

MINUTES
Troutdale City Council – Regular Meeting
Troutdale Police Community Center – Kellogg Room
234 SW Kendall Court
Troutdale, OR 97060

Tuesday, February 26, 2019 – 7:00PM

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Lead by Boy Scout Troop 174

Mayor Ryan called the meeting to order at 7:00pm.

PRESENT: Mayor Ryan, Councilor Ripma, Councilor Lauer, Councilor Kranz, Councilor White, Councilor Moon and Councilor Hudson.

ABSENT: None.

STAFF: Ray Young, City Manager; Sarah Skroch, City Recorder; Ed Trompke, City Attorney; Chris Damgen, Community Development Director and Scott Leonard, Prosecuting Attorney.

GUESTS: See Attached.

2. ROLL CALL AND AGENDA UPDATE

Mayor Ryan asked, are there any agenda updates?

Ray Young, City Manager, replied I would suggest that we take off the consent agenda item, the resolution opposing House Bill 2001, and put it down as #9 after the report on Regional Travel Options grant. We have made some public comments on Facebook that we would invite people to come make comment on that so it would probably be fair to open up public comment on it. Especially since last council session it was really kind of a side issue and it really wasn't just a discussed issue so we should probably make it a regular agenda item.

3. MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR FORMER COUNCILOR JOHN WILSON

Mayor Ryan stated a few weeks ago we lost a past city councilman, John Wilson, who had also been a fairly long term citizen of Troutdale. He had served 19 years on the SummerFest committee where I met him back in 2006. He also was a big part of the Troutdale Car Show. John was a passionate person who cared deeply about the City and people he really cared about. It's a big loss and he died way too young. If we could take a moment of silence now.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT: Public comment on non-agenda and consent agenda items is welcome at this time.

Saul Pompello, Ristorante Di Pompello, came before the Council to discuss System Development Charges for restaurants.

5. CONSENT AGENDA:

5.1 RESOLUTION: A resolution opposing the adoption of House Bill 2001 in the 2019 Legislative Session.

Mayor Ryan stated this agenda item will be moved to agenda item #9.

6. PROCLAMATION: Proclaiming February 2019 as Scout Month.

Mayor Ryan read the Proclamation.

7. PRESENTATION: Introduction of Gresham's new Fire Chief Mitch Snyder.

Ray Young stated for many of years we have had a great partnership with the City of Gresham to provide our fire services. We're excited to welcome the new Fire Chief, Mitch Snyder.

Mitch Snyder stated thank you for having me tonight. My background is I grew up in Tumwater, Washington. I got into fire service my senior year of high school. When I graduated I went to vocational school to become a firefighter and was hired by Richland Fire Department. I then transferred to the City of Kent Fire Department which has merged and grown and incorporated to Puget Sound Fire. I have some data for you that I'll go over (handout included in the packet).

8. REPORT: Annual report on the Regional Travel Options Grant.

Heidi Beierle, West Columbia Gorge Chamber of Commerce, stated I'm the Special Projects Manager at WCGCC and I've been working on this Regional Travel Options grant that was awarded in 2015 by Metro. The project had 2 parts and this is the very end of it. The first part was to develop construction documents for the Gorge hubs. That part of it is complete. This other part is really aimed at looking at how to create access for workforce to the industrial sites out in the TRIP area. (Heidi Beierle read the report included in the council packet).

9. RESOLUTION: A resolution opposing the adoption of House Bill 2001 in the 2019 Legislative Session.

(This was agenda item #3.2 which was pulled from the Consent Agenda)

Mayor Ryan asked, are there any questions from council or anybody?

Councilor Hudson replied I was hoping for more clarification on item 4 and the rationale behind that. I'm in support of the position in general but I want to make sure that I understand.

Ray Young stated in your neighborhood, Councilor Hudson, you have a number of different single family homes next to you. One of them may be a rental now and the owner is getting \$1500.00 a month renting that house. With this legislation passing there would be incentive for that landlord to tear down that building and build a four-plex there on the property because he could potentially collect 4 times the amount of rent per month. This provides an incentive for those who own rental properties, single family homes to expand their base on the same location without restriction. It does not require any off street parking which would affect you as a neighbor.

