

REGULAR MEETING
May 4, 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, May 4, 1998 at 6:39 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Present were Mayor Drake, Couns. Wes Yuen, Evelyn Brzezinski, Dennis Doyle, Forrest Soth, and Cathy Stanton. Also present were City Attorney Mark Pilliod, Chief of Staff Linda Adlard, Finance Director Patrick O'Claire, Human Resources Director Sandra Miller, Community Development Director Joe Grillo, Police Captain Paul Danko, Operations/Maintenance Director Steve Baker, City Librarian Shirley George, Development Services Manager Irish Bunnell, City Engineer Terry Waldele, Building Official Brad Roast, Sr. Planner Barbara Fryer, Project Engineer Jerry Williams, and City Recorder Darleen Cogburn.

CITIZEN COMMUNICATION:

There was no one present who wished to address the Council.

COUNCIL ITEMS:

Coun. Soth noted that he and Coun. Stanton attended a Metro meeting on Partnership. He found it very interesting, and thought they gave Metro Councilor Washington some suggestions.

Coun. Stanton noted that they had received a flyer for the Good Neighbor Days Parade scheduled for Saturday, June 27. She asked the other Councilors to let her know if they would ride together on a float again this year.

Mayor Drake pointed out that the City Attorney had driven one of the City dump trucks while the Council rode in the "dumper" part in a previous parade.

Coun. Yuen noted that the Mayor didn't mention that he rode in a red convertible in front of the dump truck!

Coun. Yuen noted that the Homebuilder's Association had a web page now and the address was: www.hbamp.com. He reported that a former Planning Commission chair was pictured in a recent issue of the *Homebuilders* newspaper.

Coun. Yuen commented on the recent City of Beaverton "sting" of sales of

alcohol to minors, and noted that it was somewhat of a negative. He asked if there was a way to make it positive, perhaps by giving a plaque to those who had successfully turned down a sale of alcohol to a minor.

Paul Danko, Police Services Captain, said those who were in compliance were listed in the newspaper, and said he would pass the suggestion along to staff.

Coun. Doyle stated that he agreed and it was important to let people know who was in compliance and that they were appreciated. He noted that he had been in a store when a clerk carded a minor trying to purchase cigarettes and turned him away. He congratulated the clerk on a job well done.

STAFF ITEMS:

There were none.

PRESENTATIONS:

98-94 "A Very Special Art Display" – Beaverton Arts Commission

Jim McCreight, President of Beaverton Arts Commission introduced Kathy Coleman, Chair of Beaverton Citizens with Disabilities Advisory Committee. He expressed their pleasure at being able to present the "Very Special Arts" display. He pointed out that the artwork on display had been created by artists with physical and developmental disabilities. He said two organizations were responsible for the exhibition. He noted that The PHAME Academy's mission was to enrich the lives of people with developmental challenges through education and performance opportunities in both Fine and Dramatic Arts. He thanked the PHAME Choir for their contribution to the program. He noted that the second organization was "Very Special Arts – Oregon." He announced that Mike Herzog and Herzog-Meier Auto Center sponsored the event, and he noted they appreciate the businesses that step forward to help with such events.

Linda Hammond, Very Special Arts (VSA) Oregon Executive Director said they were part of the VSA organization based in Washington, DC. She explained that the program was active in 98 other countries, and the goal was to represent people with and without disabilities, to celebrate the achievement of all individuals. She told of how the organization functioned throughout the State, and said one of the largest challenges was always funding, and they were very seldom fully funded. She described the artist groups and told how they had overcome challenges such as total blindness, one woman who painted from memory, and another who was a mouth painter. She pointed out artwork by Phillip Smith who was born legally blind, yet produces outstanding work while holding down a full-time job and having a full family life. She noted they work through area Arts Commissions who help VSA take their program where it is most needed. She thanked the Council for their time and asked them to share the

information.

McCreight thanked Hammond and the organization for bringing the exhibit to City Hall and to the citizens of Beaverton.

Coun. Soth commented that he drove an automobile similar to the one in Phillip Smith's painting before WWII, and it brought back a lot of memories and nostalgia for him. He related a story of a wild ride through the curves of Macadam Avenue at 80 mph, and pointed out that he was not the driver at the time.

