



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

Mayor

Paul Thalhofer

City Council

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

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

- (A) 1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, ROLL CALL, AGENDA UPDATE
- (A) 2. CONSENT AGENDA:
 - 2.1 **Accept Minutes:** June 13, 2000 Regular Council meeting and June 27, 2000 Regular Council meeting.
 - 2.2 **Approve Business Licenses:** Month of June 2000
 - 2.3 **Resolution:** A Resolution accepting an easement from Reynolds Metals Company in Tax Lot 1N3E24C 1200 for the Water Pollution Control Facility Conveyance Pipelines.
 - 2.4 **Resolution:** A Resolution accepting a temporary construction easement from Nouri Development, Inc. in Tax Lot 1N3E25B 0800 for the Water Pollution Control Facility Conveyance Pipelines.
 - 2.5 **Resolution:** A Resolution accepting a public access easement in fulfillment of approval conditions for the plat of Bellingham Park.
 - 2.6 **Resolution:** A Resolution adopting the City of Troutdale's Annual Waste Reduction Plan for Year 11 (Fiscal Year 2000-2001).
- (I) 3. PUBLIC COMMENT: Please restrict comments to non-agenda items at this time.
- (A) 4. RESOLUTION: A Resolution granting specific exceptions to the City of Troutdale construction standards for public works facilities, for SE 2nd Street East of SE Kibling Avenue. Hultin
- (A) 5. RESOLUTION: A Resolution concerning a Public Art Acquisition Policy. Lantz
- (A) 6. RESOLUTION: A Resolution approving an Intergovernmental Agreement between Multnomah County and the City of Troutdale for the Stark Street Turn Lane Project. Galloway
- (A) 7. PUBLIC HEARING / ORDINANCE (Introduced 6/27/00): An Ordinance amending section 2.08.240, Council Expenses, of the Troutdale Municipal Code. Councilor Ripma

- (A) 8. **PUBLIC HEARING / ORDINANCE (Introduction):** An Ordinance annexing certain property; amending the City of Troutdale Comprehensive Plan Map; amending the City of Troutdale Zoning District Map. Faith
- (A) 9. **PUBLIC HEARING / ORDINANCE (Introduction):** Troutdale Comprehensive Land Use Plan Text Amendment No. 21 and Troutdale Development Code Text Amendment No. 28 pertaining to amendments to implement the standards of Title 3 of Metro's Urban Growth Management Functional Plan. McCallum
- (A) 10. **PUBLIC HEARING / ORDINANCE (Introduction):** An Ordinance adopting Chapter 5.20, Franchise Requirements of the Troutdale Municipal Code, regulating the use of public rights-of-way in the City, and repealing Chapter 5.16 of the Troutdale Municipal Code. Galloway
- (A) 11. **PUBLIC HEARING / ORDINANCE (Introduction):** An Ordinance requiring criminal history record checks on all city volunteers. Chief Nelson
- (I) 12. **PRESENTATION:** Trolley Committee Mayor Thalhofer
- (I) 13. **DEPARTMENT REPORTS:**
- | | |
|----------------------------|------------------|
| 13.1 Finance | <u>Wiesinger</u> |
| 13.2 Public Safety | <u>Nelson</u> |
| 13.3 Community Development | <u>Faith</u> |
| 13.4 Public Works | <u>Galloway</u> |
| 13.5 City Attorney | <u>Sercombe</u> |
| 13.6 Executive | <u>Kvarsten</u> |
- (I) 14. **COUNCIL CONCERNS AND INITIATIVES**
- (A) 15. **ADJOURNMENT**


Paul Thalhofer, Mayor

Dated: 7-19-00

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

July 25, 2000 7:00pm

Meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m. by Mayor Thalhofer.

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, ROLL CALL, AGENDA UPDATE

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

PRESENT: Smith, Ripma, Thompson, Kight, Rabe, Daoust, Thalhofer.

STAFF: Faith, Galloway, Hultin, Lantz, McCallum, Nelson, Wiesinger, Allen, Kvarsten, Stickney.

GUESTS: Nancy Conrath, Paul Owens, Richard Anderson, Rip Caswell, Jack Glass, Brenda Bernards, Ray Valone, Greg Peart, Glenn White, Diane White, Rod Park.

Mayor Thalhofer asked are there any agenda updates?

Kvarsten replied we have two items to add to the consent agenda. Item #2.7 approval of a liquor license application from Troutdale Bar and Grill. Item #2.8 Resolution authorizing the Mayor to enter into an Intergovernmental Agreement with Multnomah County for the Community Development Block Grant Program and Home Investment Partnership Program for the program years 2001-2003. That concludes our changes this evening.

2. CONSENT AGENDA:

- 2.1 Accept Minutes:** June 13, 2000 Regular Council meeting and June 27, 2000 Regular Council meeting.
- 2.2 Approve Business Licenses:** Month of June 2000
- 2.3 Resolution:** A Resolution accepting an easement from Reynolds Metals Company in Tax Lot 1N3E24C 1200 for the Water Pollution Control Facility Conveyance Pipelines.
- 2.4 Resolution:** A Resolution accepting a temporary construction easement from Nouri Development, Inc. in Tax Lot 1N3E25B 0800 for the Water Pollution Control Facility Conveyance Pipelines.
- 2.5 Resolution:** A Resolution accepting a public access easement in fulfillment of approval conditions for the plat of Bellingham Park.
- 2.6 Resolution:** A Resolution adopting the City of Troutdale's Annual Waste Reduction Plan for Year 11 (Fiscal Year 2000-2001).

Mayor Thalhofer called this item and read the consent agenda.

MOTION: Councilor Thompson moved adoption of the consent agenda with the addition of Agenda Item 2.7 and 2.8. Seconded by Councilor Kight.

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

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

Mayor Thalhofer called this item.

Jack Glass stated I am a resident of Troutdale and a business owner. We have an event coming up, River Safety Day. This is scheduled for July 30th. It was held last year and we would like to have the event again this year. We were looking for additional parking spaces because last year there was some difficulty with the traffic, it was a much bigger event than anticipated. We are looking at parking vehicles at various places and shuttling them in, much like SummerFest and the Blues and Brews events. We were looking at possibly using the cul-de-sac turnaround for the future site of the new city hall which has been used for a parking site before, and then we would use a shuttle bus to take the people to the park. The event will probably be equal in size to last year. I am coming to the Council to ask permission to use that site for parking.