Councilor Hudson stated the part I'm skeptical about is that it would result in the opposite of providing more affordable housing. The cost per person for putting more people on the same lot it seems would drive down the cost per person. If you are putting 4 families where 1 family once was the landlord is netting more but each individual family is paying less and having less total floor space.

Chris Damgen stated what we're finding just from examples of infill or teardown development across the region is these older homes do go away. They generally do provide a lower threshold, not necessarily a lower quality, but older. As a result those rates have historically lower rent increases and lower rents all together. The idea being that people will sell their property and construct new. The new investment requires that recuperation of the investment to build new and because of the cost of construction, labor, material and so forth the actual cost to construct new therefore requires any potential tenant to pay the much more. That way that homeowner would have a higher bill to recuperate the expense. What we're seeing is a lot of out of state investment coming into the region where people are trying to use real estate as a profit driver. It's a business for a lot of folks. Does that really serve the need of the community? For a lot of communities the answer is no.

Mayor Ryan stated if we just went on #8 that would be fine with me. That was the spirit of what I brought up 2 weeks ago. I didn't want to get into details because I think good people can disagree if this is good or not. The state tells you what you're going to do. Number 8 is all I need to know. The fact that the state is telling every city in Oregon, 10,000 and over, what they're going to do or every county that's 15,000 and over is just not right. I talked to Erin Doyle from the League of Oregon Cities last week and she was on KATU, Your Voice, and she was debating this with our representative from Multnomah County, Chair Kafoury. Has she been here to talk about this with us? Because she's certainly speaking on our behalf. She represents the County. I'm very frustrated about how this is all going. I will tell you, this is going to pass. There might be some amendments that Ray and I talked about earlier. This is not okay and we need to push back.

Councilor Ripma stated I'm wondering if the wording on this resolution came from the League of Oregon Cities.

Chris Damgen stated actually, Sherwood was one of the first ones out of the gate. They entered official testimony into the hearing so some of this language was in fact templated

from Sherwood with removal of their specific local standards. It is within the power of this Council to add or delete or modify to your liking.

Councilor Ripma stated I agree with #8 and I agree with the rest of the numbered items too. I do recognize Zach's problem with the wording of #4. I was thinking we could reword that a little bit.

Ray Young stated I have a meeting scheduled with Representative Gorsek and Nolan Young from the City of Fairview in 2 weeks because they may be under 10,000 right now but they'll be close to 10,000 really soon. This is one of the issues we plan on talking about. The second thing is the City of Gresham, which is the 4th largest city, they're taking a stance on this slightly different than resisting the bill. They're taking the stance of putting an exclusion in there that if your city is already providing an adequate amount of middling housing that this wouldn't apply to you. They feel that they have enough middling housing that they're going to meet the goals of this legislation. I think that Chris feels confident that the City of Troutdale is probably that way anyway. That modification that might get in there might keep us out of the crosshairs of the worst of this bill. I'm also going to try to get with Senator Monnes Anderson too. This fundamentally has the opportunity to change your residential communities in a big way. If housing and rental costs keep going up they're going to start tearing down single family homes and put duplexes or four-plexes to get a lot more money. There's no off street parking required so all of a sudden communities like Sweetbriar that have very poor off street parking and narrow streets, it's going to be a nightmare.

Ed Trompke, City Attorney, stated I would recommend that you take the position that this provides an unfunded mandate. I believe there is an unfunded mandate that's a constitutional provision that says that if you object properly that you don't have to enforce it if the city doesn't get funding from the state to provide for the infrastructure and other needs that this creates. There are some push back points that nobody has raised yet.

Councilor Kranz stated I think it would be important to potentially add an 11th clause or just have 8 and 11 for an unfunded mandate as legal has advised us to include that with this resolution.

Mayor Ryan asked, can we send one to Chair Kafoury? If she's going to speak on our behalf she should at least know how we feel about it.

