



CITY OF TROUTDALE

"Gateway to the Columbia River Gorge"

AMENDED AGENDA

TROUTDALE PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

Troutdale City Hall Council Chambers
219 E. Historic Columbia River Hwy. (lower level, rear entrance)
Troutdale, Oregon 97060

Wednesday, January 20, 2016
7:00 p.m.

1. **ROLL CALL/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
November 18, 2015 Regular Meeting
November 18, 2015 Work Session
December 16, 2015 Regular Meeting
3. **CITIZEN COMMUNICATION – NON AGENDA ITEMS**
4. **HEARING PROCEDURE**
Tanney Staffenson, Planning Commission Chair
5. **OLD BUSINESS** - None
6. **NEW BUSINESS** - None
7. **DEPARTMENT REPORTS**
8. **COMMISSION INITIATIVES AND CONCERNS**
9. **ADJOURN**
10. **WORK SESSION**
Development Code update.

This meeting location is accessible to persons with disabilities. A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired or for other accommodations for persons with disabilities should be made in writing at least 48 hours prior to the meeting to Chris Damgen 503-674-7228, or by email at chris.damgen@troutdaleoregon.gov

MINUTES
TROUTDALE PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
Council Chamber
217 E. Historic Columbia River Highway
Troutdale, Oregon 97060
November 18, 2015

1. **Roll Call.** Chair Staffenson called the meeting to order at **7:03 p.m.** There were no agenda updates.

Commissioners Present: Sandy Glantz, Frank Grande, Jaime Kranz, Shirley Prickett, Brian Sheets, Tanney Staffenson and Marv Woidyla

Commissioners Absent: None.

Staff: Steve Winstead, Building Official and Planning Director
Chris Damgen, Senior Planner
John Morgan, Planning Consultant
Rooney Barker, Transcriptionist

Guests (see list): Sasha Yocom and Taylor, Students, Troutdale residents

2. **Approval of Minutes:**

- **September 30, 2015 Regular Meeting.** The time shown for the meeting being called to order was corrected to the correct time, and Kite was corrected to Kight in Item 6. **Commissioner Grande moved, with a second by Commissioner Sheets, to approve the minutes as amended. The vote was unanimous and the motion passed.**
- **September 30, 2015 Work Session.** The time shown for the meeting being called to order was corrected to the correct time. **Commissioner Sheets moved, with a second by Commissioner Prickett, to approve the minutes as amended. The vote was unanimous and the motion passed.**

3. **Citizen Communications – Non-Agenda Items.** None.

4. **Old Business.** None.

5. **New Business.** None.

6. **Department Reports.** Chris Damgen addressed staff's efforts in office efficiency and customer service and the example forms he shared at the last meeting. There will be something regarding this project in another month or two, and he will be requesting time for the Commission to review their product in a month or two. (Mr. Damgen's talking points are listed in **Exhibit A**),

He also briefed them on the sheep carcass removal in the north part of the City.

Exhibit A. 11-18-2015 Department Notes, provided by Chris Damgen.

Exhibit B. 11-18-2015 Copy of Section 2.20.020 – Citizens Advisory Committee, from the Troutdale Municipal Code.

The Outlet Mall is under new ownership, he informed them, and the new owners have indicated to staff that they will want new signage and perhaps some cosmetic and structural improvements; he will keep the Commissioner apprised. The new owners also indicated that they will keep continue operating as before.

At the December meeting, staff has two applications for the Commission to review; one is a Comprehensive Land Use Map Plan Amendment and the other is a Zoning District Map Amendment. They are both Type IV quasi-judicial procedures; the Planning Commission can ask the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) to review these, and that is optional, he added. The project is a seven-acre project on the southeast corner Cherry Park Road and 242. Mr. Damgen distributed a copy of Section 2.20.020 – Citizens Advisory Committee, from the Troutdale Municipal Code (see **Exhibit B**). If the Commission does seek the CAC’s comments, it will be treated as another review entity and their comments will be included in the staff report. Their review is not considered as a public hearing, and it is up to the Planning Commission whether or not they want the committee’s review. He asked Commission if they could decide soon as he would need to let the CAC know. There was a discussion and Mr. Winstead said the committee would need their review to address the criteria in the Development Code and focus only on the issues in the Findings; he said the CAC will be meeting on November 19th and that would be a good time to propose this request to them. If they receive the information on these items at their December 2nd meeting, they will have ample time to review and comment.

Commissioner Sheets moved, with a second by Commissioner Glantz, to send these items to the CAC for their review and comment. The vote was 5-yes, 2-no (Staffenson and Woidyla), and the motion passed.

- 7. **Commission Initiatives and Concerns.** Commissioner Glantz asked who maintains public trails. Mr. Winstead that if they are publicly owned and on City property or a City easement, the City does (by the Public Works Department). On private property, it’s a different story unless an agreement is made.
- 8. **Adjourn.** Commissioner moved, with a second by Commissioner, to adjourn. The vote was unanimous and the meeting adjourned at 7:25 p.m.
- 9. **Work Session.** See Work Session minutes for November 18, 2015.

Tanney Staffenson, Chair

Date

Attest: _____
Rooney Barker, Transcriptionist

MINUTES
TROUTDALE PLANNING COMMISSION
Work Session
Council Chamber
 217 E. Historic Columbia River Highway
 Troutdale, Oregon 97060
November 18, 2015

1. Roll Call. Chair Staffenson called the meeting to order at 7:35p.m.

Commissioners Present: Sandy Glantz, Frank Grande, Jaime Kranz, Shirley Prickett, Brian Sheets, Marv Woidyla and Tanney Staffenson

Commissioners Absent: None.

Staff: Steve Winstead, Building Official and Planning Director
Chris Damgen, Senior Planner
John Morgan, Planning Consultant
Rooney Barker, Transcriptionist

Guests (see list): Sasha Yocom and Taylor, Students, Troutdale residents

2. Work Session. *Consideration of Development Code Updates.* An updated version (November 2015) of the proposed amended Troutdale Development Code (TDC) as distributed (see Exhibit A).

Chair Staffenson said he updated the City Council at their last meeting on the progress this Commission has achieved to date. He said the Commission will review the latest updated draft this evening, go through the work Public Works has done on their portion, and that there is still some legal work to do on the signs portion of Chapter 10 so that will not be completed this evening. The Port of Portland has submitted some comments and the Sandy Drainage Improvement Company (SDIC) want to see what Public Works has done with their comments. John Morgan said we are also waiting for Metro; our request for comment has been sitting in the in-box of the person who will comment and that person has not been at work for a while. Today he sent the information to someone else who will get back to him. Mr. Morgan said it would be helpful if the Commission walked through the updated version of the TDC, starting at page 1. Most of what was previously discussed was compiled into this. His hope is that closure is reached this evening on everything except the Sign Code, Metro comments (whenever they may

Exhibit A. November 2015 updated draft of the Troutdale Development Code.

Exhibit B. November 2015, draft pages of Chapters 1 through 5 of the Troutdale Development Code, submitted by Steve Winstead with new text amendments.

Exhibit C. November 9, 2015, memo from City Attorney Edward Trompke regarding TDC Chapters 5, 8 and 10 Comments, with Attachment 1 a copy of the June 18, 2015, Supreme Court case of Clyde Reed v. Town of Gilbert, AZ et al regarding signs.

