



CITY OF TROUTDALE

"Gateway to the Columbia River Gorge"

AGENDA

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

7:00 P.M. -- April 25, 2000

Mayor

Paul Thalhofer

City Council

Pat Smith
David Ripma
Bruce Thompson
Jim Kight
Paul Rabe
Doug Daoust

- (A) 1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, ROLL CALL, AGENDA UPDATE
- (A) 2. CONSENT AGENDA:
 - 2.1 Accept Minutes: March 14, 2000 Regular Meeting
 - 2.2 Approve Liquor License: Texaco Star Mart # 3612
- (I) 3. PUBLIC COMMENT: Please restrict comments to non-agenda items at this time.
- (A) 4. PUBLIC HEARING/ORDINANCE (Introduced 4/11/00): An Ordinance adopting a Local Street Network Plan for the western portion of the town center, amending the Transportation System Plan and amending the Town Center Plan. Faith
- (I) 5. DEPARTMENT REPORTS:

5.1	Finance	<u>Wiesinger</u>
5.2	Public Safety	<u>Berrest</u>
5.3	Community Development	<u>Faith</u>
5.4	Public Works	<u>Galloway</u>
5.5	City Attorney	<u>Sercombe</u>
5.6	Executive	<u>Kvarsten</u>
- (I) 6. COUNCIL CONCERNS AND INITIATIVES
- (A) 7. ADJOURNMENT


Paul Thalhofer, Mayor

Dated: 4-19-00

C:\AGENDA\042500CC.AGE

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

April 25, 2000 7:00pm

Meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Mayor Thalhofer.

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, ROLL CALL, AGENDA UPDATE

Mayor Thalhofer called on Councilor Thompson to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

PRESENT: Smith, Thompson, Kight, Rabe, Daoust, Thalhofer, Ripma (7:12).

STAFF: Galloway, Faith, Wiesinger, Berrest, Kvarsten, Allen, Stickney.

GUESTS: Norman Thomas, Lauren Judd, Jennifer Wunn, Elizabeth Goodrick, Mr. Sturges, Dorothy Sturges, Dave Sturges, Pontine Rosteck, Shannon O'Donnell, Alicia McIntire, Tyson Estes, Toni Sullybrook, Wayne Schutle, Renee Schmidling, Keith & Sue Glueck, Ron Kremser, Neil Handy, Lisa Gulick, Greg & Sue Handy, Daniel Gates, Jerry Cerruti, Jeff & Denice Hay, Richard Cerruti, Angela Allen.

Mayor Thalhofer asked are there any agenda updates?

Kvarsten replied we have no changes this evening.

2. CONSENT AGENDA:
2.1 Accept Minutes: March 14, 2000 Regular Meeting
2.2 Approve Liquor License: Texaco Star Mart # 3612

Mayor Thalhofer called this item and read the consent agenda.

MOTION: Councilor Thompson moved to adopt the consent agenda. Councilor Kight seconded the motion.

YEAS: 6
NAYS: 0
ABSTAINED: 0

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

Mayor Thalhofer called this item and asked if there was anyone here who would like to speak to us on a non-agenda item.

No public comment received.

4. PUBLIC HEARING / ORDINANCE (Introduced 4/11/00): An Ordinance adopting a Local Street Network Plan for the western portion of the town center, amending the Transportation System Plan and amending the Town Center Plan.

Mayor Thalhofer read the Ordinance title, closed the City Council meeting and opened the Public Hearing at 7:04pm.

Faith stated this was brought before you two weeks ago for the first reading. I thought I would begin by refreshing everyone's memory on why we embarked on this effort and what our objective was. As you know, we did adopt a Town Center Plan for the downtown area and the surrounding lands out to the western limits of the City of Troutdale. Our Town Center Plan does establish allowed uses and densities for this area and in the western portion of the town center is largely characterized by undeveloped tracks. So, the greatest opportunity and potential for new development does occur within the western area of the town center. It was with that in mind that we wanted to take a proactive stand in planning for a street network in this area since we had already established the uses and density through the adopted Town Center Plan. We felt it now would be to our benefit to look at the street network that would go with development as it occurred. We thought it would be best to get ahead of things and to do that in advance so that when development projects come along we can advise the developer whether or not a specific road is needed there or if this project will trigger the need to connect to another development adjacent to it to ultimately provide a connection between our existing arterial or collector streets. The adopted Transportation System Plan (TSP), which was adopted by the Council in 1995, gives very sketchy guidance to how a street network will be built out in this particular area of the City. There were really only two issues that were reflected in the adopted TSP and that was it showed clearly that Sturges Drive and Sturges Lane should be connected as a through street. The other thing it indicated that an undefined connection that would occur between that street and Halsey Street, but the exact alignment was not reflected. Those were the two givens that we worked off of as we embarked on this and it was our desire to work from those as we began to plan for other streets that would compliment development in this area of the city. I think one of the larger questions that we were asking ourselves was, how extensive of a street network do we want or do we feel is desirable in this area of the city that will handle the traffic volume that comes with the housing and commercial development in this portion of the city. We have had a lot of debate and public comment and the plan has evolved and changed accordingly. I would like to highlight the key components that is now in front of you. One of the first components is the extension of Marine Drive, which is currently reflected in the Metro Regional Transportation Plan and in Multnomah County's Capital Improvement Plan. The other basic component of this plan is the Halsey Loop extension, Halsey Loop being an existing City street that curves and dead ends. The idea there is that there is already a median break at 257th, and it is the only point along 257th that Multnomah County has given their approval for a street connection. The next key element would be the local street between Columbia River Highway and Halsey Street located between the "Pig Farm" property and property owned by Mr. Wolsborn. The final major element was in removing the street connection between Sturges Drive and Sturges Lane, whether or not an emergency access and pedestrian connection should still be provided. At the last Public Hearing we did receive testimony from a number of residents and I would like to reflect on some of those and what has occurred since that time. Jim Bean who represents the current property owner of the piece of property off of 257th expounded on the break in the median that was negotiated and agreed upon when 257th was put through. He spoke to that and it was his intention that it would be allowed as this property develops, and they would have full access at that point. Mr. Winkler who is in the process of purchasing the property spoke in support of that connection and that he is willing to put that street connection. Mr. Winkler called me today and wanted to tell me that he is in support of that connection. He believes that in conjunction with developing this