Ray Young stated we can prepare a letter to the elected officials and include the resolution that's passed by the Council and strongly encourage them to come speak with us about why they would support this. I will invite Chair Kafoury and other representatives to a council meeting and have them explain to us why they think it's best for our community to have this.

Councilor Kranz stated my recommendation or suggestion for #11 to be the bill, if passed, presents an unfunded mandate upon the City in regards to supporting infrastructure.

Ed Trompke stated I don't think you need to say any more than that.

MOTION: Councilor Ripma moved to adopt this resolution including the amendments we just discussed. Seconded by Councilor Lauer.

Councilor White stated this flies in the face of the motto from the League of Oregon Cities which is let cities work. When we did push back on the Multnomah County gun ordinance that was unconstitutional. Troutdale was highlighted at the League of Oregon Cities for doing that and defending home rule. I think we're doing the right thing.

VOTE: Mayor Ryan – Yes; Councilor White – Yes; Councilor Moon – Yes; Councilor Hudson – Yes; Councilor Ripma – Yes; Councilor Lauer – Yes and Councilor Kranz – Yes.

Motion Passed 7–0.

10. RESOLUTION: A resolution approving the signing of the renewal of the Intergovernmental Agreement between the City and various other Government Agencies to continue Levy Ready Columbia.

Ray Young stated this partnership that this IGA covers goes back almost 6 years. We have had an ongoing partnership with the 4 drainage districts PEN 1, PEN 2, MCDD and the Sandy Drainage Company, Multnomah County, Metro and the other cities of Portland, Fairview and Gresham to work together under the leadership of the State of Oregon Regional Solutions to deal with the issue of the levies. A big portion of the levee is in our city that protects hundreds of millions of dollars of infrastructure, thousands of jobs and is a very big part of our landscape here in Troutdale. Why this partnership began was because after Katrina happened the Army Corps of Engineers and FEMA figured out that we have a lot of levies around this nation and who is watching them. They started coming to communities and saying they need to evaluate the levies and that the people and properties are protected. They started putting a lot of pressure on us. In the area around the City of Portland we have 4 different governmental agencies that manage different portions of that levee. The funding model is based upon a 100 year old funding model from when they began in the 1920's. So they began looking at the overall system financially and governance and stability wise to see if we're going to be able to meet the needs that the federal government's going to put on us and the needs of safety and security for our citizens and our businesses. So for the last 5 or 6 years we have been working with these other jurisdictions and sharing the costs of the organization because it's about \$1.5 million a year to run Levy Ready Columbia. Our share this budget was about \$19,000.00. This contract would bump it up to \$29,000.00 a year. The primary reason for the increase is that the State of Oregon had been putting in a couple hundred thousand dollars a year over the last 5 years or so but now that we are getting close to the home stretch of getting to a conclusion with Levy Ready Columbia the State of Oregon has said they've done their part and now they're stepping back and they took their money with them also. It could cause a small increase on our cost on an annual basis. This IGA is simply a product of months and months of discussions and negotiations among all the

jurisdictions to come up with an agreement where we continue to work together. Our cost is limited to the \$29,000.00 a year plus %5 up to the next 5 years. We are not required to do any payments for anybody else's infrastructure in any anybody else's jurisdiction. At any one year if you decide to cut the \$29,000.00 out of the budget the organization says you have the right to do that and you can financially stop supporting it. Generally this is a way to get us toward the finish line to what the long term solution to the long term stability of our levee financially and governance wise. So that is why we have this agreement that could last up to 5 years. Here this evening we have 2 representatives from MCDD and Levy Ready Columbia together. Our representative to SDIC, Tanney Staffenson, is here.

Mayor Ryan asked, does anybody have any questions?

Tanney Staffenson, SDIC Board of Directors, stated with me is Brian Sheets, SDIC Legal Counsel. Also with us this evening is the President of the SDIC, Bruce Etling. One of the things I want to make clear is that we work for Troutdale. We've been in a partnership with Troutdale for nearly 100 years. Tanney Staffenson passed out a handout (included in these minutes). What you guys do is what we're going to do. SDIC would not be required to pay for significant improvements in other districts including the PEN 1 Railroad Embankment.

