

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

Tuesday, June 24, 2003

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 Kight, Councilor Kyle, Councilor Daoust and Councilor Ripma (7:25pm).

ABSENT: None

STAFF: Erik Kvarsten, City Administrator; Jim Galloway, Public Works Director; Rich Faith, Community Development Director; Kyra Williams, Finance Director; Marnie Allen, City Attorney; Debbie Stickney, City Recorder; Clyde Keebaugh, Parks and Facilities Supervisor.

GUESTS: See Attached List.

Mayor Thalhofer asked are there any agenda updates?

Kvarsten replied we have no changes this evening.

2. CONSENT AGENDA:

- 2.1 Accept Minutes:** May 20, 2003 Council Work Session.
- 2.2 Resolution:** A Resolution authorizing an interfund loan from the General Fund to the Code Specialties Fund.
- 2.3 Resolution:** A Resolution authorizing the Mayor to enter into an Intergovernmental Agreement with Multnomah County for the Community Development Block Grant Program and the HOME Investment Partnership Program for program years 2004-07.
- 2.4 Resolution:** A Resolution providing for Budget Transfers and making appropriation changes for Fiscal-Year 2002-03.
- 2.5 Resolution:** A Resolution approving the City's affordable Housing Report to Metro in compliance with Title 7 of the Metro Urban Growth Management Functional Plan.

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.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked is there anyone here to speak to us on a non-agenda item?

None.

4. APPOINTMENT: Appointment of Fire and Emergency Services Feasibility Study member.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated I have been serving as the interim member on this committee and with the consent of the Council I would like to appoint myself to this committee.

MOTION: Councilor Gorsek moved to appoint Mayor Thalhoffer to this committee. Seconded by Councilor Thomas. Motion passed unanimously.

5. PUBLIC HEARING / RESOLUTIONS: A Public Hearing pertaining to the following Resolutions:

- 5.1 A Resolution certifying the City of Troutdale eligibility to receive State Shared Revenue.
- 5.2 A Resolution declaring the City of Troutdale's election to receive State Shared Revenues.
- 5.3 A Resolution adopting the City of Troutdale's Fiscal-Year 2003-04 Annual Budget and making appropriations.
- 5.4 A Resolution imposing and categorizing Ad Valorem Taxes for Fiscal-Year 2003-04.

Mayor Thalhoffer read the resolution titles and opened the public hearing at 7:10pm.

Kyra Williams, Finance Director stated the first two resolutions are for the state revenue sharing. Oregon Revenue Sharing Law requires the city to hold two public hearings. The first public hearing was held before the Troutdale Budget Committee on April 28th and this public hearing is the required hearing before the governing body of Troutdale on proposed uses of such revenues. The proposed uses and comparison to budget is detailed in Addendum "A" (copy included in the packet). In addition, resolutions are required each year from cities that want to receive state revenue sharing monies. A resolution certifying the City of Troutdale's eligibility to receive state revenues and a resolution declaring the City of Troutdale's election to receive state shared revenues are submitted for your adoption. The budget for adoption has been increased from the Budget Committee's budget by \$26,899 from the total requirements of \$22,079,764 to \$22,106,663 and includes unappropriated fund balances of \$3,767,899 and budgeted expenditures of \$18,338,764. Changes that have been made can be found in Addendum "B" (copy included in the packet). In addition to this we are required to publish a notice of budget hearing, which was published on June 11th in

the Outlook. There was a publication error and a correction notice published on June 18th. The last resolution is for imposing and categorizing ad valorem taxes for fiscal year 2003-04. Pursuant to Measure 50 the Oregon Department of Revenue certified the permanent tax rate for operation purposes to taxing districts for the 1997-98 tax year. Troutdale's permanent tax rate was set at \$3.7652 per \$1,000 of assessed value. The permanent rates became final on June 30, 1998 and cannot be changed. In fiscal year 2003-04 it is projected that our permanent rate will raise property taxes totaling \$2,960,544. The amount of projected taxes is based on the estimated taxable assessed value of \$786,291,403. This is the estimated taxable assessed value that includes the constitutionally allowed three percent increase plus new property or new improvement assessed value growth projected at \$5,000,000. The General Obligation tax indebtedness of the City includes bonds for parks acquisition and improvement and the wastewater treatment plant relocation project. The total debt service for the general obligation issues requires combined property tax levies of \$463,861. The debt service for parks bonds requires a property tax levy of \$35,004. The debt service for sewer bonds requires a property tax levy of \$428,857. The resolution imposes and categorizes property taxes as previously described.

Councilor Kight asked is the ad valorem tax fixed by Measure 50?

Williams replied yes.

Councilor Kight asked and that doesn't change does it?

Williams replied only if the voters vote to change it.

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

Jim Jensen stated I have been the chair of the City's Budget Committee for this past year and for many years prior. Part of my responsibility as Chair of the Budget Committee is to submit to you the recommended budget for 2003-2004 along with the committee's recommendation that it be adopted by the City Council. I want to take a moment to extend my admiration of appreciation to our city staff and the work that they did in preparing the budget. Having served on this committee for many years I am constantly impressed with the quality of work that is done by Erik and his team. As happens so often, the people who serve our city, by that I mean all of the city employees, really are the unsung heroes of the city. We are more than fortunate to have a staff as dedicated to this city and its future as they are. Knowing the effort that they put into not only the preparation of the budget, but simply trying to keep the city functioning with ever decreasing resources. At the same time I want to thank and acknowledge the work done by the committee itself. We had, to say the least, some rather intense discussions amongst ourselves and we are a stronger group for it. We also asked many pointed questions to Erik and the department heads and each and every one of them answered in a forthright and candid manner. It is important to know however, that unlike most of the budgets that have been recommended in the past to the Council, this one is not being presented with unanimous recommendation of the committee. The expenditures were generally accepted, in most cases after lengthy discussions. It was the manner in which the budget was balanced which is cause for my concern. For the first time in my experience, we

have resorted to what I believe is borrowing from the future by lowering the unappropriated funds from this budget year. While the amount itself may be small, it is a dangerous precedent and will, if followed in the future, put this city in a very precarious financial position. By borrowing money that may not exist at fiscal year end, we may have approved what, at the end of the day, will be an unbalanced budget. And that Mr. Mayor is what bothers me the most. As you recall there were some specific requests made to consider the moving of the undergrounding fund into the general fund. This requires council action and I think it is imperative that it be done. In closing I want to thank city staff as well as the budget committee members for their efforts in putting together the proposed budget and for the committee's hard work and dedication in this review process. With that I hereby submit the proposed budget for the fiscal year 2003-2004 and as Chairman of the Troutdale Budget Committee recommend its adoption by the City Council.

