

REGULAR MEETING

April 20, 1998

CALL TO ORDER:

A regular meeting of the Beaverton City Council was called to order by Mayor Rob Drake in the Council Chambers, 4755 SW Griffith Drive, Beaverton, Oregon, on Monday, April 20, 1998, at 6:31 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Present were Mayor Drake, Counc. Evelyn Brzezinski, Dennis Doyle, Forrest Soth, Cathy Stanton and Wes Yuen. Also present were Assistant City Attorney Bill Scheiderich, Chief of Staff Linda Adlard, Finance Director Patrick O'Claire, Community Development Director Joe Grillo, Operations/Maintenance Director Steve Baker, Police Captain Richard DeHaan, Administrative Chief Gary Nees, Development Services Manager Irish Bunnell, Landscape Supervisor Steve Brennen, Project Engineer Jerry Williams, and City Recorder Darleen Cogburn.

CITIZEN COMMUNICATION:

Nell Langeluttig, Chair of Central Beaverton NAC (CBNAC), gave a report on the neighborhood cleanup and said it was unfortunate that they had to turn away some people because they did not have enough dumpsters. She reported that other NACs came by and asked for them to allow others to come to their site. She read from her letter (in the record), detailing the problems with not enough containers for the trash from the cleanup in various neighborhoods. She noted that in the past CBNAC had filled eight dumpsters and declared that if a cleanup was advertised, they needed to have adequate dumpsters. She stated that the NAC considered it a goal to support community-wide efforts to maintain and improve the neighborhoods. She said they wanted support for a fall cleanup.

Langeluttig reported that Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue (TVF&R) burned the house across from the cleanup site just as truckloads of debris were arriving. She said a serious accident could have occurred with all the smoke. She remarked that it appeared there was a lack of communication within City government, because TVF&R would have had to get a permit for the controlled burn. She reported that Portland had an events clearinghouse to avoid conflicts such as that, and CBNAC suggested something similar to prevent such situations.

Mayor Drake thanked her and said he could not imagine why the City would not support a cleanup in the fall. He explained that during the budget process they could make a motion and add it. He said he did not know if they did or did not communicate about the controlled burn of the house, and if they didn't, they should have. He noted that it was sort of a quick decision so it would be done by May 9, when the Farmers Market started, and it was a training opportunity.

Langeluttig replied that she knew it was a training opportunity, but the juxtaposition was not good, because if the wind had switched, it could have been a disaster.

Coun. Yuen recalled that in years past when they had cleanup days he thought they had more capacity and more haulers. He reported that when the City went to the curbside and yard debris recycling, they thought there would not be as great a need as in the past for the cleanup. He said after reviewing the situation the past weekend, it seemed like they were wrong and had underestimated the need. He suggested they might need to reconsider and reevaluate the plans for the next time.

Langeluttig commented that from what people had said, the yard debris was fine for regular weekly debris, but for the spring and fall cleanups, they need much more room. She noted the NACs wanted to encourage people to keep cleaning up.

Coun. Yuen agreed that the timing of the seasons would put more people out pruning and cleaning up. He noted that the past week he had commented about a tree pruning seminar he had attended (provided by the City), which was intended to teach people how to prune their trees. He stated that his expectation was that if you give people skills, they would be out there using them, pruning and cleaning up.

Langeluttig reported that there was a sizable tree in the yard of the house which was burned, and it sustained damage from the burn. She suggested they think carefully about the natural resources when they do a burn.

Mayor Drake noted that it was an old house, and the City had to remove the asbestos before the burn, so theoretically the tree should have been noticed, also.

Irma Trommlitz, 515 NW 112th Ave., Portland, 97229, noted that she did not live in the City at this time, but anticipated that Cedar Mill would become part of the City, in time. She said she was there as a candidate for Washington County Chair, and she was upset about an editorial in the *Valley Times*. She wanted the Council to understand that she expected to be a partner with all the cities, and was very happy with Beaverton. She noted that she thought that she had worked as partners with the City on the Urban Services Boundary with Portland, and was actively advocating annexation to the City in the future. She stated that she did not want any of them to think that she lacked interest in the City, and valued the City as a partner. She explained, regarding the pink sheet she handed out (in record), that she and her father had spent the day at the corner of Leahy and Cedar Mill, passing them out. She stated that they were a way of collecting signatures about the connection of Leahy. She wanted the Council and citizens to know, that whether or not Leahy went through, they were trying to get the right kind of connectivity, pedestrian friendly, multi-modal transportation system, that would work with the

County. She stated that she did not think the City or County had enough money to build themselves out of the traffic congestion problems they had.