Brian Sheets stated basically what Tanney has brought me on to do is to help go through some of these issues that are related to the IGA. The IGA has a lot of great things in it. If you look at Article 3, goals of the parties, it talks about permanent governance structure and that's what I handed out today. That is something that we need to understand a little bit better and how it effects our members. Senate Bill 431 is a consolidation of the 4 different drainage districts PEN 1, PEN 2, MCDD and SDIC into a consolidated flood safety and water quality district. Brian Sheets passed out a handout on Senate Bill 431 (included in these minutes). It's going to be a consolidation. When we talk about permanent governance structure it is changing one thing for another. It's not an oversight. It's a replacement. That is what is presently written within SB 431. Section 3, paragraph 2 is boundaries. The boundaries of the district are Multnomah County within the urban growth boundary. That's basically where SDIC is operating and people pay their assessments and their service fees and that's how SDIC is funded. The new governance structure will be all of Multnomah County within the urban growth boundary so the funding for it has some good funding options. Section 20 gives the new flood safety and water quality district the opportunity to impose ad valorem property taxes on the district. Things we want Troutdale to understand is that Troutdale is specifically mentioned in this bill. Troutdale has just as much participation in this organization as SDIC does. This is changing the way that flood safety is happening in the valley. We just want to know if this is better for what's happening with our members. Part of that is understanding where the City of Troutdale is on it because we've had such a historic relationship. What we do is what Troutdale does. We have a very close relationship and we work together on so many things. The thing that SDIC is most concerned about is Section 9 Sub 11 and that's the ability of the new district to dissolve any drainage district or corporation including SDIC and Section 24 talks about it. The thing we want to know is, what is going to happen with this support of the new governance system? Is that going to be better than what we have

now? SDIC won't be required to pay for improvements outside of what our members are doing. We want to make sure SDIC has a better situation for its landowners going forward than it does now. Based upon this uncertainty with this legislation that's been introduced it sort of gummed up things SDIC because we don't know whether we want to start allocating funding or projects or committing to things if we're not going to be here. The pending legislation goes into effect 91 days after adjournment of the legislature, if it's passed.

Councilor Kranz stated this seems like 2 different vectors going different ways. In some regard, with SB 431, we're losing our home rule and we're putting it outside. We're lumping Troutdale into the greater picture at the state level.

Ray Young stated there are 2 boards. There's the initial board for the first year or two to get it up and running which includes 1 representative from Troutdale. But for the long term nature of the board it's almost a hybrid between elected officials unlike the Port of Portland's board which is appointed positions. The reason is because the people who have been in Levy Ready Columbia wanted to make sure that those people who've been involved for years continue setting up what this new district would look like. Then for the long term it would be a smaller board. We agree with a lot of things that Brian has brought forward on this. We've worked really hard to make sure that we don't pay for repairs in Portland. We've also worked really hard to make sure that this is focusing on saving property and saving people and not about the birds and bees and butterflies which there are special interest groups that are now pushing for things in the bill to make sure that we make sure it's pretty. I don't mean to be mocking anybody but if it's more important that it's pretty for wildlife than it protects us from floods and we're trying to push back hard against that. These are two separate issues but they are kind of working together because the IGA and Levy Ready Columbia is getting us toward this legislation. What we're trying to do is making sure that the advantages of a more modern governance structure and a more broad based financing structure will provide for the long term health of all the levies including SDIC. That's what we're working on. They will tell you that the levee in SDIC is probably in better shape overall than any of the other 3 districts. If they pass this, if the new governance structure does the financing the cost to those that are currently in the managed floodplain area will probably be slightly less than what they're paying now and then that additional cost for maintenance operation gets spread.

Councilor Ripma asked, does the bill give SDIC the option of being a part of this or not?

Brian Sheets replied no. The new board will have the option to dissolve any district. Based on the liabilities that SDIC has as well as the operating structure that it has, that would not take very much.