Mayor Thalhofer stated it is not our normal procedure to make decisions during the public comment section of our agenda. You are trying to take care of a real problem that you had with this event last year and with the consent of the Council I would like to get the Council's view on this.

Jack Glass stated we weren't sure the event was even going to happen this year until just 2 -3 weeks ago.

Tom from KMUZ Radio Station. We are not only asking permission for parking, but also permission to charge for parking to cover some of our costs. We are planning on making a \$1 per car contribution back to either the Parks and Recreation or to the Life Guard Program, otherwise it is a free event. We need to pay for the bus and insurance.

Councilor Rabe asked is the music going to be turned off earlier than last year?

Tom replied it was off at 8:00pm last year.

Councilor Rabe voiced concerns regarding the number of facilities, port-o-potties?

Tom replied we had none last year, we will be putting up 12 port-o-potties this year and we will be moving the food booths to the parking lot. We will also have twelve security people.

Councilor Rabe stated last year there were residents in that vicinity that were offended by the decibel of the music.

Tom replied it is no louder than the Blues Festival music and was probably less.

Glass stated we didn't have the issues with blowing the circuit breakers like the Blues Festival had.

Councilor Daoust asked you are paying for liability insurance.

Tom said yes.

Councilor Daoust stated I think it is a worthwhile community event and myself, I don't see a problem with using the parking area that we have available and allowing you to charge to help recover your costs.

Councilor Ripma asked are you aware that the City only owns about half of that property, Frank Windust owns the rest, have you made arrangements with him?

Glass stated I am aware of that. I have not talked with him yet, but I know that needs to be addressed.

Councilor Ripma asked the City Attorney, can we do this? Can we allow private group to use city land and charge?

Allen stated I am not aware of anything that would prohibit you from doing that. There are really two issues; 1) enforcement and understanding that the City is not to enforce and collect that fee; 2) the City can't give permission to use and charge a fee for property that doesn't belong to the city.

Councilor Ripma stated as far as using the city vacant land for parking for the event, if it is okay for the city to allow that use, I wouldn't have a problem with it.

Allen stated what the Council might consider doing is require them to enter into an agreement with the City whereby they would name the city as an additional insurer on the policy they are taking out.

Tom stated I don't object to doing that, I will check with our controller tomorrow.

Councilor Thompson stated I have no problem with them using the city property or charging a fee.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated I also do not have a problem with using the property. I am a little concerned with charging a parking fee. There are other people who will be wanting to use the park that will not be going there for the concert, it would be unfair to charge them. I think you ought to charge for the event.

Tom stated we want to see it more as a fund raiser and a listener appreciation day.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated we would certainly expect you to clean-up after the event.

Glass stated that will be taken care of.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated before we do this again, I think the Council needs to hold a work session to determine how we are going to handle these types of events in the future.

Councilor Kight stated one of the issues last year was the noise volume. Since that time the city has passed a noise ordinance and you might want to take a look at it and how it affects your event. I had neighbors calling and complaining about the noise last year. The other issue is that the park is a small park, the actual use area is probably less than two acres. Last year there was a lot of people

there and is there a capacity to a park like there is a capacity to anything else so you don't have derogation to the park. We acknowledge that you will clean-up the debris but the grass and plant areas get trampled when you get 6,000 in that park. The other concern is the number of port-o-potties, I am not comfortable with one port-o-potty for every 500 people. I would think you would have at least double that amount. With parking on the grass area, I would like you to check the grass height because we don't want a problem with a vehicle starting a fire. I am concerned about charging for parking, I am not real comfortable with that. In the future we will want to take a look at that. The last issue is with Jackson Park Road, we want to make sure attendees do not park on that road. Maybe we could barricade the street.

Glass replied I could look into additional port-o-potties.

Councilor Daoust stated the Council has some real valid concerns and I am beginning to wonder, given all the community events we have, what is the proper role of the Council when it comes to community events. I don't recall the SummerFest group coming to the Council and asking for permission on anything, or the Ice Cream Social or Harvest Fair committees. I am not raising that as an objection to our discussion, but it does raise the question of whether we are giving these guys the impression that they have to come to the Council to have their plans given the stamp of approval. I am asking for clarification of the Council's role on community events.

Glass stated I want to come to the City Council and make you aware of the event and any input is valid. I don't feel that we are being imposed upon that we have to do this.

Tom stated we are comparing apples to oranges here. At the Ice Cream Social where you might get a couple hundred people versus what the power of our radio station can do.

Councilor Smith stated Councilor Daoust I think our problem is that the Ice Cream Social and these other events do not bring the number of people that this event brought in. I think we are concerned with what our facility can handle. I think it is a problem and we need to address it.

City Council discussed the insurance issue and decided to have the Radio Station work out the insurance policy issues with our City Attorney.

MOTION: Councilor Kight moved that Jack Glass and his organization have access to the city property and that he meet the following conditions: that he has an insurance policy that meets the approval of our City Attorney as well as our Finance Director; clean-up of the site and leaving it in the same condition; that the grass is cut to such a length that it doesn't come into contact with the bottom side of vehicles on July 30, 2000. Seconded by Councilor Ripma.

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

Al Hayward congratulated the City and the Chamber of Commerce on the fine event that they had this past weekend on the opening of the National Scenic Highway. I have a photo of the event that I would like to donate to you.

4. RESOLUTION: A Resolution granting specific exceptions to the City of Troutdale construction standards for public works facilities, for SE 2nd Street East of SE Kibling Avenue.

Mayor Thalhofer called this item.

Travis Hultin reviewed the staff report contained in the packet.

Councilor Rabe asked do you feel that the bank on the south side will be able to be stabilized enough.

Hultin replied yes, the bank on the south side, which is the Windust property, actually lies outside of the right-of-way. The area where there would be construction on the south side is fairly flat.

Councilor Rabe stated it looks like the road bed is going to be 100' and then it goes to 110' on the bulb.

Hultin replied I was looking at the straight portion of the street. A couple of clarifications there, the property to the south of the bulb is not owned by Mr. Windust but the property owner there and his business partner have indicated that they intend to improve that in the near future which will include leveling out that property.

Councilor Rabe asked so you feel comfortable even if they do not pursue that improvement, that the slope will be stable enough?

Hultin replied yes. If we start the improvements ahead of the development we would coordinate with them to lay back that slope temporarily until they make their improvements.

Councilor Ripma stated it is the unusual topography that requires this. The fact that the street can't go through, there is no place for it to go. Would you say that is a reason that this doesn't establish a bad precedent of reducing our standards?