Coun. Doyle quipped that explained why the City had Photo Radar! He expressed Council and Staff's appreciation for the display.

TVCA Activities Update

Paula Manley handed out copies of the Tualatin Valley Community Access (TVCA) Annual Report (Report). She pointed out that they were probably aware that Metropolitan Area Communications Commission (MACC) was in the process of cable franchise renewal with TCI. She said as part of the negotiations, what the Cable Company provided, (in exchange for doing business in Beaverton and the other 15 communities in the Tualatin Valley), was currently on the table for negotiation and discussion. She played a video updating the current activities of the current Cable Company.

Manley noted that Marcie Speer usually organized a crew to videotape the Good Neighbor Day Parade, and noted that there are many Beaverton activities which were not taped. She expressed her hope that the video gave some idea of other things going on in the TVCA area, and noted that the mission of TVCA was to increase civic participation by promoting understanding and informed use of media. She commented that they wanted to train folks to use these tools to make a positive difference in their communities. She reviewed the annual Report and the variety of the things they do. (In the record.)

Manley said TVCA had been a participant with MACC doing some community needs assessment work, and found that it targeted communication within a community. She noted that also important was two-way communication, particularly between citizens and government, and another thing that was highly valued was access to technology, information and learning opportunities.

CONSENT AGENDA:

Coun Yuen MOVED, SECONDED by Coun. Doyle that the consent agenda be approved as follows:

Minutes of the regular meetings of March 16 and April 20, and the special

meeting of April 27, 1998.

- 98-95 Liquor License Renewal – Annual Renewal
- 98-96 Liquor License – Hong Kong Marketplace (Change of Ownership)
- 98-97 RZ 970007 Osprey Park
- 98-98 CPA 97007 Osprey Park
- 98-99 BDR 97190/VAR 97010 Jack in the Box on Cedar Hills Boulevard
- 98-100 Appointment of Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson to the Board of Construction Appeals
- 98-101 Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with ODOT to Accomplish the Beaverton/Hillsboro Urban Services Agreement Study
- 98-102 Annexation Agreement among City of Beaverton, CSM Hotels and Washington County

Coun. Stanton stated that she would abstain from voting on the March 16 minutes since she was not present at the meeting.

Coun. Brzezinski gave corrections to the minutes which were noted by Darleen Cogburn, City Recorder.

Coun. Doyle asked if on AB 98-99, the front yard setback reduction from 20 feet to 3 feet was just to accommodate the footprint of the building or to try to encourage getting closer to the sidewalk.

Irish Bunnell, Development Services Manager, said it was mostly to accommodate a drive-up window function to get away from the street.

Coun. Doyle asked, regarding AB 98-101, for an explanation of one sentence in the last part of Historical Perspective: “the extent of each agencies involvement.”

Ali Turiel, Principal Planner, explained that the actual IGA was between the cities of Hillsboro and Beaverton, Washington County and ODOT, but under SB 122 all providers were involved. She noted that the scope of work provided for a technical analysis that would have the various levels of participation varying throughout the project.

Coun. Doyle asked if the other agencies were approached.

Turiel said they had been, and noted that they were in year three and were hoping to get Urban Service Agreements by the end of this biennium.

Coun. Soth added that on page 6 of the TGM Grant, it noted an advisory

committee that he had participated in and was asked to stay on it for this function. He mentioned that he checked with the staff person and they had resolved the problem of getting membership participation in two or three of the CPOs in the unincorporated areas. He said he would find out the next day when the next meeting would be, and noted that it was a good process.

Coun. Yuen had a correction to the minutes of April 20, and thanked Cogburn for getting them done so quickly.

Question called on the motion. Couns. Yuen, Doyle, Stanton, Soth and Brzezinski voting AYE, motion CARRIED unanimously. (5:0) Coun. Stanton abstained from the 3/16/98 minutes.

RECESS: Mayor Drake called for a recess at 7:15 p.m.

RECONVENED:

The regular meeting reconvened at 7:25 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING:

98-103 Public Hearing for the Lombard Gardens Drainage Study

Mayor Drake said they would have a brief staff and consultant presentation. He asked that the public speakers adhere to the five-minute time limit.

