of Beaver Creek Canyon corridor between SE Stark Street and NE 17th near Mt. Hood Community College. Of that \$135.6 million there was a \$25 million local share that is split on a per capita basis. The City of Troutdale, with their portion, acquired 15.6 acres along the east side of the greenway near SE Stark and Troutdale Road. We are also working on, and the Metro Council has informally agreed upon, putting a ballot measure back out in November of 2006 to build upon the successes that we have had across the region. We will be asking for your input as to what has worked well, what would you like to see different, should there be more of an emphasis on active recreation and less on acquisition of open spaces, etc. We want to thank you for all of your help and thank the public for their help and we want to thank you in advance for the help on the next bond measure.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked is there a way to distribute these pamphlets to the people, not just to the elected officials?

Rob Park replied the pamphlet can be found on our web site at: www.metro-region.org.

Councilor Gorsek stated there have been some articles in the Oregonian about managing these areas, especially in terms of fire issues. With the new bond measure coming up has there been any discussion about the management side of this?

Rod Park replied the management issue is an on-going concern. It costs between \$87 and \$100 per acre in order to manage these particular areas. It is an on-going expense that Metro has. In the upcoming bond measure, I think it goes back to the question of do we want acquisition of additional open spaces or do we dedicate these funds to open up these areas to make the management of the areas easier. That is why we would like to have input from the citizens as to what they would like to see.

4. INFORMATION: A Metro Goal 5 Update.

Jack Hoffman, Chair of Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) stated I am here to talk about the regions wildlife and riparian habitat and the wildlife protection program. I have been the MPAC Chair for one year and I have been on MPAC for the last five years. MPAC is a regional committee that advises the Metro Council. With me tonight is Paul Ketcham who is a Senior Planner for Metro. Over the last ten years there has been a program in the works to identify stream corridors in the region to determine if they are regionally significant. Metro worked with all of the cities on this joint project or a regional program to set a regional standard to protect the streams, stream corridors and also protect the tree groves, the forests, and the habitat. Over the last five years they identified what streams were more significant and which ones were worthy of preserving. In 2003/2004 the Regional Plan was to regulate these areas, but after Measure 37 and because of some things going on in Wood Village and people saying that they didn't want to be regulated, Metro decided to take a step back and ask is there a better way of preserving the natural environment. One way is a bond to purchase property. Another way is to educate people. Another method is to give people incentives to protect the stream and fish habitat. Metro, instead of regulating both the green and the blue areas on the map, decided they would just regulate the green areas (map shown to Council but not submitted into the record). A second map was created that just

shows the green areas, which are the streams and that is what is going to be regulated (map shown to Council but not submitted into the record). Metro and the planners in the region decided to try and evaluate the environment versus the economic value of the streams and in the end they came up with a color scheme for the map using dark green, medium green and a yellowish green. The areas in dark green are high environmental value and high conservation value. Those are streams that we really want to protect. The yellowish green areas indicate where the economics are more important than the environmental. Then we focused in on the Troutdale, Wood Village, and Fairview area. The green and the blue areas are the habitat areas (map shown to Council but not submitted into the record). The Metro Councilors, along with the elected officials from the region, agreed that there would be a program. The Metro Council, back in April/May, with a lot of work with the planners and the elected officials came up with a regional program and a regional ordinance. Remember that Metro governs the cities, they don't govern people. Metro is in the process of adopting a program that will require cities in the east side of the county to do certain things. In addition to this requirement, there is a model ordinance that they put together. Metro has created a key map for Troutdale that shows the key areas of Troutdale, Fairview and Wood Village that are in dark green, medium green and the yellowish green. Metro will have an open house on September 22nd and then have a second hearing and decide either then or a few weeks later to adopt this program. The timeframe for this is, in September the Metro Council will probably make a decision to approve this program. It will then go to the Land Conservation Development Commission (LCDC) and then we will have two years to implement this program. The primary reason we are here tonight is because Metro, and every government, is required by state law to send out Measure 56 notices to the land owners whose property may be affected by new regulations. Those notices will be going out to your constituents in about two weeks. If you look at the map, anyone who has property that is located in an area that has some shade of green will be receiving this notice. If you receive questions asking what this is all about, the concept is to avoid, minimize or mitigate. Avoid the habitat; minimize your impact; and if you can't minimize then you mitigate. The concept across the region is to try and stay away from the important habitats to the stream, which are the fish. If you can't do that then soften your impact. The regional program is to allow land owners to use what is called habitat friendly development practices. That includes things like storm water infiltration, keeping the storm water on the site, using green roofs and allowing flexibility in where you put your house by moving it away from the stream and closer to the road. There are a number of habitat friendly development practices. In terms of timing, we all have two years to comply with the regulations. What is interesting is that we don't all have to be the same. Troutdale can create its own program as long as it substantially complies with and meets the regional minimum requirements. There are five ways to do this; 1) use your own ordinance and your own map; 2) use Metro's model ordinance that was basically drafted and created by city planners; 3) create an alternative program with tree protection and acquisition and other voluntary efforts; 4) have a district plan like a watershed plan; and 5) follow the Tualatin Basin Plan. Metro has created a map to show you what you already protect. Paul is going to explain the next map.

Paul Ketcham, Senior Planner for Metro stated the areas shown in purple on this map (map submitted to the city and is included in the packet) are streams, wetlands and floodplains which are some of the highest habitat areas in the region and already enjoy or receive high levels of protection. The nature of the program that Mr. Hoffman has been explaining

includes these same areas. About 70% of fish and wildlife habitat areas that are identified on these maps are covered by these existing programs so there is about 30% that is not. This map compares the two. There are some areas indicated in green that are not covered in purple and those are regional significant habitat areas that extend beyond the areas that are covered by existing protections.

Jack Hoffman stated if you receive phone calls from your citizens with questions remember: 1) it is a region-wide program; 2) nobody should get excited because you don't know what Troutdale's response will be or how Troutdale will respond to the regional program; 3) every city is going to create its own program that works for its community; 4) it is a two-year process; 5) it does not affect present use, so if you have a house on the creek and a yard that goes down to the creek, no one is going to require you to remove your garden, it only talks about new development.

Rod Park, Metro Councilor stated one of the criticisms that we heard about this program back in 2000 is that there are a lot of opportunities for people to do the right thing if we could help them out a little bit. There was an opportunity for a source of funds that came from, of all things, garbage collection in terms of the projections made. We ended up with some reserves that we hadn't anticipated due to the uptake in the economy. It seems appropriate to use those funds from something that degrades the environment for something that helps to restore the environment. There is \$1 million that will be used in a 2-year grant program to create new partnerships between the development community, the environmental groups like Friends of Beaver Creek, the solid waste industry who through their activities helps prevent degradation to making sure that an environmentally sound disposal system is available so that you end up with less illegal dumping. We are in the process of establishing the criteria to determine how to create these new partnerships.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked when will the citizens of Troutdale receive the Measure 56 notice in the mail?

Jack Hoffman replied they will be mailed out on August 8th.

5. INFORMATION: A presentation on the I-84 Frontage Road System Refinement Study conducted by DKS Associates.

Rich Faith, Community Development Director stated this study was piggybacked off of our Transportation System Plan (TSP) update process. We received a grant from the State of Oregon in order to conduct our TSP update. The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) thought it would be a good opportunity for us to take another look at the I-84/Frontage Road situation, particularly the congestion problems that we have all experienced there. They advocated for some additional grant money to be given to us so we could retain a consultant to look at that situation. Primarily this study was to look at the Frontage Road interchange and come up with various alternatives for some short-term improvements. Short of completely reconstructing this interchange, the idea was to look at some options to improve the situation. John Bosket will be reviewing the results of the study. There is a recommended alternative that has been folded into the TSP, which is still up for consideration and yet to be acted upon by you. If there is public testimony on this issue it

could be taken during the public hearing on the TSP. The report/presentation that John Bosket is going to make is background information only.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated many years ago we were promised an interchange at I-84 and 257th which we badly needed then and we need it now. We have been shortchanged on that. We were on a priority list to have an interchange here in Troutdale so we wouldn't have this mess on Frontage Road, but first they were going to build the Wood Village Interchange, which has been completed for some time now. They also took out exit 16B which was a nice route from I-84 into Troutdale without having to get involved in the Frontage Road mess. Midway through the construction of the Wood Village interchange ODOT announced that they had run out of money and therefore they couldn't do the Troutdale interchange. We have never been able to get a straight answer from anybody as to why we were dropped clear off of the priority list for the next interchange. We thought that we would still be on the list to have an interchange as soon as funds were available. No, we got dropped clear off of the list and yet we need an interchange at I-84 and 257th in the worse way. We are still fighting for an interchange. We have some work going on in Congress to help us get funds for an interchange, but that is probably going to be a longtime coming, but we are working on it. I just wanted to share that background information.