piece of property that the residents should have available to them the ability to go north up to Halsey or south to 257th. At the last meeting Greg Handy also testified. Mr. Handy, who owns parcels immediately adjacent to this Halsey Loop street voiced opposition to that primarily because as they develop their property he did not feel that they would need to use that street for their access to Halsey or 257th. They would prefer to have private driveways that would take them to Halsey. He did not feel it would benefit him and did not want to have to participate in any improvements to that street. Randy McCourt of DKS and I met with Neil Handy and explained to him the access policies of the County and with that existing Halsey Loop Street, development of the adjacent property would likely be required to connect to Halsey rather than be given a new approach out to Halsey. I think we were able to explain that to his satisfaction in terms of what might likely occur. There are still some questions in what all would be involved to bring that up to a full street standard with sidewalks. Those were questions that we could not answer at this time but I believe we at least answered questions about the likely requirement to connect to Halsey Loop and that would trigger the need for further improvements. You also took testimony from Chuck Wolsborn who owns the property adjacent to the "Pig Farm" property and his concerns was in developing this property there are some significant drainage and wetland issues that he was fearful would trigger the need to move that entirely onto his property and in so doing he would have to bear the full cost of that street as opposed to only half of the cost if it was built on the property line. We met on site with Mr. Wolsborn to look at the drainage and wetland issue that he was concerned with and we, the staff and consultant, certainly have a better understanding of that issue. We talked about a number of different options that might arise in the development of that street. It largely depends on who comes in first and whether the "Pig Farm" property develops first or his develops first will likely set the stage for what will have to happen with the adjacent property. There are a number of ways that it can be done that would relieve most of the burden, if not the entire burden, for addressing drainage and wetland issues for Mr. Wolsborn. Also, at the last meeting Mr. Cerruti testified. He owns the parcels adjacent to Columbia River Highway as well as the gas station on the corner of Halsey and Columbia River Highway. His concern was if this is put in the plan and there is the intention of putting this road in sometime in the future, does that hold him hostage as far as developing his property. In a discussion with Mr. Cerruti I explained the likely scenario that if the County does intend to construct this road at this alignment that would bisect his piece of property, that they could not simply exact that right-of-way from him, by that I mean require him to deed it or dedicate it over to the County. They would have to compensate him for that right-of-way through the middle of his property because essentially it will render much of it unbuildable. If the County chooses not to do that at this time because they are uncertain whether it will be built or it is so far out in the future they don't want to invest in the right-of-way now, there is nothing that would prevent him from developing it and then down the road when the County decides they are going to build the road, they will have to compensate him for the right-of-way. That explanation, I believe, put his fears at rest.

Councilor Ripma asked did Mr. Wolsborn favor the road?

Faith replied Mr. Wolsborn conceded that with development of his property he feels that a public road would be necessary somewhere on his property to facilitate it to be subdivided into buildable lots. It's more the issue of where that road would be located and if it would be shared jointly, in terms of the construction, with the property to the west of him. He does recognize that a public road is necessary for the type of development that he has in mind for his property.

Councilor Ripma asked but he spoke against the road that is on the map at the last meeting, are you saying he has changed his mind?

Faith replied I am saying that my impression is that he was not necessarily opposed to the road but he was concerned about whether or not he would be stuck with the cost of dealing with the drainage and wetland issues under the alignment that is shown there and he was fearful that the only way that could be done is if the road was moved easterly so that it would be entirely on his property and he would be stuck with the cost for the full street improvements.

Councilor Ripma asked could that road end up on the pig farm property?

Faith replied it could, or it could be partially on the pig farm and partially on his. There are a number of ways it could be built out.

Councilor Ripma asked on Halsey Loop Road the person that was represented by the attorney that owns the parcel on the south end of the north south road extending from Halsey south to 257th, would he have access onto 257th whether or not Halsey Loop went through, is that right?

Faith replied that is correct.

Councilor Ripma asked on the Marine Drive extension, does the fact that there is a road running through the middle of a parcel have any affect on City planning decisions, he could build whatever he wanted. The fact that it would be built in the middle of a road doesn't matter?

Faith replied we would look at the proposed development and if for example, there was structures and parking we might suggest a way that it could be laid out differently so that the structures might not fall right in the middle of where the road could go, but we could not deny him from building the development as long as it met code requirements.

Councilor Ripma asked you mentioned that the County could consider purchasing the right-of-way, where they would have to compensate the land owner they could not burden the land owner with having to build that road if I am understanding you right.

Faith replied yes.

Councilor Ripma asked are you suggesting that the County has money to buy that road right-of-way now?

Faith replied no. When he would come in with a development proposal, at that time it would be circulated to the County and if the County at that time realizes that there is a development to occur on this property, they could not just simply say you need to reserve a 90' strip through the middle of that for a future road. I would argue that the County would have to purchase that, the reality is they probably do not have the money and so what they would probably do is forego for some time in the distant future and then they would have to purchase it and compensate the property owner not for just the land but for the improvements that are on the land.

Councilor Thompson asked would you clarify for me, Halsey Loop that property owner indicated he was willing to participate in the development of that street.

Faith replied yes, that would be Mr. Winkler of Winkler Development has stated to me as well as in testimony two weeks ago that he is willing to construct that public street to allow for a connection to Halsey Loop.

Councilor Thompson asked the extension of Marine Drive and the termination of Halsey Street, I assumed that wouldn't be done unless Marine Drive was built.

Faith replied correct. What we are showing here is that if the Marine Drive extension were to go through it would be better to have a 90° intersection. That Halsey Street would not dead end but it would be intersected with the Marine Drive extension and the remaining stub would be a cul-de-sac to allow for access to the existing developments.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked it appears from your discussions with Mr. Wolsborn and perhaps Neil Handy that there is some flexibility in the location of these roads.

Faith replied I believe there is. These lines were never intended to be set in stone in terms of the road having to start here and end here, but it does indicate that there will have to be a public street connection between Halsey and Columbia somewhere in this area.

Councilor Kight asked Sturges Lane and Sturges Drive, we have heard many people talk about these roads, have you found any resident who is in favor of this connection.

Faith replied the closest testimony that we got to support was from a resident in Columbia Crest, he testified at the Planning Commission that he experience some problems with the current dead end of Sturges Drive. He talked about the number of people that come down Sturges Drive thinking that they are on Cherry Park Road and have to turn around.

Councilor Kight asked couldn't that issue be addressed by putting up a dead end sign.

Faith replied if you put it at the entrance of Sedona Park.