Coun. Stanton asked if she was going to the Washington County Commission the following day, and also how many signatures she had gotten.

Trommlitz said she would be taking about 200 signatures to the Commissioners. She said there were some people who lived on Leahy who had a problem with it being connected because they were afraid people would speed through there even more. She noted they had a meeting the previous week and invited people who she knew were opposed. She said she gave a presentation on the various types of traffic calming and reported that she hated bumps, and most of the others agreed. She reported that she got people who had been opposed, to agree and said they would be happy to have Leahy go through if they could get traffic calming. She stated that they did not trust the County to do their part, but if the County would sign and say they would do traffic calming, they would be happy. She suggested traffic circles, islands, etc., and noted that the new part of Leahy, near her home, was narrow, and that was what many others wanted. She reiterated that they did not want speed bumps, but did want traffic calming.

Trommlitz suggested the County spend part of the \$19 million in reserves.

COUNCIL ITEMS:

Coun. Doyle said he attended the THPRD opening for the Nature Park, and it was a great success. He noted that LRT was open for test rides. He said the Nature Park was off Millikan, and invited people to visit and enjoy the wonderful new park. He clarified that on Thursday, April 23, 1998, in City Hall Chambers was a Candidate Forum, and he asked what the time was. He encouraged people to attend.

Coun. Brzezinski said her announcement said 7:00 p.m., and also encouraged attendance.

Coun. Yuen announced that he received a notice from TVEDC indicating that Washington County was holding a candidates forum on April 29, from 7:30 a.m. to 9:30 a.m. at the Greenwood Inn. He asked if anyone knew about a benefit for the Chamber called "Golf Scramble."

Mayor Drake said the Chamber did have a "Golf Scramble," but did not have information.

Coun. Yuen suggested they might want to put together a City team.

Linda Adlard, Chief of Staff, said she would get him some information.

Coun. Yuen asked if there was some way of reporting an issue he

encountered with Certifax, the City's prescription drug provider.

Adlard said to her knowledge they do not keep statistics, but it would be the City's expectation that as their vendor, Certifax would respond to all issues of concern. She asked him to report it to Sandra Miller, and then someone would follow it up. She said they would let Certifax know that it was not acceptable, whether it was Coun. Yuen or another employee. She said they expect the City's vendors to give good customer service, and noted that the City dealt with those issues on a one-on-one basis.

Coun. Yuen stated that he had already dealt with it. He expressed his concern that if the City did not keep statistics about the organization, the City could keep renewing their role with Certifax and not be aware of the customer service situations.

Mayor Drake said Miller was not there, and there was the chance that issue would not go to the Mayor's office. He stated that he would make a note of it, and get back to Coun. Yuen with a memo about what the experience had been.

Coun. Yuen said he was concerned that the experience needed to be tracked. He stated that it was the City's responsibility to know about the customer service issues, if they were going to renew the contract on the basis of good customer service.

Adlard said when she said she did not know if they had statistics, that did not mean that they would not know of the experience. She said she did not know if they could tell you how many experiences they had. She noted that the City was such a small unit, she was sure the staff doing the health benefit analysis would be well aware of what was going on with the employees, as long as employees shared their experiences. She suggested that possibly at the end of the year they could do a survey to see what the experiences were. She said she would check to see if there were statistics.

Coun. Yuen stated that his experience was such, that by the time he finished he was so angry that if it had been in his power, he would have canceled the contract. He said he thought they needed to be careful, because they might only have five experiences where five employees could be going through several days not knowing what was happening with their medicine. He expressed his feeling that the City employees deserved a lot better than that.

Coun. Brzezinski noted that they all received copies of a letter to the Mayor about "cats." She wondered if they were going to send a response from the City, or if they needed to respond individually.

Mayor Drake reported that Joyce Storms, his Administrative Assistant was preparing a letter thanking the class for their information, and telling them that the City did not regulate licensing or control for dogs and cats. He noted that it was a letter from a fourth grade class. He said they

would suggest the students write to the County.

Coun. Brzezinski said she had been wondering how he was going to make cats stay in their own yard!

