

MINUTES
TROUTDALE CITY COUNCIL - REGULAR MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
TROUTDALE CITY HALL
104 SE KIBLING AVENUE
TROUTDALE, OR 97060-2099

FEBRUARY 12, 1991

ITEM #1: PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, ROLL CALL, AGENDA UPDATE

Mayor Cox called the February 12, 1991 Regular City Council meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and called on Councilor Schmunk to lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

City Recorder, Raglione, called the roll.

PRESENT: Bui, Cox, Fowler, Jacobs, Schmunk, Thalhofer, Thompson

STAFF: Christian, Cline, Farr, Gazewood, Raglione, Wilder

PRESS: Web Ruble, The Oregonian

GUESTS: Joanna Moyer, Diane Whitehead, Ed Ragan, David Ripma, Bill and Patti Polly, Ken Rust, Don Oakley, Danny Fry, Brett Parrish, Spencer Anderson, Forrest Arnold, Mike Blackwell, John Blackwell, Michael Cannon, Don Carter, Jessi Davis, Tony Ervin, Daniel Fry, Ian Palmer, Ryan Sund, Seth Tucker, Seth Tyler, Jarod Westmoreland, Liam Palmer, Kris DeSylvia

ITEM #2: CONSENT AGENDA:

Mayor Cox called this item and asked if there were any Council comments. There were none

MOTION: Councilor Schmunk moved to approve the Consent Agenda as written. [2.1 Accept Minutes 1/22/90 - Regular Session; 2.2 Approve Business Licenses - January, 1991; 2.3 Approve Bills - January, 1991; 2.4 Resolution: Accepting Sweetbriar Lane Phase I Project and Authorizing Release of Retainage (**874-R**); 2.5 Resolution: Accepting Depot Park Property (**875-R**)]

ITEM #3: PUBLIC COMMENT:

Mayor Cox called this agenda item. There was no public comment offered.

ITEM #4: APPOINTMENT: Budget Committee Positions; Planning Commission Positions

Mayor Cox called this agenda item.

Christian briefly reviewed the memorandum for purposes of the viewing public. She stated that the Selection Committee had reviewed applications and met on January 26 to interview applicants. Council members Bui and Mayor Cox and Budget Committee Chair 1990, Jim Jensen had interviewed the applicants for the Budget Committee. Their recommendations were: Diane White completing term for Position #5 which would conclude 1/93; Joanna Moyer for Position #7 concluding 1/94.

The Selection Committee for Planning Commission reviewed applicants and met on January 26 to interview applicants. Council members Bui and Mayor Cox along with Planning Commission Chair Walt Postlewait recommended Ed Ragan for Position #4 - ending term 1/95; David Ripma completing term vacated by Bruce Thompson [Position #5] - ending term 1/92; Patricia Polly - as alternate to complete any position term in event of a vacancy -- term ending 1/95 unless completing a vacancy which would then end term of position filled.

MOTION: Councilor Bui moved to accept the recommendation of the Selection Committee for appointments of Diane White, and Joanna Moyer to the Budget Committee, and recommendation of the Selection Committee appointing Ed Ragan, David Ripma and Patricia Polly to the Planning Commission. Councilor Thompson seconded the motion.

YEAS: 6

NAYS: 0

ABSTAINED: 0

Bui - Yea; Fowler - Yea; Jacobs - Yea; Schmunk - Yea; Thalhofer- Yea; Thompson - Yea

ITEM #5: PUBLIC HEARING: Ordinance Amending the City of Troutdale Official Street Plan Map and Changing the Name of SE 31st Street, at its Intersection with Stott Circle, to SE 33rd Street.

.1: Open Public Hearing - Mayor Cox opened the public hearing process.

.2: Declarations, Challenges, Ex Parte Contact - Mayor Cox called for Declarations, Challenges, Ex Parte Contact. Councilor Schmunk stated that she resided in the Sweetbriar subdivision.

.3: Summation by Staff - Cline gave background stating that ORS 227.120 required the City Council action after Planning Commission meeting of January 20, 1991 recommended the name change.