Councilor Rabe asked the connector between Halsey and 257th, that would only permit someone to go south on 257th?

Faith replied you can go either way there is a break in the median already there.

Councilor Rabe asked regarding the pig farm and the connector between Columbia River Highway and Halsey, the purpose of that street is to facilitate traffic within the pig farm development?

Faith replied right. It would certainly facilitate exits from any of the people that are at this side of the property this would provide an exit point or an entry point. It is also going to accommodate development that would occur here.

Councilor Daoust stated I have a concern about the Halsey Loop connection also. With that piece of property there, zoned for apartments and the existing apartments just north of there, was the fact that there will be multiple apartment complexes on both sides of that street was that taken into account for some kind of traffic count.

McCourt replied basically the volumes don't warrant a traffic signal initially.

Councilor Daoust asked if we do not have a street on our plan, if a developer came in and still

wanted to put the road in, would we consider it?

Faith replied we would consider it. It would be to our benefit to know that we intend to have a full connection down to Halsey Street down to Halsey Loop, you can count on it happening and then any subsequent development adjacent to that you could hold them to that as well. In the absence of that it is more difficult to hold that position and require that of the development which is why I would like the map to reflect that. Certainly if the line is not there and the developer says I am willing to build a public street that will just stop at my property line and let you worry about whether it ever continues beyond that, we could do that, it is just very awkward.

Councilor Daoust asked if the Sturges sold their property twenty years from now. They wanted to get out of town and someone bought their property and wanted to develop it and we did not have a street connection on our plan but they wanted to put the road through, would we allow them to do that?

Faith replied if they, based on how they wanted to lay out their development, they thought it was in their best interest to have a street running the full length of the southern property line so that it connected Sturges Drive on the east and Sturges Lane on the west, I don't think we would do anything to prevent them doing that. I assume, in terms of the public notice that would go out for that development that there would be a lot of opposition to that.

Councilor Ripma asked the on the Wolsborn/pig farm the north south road, the pig farm has immediate prospects for development there and it might include roads in addition to the dotted line couldn't it?

Faith replied it could but in their mind that doesn't exist right now and they do not intend to do that unless that is something that the City would require of them to accommodate a street network.

Councilor Ripma asked is there any reason we can't wait and see what they end up doing there, we don't know what the proposal is, or is this the idea that we are going to force that road to be built by putting it on the map now. I guess I am just wondering why can't we just wait and see what develops there?

Faith replied because if they do not show on their plans that they want to build a road there, I guess it may never get built and then the opportunity would be lost. If we do desire a road to be there, we are going to be pro-active in planning for a road, we are going to show where a road is necessary, we are going to require it in conjunction with development. In the absence of that, there is no assurance it will happen.

McCourt stated I think the other thing that is important, is in that case it is a perfect example of if you didn't put the line on the map and the development didn't put the road in and then Mr. Wolsborn came to develop and realizes he really needed that road, he would be stuck with the whole road. Whereas with it on the plan it basically has a shared impact upon development on both properties by planning ahead rather than waiting until after the fact to figure out that a problem exists.

Councilor Ripma stated I guess I don't follow that. If you have one developer that wants the road and one that doesn't want the road why should the one who doesn't want the road share with the one who does. The one that wants it should pay for it, shouldn't he?

McCourt replied they both get access off of the road.

Councilor Ripma replied they wouldn't have to. Wolsborn could put it entirely on his property, couldn't he?

Faith replied that is what he wants to avoid.

McCourt stated our meeting with him on Friday, he was very clear that is what he did not want.

Councilor Ripma stated the hypothetical that stated was that he wanted it.

McCourt stated no, I did not say that. I said that you did not require it upon the pig farm, but then after the fact you realize that you need that road and then it becomes the full responsibility of Mr. Wolsborn.

Councilor Ripma asked by putting this dotted line road on the map, what affect are we having on the potential for development of that property if any?

Faith replied the way I would implement or carry out that dotted line is with the pig farm development I would want an assurance that there is an internal circulation pattern that allows for a continuous opportunity to get from one end of that property to the other end without the need to have to come out to the public street.

Councilor Ripma asked won't we have the opportunity to decide that once we see what they are planning. I am wondering why we have to draw it on the map now?

Faith replied we could as we review that we could express that in terms of how we would like to see it developed. I guess having it there expresses our vision, puts it on paper that this is what we want to hold you to, plan and design your development with that in mind.

McCourt stated the plan was developed based on their input. Those roads were roads that they had given us as input as we developed the plan.

Councilor Ripma stated if I am understanding you right, then there is no need for us to put it on our plan, they are planning to do it.

McCourt replied that is not correct. If they sold out tomorrow to another group they may not have that plan, they could change that plan.

Councilor Ripma asked on this road, the north/south road that we are talking about, I understand the purpose is connectivity, to provide people access to roads but isn't it true that Historic Columbia Highway west goes nowhere. It goes to the animal shelter, you can't get anywhere except back onto Halsey from either end of it. Is there any plan to connect W. Columbia River Highway to anything.

McCourt stated to the east Marine Drive connection this provides an outlet for that development. It is part of the future plan.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated as I understand it Mr. Faith you are saying if you plan for a road when the developers come in they will see what the plan is and they will be more apt to follow the plan is that correct?

Faith replied that is correct.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked would that same logic apply if you had the emergency access between Sturges Lane and Sturges Drive. If you have something in place would that developer be apt to follow that plan?

Faith stated we would hold the developer to that.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked what if the developer didn't want to be held to that and said I want to develop a street through there.

Faith replied if the plan showed that there is going to be an emergency access and if the developer said I want to put a full road through there. I suppose if that is the best for him and for that development we would go ahead and process it that way and then give notice through the normal channels. When we review that development and allow neighbors to object to that if they wish to and let the developer argue why he feels that would be necessary. If that was defeated then we would still hold him to the emergency access if that is what our street plan shows.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked Mr. McCourt, the stop light on 257th, you say we are almost there as far as showing a need for it?

McCourt replied our analysis initially, and again we were basing it on the material that was provided by the developer and that may change, but based on what we saw with there development and with the connection to Halsey as well as 257th, it was not warranted. Now there is other property in that area that could be developed and at such time there may be a need for a signal light.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked how many feet is it from the stop light at Cherry Park Road to down the hill north to where this intersection would be?

McCourt replied it is a little less then 1000'.