Attachment 1 to Exhibit C. June 18, 2015, copy of a U.S. Supreme Court regarding the case of Clyde Reed, et al, Petitioners v. the Town of Gilbert, AZ, et al, Case No. 13-502, regarding outdoor signs and 23 categories if exemptions.

Exhibit D. A copy showing slopes in the main part of the city and other areas, distributed by Chair Staffenson.

come in), etc., and then the next steps. We need to have the public hearing before this is taken to the City Council, and we can amend your recommendation based on that hearing. The input we receive from those agencies can come in the hearing process and you can respond to it as part of that process, or you can wait and look at those in another work session. We should come to an agreement on the Commission's schedule and how to strategize getting through this to the end. That will help staff get what they need in order to know how to package it.

Steve Winstead introduced the students in the audience who are here to learn how the Planning Commission functions. Chair Staffenson thanked the students for being here.

Mr. Winstead distributed a copy of a November 2015 draft of new amendments to Chapters 1 through 5 (see **Exhibit B**) where he supplied new proposed language and input from the Public Works Department. He said staff and the Commission, in attempting to streamline the Development Code, tried to pull the engineering requirements out of this Code and put them back into the Public Works Code. There are some issues where Public Works wants some of their verbiage to remain in the TDC. He will review those before going on to the other four Chapters addressed. The City Attorney also has given his input to Mr. Winstead on four different Chapters which he will review.

Chapter 1 Introductory Provisions

p. 1-8 – .55 Food Vendor (Mobile), Item i. This Item should be renamed as Item a, not i (typo).

p.1-28 – Item .66 Substantial Improvement, Item b. The note regarding Chair Staffenson's edit will be deleted.

Chapter 5 – Other Permit and Issue Determinations

p. 5-28 – Section 5.600 – Erosion Control and Water Quality Standards. We had previously deleted this Section, and Public Works has agreed to delete all the standards and just leave the heading as Erosion Control, Mr. Winstead said. They also wanted to add what we had previously deleted to put it back into Public Works as Sections 5.610 Purpose, 5.620 Applicability, and 5.630 Reference Standards. These are their specific input into our Development Code (underlined in blue). Mr. Morgan and Mr. Winstead agreed that all of the new proposed Sections 5.610, 5.620 and 5.630 are incorporated back into the document with the Commission's agreement.

p. 5-35 – Section 5.800 Stormwater Management, Section 5.810 Purpose. Previously deleted, Public Works wants to keep this Purpose statement in place; that was agreed to by the Commission.

p. 5-35 to 5-36 – Section 5.820 Reference Authority was previously deleted. It will now, with Public Works' request and approved by the Commission, be reinstated into the Code as follows: Item A, as shown in this draft, i.e., the reference: Chapter 12.06 of the Troutdale Municipal Code); Items B through F are still deleted as previously approved.

p. 36 – Section 5.830 Applicability. Public Works wants this Section to remain (it was previously deleted) and the phrase, “. . . in accordance with the requirements of the reference standards cited in 5.820” added at the end of the first sentence, and the last sentence remains deleted (~~Water quality treatment for Stormwater is required under any of the following:~~).. Items A through E in this Section remain as deleted. The Commission approved.

p. 5.45 – 5.1100 Public Improvements. This Section will remain in the Development Code, with the following amendments/changes:

p. 5.45 – Section 5.1110 Purpose. The City Engineer commented that he would like to have Public Improvements as a definition in Chapter 1 so we will have to go back to Chapter 1 and add that definition if we haven't done that already.

p. 5-45 to 5-46 – Section 5.1120 Applicability. Add to the first sentence “. . . land division or development requiring public improvements . . .”

p. 5-45 to 5. 46 – Section 5.1130 Standards. Keep Item A in the Code but amend it to read “. . . provisions of Chapter 7, Land Division, or of this Code and the current edition of the ~~adopted Public Works Design Standards~~ Construction Standards for Public Works Facilities.” Keep Item B in the Code, amended to read “. . . set forth in Section 7.370 of this Code and a permit application in accordance with the adopted Public Works Design Standards, Chapter 12 of the Troutdale Municipal Code, and the Construction Standards for Public Works Facilities.” Keep Item C as amended to read “. . . to Commence Construction or Public Works Permit is issued by the Public Works Department. Keep Item D. Keep Item E as amended to read “. . . only after the requirements in Sections 7.410 and 7.420 of this Code and the ~~Public Works Design Standards~~ Construction Standards for Public Works Facilities have been met. Responsibility for the operation, maintenance, and repair of the public improvements remains with the developer until ~~their~~ the improvements are acceptance accepted by the City. [Adopted by Ord. 792, ef. 9/25/08]” The Commission agreed.

There was a brief discussion on formatting this document that was mostly inaudible because of a train passing by.

Chapter 7 Land Division

p. 7-5 – Section 7.070 Application for *Subdivision* Tentative Plat. (Note that Subdivision is added to this title.) The previous changes were retained except for the following change in the second sentence: “. . . waives a specific provision, ~~as it is not deemed unnecessary~~ unnecessary to evaluate the proposal . . .” This was approved.

pp. 7-7 to 7-8 – Section 7.100 (Section 7.090) Final Plat Submission. The previous Section 7.090 Submission and Review of Final Plat was deleted and Section 7.100 is now Section 7.090. In Item B.7, the second sentence is amended to read, “If an easement is not definitely located of record, a ~~statement~~ description of the easement shall be given.” This was approved as was the proposed final sentence reconfirmed.

pp. 7-12 to 16 – Section 7.180 Design Requirements, Item B. Water, Sewer, and Stormwater Facilities. The changes previously approved were retained, as shown, with the exception of amending the first sentence to read, “. . . will be designed, permitted, installed, constructed, operated and maintained . . .”, as were those in Item C.2. Underground conversions, to read, “. . . of the Troutdale Municipal Code and the Construction Standards for Public Works Facilities.”

p. 7-14 – In Item E. Lot Design, Item 7, add the following to the last sentence: “. . . on-site water supply in accordance with the requirements of the Oregon Water Resources Department for each lot . . .”

p. 7-14 – Item E.8. Shared Private Drives, Item c. is amended to read: “. . . All ~~utilities~~ Each lot, except the private drive or approved Stormwater laterals, shall have separate connections to the public water and sanitary sewer systems.”

p. 7-15 – Also changes to Item F. Erosion Control were approved to read, “Erosion control shall be provided in accordance with applicable City, County and State laws and standards.”

p. 7-15 – Item G. Surface Drainage and Storm Sewer Systems, Item 1 General Provisions, all previous changes remain, as shown.

p. 7-15 – Item G.2. Accommodation of upstream drainage areas was previously deleted; Public Works asked that it be restored with the following change to the last sentence: “The Director of Public Works shall approve the size of the facility, based on the provisions of the ~~construction standards and specifications~~ Construction Standards for Public Works Facilities, assuming conditions of maximum potential watershed development permitted by this code.”

p. 7-15 – Item G.3. Effect on downstream drainage, also previously deleted, was reinstated with the following change: “Where additional runoff ~~incidental to~~ generated by the development of the subdivision . . .”