Hultin replied yes. This situation we are looking at is a retrofit essentially. If you were looking at a new subdivision being built on a large vacant piece of property there is a lot more freedom with the right-of-way dedications that you can ask for. If we were to ask for anymore right-of-way dedication in this situation, it would inhibit the owners ability to develop that property. 70' is really pushing it as it is to get a cul-de-sac into this location. I think the fact that it is a retrofit really justifies the exception to the standard.

Councilor Ripma asked the property to the south side is developed also, isn't it?

Hultin replied it previously had a home on it that has since been demolished and is being prepared for new development.

Councilor Ripma asked is there any reason why, since it is a vacant lot, that we couldn't require the same dedications and standards that other parts of the city are required.

Hultin replied we have discussed this with the property owner and some of the land use staff and

I think everybody agreed if we were to try to go to a 80' cul-de-sac there wouldn't be enough usable land in that lot to build any kind of worthwhile development at least in the respect that the owner wishes to develop it.

Councilor Ripma asked what is the plan.

Hultin replied I believe they plan on building town houses but you should speak to the owner.

Councilor Ripma asked is that what is triggering this?

Hultin replied no, it is really an ongoing effort by the Public Works Department to finish out our down town streets that have been unimproved.

Councilor Ripma asked could a house be built there?

Hultin replied you should direct that question to a land use planners.

Councilor Ripma stated you offer as a reason for reducing our standards is that the land can't be developed the way the owner wants it developed. That is relevant to why we are waiving the standards isn't it? What persuaded you that this was justified?

Hultin replied essentially we are trying to meet the desires of all the stakeholders involved in the project. We have three abutting property owners there. If we were to say it has to be 80' or nothing, we are definitely not going to get a consensus from one of those property owners and that would give us a situation where one-third of the property owners are not in consensus with our plans. Considering the small number of people that are served by this street, we wouldn't feel that it would be a worthwhile project at that point.

Councilor Ripma stated with every development there are property owners that have plans and they would rather, in some cases, shave off some of the requirements. The fact that they would prefer to not put in sidewalks or greenspace or setbacks that is usually not offered as a reason for waiving the requirement. Would it be in our right to require the street to be put in in the normal way.

Hultin stated again you are getting into some land use issues. The question would be, could you require that property owner to dedicate the necessary right-of-way. At this point and time they are proposing to willingly grant us the right-of-way that we would need to construct this cul-de-sac.

Councilor Ripma stated I agree with your willingness to accommodate the people, I just don't want us establishing a bad precedent. If we are making this unusual accommodation simply because he wants to put in more units, that usually isn't the kind of reason that we use to justify waiving our requirements. I am concerned that is the reason that you are advancing here.

Galloway replied I think, Councilor Ripma, the big concern is the topography. Just to add one more aspect that hasn't been mentioned yet. We currently have 60' of right-of-way, the standard would be for 80' of pavement. The property owner to the south side has already agreed to grant an additional 10' that brings us to 70'. One could logically say that perhaps the property owner to the north should come up with the other 10'. I think you can see from the constraints that we have on

the north side with the existing structure that physically it would be impossible. I think that is one of the big conditions why this is probably different from anything else. As Travis mentioned it is a retrofit, we are trying to meet an existing right-of-way, existing property lines, existing buildings, wishes of only three property owners, a street that is not going to become a through street. It seems that if there was a situation where we would be accurate in allowing a reduction in our standards, this might be it. There are only three properties that are, or probably ever would be, served by this. One property owner is giving what he probably feels is his fair share, it would be infeasible to ask the property owner to the north to contribute a like share.

Councilor Kight stated I could have a potential conflict of interest. I own a piece of commercial property immediately to the south. My property abuts the property that abuts up to the bulb.

Allen stated will the decision that you make could affect the value of your property?

Councilor Kight replied I don't think in this particular case it would, I just wanted to make that public knowledge.

Allen stated what I hear you saying is you are declaring a potential conflict of interest which doesn't preclude you from deliberating the matter.

Councilor Kight stated I, like Councilor Ripma, am concerned about folks that have taken down a single family home to put in town houses. In front of the Windust property do we not have sidewalks?

Hultin replied the block that is shown on this map which is east of Kibling, there are currently no sidewalks on either side. The sidewalk only goes as far as the driveway that leads into the existing Windust development.

Councilor Kight asked do you have any idea how many town houses he plans on putting in there? I ask because of the capacity problem with parking because I notice as one of the conditions there would be no parking in the bulb of the cul-de-sac, is that correct?

Hultin replied that is correct. I believe it is going to be three, you may wish to ask the owner that.

Councilor Kight asked the property as it drops off to the east is very steep slope, it has been stable. What are you going to do to make sure there isn't any disturbance of that area?

Hultin replied that will be part of the design analysis.

Paul Owens stated I am working with the property owner on developing the property for three town houses.

Allen advised the City Council that you need to be careful if you are going to hear testimony related to a land use application that may come before you because that would be an ex-parte contact. Certainly you can get information related to this request on the road, but I would advise that you avoid getting into details about the future development.

Council had no question of Mr. Owens.

MOTION: Councilor Daoust moved to adopt the Resolution granting specific exceptions to the City of Troutdale construction standards for the public works facilities, for SE 2nd Street east of SE Kibling Avenue. Seconded by Councilor Rabe.

Councilor Daoust stated I think there are very few case by case situations where I feel the Council can address exceptions and I think on this particular case I am willing to grant exceptions based on common sense and on topography because I see no need for sidewalks plus there is no room for landscaping.

Councilor Rabe stated it is a good project and it needs to be done.

Councilor Smith stated since it is a short street that is not going anywhere and there is no room for sidewalks, I would be in favor of it.

Councilor Ripma stated I agree with Councilor Daoust that this is a very exceptional situation. I support the resolution

Councilor Thompson stated I support the resolution and agree that this is a time when the standards can be relaxed in this situation.

Mayor Thalhofer stated I think this is a common sense solution to the difficult problem.

Councilor Kight stated I favor this motion.

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

Mayor Thalhofer called for a break at 8:30pm and reconvened the meeting at 8:37pm.

5. RESOLUTION: A Resolution concerning a Public Art Acquisition Policy.

Mayor Thalhofer read the Resolution.

Valerie Lantz stated about a year ago the Council asked the Parks Advisory Committee to discuss and come up with some recommendations on a public arts policy. One of the benefits of the recent growth in the city is that we even needed to consider that. We have had some recent donations to the city and staff didn't really have a process to review those. With me this evening is Nancy Conrath, she is a representative from East Metro Arts and Culture Council. She was very instrumental in helping our committee go through and discuss and identify some of the issues. She also helped draft the language reflecting the discussions that came out of the Parks Advisory Committee. It has been reviewed by the committee and is now before you for action.