Councilor Kight stated a note in your staff report that you had a pre-application meeting on March 9th for a 234 unit apartment complex on the 15.5 acres where the Halsey extension would be. As you have already heard from several of the Council members, we are concerned about traffic entering 257th either going north or south bound. Is there another possibility for a different outlet other then 257th for this proposed 234 unit apartment complex?

Faith replied I think that question was asked, could we require them to only access onto Halsey and not on to 257th. My answer was that the developer has access rights that were negotiated and built into there agreement with Multnomah County when the right-of-way was purchased and I believe they intend to exercise that right to have there access on 257th. Even if we didn't or we told them to plan on getting your access off of Halsey as opposed to 257th, there is a problem in that right now there is a small triangular piece that obstructs or would block the connection between their property and the existing Halsey Loop. It is owned by a different property owner therefore we would be

requiring them to have to get access across that other property or the City would have to come in and condemn the property in order to do that.

Councilor Kight asked when they were granted access from the County, does that mean they can go north as well as south on 257th?

Faith replied that is right. That is why there is a median break there, to allow for full access.

Councilor Kight stated at least in my minds eye, there is no way they are going to cross 257th.

Faith replied at certain times of the day, you are correct. It is the same problem that the people in the south part of town experience daily in trying to get out onto 257th.

Councilor Kight asked you are sure that they have a guarantee that they can go north and south?

Faith replied unless I heard the testimony of Mr. Bean incorrectly the two or three times he has spoken on this issue.

Councilor Kight asked do we have any written comment from the County.

McCourt replied I have one page of the legal agreement that grants them the access.

Councilor Kight asked are they willing pay for the traffic signal?

McCourt replied I believe if it was warranted they would end up having to pay for it.

Faith stated the one thing we could do is require a traffic study in conjunction with that development to see if it warrants a traffic signal there.

Councilor Rabe stated I also have some pretty big concerns about that. I understand your rationale and I understand your rationale for having a blue print that we can work from. If for instance we would propose that from the terminus of that property line on Halsey Loop, if that was just put in as a proposed street as opposed to a primary local street, would that have any kind of bearing on the type of development that may occur?

Faith replied if we were to do that the developer might be willing to maintain his layout and design so that this is a private drive but in essence everything is set back and reserved so that it could be dedicated for public street in the future. The pitfall to that is that if this developer is not required to construct that road at the time he does his development but he is told to maintain adequate setbacks and perhaps a private drive that will accommodate you now but at sometime in the future when we know what we want to do and we might put a road through, who is going to pay for the road construction, who is going to build it? Is the City going to build it?

Councilor Rabe stated so it would either then be the City's burden because it would be difficult to go back to the applicant.

Faith replied absolutely, he fulfilled his obligation.

Councilor Rabe asked how compelling does it have to be prior to the fact that the City becomes responsible for the development of that?

Faith replied if the City desires to have that street built as a public street and this development is done and the developer is gone, the burden is entirely on the City to come up with the funds to build that.

Councilor Daoust stated back on the Halsey Loop connection, say the apartments go in a couple years from now and they build a road on their piece of property out to 257th, that is all we will have when the apartments go in. You said there was a triangular piece of property right in the middle, is that piece of property developable?

Faith replied it is very small. I suppose there is enough area that you might be able to build one housing unit on it.

Councilor Daoust asked would that triangular piece of property stand in the way of moving the road farther north towards Halsey?

Faith replied it does.

Pontine Rosteck stated I am a supervisor with American Medical Response and I am here to address Sturges Lane/Sturges Drive emergency vehicle access. We have a deep commitment to providing emergency care and an interest in planning for emergency vehicle access. We have found that police, fire and EMS all know that it is always better to have more than one access in and out. We would support any planning that would allow us better access to that area.

Councilor Ripma asked you are speaking on the merits of the Sturges Drive connection and that would be regardless of any affect on the neighbors or the property owner?

Rosteck replied I know you have a lot of issues to consider. All our interest is in asking for better emergency access so we can get in and out better. It is very frustrating to get into an area and be able to see the place you need to be but have to go all the way around to get there. We do post at the Safeway store so we do have good access from the south.

Mayor Thalhofer asked from your experiences have you found that a minute or two makes a difference.

Rosteck replied a minute makes a big difference.

Councilor Kight stated I think time is critical, I don't think anybody in this room would argue with that. Lets say your emergency vehicle is at Safeway and you had to go to Sturges Drive, in other words you have enter off of 257th, how much additional time would you have to allow for that?

Rosteck replied I am guessing about four minutes. If they found that the address was actually on the other side, they would have to go back around and that would add quite a few minutes.

Councilor Kight asked are your ambulance drivers familiar with the area?

Rosteck replied part of the orientation process for the field training program for new employees is to focus on geometry as well as their medical skills. Mapping and learning how to get into different areas is a major part of our training. We have a large county to cover and not everybody knows every area.

Councilor Kight asked if Sturges Drive and Sturges Lane were not to go through and the Council decided against it, would you draw that to the attention of your folks?

Rosteck replied we try on a daily basis, we get reports from the City on road closures and stuff like that. Any areas that we find that are troublesome or are brought to our attention as a hard to access area we try to post those on a daily basis for our crews.

Councilor Kight asked not to be redundant but since there has been so much publicity about this issue and you are here tonight to speak to that issue, if it doesn't go through you would draw this to the attention of your employees?

Rosteck replied absolutely.

Keith Glueck stated I live in Cherry Ridge. I would like to reiterate for all of our neighborhood that the added traffic would be a deterrent. The added traffic would probably cause accidents which would entail having more ambulance service. As to multiple access into our neighborhood, I think people have forgotten that we have two streets into our neighborhood.

Liz Goodrick stated I live in Sedona Park. I was involved with the CAC when this issue went back to them and a question that I believe was asked last week was how do the people in Sedona Park feel about opening up 11th. I can tell you that we never wanted it.

Mayor Thalhoffer called for a break at 8:30pm.

Meeting was reconvened at 8:40pm.

Neil Handy stated I represent Handy Investment Group and our particular concern is with Halsey Loop connection to 257th. As we stated in our letter at the meeting two weeks ago, we are strongly opposed to this. We feel that this could become a 257th bypass for people coming off the freeway on the Marine Drive extension and bypassing the traffic signal and back-up at 257th and Columbia, this would provide a shortcut. This is a residential neighborhood, it has a narrow street. We strongly oppose any type of connection up to 257th.

Councilor Daoust asked the triangle piece of property that is just south of yours, do you know who owns that?