Mayor Drake said if anyone had any ideas, he would appreciate them.

Coun. Stanton requested that the Council receive a copy of the Mayor's letter in response. She reminded everyone of the Mayor's Prayer Breakfast at 7:30 a.m., on April 28, at the Greenwood Inn.

STAFF ITEMS:

Adlard reminded the Council that in their franchise agreement they required the garbage haulers to participate in one cleanup. She said they could have many cleanup days, but the City could not rely upon the charity of the haulers. She reported that she thought it would be about \$10,000 per day, but to keep the City looking good they would put figures together so during the budget process it could be addressed.

Coun. Stanton noted that, while that might be true on a City-wide level, she reported that West Beaverton Sanitary had donated equipment and/or services to her neighborhood, more than one time per year. She suggested that others might be willing to do more as service businesses.

Adlard said they would ask them again, but reported that the past fall they asked and were turned down.

PROCLAMATIONS:

Oregon Crime Victims' Rights Week

Days of Remembrance

Arbor Week

CONSENT AGENDA:

Coun. Yuen noted that there had been an amendment to AB 98-91, and **MOVED, SECONDED** by Coun. Doyle, that Council approve the consent agenda as follows:

Minutes of the regular meeting of March 2, 1998

- 98-90 A Resolution Declaring a Nuisance of Discarded Vehicles, on Property at 6945/65 SW Murray Blvd. Beaverton, OR 97007 (Tax Lots # 1S1 20 AD 5600/5700) and Ordering its Abatement
- 98-91 Land Use Final Order Granting Appeal and Reversing the Decision of the Planning Commission (CUP 97006); Murray Manor PUD

98-92 Contract Change Order And Transfer Resolution – Consultant Work To Assist With The Round At Beaverton Central

Coun. Doyle gave his corrections to the minutes to Darleen Cogburn, City Recorder.

Coun. Stanton said she would abstain from voting on the minutes because she had not read them.

Coun. Stanton said, regarding AB 98-92, she appreciated Coun. Yuen's question, for which she also got the answers. She stated, given the scope of the funds involved, especially the one increase which almost doubled it, she felt it possibly should have been additional work, as opposed to completing it on the existing contract. She said she respected the answer given to Coun. Yuen, but she still, had concerns.

Adlard apologized and said she did not think they communicated very carefully. She explained that all of the dollars were additional work, which they did not anticipate because they did not understand the complexity of the issue. She said she did not believe she could bring information to the Council and Mayor based upon half information. She stated that it was unfortunate, the way information had been presented, which was different to the financing population for the developer, vs. what the City would like to see. She explained that the City staff would like it to be a standard that they feel should be met, in order to assure the Council that the project was feasible, completed and exactly what they asked for. She noted staff had to continue to dig through the pile, and do further analysis, which has led them to another step they need to do. She stated they were not doing one hour of work that was not necessary in order to give the Council the absolute best recommendation they could regarding the project, in June.

Adlard noted that with the modifications of such things as the roads and the different buildings, and modifying what those costs were, and spreading that across the entire project, it meant that there were some legal differences. She explained that there were changes in the CC&Rs, and even though the City was not writing those, Mr. Norville did speak to the developer's attorney and make sure they were the standards the City wanted downtown. She said the formation of the non-profit group to handle events, etc., and other such things, had just added up. She stated that if the City did another such project, she would know this, but she did not and apologized because they kept returning to ask for funds. She assured them they needed to do those things in order to give the Council and citizens the best product possible.

Coun. Stanton asked if it had been a month or 6 weeks ago, that they had a presentation on "these are all the new things we are going to need." She expressed her concern that at that time she thought that was the last extra check they were writing and then this came up. She wondered if

once a month they were going to get *dinged*.

Adlard said she hoped it was not once a month. She explained that there were nine phases to the project, would have something happening in every phase, and noted they were doing the extra work in-house as much as they could. She said some of the expertise they did not have, or else had not had the staff time to do it. She clarified that the financial analysis was a critical step, because if they recommended that the Council transfer the property, and then found that somehow they did not dig deep enough into part of it, it could be a problem. She said they were being very careful. She stated that she thought they could expect to see other cost relating to a \$100 million project. She said none of them had been through this before and there were components the City did not control. She noted that as they change some of the standards it changed things.

Coun. Stanton thanked Adlard for the explanation.