pp. 7-15 to 7-16 – Item H Sewerage Facilities, Item 1. General Provisions, the following changes are approved in the last sentence: “. . . shall be approved by the ~~City of Portland Bureau of Environmental Services~~ State of Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) or DEQ’s designated agent.”

p. 7-16 – Item H.2. Sizing system, in the last sentence, the following change was approved: “. . . an adequate allowance for inflow and infiltration and other extraneous flow and must meet ~~city construction standards~~ requirements of the Construction Standards for Public Works Facilities.” Also the number of this Item is changed to 1 instead of 2 (typo).

p. 7-16 – Item L Streets, the following change was approved: “. . . public streets shall be designed, ~~improved,~~ and constructed in conformance . . .” and the previous amended text stays.

p. 7-17 – Item L.3. Local street connectivity, the following change was approved: “The City of Troutdale Comprehensive Land Use Plan, Troutdale’s Transportation System Plan, the Construction Standards for Public Works Facilities and applicable regulations . . .”

p. 7-18 – Item L.7.c. is an approved added paragraph: Compliance with Multnomah County’s Road Rules.

p. 7-19 – Item L.11 Surfacing and improvements is amended as follows: “. . . with the requirements of the ~~City or the standards of the Oregon Department of Transportation~~ Construction Standards for Public Works Facilities. ~~An overlay of asphaltic concrete, or material approved by the Director of Public Works, shall be placed on all streets with the development.~~ When required by the ~~Director of Public Works,~~ neighborhood traffic management measures shall be constructed in conformance with the ~~City’s standards and specifications~~ Construction Standards for Public Works Facilities.

p. 7-19 – Item L.13 Intersections is amended as follows: “. . . as nearly as possible at right angles, ~~A proposed intersection of two new streets at an angle of less than 75° shall not be acceptable.~~ An oblique street should be approximately at right angles for at least 100 feet therefrom. ~~Not more than two streets shall intersect at any one point unless specifically approved by the Director of Public Works.~~ in accordance with the Construction Standards for Public Works.

p. 7-19 – Item L.14 Street Lighting has the same approved change, as follows: “. . . comply with the standards of the Mid-County Lighting District, the Construction Standards for Public Works Facilities, and the standards of the Troutdale Municipal Code . . .”

p. 7-20 – Item M. Street Standards, Item 2 Collectors. A proposed change in the first sentence, “Collector streets collect traffic from local streets and distribute traffic . . .” Mr. Hultin, City Engineer, recommended, Mr. Winstead said, that we check with the County to match our designations and definitions to theirs since they own all the arterials and some of the major streets. There was a discussion and Mr. Morgan said he will review this and, with the Commission’s permission, adjust Item M’s highlighted paragraphs to match the County’s designations and definitions. The Commission agreed.

p. 7-21 – Item M.5. Streets belonging to other jurisdictions. This was amended to read, “Streets and highways belonging to other jurisdictions . . .” and was approved.

p. 7-23 to 7-24 – Section 7.200 Other Sidewalk and Bikeway Standards, Item A.1. An amendment was approved to change the end of this paragraph to read, “. . . shall be constructed ~~during home construction in accordance with the Construction Standards for Public Works Facilities.~~ Item A.3. was proposed to be modified to read, “. . . both side of all new public streets and on both sides of reconstructed public streets, unless there is insufficient right-of-way to permit sidewalks on both sides of the reconstructed street. After discussion it was determined that Item A.3. will *not be amended* as the proposed language was deemed too restrictive, and will stand as it is currently written. Item D, Bikeways (on p. 7-24) was approved to be modified to read, “. . . Bikeways shall be designed and constructed in accordance with ~~Multnomah County construction standards~~ the Construction standards for Public Works Facilities.”

pp. 7-24 – Section 7.350 Guarantee, Item A. was amended to change the last sentence in this paragraph to read, “. . . shall remain the property and responsibility of the subdivision . . .” This was approved. Item B. was approved to be amended (as a last sentence) to read, “The form of all bond and letter of credit instruments must meet the approval of the Director of Public Works City, and the Director City may prescribe such forms to be used by the subdivider.” [NOTE: The references to the Director of Public Works were modified in discussion to read the “City” instead.]

p. 7-25 – Section 7.370 Construction Requirements. The Title of this Section was previously amended to read Construction Documents Requirements. It was proposed and approved at this meeting to further amend this item to read, “Construction drawings documents conform with to the requirements of the City of Troutdale Construction Standards for Public Works Facilities. Construction of Public Improvements shall not commence prior to approval of construction plans by the Director of Public Works or the Director’s designee.”

p. 7-25 – Section 7.380 Design Plat Format. Because of too much detail in this Section, it was previously deleted. With this evening’s proposed changes, it has been reinstated as rewritten: “Design Plat Format. Submitted design plans shall conform to the requirements of the City of Troutdale construction standards for Public Works Facilities.” Item BA in this Section was also reinstated, as follows: Submittal Requirements. The subdivider shall submit seven sets of construction drawings documents that include site grading, erosion control, streets, sanitary sewers, storm sewers, water mains, street lighting, and associated details. Drainage pPlans shall be accompanied by design calculations (two sets only) as required by the Construction

Standards for Public Works Facilities. Plans shall also include parks and open spaces if public improvements extend into those areas. The rest of this Section remains deleted.

p. 7-28 – Section 7.410 Certificate of Completion, Item B. The second to last sentence was approved to be amended to read, “. . . within the development ~~for~~ that are identified during that period.”

p.7-28 – Section 7.415 Restriction on Issuance of Building Permits. After discussion and at Mr. Winstead’s request, it was determined to leave this Section as it was previously amended in October 2015 and to not include any additional changes. It was suggested that Travis Hultin be invited to comment on this to the Planning Commission.

p. 7-29 – Section 7.420 Acceptance of Construction Improvements. This approved amendment is as follows: “Acceptance will not occur until after a Certificate of Completion has been issued and as-built drawings (~~one Mylar set and four copies~~) have been received and approved by the City. [Adopted by Ord. 50, ef. 9/25/90; Amended by Ord. 745, ef. 5/13/04]

Chapter 8 Site Orientation and Design Standards

p. 8-1 – Section 8.020 Applicability and Exemptions. Mr. Hultin had questioned the word “remodels” in the first sentence, Mr. Winstead said, and after discussion the Commissioner kept that word and made no other change. A definition of remodels will be placed in Chapter 1-Definitions, and Mr. Winstead and Mr. Morgan will do some research in order to craft better language.

p. 8-1 – Item B. The following text amendment was approved to remove reference to the square footage: “. . . Physical expansions of existing uses ~~by 10% or less~~, occurring in a single . . .”

p. 8-3 – Section 8.040 Application Submittal Requirements, Item B. An additional paragraph was inserted (and approved) between items B.1.d. and e., to read, “The location and State registration/permit number (if any) of all wells and on-site sewage disposal systems.” This Item will be renamed as ‘e’ and the other items will move down the alphabet.

p. 8-4 – Item B. 2.h. was approved to add: “Pedestrian and Bicycle parking and circulation areas, including sidewalks, . . .”

p. 8-5 – Section 8.050 Approval Criteria. The first two paragraphs will be alphabetized as A. and B.

p. 8-6 – Section 8.056 Transit Facility Design. This was added to replace the previous text, Mr. Morgan said.