Mayor Drake noted that it appeared that the Council would be leaning towards Options 3 & 4. He said as Option #3 was presented, the staff was recommending that Community Development Block Grant money could go to fund the three streets and the three-year project, or Option #4, a full street improvement, which would necessitate additional funding. He stated that at that point he would have difficulty recommending Option #4 because there was no money budgeted. He suggested one thing they could look at was a Local Improvement District (LID). He said if the Council was interested after public testimony, in either Option #3 or #4, they could instruct staff to come back with some final details. He reported that in the next few weeks, they would hold another community meeting to see what serious interest there was in an LID, if any, and come back to Council on June 29 to discuss an LID. He said it had not been ascertained if an LID were formed, if it would be formed that night, or if Council would have to go through a formal notification process and hold a Public Hearing. He explained that the testimony would give the Council some idea of what the people were interested in, they would ask staff to come back with hard figures to consider.

Jerry Williams, Project Engineer, and Tony Righellis of Harper, Hoff, Righellis introduced themselves and said they would present their report.

Righellis noted that the drainage problem was attributable to there being no surface water drainage facilities to take the rainfall out of the neighborhood. He said they decided to establish a range of options, from "minimal" to "City standard," and noted that "minimal" was a Band-Aid type of solution. He said the second option was a rural road type option with both benefits and drawbacks. He reported that Options #3 and #4 had met with the most positive response from citizens.

Righellis described Option #3 as an interim type of improvement, which would function fully, but the look would still be a narrow road with paved shallow swales focused on solving the drainage problem. He said Option #4 was the City standard - RL-2 standard, such as what would be in new City subdivisions. He pointed out that because of the curb nature, they would have to look at pedestrian facilities. He noted that Option #4 would allow parking on both sides, full-service, and would bring the neighborhood up to looking like a new subdivision with vintage homes.

Williams said they would respond to questions or he could talk about the costs and potential funding sources.

Mayor Drake stated that Option #3 involved up to \$250,000 per year in CDBG money and another \$500,000 for upgrading water and sewer facilities under 11th, 12th, and 13th Streets, which were currently earmarked for replacement up to 10 years in the future. He said the idea was to defer some other projects, move those streets up to the front of the line, get them taken care of, and then do the roadwork. He said if they did it over a three-year period, they would recommend beginning on 13th, because it was the highest in elevation. He explained that since water ran downhill, they would eliminate the problem the first year because the storm drains would be in place and the swale would send the water down the street instead of into the homes and backyards of homes on the other streets.

Mayor Drake noted that with Option #4, it would include the full street standard and would still go in over a three-year period, but 13th would begin first and be fully improved, then 12th and 11th. He said it would use CDBG and Water and Sewer funds and that the projects would begin earlier rather than later. He asked Williams if that information was correct.

Williams said that was all correct.

Coun. Stanton asked what he had said about timing.

Mayor Drake reiterated that because of the CDBG funding, they could only use \$250,000 per year, so the three streets would be phased-in, full street improvements one year at a time, and the water and sewer improvements would be bumped up and done simultaneously.

Coun. Soth pointed out that Option #3 did not include streetlights.

Righellis said that was correct.

Coun. Soth asked, of the 76 properties (his count), if they had a count of how many were owner occupied.

Coun. Stanton said that in going through the responses, she came up with 86, which was 18.6% non-resident, 81.4% owner-occupied of those on the mailing list.

Coun. Soth noted that part of those responses were properties in the area but not directly affected by the proposals.

Williams agreed that there were residents on Lombard and Alger Street included in the mailing not anticipated to be directly affected by street improvements.

Righellis pointed out that there were also names such as "Vose NAC Chair" included in the list.

Coun. Soth recalled that previously, they made some interim improvements in three projects, which included some of the same types of things, but recognized that it was on an interim basis. He stated that in 12 to 15 years, they would have to make a decision as to whether to continue that or go into actual street improvements. He said he thought a full LID without any funding was a little expensive. He remarked that on the other hand, it was his understanding that an improvement such as either Option #3 or #4 would add about 6% to the value of each property. He said the difference was which Option would be most advantageous for everyone.