Handy replied no, but I will be finding out tomorrow morning.

Norm Thomas stated I am the Chair of the CAC. One thing that concerns me that has been talked about tonight is the issue of moving traffic through the city. I am not sure that the existing plan or the modified one as it is being presented will handle that. In regards to the emergency access on Sturges Drive and Sturges Lane, as you know the CAC was very much in favor of that. One of my concerns is that many of you were on the Council at the time that road was originally put on the

TSP. The other concern of the CAC was safety, not only getting safety people into the area but also getting them out of there so they can reach other parts of the city.

Councilor Ripma asked the CAC did not consider the Marine Drive extension as I understand it?

Thomas replied at the time we were presented the material I think it was in the concept stage but it hadn't been actually put on a map yet.

Councilor Daoust asked did you get any testimony during your meetings on street connectivity?

Thomas replied the main concern we ran into was the bulk of the opinions did not want that particular street to go through.

Richard Cerruti stated my concern is the Marine Drive extension. What financial impact will it have on my property. If it takes twenty years for this to happen, can we develop and then they buy us out at the time when they do decide to do this? Or are we stuck with a piece of property that we can't do anything with?

Mayor Thalhofer asked the City Attorney to address this question.

Allen stated it depends in large part on when you are ready to develop your land and what kind of development you are proposing. If the City were to adopt the plan with the Marine Drive extension going through that would guide future decisions at the time that development was proposed. So if you were going to propose development on your property, when you came to the planning department here at the City, they would look at your planned development and make a decision about whether or not it was consistent with the plan. As Mr. Faith explained in his testimony, if you were proposing a significant building in the area where the street was shown in the plan he would redirect you so as to not interfere. If the County had no plans and no money to pay for that road you wouldn't be totally denied development of the property.

Cerruti stated it shows that it goes right through the middle of the property and there is nothing left to do anything with on either side.

Allen stated is the property vacant now?

Cerruti replied no, we are using it for truck parking. We would like to make a small industrial park there.

Allen stated there is always the ability to amend the plan depending on what kind of development proposal comes into the City. If the City felt that it was something that was in the best interest of the City and that the street shouldn't go through there and the County had no money and no plans to pay you for your property then the plan could be amended.

Cerruti stated you are still not saying that you would. You are saying that you could stop us, it is up to whoever is on staff, they could say you can't develop because there is going to be a road going through here. Or they could change it and say there is a road going through but it is not going to be for twenty years, yes you can develop and then the County has to buy it when they come through.

Allen stated right, I think that is consistent with what we are saying. That is the advice that I would give the City Council is that it is hard to make an assessment today about exactly how the plan is going to affect the property because you have to look at it at the time development is proposed. What the plan does is guide those future decisions.

Cerruti stated if the City Council adopted this plan and we decided to develop this summer, we would be able to go ahead and do it?

Allen replied you could submit your plan and the County would be given an opportunity to comment on your development proposal, the City would take a look at it and if the County wanted to preserve the ability to put this road through and require you to dedicate or give to the County the property for that road they would have to compensate you for that property.

Cerruti stated they would have to compensate me for that property at that time. So they can hold us hostage for twenty years?

Allen replied no.

Cerruti stated the cul-de-sac that you are proposing on the end of Halsey that is going to affect our station, it shows a turn around there it looks like. I don't know how much property it is going to take out, what the dimensions are.

Faith stated I don't think we know the design or dimensions or anything of what would be required at the end of Halsey. If Halsey were realigned to intersect with the Marine Drive extension then obviously the remnants of Halsey east of that new alignment would provide access to existing development that is currently there and we would need to provide a means for vehicles that go there to be able to turn around. It may be able to be accommodated within existing parking lot. We would have to deal with that at the time to see what the best configuration might be.

Cerruti asked it won't deny us access to that cul-de-sac, we will still have access to go through and back out to Halsey?

Faith replied again I can't say with any certainty right now. I think we will have to look at all of that at the time to see what the adjacent uses are, what the circulation pattern is.

Cerruti asked if you ever do this, you have the code that doesn't allow free standing signs in the Central Business District, are we going to be able to put a sign to the west side of us?

Faith replied it is premature for me to answer that question.

Mayor Thalhoffer closed the Public Hearing at 8:59pm and reconvened the Council meeting..

Councilor Ripma stated I have an alternative ordinance that I would like to propose. Instead of the second reading of the ordinance that was presented at the last meeting, it is item 4 "B" in our packets. What we had before us the last time was the Planning Commissions recommendation. My proposal is a simple one and if we adopt it unanimously we could enact it tonight under our Charter. This ordinance deletes the Sturges connections, emergency connections, trail connections or connections between I 1th and Sturges Drive it deletes all of those. It leaves in the place the trails

shown except the one that goes across the Sturge's property and it deletes all of the other roads including the Marine Drive extension. Councilor Ripma read the ordinance contained in the packet.

MOTION: Councilor Ripma moved to adopt Ordinance 4 "B" in the packet which amends Ordinance 636 adopted in December 1995 to eliminate the connection between Sturges Drive and Sturges Lane. Figures and text in the Transportation System Plan that reference this connection are to be updated accordingly. The Troutdale Transportation System Plan adopted on December 12, 1995 is also amended to add the trails shown in the attached Exhibit "A". Figures and text in the Transportation System Plan that reference trails and pedestrian connections are to be updated accordingly. Seconded by Councilor Kight.

Councilor Ripma stated I know a great deal of time and effort has went into this on the part of the CAC and the Planning Commission as well as the Council. The citizens have spent the most time on it by having to go to all these meetings. My feeling is that the CAC didn't have all of the facts that came before the Council. The main one being the Marine Drive extension. I can't say what they would have decided but I don't favor that connection. I think it would bring a lot of traffic into Troutdale into an area of Troutdale that would be a deterrent to it. I happen to know that there is absolutely no money for the County to buy a right-of-way. The County knows that they want to extend 257th to the south, the County doesn't even have money to buy those obvious extensions. So it would end up being on the map for decades before anything could ever happen, I just don't think it is fair or a good idea. As exit 17 becomes overburdened, ODOT has refused to spend any money other than to put in the one-ways and the lights. I do not favor having the traffic diverted from ODOT's problem by diverting all of the traffic through the middle of Troutdale. People can use the new 207th and the newly reconstructed 238th exits as exit 17 becomes overburdened. The CAC didn't have all of the facts when they agreed to put Sturges Drive through which I think would carry a tremendous amount of traffic particularly if Marine Drive was built, but even if it wasn't. The Planning Commission did remove Sturges Drive but they left a couple of lines across the Sturge's property that I think will have real adverse affect today and for the future on the owners. I think these lines are not meaningless, in fact we got a memo and we have had testimony from our City Attorney that these lines guide planning decisions. The owners, the Sturges, that is their home and business and anytime that they want to do anything on their property they would have to deal with these lines on the maps. I think in the end it would tend to force people out. I have to admit I have a soft spot in my heart for large old undeveloped parcels of land in Troutdale, they're aren't very many of them and there is very few left that people don't want to develop and the Sturges family is one of them. I think they add to our City by leaving a little elbow room between developments. I also don't favor putting it on the map because it will not help to build an emergency road, it actually doesn't do anything to build an emergency road or a road or a trail, it only puts a line on the map. There is no money and there is no plan to buy out the right-of-way. What we would be doing is burdening a property owner, a family that has been here a long time, inconveniencing them and worrying all the neighbors for what, for no benefit.