City Attorney’s Review. Commissioner Sheets asked if this memo was under attorney/client privilege; the Commission said it was not, that it was a legal review for the Commission to consider.

Chapter 5 Other Permit and Issue Determinations. Mr. Winstead reviewed the comments provided by the City Attorney (see Exhibit C) where he suggests in Chapter 5: 1) text for home occupations which allows those business persons to engage in limited merchandise sales, and 2) that consideration of Chapter 5 be delayed until he and Mr. Gaschler can review the materials and discuss new legal materials on Stormwater programs.

Home occupations were then discussed. The Commission said they appreciate Mr. Trompke’s comment; Mr. Morgan said the Commission has already addressed home occupations and the work ‘retail’ was addressed in their review as Mr. Trompke suggested (see Section 5.230, Item

B.). As for Mr. Trompke's comment to delay consideration of Chapter 5, Mr. Gaschler (and the City Engineer Travis Hultin) have reviewed the materials on Stormwater management of which Mr. Trompke was more than likely not aware.

Chapter 8 Site Orientation and Design Standards. The next page is a second memo included in this Exhibit and addresses Chapter 8 previous edits, some of which Mr. Trompke said will not pass DLCD and Metro approval; Mr. Trompke asked Mr. Winstead to ask the Commission whether this Chapter should, when the Commission has completed their review of it, be given to Mr. Trompke again for further legal review. Chair Staffenson said the Commission will revisit this again.

Chapter 10 Signs. The last page of this Exhibit is a memo regarding TDC Chapter 10 edits (see Attachment 1 to Exhibit C) regarding the Sign Code. Mr. Trompke recommended that the Commission read the Supreme Court's opinion and schedule a discussion with him on how best to amend the City's Sign Code in light of this and the Oregon constitutional law affecting free expression. Chair Staffenson said that in his recent discussions with Mr. Trompke, he feels we are about ready to go on Chapter 10 after he tweaks a few things in it.

Chapter 17 General Provisions. Mr. Trompke had two comments on this Chapter about the changes in Section 17.050 (previously 17.040) Effect on Other Public and Private Regulations and Restrictions. Mr. Trompke did not include the referenced attachment on these changes in his memo. After discussion, the Commission approved the following changes to this Section's second sentence: Chair Staffenson read Mr. Trompke's revision to the second sentence: "It is not the intent of this Ordinance Code to interfere with other laws or ordinances relating to the use of structures, vehicles or land or relating to the construction or alteration of any buildings or improvements. It is not the intent of this Code to interfere with any easement, ~~grant~~ grant, deed restriction, covenant or other legally enforceable property interest ~~restriction imposed on the use of development of land more restrictive than the provisions of this Ordinance~~. [Note: Commissioner Glantz asked if it matters that Mr. Trompke took out the word 'grant' and Chair Staffenson said we can put it back in, and they did; see above.] Sections following this one will be renumbered. Mr. Winstead asked Chair Staffenson to provide him a copy of Mr. Trompke's text on this Item.

p. 17-3 – Section 17.110 (formerly 17.110 Abatement and Penalty) Violations. This language replaces the former language under the former 17.110 and was previously approved.

Chair Staffenson addressed the following:

p. 2-2 – Section 2.015 Computation of Time. He wanted to verify that this amended text was approved. It was.

p. 2-2 to 2-3 – Section 2.030 Pre-Application Conference. The following text was amended, in the second sentence, to read, "For other applications the an applicant or authorized representative . . ."; other amendments in this paragraph were previously approved. The City Attorney and some other elected officials recommended, via Chair Staffenson, to keep the text regarding a written summary of the conference provided to the applicant and he asked the Commission to reconsider that deletion. The point is that the applicant needs to request the written summary, Mr. Morgan said, which means they would waive confidentiality by doing so and that was our concern. Commissioner Glantz said she remembered that part of the reason for deleting it was the staff time it takes to provide that summary. Mr. Winstead said he had asked Mr. Damgen to provide the applicant with highlights of the conference, and this is not worrisome. The problem, he said, is the other agencies who are supposed to provide their

comments in a timely fashion and we don't always have those in time for the pre-application conference. It was agreed that staff will provide what we have and then provide the contact information on those comments. The formerly deleted paragraph was reinstated with the approval of the Commission: The Director, if requested by the applicant, shall provide the applicant with a written summary of the conference within ten days of the conference. The summary should include confirmation of the procedures to be used to process the application, a list of materials to be submitted, and the criteria and standards which may apply to the approval of the application. [Adopted by Ord. 550, ef 9/29.90; amended by Ord 791, ef. 2-21-08)]"

Slopes. The Commission had previously discussed slopes, and Chair Staffenson said he has a concern with the main part of town and a few other areas; he distributed a document he purchased from Metro that shows these slopes (see **Exhibit D**) and said his concern is the number of structures in that area. (There was a discussion on why Chair Staffenson paid for this information when the City of Troutdale could have provided it. We will do this for you, Mr. Winstead added, and said he will make sure it's done.) Chair Staffenson recommended that we create an Overlay for an exemption to the 25% for particular areas, and he named a few. There was discussion on where and why, good engineering for new construction in slope sites, and remodeling of residential structures. Chair Staffenson said he was basically saying that most of the areas he was speaking about have holes on their map. Commissioner Grande asked if we could look at other cities to see how they handle this.

Mr. Morgan quoted the Code, "Slopes greater than 25% that extend more than 50 feet" so it is a continuous slope, not bad. He also directed them to look at the Figures on p. 4.300-19 of the current TDC showing the standards that apply to build a house or remodel a house or any building in the Slope Zone. It is not that development is prohibited but that it has to meet these standards, and he quoted the requirements, specifications and mitigations stated here. His point, he said, is that there are standards in the Code that allow development to occur on steep slopes and they require minimization and then mitigation of impacts, but they do not prohibit development. If Chair Staffenson wants to waive these areas, and you can, you will find a lot of push-back from the State of Oregon on this because that starts running into a couple of the State Goals which include Natural Resources and Hazard Mitigation. Chair Staffenson said he was talking about areas that are developed even though they are on a steep slope. Mr. Morgan said the Code said the rehabilitation or replacement is to be rebuilt on the same footprint of the original structure, so one would have to meet the standards for new construction, and then go back to the minimization of impact. One could remodel up but not out. Mr. Morgan said he will look into this and the implications if the Commission wants to pursue it, but he would not blindly throw these out. Chair Staffenson said he would like to explore creating a map for a zone extension for slopes to assist people in the core area of town primarily by limiting the restrictions there now if they want to rebuild or remodel their residences. This discussion will be continued as nothing was decided. The issue is expanding, Mr. Morgan said, because they can rebuild and remodel. You can do an overlay zone, Mr. Winstead said. The area Chair Staffenson is looking at, Mr. Damgen said, seems to encompass the Town Center Overlay; part of it does, Chair Staffenson said, and he is looking at slope areas that are already developed. If a slope district were exempt, that would affect new construction or a rebuild. We are looking at if we select an area of the city that is already developed, Mr. Winstead said. He added that he could contact the City of Astoria to see what they have regarding new development (here Mr. Morgan added that quite a few cities will have that), and he will bring the results back to the Commission at their January meeting. Commissioner Sheets asked them to also identify any major concerns and the hazards they had discussed.