Councilor Ripma stated one of the issues for us in Troutdale is the major capital projects, there's only one that even touches SDIC that's enumerated and it's remediation of a flow control gate in a levee that's between SDIC and MCDD. That's it. All the other districts have big capital projects that are going to need to be funded. There's no way that property owners in SDIC won't be paying for big projects in other districts.

Brian Sheets stated based upon the ability to have those ad valorem property taxes within all of Multnomah County everybody in Troutdale will be paying for those projects.

Councilor Ripma stated Troutdale and SDIC is treated the worst on this whole deal of all the other cities or districts, I think. As citizens of Troutdale I recognize that we benefit by having the industrial area all the way along the south shore of the Columbia. The whole region benefits from it. The fee that's going to be charged is going to be fairly modest. Because we are bringing the most well-funded, well equipped district into this thing, the one that has the least need for repairs, we will end up paying the same as everybody else. It's the least good deal for Troutdale. That doesn't mean I say we vote against it. I cannot think of a way to fix that other than keep us out of the district altogether and that does not seem to be an option.

Ed Trompke stated there still is a way and that is to remove the ability to shift the burden this direction which would be take away ad valorem taxes to pay the bonds and require that the assessments pay the bond. That is something that has been done in Washington County. Assessments are being used to pay bonds. It was unusual. My firm helped negotiate that at the City of Hillsboro for some development in the south Hillsboro area. It's not the ordinary way to do things but sometimes you do that.

Colin Rowan, Levy Ready Columbia, stated I want to make a few notes about timing. The IGA that is currently being discussed is a 2019-2024 IGA. It's in response to the Declaration of Cooperation that was signed in 2015 by the project partners and that declaration included the two primary goals which is to recertify the levee system and also to maintain accreditation as well as staying active in the rehabilitation inspection program. Accreditation benefits the City of Troutdale. That basically allows the land uses that are currently zoned within SDIC to continue to be zoned as such as well as throughout the managed floodplain behind the levee. It is the heart of our economic sector in our area. The project partners came together to really make sure that these levies are in good shape, they maintain certification and also from the drainage districts perspective is that they have a requirement from the Army Corp of Engineers and they must stay active in what's called Public Law 84-99 which is the rehabilitation inspection program. That means the Army Corp of Engineers came in, they funded the levee system and they handed the keys over to those local districts. When they handed the keys over they said you need to keep this up to federal standards. Federal standards have changed. After Hurricane Katrina the Army Corp of Engineers basically said they're no longer in the certification game and we're no longer going to be both certifying these levies and also inspecting them. They put the onus onto the local community. Most of these local communities are just like SDIC and MCDD and the other districts in that they have very limited funding ability to pay for very large infrastructure. How these drainage districts are funded, the drainage districts and drainage improvement companies, is based on a 100 year old way of property assessment. It is one acre one vote. It is also based on how much impervious surface you have, that's how much you have to pay for. It was never set up to actually pay for major capital improvements that were needed. It does an okay and a pretty good job at that, actually, in keeping O&M costs but not in response to a modernized levee

system. So we came together through Levy Ready Columbia through the original IGA's to really do very expensive certification work that had never been done before. Certification is really just for FEMA accreditation. It's an insurance minimum. It's not about future and major investments in it. It's an important nuance there that the IGA is responding to. So what you see as the projects listed in this current IGA are largely in response to certification needs. That does not mean that SDIC has a clean bill of health. In fact, through a lot of work we were able to basically lobby the Army Corp of Engineers that there needs to be reinvestment in this levee system from the federal perspective. We have been awarded a feasibility study. That feasibility study is a 3 year study to see what kind of investments are needed. There are future regulations that may be needed. There needs to be a modern governance structure that doesn't just have a severely limited means of paying for these things that have regional significance. So spreading that cost based on the benefit or the cost that's incurred was seen as the best way to do that. In the next 5 years in response to the feasibility study this IGA keeps the partners at the table, helps them negotiate the local share for those certification projects and helps them participate in this feasibility study. There's going to be more modernization needed in the next years.