John Bosket, Traffic Engineer with DKS & Associates showed the Council a PowerPoint presentation (a copy of the presentation is included in the packet). The I-84/Frontage Road Refinement Study is actually part of the overall TSP update. The focus of this study was mainly on the S. Frontage Road, south of I-84, to improve circulation through that area with the objective of identifying an improvement project that could go into the TSP. We started out by identifying what the problems are today. One of the first findings we made was there is a very high demand to travel from I-84 eastbound down S. Frontage Road and make the right turn to go south on Graham Road (also referred to as 257th). In conflict with that you have a lot of driveways along S. Frontage Road, especially as you get closer to the Graham Road intersection. We also noticed that a lot of auto traffic is coming from I-84 eastbound and they need to be on the right side of the road to turn right, but a lot of the truck traffic that is on S. Frontage Road either wants to be in the left turn lane as they get to Graham Road or they want to go straight. So you have some competing movements with large slow vehicles. You also have a lot of vehicles that want to turn into those businesses and they are also competing with the heavy demand of traffic that just wants to get through this area and head south. Right now there are two right turn lanes at S. Frontage Road and Graham which are needed to serve that high demand. Part of the problem is one of those right turn lanes is actually shared with the through lane at the intersection. There is only about 100' of storage for through traffic which equates to about four vehicles or quite a bit less than that if one of them is a truck, so it doesn't take much for that second right turn lane to get taken away.

John Bosket reviewed a series of photographs that showed real traffic situations that are currently happening on S. Frontage Road (pages 4 – 12 of the presentation).

John Bosket stated in addition to identifying the existing problems we forecasted to 2025 to see how much worse the problem would get in 25 years, and it got significantly worse. With the existing and future deficiencies identified we set some objectives for the improvement alternatives that we looked at. Based on what we were seeing we felt there was obviously a

need to improve the capacity for that demand that wants to go up I-84 east to Graham Road or 257th southbound, reduce the impact of truck traffic on the auto flow, and improve access management within the interchange area. We formed an informal Technical Advisory Committee with staff from ODOT, Multnomah County and the City of Troutdale. We held a couple of workshops where we came up with several potential alternatives for fixing these problems. We used screening criteria to reduce the number of alternatives. The criteria used was: 1) facilitate the eastbound to southbound demand from I-84 to Graham Road; 2) reduce passenger car/truck conflicts; 3) improving the interchange area access management; 4) compatibility with long-range interchange improvement; 4) minimize private property impacts; 5) feasibility of construction; and 6) ability to comply with agency design standards and policies. The following alternatives survived that screening process: **Alternative 1** – acts as a bypass by extending Marine Drive (from the I-84 eastbound off-ramp/Marine Drive/S. Frontage Road intersection) south and wrap behind all of the businesses to 257th Avenue meeting up at the signalized intersection opposite the Outlet Mall driveway. (Map is on page 15 of the presentation.) **Alternative 3** – is the Graham Road fly-over. This is another bypass of Frontage Road coming directly off the I-84 eastbound off-ramp and runs parallel to I-84 and S. Frontage Road, probably at the same elevation as I-84, crossing over S. Frontage Road and tying in at the signalized intersection on Graham Road/257th at the Outlet Mall driveway. Rather than creating an opposing approach to the Outlet Mall driveway this would be parallel to Graham Road/257th. (Map is on page 16 of the presentation.) **Alternative 4** – Marine Drive Extension to Halsey Street. This extends Marine Drive from the I-84 eastbound off-ramp Marine Drive/S. Frontage Road intersection up and over the railroad tracks and the Historic Columbia River Highway and would come back down and connect at Halsey. (Map is on page 17 of the presentation.) **Alternative 8** – two-way Marine Drive under I-84. This is in the section of Marine Drive from S. Frontage Road north of the interchange. This makes Marine Drive two-way from N. Frontage Road to S. Frontage Road allowing traffic that was destined for areas north of Marine Drive to take a direct left turn instead of going all the way around the interchange. (Map is on page 18 of the presentation.) **Alternative 9** – Two exclusive eastbound right turn lanes from S. Frontage Road. This is directed at capacity problems where the queues going through block the right turns from S. Frontage Road onto Graham Road/257th. This shifts all of the lanes to the north by building a new left turn lane on the north side of S. Frontage Road. That creates two exclusive long right turn lanes that won't get blocked by through traffic. (Map is on page 19 of the presentation.) **Alternative 12** – Two-way N. Frontage Road, Marine Drive and Graham Road. This would undue a lot of the one-way system and creates two-way roads on Marine Drive, N. Frontage Road and Graham Road underneath I-84. (Map is on page 20 of the presentation.) As we analyzed these alternatives we found that a couple of the alternatives didn't work very well. Alternative 4, as we ran the trial demand model, was not effective at all. Alternative 12 actually produced a whole host of problems. Those two alternatives were quickly thrown out. Alternative 8 had some positive aspects in that it did remove some of the traffic from S. Frontage Road but on the down side it really didn't do a lot to relieve the congestion on S. Frontage Road. This actually was already being proposed to be included in the TSP so we retained it. It is really a stand-alone project and has its own benefits but as far as really getting to the root of the problem on S. Frontage Road it wasn't going to do it on its own so we retained it as a potential add-on to other alternatives. Alternative 9 actually performed very well. It really opened up the capacity and reduced queuing significantly and it has a very low cost for construction. The downside was that it really doesn't do anything to address the conflict of

the passenger cars and the trucks. Through the simulation modeling process we weren't able to accurately reflect what goes on there with the cars and the trucks because it is very unique. So while it looked good on paper and on the computer screen, there is a lot of reluctance to put all of our eggs in that basket. We decided to retain that as a short-range improvement, because it did provide a lot of benefit in a relatively cost effective way, and continue to look for a long-term alternative that would provide more benefit. That left us with Alternative 1 and 3. We found that Alternative 1 was effective at facilitating the eastbound and southbound travel demand. It also reduces the car and truck conflicts by taking folks that don't have any business on the S. Frontage Road, that just want to go south on Marine Drive, completely around the S. Frontage Road issue. It was also very effective at reducing queues on S. Frontage Road. One really nice aspect of this alternative was that it appears to be completely compatible with any future interchange improvements. It also provides a direct access to the Outlet Mall and the redevelopment of the former sewage treatment plant site and will enhance bike and pedestrian connectivity if you add bike lanes and sidewalks. One downside is the significant private property impacts. The estimated cost for this alternative is around \$8 million. Alternative 3 was even more effective at facilitating eastbound and southbound travel demand. It did an excellent job at reducing the queues on S. Frontage Road. Like Alternative 1, it reduces the car/truck conflicts. It also has very few private property impacts. The negative aspect of this alternative is that it is probably 100% incompatible with future interchange improvements. Unlike Alternative 1, which is probably very much out of the potential footprint, anything you do to rebuild this interchange is probably going to wipe out whatever you build with Alternative 3. It also appears to contain some substandard design elements. The estimated cost for Alternative 3 is \$14 million. Considering these things, the Technical Advisory Committee was very reluctant to spend the \$14 million on something that in ten, fifteen or even twenty years would be completely demolished if the interchange were to be built. There were also concerns regarding the substandard design elements. It was recommended that we move forward with Alternative 1 for this project. The overall Committee recommendation was to retain, as a short-range improvement, the capacity improvement at S. Frontage/Graham Road, which is the two exclusive right turn lanes, at an estimated cost of \$250,000. In addition ODOT had recommended that we plan for the completion of the Interchange Area Management Plan, which is estimated to cost \$150,000. Then to move forward with Alternative 1, which was constructing the two-lane access-controlled roadway from the Marine Drive/S. Frontage Road intersection to Graham Road, which is estimated to cost \$7,740,000. Then there is the add-on project that provides some benefit which is to widen Marine Drive under I-84 to five lanes and is estimated to cost \$5,540,000. In conclusion the proposed modifications to the TSP were to add that capacity improvement project with the two exclusive right turn lanes and the S. Frontage Road/Graham Road project to the Master Plan and the Action Plan and also to add the Interchange Area Management Plan as well as the project to construct a two-lane access-controlled roadway in the Master Plan and Action Plan. And again, the add-on plan to widen Marine Drive to five lanes isn't in our recommendation because it was already being proposed in the TSP update.