Mayor Thalsofer closed the public hearing at 7:20pm.

MOTION: Councilor Daoust moved to adopt Resolution 5.1, 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4. Seconded by Councilor Gorsek.

Councilor Daoust stated we did put a lot of hard work into balancing the budget. It was tough to go through and see where we could cut to make things balance but we did it and I respect the outcome.

Councilor Gorsek stated I concur with Councilor Daoust. I understand Mr. Jensen's concern about the issue of borrowing from the future. I think that it will work out okay and we will be able to deal with this issue. I was very impressed with the way Mr. Jensen ran the meetings and I appreciate the work done.

Councilor Thomas stated I would like to thank Mr. Jensen for his hard work in conducting the meetings, which is not exactly easy at all times. I would also thank the staff and the committee members for their excellent work.

Mayor Thalsofer thanked the staff and budget committee for their dedication and hard work. I would also like to thank Jim Jensen for chairing the committee.

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

Motion passed 6-0.

Councilor Ripma arrived at 7:25pm.

6. REPORT: A report and recommendation concerning a Troutdale Skate Park Facility.

Rich Faith stated this matter was brought to you on May 27th but it was continued to tonight because of the uncertainty as to whether or not surrounding property owners had received

written notice for the May 27th meeting. Based on that, Council decided that we should re-notice the property owners to be certain. Just for your information, we did determine that notices had been mailed out to the property owners prior to the May 27th meeting as well as to everyone that had attended and signed in at the Parks Advisory Committee's (PAC) March 18th meeting where they discussed converting the basketball court at Kiku Park into a skate park facility. We have sent out the same 77 notices for tonight's meeting, copies of the notices have been provided in your packet. What brings this matter to you was the conclusions that were drawn by the PAC based on the testimony they received at the March 18th meeting. I would like to recap what those conclusions were. The first thing that the PAC was able to determine from testimony that they received, not only at the March 18th meeting but at other meetings and hearings they held over the years on this issue, is there seems to be unanimous agreement that there ought to be a skate park facility in Troutdale simply because there is a high demand for such a facility. So the issue is not really should we have a skate park but where should we put it. Another conclusion they reached at the March 18th meeting is that Kiku Park is not a suitable location for a skate facility. The third conclusion that they came to is even though we are having difficulties finding the perfect location, having something is better than nothing and therefore they are recommending that the Council look very seriously at the vacant field that the city owns immediately west of the City Conference Building. This site was acquired for the purpose of a future city hall, which appears to be a few years out and so the committee would suggest we look at putting a temporary skate park on this site until a permanent location can be identified. The fourth thing that came out of their meetings was that those who engage in this sport and supporters of skateboarding seem to feel very confident that if the city provides a location that they can secure the donation of material, labor and funds to make it happen. The PAC is recommending that the City Council will authorize construction of a temporary skate park facility on the vacant field immediately west of the City Conference Building parking lot until such time that the property is needed for a city hall or other uses that the city might have at which time it would have to be moved to a more permanent site.

Councilor Ripma stated the exhibits you included in your report show that the skate park would be in the thousands of dollars to build and as I understand it, the city wouldn't be putting out the money to build the park, it would be by donation. Is that correct?

Faith stated that is your call. All that is really being asked of you is to authorize a site for the park. Once that has been decided city staff would work with the community and with the supporters of the skate park to determine how we can work together to secure the funds. The council could choose to authorize money to be spent on it.

Councilor Ripma stated in the approved budget for the 2003-2004 fiscal year there is no money for it.

Faith replied there is no money in the general fund, however there is approximately \$137,000 in the Park SDC fund, which can be spent on growth related capital improvements.

Councilor Ripma stated which may or may not include a skate park.

Faith replied I would have to look into that.

Councilor Ripma stated presuming it is funded largely by donations and the skate park gets built, since this is a temporary park who would we ask to remove it when the time comes? Wouldn't we be forced to move it to some other location? I want to make clear who is going to cover the expense related to moving it.

Faith replied we aren't at that point so we don't really know the answer to that. If a permanent location is identified and made available I think the skating community themselves would be more than willing to take it upon themselves to move these modules to the permanent site.

Councilor Ripma stated there is some permanent parts to the structure.

Faith replied correct, we will have to put down some asphalt or hard surface that would serve as the base.

Councilor Ripma asked could we fund the move in advance by raising the money now and setting those funds aside?

Faith replied if you want to structure it in a way that you would not authorize us to commence any kind of construction until there are sufficient funds set aside to relocate it.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked are we going to have a demonstration project to see if this is the kind of skateboard facility that the kids would like?

Faith replied I would like to ask Clyde Keebaugh our parks supervisor to respond to that.

Clyde Keebaugh, Parks and Facilities Supervisor stated the vendors are more than willing to bring in their products for people to view. Whether it is feasible to actually setup something for people to use, I don't know. These modules are used throughout the state in a variety of skate parks and I would imagine that most of the youth are familiar with their construction and they have their own preferences as to what they like. The thought has always been to involve the skate community in the design of the skate park.

Councilor Kight stated comparing siting this skateboard park with siting a sewer treatment plant or an airport, everyone wants it but they don't want it in their neighborhood. Maybe I am missing something, what is the negativity surrounding siting a skateboard park?

Faith replied I can't speak for the people but from what we have heard at the various meetings is there is concern about misbehavior, litter, noise, disruption of the neighborhood and undesirables coming in. The list could go on and on.

Councilor Kight stated lets talk about the noise. Is the material they are going to be using cement?

Keebaugh replied the skate surface would most likely be concrete. The components themselves are constructed out of various products. Most of them have sound dampening layers of rubber or foam in them.

Councilor Kight asked are some of them less noisy than others?

Keebaugh replied I would imagine.