Ray Young stated all the kudos to the SDIC and the board. They've done an amazing job at SDIC in the things they have done. But as your representative, as your City Manager and having to look at the finances and the concerns I have for the future the rules of the game have been changed. There is also some very valid disagreements as to the condition of the pump station that is out there. I've toured the pump station and I know SDIC and some of the board members feel a little more confident in that pump station ability. One of the pumps is from the 1940's and one is brand new but with Amazon coming in and the other development out there they're going to easily expand that. The argument has been made, I think credibly, that that pump station which could cost 5 to 7 million dollars is also another burden on SDIC. The other thing is that the future rules and regulations every year FEMA makes it tougher and tougher to and more expensive to meet their needs. It's only going to get more expensive. We are as a city already paying for things. Since we are the map holder we may get stuck for holding more. SDIC has found and realized that they undercharged for years and they're redoing their structure and trying to get more money but you can only get so much money out of a limited space and that's what the new structure is trying to do. That's on the legislation and it is a very complicated issue. Tanney and I and Evan and Colin have been very involved in this for years and I'm not sure all of us completely understand it. For the citizens of Troutdale my concern is that the next 10, 20, 30 years, is SDIC still going to be able to do what they've done for the last 100 years.

Councilor Kranz stated as we are considering the IGA agreement with Levy Ready Columbia I'm trying to comprehend how this is going to work as we move forward. If you could speak to us on that. I know we said we're not going to discuss the SB 431 but if that comes into play, how do you see Levy Ready Columbia assisting the City of Troutdale?

Evan Mitchel, Levy Ready Columbia, replied the timeline that you have in front of you shows 3 parallel pathways. We've got Levy Ready Columbia and the IGA, the Corp

Feasibility Study and essentially what would become the governance structure that's starting to be formed in SB 431. The way that the bill has been written that even though it goes into effect 91 days after it's passed there is a period of time that's built in where the drainage districts continue to operate and continue to provide all of the operations and maintenance so that this new district can focus exclusively on setting up a new financial structure. We've done modeling. We generally can say that a utility fee would not be a lot more expensive for residents that are currently paying. We have some basic understandings but there's still a lot more work that has to be done, an entire public process that would have to be done to set up the utility fee. Not to mention, the general obligation bonds. There's probably, don't quote me, at least 4 to 5 years of work right there just in setting up the financial system. The vision is that the IGA carries us through this initial certification push and the sort of preliminary getting this financial system up and running and then we will have more information from the feasibility study. We'll know at that point what the feds are willing to contribute to the levee system throughout the levee system. And then once we get to that point there will be more of a transition. Within the bill once the board makes a resolution to call for the dissolution of the drainage districts there's a year built in within that window. It could be as many as 6 or 7 years before all these things happen which is why the IGA becomes really important to make sure we're continuing to move forward because FEMA has said that they will not revoke accreditation if we continue to demonstrate progress.

Councilor Ripma stated the capital projects identified in the IGA are the ones they don't include a pump station or other things. They include all the really expensive projects to the west and one that borders SDIC. I just want to go on record that we recognize this isn't fair but I can't think of a way around it. This IGA identifies and the language is, the parties agree, meaning us, that the engineering analysis identified in the following capital projects need to be completed to achieve accreditation certification. And it lists 8 of them and the last one is the one that touches SDIC. There's no perfect system. I recognize that the tax base supporting these levies needs to be broadened. I should also point out that this IGA says the parties agree to pursue a new governance structure. It doesn't say SB431 or the House Bill that's equivalent or anything specific. That's going to be needed too. I'm willing to support the IGA partly because the SDIC is stating that they're in support of the IGA. If you care to dissuade us I would be one to listen to a different opinion.

Brian Sheets said the SDIC is on the record saying that it will go the direction that Troutdale goes.

Councilor Lauer stated I don't see how we can go it alone. I don't see how it would be smart to go it alone.