Commissioner Woidyla said the Commission has reviewed Chapter after Chapter in the TDC, and he thinks most of those have been finalized except for the few items being brought up tonight. Going over it all again, Chapter by Chapter, would be a waste of time and effort. We've make our recommendations and editorial comments, and he thinks a final copy should surface in January 2016. All we will discuss are the items we just left unfinished, Mr. Morgan said, the four or five topics. Mr. Winstead said in the future the Commission could come back every two years to make amendments, and if it's done on a more periodic basis it would save time and work. Many cities and states do that, Mr. Morgan said.

Chair Staffenson asked the Commission if they want to see any comments that come up, and how they want to handle comments that come in from outside agencies that we will need to address. Mr. Morgan said we should have all those by January, so we should plan just one more work session and be ready for a hearing in February. Mr. Winstead said he does not want to see any stone left unturned before we take this to the City Council. The next version of the amended Code was discussed as well as the timing of it; Commissioner Glantz said she would like to have enough time to review it, and were are some changes made that are not included in the drafts received to date. Chair Staffenson said he could go through it with her; Mr. Morgan said he can walk through it with her, as well, as he believes some of the recent drafts Commissioner Glantz has do not include the latest changes, although he is certain they have been included in previous versions. Mr. Winstead said he uses his own notes as well as the transcribed minutes to give to staff. If something is not approved, he will not include it. If something is missing, he needs to know it. Chair Staffenson said he believes they all feel that same way. Mrs. Barker asked if it was permitted for her to send the Commissioners a copy of draft minutes that they haven't yet seen and would not approve sometimes for at least one month after they were transcribed; she was told yes. As long as we follow what has been recorded, Mr. Winstead said, we shouldn't miss anything. The Commission agreed. The change from calendar days to working days is one example of a change not made, Commissioner Glantz said (see minutes of August 19, 2015), and she again asked why 'calendar' instead of 'working' days. Chair Staffenson said calendar was used to be consistent throughout the document.

The timeline of Development Code Commission meetings, work session, and hearings was reviewed. It was agreed that a work session will be held on January 6, 2016 (with regular meetings on December 16, 2015 and January 20, 2016), and the public hearings will be scheduled in February and March, 2016.

Adjourn. Commissioner Woidyla moved, with a second by Commissioner Prickett, to adjourn. The vote was unanimous and the meeting adjourned at 9:08 p.m.

Tanney Staffenson, Chair

Date

Attest: _____
Rooney Barker, Transcriptionist

MINUTES
TROUTDALE PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
Council Chamber
217 E. Historic Columbia River Highway
Troutdale, Oregon 97060
December 16, 2015

1. Roll Call. Chair Staffenson called the meeting to order at **7:00 p.m.** There were no agenda updates.

Commissioners Present: Sandy Glantz, Frank Grande, Jamie Kranz, Brian Sheets, Tanney Staffenson and Marv Woityla

Commissioners Absent: Shirley Prickett.

Staff: Steve Winstead, Building Official and Planning Director
Chris Damgen, Senior Planner
Travis Hultin, Chief Engineer
Rooney Barker, Transcriptionist

Guests (see list): Councilor Glenn White, 1225 E. Historic Col. Rvr. Hwy.
Diane Castillo-White, 1225 E. Historic Col. Rvr. Hwy.
Peter Kappertz, 1384 SW 22nd Ter., Gresham 97080
Mary D. Szabo, 2401 SW 22nd St., Troutdale 97060
Rick Givens, 18686 Sunblaze Dr., Oregon City
Carey Shelton, 23765 SE Hwy 212, Damascus 97087
Joanna Valencia, Multnomah County, 2602 SE 190th Ave.,
Portland 97237
Virginia Welch, 2133 SW Larsson Ave., Troutdale
Paul Wilcox, Troutdale
Gary Cohen, 2323 SW 22nd, Troutdale
Daniel C.

2. Approval of Minutes:

- **October 21, 2015 Regular Meeting.** Commissioner Woityla moved, with a second by Commissioner Sheets, to approve the minutes as written. The vote was unanimous and the motion passed.

Exhibit A. 12-16-2015 copy of PowerPoint presentation for Case File No 15-057.

Exhibit B. 12-16-2015 copies of four slides from staff presentation of Case File No. 15-057, distributed by Chris Damgen, Senior Planner.

Exhibit C. 12-15-2015 copy of e-mail to Chris Damgen from Jamie Ellam in favor of Case File No. 15-157 development.

Exhibit D. 12-16-2015 copy of the staff report for the discussion of the Capital Improvement Plan.

Exhibit E. 11-15-2015 TriMet brochure on Future Transit.

- **October 21, 2015 Work Session.** A period after 'Chapter 10' on p. 2 was removed. **Commissioner Sheets moved, with a second by Commissioner Kranz, to approve the minutes as corrected. The vote was unanimous and the motion passed.**

3. Citizen Communications – Non-Agenda Items. None.

4. Hearing Procedure.

Chair Staffenson read out loud to the audience the public hearing procedure. The Commission will make a recommendation on this item to the City Council for their decision.

No Commissioners said they had any ex parte contact, bias or conflict of interest with this case. Chair Staffenson then opened the public hearing on the following agenda item.

5. Public Hearing Type IV

Quasi-Judicial Procedure

Case File No. 15-057 Sheldon Development

Comprehensive Land Use Plan Map and Zoning Map Amendments

Before presenting his staff report, included in the agenda packet, Chris Damgen distributed additional copies of four important slides for this proposal (see **Exhibit A**-PowerPoint presentation and **Exhibit B**-copies of the four slides). He clarified that this application is for two Comp Plan Land Use Map amendments and a Zoning Map amendment, proposing a zone change from R-5 Single-Family Residential to A-2 Apartment Residential. A traffic impact analysis was submitted. He emphasized that this is not a request for approval of a specific development project or a request for a site and design review, just changing the zoning to allow for the possibility of apartments. The City Council, after receiving the Planning Commission's recommendation, will make the final decision. If there is an appeal of the City Council decision, the case goes before the State's Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA). All requested information was submitted by the applicant (see *Applicable Criteria* on p. 1 of the staff report), and staff performed the appropriate notifications to all parties. Both the State and Metro have looked at this and have not provided any objections or further comment. Comments from other agencies are included in the staff report as well as public comments. He distributed another comment received today from Jamie Ellam expressing her concerns (see **Exhibit C**). The Commission asked the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) to review this and provide a recommendation, but the CAC did not have a quorum at their meeting earlier this month so were not able to do so. He also spoke of comments received from other agencies, also in the agenda packet. Most of these were related to Site and Design Review. The Commission had no questions.

This proposal is planned for 24.4 units per acre, and he compared this to other apartment complexes in the area to give the Commission an idea of the proposed density. This site is close to the shopping center on Cherry Park Road and is near a school, a library and a park. He acknowledged the concerns put forward by the neighbors and of the traffic levels, as well as the infrastructure.