Councilor Kight stated I think Councilor Ripma has articulated very well what my position is on this ordinance. I will say that it is very clear to those of us on the Council as well as the testimony given to the CAC and Planning Commission that the folks in Sedona Park, Cherry Ridge and the other neighborhoods do not want Sturges Drive and Sturges Lane to go through. They see no benefit, they are the ones that live in that community and they

know better than the decision makers up here what is best for their community. I share with them their concern about safety and having people pass through their community. It is a safety issue. You go through neighborhoods and see kids playing ball and riding bikes on the street. I can understand their concern for not having pass through traffic. Even after hearing testimony from AMR, it is clear that their drivers and the people operating those ambulances are well aware that Sturges Drive and Sturges Lane does not go through. Regarding south Marine Drive, I sit on the transportation committees and frankly I was blind sided by south Marine Drive going through and connecting up with 257th. My number one rule as far as decision making is to protect the people of Troutdale. Frankly anything that causes additional pass through traffic, I am opposed to. What I don't want to have happen on 257th is to turn that into a quasi Mt. Hood expressway. I know it is suppose to be an arterial road, but I don't want to necessarily be serving Sandy, Boring and Damascus. We have a major school, Reynolds High School, and I have watched kids try to access that school by crossing 257th and as I have mentioned before it is turning into a real raceway. I am opposed to the south Marine Drive and whatever we can do to eliminate that.

Councilor Thompson stated I think this ordinance throws out the baby with the bath water. We need planning for streets that are going to occur in the future and that planning needs to be done now not when the development occurs. We need to have an overall plan. The Planning Commission and the CAC have worked on this plan for a long time. There may be some features of it that change, for example the Sturges Lane and Sturges Drive problem I think should be taken off including the emergency access. I agree with that part of it but I don't agree with throwing out the other proposed streets like Halsey Loop and Marine Drive extension. Under this type of thinking 257th would never have been built to move the traffic through the City of Troutdale like it does today. We need collector streets and we need major thoroughfares to make the traffic through, if we didn't we wouldn't be having 20,000 cars a day pass on 257th. I am not in favor of this ordinance.

Mayor Thalhofer stated when this first came up to the Council it had been studied for eight months by the CAC, a committee that the Council appoints to represent the citizens of Troutdale to come up with a reasonable proposal to pass on to the Planning Commission and the City Council. The CAC did an admirable job and I think they had all of the information they needed except for the Marine Drive extension. The Planning Commission took the CAC recommendation and debated it and they came up with the recommendation that is before us tonight which is the emergency access from Sturges Drive to Sturges Lane and the other roads and trails. I have high regard for the Sturges family. I don't think anything that we do or don't do tonight is going to affect them because when they choose to sell or develop their property that is when anything that we do or don't do tonight would take affect. One of the things that concerns me is that we do have our CAC Committee and our Planning Commission spending months on these issues and they come up with a plan and the proposed ordinance just trashes it. I think more weight ought to be given to the recommendations of these citizen bodies that are appointed. The emergency vehicle situation bothers me in that when an emergency vehicle needs to get on the other side of the Sturges property it will take another three or four minutes to go around. Any of you that have had family emergencies, police, fire or ambulance, probably can figure out what can happen in three or four minutes. I am very concerned about that because we, the City Council, are charged with providing the best public safety possible for our citizens. We have had the people that we rely on for those services testify to us that they need to have the emergency access. It doesn't bother anybody now when you don't have an emergency, but when you do have an emergency and the ambulance gets lost, which has been known to happen in Troutdale, it happened not to long ago and a little boy died. Anything that we can

do to make sure that these emergency vehicles can get to where they have to go in a timely fashion, I think we should do. I know that the neighbors don't think that is a problem, the Cherry Ridge Neighborhood Association has considered that and decided that they are willing to take the risk of that type of situation. I understand that and I understand why they would say that because they think the alternative is worse. The other part of this piece is the Wolsborn, Cerruti and Handy piece that I think needs to have more study before we decide what we are going to do, there have been a lot of good questions raised and I am in favor of trying to work those matters out and have flexible plans. But to trash the entire plan after months of work by the CAC and the Planning Commission does not appeal to me. The Cherry Ridge Neighborhood Association has done a magnificent job, they have been active interested citizens and I really appreciate that. I also want to apologize for any activity on the part of the Planning Commission for any comments that were made at the last Planning Commission meeting that were uncalled for. I think the ordinance presented to us by Councilor Ripma needs some more work. As Councilor Thompson stated, it is like throwing out the baby with the bath water. I am saying that you are trashing over a years worth of work by the CAC and Planning Commission. I think this is something that we ought to consider for another meeting.

Councilor Rabe stated I agree with Councilor Thompson. We seem to be caught between two extremes. This evening, based on the testimony that occurred, there seems to be very little support for the proposed plan. Maybe the CAC would have derived a different conclusion if knowledge of the Marine Drive extension had been available to them. I have the highest regard for their work. I am opposed to the Halsey Loop, I think that is a very inappropriate place to bring a road into based on what I have seen on 257th. The Sturges connections has little or no support in the community. I will endorse the ordinance.