Councilor Kight stated temporary bothers me. We are spending a lot of time and energy on a site that we are calling temporary. As we all know in government, nothing is more permanent than a temporary site. I wonder if our time would be better spent finding a permanent site so we are not going to have to go through the expense of having to move the equipment?

Faith replied I would agree. That has been a four or five year mission that we have failed in. Every proposal that we have put in front of this council for consideration has failed for one reason or another. We are simply running out of ideas. When the PAC met on March 18th and came to this conclusion and recommendation, part of that was if the city council does not favor this recommendation then they want a specific site from the city council.

Councilor Kight stated lets say we choose this location for a temporary location for a skateboard park. In order to have the tag temporary that means it will not be there forever. Wouldn't it make more sense that at the time that we identify this site as temporary that we also identify within a short timeframe a permanent site so that the temporary site doesn't end up being permanent?

Faith replied I would agree, but once again we have exhausted all of the possibilities that we can think of. In our inability to find a permanent site, I believe that I speak for the PAC, when I say they are looking to you to identify a permanent location.

Councilor Kyle asked can SDC's be used for temporary capital improvements or do they have to be permanent?

Faith replied the premise we are operating off of is that there would be a minimal investment by the city and perhaps only in site preparation and that the skateboarding community would come up with the donation of funds and materials to construct it. There really wouldn't be a need to use the SDC funds to purchase the materials. If that is how it happens then it is a donation of materials to the city and would become part of the city's assets with the understanding that they are going to be moved elsewhere if and when we find another location.

Councilor Daoust asked I realize that we will negotiate with the skating community as to what they can donate. At the last meeting we discussed that blacktop was too rough for skating and that concrete would be better. If the city ended up paying for that, do you know what the increased cost would be for concrete versus blacktop?

Keebaugh replied I don't know what that would be but it would be considerably more.

Councilor Daoust stated one good thing about this site is it has easy access to the police. I bring that up as a mitigation measure to some of the complaints that we might have.

Keebaugh replied that is one of the reasons that it was considered a good site and that it was not adjacent to a residential neighborhood.

Councilor Daoust stated so in your opinion it meets the criteria for a good location?

Keebaugh replied it seems like it meets those criteria. It is open, easily accessible, it is highly visible but it is off of the main road, it does not abut a residential neighborhood, police and emergency facilities are close by and the City Conference Building is staffed during the day if there is a problem.

Councilor Daoust stated to address Councilor Kight's concerns, I guess I don't come to the same conclusion. The council could look for other sites concurrently with approving this site. I do like the idea of getting design input from the skating community.

Councilor Gorsek asked Marnie Allen, what is your opinion of Rich's response to being able to use SDC funds?

Marnie Allen, City Attorney replied what I heard Rich say is he didn't anticipate the Parks SDC's would be spent for these improvements. If the city found itself in the position of wanting or needing to use Parks SDC's for a portion of the improvements we would want to do an evaluation about which part of the improvements actually have capacity to accommodate future growth. There may be a portion of those improvements that would be eligible.

Councilor Kight asked how much property do we need to set aside for a skateboard park?

Faith replied approximately 8,400 square feet.

Councilor Kight asked could this be sited in an industrial and commercial area?

Faith replied this would constitute a park facility, which is identified in most of our zoning districts as a community service use, which is only allowed by conditional use. However, in our industrial zones parks are listed as an outright permitted use. Even if you approve this we would still have a land use process to go through and there is a conditional use requirement to establish a park facility on this property in the Central Business District.

Councilor Kight asked has the PAC looked in the commercial and industrial area down on Marine Drive and around the airport?

Faith asked in terms of privately owned property?

Councilor Kight replied yes.

Faith stated I don't believe that the PAC themselves have approached individual private property owners for donations of land for this. In 1997 when we had a citizen activist seeking donations and the city support for a skate park, she did approach a number of private property owners and was unsuccessful in getting any of them to agree to donate land.

Bill Wood stated I live on the NW corner of 4th and Buxton. I wasn't going to say anything tonight about the fiasco with the meetings and not being notified, but I have to say that we did receive a mailing for the May 27th meeting but nothing prior to that. This time for neighbors to have a voice about this property being identified for a skate park should have been prior to the PAC meeting and recommendation. We have wasted a lot of time this past couple of weeks on this. When the city purchased the property next door to me it was my understanding that it was going to be for a city hall. I think that is a great idea and I am looking forward to it. But the notion of locating this temporary skateboard facility that may very well become permanent, I have a real problem with. I have an excellent view from my house. The city seems like they are trying to slip this thing through below the radar and plop it right in our view. Mr. Faith said during the last meeting that the primary concern is to put the facility in a location convenient for kids. How can it be convenient for kids when its location is only a stones throw from downtown where it is not wanted but yet miles away from the principal residential areas where most of the kids are. Most of the users of this facility would have to travel there by car or worse yet a dangerous bike ride or skate down Buxton hill. What about the true expenses of building and operating a skate park? The \$14,000 is a drop in the bucket for site preparation. What are we doing about parking, bike racks, landscaping, restrooms and drinking fountain? What do you really know about this commercially manufactured equipment? If it is made of anything but steel it will last about three years and then it will have to be replaced. How about security? It is going to take more than the occasional police officer driving by. It sounds as if they are taking the bargain basement approach. I am actually in favor of a skate park that is more ambitious than that proposed, but only in the right location. Mr. Shields last week raised the point that the best solution may well be a community center approach that provides for a diversity of activities. I accidentally found myself at a skateboard park in Gig Harbor, Washington over the weekend. Those folks really did their homework. It was a beautifully designed facility in a true park like setting with restrooms, picnic tables, and landscaping. The activity area was all concrete with no fences and no store bought equipment. It was located near a large residential area and shared parking facilities with a community center. I know that would be more expensive to build but it would be less expensive to maintain in the long run. If a site cannot be found to satisfy the fundamental criteria then maybe we should admit that the time has just not come yet for a skateboard park. For twelve years I have seen the downtown evolve from virtual wasteland with little appeal to one of the most beautifully developed and attractive areas anywhere. It is unimaginable to me that a city government, which in recent years has been so concerned with blighted areas is now on a steadfast course to create a future one practically downtown. This is a classic case of lets do something even if it is wrong just to get it out there. Locating it on this particular site is wrong. We need to step back, do the research, do this right or not do this at all.