Mr. Damgen pointed out that there are separate criteria for the Comp Plan Land Use Map amendment and the Zoning Map amendment, and the applicant has submitted compliance with both. Mr. Damgen said staff recommended approval of this application subject to the Conditions of Approval in the staff report. The Commissioners asked about other high-

density residences in the city, the traffic on 242nd (Mr. Damgen said Ms. Valencia of Multnomah County would address this), whether or not these apartments would offer Section 8 housing (they would not), and how an apartment development will affect the tax structure of the city (Mr. Damgen said this is not something we can look at and that would be for the City Council to determine). If the City Council approves this application it will come back to the Planning Commission for Site and Design Review, Mr. Winstead said.

Applicant. Rick Givens, Planning Consultant for Mr. Sheldon, and Peter Kappertz, Architect, spoke to their application explaining that they planned seven 24-unit buildings that would be user friendly and aesthetically pleasing. Mr. Givens said he felt development at this site would serve the community well. Mr. Sheldon plans these as upper-end apartments, two- and three-bedroom units with nice features; that plan will be developed in more detail. He told where the garages would be located and the setbacks, with sensitivity toward the neighboring homes. He agreed that there are traffic issues but said this site is a good location for this project. Mr. Kappertz said he tried to develop the design of this project to use materials from the Pacific Northwest with wood accents and siding, appropriate colors, and that it would be an asset to the neighborhood; it meets the Statewide Planning Goal for increased density near urban arterials and commercial areas. We want this to be a very user-friendly and aesthetically pleasing facility. The gentlemen were asked if they have experienced the traffic from Reynolds High School and the traffic patterns (the Traffic Analysis addressed that, they said), and if they had figured in amenities for children in this project (yes).

Chair Staffenson asked that all comments from the audience please be kept to five minutes.

Proponent Testimony. Mr. Damgen read the e-mail he had received from Jamie Ellam, a neighbor to this property (see **Exhibit C**). Delwin and Jamie Ellam said they are in favor of upzoning the property adjacent to theirs, happy that the trees there will be saved, and added that this development will be an asset for Troutdale's growth, local businesses, parks and schools.

Opponent Testimony. Mary D. Szabo's back yard abuts the southeast corner of this property and she said she had read the e-mail submitted to staff by Gregory Ashton (see Attachment C in the Public Comments section of the staff report) and agrees with his concerns. She specifically addressed the traffic in this area, and also that the people in their three-story apartment will be able to see through the back windows of the neighboring homes. When she moved into her home in 1989 she made sure the area for was single-family homes. While she understands that things change, she does not think three-story apartment buildings are appropriate here because of privacy, traffic, schools, and property values.

Gary Cohen, another neighbor to this site, said this would be a big change for the neighborhood and he expressed concern about the traffic generated and where the entrances to this property would be located. He said he can't see how the traffic study could take into account the traffic from the proposed development since it hasn't happened yet. We have no idea what the traffic will be from the other development going on across 242nd, and we always have to deal with the traffic to Mt. Hood in the winter. Sometimes it can take five minutes to get through the traffic light at 242nd and Glisan. Troutdale has grappled with this traffic issue and still has not solved it. He disagrees completely that traffic will not be

disruptive. There is no bus service within a five-minute walk; the closest is Stark Street, a 12-minute walk, and the land values will be greatly impacted.

Virginia Welch lives adjacent to this proposed development and said her concern is mostly about the traffic, and the high school traffic is so bad that she's waited through three stoplights to exit the Safeway parking lot onto Cherry Park Road at the northwest corner of that intersection. The impact on her property is going to be huge. She said she would also like to see fewer units per acre. There is no bus service there; one has to walk all the way to Fred Meyer's or over to Stark to catch a bus; she believes apartment dwellers use bus service. She was asked if she thought better bus service would alleviate her concern; traffic has grown exponentially, Ms. Welch said, and there has been no improvement and she does not think there is any intention of improving bus service.

Neutral Testimony. Joanna Valencia, Transportation Planning and Development Manager, Multnomah County reviewed how the traffic impact study was done, taking into consideration the concerns the neighbors expressed about the high school traffic, the level of service on 242nd at the intersection with Glisan, and the impact of the other nearby Gresham development projects. Assumptions were made since the development here itself has not yet been approved, and the projected impacts of traffic were based on a worst case scenario used for this study; population number projections were also used. If the development is approved, those items will need to be addressed again. Commissioner Sheets asked if there has been any traffic impact yet from the Gresham development. Ms. Valencia said the County is not doing studies on that now so she has no calculations on it at this time. It will increase traffic there, however, she added. Replying to a question from Commissioner Kranz, Ms. Valencia referred to the East Metro Connections Plan and capacities. Generally, there is a good road system in East County, she added, and they are working on a number of projects there, one being the Bus Project for improving service. All the details will need to be fleshed out if this development is approved. The main concern is the level of service, and signal timing improvement. Commissioner Glantz asked her to define the levels of service, and Ms. Valencia said they are what is allowable for delays of from 25 to 35 seconds per vehicle. Another question was what could alleviate wait times other than traffic signals, and Ms. Valencia said there is an effort going on now to make improvements in traffic flow in East County.

Commissioner Glantz asked if the proposed new zone here would impact where the vehicles will enter and exit the property. Ms. Valencia said it is her understanding there are two proposed places, one right across from Safeway and the other a right-turn/left-turn onto 242nd. Depending on this development, there could be a higher-access emergency fire lane as well.

Mr. Givens asked to speak again to address the concern expressed about Larsson cutting through the development; his intent is to make Larsson gated and to have no crossing of vehicular traffic. He also addressed the comments about the lack of bus service, which is correct at this time, but he noted that TriMet arranges their bus lines where the people are, so eventually there may be a line there. While he said he understands the concern regarding land values, that just doesn't pan out, that the development will, in his mind, bring up the value of the properties as he plans it to be a nice, upscale apartment development with nice landscaping, screening, the location, etc. He will also work to preserve privacy and back yards. Those can be reviewed when they come before the Site and Design Review when

this proposal is approved. Also, he said he thought some of the improvements being done on 242nd will improve this property. Commissioner Woidyla asked how he would mitigate someone looking down into a single-residential property owner's yard or house from their three-story apartment. Mr. Givens said there will be parking garages on the property's side. Mr. Cohen said the one person who testified as a proponent of this development is looking to sell out and make good money on their home.

There was no more testimony and Chair Staffenson thanked everyone who spoke. Commissioner Sheets moved, with a second by Commissioner Kranz. The vote was unanimous and the public hearing was closed.

Discussion. The Commission discussed the two parking spaces per unit plus 1 space per three-units for use as guest parking for apartment zoning, the ratio of apartment zones to housing zones; were they taking the public good into consideration by continuing to increase density; what it takes for TriMet to make a bus line available to these potential tenants and how do we consider that; that the map shows this as a convenient area for people with stores, shops and schools; how the development will impact the area school districts; adding all those tenants on an already busy street; these apartments have 2-1/3 parking spaces per unit which means they're looking at at least 426 trips, and livability which is one of the criteria they need to take into account; and the fact that it was difficult to have this discussion when they are charged with looking at this specific Case File now while the actual Site and Design Review may or may not occur in the future -- they agreed that this is not an easy decision. Commissioner Sheets asked if a copy of the traffic study could be sent to him, online. Commissioner Grande reminded everyone that for this Case, the Planning Commission's decision is not final, that the City Council makes the final decision.