- .4: Public Testimony Proponents - None.**
- .5: City Council Questions - None.**
- .6: Public Testimony Opponents - None.**
- .7: City Council Questions - None.**
- .8: Rebuttal - None.**
- .9: City Council Questions - None.**

.10: Recommendation by Staff - Cline stated that staff supported the Planning Commission recommendation for the amendment to the Street Plan Map and Changing the name to SE 33rd Street.

.11: City Council Questions - None.

.12: Close Public Hearing Process - Mayor Cox closed the public hearing at 7:12 p.m.

ITEM #5a: ORDINANCE: Amending the City of Troutdale Official Street Plan Map and Changing the Name of SE 31 Street, at its Intersection with Stott Circle, to SE 33rd Street. (564-0) (Tape 1, Side 1 11:06) First Reading

Mayor Cox called this agenda item and read the Ordinance by title.

MOTION: Councilor Bui moved approval of the Ordinance. Councilor Fowler seconded the motion.

YEAS: 6
NAYS: 0
ABSTAINED: 0

Bui - Yea; Fowler - Yea; Jacobs - Yea; Schmunk - Yea; Thalhofer - Yea; Thompson - Yea

ITEM #6: PUBLIC HEARING: Ordinance Modifying 530-0 (System Development Charges) and Imposing Storm Sewer System Development Charges

.1: Open Public Hearing - Mayor Cox opened the public hearing process.

.2: Declarations, Challenges, Ex Parte Contact - Mayor Cox called for declarations, challenges, ex parte contact. There were none stated.

.3: Summation by Staff - Wilder stated this had been discussed for a considerable period of time. The new language was indicated in underscored larger type. There were as many inclusions as possible in order to meet the July, 1991 statutory requirements for SDC compliance. A more thorough codified version of the SDC ordinance would be before Council by June to bring the SDC issues into total compliance with state statute. During the intervening time, review of water/wastewater/street SDC's and relating that to capital needs and requirements. Wilder stated it was possible that they wouldn't increase and could possibly be less. There was a deadline for compliance of July 1, 1991.

Wilder stated that there was an emergency declaration attached to the ordinance due to the substantial amount of improvement which was pending in the North Troutdale Watershed area. In order to be equitable and fair, it was perceived that the SDC's should be the method and procedure to build capital facilities rather than an element of on-going user fees.

Don Oakley, Oakley Engineering and Ken Rust, Public Financial Management, Inc., financial advisor were utilized to prepare the rates/fees/charges for the ordinance. They made a brief presentation with graphs and charts on the overhead to aide visually the materials.

Don Oakley stated that Troutdale was unusual in that there were two different zones with substantially different drainage requirements for the two areas. The North Troutdale Watershed drains down the hill across I-84 through the airport area and ended up along the levy next to the Columbia River. All the water running into that area requires it to be pumped out of the system. The pumping cost differentiates the watershed from the rest of the City. The balance runs directly into a creek or the City storm drain in the street which then runs into BeaverCreek or the Sandy River.

As part of the Master Drainage Plan a number of improvements were identified. These improvements were determined as needed over 20 years to accommodate development expected in the watershed over that period of time. Estimated costs for those improvements over a 20 years period was \$3.8 million. Of that figure more than \$2 million was for the pump station system alone. It was the engineer's opinion that some costs should be borne by the Sandy Drainage District. The boundary indicated that everything North of the railroad - the City overlapped into the Sandy Drainage District. In working with the District and staff in Spring 1990, some responsibilities were talked through at that time. The Drainage District's responsibility was basically to receive water from developed areas of the City and transport it to the pump station as well as maintenance and operations of the pump station itself. As lands were annexed into the system not all of the burden should be borne by the Sandy Drainage District but it should be a sharing of responsibility between the Drainage District and the City.

Oakley stated there was a small area inside Wood Village and they had been included in presentations last spring regarding sharing some of the costs within the watershed. For pump stations and other improvements there was a percent of future benefit - attributable to future increased flows and the system being able to handle those flows. Oakley stated that the other equation was how much of an impact would future development have on the system. Existing areas of impervious surfaces which shed drainage off into the system more quickly than original forested land. Existing and anticipated impervious area by percent for each sub-basins was reviewed for calculations. This showed acres of impervious area by City for both existing and future development conditions. There were two equations -- cost side and impact side.