Pat Smith stated we have spent millions of dollars on the downtown area to make it a nice place for people to come and shop. You say you have \$300,000 all of a sudden for this skateboard park but yet when it comes to the other parks that have not been finished like Sunrise, we are out of money. You are looking for a temporary spot; the sewer treatment plant is just sitting down there. That would be the most logical place to put one. This is not going to be a cheap proposition no matter what way we look at it. If you put something like that on a main street in the downtown area, that would be an eyesore and a detriment to the city. If we have money for something like this why aren't we fixing our other parks?

Allen Nelson stated I live at 425 Buxton Avenue. I am opposed to this park and I hope you don't put it in. There is enough noise living up there as it is from the traffic. I am concerned about kids coming down the hill on skateboards. The Plaid Pantry will become a gathering place for these kids. The downtown, I can't see coming down here and having to weave between the skateboarders. Has the police department commented on this location?

Mayor Thalhofer replied I don't think they have spoke to this issue.

Lou Nederheiser stated I have property at Buxton and 2nd Street right across from the future city hall. I am here tonight, not for myself, but for the City of Troutdale. Right now I live in Sandy and I am 3 blocks from the skate park. I go by there twice a day. At the Sandy park there have been quite a few injuries that are reported in the newspaper. The kids don't always use the skate park they will go down the street, which is where I think some of the injuries are coming from. My wife has seen two arrests and I have seen one arrest. This was not your young kids, they were young adults probably in the 20's. I have noticed a lot of bicycles at the skate park. If you are going to have a skateboard park you should exclude all bicycles. I have seen the neighbors out picking up the garbage. One of the main reasons that I am here tonight is if you are considering locating the skateboard park on the property where you are going to put the future city hall; I think it is a major mistake. If you are going to put a skateboard park in put it on the school property or in a park like Glenn Otto Park. It should be located where it is available to the kids. If you put it off of Buxton you are going to have a lot of accidents from kids riding their skateboards down the hill. Nothing is temporary. If you put it in it will be there 50-years from now. I had a vision when it was announced that city hall would be going in next to our property, I thought that would be terrific. Currently at times there is a parking problem already at the City Conference Building. If you put in a skate park you will have people coming from Hood River, State of Washington and a lot of people from Portland and there is no parking to accommodate that. I am truly against a skate park on city property.

Shane stated I live at 1088 SW 25th Street. I have been skateboarding since I was 8 years old; I am 22 now. It is not like a sport or a college game. It is a serious thing for some people and it helps them get out of trouble and stay out of drugs and alcohol. There are some people that cause trouble on rare occasions. I have spent a ton of time at the park in Sandy and it is pretty much self-contained. The skate park is on a school site and I have seen kids get out of school and throw garbage, so that could be the problem. I am really not in favor of a temporary park. I would like to see a permanent park. I don't think this is a good location. Somewhere behind Reynolds High School would be better. When I was younger I was one

of the people that helped with Burnside Skate Park and that was funded in full by donations. I don't see the city having to contribute anything but the land.

Neil Handy stated I represent three corporations that own property in the commercial business district. I am just wondering where our fiscal lines are at when we borrow money from the future and we turn around and spend money on a skateboard park. I have to question that judgment. I would think our focus would be on doing something with the property that the city purchased 4 to 5 years ago and move the city hall project along. There are some questions that I would like you to think about before making a decision on this. Is it going to be designated a park? What will the name of the park be? If it is a park, will it have to conform to site and design review? Will the city be paying for liability insurance that I am sure will be required? Will there be traffic controls? Will there be restroom facilities? Is the city in the sport recreation business now? If a group of citizens came to this council and wanted a motor-cross course built, are we going to build that? If we can't find a site now and we have looked at every possible location, you are not going to find it five years from now. Why has the recommendation from staff sited this facility so far away from the neighborhoods that want it? If the people in the neighborhoods want a skateboard park then that is where it should go. If you want to make it temporary move it every five years from park to park then everyone will get to enjoy it. I disagree strongly that this particular project would be allowed to be funded out of the Parks SDC funds. I think it is a really bad idea to site it at this location. We have spent thousands of dollars on our property to upgrade it from residential to commercial to bring business to this town and now you want to put that thing right across from one of my properties. I am not happy about it and I am going to fight it.

Gail Thurber stated I am a high school teacher. I was really surprised to see a proposal for a skate park because I understood that we were in fiscal hard times in the city. The school district I teach in will not allow skateboarding and there are a number of reasons for that. One of the major reasons is liability. Students are getting injured all the time from skateboarding so we don't allow it on school grounds. I had a student last week, who is a "D" student and he came in with a cast on his arm and I asked him what happened and he said I was skateboarding. In my experience as a teacher, it is not the "A", "B" or "C" students that are skateboarding it is my "D" and "F" students that are skateboarding. They tend to be a little more reckless. I am not categorizing all of them, I know there are some skateboarders that are good people and hard working and go to school. But there are some who could be using their time in a better way. I question the whole need for a skateboard park in our city. We would be encouraging adolescents from all different areas to come to Troutdale. We are looking at a very narrow age group of 13 to 17 year olds. In this city I would like to see, when we are going to be allocating scarce resources, I would like a park for all age groups to benefit from. I like to see kids have a good time but the safety and liability issues are too great. From my point of view it is not just this site, I think we have better uses of our time and money than worrying about a skateboard park.

Roman York stated we have witnessed some really close calls. If you locate a skate park here kids are going to be skateboarding down Buxton. Skateboards and roller skates do not have breaks. Aside from this being a bad idea and spending money in bad economic times, I

don't think we should do this; it is a bad idea. There are many issues such as the liability and the potential injuries of the participants and innocent victims.

Greg Handy stated I agree with what my brother said. I also agree with all of the other negative comments. I believe that skateboarding is a legitimate sport both nationally and internationally. Obviously it has been going on for some time. I have faith that it will survive. I am convinced that you need to serve as a resource to the groups in the community by helping to put them together, allow them to lobby in support of their own sport and they will survive on their own. If it does it will have a place just like baseball, basketball, boxing and skiing. We need to get away from the notion that the city council and city staff has to solve every problem that is brought before them. There are serious issues that you need to deal with like SDC fees and we don't have the resources to take care of all of the problems. I am fully against locating the park in the business district; it doesn't make any sense.