Couns. Soth asked how much differential there was in such things as mobilization costs for the contractor to do all three in one year vs. mobilizing three years in a row. He also asked what the percentage rate increase was for the Engineering Cost Index each year.

Righellis noted that the estimates didn't break things out specifically, such as one big project vs. three incremental projects. He noted they could be built independently because they were each unique. He explained that the advantage of doing it incrementally was that the whole neighborhood would not be disrupted all at once, however the advantage of doing it all at once was that it would be completed faster. He said there would be an economy of scale of 5 to 10 percent, if they went out to bid only once, and would also avoid increased construction costs. He commented that it was a balancing act.

Mayor Drake reported that the County evaluates the City's Traffic Impact Fee annually and recently informed the City that the Construction Index increased 17.5% this year. He noted that was why, with road projects, the dollar does not go as far. He said it was a consideration, and if they did it in one year, it would push some other projects back further.

Coun. Doyle asked, regarding the neighborhood questions, if the neighbors had the opportunity to read the answers.

Williams said they were available and he had faxed a copy to Eric Graham.

Coun. Stanton asked regarding Economies of Scale vs. disruption of services, how much time would it take over three years, as opposed to having one contractor do all three at once.

Righellis noted that they had not talked about that internally. He said he thought if they did it all at once it would be about five months, but if they did it over three years, each one would take about three months. He noted that it was over half a mile of street with a lot of existing utilities.

Mayor Drake stated that staff would investigate and come back to verify that HUD funds (CDBG money) could be borrowed against future grants for up to three years. He said he thought that it was something to consider, but was highly unlikely. He noted that Congress had to put the CDBG funds through a two-year cycle.

Coun. Stanton pointed out that it was like State Revenue Sharing and that at any time they could "pull the plug."

Mayor Drake said he had asked staff to go copy the question and answer piece from Eric Graham, to distribute at that meeting.

Coun. Brzezinski said they got a copy of a letter dated April 27 (in the record), from Rosemary Egan who owned property in the area. She asked about her statement that the CDBG money would not be available if they were to select Options #1, #2, or #3.

Williams said that statement was incorrect.

John Engel, Redevelopment Projects Manager, said Beaverton was an eligible Block Grant community, and because of that, was designated by HUD for public improvements, and therefore would be eligible. He noted that future funding was anyone's guess.

Coun. Yuen noted that they had characterized Option #3 as temporary but once they had done it, he did not think they were likely to tear it all back up again. He asked what the cost differential was between Options #3 and #4.

Coun. Doyle calculated it to be \$212,000.00.

Righellis thought \$300,000 based on the scenario from Williams.

Coun. Yuen explained that one reason he asked was the implication that

Option #3 was temporary. He said, if they would rip it out and bring it up to urban standards at some future date, he felt that was not a wise use of taxpayer money for a cost of differential of \$300,000.

Mayor Drake commented that he would not disagree with Coun. Yuen, but was concerned because they often “guesstimate” low. He said he thought that Williams’ intention was to come back with something more definitive before June 29.

Williams agreed that they could go back and take a look at the figures before June 29, but reminded them that they could not get a final design, until it was engineered. He pointed out that they would not be able to provide them with an extremely reliable engineer’s estimate until they had done the final design. He explained that they would be talking an order of magnitude estimate with an order of reliability of + or –25 percent.

Coun. Yuen asked if when they said “temporary,” there was a life expectancy on the work, and would there come a point of time when it would actually have to be improved.

Williams noted that with Option #3 they were not proposing to reconstruct the existing street, they were proposing to patch and overlay it, so the quality of the roadway would be smoother, but it would not have deep structural integrity. He said with Option #4 they would go in and construct a new roadway and it would be 20 years before it needed an overlay. He noted that 17 years ago they thought they could build an improvement that would last 15 years, so he suspected that within the next few years the City would be looking at road improvements again. He commented that asphalt and rock does not last forever.

Joe Grillo, Director of Community Development, distributed the questions and answers from Eric Graham.

Mayor Drake opened the Public Hearing.