Coun. Yuen thanked staff for answering his questions and for making the corrections he had asked for. He said it was important for the record to be clean and correct.

Coun. Yuen said he would abstain the minutes because he was not there, and also on AB 98-91, because he was not there for the hearing.

Coun. Doyle said he also would abstain from AB 98-91.

Coun. Brzezinski asked if Coun. Doyle was sure he was not at the hearing on Murray Manor PUD.

Coun. Doyle said he was sure.

Question called on the motion. Couns. Yuen, Doyle, Stanton, Brzezinski, and Soth voting AYE, the motion CARRIED unanimously. (5:0) Note: Couns. Yuen and Stanton abstained on the minutes of 3/2/98, and Couns. Yuen and Doyle abstained from AB 98-91.

WORK SESSION:

98-93 Engineer's Report for the Lombard Gardens Drainage Study

Mayor Drake explained that this was a work session only and there would be no public testimony at this time. He explained that a public hearing would be held on May 4, 1998, at the Council meeting and the public would have an opportunity to speak at that time. He commented that Council received a copy of the Engineer's Report (Report) prior to the meeting. He noted that there had been opportunity for public comment earlier on the material in the Report.

Jerry Williams, Project Engineer, and Tony Righellis, consultant, were present to answer questions.

Coun. Soth commented that from reading the material and some comments from residents, he was puzzled as to whether or not in the presentation to the residents, it was said or inferred in some way that the CDBG Grant would cover the entire cost. He noted that because of all the things involved, it appeared the citizens would rather go with Option 4 and have the full improvement. He said to the best of his knowledge, they had never done an entire project through CDBG; there had been partnership agreements.

Williams explained that on pages 8 and 9, of the Report, they discussed potential funding sources, and that information was provided to the people in the neighborhood. He noted that if a substantial portion of the funding came from CDBG, it would take a multi-year commitment.

Coun. Stanton said that was a nice answer but it did not answer the question. She asked what parts of the entire project would be funded by CDBG, regarding Option 4.

Williams clarified that when they were discussing funding options they were discussing all four of the Options and the funding alternatives. He noted that some of the funding sources they identified applied to specific options, but concerning CDBG funds, there were no commitments made as to where funding would come from. He said they were attempting to identify potential sources.

Coun. Stanton clarified that she wanted to know what portion of the project for Option 4 would be paid for with CDBG funds. She noted that she did not need an answer that night, they could get that information later.

Mayor Drake reported that there was a lot of internal discussion and his concern was that people would believe that if they went "Cadillac," i.e. a total redo of everything, there would be just one funding source, or that was the only option. He noted that the City did not receive even \$500,000 in CDBG funds per year. He explained that the administration costs would come off the top and there was funding to social services from it also, which left a much lesser amount to use for other projects. He said he wanted to be sure the Council and the citizens got the information up front to understand that CDBG may be a source but not the only source. He noted that the lesser Options 1 and 2, CDBG could pay for, but if they chose Options 3 or 4, they might need other funding options, which could include a Local Improvement District (LID).

Coun. Stanton asked how much would be left to fund through an LID if all resources available, i.e. CDBG, Street Lighting Fund, Water Line Replacement, Sanitary Sewer Main Rehab, if they took out of every one of those "pots," how much would be left. She said that was an answer they could get her later, before the public hearing.

Mayor Drake noted he thought she was asking was for some scenarios which would give her some funding options for the various project

options. He suggested a menu and one for citizens to look at and comment.

Coun. Stanton explained that while they had very good cost estimates for the options, they did not have the funding options. She called attention to the fact that this "Cadillac" version was City standards for every other neighborhood, so they were not giving this neighborhood more than every other neighborhood already had.

Mayor Drake commented that part of the internal discussion had been that as an older city, it had older standards when 11th, 12th, and 13th Streets were developed; they did not require sidewalks, and other things that currently were required. He said if it were new development, infill in that neighborhood, the sidewalks would be required as well as storm drains and everything else up to City standards.

Coun. Stanton pointed out that the City Hall was being upgraded to seismic standards even though the law did not require it. She gave the analogy of buying the three-year old new shoes because the hand-me-downs did not fit, was not necessarily a bad thing.

Coun. Brzezinski noted that they needed to keep in mind that as the newer neighborhoods were getting the newer standards they were paying for them in the cost of the house. She clarified that the people in that neighborhood did not make that kind of payment and they should keep that in mind.