Councilor Daoust stated Pat Smith brought up the idea of the old sewer treatment plant. I have seen a lot of the concrete based skate parks. The old ponds are made of concrete, could they be conformed into a concrete based skate park?

Faith replied possibly but I would have to wonder how permanent that would be. If the concern is that you don't want a temporary site, this property is being earmarked for some kind of future development.

Councilor Daoust stated I was not prepared to make a proposal tonight and I wasn't thinking permanent but just as something that could be used in the meantime.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated a group of us have visited the site and checked out that location isn't that correct?

Faith replied we did not look at the pond, we looked at the shed that is down there.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated it was determined by the group that it wasn't a good place.

Faith replied there were a number of opinions stated. If it were selected there would need to be some modifications done to the site like fencing to secure the areas of the former sewer treatment plant site that offer some dangers to kids. It certainly lends itself to a skating facility. There might be some issues that have to be dealt with as far as how the property was technically purchased and what the required uses are. I think there would be some legal issues that would need to be looked into before a decision could be made that it could be used as a skate park.

Councilor Kyle asked we heard testimony from one skateboarder, do you know if we have had other testimony from skateboarders as to how they felt about that location?

Faith replied this is the first meeting where we have had testimony on this site. It was not the subject of the PAC March 18th meeting. I have not heard anything from other skateboarders.

Councilor Thomas asked do we have any idea what the life expectancy is of the equipment?

Faith replied no, that is part of the research that we would have to do as we look at the various vendors and the type of equipment that they provide.

Councilor Thomas asked of the areas that we have looked at did we exclude any of the parks from the initial search?

Faith replied my recollection is that quite a number of parks were eliminated simply because there was inadequate room in the park.

Councilor Kight stated we have a high school, middle school and two grade schools and I find it telling that none of these facilities have looked into developing a skateboard park. Has anyone been in contact with the school district about whether they are planning on developing a skateboard park and if they are not, why not?

Faith replied I believe that was explored early on. I don't remember the response but I know they were approached.

Councilor Kight stated to me the most logical place to develop this is where the kids are.

Denise Wood stated I live at 4th and Buxton. I work for an education service district and we do not promote skateboarding because of the injuries to the kids. We are talking about traumatic brain injuries. The majority of these kids are usually in there 20's and there is a lot of damage to the property around the school even though it is posted as a no skating zone. Primarily it is the injuries, the broken bones but especially the traumatic brain injury. There is no true recovery from that type of injury. There was a notice that came out for the March 18th meeting regarding Kiku Park. It didn't really concern me because it was not in my neighborhood. The next thing I know is I am running through the channels one night and I hear someone saying that they live on SW 4th and Buxton and they are talking about a skateboard park that is going to be located right behind me. No notice was given that had any official city seal on it or anything that even looked official. When I looked back in my trash I came across something that looked like a junk mail flyer and I opened it up and sure enough there was the meeting notice on the 27th of May. I think that in the future when notices are given for meetings and you truly want public comment, please put the city logo on it and make it look official.

Frank Windust stated I spoke to you at the last meeting and I mentioned that I had not received notice of that meeting. After Mr. Faith mentioned that he had sent out these notices to everyone, I went home and looked as well and I found it in my garbage can and it looked like nothing. It was a folded piece of paper with a label across the front. I don't think that is the way to notify people. I thought it was just a nothing something from the city about some meeting but I didn't think it was very official. This recent notice I received came in an envelop with the logo on it and it looked more official. I think this is a poor place to locate a skate park. I am opposed to it.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked are there any members of the Parks Advisory Committee that would like to speak to us?

Bruce Stannard, Chair of the PAC stated we have looked at a lot of potential sites to locate a skate park. For one reason or another all of those sites have been eliminated. We have kind of thrown our hands up in the air. This place we have suggested doesn't have neighbors right next door. The police department is across the street. The city owns the property. We just thought we should try this location. The kids are riding their skateboards downtown and in Mayors Square so we thought this was a location where kids could come that would keep them off of the main street. We did not see this as a permanent location but if the land isn't being used for a city hall that we thought it could be used for a temporary location. If you can give us a permanent site we will go for that.

Carolyn Taylor stated since 1995 we have been looking for a location. We want something that is easy to access for the kids with high visibility and safety. I think the property behind the City Conference Building for a temporary park would work better than other parks we have looked at. There is no money to buy land. The money that is in the SDC fund, some of it could be used but to take all of that money to buy property we couldn't do that. We have a lot of things that need to be done at Glenn Otto Park and the other parks. We have checked with other cities and they have not had a lot of problems with injuries, vandalism or behavior.

Donna Kurilo stated I believe that this city is for all ages; it isn't just for shopping. To bring in the younger people in some way into this downtown area I think is wonderful. If it could be a permanent location that would be great but as we have heard it is temporary. I think it would be good for the city and good for the kids in the community.

Bill Edgett stated we have been talking about the possibility of looking at other locations. Glenn Otto is a jewel in itself; it really doesn't have room for a skate park facility. Columbia is over used and there is simply no room left for a skate park facility there. There is a need but everywhere that we look we get the not in my backyard.

Councilor Ripma asked was there the same process for this location as there was for the Kiku Park location as far as holding a public meeting at the Parks Advisory Committee for this location at the City Conference Building?

Carolyn Taylor replied no. We wanted to wait and see what the city council said before we got the kids and everyone else involved, then we will hold a public meeting for this location and take citizen input.

Councilor Ripma stated we were asked to make a decision and all of the neighbors had to come here instead of having an opportunity to talk to the PAC. I think that is part of the concern.

Carolyn Taylor stated what we are asking the city council for is permission to consider putting the skate park there. We are not asking you to okay the park or to make a commitment to a park.

Councilor Ripma stated I do appreciate what you have done.

Donna Kurilo stated the other thing is that if that is not a viable location maybe you could give us some alternatives.

Councilor Gorsek asked there is a lot of space behind the building across the street where the railroad museum is and I believe the city owns that. Has that been considered?