Ray Young stated I think we mentioned in the fall at our meeting that SDIC needs to show us what their income stream is and the income stream for the next 20 years because they have a limited pool. Where is their capital improvement list and the lifespan and cost to replace it? And then what is FEMA going to require us to do in 10 or 20 years that they're not requiring us to do now. Can we see through the financial planning of SDIC that they can assure us that they're not going to come back to us and say they're short on money?

SDIC needs to provide us the assurance that you can finance this for the next 20 to 30 years and keep everybody happy without coming to us and asking for more money.

Ed Trompke stated I was talking to Mr. Young about a potential solution to the taxation unfairness with shifting ad valorem property taxes to this end of the county from the other. If Section 20 of the bill, which talks about ad valorem property taxes for bonds, if the bonding has to be outside the Measures 5 and 50 cap then there's no compression because it effects everybody equally then everybody in the county or in the district pays their fair share. That I would assume is going to be within the purview of the intention to be fair to everybody. So if the council wanted to protect the citizens here from paying a disproportionate share making it outside the 5 and 50 cap, takes the taxes out of compression so Portland, which is in compression, pays its fair share.

Ray Young stated they actually have much bigger capital projects. The way it's set up for the bond levy is that the City of Portland is going to pay 95% of it because they have 95% of the property value within the new district. Then anything in the City of Troutdale, SDIC 10 or 20 years down the road when the pump station has to get done, the City of Portland pays 95% of that cost too. In the long run the City of Portland is still going to pay a hugely bigger chunk of any capital projects either there or here than we are.

Ray Young stated I agree with Ed and I think from what everybody has said that everybody is in agreement that we have to make sure that compression is not allowed in here where the City of Portland residents are able to hoist a larger proportion of capital costs on the City of Troutdale.

Rich Allen, Troutdale resident, stated I wanted to mention some of the history. Years ago when the Levy Ready Columbia IGA came before council we were told that we would work together to do a needs assessment and to submit the paperwork to the federal agencies. What it's turned primarily into is taxing study and the proposed bill that you've been referring to. So I ask that you really think about this carefully. Because if you think about what's actually going on here the levee area for a very long time has been supported by the properties covered by that levee system and if you look at it, primarily industrial. So what we're really asking here is we're asking for an expansion so that residential subsidizes the corporations in the industrial area. And the creation of another regional government body. Once that regional government body gets created it's going to morph into whatever it's going to morph into. This bill may morph into something you don't expect it to. I just ask that you be very careful about that. The other thought is we already have a government agency that covers Multnomah County and it is called Multnomah County. We really don't need to be doing this. It's being done to increase the tax structure.

MOTION: Councilor Lauer moved to adopt the resolution approving the signing of the renewal of the Intergovernmental Agreement between the City and various other Government Agencies to continue Levy Ready Columbia. Seconded by Councilor Kranz.

VOTE: Mayor Ryan – Yes; Councilor White – Yes; Councilor Moon – Yes; Councilor Hudson – Yes; Councilor Ripma – Yes; Councilor Lauer – Yes and Councilor Kranz – Yes.

Motion Passed 7–0.

11. DISCUSSION: An introduction and discussion of a future ordinance that will be amending Troutdale Municipal Code Chapter 10 – Vehicles.

Ray Young stated this is not a rush project. This is not an immediate project. There is no voting on this tonight. We are simply introducing to council some suggested changes in Chapter 10 of our ordinance. Mr. Leonard, who has been your City Prosecutor for many years has gone through and worked on those. We want to talk through the changes, what they are and getting some input. Most of this chapter comes from the years 1981, 1996, 2002 and one section in 2011 has been looked at. Over the last 30 years of this myself as your municipal court judge, Mr. Leonard as your municipal court prosecutor and Chris Damgen as your lead over enforcement, we keep running into issues that impact you as citizens that we need to update this section of the code to better reflect the problems that we're seeing in the city and problems with enforcement that we're seeing and how better to meet the needs of the problems that you and your fellow citizens are bringing to us.