Coun. Stanton noted that those in that neighborhood had been paying for sewers, sanitary, street lighting fund, etc., and through their property taxes, at least some of it.

Coun. Soth asked, assuming Option 4 was chosen, with the complete upgrading of water and sewer, where in that area, were those two items (water and sewer) in the current Capital Improvement Project fund (CIP). He wondered how far out they were, in terms of years, and should they be included in the project being discussed, what other projects would be bumped further back. He said they could get that information to him later.

Williams said he could not tell them to the year, when sewer and water lines on 11th, 12th, and 13th were to be replaced. He noted that they fell into a category of the oldest sewer lines in the City. He said he could also not tell them what projects would be rearranged if those were moved forward, but he could get the answer for the hearing.

Coun. Soth noted that in each of the other three scenarios, some sump pumps would be required, and asked if it was intended or proposed to continue use of those already in existence or would they be new. He also wanted to know if that would fall on the owners of the property.

Williams explained that when they did the estimate of the costs of the

project, they tried to include all costs. He said they identified that private plumbing and sump pumps on private property would be the responsibility of the property owner. He explained that whether or not they used the existing pumps would depend on if they could handle the amount of water. He stated that they would not require specific pumps to be used; they would advise the owners to the best of their ability.

Coun. Soth clarified that as he interpreted it, any drains and perimeter drains would be the responsibility of the property owners.

Williams reported that if they built either Option 3 or 4, stubouts would be taken to each property line in a convenient location, and it would be the property owners' responsibility to connect them.

Righellis clarified that even though there are sump pumps in Options 3 and 4, those were only for homes on Lombard Avenue, where they were away from the main streets. He said they had identified where sump pumps were, and there were some sump pumps in the neighborhood but not nearly the number it would take for Options 1 or 2.

Coun. Soth noted that there were some properties with an address on Lombard where a drain was proposed to be connected to one from the residential street, rather than the normal way of a drain line going out to the street of the address. He asked if that was because of the slope of the land.

Righellis said that was correct. He noted that the only homes they proposed to connect to Lombard were those which were not corner lots.

Coun. Yuen said his questions related to pages 4 and 6. He said on page 4, in looking at the different Options, he was interested in the division of opinion in regard to the Options. He noted that he found it interesting, the concerns about retaining the character of the neighborhood vs. notions of safety. He stated that Options 2 and 3, at some level were feasible, because they do address the 25-year flood event. He noted that they did so by the construction or excavation of ditches or swales, and the neighbors had serious concerns about safety for children. He asked if the ditches were deep enough for a child to fall in and get injured or drown.

Mayor Drake asked how deep they were and how the channeling worked.

Righellis explained that in Option 2, they were the typical county road ditches, 2-3 feet deep, and such a ditch had its depth and issues of safety. He explained that for Option 3, the swale was shallow, in about a 6 foot span, the depression would only be 8 inches, so it was like a gradual gutter. He said it could be driven through without the need for culverts and driveways. He clarified it would be the 18 feet of current asphalt and this swale on each side, which made the asphalt seem a lot wider.

Mayor Drake asked if the swale had an underground piping system.

Righellis noted that Options 1 and 3 were similar, except 3 had the piping and was paved. He said there were no sidewalks, and he thought that the current behavior of parking just off the pavement would continue, with parking in the swales. He explained that would not change the character, but would add a drainage system.

Mayor Drake Rob explained that this was changing what neighbors had said, that especially since the road had been overlaid, people thought the water was running off the crown and backing into their front yards. He said this small depression would funnel the water and the storm drain system would take it away, as opposed to leaving it sit there.

Coun. Yuen asked, regarding Option 3, had they discussed the issue of maintenance of the swales, such as street sweeping.

Williams stated that with the asphalt swales, the street sweeper could maintain them with no problem.

Coun. Yuen referred to the paragraph on water and sanitary sewer in Option 4, page 4, and said he did not know enough about the process. He explained that he knew that at some point they would have to replace the sewer lines in that area, and the cost would be from City funds. He said what he did not understand was how much of that work would involve road work or work within the right-of-way (ROW). He asked if the work they would do for the sewer lines would involve some road work, wouldn't that reduce the overall cost of the project (Lombard Gardens Drainage Study), because that work would not have to be done by the project. He clarified that if the City had done the sewer lines, the work would have been done, anyway.