Councilor Fowler asked about "any change of use" - if this took all properties presenting in use and then calculating property not in use for amount of drainage that was being added - how do you take County Farm [prison/old folk's home] and say not with the change in use we will effect all the SDC's when the other properties aren't effected?

Wilder stated that the change in use is more complicated than that in that if no one has bought into the system in the past, but not is affected because of a change in use [i.e., County Farm] there has been no contribution to taxes or other method to help pay for the system. They should legitimately be faced with charges - as they expand the parking area or otherwise contribute to the system they should be charged the same as anyone else that might be connecting to the system with a new use.

Councilor Fowler asked about changing a restaurant to an office complex can the SDC's be changed on that?

Wilder stated if the SDC's had been paid, [example given] and a change of use would increase the impervious area they would pay for the increased usage of the change. Credits are not given back, however. If everything stays the same, then there is no increase in charges. Wilder stated regarding credits there was a system for the amount of drainage. If the change in use decreased, a smaller pipe isn't put in and the larger pipe taken out.

Councilor Fowler stated if it was a swap in ERU's then the change of use doesn't change the ERU's it only adds to the ERU's, is that correct?

Wilder stated yes.

Mayor Cox asked if there were other questions. There were not.

Ken Rust then gave his presentation. He stated the analysis was approached with 4 steps in calculating the drainage SDC. (1) What is the cost basis? How much has to be paid, when... (2) Who will be the users of the facilities? What's their demand going to be? What are their usage requirements? He stated that everyone would be using the system the same in terms of the impervious area. The cost allocation was pretty forward. The unit costs are based on a square foot impervious area then calculate rates/charges for different types of land uses or properties.

Rust stated that in looking at requirements to measure costs State statutes provides three ways to measure cost. (1) Set an improvement fee basis [a fee for capital projects that will be constructed now or in the future]; (2) reimbursement fee [look at costs of facilities already constructed; (3) System Development Charge [combination of costs already incurred or costs that will be incurred in the future. Given the nature of the North Troutdale Drainage area we will be basing the charge on what is called the improvement fee or looking forward at the costs that would be incurred.

Wilder stated that didn't mean that it couldn't be called a System Development Charge to keep everything uniform. A SDC can include that or an improvement fee or the existing infrastructure. The City would be calling it a System Development Charge [SDC].

Rust stated that the 4 options looked at was: (1) Sandy Drainage District picking up their share of the costs and Troutdale and Wood Village share of the demand for facilities is borne equally; (2) costs

only borne by Troutdale properties; (3 and (4) assume that there is no negotiation with Sandy Drainage District and they are spread over the Troutdale/Wood Village area or Troutdale alone. The bottom line is cost per square foot basis ranges from a low of 9.6 cents per sq. ft. to .12 cents per sq. ft. A charge for single family equivalency [2,700 sq. ft. of impervious area] \$260-\$331. Depending on size of development commercial/industrial is directly proportional to what the bill would be - impervious area is the factor that drives the costs. It depended on the ability of the City to negotiate some cost sharing with the Sandy Drainage District and looking at spreading the costs between Troutdale and Wood Village.

Wilder stated that it was strictly tied to impervious area regardless of the type of use.

Rust stated that there would be annual actions that would occur. The costs presented are based on current construction dollars which will change over time. A construction cost index reflecting price changes over the implementation period would be needed.

These changes can be revisited to make sure they are accurate after land use changes are made. Once agreements are made, should negotiations be successful with the Sandy Drainage District and Wood Village, would change the charge that would be collected. Changes in the Master Plan itself could affect charge and it needs to be able to be updated and revisited. Ballot Measure 5 could affect these charges and the legislative initiatives will be closely monitored to ensure that this initiative stays consistent with what comes out of Salem.

Wilder stated it was important to remember, as is with water/sewer SDC's, that all the perimeters that go into making this are specific to Troutdale. In the case of Troutdale the impervious area for an ERU was calculated by having a series of 6-8 areas of the City, had them enlarged and actually calculated the average impervious area on a residential lot. Gresham's is 2,500 sq. ft. Troutdale's is 2,700 sq. ft. There is an advantage on an ERU basis to ours. Gresham's is \$500 per ERU; Washington County is 2,640 per ERU and their SDC charge is \$375.