Councilor Thomas stated I have concerns about the affected property owners.

Councilor Gorsek stated with Alternative 1, which runs behind Flying J and goes up to match the grade on Graham Road/257th, did you consider that to be a closed construction, more like a bridge, as opposed to using fill?

John Bosket replied that wasn't ruled out, it just wasn't included in the cost estimate.

Councilor Gorsek stated it seems to me that would definitely make access back and forth to the south section of that property fairly well guaranteed. You may be able to do that with the contained fill. Rather than do all this, why not simply try to find a way to return Exit 16B. Was that considered by the Committee?

John Bosket replied we actually did consider that. It was screened out because with the 238th interchange in place now it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to put another exit from the freeway in between these two interchanges in a safe manner because there isn't enough distance between the on-ramps at 238th to the off-ramp to Troutdale.

6. PUBLIC HEARING / ORDINANCE (Introduction): An Ordinance to adopt an updated Transportation System Plan to replace the 1995 Transportation System Plan and repealing Ordinance #'s 636 and 686.

Mayor Thalhofer opened the public hearing at 8:34pm and read the ordinance title.

Rich Faith, Community Development Director stated the Transportation System Plan (TSP) is the City's official policy document that spells out what our transportation needs are for the next twenty years. It addresses all manners of transportation including: pedestrian, bicycles, transit and motor vehicle. It looks at all of those modes of transportation together to arrive at a comprehensive list of needs to be able to move people and goods around and through our city. The reason we are doing this update is that our current TSP was adopted in 1995. Despite the fact that it is ten years old and therefore outdated, there are other things that have occurred since then that really make it necessary for us to update the plan. Most notably is in the year 2000 Metro adopted the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). That is the umbrella plan that all of the jurisdictions in the Metro region need to be in compliance with so that the transportation network fits together as a unified system. Another driving force is what is called the State Transportation Planning Rule and all local transportation plans must comply with the State Transportation Planning Rule. The Transportation Planning Rule was originally adopted in 1992 but underwent major revisions in 1998 so our current plan, which was adopted in 1995, is out of compliance with the current Transportation Planning Rule. In addition to that there is also growth in general that has taken place around us and is going to be occurring in the future. Things that we know of that are going to affect that are: the expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) which took place a couple years ago and brought in the area around Damascus which we know is going to become a full city in the future and areas to the southeast of Gresham, particularly the Springwater area that was also brought into the UGB. Major growth and development is anticipated for that area. There are a lot of things happening to the south of us and we know that the people living there now and the employment base that will be there will be looking for ways to get to I-84 so we can anticipate that there is going to be more traffic coming through Troutdale and we need to plan for that for the efficient movement of those people. The way we approached this plan update is we applied for and received a state grant and with the assistance of the Oregon State

Department of Transportation we were able to retain a consultant, DKS Associates. We also formed two different advisory committees to guide and assist us as we proceeded through this update. The first is primarily our standing Citizens Advisory Committee that we supplemented with additional people that have interest in transportation issues. Then there was a more technical committee that was comprised of representatives from the various agencies that deal with transportation issues. ODOT, Metro, Tri-Met, Wood Village, Fairview, Gresham and Multnomah County all had representatives on this Technical Committee. The two committees met on a number of occasions to review the work of the consultant and offer comments, revisions and feedback and all of that was folded into the document as it went through the process. In March we had a community workshop for the citizens of Troutdale to attend and comment on the draft plan. A public hearing was held by the Planning Commission on June 15, 2005 where public testimony was taken. The Planning Commission has now forwarded the Plan to you for your consideration. I think it is important to mention how we went about publicizing meetings in this process so that citizens in Troutdale could become involved. This is a broad and sweeping legislative matter in that it affects the city as a whole, not just specific properties. Although, it certainly would affect individual properties if everything is built that is shown in the Plan, but more importantly is that it affects us as an entire community. We couldn't hand select different neighborhoods or different individuals and give them personal notice so we had to use a broader means to publicize this. The vehicle that we used was the Troutdale Champion, the city newsletter that is published six times a year and mailed to every postal patron in the city. We had front page articles in five different editions of the Champion, from September 2004 until last month, trying to highlight that this Plan update was taking place and separating out when there was specific meetings that we wanted to bring attention to in hopes that people would take an interest and read the articles. In every one of the articles there was a contact phone number to call for more information or if you wanted to be on a mailing list you could call in and request that. We compiled a mailing list of people who did call in or who attended any of the meetings and they were notified of other upcoming events. The consultant will go through the Plan in detail, but in a very broad sense the TSP is required to address all modes of transportation. The Plan contains a lot of information but an attempt was made to condense the most important parts of the Plan into the first chapter which is the Executive Summary. Chapter 4 is where the specifics of the various modes of transportation are addressed in detail. That is also where the "master plans" and the "action plans" are located. Chapter 5 evaluates the funding mechanisms and recommends ways that various projects that are given a priority can be funded and completed. I would like to bring to your attention the projects of special note (page 4 of the staff report). As we have gone through this process there has been public input on some specific projects, and based on our current TSP, meetings that we have had in the past and public input that we have received in the past we think we have a good sense of some of the projects that are of specific concern or interest to our citizens. Those projects are: 1) Construction of the I-84 Frontage Road by-pass between the Marine Drive and Graham Road/257th; 2) Extension of Hensley Road through Sunrise Park to provide an east-west connection between 257th and Troutdale Road. That project is already in our current TSP and is being carried forward and continued in the updated Plan as well; 3) Proposed intersection improvements and a traffic light at Buxton Avenue and Columbia River Highway. This is being proposed instead of extending 2nd Street to intersect with 257th Avenue to relieve some of the future traffic that will be using and traveling down Troutdale Road/Buxton Avenue. In conjunction with that the Plan does call for the eventual upgrade or widening of

Troutdale Road/Buxton Avenue to three lanes, two travel lanes and one turn lane; 4) A proposal for a pedestrian/bicycle path connection between Sturges Drive and Sturges Lane. You received in your packets a memorandum from DKS (Exhibit C to the staff report) with some additional changes that they feel would be necessary in light of the Frontage Road recommendations. Those are additional things that they feel need to be incorporated into the Plan to address the Frontage Road improvements that are being proposed. I have identified three options for your consideration of this ordinance. 1) You can adopt the TSP in its current form without changes except for the modifications recommended by DKS. 2) In response to public testimony you receive you could adopt the TSP with changes. 3) Do not adopt the TSP. This would mean that we would continue to use our current TSP which is not in compliance with either the Regional Transportation Plan or the State Transportation Planning Rule. By doing that we could jeopardize our ability to secure some funding for various projects that are based on our compliance with both the State and Regional Transportation Plans. In conclusion, this has gone through a rather extensive public involvement process. It has gone through a public hearing by the Planning Commission and they have concluded their review of the Plan and are forwarding it to you with their recommendation for adoption. Late today we received two additional pieces of correspondence regarding this agenda item. The first was an E-mail from Sheila Ritz, City Administrator for Wood Village asking that the City consider taking the 242nd right-of-way connector off of the maps in our Plan, or if it needs to remain in the Plan for purposes of compliance that we put some qualifying language in the Plan stating that we are not in support of it. The second item received was from Lawrence Hart opposing the Hensley Road extension through Sunrise Park. (Copies were provided to the Council and are included in the packet).

Carl Springer with DKS Associates showed a PowerPoint presentation to the Council (a copy of the presentation is included in the packet).