Eric Graham, 11755 SW 12th Street, Beaverton, said he wanted to voice some concerns as part of a neighborhood, in terms of the project, the cost and some other issues. He thanked everyone involved and expressed his total surprise at how responsive the City had been, stated that the staff had been super to work with. He said that over the last few weeks there has been some confusion, which he thought was somewhat normal because working-class folks don’t have as much understanding of the ins and outs of major funding. He noted that they figure out their budgets each month with what they had to spend, but the bottom line was always the dollars involved. He said on April 26, they were confused by where the money would come from, how it would be generated, and said that was of concern to the homeowners. He said some of those questions were answered in the memo he received by fax at his office, (in record).

Graham stated that they needed to understand what an LID was, since for

many people that was an entirely new concern. He reported that the flooding had been significant the last two or three years, and there needed to be something done to resolve it. He pointed out that part of it was due to the repeated patchwork on the streets, until the streets were higher than the yards. He expressed his appreciation for the answers to his questions and asked for more detail on an LID and what the financial consequences were. His said he sensed at the end of the previous meeting that because of the money issue, consensus was waning in terms of whether to proceed in favor of the project or not.

Mayor Drake said he would have the Finance Director explain what a LID was. He noted that they had distributed to him, Sandra Bertrand and another person, the drainage study information. He said they would try to answer some more of their questions that evening, and schedule another community meeting in a few weeks, to respond to further questions.

Patrick O'Claire, Finance Director, gave an explanation of an LID, and said an LID would be formed by the properties benefited by the improvement. He reported that the City would contribute a certain amount of funding toward the project, and if they decided on Option #3 or Option #4, where additional funding is needed from the homeowners, a preliminary assessment roll would be formed. He explained that would show what the assessment would be against each benefiting property for the amount needed to fund the LID, to pay for the improvements. He noted that would also include the costs of borrowing money, the Bond Attorney costs, and financial advisor costs for forming the LID and getting the interim financing. He said after the construction was completed and the final amounts were calculated, the shortage needed would be borne by the benefited properties. He explained that it was usually done with a bonding issue, where they would go out and bond and pay back the interim financing with what they needed to borrow to complete the construction. He said the property owner would pay the assessment. He noted that he had not done any LIDs in Oregon, but they were usually done over a 10-year period. He explained that the City would place a lien against the property so they could in turn pay the bondholders. He explained that it was a principal and interest type of arrangement.

Graham said he thought people were confused about part of Option #4 that would require the repurchase of some of their frontage property in order to accomplish the standards that had been set for City streets. His understanding was that when the LID was formed, part of what it would do was borrow the funds necessary to purchase that land, because CDBG money could not be used to purchase land from homeowners.

Engel explained that it was not true that CDBG funds could not be used, but it was incredibly prohibitive. He reported that the amount of strings attached to Block Grant money when used for acquisition was phenomenal, so it was preferred not to use it for acquisition.

Graham stated that although it might be possible, it would be a tough deal.

He asked if an LID was formed and money was borrowed to buy back the frontage property, was it correct that they, as homeowners, could write that money back over to the LID.

Mayor Drake said over the term, they could do one of two things - they could dedicate the land to the City, or the City could buy it from them and it would go through the improvements process. He pointed out that not everyone would want to dedicate the land. He explained that if the LID was formed, the City had the authority to take the land, but they would hope it would be a cordial process.

Coun. Brzezinski asked if, for example, the ROW acquisition was \$2,500 and the LID was \$4,000, that \$2,500 could be applied to the \$4,000, so that the only thing left for the homeowner to pay would be \$1,500.

Mayor Drake said it did not work that way, and explained that it would mean the property purchase portion would be less but there would still be the physical improvements portion that would need to be paid.

Coun. Soth explained that part of the situation was that for any ROW that was necessary to acquire, if all the property owners did not dedicate, whatever was not dedicated had to be purchased. He noted that it would go into the total cost of the LID, and wherever those funds came from, it would be paid to those people who did not dedicate. He stated that if one person were going to dedicate, it would behoove everyone to dedicate to avoid that kind of confusion, otherwise, for example, if he dedicated his property and someone else did not, then he would be paying for the other guy. He said if everyone dedicated, it would be simple, but if everybody didn't, then it would require negotiations for purchase of ROW.