Mr. Winstead said the traffic study projects 1,160 trips, with weekday a.m. peak of 86 trips and p.m. peak of 110 trips; he said we defer to Multnomah County for their input on the traffic study. Commissioner Sheets asked if they were projected numbers. The traffic study was discussed in more detail. The question before us is the zone change, Commissioner Woidyla said, and the Comp Plan Map Amendment for the zone. For clarification on areas of land that can be zoned as such, Mr. Damgen quoted from Troutdale's adopted Comp Plan on High-Density Residential. It was determined that Troutdale is fairly well built out and there is not much available buildable land; those areas that are available do not have that type of proximity to public facilities, services and job centers. TriMet periodically reviews where their service should go, and this would create the opportunity for them to look at this. At this time, they had no comment on this Case. The crux of it, however, is that we need to determine if this is the appropriate place, Commissioner Sheets said, and also the possibility of getting transit to an appropriate place here. Metro has requested that we increase density, Chair Staffenson said. Mr. Winstead said it has been determined that Troutdale is fairly well built out and there is not much available buildable land; the task this evening is to look at the zone change and Comp Plan Amendment and the Commission will have ample opportunity at a later date to look at the Site and Design Review.

Commissioner Grande moved, with a second by Commissioner Woidyla, to approve the application for a Comprehensive Land Use Plan Map and Zoning Map Amendment in Case File 15-057, Sheldon Development, as presented to the

Commission. There was no discussion. **The vote was 3-yes (Grande, Woidyla and Staffenson), and 3-no (Glantz, Kranz and Grande), a tie – the motion failed and the application was not approved.**

The Commission reminded the applicant that the City Council will make the final decision; Mr. Winstead said he hopes to have it placed on the next Council agenda for the first Tuesday in January. Notifications will be sent on specifics. The Commission took a break.

6. Old Business. None.

7. New Business. Presentation Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). After Mr. Damgen distributed a copy of the staff report for the discussion of the Capital Improvement Plan discussion (see **Exhibit D**), Mr. Winstead said this Plan supports the Comprehensive Plan and is before the Commission now since they regulate the land use in the city. It will ultimately go before the City Council; this is informational for the Commission and they do not need to make a decision now but Public Works would like to have their comments at some point.

Travis Hultin, Chief Engineer, explained that not all the projects listed in this Plan are scheduled and future budgets will determine how they are funded. Chair Staffenson said we are looking at this from a planning perspective but we need to keep in mind that this Plan affects System Development Charge (SDC) rates and that does affect development. This is the project list that the Council received and any corrections or revisions are reflected. The Commission is to report back to the Council with their comments on the project list, Chair Staffenson said. Mr. Winstead added that they can make a recommendation or submit comments on the list, but this is a presentation only this evening. Mr. Hultin said there is no formal or statutory role of the Planning Commission in this process, but the Council asked Public Works to take it to the Commission for their feedback and/or comment. Public Works would like to move the process forward and asked the Commission to provide their feedback and/or comment this evening, if possible.

This is a little better than the first draft, Mr. Hultin said, and it includes a few projects that Public Works is still reviewing which he will point out. It is a work in progress. We would like your feedback and your guidance before we finalize it so that we can take those into account before it goes to Council and Public Works would like to take this to them in January, but certainly February.

Mr. Hultin summarized his staff report and explained what the CIP is, basically making a list of what project the City will need in the foreseeable future. This covers five systems: water, sewers, storm drains, sanitary sewers and parks, and includes only projects that are for building new facilities, expanding existing facilities, or upgrading existing facilities. Projects that are maintenance or replacement projects will not be in this Plan. There are other projects the City will do but they are not in this Plan. Mr. Hultin also addressed how System Development Charges (SDCs) are used in this Plan. The Budget Committee will also review this Plan before it goes before the City Council for their review and adoption. He spoke of previous CIPs, and said this CIP includes those projects as well as new items. He closed by saying he would be open for questions.

Commissioner Glantz asked about the proposed right-of-way through the Outlet Mall (p. 6 of Exhibit A in the staff report); Mr. Hultin said it was determined that the 257th access

there would not be sufficient; the ideal would be to have direct access and the City is in negotiation with the current owners in an attempt to acquire that right-of-way. On p. 10 regarding the Improve Stark Street from 257th to Troutdale Road project, she asked what the project is and why. Mr. Hultin said this has been in the Plan for quite some time, and he explained exactly what it was. The funds are not secured for it yet, but the culvert portion of it is funded. The culvert is not long enough to widen the road, so everyone knew the first step was the culvert. Fish passage through the culvert is another part of that and is being designed now. The County expects to construct it next summer. ADA standards were also discussed and Mr. Hultin said some of that could be supplied by development.

The Halsey Corridor Plan (p. 11) did not show the estimated cost, and Mr. Hultin said he's been working on trying to get that number. Chair Staffenson spoke of the Halsey Corridor Development Study of May 29, 2015, where in Table 3 it states that the Troutdale portion would be \$5,464,000. That may be for the improvements that come out of the Plan, Mr. Hultin said, and added that he could not imagine that plan costing that much. That number might be the total cost of the improvements and he offered to look it up. Chair Staffenson said that plan was submitted by Fairview, Wood Village and Troutdale, but he wasn't sure who they submitted it to.

On p. 14, Signal at Buxton/Historic Columbia River Highway, Mr. Hultin said he has been pestering the County for the last six months about this traffic signal. This has been in our CIP for at least 15 or 20 years.

Commissioner Staffenson asked why we would do the Pedestrian Bridge from the CBD (Central Business District) to the URA (Urban Renewal Area) (p. 16). That came out of the Urban Renewal Plan, Mr. Hultin replied. The vehicle bridge was also discussed, but the original plan was for this pedestrian bridge. The Commission felt this was not a good use of funds.

The Backage Road (Marine Drive Extension (p. 17) funding was discussed; Mr. Hultin said the City's portion typically would be in the range of 10% to 12%. He is working to refine this project to try to take down the numbers. ODOT and the City put the Troutdale Interchange Area Management Plan in 2011, and that is what prompted this Backage Road item to protect the pedestrians there. ODOT did follow through on this Plan as the other projects that came out of it were adding a lane on Frontage Road, putting a left-turn lane on Marine Drive which they have just completed, and adding a lane on the off-ramp.

On p. 8, Shared Roadway Pavement Markings (Exhibit B in this report), Commissioner Sheets asked what streets have bike routes and which are included in this, and Mr. Hultin said this comes out of the Transportation System Plan (TSP) and a few streets he could think of were portions of Sturges (off 257th), Sweetbriar Lane, Hensley Road and maybe a few others.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Kranz, Mr. Hultin said the order of the projects in his staff report is that they are sorted by short-term, short/medium-term, and long-term. The project numbers are simply the order in which they were identified.

On p. 8 of the Water Improvements section of the report, Mr. Hultin described where the additional well will be located, off Strebin Road, because the City has land there and it is a good location for a well. We will drill until we hit the aquifer. The amount of funding listed

is solely for construction costs. Discussion prompted Mr. Hultin to refer the Commission to p. 6, Construct a 1.0 MG Standpipe (Reservoir No. 5) with line to Zone 1, and he explained how a well construction differs from a reservoir construction. Pressure control stations will control the water feed to any zone, he added, although this is planned to add capacity to Zone 1.