Carl Springer stated we started this study in July 2004. We identified what issues are out there today, how well the systems works today and we looked at the growth and future needs. We put those needs into plans for each of the travel modes. When we look at the growth in Troutdale (as viewed by a transportation planner) between the year 2000 and 2025 they are expecting somewhere between 2,000 new households and another 10,000 new employees in the city. Together that is about 5,500 new peak hour vehicle trips in the city. I am not talking about through traffic, I am talking about trips within the city and a lot of that will be happening north of the freeway because of the Alcoa site and what could potentially go in there. Our task was to not only capture the affects of local growth but also the affects of what is going on around you (Pleasant Valley, 5,000 jobs and 5,000 houses, Springwater 18,000 jobs and 3,000 houses and Damascus 1,200 jobs, that could go as high as 67,000 and 25,000 houses). We updated the goals and policies in your TSP and we incorporated a couple of the elements of the RTP including the mobility standards and street spacing/access standards. Mobility standards are a way to measure how congested facilities are. By incorporating those standards it helps you have specific quantitative guidelines about how well your system works. There are two types of system plans that we are going to be talking about in the document. A "master plan" is the entire list of projects for a particular travel mode. It is everything that you need in the city to serve that particular mode of transportation. The "action plan" lists the top priority projects; the ones that are most likely to be needed or funded within the next twenty years. In the Pedestrian Master Plan we looked at tying the

sidewalk system that is built within the city to the trail system and the routes to the schools. The map included in the Plan identifies where the sidewalks are today and where sidewalks will be needed. We specifically looked for crossing enhancements on 257th Avenue, Troutdale Road and some sidewalks on key streets and trail connections. The total cost of the Pedestrian Master Plan is \$1.4 million. The cost for the Pedestrian Action Plan is \$167,000. The Bicycle Master Plan includes roads that make sense to share with autos or you can have routes off-street and on-street bike lanes. We are showing these as separate pieces but they are integrated together with the pedestrian, bikes and trails. Key projects include crossings on 257th, bike lanes on Stark Street and Historic Columbia River and a trail connection on Sturges. The total cost for the Bicycle Master Plan is \$2.0 million and the cost of the Action Plan is \$22,000. The Transit Master Plan, the city doesn't offer transit but takes leadership from Tri-Met. We are basically making recommendations to Tri-Met as part of this Plan of where new services should be provided. It is really up to them to incorporate that into their plans and figure out a way to pay for it. The key features of the Transit Plan are looking for ways to improve the reliability of the buses that are out here. We are looking for service north of I-84 and we are looking for better bus stop amenities. The total Transit System Master Plan cost is \$150,000. None of the costs in the Action Plan will be borne by the City. The way we approached developing a Motor Vehicle Plan is we started with the future forecast and then we started to work out the problems using measures such as looking for ways to produce demand through travel demand management. Metro has a long list of programs and policies that they would like to see done to produce that. Other tools include access management and making better use of the roads that you already have. At the end of the day those pieces alone are not enough. On page 16 of the presentation is the Local Street Connectivity map. You already have something like this in your TSP but this is an updated version. The purpose of the Local Street Connectivity Plan is to point to vacant lands in the city. Most of this Plan doesn't happen unless vacant properties develop or property redevelops. This is an indicator of where you might have opportunity to provide local circulation where you don't have it today and if you have a vacant parcel with plans for development, where and what kind of access they might expect. Functional classification is a strange phrase that traffic engineers use to describe the hierarchy of a road. Breaking down the hierarchy, the highest class routes are the freeways shown in yellow, the arterials in red, the collectors in blue and the neighborhood streets in green (refer to the map on page 17 of the presentation). One of the key maps in the Plan is the Motor Vehicle System Master Plan. This is the one that is the subject of a comment that Rich Faith made about the 242nd connector. We are showing that on the Plan because it is in the RTP, it is not that we are recommending it or that it is a solution that is needed to make the City of Troutdale work; it is there primarily for consistency. Another project shown is the 238th extension. The key projects in the Plan are Frontage Road improvements, widening on Halsey and Stark, extension of Hensley and signalization of Buxton/Historic Columbia River Highway. A lot of the projects have more to do with county facilities than they do with city facilities. The total cost of the Master Plan is \$85.2 million, which also includes an interchange at I-84. The City Action Plan cost is \$1.6 million. The RTP update will be starting next year and that is when they will need to decide on the need for the 242nd connector. It is noted in the Plan that about 2,000 vehicles per day are expected to use the Hensley Street extension. When you hear that it sounds like a lot of traffic but compared to any other street that we counted in the City as a part of this update, that would be the lowest volume. When you break it down from a daily context to what happens in the peak hour, 2,000 vehicles a day is about 3 or 4 a minute

during the busiest hours of the day and 1 or 2 during the other hours of the day. The other thing about Hensley Street is that it was recommended to be designed to include traffic calming features to keep the speeds down. If you add up all of the Action Plan capital projects that are the City's responsibility it totals \$1.8 million. The bigger and much more significant piece of transportation funding is operations and maintenance. The City of Troutdale has \$17 million over the next twenty years. You are in a better situation than any of the TSP's that I have done in the last five years. Your revenue estimate is at \$16.1 million and you need \$18.8 million. I think most cities would be envious of your situation. We have suggested a couple of options to cover the shortfall that can be considered during a separate process, not as part of the adoption of the TSP. One suggestion is to increase the SDC for Transportation from \$598/trip to \$628/trip. Another option being considered by many cities because of the dwindling gas tax revenues is a transportation utility fee. The average price of other cities around the state that impose this fee/tax is \$2/month. That concludes my presentation and I will answer any questions that you have.

Phone connection lost with Councilor Thomas.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated one of the projects you mentioned was the extension of Hensley/21st Street. This was a big issue the last time we considered this. There were a lot of people who were opposed to the extension of Hensley down the hill through Sunrise Park. There are a lot of concerns about the street going through there, the speeds, noise, and other improvements that were being talked about at the time. That is still a big concern now. Have you really had a hearing with the folks in that neighborhood?

Multiple folks in the audience replied no.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated the City Council wasn't involved in the work on this but here we are and here are the folks from that neighborhood. I am surprised that we didn't have some kind of a meeting with them knowing the history of that proposed extension of Hensley. There are a lot of people here tonight and probably not all of them are going to be able to speak to us but I hope we can get through quite a few. It certainly would have been useful to have had a neighborhood meeting with the folks from 21st/Hensley area to go over the plan for the extension of Hensley. Is there any reason why we didn't have a neighborhood meeting with these folks? If you would have asked us, we probably would have recommended that because some of us have the history of what happened before. In any event we haven't had that meeting, which would have been very useful and would have saved us a lot of time. So now we are where we are and the proposal is to extend Hensley to Troutdale Road, correct.

Carl Springer replied correct.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated there was concern about speeding but that is just one of the many concerns. You mentioned traffic calming devices, what kind did you have in mind?

Carl Springer replied I think that the best response is if this project were carried forward in the TSP there would be a separate design process that would have to take place for any kind of street improvement. We can't pre-design the street tonight. As far as the alignment of the street, how wide it is, how narrow it is, whether or not there are humps, etc., it is premature

for me to say what those might be. A street that could be compatible in a neighborhood can be designed. Decisions regarding design and funding would take place after the Plan is adopted.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked what if the Hensley extension didn't occur?

Carl Springer replied it is not carrying enough volume to make much difference.

Councilor Canfield stated I have read the Plan and I have more questions than anyone cares to know. I will email staff with my questions because I am interested in hearing from the public tonight.

Councilor Kyle asked Rich, did you say that the extension of Hensley is not a new addition to the Plan?

Rich Faith replied it is in our current Plan. It was put in the Plan and adopted by the Council in 1995.

Councilor Kyle asked how many times were articles put in the Champion?

Rich Faith replied the articles concerning the Transportation System Plan were in five different editions of the Champion, all on the front page.

Councilor Gorsek stated I know that the nature of small cities in our area is to be held hostage by other political organizations. We have to deal with Metro, the County, etc. Tri-Met comes to mind as one of those entities that works pretty much for themselves and not for us. I am very concerned that the Plan says lets leave it up to them. I think we need to put more pressure on Tri-Met. We need to put more things in our Plan that says to Tri-Met that we do exist and that we do have some issues. Do you think that it makes more sense to put those things in the Plan or rely on Tri-Met?

Carl Springer replied the Plan shows that the needs are there and it specifically lists what services should be added. I don't know if there are needs that exist now or in the future that we didn't include.

Councilor Gorsek stated for instance, Figure 1-3 in the Plan shows bringing the line from Kane down to Sweetbriar and Troutdale Road and then over. It seems to me that bus line should come all the way down Sweetbriar and through the Sweetbriar neighborhood and go through on Evans to Stark and then come back to Troutdale Road. That would give a lot more coverage to the Sweetbriar neighborhood.

Carl Springer stated we actually looked at that as part of the CAC's review and I think that we decided that for fixed route service you want to keep the buses on main roads instead of running the big Tri-Met busses through the neighborhood.