Coun. Stanton noted that using Couns. Brzezinski's \$4,000 and \$2,500 example, the LID would be \$6,500, if the property wasn't dedicated. She reiterated Coun. Soth's comment that unless they all agreed to dedicate, those who did dedicate would be paying for the ones who did not dedicate.

Graham said that was a point that he and most of his neighbors did not know. He hoped they would discuss the fact that the three streets face unique issues, and that they would elaborate on the question of whether all three streets needed to have the exact same thing done and in the same way.

Mayor Drake noted that in a broad sense, they had to comply with City standards, but there would probably be some design variables since some yards do not have the frontage that others do. He reported that he had driven down 11th Street that evening and it seemed narrower than 12th and 13th Streets. He agreed the streets are all unique with some homes very close to the street, and staff had indicated that there would have to be some uniqueness to each street.

Coun. Soth noted that unless they knew where their property markers

were, it was easy to be confused by where the grass stops and the pavement begins, because the centerline of the ROW was not always clear.

Coun Stanton noted that their recommended action was the optimum solution and she would be asking those who came to testify if they were for Option #3 or #4.

Graham expressed his concern with the word "temporary," and noted that if he was going to let something like this disrupt the neighborhood, he would rather that it be something final. He said he would choose Option #4 and would be willing to participate in an LID.

Pilliod commented that while there was discussion about the LID process, it was a stylized process laid out in City Code, and the City and the Council had not really begun the process. He clarified that it would begin with a resolution of the Council declaring an *intention* to form an LID, and they were well in advance of that, with no resolution being passed. He stated that it was the neighbors' preference that was important, and their willingness to participate in an LID was also important, but it was not their vote, "yes" or "no," at that point. He said this was only to give the Council and staff an indication of the general willingness of the people in the neighborhood to participate in that particular funding formula.

Coun. Brzezinski commented that she thought the purpose of the hearing was to obtain input, give some information to the neighbors and then have them go back and discuss again what the options were. She asked if they were really trying, that evening to decide the optimum, or were they waiting to get feedback from the neighborhood after they talked again.

Mayor Drake said that since forming an LID would be a time consuming process, they needed to find out sometime soon. He noted that many resources had been spent and the neighbors had spent a lot of time meeting with staff and consultants to better understand the issues. He said it appeared to him, from reading the results of the polling and all the information, that the only real options were #3 and #4. He stated that Option #4 appeared to involve some sort of shared cost between the neighborhood and the City. He recommended about \$250,000 per year, based on what the other CDBG needs were, and apparent requirements over the next three years. He said if they added that into the true cost, the money would have to come from somewhere to do Option #4 outside of what the City would spend. He suggested that in the next few weeks they would need to refine a little more information based on the questions and comments from that meeting, and then in three or four weeks, have another meeting to answer questions. He said they would return on June 29, and decide whether to instruct staff to proceed with the LID formation process or not.

Coun. Brzezinski remarked that the recommended action for that meeting was not to select the optimum solution, so the people did not have to say that night if they were for or against a particular option.

Mayor Drake clarified that they needed to find out preferences between Options #3 and #4.

Coun. Brzezinski asked for clarification about the recommended action on the agenda bill, and what Coun. Stanton had said about coming back the end of June.

Mayor Drake stated that this was a "moving target," and there was new information. He noted that Graham's questions raised other issues in his own mind, which he discussed with staff so they could try to answer as many questions as possible at that meeting.

Coun. Doyle said he took the direction on the agenda bill to mean that Council was to try to come up with what they thought was the best solution, then in eight weeks let the neighbors say, "No," that was not what they wanted.

Mayor Drake explained that they were formalizing the process, and this was like the bottom of a funnel at this point, assembling the information. He said if they looked at the information, based on some input at this meeting, the Council did not think an LID made sense, and nobody was arguing for it, the Council had the authority to make a decision to proceed with Option #3. He clarified that if the Council thought there was interest in the neighborhood to do Option #4, then they would go back in the interim and look at the possibilities, including talking with the neighborhood about whether or not they would be interested in forming an LID.

Coun. Doyle noted that they had to make a recommendation and see if the neighborhood could live with it. He said another question for the neighbors was if they would want a one-year disturbance or once a year for three years.