Councilor Daoust stated I will endorse Councilor Ripma's ordinance. I take the analytical approach a lot and when my analytical approach lines up with what the public wants, I think we have a winner. I can just imagine that professional planners are shaking their heads at this council. I have been involved in a lot of long range planning and that is what we started out doing and I am just sure they are shaking their heads at this council in disbelief that we are throwing the plan out. I am sure the proposal will be open to challenge for failure to comply with street connectivity requirements under the transportation planning rule that the state has, under Metro's Functional Plan and with the City's Transportation Plan. I am sure that we do not meet street connectivity requirements. The proposed streets that we were looking at were really a minimum number of streets to connect compared to what we could have looked at which was double or a lot more streets to connect the whole western half of the Town Center. The north/south connector between the Historic Columbia River and Halsey I see as absolutely no benefit to anyone except for that it may provide a good circulation around McMenamin's development and I am sure that we will work that out with them when the proper time comes. The Halsey Loop connection, I think that will become a major shortcut between Halsey Street and 257th. I think that the 257th point of that connection would be a very dangerous point. Whoever owns that triangular piece of property in the middle holds the key. The 11th Street Sedona Park connection is not necessary. The bottom line is the people have spoken and the people don't want multiple access points, they don't want connectivity and circulation I heard that very clear. What they do want is safer streets for the kids to play on, they want quieter neighborhoods and they want to get away from cars. I don't think this attitude will change twenty years from now even with a new set of neighbors. In conclusion, what I was told as a City Councilor is you do what is best for the City. I struggled with this on this issue because I was struggling with providing ease of transportation in cars for many people and comparing that to

providing comfortable neighborhoods for fewer people. People desire islands of refuge when they go home, they want to get away from the rat race the congestion and the development going on all around us. To provide that on a case by case basis, I think is this City Council's challenge. I think in this case we can do it without a negative affect on the rest of the citizens in Troutdale. I appreciate the citizen input which led me to that conclusion which leads me to supporting the motion.

Councilor Smith stated I support the motion for the simple reason that people like Troutdale for its livability. I feel like the more through streets that we put through neighborhoods, we are just asking for more traffic and less neighborhood livability. If we want to keep the small town atmosphere, outside our major arterial roads which we have to have, if there is a short cut people are going to start taking them. People move into these neighborhoods with the idea that the streets are a dead end so they know the shortfalls of fire, police and medical but they would rather have the safer neighborhood where their children can play. I feel that putting the Sturges connection in would not help matters, it would make it worse. The Marine Drive connection would be disastrous, the traffic on 257th is horrendous and would add a lot of traffic to the neighborhoods. To me when you plan you should lay out the streets first and then build your town around it, you don't take and put the streets in afterwards.

Councilor Ripma stated I would like to take a stab at answering some points brought up by Councilor Thompson and you Mayor, you both raised some very good points and see if I couldn't persuade you to vote for this motion for the sake of the citizens that are here to make it unanimous so they wouldn't have to come back in two weeks. Councilor Thompson mentioned that the motion throws out the baby with the bath water, I want to emphasize that we do have a City Transportation Plan that was adopted in 1995 and it covers this area of the town, it didn't necessarily need to be changed. That plan was worked on for many months by a citizens group of seven or eight, a Planning Commission member and one Councilor, me. It was comprehensive, it covered the whole city not just one area. We are not throwing out that plan. These proposals from the Planning Commission were modifications to that plan and other then eliminating the Sturges Connection the rest of the roads proposed are not on our current plan. I have spoken with CAC and Planning Commission members, they were divided in there decision. They had mixed feelings about the recommendations they made to us but ultimately the Council has the final decision and we are the elected officials and it is up to us to make the decision. I don't want to throw out anybodies work and I think I am leaving enough of it in here to have benefitted from their work. Halsey Loop is just a bad idea, several of you mentioned that it would be a very busy cut through. I don't favor doing the other roads around McMenamins simply because we are going to have our say on that, we are going to design an excellent development. There is no reason to just draw some lines on the map in my opinion right now. Mr. Mayor, I disagree that putting a line, even an emergency access across the Sturges property wouldn't affect them, that is your comment. I point you to the memo from our City Attorney, number one on the list states "If the City adopts the proposed Local Street Network Plan how will it affect private property? The Local Street Network Plan will guide future land use decisions and affect development on private property in the future." Regarding your comments on the ambulance service which are thoughtful and I understand where you are coming from, but the citizens most affected by it don't want the road or the emergency access through and I think we should listen to them. Finally, if we pass my motion it doesn't preclude either of you or any of us from proposing still putting through the Halsey Loop or any of those other roads if you would like to, I don't think there would be majority support to do that but there could be.

Mayor Thalhofer stated in response to the memo from our City Attorney that states “ the Local Street Network Plan will guide future land use decisions and affect development on property” that is true but not negatively in my opinion. I have grave concern about dragging people back to this hearing room for another meeting to debate this issue again, that is the only thing about this that bothers me. The Sturges Lane connection is going nowhere, that is not going to happen, there is not going to be an emergency access. That does not have a chance of passing this City Council, you can be sure of that. The only part I am talking about now is the other part, Halsey Loop, Wolsborn and the “Pig Farm” where we have some lines on the map which will guide development down there. I am torn, if we had some way to separate this out and just eliminate the Sturges connection at this point and concentrate on the part that will develop soon.

Councilor Ripma asked the City Attorney, does this ordinance preclude us further considering Halsey Loop.

Allen replied you could direct staff to come back with a proposal to add other roads.

Councilor Daoust stated your proposal Councilor Ripma removes all of the proposed black and dotted lines.

Councilor Ripma stated it does not say the word remove anywhere, it simply references exhibit “A”. It only removes the Sturges connection and adds trails, those are the only amendments to our current plan being proposed. It does not remove the rest of the roads because they are not in our current plan to remove.

Mayor Thalhofer is there anyway to put the Sturges connection to rest so these people would not have to come back again. Then we can concentrate on the other issues and maybe do some more work on the other issues?

Allen replied I think there is a way to do that, how to do that without starting over with a new street plan that would have to go back to the Planning Commission is a little bit harder to resolve. If you adopt the ordinance tonight you deal with eliminating the Sturges connection. I suppose you could adopt that ordinance by unanimous support tonight and direct staff to bring back another ordinance dealing with other aspects of the Transportation System Plan at a later meeting for you to consider with the direction to staff and the understanding that Sturges Drive has been dealt with in this separate ordinance.

Mayor Thalhofer does that address the problem that we have about starting all over again?

Allen replied I think if you are limiting it to the testimony and the issues and the area that is already currently before you and been reviewed and commented on by the CAC and Planning Commission, you wouldn't have to go back and start over.