.4: Public Testimony Proponents - City statements above.

.5: City Council Questions - Councilor Fowler stated that he had a problem with presenting an ordinance without already having the agreement with Sandy Drainage District and the negotiations should be ironed out prior to the passage of the ordinance.

Wilder stated that was an excellent point and staff didn't know what the negotiations with Sandy Drainage District or Wood Village would be or when it would occur - it was hoped July 1. At that time the recommendation for adjustment in rates would be before Council. However, there was currently substantial development taking place someone else would have to pay for. What happens is that remaining parcels will have to pay more to make up for the difference. He didn't feel that way fair. Or a monthly user fee would have to be high enough and assignments made out of that for capital costs to make up the difference. Anything new coming in along now, if not covered by this ordinance, someone else would have to pay for even though they would be using the system as much as anyone else, and maybe more.

Councilor Fowler asked if this was being placed over the entire City or only Sandy Drainage District.

Wilder stated no, only the North Troutdale Drainage area. Very little residential area. Capital costs and SDC's would be before Council in July which would be considerably less since there are no pumping requirements.

Councilor Fowler clarified that this referred only to the North Sandy Drainage District? Wilder, yes. The resolution following later referred to this area only.

Councilor Fowler stated is there no grandfathering which totally excludes any changing, he was concerned with Section 7. Change in Use. He had a problem with the wording in the ordinance under this section 7.

Councilor Fowler and Christian discussed examples of change of use, existing, impervious surface. Councilor Fowler asked that the wording be changed to ensure that it is understandable that there is no back charge on a developed piece of property that the drainage is already there existing, or had been paid for previously.

Christian stated this specific section speaks to drainage.

.6: Public Testimony Opponents - There were none.

.7: City Council Questions - No further questions.

.8: Rebuttal - None.

.9: City Council Questions - None.

.10: Recommendation by Staff - As previously discussed.

.11: City Council Questions - Councilor Thalhofer asked if the wording [amendment] could be included in the language. The response was yes.

.12: Close Public Hearing Process - Mayor Cox closed the public hearing process.

ITEM #6a: ORDINANCE: Modifying 530-0 (System Development Charges) and Imposing Storm Sewer System Development Charges First Reading

Mayor Cox read the ordinance by title.

After considerable discussion, City Attorney Jennings stated that the wording should be changed on Section 7 to include "terminated, IN THE CASE OF STORM WATER DRAINAGE "ANY CHANGE OF USE" SHALL MEAN ANY INCREASE OF IMPERVIOUS SURFACE AREA INSTALLED."

MOTION: Councilor Bui moved approval of the ordinance, as amended. Councilor Thalhofer seconded the motion.

YEAS: __5__

NAYS: __1__ [Fowler]
ABSTAINED: __0__

Councilor Fowler stated he voted no because he wanted it read a second time.

Bui - Yea; Fowler - Yea; Jacobs - Yea; Schmunk - Yea; Thalhoffer - Yea; Thompson - Yea

ITEM #7: ORDINANCE: Creating an Urban Renewal Agency 565-0 [Tape 1, Side 2 27:20]

Mayor Cox read the ordinance by title and stated this was a second reading public comments were taken at the January 8 regular City Council meeting.

Christian stated that the County had some concerns relating to the interest which were at Council places. The concerns were in a broader sense and Wayne George had Faxed the material that afternoon.

Councilor Thalhoffer asked if there would be a presentation?

City Attorney Jennings stated that this was second reading and any presentation would have been at the public hearing. It would be inappropriate to have a presentation now but was certainly open for Council discussion. He asked that the Mayor read the ordinance title, have a motion and then have Council discussion.

Mayor Cox read the ordinance again by title.

MOTION: Councilor Schmunk moved for approval of the ordinance. Councilor Bui seconded the motion.

Councilor Thalhoffer stated there hadn't been backup materials to this ordinance. He questioned the first WHEREAS clause wording.

Christian stated there was a vacant land inventory, available as part of the Comp Plan for review. Under all of the conditions listed in the statute there was a wide variety of areas, large and small, down to several blocks up to as big as the County Farm that could be addressed. It could be the downtown area, the County Farm property or any portion of those areas.