Graham expressed his appreciation for their comments. He said one of the concerns that came out of their previous meeting was that this project could go forward without any support at all. He noted that the neighbors thought the Council and the City could determine that this was something important to the City and its overall well being, and the neighborhood would have a limited voice, if any. He said he had tried to tell the neighbors that he understood that they had quite a voice, and the Mayor and the Council had reiterated that.

Mayor Drake reminded them that Graham had started the ball rolling and it was the citizens who brought the problem to the City's attention. He assured them that there were far more needs in the City than could ever be funded. He said if it didn't go to Lombard Gardens, there will be other parts of the City where they could funnel CDBG funds which would be in their broader neighborhood or the Central Beaverton NAC. He reiterated that this action was the City's responsiveness to the neighbors and their issues, and if they did not want the work done, and chose to deal with the

problems caused by the water in their area, then the City didn't have to spend the money in the neighborhood. He stated that what they were discussing was the minimum and the maximum.

Graham told the neighbors that this is an opportunity, that they had the ball rolling and he hoped they would continue the process to its resolution.

Sandra Bertrand, 11775 SW 12th, thanked everyone for turning out, and said she liked the idea of asking what peoples opinions were. She thanked them for considering an attempt to address their drainage problems. She stated that at this point in the process, her efforts were focused on attempting to make this project a partnership between the citizens and officials, and assure that the project be performed in the most effective and economical way possible. She commended the efforts of the City and especially Jerry Williams, John Engel and Mike Matteucci for going the extra mile.

Bertrand stated that she thought Options #1 and #2 were unacceptable and Option #4, the City Standard, sounded good in theory, but would not fit their streets without invasion of three more feet of ROW and the loss of many huge trees. She said she thought it could only work if drastic variations were made in order to have driveways large enough for cars to park without blocking the sidewalks and for trees to be preserved. She expressed her concern about the costs escalating due to necessary variations with Option #4, but could not see any negative aspect to #3; it was more cost effective, and was not invasive to small properties. She said if it was not a complete improvement, and the City would have to come back later to finish it, they might as well spend the money and do it right this time.

Bertrand noted that the problem was that no improvements had been made to the neighborhood in its 50-year history, so it seemed unlikely to her that the City would come back in 20 years and install sidewalks. She said if it was not cost effective now, it would not be cost effective in the future. She said the other reason to be in favor of Option #4 was the safety feature of sidewalks, and agreed they do cut down the risks, but in over a decade of living there, she had seen pedestrian and vehicle traffic work together. She stated that she did not think it was reason enough to spend the added money and make small front yards smaller. She pointed out that the neighborhood had been a source of stability for Beaverton for 50 years of taxes, along with storm drain fees and Federal tax dollars paid which supported CDBG, so she suggested that there be very little or no additional dollars requested from the residents. She stated that the problem of the streets being above the level of the house was due to overlays, and not created by the residents, yet they had to suffer the consequences. She said they should not have to pay the financial consequences of getting the street back down to a proper level.

Bertrand asked Council to approve the \$250,000 proposed in the action plan; suggested they choose Option #3, and that none of the funding

scenarios be followed. She proposed that the City fund the remaining \$402,890 cost to complete the project through the next two years with CDBG money at a little more than \$201,000 per year. She said the timing was a sensible fit with the replacement of water and sewer lines on Alger this summer. She disagreed that the improvements would add to the value of their properties, and said she felt that the City meeting their basic need of rain runoff control was expected. She suggested that the project be completed over three years to reduce the disturbance in the neighborhood. She noted that she had not realized that Option #3 was another overlay, and asked when they were going to get the street lowered. She said they asked for the \$250,000 for the next year, and the cost of the whole project was that the \$250,000 each year would be more than they needed.

Jim Crutcher, 11870 SW 13th Street, said he appreciated what Bertrand had said. He noted that he and his wife had lived there since 1991, and recently they learned that the City was proposing some changes that could concern them. He reported that 18 households on 13th Street were represented at a neighborhood meeting, where they were told that funding for Options #1 through #3 were in place, and most for Option #4. He reported that at that point, nine of the households said that they wanted Option #3, five wanted Option #4, and the rest, including him, were undecided.