Rich Faith stated that is part of Depot Park. I think the main drawback to that location is that it is hidden. Ideally we don't want it to be tucked away out of sight because that does invite bad behavior. It is not an ideal location.

Councilor Gorsek asked could the city hall parking area be developed into a skate park and move the city hall parking to behind the depot.

Faith replied I'm not sure how the business owners would respond.

MOTION: Councilor Ripma moved that we do not authorize construction of a temporary skateboard park on the city owned vacant field west of the City Conference Building parking. Seconded by Councilor Kight.

Councilor Ripma stated I got my hopes up at the last meeting when no one showed up against it. I think that has been explained in some ways. This is a different process and probably not very well noticed even though official notice went out. We truly do want public comment; we always have and always will. I never was a fan of making the site a temporary location. If we voted for it, it would be a permanent vote because we will have the same problem five years from now trying to relocate it. For me it had to be a potentially permanent site. With the exception of the PAC, which we dearly love and deserves to have this process end, no one was in favor of this site even the skateboarder.

Councilor Kight stated I thought the testimony tonight was informative as well as telling. I didn't get the feeling that they were anti-skateboard park. The gentleman that spoke about the Gig Harbor site gave some information about that site indicating that it was well planned. One of the reasons that we have lack of support in the community for a skateboard park is the fact that we are trying to find a location just for a skateboard park. I think the idea of a more comprehensive plan with a community center and other activities around the skateboard park would gain broader support from the community. It would also take care of a lot of the other problems like vandalism and garbage. I think it is also interesting that none of the schools in the community allow skateboarding on school property. I think if we site a skateboard park we need to look at the material they are using so we find material that is not only quiet but as safe as can be for children. A couple of people indicated that children are suffering serious injuries, even brain damage injuries. These are not the kinds of things that we want to have and expose the city to liability. I think we need to look at

gaining broader support from the community, have a park that has multiple activities to meet everyone's needs and at the same time provide a skateboard park in a safe environment that is highly visible.

Councilor Thomas stated I would concur with the remarks made by the other councilors so far. However, I wouldn't necessarily tie it to a community center. I think in addition, we as a city council, rather than say no you can't do it, we need to say let's see if we can find a place that we can build a recreational facility to include a skateboard park.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated this is just like every other hearing we have had on this subject. People come out and say "not in my backyard". Everyone has good reasons. I attended the PAC meeting where they discussed Kiku Park where there was standing room only and all of them were in favor of skateboard parks but not at Kiku Park. You will find that wherever we try to site a skateboard park. There is a real need for a skateboard park. We will have a real hard time finding an area where anyone will want it located near them. I am prepared to vote against this on the basis that it is temporary and it doesn't have the support of the people around it. I am also going to make a charge that this city council, instead of just rejecting these sites that come before us, that we take the initiative and find a site for a skateboard park. I will promise you that I will work with the Reynolds School District to see if there is a site at one of the schools, primarily Walt Morey Middle School. I talked to over 100 kids there and a skateboard park was high on their list. I can't think of a better place to try and locate a skateboard park than at Walt Morey Middle School. I will do everything I can as Mayor of this city, to find a place for a skateboard park.

Councilor Kyle stated I am not opposed to skateboard parks but I just don't see that this site would be a temporary site. I can't support this. Also the one skateboarder that appeared before us said it wouldn't be a good site.

Councilor Daoust stated we have been working on locating a skateboard park for the last five years and I have a thick file on skateboard parks with information on design criteria and examples from other parks. I thought we had a good location here as far as site selection criteria goes. It is highly visible, it is in a good location and I thought we had a winner here for a while. I was persuaded by the public comment. I think this council needs to have a creative and fun process to come up with a new site. We need something fun to do, so let's look for a new site. I don't want to turn it back to staff or the PAC, we need to take this on. I agree with the Mayor.

Councilor Gorsek stated I agree with everything that has been said here. I was swayed also by the public testimony. It is unfortunate because I wish we could just select a site and go forward. I think some of the comments and questions that were raised about the city's fiscal position at this time were also very relevant. It is really important to not just do something to just do something. I think the Mayor and Councilor Daoust are right, we should take this on ourselves and I would be in favor of that.

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

Motion passed 7-0.

Mayor Thalhofer called for a 10-minute break at 9:22pm.

Mayor Thalhofer reconvened the meeting at 9:37pm.

7. RESOLUTION: A Resolution adopting the Capital Improvement Plan and adjusting the rate for parks and recreation system development charges and rescinding Resolution No. 1605.

MOTION: Councilor Ripma moved to take the matter of Parks SDC rates off the table. Seconded by Councilor Thomas. Motion passed unanimously.

Marnie Allen, City Attorney stated as you may recall at the last meeting just before this matter was tabled you directed staff to ask the Oregon Government Standards and Practices Commission (GSPC) for an advisory opinion regarding potential conflicts of interest. I did request and receive the advisory opinion, which you should have received a copy of. GSPC concluded that four council members that live next to park property have a potential conflict of interest that simply needs to be disclosed at the beginning of this hearing and then all the council members may participate in the deliberation and decision regarding parks SDC's.

Councilor Ripma stated I reside on Troutdale Road across the street from vacant land owned by Mt. Hood Community College, which could potentially someday be developed as a park and therefore I have a potential conflict of interest.

Councilor Kight declared a potential conflict of interest and stated that I own two pieces of property; one is my residence. I live adjacent to a city park and I have a potential conflict of interest. My second property is located on SE 3rd and there is property immediately to the east that could be purchased as a greenspace.

Councilor Kyle stated my potential conflict of interest is because I have approximately one acre of property that abuts existing parkland.

Councilor Daoust stated according to GSPC I am disclosing my potential conflict of interest. I own a lot on Hope Circle, which abuts potential park property owned by the Burlingame's. The city is currently considering purchasing that for use as a park. The city council may acquire this property with or without the revenue that may result from the passage of this resolution.

Councilor Gorsek stated I potentially had a conflict of interest but as a result of the advisory opinion from GSPC I don't have a conflict, I am considered a part of the group that is around that property.

Councilor Ripma stated I have an additional potential conflict of interest and that is I am a trustee of an established trust, which owns 21.1 acres of farmland in Troutdale that has been identified as potential parkland.