Councilor Thalhoffer wanted to get more specific. He believed this was before Council because there was a certain area(s) in the City that this Urban Renewal Agency was being directed toward. He wanted to know what those areas were. In his opinion, there was a hidden agenda and he wanted to know what it was. Why should Council establish an Urban Renewal Agency if there were no specific plans to implement it? Why? Why go through the exercise?

City Attorney Jennings stated that an Urban Renewal Agency is established to allow the City to use its eminent domain procedure to condemn property which is difficult to develop. It was up to Council

to use this, not now, but when Council would encounter a specific piece of property - it would be Council decision to determine that specific piece of property meets the conditions called out in the first Whereas. This isn't intended to target a specific piece of property. It is intended to create the agency whereby the City can establish an Urban Renewal District where the City deemed it appropriate.

Jennings added that the City of Portland had an Urban Renewal District without having targeted certain areas and did in fact form the URA without a specific agenda when they formed it. The purpose of the ordinance is only to give the City the power when it sees fit to create an Urban Renewal District -- either in response to public needs or private developers serving public needs. It wasn't intended to target Multnomah County Farm. A shovel is meant to dig a hole, you don't tell the shovel when you invent the shovel...you just invent the shovel.

Councilor Fowler clarified that it only took 60 days at the maximum to form the Urban Renewal District and it could be done in 30 days once there was a specific piece of property that this could be used for. He stated that this was like buying a shovel and not knowing what to use it for.

Jennings stated there was nothing to keep Council from forming an Urban Renewal Agency at any time they choose to do so.

Mayor Cox asked if this could be used to help implement the downtown plan i.e., the area below the bank and it could be used for monies that could possibly be gotten if there was this type of Agency?

Christian stated this wasn't a tax benefit, it was tax increment financing.

Councilor Thalhoffer stated that normally when there was an ordinance such as this there was backup materials to explain the Whereas. Where it states land development is hampered by physical condition of the areas...What are those areas? By the condition of title to the land....What land are you talking about that condition of title is a problem? By diverse ownership of land....What property is that? By street layout or other conditions...What we are alleging are certain conditions and he wanted to know what those conditions were? If passing an ordinance, he stated that he wanted to know what those certain conditions were? It didn't make sense to him. Just to create the Agency to have it standing by in case it was needed didn't make sense. He believed there was something that everyone wasn't attuned to somehow. Why was this before Council now? If it is targeted for downtown, why not just say so and discussions could go on about the downtown area.

Christian stated this issue was taken to Council as part of an Executive Session, staff was directed to provide the ordinance at the direction of Council. She stated it wasn't up to staff to debate the issue, but rather to respond to a Council direction. Based on State statutes, the City Attorney prepared the ordinance. If it was a debatable issue, it was debatable issue between Council not between Council and staff. Staff acted on direction of Council.

Councilor Thalhoffer stated it was brought up in Executive Session and he missed that meeting.

Councilor Fowler stated that he missed the meeting also.

Councilor Thalhoffer stated that anything Council directed at that time wasn't done by a formal vote. It couldn't have been in Executive Session.

Councilor Schmunk stated it was by consensus.

Councilor Thalhoffer agreed. So when saying it was Council direction, there were two that weren't even aware there would be discussion about this issue.

Christian stated it was in the legal notice.

Councilor Schmunk stated everyone but Thalhoffer and Fowler were there, including Councilor Thompson and Councilor Burgin. It was done by consensus.

Councilor Thalhoffer knew when and how it was done. He stated that the City Administrator saying it was by Council direction and he didn't see how it could be in Executive Session by a consensus. It was his opinion that there would have to be a formal Council vote.

Christian stated there was no vote. Council was asked by consensus, do you want this legislation prepared so that it could be part of a public hearing, go through the full public process and Council could debate the issue at public hearing. Staff was directed to prepare this legislation so the debate and discussion was between Council now not between staff and Council.

Councilor Thalhoffer asked who then brought it up in Executive Session?

Councilor Fowler stated Councilor Burgin did. It wasn't on the agenda or anything.... Councilor Schmunk stated Councilor Fowler wasn't at the meeting to know who brought it up.