Councilor Gorsek stated we are running the smaller 1600 series busses, which are the short busses. I am sure they could navigate Evans. When you don't bring that bus down to Evans

and Stark, everybody that lives in Sandee Palisades is completely cut off from Troutdale Road and you don't even give them a chance to get close to transit. Why would anybody hike all the way up to Troutdale Road? It doesn't make sense.

Carl Springer replied we looked at extensions out there and I think it was problematic because we are looking for a circular route and we are trying to keep off of collector streets.

Councilor Gorsek stated the way we run bus service in Troutdale does not serve Troutdale; it serves people who move through Troutdale but not those that live in Troutdale. I think that is a deficiency in the Plan. Corbett is not represented here tonight, but there ought to be at least a peak hour bus that goes out to Corbett so that they can have a park-and-ride and they wouldn't be driving through Troutdale. It is ridiculous that they don't have that service. I do like the extension to Glenn Otto Park. I also see in a number of places throughout the Plan that there are plans to fix Stark Street between Kane and Troutdale Road. That would be wonderful because Stark Street is extremely dangerous as it sits now. The airport, I think we should still push on the Airport to give us at least Horizon service. Southwest Airlines has actually said to the City of Seattle that they want to go into Boeing Field and as soon as they said it Alaska and Horizon said we would like to go into Boeing Field also. I don't know that it is as far fetched as we might think. Again, to leave that up to the Port of Portland who is kind of like Tri-Met, it is a problem and we need to push harder. Regarding Hensley, the one thing that I think you will hear a lot of people say tonight is that Sunrise Park is rural nature. It is a natural setting. You are right 2,000 vehicles isn't a lot. I live in Hampton Point and I think we have about 50,000 vehicles on those side streets. On the other hand what it does is it introduces vehicles, noise, and exhaust into a setting that is extremely valuable to the community. Was that taken into account in the Plan? Did anybody think about the impacts on the uniqueness of that particular park?

Carl Springer replied no.

Councilor Gorsek stated I understand that this is a transportation plan but on the other hand Sunrise Park is very unique. It seems like something that we should probably think about just in terms of the rural character of that park.

Mayor Thalhoffer called for a break at 9:24pm and reconvened the meeting/public hearing at 9:35pm.

Councilor Kyle asked if we were to take the Hensley access out of the Plan does it have any affect on the overall plan or any grant funds that we may receive without that connectivity?

Carl Springer replied not that I am aware of. If you carried this project forward it would be funded with city money. As Rich mentioned it is actually in your Plan now, we are just carrying it forward.

Councilor Kyle asked could we just make a motion to remove it from the Plan now?

Mayor Thalhoffer replied we are going to have a public hearing on this and a second hearing on August 23rd and then Council will make a decision as to whether or not we are going to take it out. It certainly sounds like it is a candidate for being eliminated.

The phone connection with Councilor Thomas was reconnected.

Dianne Lawson read a letter into the record which speaks against the proposal to extend Hensley Road through Sunrise Park to connect 257th and Troutdale Road. (A copy of the letter is included in the packet.)

Marsha deJesus' stated I live on SW McGinnis Court. My concern is about the bicycle/pedestrian pathway on Sturges. I am a property owner on the southwest corner of the Sturges property in Columbia Crest subdivision. I attended the CAC meeting and the public forum with the Planning Commission. I saw numerous articles in the Troutdale Champion and the Gresham Outlook regarding all of these events and the progress. I wrote a letter to the Planning Commission (copy included in the packet) because I wasn't sure if I was going to be able to attend the hearing. Years ago when they started to build Cherry Ridge subdivision it was in the plan to make that a road. There were citizen complaints that we never wanted a road to go through there. I personally didn't, my husband didn't and my neighbors didn't. At that time we were told a road would never be in any of the Troutdale plans. Contrary to that promise, the road popped up again in the plans and we marched back to City Hall and voiced our concerns. I was quite surprised to see that when this TSP came about that the road, or a bicycle/pedestrian path, was back in the Plan. I am dead set against a road in that area but I do believe that it is time for the City of Troutdale to have some form of connectivity from the east side to the west side. It has been believed through all of these years that all of that property, from my property line to the Sturges property was owned by the Sturges. I have found out within the last year that is not true. The developer of the Columbia Crest subdivision maintained and held out the 16' portion of property. Through these years the Sturges' family has used that 16' as if it was their own property and it was not. They, at the time the roads were stubbed, put a chain link fence all the way to the corner of my property blocking off access across what we thought was their property. The City now owns the 16', from one stubbed street to the other stubbed street. I would like to see a bicycle/pedestrian path. My biggest concern is it poses a fire hazard; it is not maintained any longer. The Sturges used that as a road to their business and when they stubbed the road off they quit using that access. They have let it become overgrown. I have been in contact with the Code Enforcement Officer over the last several years to see how to get the weeds abated and I was told they couldn't do anything because they couldn't find the owner. Now that the City owns it there are numerous weeds there. There is a plan to make a water connection from one end of the stub to the other end of the stub and I thought that work was going to start at the end of June. It would be an excellent opportunity while they were digging that up, if by some miracle this Plan would be accepted, to do the pedestrian pathway at the same time. I know that there is citizen disagreement from the Cherry Ridge subdivision. They do not want anyone to have access through that area. What they don't understand is that there is access through that area everyday. I am in support of the pedestrian/bicycle path. I have to thank Rich Faith. I think we have great citizens in this city but I think we take a lot for granted and as a citizen it is our responsibility to read the information that is sent to us. There was a lot of publicity on this.

Jim Davis stated I live on Hensley Road adjacent to the top entrance to Sunrise Park. I have lived there for almost 26 years. I think in the early 1980's I called one of our police officers to report the fact that there were two guys that had driven into the pit and they were shooting high powered rifles into the bank. When the east winds blew our house was covered with dirt. Fifteen years later, after listening to all of the tailgates of the trucks and all the traffic in and out of there filling the pit; we now have a wonderful asset. I like to get up early and take my cup of coffee and go sit along the bank and enjoy the sunrise and watch the people that are enjoying the park; that just can't be replaced. I am opposed to a road or a maintenance repair facility or basketball courts in this park at all.

Eric Camp stated my house is on the south end of Sunrise Park and I have a complete view of the park. I am very opposed to the road going through. One of the things that sold me on buying this house and moving to this neighborhood was the park and the fact that it was a nature park. I echo Ms. Lawson's statements and I think she speaks for a lot of us who are here this evening.

Michael McRae stated I live on Hensley on the corner. People during the night travel so fast down that road that they are missing the corner and they are smashing through my concrete wall. I came here to see if it is possible to get more signage up to let people know that this is a 15mph turn. I have talked to, I think it was Tyler, and he said he would do everything possible he can to make that happen. I received a letter back from him saying that one sign is sufficient by highway control regulations. That is where my concern comes in. If the road goes through and all this traffic is coming through here without speed bumps and so forth that would be bad, so I am really against it. Is there something that I can do or you can do about the traffic traveling so fast down that road? I have lived there for almost two years now and this is the third time that people have plowed through my concrete wall.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked John Anderson to make note of this problem and follow-up.

Sharon Burge stated I have lived on SW 19th Place for over 30 years. The worse thing that has happened in our neighborhood is the Horton development. There are way too many houses in a very small space. One of the best things that has happened in the neighborhood since I've lived there over the last 30 years is the final evolution of Sunrise Park. It was one of the things that was promised to us when we bought the home many years ago. My husband and I walk at least once a day. We take advantage of the neighborhood and we spend a lot of time in Sunrise Park. One reason I want to speak against this is the aesthetics in that area. Standing at the top of the park you get an absolutely spectacular view of the valley and the mountains. To walk around that park you get a nice jaunt that is not only level on the top but you get a nice racing heart rate when you are coming up the hill at the end. The walk is accompanied by the birds that are talking to you, the huge frogs and the wonderful display of flowers that are in the park. I don't know how you could maintain that if you put a road through there. It has truly enhanced our neighborhood and it is something that I take advantage of. The second issue that I want to address is the traffic. We have already experienced changes on Hensley because of the Horton development with a lot of additional traffic in and out. You get to the end of Hensley, if you extend that road, there is simply no where to go once you get to 257th, you either have to turn right or left. It is really

getting hard these days to turn left. This is only going to grow with the additional road that is coming out onto Hensley from the Horton development, so we are already going to see extra traffic. If you are coming north on Stark and you make a right turn on Hensley you better really slow down and hope that the people behind you slow down because you have to make a very sharp right angle turn. Don't swing wide or you are going to get hit by those people who are trying to turn left. I don't think that road, without changes, can bear anymore traffic. The third thing I want to talk about is the financial issues. If you are looking at only changing things for 2,000 cars a day, if this is not going to make any impact in the overall funds that we might receive from the state to meet the transportation requirements and you have so much opposition, why do it?