Councilor Daoust asked on the second page of the resolution, the second bullet from the bottom,

it says "if the proposal is funding for a proposed acquisition, a call for artist or invitation to artist to participate shall be developed and publicized". What if we have a local artist that develops something and part of the package is that the city puts up a certain portion of the cost, does that mean that we have to go out and invite other artist to propose the same type of art structure?

Conrath replied it depends who is funding the proposal. If you received a grant, then you would have to make that open to all artists to compete. If the city decided that you wanted a Rip Caswell sculpture with money that you are putting out, then you would be selecting. There would be opportunities for you to select for specific purposes.

Councilor Ripma stated the way it is written it looks to me like you would have to go out for a call for artists.

Lantz stated I think the difference is if it is an item that is being offered for donation, this policy sets up a process where a committee would be reviewing it and making recommendations. If it is a funding issue then it is opened up for competition.

Councilor Thompson stated in the section mobility and de-accession it says "art works no longer deemed appropriate to specific sites and for which no alternative site has been determined may be de-accessed and sold, donated or removed by resurfacing".

Conrath stated this is another feature of most public art policies. There needs to be, because at some point you end up with a rather large collection of art work, you need to be able to place it somewhere else, remove or sell it.

Councilor Thompson asked can you give it back to the artist?

Conrath replied if they are still living.

Councilor Kight asked I am curious what triggered this resolution. How many art pieces do we have?

Lantz replied less than 10.

Rip Caswell stated I have somewhat of a vested interest in this. Although I appreciate the process of the public art acquisition in other cities, I feel we have a unique situation going on here. So far we have four pieces of bronzes that the city owns. Their value is \$78,000 in the current market. The city has paid approximately \$6,000 to acquire these pieces. If this was to go out for a call for artists, how would the funding be established. I guess what I am saying, normally in a process like this the city would say we want a piece of art in this location and we have \$10,000 to spend. That would go out to artists and they are not bidding on the piece for the price, it is bidding on concept. We have been able to acquire some significant art at some exceptional prices, which I think just because we have an interest in our city and want to see it develop and prosper. I understand why if there is that process that you have a budget that should go out to all the artists and it should all come together with different proposals and different ideas so that we have diversity. But I would hate to see the process that we have had to this point be stopped. I am still not clear if that would have been allowed under this wording. The other part that I have concerns about is, with the significant amount of art that the city has acquired, if that was sold, I personally would be very

offended. I would like the opportunity to purchase it back for what the city paid for it. I would plead with the Council to take a look at the wording and the ramifications of this wording and put it in the intent that I think was meant to be and allow for flexibility to continue on with the process that we have had in the past, to encourage the possible gifts that we have had. I think it would be wonderful if the city at some point does see it fit to allocate funds towards more public art.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked Val Lantz, Rip Caswell is probably one of our leading artists in our community, was he involved in this, didn't you consult him or other artists in the community. It seems to me that everyone involved should have sought the advice or input of Rip Caswell and other artists. I would suggest that you do that before we proceed with this. Would you be willing to do that?

Lantz replied yes.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated with the consent of the Council I would like to refer this back to the Parks Advisory Committee with the instruction that you consult the artists in our community, at least some of them including Rip Caswell, and then bring it back to us.

Council agreed.

6. RESOLUTION: A Resolution approving an Intergovernmental Agreement between Multnomah County and the City of Troutdale for the Stark Street Turn Lane Project.

Mayor Thalhoffer read the Resolution title.

Galloway reviewed the staff report contained in the packet.

Councilor Rabe asked this is a left turn lane, will it be for both sides, east and west bound?

Galloway replied yes.

Councilor Rabe asked is there going to be a signal light?

Galloway replied I don't think the traffic warrants a signal light.

Councilor Daoust asked so this will create a bulge in Stark Street that would go to the south just long enough to incorporate a left turn lane?

Galloway replied that is correct.

Councilor Daoust asked is that within the current right-of-way that Multnomah County has?

Galloway replied yes.

Councilor Daoust asked so the City of Gresham is not involved with this at all?

Galloway replied based on our last change, no.

Councilor Rabe asked will this include a crosswalk?

Galloway replied certainly not a lighted pedestrian crosswalk.

Councilor Ripma asked the County was going to eventually widen Stark Street and include a left turn lane weren't they?

Galloway replied yes. The project to do that between 257th and Troutdale Road was imminent years ago and is even further away now because of the funding situation that the County finds itself in.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked is there anyway you can get street lights there?

Galloway replied as you may recall at the September meeting last year when this issue came up also I think the issue of the fact that stretch of Stark is dark also came up. On separate action we asked the Mid County Lighting District to look at additional street lighting. They have agreed to do so. It is an issue where they turn to PGE to make those improvements. It is still planned, I just can't give you a date.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked is there anyway we can push PGE?

Galloway stated I can certainly try. But frankly giving the other ways that they can use their forces to make money, putting up one or two light poles is probably not a high priority for them.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated it is a high priority to us, it is a matter of public safety. I think we need to remind them it is a high priority to us for that reason.

Galloway stated I will work with the County folks and PGE and see if we can speed that up.

Councilor Kight stated what bothers me about this, and I think we would all agree that the project needs to happen, but what I worry about is that we are setting a dangerous policy precedent by totally fronting 100% improvements to a county road and they in turn shift that money to other projects in East Multnomah County. In the future when Troutdale wants to go to the county and ask for projects they are going to say they don't have any money. We could end up funding county roads and paying for it out of SDC's or another fund that we may have available. This bothers me. Is there a possibility that we could draw up an agreement with Multnomah County saying that we would front the money for the project and that in the future they should pay a portion if not all of the costs to make this improvement?

Galloway replied I haven't explored that in the particular context that you gave it. I did initiate discussions with Multnomah County on the basis of, we would like to get this done, will you do it. The response I received from the staff at the County, not the elected officials, the answer came back as no, we don't have the money and it is not that high on our priority list. Then I tried the approach of what if we do some matching funds perhaps 50/50, and I got the same answer, no we don't have the money.

Councilor Kight stated considering the transportation needs that Multnomah County has, and I speak specifically to the bridges in Portland, they could be saying they don't have any money for the next

25 years. I would ask the Council if we couldn't negotiate from another prospective and that is reimbursement should funds become available. The other question is, that is only a two lane road and how do you plan on having a turnout, are you going to pave further over towards the edge of the road. How is that going to be handled?