Williams said if water and sewer lines were replaced in that neighborhood without other improvement, there would be substantial asphalt patching. He explained that the patching would be to the extent that if that work was done as part of the package, where the road work was done on top of it, then the portion of the costs that would have gone into asphalt patching, would not have to, so it could be used as part of the total street cost.

Coun. Yuen said that was exactly his point.

Righellis noted that the percentage would probably not be a big item, because most of the water line/sewer replacement, they estimated the numbers at \$200,000 and \$240,000, which were not inclusive of the \$1.1 million. He explained that it was only the surface part because you would still come back with rock, etc.; it was only the final surface. He noted that the benefit of doing it all at once was you did not pay for that extra asphalt, and you have a nicer looking product on the surface.

Coun. Yuen explained that he was trying to determine if the two costs were separate, or if one could subtract from the other if they were done concurrently. He wondered if they were actually two distinct costs and

you simply add them together and that was the cost of the project.

Righellis said the latter was correct.

Coun. Yuen noted that on page 6 of Option 4, he appreciated the information regarding the advantages and disadvantages. He remarked that it was interesting that Option 4 was the only Option that warranted (logically) the comment "upgrades neighborhood to Comprehensive Plan Standards and (the important phrase) improves property values." He noted that made sense because of the improvement, and thought it ought to be factored into how they viewed this. He noted that he might be in the minority, but if what they were doing actually increased their property values of those who lived here, then the City should expect them to participate in the improvement. He commented the owners would benefit from the improvement, and philosophically it was a reason to at least ask them to participate.

Coun. Soth reported that the last time he checked with an appraiser, a fully improved street would add between six and ten percent to the property value, and was not sure if that was still accurate. He referred to the schematic on page 5 of 9, of Option 4, and noted that it appeared that the ROW was 40 feet on all three streets, and to bring everything in there would require 46 feet. He said it was unclear in reading some of the comments, (particularly regarding the north side of 13th Street), if the center line of the ROW went down the center of the pavement.

Williams said if they could take a plus or minus three or four feet, it was approximately in the middle of the roadway.

Coun. Soth explained that he was curious because of the opinions and the concerns expressed in the comments. He said if he recalled correctly, at the time most of those houses were built, the front yard setback was either 20 or 25 feet. He noted that the construction would take a couple or three feet off of that.

Williams stated that he was aware of two houses on 13th St. that currently had about 17 foot setbacks, and if three feet were taken off, the setback would be 14 feet.

Coun. Soth asked whether or not there would be a possibility that if those two houses were next to each other they could put a little "wow" in there to lessen the impact. He said he was curious and they could let him know later.

Coun. Soth said it appeared they were looking at a 28 foot pavement, curb-to-curb, which was skinnier than the standard of 32 feet, and asked if that would allow parking on one side.

Righellis responded that Coun. Soth was correct that it would be 28 feet from curb-to-curb, but it would allow parking on both sides, and noted it was the current standard.

Mayor Drake noted that the fire department had signed off on them.

Coun. Soth reiterated that it seemed skinny to him, but he knew they were going that way for traffic control.

Bill Scheiderich, Assistant City Attorney, said he was curious as to what the current Comprehensive Plan standard was for a local street. He noted that if the design varied from it, they would have to go through a separate process for the variance.

Williams said the current Comprehensive Plan standard for a street with less than 1000 vehicles per day, RL-2 standard, was 28 feet with 46 feet of ROW.

Coun. Stanton commented that of the 86 people in the neighborhood, there was a tremendous turnout at the open houses. She said she was impressed with the numbers, and it was indicative of how concerned the residents were.

Coun. Stanton referred to the culvert /ditches in Option 3, (which she said she hated), and said her question had to do with Option 4, and the issue of how wide the street was and how much was taken up with sidewalks. She asked if they added the sidewalks and the street trees, would that impact the length of the driveways; would people have to park on the sidewalks. She expressed her concern about that possibility.

Williams recalled that he had mentioned there were at least two properties on 13th St. which had 17-foot setbacks, and if they did the widening and took an additional three feet, they would have only 14 foot setbacks. He noted that could put them back close to the sidewalk.

Righellis stated that you normally use 20 feet per vehicle for length, and they could possibly do some design variations, creative things in those local areas to minimize that. He agreed there was a potential for some problems.