Karen Davis stated I live on the north/south portion of Hensley Road adjacent to the park. As my husband stated we have been there almost 26 years and we have seen a major change occur in the neighborhood with growth and of course the park has been the most obvious change that we have seen. I think when it started out we weren't quite sure what it was going to grow up to be. It went through a lot of transition as it was being decided what it was going to be. Perhaps that is why the road was originally put into the Plan in 1995 because I don't think it was fully established as a nature park at that time. Now it is and it is absolutely wonderful with the birds and the wildlife. When you walk into that park you can put your worries aside. It is like an oasis. If there is a road put through there that oasis is gone. With regards to the traffic issue, Michael McRae said he has lived there two years and he has had three crashes into his concrete wall. We have lived there 26 years and I can't tell you the number of times that vehicles have went into his property, as well as ours, coming around there too fast. That kind of went away once the Kane Street extension to the freeway went in; we don't have quite as much traffic. But now here is the possibility to bring it all back and it is just intolerable. One thing I have learned is you have to give up something to get something. I don't think you accomplish anything by giving up the park to get a road. It isn't really going to take the load off because it is going through a neighborhood and Stark Street and Cherry Park Road are already good roads to get to Troutdale Road. With speed bumps then the idea is for vehicles to go slow so you are trying to say don't really come in here and use it as a thoroughfare, so what is the point?

Steve Smith stated I live on 25th Circle on the south end of Sunrise Park. I have lived there almost 9 years and in the time I have enjoyed the continuing development and evolution of Sunrise Park. The people that did the planting of the trees and foliage have done an outstanding job of enhancing the natural beauty of the park. A few years back, I don't know the technical explanation, but there was a reason that the pond had to be drained and rebuilt. I was totally impressed that this city had the foresight and valued the nature of the park to redo the pond rather than just plow it over. I knew that this plan of extending Hensley had been on the books for quite some time but after the pond was rebuilt I thought there is no way that they will ever put that road through here. I don't see where there is any tangible positive impact. For 2,000 vehicles it is just not worth it. With the obvious increase in demand at the intersection of 257th and Hensley that is going to come from the new development, I would hope that we would get a light in at that intersection before someone gets killed. It seems like we heard earlier tonight that in the Plan it talks about crosswalks across 257th, that would help to support that.

Slaven Grzelkowski stated I live on 19th Circle. To me the issue of the park is the issue of the quality of life in the neighborhood. I think people who have spoke before me very poetically described the positive aspects of what the park represents and some folks also mentioned the negative aspects. Frankly, the quality of life in that neighborhood has taken some beating with the construction project that is going on. That is obvious. I am sure there is a kernel of public good in all of that dust and noise. Going through with that road, in my view, would sort of be over the top. We have a situation where there is no real need that is going to be met. The point that I want to make is it would seem to me that the City has already made a substantial investment in the park and now we're being asked to make another investment which would be largely destructive of the effort put into it. I am a heavy user of the park. The thing that I really enjoy and appreciate is the work being done by the maintenance people, especially one who is there all the time. There is a real value in seeing somebody loving the job that they are doing and doing a great job. I know that he would be very distressed if the road was there and introduced a variety of elements such as vandalism into the park. The park will get trashed with this access. To me the main issue here is why do a double investment, one of which negates the previous efforts put into it.

Justin McCauley stated I have lived on Fox Court for 2 months. I lived in Fairview before that and my wife, children and dogs have been long-time users of the park way before we ever dreamed of moving here. There was no way for me to find out about this process. What I want to say is not so much how much we have enjoyed the park but I would encourage you that between now and August 23rd you take some steps or action to notify the people that don't necessarily live in Troutdale but that use the park and are affected by these decisions so that they can come and be a part of the process as well. Perhaps post a sign at the park about the public hearings.

Becky Lindsay stated we live on SW 20th Way which is in the new DR Horton development. We have a backyard that is about 15x30; it is very small. One of the reasons we moved there is to be close to the high school. We utilize that park frequently; we have a dog that we like to walk there. It is the only park, according to the parks map, in the City of Troutdale that allows dogs at all. I want to point out that on Hensley Road, right by 257th, there are elementary and middle school bus stops and I don't think there is any signage saying that it is a school bus stop. This is already a dangerous situation with speeding traffic going past the school buses; we don't need to add more traffic to add to that problem. The only thing I haven't heard anyone address here is when it was turned into a nature park, what was the original intent? Did somebody purchase the park for the city or did the city purchase the park?

Mayor Thalhofer replied it just evolved into a nature park.

Tamara DeRidder, Community Development Director City of Fairview stated I am here to look at the impact of this Transportation System Plan and how it affects the City of Fairview. I have been participating somewhat in your Technical Advisory Committee and have made comments there as well. We have common roads, Halsey, Sandy, and Marine Drive that connect our communities and businesses. We also share in the north-south commuter traffic. As we travel to work and back again we find that there are certain strangulations in the transportation thoroughfare on 242nd and 238th. We have been affected by these choke

points as well on 242nd because a lot of the freight traffic and commuter traffic kicks over to 207th to get to I-84. Tonight I would like to submit new information to be considered. (A letter was submitted to the Council, a copy is in the packet.) This is the results of the Fairview Industrial Lands Master Plan where we had a traffic study that was completed by Group McKenzie. With that Plan we determined that with the build out of our industrial lands we would have adequate accessibility on 3-lane travel on both Sandy Blvd. and 223rd. However, whenever the Troutdale Industrial Park develops, primarily the Alcoa property, those roads would have to go to 5-lane development through an area that has wetlands, steep banks as well as road overpasses and I-84 overpasses. It is pretty insurmountable as far as costs. The only way that we can overcome those costs for that potential impact is with the extension of 238th south to Marine Drive to connect to Sundial Road. You've already got that identified in your Plan and I just wanted to support that connection in your Plan. I also wanted to carry it forward a little bit further because right now there are two action documents, one is called an "action plan" and the other is called a "master plan". The master plan is global; it shows all of the projects that are not in the action plan. The action plan has dollars assigned to it and some dedication behind it. Those are dollars that says Troutdale costs. What I am proposing here is to review the language to iterate that the action plan would be including those projects funded by the City of Troutdale and future development because future development can pay for this extension. I would like to call out an additional illustration that shows those improvements because right now there is not an illustration that shows the action plan improvements. In addition, call out a separate column that says developer costs separate from the Troutdale column. Then what I propose is to add a notation that the Transportation Mitigation Plan will be developed to fund this improvement with the participating jurisdictions, including the City of Fairview, Wood Village and Multnomah County to establish equitable payment for this improvement. I feel like it is an item that has been talked about through EMEA and a number of different venues but we just need to put our heads together and figure out a way to get the improvement in place that is equitable for the service of your properties to the north. The second item is the extension of 242nd. That item is also on your agenda tonight potentially as a future vacation of right-away. Again, having that extension continue from 242nd down to the interchange at I-84 is incredibly important for the north-south travel. Carl Springer has participated in doing the north-south investigation for the four cities to determine if there needs to be two major expressways connecting the north and south; 242nd is more likely than not to be one of them. If you take away the potential for that extension to go through and that interchange to be installed then we are just going to have to buy it back in the future for five times as much the price. What I would encourage to be placed in the language in your Master Plan is some emphasis behind the list to say that although no city funding is dedicated for these items in Table 4-25, the recommended Motor Vehicle Master Plan, the City of Troutdale will continue to support the creation of these improvements through development exactions, alternate funding sources and protecting future alignments. Again, looking at what assets you have, holding on to them where needed and making provisions for those improvements to take place in the future is very important and we will help you where we can.