Rich Faith, Community Development Director stated this resolution was first presented to you on May 13th. At that time our consultant Don Ganer explained the methodology that went into his report and the SDC rate that resulted from that. The result of the original report that he prepared stated that the maximum SDC rate that the city could charge would be \$5,117 per dwelling unit for new residential development and \$198 per employee for new non-residential development. Mr. Ganer also presented to you several options of how you could adjust that figure, particularly for the residential SDC rate if you choose to do so. The Council took testimony on May 13th. You then closed the hearing and deliberated on the proposal in front of you. The Council directed staff to make several revisions and modifications to the methodology. You asked us to come back with a revised methodology that changed the Park SDC rate to \$4,858, which was based on the consultants option "B" that he provided to you which eliminated some of the categories of parks for SDC funding. You also asked that we remove the charge of \$198 per employee from that methodology and that we add an appendix that lists all of the city's parks and open space sites. Finally, you asked us to factor in the current balance of money in our Park SDC Fund. That revised methodology was brought back to you on May 27th. As a result of the changes that you had instructed us to make, the methodology produced a new maximum SDC rate of \$4,608, which is different than the figure that was presented to you as option "B" at the previous meeting. As a result of eliminating the non-residential component for an SDC rate per employee it reduced the deficiency repair and growth need resulting in a lower figure than what had originally been provided to you. At the conclusion of the May 27th meeting, at the advice of the City Attorney, the Council also instructed us to make further revisions to the methodology include existing natural areas and open space areas that are in the city but owned by Metro as part of the inventory of existing parks. That has been done and a revised methodology report has been prepared, which is the Exhibit "A" to my staff report (copy included in the packet). In incorporating the Metro owned open space and natural land as part of the inventory the result is that the maximum park and recreation SDC rate that the city can charge is \$5,140 per dwelling unit. This is now a new figure from any of the previous figures and is a result of changes to the methodology as instructed. The higher rate results from a significantly lower credit for new growth's share of repayment on bonds assumed as a source of funding to make up current park deficiencies. Therefore, the SDC credit is reduced because the deficiency of the natural areas and open space category has been eliminated with the inclusion of the Metro owned property being included as part of the City's current inventory. Since the last meeting we have been in discussions with the Home Builders Association, who testified at previous meetings in opposition to the maximum SDC rate that has been generated from the methodology report. In a letter that was received today from the Home Builders Association, they are offering a proposal that they are willing to accept and is being presented for your consideration. It states in their letter that they would not oppose an

increase from the current \$811 per dwelling unit to a fee of \$2,600 per dwelling unit if a couple of considerations are given to that. First of these is if you were to accept this offer of \$2,600 that you would make the effective date for this resolution and the new fee to not take effect for at least 60-days. The second consideration is that future increases in the fee during year 2004 and 2005 would be limited to no more than \$500 per year and that any increase that you adopt would be formally re-evaluated by the Council prior to becoming effective in an event that there is a successful passage of a bond measure to secure additional funds for parkland acquisition and development. Given all of the past testimony we have received and the proposal being made by the Home Builders Association, it is staffs recommendation that the Council accept the Home Builders proposal and adopt a resolution that increases the Parks SDC's subject to a phased schedule and a staff level review that would confirm that the fees do not exceed the maximum amount under the adopted methodology.

Councilor Ripma asked is there a draft resolution in the packet that captures what you are proposing?

Faith replied the resolution that is in the packet does not capture what the Home Builders Association is proposing.

Marnie Allen stated I have drafted some language that could be considered and adopted tonight that would amend Section 3 of the resolution that is before you that would implement the staff recommendation. That would read, "Section 3, Cost – The system development charge, supported by the methodology in Attachment A is hereby imposed as follows: Current \$811; effective September 1, 2003 \$2,600; effective July 1, 2004 \$3,100; effective July 1, 2005 \$3,600. Provided however that if a capital bond measure for parks is approved by the voters before the increases in July 2004 or July 2005 automatically take effect, the city will re-evaluate the amount of the parks SDC's. The system development charge is payable at the time of issuance of a building permit by the City. Except as otherwise provided in Chapter 12.02 of the Troutdale Municipal Code, no building permit shall be issued for a development subject to this system development charge unless the system development charge is first paid in full." Section 5 would need to read, "The effective date of this resolution is immediately." Section 9 of the resolution would need to be amended to read; "Resolution No. 1605 is rescinded effective September 1, 2003."

Councilor Thomas asked can you tell me how many projects are in the process that would fall within that 60-days before this becomes effective?

Faith replied there are currently five subdivisions that were recently approved and would be effected by this. Two of those are 5-lot row house subdivisions where there are no infrastructure improvements that need to be built, so they would likely be able to get their construction plans in and pull permits for those within the next 60-days. The other three subdivisions all need infrastructure improvements before they can pull building permits and I don't see that happening within the next 60-days.

Councilor Daoust asked on multi-family versus single-family, in looking at Exhibit "B", we are thinking of making the single-family rate the same as the multi-family rate. When I look at

what other cities have done, mainly the top 8, they all have a multi-family rate that is substantially less than the single-family rate. If I look at the whole list 22 out of 34 have the multi-family rates less. That tells me that is something we should consider.

Marnie Allen replied I work with school districts and I prepare, in the State of Washington, school impact fees for school districts so I am generally familiar with methodologies that are used to calculate system development charges and school impact fees. The difference in the single-family and multi-family fee is really based on the methodology that has been prepared. You can either adopt a methodology that looks at the average number of persons per household, combine the single-family and multi-family and determine how many people live in all of those units on average. Or you could separate them out and say in the single-family we get on average 3 people per household and in the multi-family you only get 1 or 2 people per dwelling unit and because we get a different number of people per dwelling unit we are going to do separate methodologies and costs per unit. This methodology has combined those and uses the average regardless of the type of dwelling unit. If you wanted to look at having different fee amounts for single-family versus multi-family, we would have to go back and do a different methodology.

Faith stated that was a conscientious decision of the PAC. That was one of the options that they were asked to look at and after discussing this it was decided to apply one SDC rate for all housing types. That is currently how we do it and that is how we did it prior to our current SDC.

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

Neil Handy stated I represent 3 corporations who own property in the City of Troutdale. I am a little confused about what is going on here. The proposal that is on the table right now, is that proposal part of the testimony or is it a proposal that has been solicited by city council and/or staff?