Mayor Drake clarified that Righellis was referring to possibly jutting the sidewalk and curb out along those properties.

Righellis explained that maybe they would just have a sidewalk and remove the planter at a certain location, jutting the curb out, and things like that, but they had no detailed information at this point.

Coun. Stanton asked if, in a neighborhood that at this point had neither street trees, sidewalks nor storm drains, they had considered giving them the street, the storm, the water, the sidewalk, and a planter strip on just one side of the street. She stated that there were no street trees on her street and it did not matter to her, it was just one less thing to mow. She expressed her concern that in terms of standards which included all of those things, would they get the width and allow people to have the space

they needed for their driveway if they only put the planter strip on one side. She said that was not a question but something to look at.

Coun. Doyle commented, regarding funding, that he was curious what the estimated cost of the acquisition of ROW would be. He noted that he knew some of it could be dedicated to the City by the owners. He stated that when they were talking about Local Improvement Districts (LID), which was not one of his favorite subjects, he wanted people to know what it would cost them. He also said that if there were costs and people chose to incur them, he wondered if there was anything they could do as a City to help. He asked what the creative financing options were available to the City. He stated that he thought it would be good to let the neighbors know exactly what the dollars and cents were.

Coun. Brzezinski asked if they knew how many renters there were in those houses, as opposed to owners.

Coun. Stanton said she had figured it out; it was 81.4% were owner occupied and 18.6% were non-owners.

Coun. Brzezinski commented that with that information she felt better about the survey. She noted that if the ratios had been different, it would have been the renters at the open houses saying what they wanted.

Coun. Doyle suggested that the neighbors who were going to attend the public hearing should address their questions to the Council or appropriate staff in advance, so they could have answers for them. He noted it would be a more sensible discussion and the Council could be better informed in advance. He stated that it would be a helpful process to get the questions in advance, so they would have correct answers and could address issues before the meeting. He thought it would speed the process and make it more rational.

Mayor Drake suggested people should address their questions to Jerry Williams, the project manager.

Coun. Yuen requested that when this came back to the public hearing, he would like the minutes for this meeting for reference.

Coun. Soth complimented Williams and Righellis on the report. He said it was very thorough, comprehensive and indicated to him that they had done their work, and communicated with the residents most effectively.

Coun. Doyle remarked that he also was impressed with the public participation and comments. He said he was happy to see this happen.

Coun. Brzezinski MOVED, SECONDED by Coun. Soth, to direct staff to schedule a public hearing for May 4, 1998, to take public comment.

Coun. Doyle clarified that on May 4, they were not required to make a decision, they were under no deadline.

Mayor Drake explained that they were not under any deadlines but it was important to get some finality, so people did not have to keep coming back.

Coun. Doyle explained that he was concerned there were funds that had to be spent by a deadline.

Mayor Drake noted they would be handling the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), Budget, etc.

Coun. Stanton recalled that they had just done the CIP review in February.

Mayor Drake said they had the new CIP for 1998-99 coming forward, and they needed to get that into the budget process, because if they took funds away from another project in the CIP, it would start a domino effect.

Question called on the motion. Couns. Brzezinski, Soth, Stanton, Doyle and Yuen voting AYE, motion CARRIED unanimous, (5:0)

ORDINANCE:

Second Reading and Passage:

Mr. Scheiderich read the following ordinance by title only for the second time:

98-89 An Ordinance Amending Ordinance No. 1800, the Comprehensive Plan, to Add Provisions Pertaining to Multiple Use Designations; CPA 97001

Coun. Soth MOVED, SECONDED by Coun. Doyle that the ordinance embodied in AB 98-89, now pass.

Coun. Yuen called a point of order, and asked Scheiderich what the CPA number was he had read.

Scheiderich said it was CPA 97001.

Coun. Yuen explained that he had misunderstood and thought Scheiderich had said CPA 97006.

Roll Call vote. Couns. Soth, Doyle, Yuen, Stanton, and Brzezinski voting AYE, motion CARRIED unanimously. (5:0)

OTHER BUSINESS:

Mayor Drake said he wanted to make sure the Councilors all got the information about a make sure they got the information about an initiative petition regarding THPRD from Ron Willoughby.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business to come before the Council at this time,
the meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Darleen Cogburn, City Recorder

APPROVAL:

Approved this 4th day of May, 1998

Rob Drake, Mayor