Councilor Thalhoffer again asked who brought it up? Was it a member of the Council or a member of staff?

Councilor Thompson asked if it made a difference?

Councilor Thalhoffer said yes, it made a difference because Councilor Schmunk was stating that it didn't happen.

Councilor Jacobs stated maybe she brought it up.

Councilor Thalhoffer asked Councilor Jacobs, alright then, did you?

Councilor Jacobs said sure, why not?

Councilor Thalhofer stated he was asking serious questions, if they wanted to joke about it then fine. But, he stated to create an Urban Renewal Agency under these conditions without having any specific properties in mind, to make these allegations in the preamble and that's the way Council wanted to do business, fine. That wasn't how he wanted to do business. When you allege in a preamble that the development was hampered by physical condition of the areas...What areas? What physical condition? By title to the land. What land? What title to the land? Diverse ownership. What diverse ownership? To have an ordinance before us that makes these allegations, we don't even know what they are or what is being talked about for sure? He stated he wouldn't buy into it and wasn't sure that he should in representing the people of Troutdale. If the other members wanted to be flippant about it that was their business but he wouldn't be part of it.

Mayor Cox stated many cities had urban renewal.

Councilor Thalhofer stated that wasn't the point.

Councilor Schmunk called for the question.

Mayor Cox stated there was a motion and a second. He called for the question.

YEAS: 4
NAYS: 2 [Thalhofer, Fowler]
ABSTAINED: 0

Bui - Yea; Fowler - Nay; Jacobs - Yea; Schmunk - Yea; Thalhofer - Nay; Thompson - Yea

ITEM #8: RESOLUTION: Setting Storm Water System Development Charges [Tape 2, Side 3 12:10]

Mayor Cox called this agenda item and read the resolution by title.

Wilder stated this resolution was moot until the next Council session without the unanimous passage of the agenda item #6a. He added that adjustments will have to be made for development that take place between now and the next meeting. Adjustment would have to be made to the SDC rates to make up the difference. They would in effect be higher if development occurred between this meeting and the next meeting.

Christian stated it would be appropriate to table this to the next meeting.

MOTION: Councilor Bui moved to table this agenda item to the meeting of February 26, 1991. Councilor Schmunk seconded the motion.

YEAS: 6
NAYS: 0

ABSTAINED: __0__

Bui - Yea; Fowler - Yea; Jacobs - Yea; Schmunk - Yea; Thalsofer - Yea; Thompson - Yea

ITEM #9: RESOLUTION: Supporting an Application for the U.S. Corps of Engineers Projects/Sandy River Embankment Stabilization (Section 14, Flood Control Act of 1946, As Amended) 876-R [Tape 2, Side 3 13:32]

Mayor Cox read the resolution by title.

Wilder stated this was asking Council authority to make application to the US Army Corps of Engineers for public river improvements. Staff had met with the Corps of Engineers and they identified there was a problem with the river that needs attention. They are willing to put this project on their project priority list and fund it when "they have funds available to do it".

Councilor Schmunk asked what kind of timeframe they were on after funds available.

Wilder stated 6 months to a year. They were currently out of funds. They have no allocation this year but that was expected to change after this year. They looked at it in proportion to the danger and to mitigate the damage as much as possible.

Councilor Fowler stated he may have a conflict of interest because he believed in it so strongly.

MOTION: Councilor Bui moved approval. Councilor Thompson seconded the motion.

YEAS: __6__

NAYS: __0__

ABSTAINED: __0__

Bui - Yea; Fowler - Yea; Jacobs - Yea; Schmunk - Yea; Thalsofer - Yea; Thompson - Yea

ITEM #10: RESOLUTION: Authorizing Application for Community Development Block Grant [CDBG/Downtown Improvements] 877-R TAPE 2 SIDE 3 15:53

Mayor Cox called this agenda item and read the resolution by title.

Wilder stated this would be used to put together a grant application for a downtown public square improvements. The piece of property north of the bank building adjacent across the street from the Troutdale Cafe...currently a vacant piece of property. The grant would be used to acquire the property, construction restaurants, bus turnouts as envisioned in the Downtown Concept Plan approved by Council several years before.

Councilor Schmunk asked if this funding had to be shared with Fairview, Wood Village?