Marnie Allen replied this is a proposal that came from the Home Builders as a way to resolve the differences between setting Parks SDC's at the maximum amount or reaching a compromise.

Neil Handy asked my question goes to whether or not other individuals or associations or property owners can also present their proposal?

Marnie Allen replied it is my understanding that several individuals and entities have submitted letters with various proposals and recommendations regarding the parks SDC's and all of those, as with the Home Builders letter are included in the record and presented to the council for their consideration.

Neil Handy stated so basically the proposals are part of the testimony?

Marnie Allen replied they are part of the written record.

Neil Handy stated we just finished a project in the City of Troutdale and I think it is important that you understand how these fees can impact what a developer is proposing and what the costs can be and what kind of nightmares it can cause a person who is trying to do a project. We had prepared all of our loan documents and submitted them for review by the lender. In that period SDC rates have been bounced around. I don't know what exactly is going on here and I don't understand this methodology verses that methodology but I do understand basic math. If we are raising SDC's by a factor of 6 why are they so low? What are we going to do about the disparity between what you should have been charging developers up until now and the amount that you are going to assess future projects? You are penalizing the developer now for either not watching what was going on prior or the number that you have now is in fact correct and all we are doing is saying lets raise it because we want to increase our parks. Has the methodology changed so drastically that it is going to cause this type of multiplication of the SDC charge? It is hard for me to imagine that an SDC charge for parks would have a higher value or is more important than a sewer SDC charge. The water and sewer systems are a priority over parks. On our project, had we been assessed this \$4,800 fee, we would have been charged another \$200,000 on our project, which would have required us to go back and re-file loan papers and may have even caused the project to terminate. You can't just sit up here and start throwing these numbers out and talk about methodologies without realizing what the real world impact is on people who are trying to make a living developing property.

Jonah Nail stated I will soon be a developer here in Troutdale of a fairly decent sized project and will be affected by this SDC fee. From what I see tonight and at the last meeting, there are a lot of people in opposition to these increases. From what I can see you don't seem to care. I don't understand the methodologies. I have lived in Troutdale all my life and I see a lot of parks everywhere and I don't see a deficiency at all. I don't see the parks full of people and the drastic need for more parks. I feel that the people, like myself need to have faith in you who are suppose to be representing us and looking out for the publics best interest and I don't see this hall filled with people saying yes we need more parks. I see a bunch of people saying the fees are outrageous and what you are doing is outrageous.

MOTION: Councilor Ripma moved to adopt the resolution adopting a Capital Improvement Plan and adjusting the rate for parks and recreation system development charges and rescinding Resolution No. 1605 as set out in our packet with the changes to Sections 3, 5 and 9 that were outlined by the City Attorney this evening. Seconded by Mayor Thalhofer.

Councilor Ripma stated this is a compromise. We have a process with a citizen committee representing a lot of citizens in this city that aren't here tonight but were here at the previous meetings. We try to represent everybody and this is a compromise. Some of us were ready and willing to adopt a higher figure because in our opinion the rate has been too low too long and we developed a deficit that has to be made up by the citizens who reside here now. Part of the state mandated system for SDC's is to try and capture at least some of the additional costs associated with new development in the city. They are not perfect and there are limits as to what we can capture. If it is any comfort it is lower than what I was prepared to go forward with.

Mayor Thalsofer stated this is a methodology that was calculated by a consultant as the proper parks SDC amount for Troutdale. We were not charging enough previously which was based on a different methodology. This is a compromise that was dropped from \$5,100 to \$3,600. \$2,600 would go into effect in 60-days and \$500 would be phased in July 2004 and July 2005.

Councilor Kight stated these are always difficult decisions to make. A comment was made that we don't represent the people or we don't listen to the people. We spent a great deal of time taking testimony from a variety of different sources. This agreement was hammered out between the Home Builders Association and this is something that they felt they could live with. So the people in the homebuilding industry have taken a look at the fee and recognize that parks are an important part of the community, they provide livability. There was a comment made that you see a lot of parks in Troutdale and I think that is one of the attractive things about Troutdale. I think I can live with this SDC fee; I know people aren't happy about it. I find it interesting that we just finished discussing skateboard parks. I think the community at large recognizes the need for it. There is only a small amount of money in our parks SDC fund and we don't have enough to buy additional parkland and the inventory of land is fast disappearing.

Councilor Kyle stated I have always felt like this fee is excessive. I didn't support this amount to begin with and it doesn't necessarily have anything to do with the impact on the homebuilders. Because of the business I am in I see that it is going to have an impact not just on homebuilders but homeowners in general.

Councilor Daoust stated Don Ganer and Associates used valid methodology. I take stock in the fact that the Home Builders Association bought off on this charge. They stated that they were not opposed to an increase from the current \$811 to a fee of \$2,600 with the next two \$500 increases.

Councilor Gorsek stated I really dislike having to make votes like this. I am not going to gain or lose from this in terms of money as Mr. Handy and others have talked about. I try to listen to the testimony and take it to heart and at the same time I know that the \$811 is too low and has been too low. I still do, like Councilor Kyle, worry about the cost impact that is passed on to the home purchasers. Even though I think it is a good compromise it is still higher than what I would like to see.

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

Motion passes 5-2.

8. COUNCIL CONCERNS AND INITIATIVES:

Councilor Ripma raised an issue regarding the proposal by Multnomah County to replace the bridge over Beaver Creek next to Glenn Otto Park. It is the oldest bridge on Historic

Columbia River Highway. As I understand it is the oldest concrete bridge in the State. I would like the Council's approval to invite the Multnomah County to attend a future meeting and explain this to us. Council agreed.

Councilor Ripma stated there is a B-17 parked at the Troutdale Airport tomorrow and Thursday morning.

Mayor Thalhofer stated I would like to urge everyone to support the stadium bill that is in legislation right now to bring major league baseball to Portland.

Councilor Kight urged the Councilors to go on a ride-along with the Troutdale Police Officers.

9. ADJOURNMENT:

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

Meeting adjourned at 10:35pm.

Paul Thalhofer, Mayor

Approved July 22, 2003

ATTEST:

Debbie Stickney, City Recorder