Galloway replied I think all of the widening would probably occur to the south.

MOTION: Councilor Daoust moved to adopt the Resolution approving an IGA between Multnomah County and the City of Troutdale for the Stark Street Turn Lane Project. Seconded by Councilor Thompson.

Councilor Daoust stated in my mind this is one of the top projects safety wise that the City needs to look at. It would have been better if Multnomah County paid there share of it, but I think if we approach them and say we will loan you the money and you can pay it back when you want to or when you are able to, I think we would get the same answer. This is high on my list of safety concerns within the entire city and I am willing to use our SDC's to accomplish this project.

Councilor Thompson stated I agree with Councilor Daoust. This is a project that is needed, it is a safety hazard and it needs to be rectified. Obviously Multnomah County doesn't have the money and if we can fund it with our SDC's, although I would envision better projects for it, but this is needed so badly that I think we should do it.

Councilor Rabe stated I would agree. I realize that this is a county road, but I think the city needs to step up to the plate here and take care of a safety hazard and if we can write the document so that maybe some day we will get paid back, that would be nice but I don't have much hope for that.

Councilor Smith stated I would favor it, but we probably won't get our money back. If we wait for them to do the project it may take forever. In the meantime there are problems there, it is a hazard and with that in mind I would go along with it.

Councilor Ripma stated I agree and I also share Councilor Kight's concern about a precedent about funding 100% of a project on a county road that they should have completed years ago. The reasons that I can favor going ahead with this project is primarily that it is a modest amount of money for real safety hazard. I am also persuaded by funding with the SDC's, that it is an appropriate use of the SDC's. For those reasons I think it is exceptional and I can favor this.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated I am in favor of this project. It is a very dangerous and dark area. We also need street lights there right away.

Councilor Kight stated I am going to support this project mainly because of the safety factor. I would like to ask Mr. Galloway, if at the very least he could maybe make a request to consider the idea of reimbursing us in the future. I agree that the project should go forward and if we wait for the County it would be many years

before they get to it.

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

7. PUBLIC HEARING / ORDINANCE (Introduced 6/27/00): An Ordinance amending section 2.08.240, Council Expenses, of the Troutdale Municipal Code.

Mayor Thalhofer read the Ordinance title, closed the City Council meeting and opened the Public Hearing at 9:40pm.

Councilor Ripma read the report he prepared (a copy is in the packet).

Council had no questions.

Mayor Thalhofer asked if there was anyone who would like to speak to us on this issue?

No public comment.

Mayor Thalhofer closed the Public Hearing at 9:43pm.

MOTION: Councilor Ripma moved to adopt the Ordinance amending section 2.08.240, Council Expenses, of the Troutdale Municipal Code. Seconded by Councilor Kight.

Councilor Kight stated I think the best way to reimburse expenses is receipt driven. I think this is the fairest way for all people concerned.

Councilor Rabe stated after reviewing the material provided and consulting with people from the city plus other cities and they felt the reimbursement procedure seem to be the most appropriate method. I would support this and that you should be reimbursed for that which you have spent.

Councilor Daoust stated the \$600 a month is not a salary it is an average reimbursement for expenses related to city business. For a long time the Budget Committee and City Council together have determined that this is indeed the average monthly amount for reimbursement of expenses. For all those years it has been determined by the Council and Budget Committee that this has been an acceptable way and in fact it is in our budget document that we voted for as a council. I think it is more of a process thing that I am objecting to. I certainly don't object to submitting receipts for expenses, I am objecting to the process. I am not going to support the motion. I think the Budget Committee should review the budget decisions that they have made since 1983 to have this monthly stipend for the mayor, that way they could address another old ordinance that is on the books since 1968 that addresses reimbursement and just handle the whole thing at once.

Councilor Smith stated I feel that with all the meetings that are going on today that our councilors are putting in a lot of hours besides the regular Council meeting. Things are getting a lot more complicated. As far as the Budget Committee is concerned, I feel this is a Council matter. If everyone is on equal footing there is a lot less problems, if we all have to submit mileage and receipts for meals. We are all working people and you have to take off during the day to attend meetings, I think it covers more than just the mayor, I think it covers the councilors also and with that in mind I support the motion.

Councilor Thompson stated I am not going to support this ordinance because I think the arrangement for the Mayor has been equitable for all these years. If the Mayor gets a little more then his expenses are, so be it. He puts in a lot of extra time that Councilors don't. His duties comprise a lot more then the City Council does. He has to perform those mayor duties in spite of his own business, it is bound to make his business hurt. If he can make a claim for reimbursement under the article relating to lost wages, I don't think we need that, I think the \$600 a month stipend is good enough. I am not going to support this ordinance.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated I want everyone to understand this is not a salary, some people think it is a salary, I guess it was in the paper that way. It is not, it is like a car allowance. In my view it is a solution looking for a problem. (Mayor read a memo he prepared which is contained in the packet)

YEAS: 4
NAYS: 3 (Daoust, Thompson, Thalhoffer)
ABSTAINED: 0

8. PUBLIC HEARING / ORDINANCE (Introduction): An Ordinance annexing certain property; amending the City of Troutdale Comprehensive Plan Map; amending the City of Troutdale Zoning District Map.

Mayor Thalhoffer read the Ordinance title and closed the City Council meeting and opened the Public Hearing at 9:50pm

Faith reviewed the staff report contained in the packet.

Council had no questions.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked is there anyone else who would like to speak to us on this issue?

No public testimony received.

Mayor Thalhoffer closed the public hearing and reconvened the Council meeting at 9:58pm and stated that this is the first reading of this ordinance, a second public hearing will be held on August 22, 2000.

9. PUBLIC HEARING / ORDINANCE (Introduction): Troutdale Comprehensive Land Use Plan Text Amendment No. 21 and Troutdale Development Code Text Amendment No. 28 pertaining to amendments to implement the standards of Title 3 of Metro's Urban Growth Management functional Plan.

Mayor Thalhoffer read the Ordinance title, closed the City Council meeting and opened the Public Hearing at 9:59pm.

Councilor Kight asked the City Attorney, I have a potential conflict of interest and ask for clarification. I own a piece of property adjacent to Beaver Creek.

Allen stated as legal counsel for the city, it is my understanding that you have an actual conflict of interest because you own property that has a water resource on it and therefore your property and development of your property would be restricted and it is reasonable to conclude that the financial value of the property could be affected. We would recommend that you declare the actual conflict and not participate in deliberations or the decision.