Councilor Bui stated it hadn't changed just more money in the pot than had been expected in the past. He stated that \$160,000 had been set aside for projects of this nature. He didn't know if other jurisdictions would come in with projects under this category he didn't know. He felt there was an excellent chance.

MOTION: Councilor Fowler moved to approve. Councilor Thalhofer seconded the motion.

YEAS: 6

NAYS: 0

ABSTAINED: 0

Bui - Yea; Fowler - Yea; Jacobs - Yea; Schmunk - Yea; Thalhofer - Yea; Thompson - Yea

ITEM #11: DEPARTMENT REPORTS:

- o Public Safety - Nothing to add.
- o Finance - Nothing to add.
- o Community Development - Cline stated that at the Gorge Commission Cox proposal for a restaurant and gardens was approved by the Commission. It was a landmark victory. Mayor Cox stated that Paul Thalhofer representing the Troutdale Chamber of Commerce, had been a great help as well as Gene Bui and Scott Cline.
- o Public Works - Wilder stated the new water rates had gone out and there had been no complaints.
- o City Attorney - Nothing to add.
- o Executive - Nothing to add.

ITEM #12: COUNCIL CONCERNS AND INITIATIVES

Councilor Schmunk stated that the first of two meetings, two proposals previously discussed at the Council meeting were discussed. Schmunk was asked not to vote. On the second meeting, the Troutdale/Hogan alternatives were narrowed to three. There were two on Hogan now and two on Kane. The first public meeting would be March 7 at Reynolds Middle School, 202 & Halsey. Everyone was welcome to attend. On the March 28th the CAC will again meet and select a preferred alternative out of the five and go from there.

Christian asked if the Environmental Study was discussed at the CAC or TAC. Wilder stated the TAC. Christian asked Wilder to report for purposes of public information prior to the public meetings.

Wilder stated that the TAC was sternly lectured at the last meeting by the State Highway Environmental Group. 257th wasn't considered and thrown out early in the game. The Federal agencies don't care what the political issues are they are only concerned with environmental issues. The State environmental people made the comment that the entire project could be in some jeopardy because one of the most obvious routes [257th] wasn't considered.

Councilor Schmunk stated that wasn't the City's fault, that was the County's fault when they didn't consider, sometime ago.

Wilder stated that if 257th was found to be the better route, Troutdale could and should still say no. But the process may be flawed because adequate consideration wasn't given to the 257th Corridor route. Language was being worked on so that the entire EIS wouldn't be thrown out. However, it could mean that 257th will come back to be looked at or none of the routes will be looked at.

Christian stated their concern was strictly process. If the process isn't gone through then the project could be in jeopardy.

Councilor Schmunk stated no build is an option.

Councilor Thalhofer stated there had been an issue being debated earlier and voted on. He didn't feel that the issue had been fully debated and he personally had other questions [Tape 2, Side 4 0.03]. He didn't feel Council courtesy was extended and would be interested to see how the Urban Renewal Agency unfolded. He expressed his disappointed with the process and hoped that type of process didn't continue from this Council.

Councilor Bui asked about the congestion on Frontage Road near the Columbia Crossing development. Was the state going to do something with the roadway?

Wilder stated that the State was working with the developer in designing the roadway to a 6 lane cross section from the entrance of the Columbia Crossing north to the Frontage Road and a 5 lane cross section [same as 257th] from that entrance, including a widened bridge which is scheduled for construction start as soon as this October. Signalization of the on ramp is part of the project, signalization at the entrance of Columbia Crossing is a potential part of the project. Before Columbia Crossing opens that half of the road they will have improved at the developer's expense. It is a \$3.7 million project overall. Wilder stated that the State had moved quicker than he had expected on the project.

ITEM #13: ADJOURNMENT.

MOTION: Councilor Schmunk moved to adjourn. Councilor Fowler seconded the motion.

YEAS: 6

NAYS: 0

ABSTAINED: 0

The regular City Council meeting of February 12, 1991 was adjourned at 8:32 p.m.

Sam K. Cox, Mayor

Dated: _____

ATTEST:

Valerie J. Raglione, CMC
City Recorder
F:\MINUTES\021291CC.MIN