Bob Whipps stated I live on Burlingame Avenue. I retired from UPS a few years ago and I was a driver here for 12 years. I was asked to be on the Citizens Advisory Committee for this study. The road was supposed to go through having nothing to do with any of these homes that are just being built or the homes on Sunrise Circle or Hampton Point or having nothing to

do with the park as it is now. Somehow or another it didn't go through and there was no signage at that point saying that there is a future road that will go through here. If that would have happened then the people moving there would have known that a road would be going through in the future. I walked through the park Saturday and the view is stunning. I walked through there when we were dealing with this and the amount of people that it is going to affect if the road goes through is very minimal compared to the amount of people that would be using the road. The way some people say it will affect the area, I don't necessarily agree with them. One of the things that holds water is that the traffic going through there is going to be polluting the park. Being on the committee, as I think back, nobody showed up to the meetings from this area. Whereas when we talked about Sturges there were people that showed up and testified and because of their comments I changed my opinion on the Sturges property. Having said all of that, if all or some of these people would have showed up at our committee meetings I would have changed my mind. I have been in favor of that road from the time that I started delivering in Troutdale because that road would be very beneficial to UPS drivers, Postal Carriers, and all the people in Beaver Creek, Sandee Palisades and Sweetbriar because it gives them another opportunity and it also seems like there will be a traffic light on 257th and Hensley. The new street going through would eliminate some of the problems that have been brought up because there would have to be a stop sign where Hensley takes the turn. But after listening to everyone I would not have voted to put the road through because there is so much opposition that it just doesn't make sense even though I have really wanted that street to go through.

Rick Taylor stated I live on 6th Street. We are adamantly against widening Buxton. The word never got out to anybody in our neighborhood about any of this. I just happen to be watching TV late one night and I saw the Planning Commission and I came down to City Hall and about that time they had moved on to the next agenda item. I signed up and asked to receive information. I started asking around our neighborhood and nobody had heard anything about the widening of Buxton. I know that you are probably going to have as many people if not more from Buxton/Troutdale Road area here on the 23rd. We received some information from Rich Faith that there is going to be a 5' encroachment onto people's property. There is a daycare center that is right on Buxton and 6th and if you take 5' from where it sits today it will bring it right up to her front porch. If you put a light in at the bottom of Buxton and have three lanes there, in the winter time when you have a sheet of ice and the wind is blowing 50mph you are going to have pile up there. I won't get into it all tonight, I will wait until the meeting on the 23rd. There should be a different way to get the word out to the people. I did read the Champion and it talks more about bike and pedestrian paths and it didn't really let you know that something major like this was going to happen.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated we are constantly looking for ways to get people better informed.

Carl Tebbens stated I live on Hensley. I am on the Troutdale Citizens Advisory Committee and as a member I sat in on two of the discussions with the consultant on this Plan. Basically I am in support of the Plan. I do enjoy the park and I supported the fact that Hensley in the Master Plan would go through the park. I listened to the commentary tonight and I completely concur with everybody that enjoys the park as much as I do. Purely from a transportation standpoint the extension of Hensley makes sense. From the standpoint of the citizens and their use and quality of the park, it doesn't make sense. I am going to let the

Council decide what they want to do with it. Councilor Gorsek talked about Tri-Met, we did have a lot of discussions about Tri-Met going down to the eastern part of Troutdale and discussed maneuvering through residential streets, the amount of usage there might be, or even going down Stark and trying to figure out how to turn around. We came to the conclusion that we would put in just what is being recommended in the Plan because there are some difficulties. I do support the Plan.

Larry Hart stated I live on Sunrise Circle next to the park. Mayor, thank you for remembering that we have visited this issue in the past quite extensively but it keeps showing up. This is the time that you can rectify that so we won't have to visit it again by removing it from the TSP altogether. I have been to a number of committee meetings, neighborhood committees, and my experience is that public input really doesn't matter until it gets to this point. You go back over all the same material when it comes to the Council, so this is where the public input really becomes effective. I submitted a letter tonight (copy included in the packet) objecting to the Hensley Road connection/extension. There has been comment that they haven't seen people coming to the meetings. I would like to comment that I received a letter from the City of Troutdale dated July 21, 2005 telling me that this meeting was going to be held tonight and that the Draft TSP was available on the internet. I called the City a number of times trying to figure out how to get access to the document but was told I had to visit City Hall and I could read through the material at City Hall. That is not terribly convenient to go through a 300 page document and be able to effectively comment on it. Downloading it from the Internet with my dial-up connection takes awhile because it was a large file. I am not sure how we will get the updates to the draft TSP. I have heard several revisions tonight coming from the consultant making some significant modifications to the draft document that is already available on the Internet. I am hoping that is updated so that we can review it and comment on it. I want to thank you again for remembering that we had visited this issue and that the neighborhood has not been asked what we think about it.

Michelle Wilson stated I live on 22nd Street so my backyard is on 21st and I live adjacent to "Cougar" school. My concern is the widening of that road, which will go into my property. There is a berm at the edge of my backyard and my backyard slopes toward my house. With the sandy soil we have water rushes down and I have to take the soil and put it back up on the hill. The neighborhood school is going to be at the bottom of this hill that is going to be going down to Troutdale Road. I like my peaceful backyard that dead ends at Hampton Point. I like having no traffic back there.

Carole Fairchild stated I live on SW Hensley Road. I have concerns about the park and putting the road through it. I am concerned that it will ruin a beautiful park, the beautiful views and the very low lights in the evening where we can see the stars. I challenge you to try and do that anyplace else in Portland. I enjoy watching the kids play in the snow and also flying their airplanes and such. I am also concerned about the increased traffic and not having a light at 257th and Hensley. I am against the basketball courts or any other enhancements that are being considered for the park, like a maintenance yard. I would like to see it remain the way it exists. I am concerned about the speeding vehicles at night on Hensley Road that we are currently experiencing.

Andrew Johnson, Senior Planner for Oregon Department of Transportation stated I wanted to be here to answer any questions that you might have. Mr. Mayor, I can only extend my condolences for the way that the City has been treated in the past. All I can really do from this point on is assure you that I will not give you any false promises. I will work with the City to get things funded. Councilor Gorsek, I can share your skepticism with the way that government can work sometimes. I hope that I can serve in a way that is different from that. With that said, I would like to state support specifically for the interchange area. I feel like this is a big step in the right direction. If the Council and citizens think that this is a good idea and this document gets adopted, this is an improvement that I can carry forward to get funding for. In addition to that we have already been looking into funding, and we may find some funding to at least contribute towards the smaller improvement which was \$250,000. Along with that, what I will call the Marine Drive extension, will set us up perfectly to look into an interchange when it is needed and the Marine Drive extension will complement that very well. In addition to that it will serve to provide access to that industrial area and it could potentially separate some of the heavier traffic from the cars that are there. I think this is a big step in the right direction.

Karen Davis asked if we were to put together a petition, because this is just a small percentage of the people that live in the area, is there a guideline to follow to put together a proper petition?

Mayor Thalhoffer asked the City Attorney to follow-up with Ms. Davis.

Mayor Thalhoffer closed the public hearing at 10:45pm and stated that there will be a second hearing on this matter on August 23rd.

Councilor Kyle asked when is the light scheduled to go in at Hensley?

Jim Galloway replied that is a county project.. I believe they did obtain some partial funding for that as part of the development agreement for the Morgan Meadows planned development. I spoke to the folks at the County today and it will probably be late this calendar year.

Councilor Kyle asked somebody asked about the widening of Buxton, where was that going to begin?

Rich Faith replied I think what they are referring to is Figure 4-11 in the Plan which shows that Buxton and Troutdale Road are suppose to be a 3-lane road sometime in the future. That is a county road and that would require the County to make those improvements. I received a couple of calls from people today who live along Buxton that are concerned that their property was going to be taken to widen the road. I told them that was not known and nothing has been determined in terms of how much right-of-way there is now and the configuration of the three lanes and whether they would need additional right-of-way. My answer to them is I can't imagine where the County would need so much right-of-way that they would have to take someone's house or buy their entire property, maybe they might need an additional 5' on each side or something along that line. Somehow they interpreted that to mean they will need 5'. There are a lot of unknowns.

Jim Galloway stated I believe in the County's Capital Improvement Plan there are two or three projects to widen various segments of Troutdale Road. I don't recall any of those being north of the point where it transitions from Troutdale Road to Buxton. Even those projects that do appear in the County's Capital Improvement Plan for Troutdale Road, none of them are in their 5-year funding. I don't anticipate anything occurring on Troutdale Road as far as the widening project goes, within the next 5 years or so and I would be very surprised to see anything happen in the Buxton portion in the foreseeable future.

Councilor Thomas asked wasn't the street light at 257th and Hensley a requirement at the time they got to Phase III of the development?