Councilor Kight stated I am declaring a conflict of interest so at this time I will step down.

Councilor Ripma stated I likewise have been advised that since I am a trustee of the Vera Strebin Trust which leases land from Metro along Beaver Creek that I have an actual conflict of interest also and I am going to step down. I would also ask if I could be excused from the rest of the meeting.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated I see no reason why not. Councilor Kight would you also like to be excused for the evening?

Councilor Kight replied yes.

Beth McCallum introduced Ray Valone and Brenda Bernards of Metro. McCallum reviewed the staff report contained in the packet.

Councilor Rabe asked this has been submitted to Metro for review and has come back to you as largely being in compliance?

McCallum replied yes.

Councilor Rabe asked the storm water, we are in compliance there?

McCallum replied Metro Title 3 does not require at this time a storm water aspect. We already have a storm water aspect and we are just building on that in respect to proper erosion control.

Councilor Daoust asked we are not dealing with the State Wide Planning Goal 5, the safe harbor provisions at this point?

McCallum replied yes, we have introduced this in this amendment because our standards did touch on them. Metro Title 3 does not touch on Goal 5, but our standards do and as I understood the State Wide Planning Goal provisions, if we open any standard that related to Goal 5 that we, even

though we are not in periodic review, had a responsibility to look at what we needed to revise at this particular moment to make Goal 5 in more compliance. That is my understanding, so we do touch on that. Where we touch on that is with respect to a minimum starting setback from the Sandy River of 75'. Our current standard is only 50' and it is in non-compliance with the safe harbor provision. Metro's Title 3 standard is based upon a vegetation corridor with a minimum setback beginning at 50' and going up to a maximum of 200', we already have provisions in our code that if you have a slope of 25% or greater, we are not allowed to develop on that slope. In that respect we have a proposed standard that would be more restrictive in some instances when the slope adjacent to the Sandy River exceeds 25% beyond Metro's 200' but the beginning point is a minimum of 75' to be in compliance with Goal 5.

Councilor Daoust asked will we have to address in the future the State Wide Planning Goal 5?

McCallum replied yes.

Councilor Daoust asked do our standards that we have in front of us meet the minimum requirements for compliance with Metro Title 3, do any of them exceed Metro's requirements?

McCallum replied the proposed standards all meet them and where they exceed is the beginning point for the vegetation corridor with the Sandy River and the applicability to slopes at 25% and greater outside of what Metro has defined as a vegetation corridor. Metro does not address slopes outside of areas related to protected water features, whether they are secondary or primary protected water features. Our code already does address slopes outside of these areas and we are continuing on with that.

Councilor Daoust asked so the proposal here is more restrictive you said to the starting point?

McCallum replied not the starting point, the minimum width of the vegetation corridor such as with the Sandy River, under our proposal it would be 75', under Metro Title 3 it would be 50', which is our current standard now.

Councilor Daoust asked could you explain why we would desire to exceed Metro Title 3 in regards to that?

McCallum replied because that is the standard under the State Wide Planning Goal 5. Unless you do an economic social environmental and energy analysis to protect that waterway, it is a minimum safe harbor setback of 75'.

Councilor Daoust asked in the Beaver Creek canyon where we have steep slopes coming out of the stream corridor and they go up more than 200', what would the setback be in the Beaver Creek Canyon?

McCallum replied we are not proposing to adopt the map you see on easel, because there has not been a survey. When you are measuring a slope, you are not measuring the hypotenuse from the bankfull stage, it is an imaginary right angle. Even though your hypotenuse might be over 150' in distance, your other leg of the triangle might be less. You can't just look at the distance measured on the slope itself. In some instances, Beaver Creek, if the slope of 25% or greater continues for 150' or more, then you can have under the basic elements of Title 3 you can have a setback from

Beaver Creek of 200' minimum, but under our provisions that is more restrictive under the Troutdale Development Code that already exist that prohibits development on slopes with 25% or greater you would continue measuring until you came to the break in the slope. If you already are beyond the 200' minimum that Metro has established your development can start right there at the break in the slope, that is distinct from our current standard which requires a 30' setback from that break in slope or escarpment.

Councilor Daoust asked let me clarify one thing you said. You said that the measurement is not the slope distance, I always assumed that it was.

Brenda Bernards stated the 25' is measured as going up 1' for every 4'. You don't take a tape measure at the bottom and go to the top.

Councilor Daoust stated the setback that property owners have to deal with then would be the slope distance.

Bernards stated it is not the hypotenuse it is the right angle.

McCallum stated in tab 7 page 13 we have a drawing that shows this. You draw a vertical line straight up from the bankfull stage and then get your horizontal leg of your triangle.

Councilor Daoust asked could you clarify what the affects would be on the RV Park we have.

McCallum replied that is a pre-existing non-conforming use in some aspects. Development in a flood plain area is not totally excluded. Any development proposed would have to come in through the three part analysis that I summarized. It would have to establish that they are unable to use their land in any other way. The RV Park is non longer an allowed use in that zoning district.

Councilor Daoust asked are Metro's concerns listed in the letters under tab three addressed in our text amendments?

McCallum replied over time everyone of these amendments and requested changes have been incorporated into the draft you have or as stated in the most recent staff report.

Councilor Thompson asked I am not understanding how far this 200' setback goes. In Sandy Palisades above the Sandy River, where backyards are on the bank, would that be a permitted use under these guidelines?

McCallum stated the uniqueness of each property makes it difficult for me to make a blanket statement that part of a backyard would be in the vegetation corridor or not. It is based upon how many horizontal feet the slope continues. The minimum setback from the bankfull stage of the Sandy River as proposed would be 75' and that is measured at an imaginary right angle.

Councilor Thompson asked the property where the treatment plant is, if that property was to be developed how far back from the Sandy River would you have to go.

McCallum replied that property I believe has a slope of less than 25%. Under these drafted provisions the setback from the bankfull stage would be 75'. Only when you get into slopes of

greater than 25% would the setback increase beyond the 75' in the Sandy River instance.

Councilor Rabe stated property owners along both the Sandy River and Beaver Creek are concerned about what would happen if they were to have a loss of property.

McCallum stated there is a three part analysis for new development in the vegetation corridor or flood management area.

Councilor Rabe asked on new development is it the city that would evaluate that as being applicable or not under those guidelines?

McCallum replied yes.

Councilor Rabe asked at no point does it go beyond that. As a city we do not have to submit that plan to Metro for further approval?