In Exhibit C, Sanitary Sewer Improvement, in this report, Mr. Hultin said there are a few projects in the industrial area that are on the cusp as staff is not certain they will be included and they need to do more analyses before they go to the Council for adoption. This will depend on the intensity of industrial development and on the discharge from said development. We're looking at whether or not we will keep them in the CIP or rule them out, and he gave a few examples: Airport to Graham Road Sewer Main Upsizing (p. 7), and Upsize Pump Station #7 (Sundial Pump Station) (p. 10).

Commissioner Glantz asked, referencing on p. 11 the Lower Beaver Creek Sewer Main Upsizing, where the 'future growth' figures come from, and Mr. Hultin told her about the areas that could be developed. A concern there is the elevation of the properties on Beaver Creek Lane. On p. 12 WPCF Upgrades, he said we don't know yet what these upgrades are but we are anticipating the potential for them and he added some detail. Temperature is our main concern now but others could come along in the future and we want to be prepared.

In the Parks Improvement projects, p. 1 Update Parks Master Plan, he explained that the Parks Master Plan was created in 2000 to 2006 and a very large component of the funding in the Plan was based on land acquisition which was determined by the level of service, so by the time the Plan was adopted that was agreed upon. Based on that, we looked at having so many acres for each type of park per capita and that was based on the population forecast which is unlike all the other master plans which are based on land use or land coverage. The population forecast at that time was over 19,000 and now it's projected just over 17,000, so that land acquisition number should be re-run and reduced, in his opinion. A lot of the parks projects, as determined ten years ago, were based on what the users wanted then. Maybe that has changed and we need to address that. When this Plan was created it was planned to cover up to 2020 and we're close to that; he recommended engaging the community again, confirming their desires and needs, revising the numbers, and updating the Plan at least into 2020.

The Parks projects listed in the CIP Summary Tables (Draft) show the costs in the original Parks Master Plan. Mr. Hultin said he has reduced the dollar figure on one of the trail projects based on what he knows was completed (on the 40-Mile Loop); everything else is exactly the way it was in the first Plan. There was discussion on where exactly these projects will take place, and a request for one map that will show this, perhaps by year. Commissioner Kranz and Chair Staffenson asked about the different numbers for what looked like land acquisition; Mr. Hultin said, again, that these numbers came directly from the existing Plan, although some of them include actual acquisition as well as improvements to the land. Commissioner Woidyla said this Plan is ten years old and when it's updated he believes all the funding amounts will be lowered. Commissioner Sheets expressed his concern about the methodology, particularly the linear relationship within a defined area based on population, and he went into detail and said this could be problematic. Mr. Hultin agreed and said the city is getting pretty full in terms of available

and relevant land; even if we were sitting on all the funds to buy land, would there be any to buy, he asked.

Funding the CIP was discussed; until this CIP is approved we work with the current one, Mr. Hultin said. If this Commission agrees that this Plan should be updated, Public Works can take it to the City Council with their comments and suggestions to inform their decision on whether or not we will do it.

Regarding the Storm Sewer Improvements section of this staff report (Exhibit D, p. 1 in the report), Mr. Hultin said everything north of Columbia River Highway projects came out of this Plan, and helped develop this area which has changed it dynamically. The Master Plan has also prompted identification of even more projects while looking at those that are no longer needed. It's only been a ten-year Plan and it will probably be another five years before they look to update it, but given the rapid changes that have occurred he recommends updating it sooner. He also spoke of the Unified Storm Drainage Master Plan (p. 19) which, in another 20 years, might be at that point and we may need two separate Master Plans.

Generally speaking, Mr. Hultin said the Columbia River Highway Bike Path (p. 4, Exhibit A) has flooding problems that the drainage system can't handle and it's a safety issue. He also said the funding costs shown for each project in the CIP has been projected out to be what the project will cost in the future. He recommended updating the Storm Sewer Improvements Master Plan in the north of the city, and in the Sanitary Sewer Improvements Plan they plan to review existing analyses to determine if the projects are now needed. We won't have to do another study or hire a consultant since we have the material and can look through it and make that determination ourselves. He thanked the Commission for their comments and feedback, and to let him know if they have any other comments. Mr. Winstead suggested that all comments be consolidated before this goes to the Council.

Commissioner Sheets moved, with a second by Commissioner Glantz, to continue discussion on this item at the January 6, 2016. There was no discussion. The vote was 6/0 and the motion passed. Mr. Hultin was invited back for that meeting.

8. **Department Reports.** Mr. Damgen distributed a status update on TriMet's efforts (see **Exhibit E**) in their long-range planning for their buses. They are looking for feedback from the Commission, the Council and citizens about bus and transit service in East County, hopefully by the end of January.

He also reported on a meeting last week at the Port of Portland headquarters at PDX on their upcoming intentions at Troutdale's airport, and how to present information on the Troutdale Airport Master Plan which will be next month. Staff as well as Commissioner Woidyla attended that meeting, and Mr. Damgen asked the Commissioner to explain what the Port intended. The Commissioner pointed out (on a Troutdale map) the airport property (on the north side) that is proposed to be designated as industrial land, and he also showed where offices and businesses were now located and how many people worked at each, stating that all those businesses and employees will be gone by 2020 if this Plan is approved. No business jets will be allowed because the runways will be too short, and the people who have been landing here, renting cars, staying in local hotels, etc., will go to either Portland or probably Aurora. What we have enjoyed in the past is gone, in a

nutshell. The Port's next meeting is scheduled for January 28, 2016, at Edgefield, from 5:30 p.m. to perhaps 9:00 p.m. Mr. Damgen said he will send out a reminder to the Commissioners. Commissioner Glantz asked why the conversion to industrial land is so important to the Port, and a lengthy discussion followed.

9. **Commission Initiatives and Concerns.** Commissioner Grande said the audience in this chamber cannot hear testimony or the Commission and asked why there is not a PA system (public address) installed as there was at the old City Hall. No one had an answer. Mr. Winstead said he will look into this. Commissioner Glantz said there are homeless people living in the nature park on Stark and Troutdale Road, by Mt. Hood Community College. Mr. Winstead said he'll make sure Commander Anderson is aware of that; he believes the Commander has mentioned it. Chair Staffenson asked about the Kane Road culvert and the timeframe on that; Mr. Damgen said Gresham is getting an update but doesn't have an official timeline as there are several issues they have to contend with. Mr. Hultin said he hasn't heard any specifics from Gresham but he believes the range will be from three weeks to 90 days, perhaps even 120 days. There is a sink hole on Kane Drive in front of the college.

Chair Staffenson thanked everyone for the work they did in 2015.

10. **Adjourn.** Commissioner Glantz moved, with a second by Commissioner Sheets, to adjourn. The vote was unanimous and the meeting adjourned at 10:49 p.m.
11. **Work Session.** Development Code Update. This item was not addressed this evening.

Tanney Staffenson, Chair

Date

Attest: _____
Rooney Barker, Transcriptionist