Jim Galloway replied my recollection is that you are right. I believe, however, we required them to enter into an agreement with Multnomah County. I think that did call initially for a light at a particular phase of the development, I think after so many dwelling units went in. They then amended, as I understand it, their arrangement with Multnomah County where instead of the developer actually getting that light in they simply would turn the money over to Multnomah County. It is basically added to the County's backlog of projects. I believe that project has been designed or is nearly designed and they either have gone out or shortly will go out for bids on that. The big unknown is the delivery time for the components and they are looking tentatively at installation late this calendar year.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked can anybody be more definite about how many feet will be required if they widen Buxton? If there are 3-lanes on Buxton how much right-of-way will you need more than you have now? Can we get more exact about that so we can let the people know?

Jim Galloway replied I think the answer to your question is no, I am not sure that we can. I could certainly pose the question to the County and they may respond as they don't really have any plans to widen it. Another possibility is to go to the County Standards and simply say if it gets widened it would probably get widened according to the County's standard for a 3-lane road which would be so many feet. We could use that figure but I would be concerned, as Rich did when he tried to give an example and he mentioned 5', in some people's mind it got locked in that it is exactly 5' no more and no less. The exact details of the project, the exact width being one of those, probably wouldn't be finalized until you went through the design process. I think there are other issues to resolve. First of all I don't know, without doing some research, what the County's existing right-of-way is because they own some land behind the lot. I think most people kind of assume that their property goes out to the sidewalk. What some people may view as their front yard may actually be a little bit of County right-of-way. I would be concerned that any number that we give out would become the city promised and years from now another council would be faced with some irate citizens.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated I am sure that if the City of Troutdale worked with Multnomah County they could let us know if some of the front yards are on County right-of-way right now and what would be the standard widening for a 3-lane roadway or they could give us an idea of approximately what it would entail so people would have something to consider otherwise

they don't know what is going to happen. It is not fair to the citizens to leave them in that position wondering if they are going to lose their house or their yard or part of it.

Jim Galloway stated I can pose the question to the County and share the answer with you.

7. MOTION: A motion to consider the recommendation of the Three City Ad Hoc Fire Service Study Committee.

Mayor Thalhofers stated as you know we have had a Three City Ad Hoc Fire Service Study Committee that has been meeting almost every week for the last six months. We have considered many aspects of fire service and it has come down to a couple of options.

Mayor Thalhofers stated the Committee's recommended first choice is:
Ten-Year Agreement – Two-Year Opt Out

	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10
Troutdale	\$1,109,000	\$1,252,000	\$1,295,820	\$1,341,174	\$1,388,115
Fairview	526,000	621,000	642,735	665,231	668,514
Wood Village	245,000	296,000	306,360	317,083	328,181

	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
Troutdale	\$1,443,640	\$1,501,386	\$1,561,441	\$1,623,899	\$1,688,855
Fairview	716,055	744,697	774,485	805,464	837,683
Wood Village	341,308	354,960	369,158	383,924	399,281

Note: All three cities have approved a one year agreement with Gresham for fire service for FY 2005-06 at the rate shown in the table above for 2005/06.

A ten year term; a right for Gresham to review the terms of the IGA in years six through ten, only if there are extraordinary and unforeseeable events outside of Gresham's control that result in a twelve percent (12%) or higher increase in costs that Gresham incurs to provide fire services. An increase in costs that justifies a request to review the terms of the IGA is limited to unfunded mandates from another jurisdiction that Gresham must comply with, such as changes in the laws that are adopted by the Oregon Legislature, United States Congress, or a state or federal agency, or a ruling from an arbitrator as a result of mandatory binding arbitration; an option for any one of the three cities to withdraw from the IGA provided that the withdrawing city provides two years prior written notice of its intent to withdraw; mandatory level of service for the three cities that is currently being provided; A quarterly payment schedule; the creation of a user board with representatives from the three cities (one elected and one appointed); and an arbitration clause to resolve disputes.

Mayor Thalhofers stated the Committee's recommended second choice is to create our own Three City Fire District. This option, although requiring significant work and some risk, is seen as a viable option to contracting with Gresham should the Three Cities be unable to complete negotiations with Gresham.

MOTION: Councilor Thomas moved to approve the Three City Ad Hoc Fire Service Study Committee's recommended First Choice. Seconded by Councilor Kyle.

Councilor Thomas stated I think we need fire service for the next several years and a 10-year contract with Gresham gives us some stability in our fire service costs. Although creating our own fire district is still a viable option.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated we definitely need to move ahead on this. I favor the motion.

Councilor Canfield stated I am going to vote for this. It is time to move on. We need the fire service and Councilor Thomas was right this does give all of the cities some stability.

Councilor Gorsek stated I support the motion.

John Anderson stated the other two city councils approved this recommendation last Wednesday. We are not certain that all of this recommendation will be accepted by Gresham. We are very close, but we are not certain.

VOTE: Councilor Thomas – Yes; Mayor Thalhoffer – Yes; Councilor Canfield – Yes; Councilor Kyle – Yes; Councilor Gorsek – Yes.

Motion Passed 5 – 0.

8. RESOLUTION: A Resolution supporting the vacation of the 242nd Avenue connector right-of-way.

Mayor Thalhoffer suggested postponing this item until the August 23, 2005 Council meeting.

Council agreed.

9. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

John Anderson stated we have provided to you tonight two memos following-up from the Business Summit for your information. Jim Galloway is going to give you a quick update on the steps being taken to respond to the water hardness issue.

Jim Galloway stated one of the major comments that came out of the business survey had to do with the quality of the water, primarily in the downtown area. We have done a couple of things since the meeting to try to gather enough information for you to make some decisions. We hired a consulting engineer, CH2MHill to help us do a preliminary study of the water quality issue. Secondly, we provided to them the comments that came from the business survey. They felt that there were some more specific questions that could be asked to help better categorize the taste and odor issues that came out of that survey. For those firms that commented on the water quality and also provided us with their name and address (approximately 32 businesses) we sent out a follow-up survey to try and get more information

to focus in on what the issues are. It is our intent to get that study completed and come to you at a work session on October 11th to present to you their findings and recommendations and move forward.

John Anderson stated at the 4 Cities meeting the City of Gresham asked us to consider appointing a new member to their Fire Advisory Committee. Teresa Hall had been the City's representative and she has moved out of Troutdale. The Mayor of Wood Village would like to encourage our Council to consider appointing a council member to the Committee.

Mayor Thalsofer recommended putting this item on the first meeting in September.

10. COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS

Mayor Thalsofer stated the City of Wood Village has a person who is interested in serving on the Port of Portland's Citizens Noise Advisory Committee. I think we should support the appointment of Michelle Sturdavant to the Port of Portland's Citizens Noise Advisory Committee.

MOTION: Councilor Canfield moved to support the appointment of Michelle Sturdavant as the 3 Cities representative on the Port of Portland's Citizens Noise Advisory Committee. Seconded by Councilor Kyle.

VOTE: Councilor Thomas – Yes; Mayor Thalsofer – Yes; Councilor Canfield – Yes; Councilor Kyle – Yes; Councilor Gorsek – Yes.

Motion Passed 5 – 0.

Mayor Thalsofer stated I think SummerFest was a huge success. I think Councilor Kyle deserves a standing ovation for the work she did on SummerFest this year.

Mayor Thalsofer stated the Multnomah County/City of Gresham roads issue is still moving along. They are meeting to try and remove this from the legislative agenda.

Councilor Canfield stated the Troutdale Thriftway will be missed in our community. I want to thank Thriftway for hanging in there that long and a special thanks to all of the great employees there.

Councilor Kyle stated I want to echo Councilor Canfield thoughts. I am really very sad about the closure of Thriftway. I love going into that store. It is nice to go in there and recognize the people and to be recognized. I am going to miss them; they have been here a long time.

Councilor Gorsek stated I agree.

Mayor Thalsofer stated that is my favorite store in the area. I have been trying to think of any way that the City could be of assistance to Thriftway. I think myself, and maybe some of the staff, will try to at least meet with them and see if there is anything we can do at all. It's not likely that we can but we should give it a shot and see.

Councilor Thomas stated I hate to see Thriftway go and if we could save them that would be great.

11. ADJOURNMENT:

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

Meeting adjourned at 11:20pm.

Paul Thalhofer, Mayor

Approved August 23, 2005

ATTEST:

Debbie Stickney, City Recorder