McCallum replied under our ordinance typed II, III and IV development proposal are circulated for comment to interested parties and agencies. It is only the administrative review that would not be circulated for comment. So Metro being an interested agency would have an opportunity to comment on a required alternative analysis.

Councilor Rabe asked in the case of Jack Glass, what if his existing structure is washed away by the river and he wants to rebuild it in the exact location, may he do so without going through a series of channels?

McCallum replied no. Under the provisions of the Development Code with respect to non-conforming use, when the non-conforming use is destroyed over 80% of its value, which is established by the County Assessor, it must be replaced with a conforming use. He would have to go through the analysis.

Councilor Rabe stated so it has been worded so that it would be possible to replace the structure, but he will have to go through an analysis.

McCallum replied up to a certain point. It can not exceed destruction of over 80% of its value at which point it would have to become conforming and he would have to go through the alternative analysis to establish that he could have no other use of his property.

Councilor Rabe stated that is a venue by which he could possibly get the structure which was lost rebuilt in the same location and same shape and form?

McCallum replied I can not speak definitively to that. I could not say that he could build it exactly the same as it was.

Ray Valone stated Councilor, getting back to would Metro look at and review and comment on that location for development, Ms. McCallum stated that we would, we wouldn't. Once the City adopts Title 3, the only thing that gets run through Metro is comprehensive plan amendment or zone change. It is just ran through us to look at it for consistency with the Functional Plan. Once you have adopted your standards and your code, that is your call on subdivisions and it is your call on

building permits.

Mayor Thalhofer asked what bothers me a great deal is if a person has a house and they are on the Sandy River, or if Tad's Chicken'n Dumplings burns down, they can't rebuild it, is that correct?

McCallum replied that is incorrect. They must go through, at a minimum, they start with the three-part analysis to establish that there could be no use of their property apart from building within the minimum vegetation corridor. Then they would proceed on from there to ask for variances from the standards. It may not be that they can build exactly like they have. The provisions under the alternative three part analysis is that the use of the vegetation corridor is the least necessary and that the plans include restoration, replacement and mitigation for loss of the function of that vegetation corridor. The scope of, lets take Tads, probably under these provisions and analysis it probably would not be allowed to be built back at the same exact size because there are other economic uses of that property.

Mayor Thalhofer asked to build it back at all, don't they have to get a variance?

McCallum replied no. Under the provisions of this code, it is not a variance procedure, it is a three part alternative analysis.

Mayor Thalhofer stated lets look at a house that is on the Sandy River, if it burns down, is it the same procedure?

McCallum replied yes.

Mayor Thalhofer asked are you telling me that he doesn't have to go get a variance from the Planning Commission?

McCallum replied not unless he wants to exceed the standards that are already established here, mainly proving that there is no reasonable, practical, alternative design or method to develop his land. In other words we have built into this, based on Metro's language, a provision that everybody will still have a right to develop but the right to develop the entirety of the property is not there for anybody.

Mayor Thalhofer stated my question really is that they can't rebuild the same house that they have?

McCallum replied likely not.

Mayor Thalhofer asked unless they get a variance.

McCallum replied it probably would require a variance to build the exact same house.

Mayor Thalhofer stated and a variance is not automatic. It is something that may or may not be given. That is a real problem and it doesn't seem to be fair.

Jack Glass stated I appreciate the Councils concern for the land owners along the waterways. What concerns me is this whole thing of getting Metro involved. In 1995 I voted for Ballot Measure 26-26 to protect the greenways and waterways and there was nothing at all on this plan that said they

would prepare a plan to go into the waterways and start taking over. I did build a new home on the Sandy River in 1993, it did meet all the code requirements. Recently opening the tackle store we had to meet all the escarpment measures which was 50' from any escarpment and we used the bank as the boundary so it was easy. Now we are doing all these geological differences and trigonometry and stuff I don't understand. It makes it to hard, there are to many variables involved, why not start at the bank and measure back, that is easy to understand. It worries me getting a big agency like Metro involved that went from a fairly small agency in 1995 to a huge agency that owns huge amounts of land and is involved with fisheries and things that didn't have anything to do with them when I voted for this. I wanted to protect greenspaces for squirrels and birds and now we are getting into big political issues with this agency. The city could have its hands tied. If my home burns down, which when I built it in 1993 it met all of the requirements, and now I can only build a smaller one, that affects the value of my land. I can go into some kind of a lawsuit for compensation for the loss of the value of my home that I built. I felt that the present status of what the city has developed is a workable doable operation. I would like to see Tads rebuilt to the same size, it has been there for 55 years, I would hate to lose that opportunity, it is a landmark. Governing agencies moving in more and more is a real concern to me.

Glenn White stated I live on the river and I am very concerned about this. There is a lot of changes involved with this. I think that Troutdale is in a situation now where we have very limited commercial space left and to waste that needed space is not fair to the citizens. The areas within Troutdale are already highly disturbed areas, they have been developed and used commercially for some time now. Because we are dealing with this set of rules, we are playing on a field where we have flood plains in place by FEMA, we have a 50' setback on Beaver Creek and the Sandy River. Everything else outside of that is developed space. I am asking that the City Council look at the properties that are within the Town Center Overlay and create a special district under the Development Code 4.315. I would like to see grandfathering the current setback that we have for areas within the Town Center Overlay. It was doubled just four years ago, it was just 25' when the RV Park was built on both Beaver Creek and Sandy River, and without any public hearings or notice the setback was increased to 50'. I don't have a problem with that because I don't want to build anywhere near where there is a chance of flooding. In the current code they are measuring that from the ordinary high water mark, and this proposal is talking about measuring from the top of bank. I asked a lawyer what the top of bank means and he told me that is where the water would reach during the peak of a winter storm, that would be the new starting point for the setback. That could, if you have a gradual bank, could be an extra 25' to 50' just for the starting point. I don't think the City Council, from the questions you are asking, I don't think anyone really has a firm understanding of what all of this implies to the future development of Troutdale. I think we would be better off if we could keep the current standards in place.

Councilor Daoust stated as I understand the standards that we are looking at and the topography is on your land, there is a steep slope coming off the rivers edge for maybe 25' and then it levels off. So I think according to these standards the setback would be 50' from where the slope breaks.

White stated what I understand is it would be 75' if they adopt the safe harbor from the top of bank.

Councilor Daoust stated that is not what these proposals are saying. Under the proposals we have in front of us the setback on probably most of your property would be 50' from the top of the bank.