Scott Leonard, City Prosecutor, stated I've been working with our code enforcement officer, Lisa Clayton, on various interpretations of the code as it is now. I've been working with the court on how to process some of those citations and other parking issues. To summarize, while constantly looking at the code trying to come up with answers it became very confusing even to me as someone who looks at laws every day. I find that the current Chapter 10 is confusing and sometimes lacking in certain areas. Particularly when it comes to the process of issuing citations, how to address those citations in court, when to impound vehicles and things like that. From my perspective, the procedures in the code were very important to me to look at and revise. I sat down and worked on a draft of Chapter 10 trying to keep what I could keep and what I thought was wise to keep. Also looking at some other cities in this area and how they address parking and borrowing from those codes and incorporating them here. I came up with a draft and I reviewed that draft with the code enforcement officer and the court clerk and some other parties and we've been working on some changes and finally came up with this draft. I want to address a couple of key changes and new things that are in the code. There are some new definitions and I also tried to tighten some definitions. One of the biggest changes are to Chapters 10.12 which is the section that actually states what is and isn't unlawful parking. A lot of things carry over from the current code but there are also some new provisions that were added primarily based on feedback from Lisa Clayton and the community input that she's getting regarding parking. Some of those new changes to what is proposed to be unlawful parking would be blocking driveways or parking too close to mailboxes. There are some new acts that would be prohibited as far as parking. That's all in 10.12. The other major change or major overhaul would be how to address abandoned and hazardous vehicles and also how to address the process of impounding vehicles when they can be towed and what notice is required to vehicle owners. And then how do residents or vehicle owners contest both a citation and a tow. So chapter sections

10.36 and 10.38 are pretty much completely new sections that I drafted. I know there were some questions regarding specific sections including animals left in vehicles. That was a result of some conversation between the different city employees that had input on this and how to address that. There's currently a section in our code addressing children left in vehicles. The idea was to address animals that are left in vehicles.

Ray Young stated one of the biggest things we changed in here in terms of how we do things is under the current code a disabled car sitting up on blocks with the tires stripped off it sitting on your street can sit there 5 days before we can do anything. And when we do something we have to send a registered letter to the registered owner to try to ask them to get rid of it or we'll tow it. There are 2 problems. One, quite often people will buy and sell vehicles and not change title to them so we don't really know who the real owner is. A lot of jurisdictions don't go through that whole long process of an abandoned vehicle. They simply take a big orange sticker and put it on the window saying it will be towed after 72 hours.

Councilor Ripma asked, could I request that we get a markup with the redline version with the changes.

Mayor Ryan stated it would help me if we could come back with a redline copy with the new suggestions and changes.

12. STAFF COMMUNICATION

Ray Young stated next Monday, March 4th, the Main Streets on Halsey group will be hosting a community meeting at 6:00 at the Wood Village Baptist Church. They're going to be discussing branding opportunities for the corridor and light refreshments will be provided and childcare on sight. If anybody coming over to Fairview for their meet and greet? There is no agenda. It's simply a social thing at the Fairview City Council chambers to meet with Fairview and Wood Village and Gresham was invited too. This Thursday at 6:00pm just to meet the other council members from the other 3 cities. March 12th we will have a council meeting. We are planning on having a work session on the 19th to work with the Chamber. We've got 15 years of history with the Chamber, an IGA that is 15 years old and so many things have changed. We need to talk about the ongoing relationship with the Chamber of Commerce. We will not have a meeting on the 26th of March due to it being spring break.

13. COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS

Councilor Lauer stated last month on January 25th we had the first meeting of the new year for the Regional Disaster Preparedness Organization. One of the topics that was tasked to bring back to the council was to discuss House Bill 2208 which is a bill proposed by the City of Portland for finding a funding structure through Lotto dollars to retrofit unreinforced masonry buildings in and around the state, not just Portland. I was asked to ask you all if you would be in support or not of this bill. It's something to think about and read on and let me know.

14. ADJOURNMENT

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

Meeting adjourned at 9:29pm.



Casey Ryan, Mayor
Dated: April 14, 2019

ATTEST:



Kenda Schlaht, Deputy City Recorder