Mayor Thalhofer stated if we could do that I am willing to do that although I am not really in favor of this ordinance. I am willing to do that so it doesn't require the citizens to have to come back here again. I am concerned about the other aspects, I think we need to push forward on those. What does it take to do that, vote yes on this and then going with something else?

Allen replied right. A motion to adopt this ordinance but also a motion to continue the discussion and review the Local Street Network Plan for this area to a date certain in the

future with some direction to staff on what you want them to work on and bring back to you. So you are in essence leaving open for future public hearings and testimony the balance of the Local Street Network Plan that you are not adopting tonight.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated I am prepared to vote yes on this ordinance if we proceed along the lines of what the City Attorney suggested that we do.

Councilor Daoust asked would that mean two more hearings on the remainder of the plan?

Allen replied if the Council unanimously supported an ordinance that came back before it, it could also be adopted in one meeting otherwise it would be adopted in two meetings.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated that is what I would like to see happen here and direct the staff to see what they can do if anything to accommodate the parties and still have a sensible plan for future development. Is there an agreement on the part of Councilor Ripma to do that?

Councilor Ripma stated I pledge to make a motion along those lines asking staff to come back with something as soon as we dispose of this one. I am not pledging to vote for it, I will pledge to make that motion.

Mayor Thalhoffer called for the vote on the motion.

YEAS: 7
NAYS: 0
ABSTAINED: 0

MOTION: Councilor Ripma moved to direct staff to come back to us for further consideration the remainder of the Planning Commission's recommendation for further discussion and consideration by the Council in one month. Seconded by Mayor Thalhoffer.

Councilor Ripma stated I promised to propose a motion but I did not promise to support it. I personally do not favor the rest of the roads. If the rest of the Council wants to direct staff to come back and consider it, okay. To respond to your proposal to meet with the property owners, they did meet with the Handy's and the Handy's came up and said they didn't want it. They said they met with Mr. Wolsborn and it sounded vague, he choose not to come this evening but he did testify at the last meeting that he didn't want that road. As for Mr. Cerruti it is obvious that he didn't want the road. I don't see what benefit would come from additional meetings with those folks, but that is my opinion.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated I have never seen a problem yet that couldn't get worked out with people that have open minds and who want to work out a compromise. I think when people sit down and talk they can accomplish a lot. If the Council wants to make the decisions as to what roads we should have as the development comes up then that is the way you can vote on it. To me it seems like we need to have a blue print for these roads and guide development.

Councilor Thompson stated Mr. Mayor I agree with you that the planning needs to be done but I can count the votes on the Council and there is no point in wasting the Councils time

looking at roads that they are not going to vote for anyway.

Councilor Rabe stated I agree with Councilor Thompson. I am opposed to the Halsey Loop and I will have faith in the planning of the McMenemy's project. I don't know why we would need any kind of connector down to the north end of Historic Columbia Highway.

Councilor Daoust stated I think the work that staff did and presented was adequate. I don't desire to go and ask staff to do more. The only negotiations that were made were with current land owners, we keep making the argument of what if the current land owners sell then we would be dealing with different land owners. To come back with more negotiations with current land owners to make me feel better about those roads that are proposed, I don't think that would move me much. I have oppositions to the roads regardless of what the land owners would say they would like to do or not do.

Councilor Smith stated I don't like the idea of Marine Drive coming up through the middle of a residential area. I don't think two weeks is going to make a difference one way or the other.

YEAS: 1
NAYS: 6 (Ripma, Thompson, Kight, Rabe, Daoust, Smith)
ABSTAINED: 0

Faith stated there is one thing that we as staff need specific direction on and that is the Marine Drive extension, which is still on the County's Capital Improvement Plan and on the Metro plan. What we need to know is if you want us to express the Council's opposition to that connection so that we are on record opposing that and we can begin to put the wheels in motion for that to die.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated that is an issue that we can debate further.

Faith replied than that is an issue that we can bring back at a future meeting.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated lets put it on the next agenda.

5. DEPARTMENT REPORTS

Mayor Thalhoffer called on the Department Directors.

Department Directors had no additional comment to add to their reports.

Council had no questions.

6. COUNCIL CONCERNS AND INITIATIVES

Mayor Thalhoffer called this item.

Councilor Ripma stated the Troutdale Historical Society is holding our Annual Tea and Tour on Saturday May 6th. On Jun 7th the Troutdale Poor Farm wine is going to be released. McMenemy's is releasing the first wine made from grapes grown in Troutdale.

Councilor Rabe stated I want to invite those in the community to participate in the Earth Day clean-up.

Councilor Daoust stated the Troutdale Lions Club is sponsoring a 10K run and walk on Saturday May 13th.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Thalhofer called this item.

MOTION: Councilor Smith moved to adjourn the meeting. Councilor Thompson seconded the motion.


**YEAS: 7
NAYS: 0
ABSTAINED: 0**

Meeting was adjourned at 10:21pm


Paul Thalhofer, Mayor

Dated: 6-15-00

ATTEST:


Debbie Stickney, City Recorder

CITY OF TROUTDALE

PUBLIC ATTENDANCE RECORD

April 25, 2000
CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING

PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING

NAME <input type="checkbox"/> (please print) <input type="checkbox"/>	ADDRESS	PHONE #
Norma Thomas	2751 SW Clark Ct Troutdale	662-4320
LAUREN Judd	726 SE 17th Troutdale	667-2700
Jennifer Wynn	2611 SE Lewellyn, Troutdale	666-5219
Elizabeth Goodrick	1437 SE 29th Ct Troutdale	661-0204
Jeff Sturges	1601 S.W. Sturges Dr	665-4896
Dorothy Sturges	1603 SW Sturges Rd.	666-9601
Dave Sturges	1601 SW Sturges DR	665-4896
Pamela Rostek ARIK	424 NE 44 Alder	236-2471
Shannon O'Donnel	4022 SE Lenore Circle	666-5067
Alicia McInroe	4201 SE TOPAZ Ct.	667-9575
Tyson Estoc	2741 SW Campy Club ave	667-2110
Toni Lillybrook	2012 SE Montmore Way	492-9153
Wapa Schutte	2003 SW Sturges Ln.	666-5759
RENEE SCHMIDLING	1972 SE THOMPSON Rd	665-1996
KEITH+SUE G-LURIC	1773 SW DAYBARA WAY	667-9179
Rob Klug	1160 SW Park Lane	492-4208