Faith stated it is 75' from the Sandy River and 50' from Beaver Creek, he is on both.

White stated I lost property on both ends that is why this really concerns me.

Councilor Daoust asked could staff clarify what the setback would be. I am looking at the table where it says for all primary protected water features including the Sandy River if you have greater than 25% slope for less than 150' you go to the top of the ravine and add 50'. If I am incorrect in assuming that, I would like to know.

McCallum replied when a slope is 25% or greater, under the Metro Code, the minimum vegetation corridor is 50'. So in this diagram you measure the 25' and then another 25' that gives you the 50' you have to go 50' beyond where the break ends when you have a slope of 25% or greater. This example for the Sandy River I believe you would be covered by just going 75' back.

Bernards stated you would meet the Title 3, I don't know if you meet the safe harbor.

McCallum stated the safe harbor is 75', so you meet both Title 3 and safe harbor.

White asked could you explain on that drawing where we currently start which is the ordinary high water mark.

McCallum replied that is incorrect. The starting point under the current standards is the top of bank.

White asked when did that get changed?

McCallum replied in 1994. The current language says top of bank, the new proposed language reads bankfull stage or two year storm event.

White asked is 1994 when they increased from the 25' to 50'?

McCallum replied 1994 is when we established the 50' setback and that was a public hearing legislative change to the Development Code.

White asked were any notices sent out on that?

McCallum replied legislative changes at that time did not require individual notices.

Greg Peart stated I live at the bottom of Beaver Creek canyon. If there were a disaster and my house burned down I wouldn't be able to rebuild the house as I have it now is what it looks like. The way it was explained tonight you have to minimize the impact on the corridor, what does that mean? I have a 3,500 square foot house, can I rebuild it with a 2,000 square foot home or would a 1,000 square foot home minimize it even less.

McCallum stated just because a part of a property might be within the vegetation corridor doesn't mean in some instances that the entire parcel is in that vegetation corridor. If your house were to be destroyed and you need to rebuild it you would go through a three part analysis to establish that there was not usable area outside of the vegetation corridor or the flood plain to build a house. We don't have a measuring rod saying what the least amount of impact is, that is subjective.

Peart stated that is one of my concerns, that it is subjective.

McCallum stated one aspect of the standard is 30% of the vegetation corridor can be used if you had no other place to do that development. That is measurable. It is when you get into asking for variances beyond that measurable standard that we don't have a rule, that is where it becomes subjective.

Peart asked someone brought up adding onto or rebuilding a deck, how is that going to be affected.

McCallum replied if the deck encroaches into the vegetation corridor now, we are not allowing expansion into the vegetation corridor without going through the three part analysis. If you have an existing deck that rots, the provisions allow you to replace that without going through any analysis.

Peart stated I agree with Jack, that we are getting to much big government in our small town. I would plea with you to take that into consideration before you adopt this.

Mayor Thalhofler closed the Public Hearing at 11:28pm and stated that this is the first reading of this Ordinance, a second hearing will be held on August 22nd.

10. PUBLIC HEARING / ORDINANCE (Introduction): An Ordinance adopting Chapter 5.20, Franchise Requirements of the Troutdale Municipal Code, regulating the use of public rights-of-way in the city, and repealing Chapter 5.16 of the Troutdale Municipal Code.

Mayor Thalhofler read the Ordinance Title, closed the City Council meeting and opened the Public Hearing at 11:29pm.

Galloway reviewed the staff report contained in the packet.

Council had no questions.

Mayor Thalhofler asked is there anyone here who would like to speak to us on this issue?

No public comment received.

Mayor Thalhofler closed the Public Hearing at 11:31pm and stated that this is the first reading of this Ordinance, a second hearing will be held on August 22nd.

11. PUBLIC HEARING / ORDINANCE (Introduction): An Ordinance requiring criminal history record checks on all city volunteers.

Mayor Thalhofler read the Ordinance Title, closed the City Council meeting and opened the Public Hearing at 11:32pm.

Chief Nelson reviewed the staff report contained in the packet.

Councilor Daoust stated I wasn't aware we were doing that. Do those people need to be notified that you are doing a background check?

Chief Nelson replied yes they would need to know that.

Councilor Daoust asked so it is currently part of the form that our volunteers fill out that a background check will be done?

Chief Nelson replied yes.

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

No public comment received.

Mayor Thalhoffer closed the Public Hearing at 11:35pm and stated that this is the first reading of this Ordinance, a second hearing will be held on August 22nd.

12. PRESENTATION: Trolley Committee

Mayor Thalhoffer called this item and stated we are getting the trolley ready to go. We have been storing it at the Public Works Shop area and we would like to have permission to continue to store it there while it is here in Troutdale. We are going to do a 90 day pilot project, and we would like permission to store it there for that period.

MOTION: Councilor Daoust moved that the Council continue to allow the Trolley Committee to park the trolley at the Public Works Shop area. Seconded by Councilor Rabe.

**YEAS: 5
NAYS: 0
ABSTAINED: 0**

13. DEPARTMENT REPORTS:

Mayor Thalhoffer called this item.

Department Directors had nothing to add to their reports.

Council had no questions of the Department Directors.

14. COUNCIL CONCERNS AND INITIATIVES

Mayor Thalhoffer stated due to the lateness of the hour we will skip this item.

15. ADJOURNMENT

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

YEAS: 5
NAYS: 0
ABSTAINED: 0

Meeting was adjourned at 11:38pm.



Paul Thalhofer, Mayor

Dated: 8-23-00

ATTEST:



Debbie Stickney, City Recorder

CITY OF TROUTDALE PUBLIC ATTENDANCE RECORD

July 25, 2000
CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING

PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING

NAME <input type="checkbox"/> (please print) <input type="checkbox"/>	ADDRESS	PHONE #
NANCY CONRATA	PO BOX 267 Gresham 97030	661-8929
Paul L. Dims	P.O. Box 152 Troutdale 97060	449-0635
Richard J. Andersag	P.O. Box 142 Troutdale, OR	665-4937
[Signature]	201 W. Columbia River Hwy	
Jack Klara	1202 E HISTORIC COLUMBIA RIVER	665-2257
Brenda Bernanel	600 NE Grand Pkwy	797-1736
PAT VALONE	600 NE GRAND PKWY	797-1808
Greg Peart	901 Jackson Park Rd	
Chaim White	1225 E. Historic Col. Riv Hwy.	669-9759
Stake White	1225 E. Historic Col. Riv	669-9759
Red Park	Me JRO	797-1547