Crutcher explained that he did not personally have a drainage problem and did not like the idea of fixing something that wasn't broken, but in the spirit of being a good neighbor, he could be persuaded on Option #3, if the costs could be contained. He noted that Option #4 raised the streets to modern City standards for a new subdivision, but the neighborhood was not a new subdivision, and bringing it up to those standards was over kill. He said had given his written comments to the City Engineer's office the Tuesday before the Engineer's report was due, but somehow his comments did not get into the binder. He commented that what had started out as a study on surface water problems had turned into a discussion on a variety of subjects, including traffic, safety, sidewalks, lighting, sewer and water line replacements, street width, planter strips, CDBGs, CIPs, and LIDs; in other words, the project quickly lost its scope.

Crutcher said if everybody wanted sidewalks, so be it, but said he had some concerns. He reported that his neighbor across the street has proposed moving the centerline two feet in his direction because of his setback, and Crutcher's wife was upset because she would lose five rose bushes and a maple tree. He expressed his concern about getting saddled with a \$12,000 debt if funding was not in place, because he did not need another outlay. He noted that the past month when Council discussed the subject in a work session, one of the comments made was that if Option #4 went through, property values would increase by six to ten percent, and if that was the case his property would go up in value \$8,000 to \$10,000, so it did not add up. He said he would lean towards Option #3, but was concerned about funding.

Coun. Soth noted that the next question after how to eliminate the flooding problem, was what were the ramifications downstream from where the flooding occurred. He explained that often when they look at the cost to fix one problem, they need to look at potential costs downstream or in a different location, so they often go beyond the immediate problem stated.

Crutcher noted that in their water bills they were billed for storm drainage but they had no storm drains.

Mayor Drake explained that was for collective use in the City and that question had been asked earlier. He said water drains somewhere, went into the water table, drained down through yards, streets were cleaned with it, etc. He reported that the City was required by USA to handle water collectively in the City.

Crutcher said he did not want to be argumentative, he just wanted every tax dollar he spent to be accounted for.

Mayor Drake said it was accounted for, because some of the water from his neighborhood does eventually get into lower areas, and it was the City's responsibility to take care of the water collectively.

Crutcher said if he were not mistaken, the reason they were having that meeting was because the water was all standing, not draining.

Mayor Drake agreed that was the point; the neighborhood had asked for a solution and that was what they were trying to do. He said he was not arguing with Crutcher, he would like to get it resolved, and the engineers had to look at the various possibilities.

Julie Madison, 11825 SW 13th Street, said she was unwilling to give up any of her property to widen a road and place sidewalks. She explained that it would put people too close to her home and her neighbor's homes, it would remove too many trees on the street and the trees were one of the reasons she bought her home. She said she believed if they widened the road, even more people would drive too fast through the neighborhood than already do, because they would have more room to navigate at greater speed. She stated that she could not afford to pay for street improvements because her income was way below the Federal poverty level. She noted that she also had paid a drainage fee on her water bill, and paid her taxes, so she felt she was entitled to the same type of streets as everyone else in the City. She said she especially could not pay for it at a 20% interest rate as shown on the printed information she had received.

Mayor Drake said the interest rates were currently 5-7% and that the amount on the form she had was not an interest rate.

Coun. Soth noted that the 20% on the form was describing the costs at a

high rate, when they get into a detailed design. He explained that none of the engineering had been done in detail to determine the exact cost of materials, and that was what the + or – 25% was. He pointed out that it could be 25% less just as well as more.

Madison said that even at 6% she couldn't afford to pay. She explained that she bought her home because she liked the rural feeling of the neighborhood. She said Option #3 seemed to be the best option for her and the majority of her neighbors, and it would be a \$700,000 waste if they didn't do it right the first time.

Coun. Stanton asked Madison if in picking Option #3, she minded not having streetlights.

Madison noted that she thought they had adequate streetlights, so she did not know where that issue came from. She said she thought the neighbors would agree that it was adequate.

Coun. Stanton asked why street lighting was listed on Option #4 if it was already in place.

Williams noted that there were some streetlights on those streets, but it did not meet City standards, so if they went with Option #4, the lighting would be brought to standard, as would the curb, sidewalk, etc.

Coun. Yuen asked Madison her opinion about phasing, if she would prefer to have it done all at once or in three phases.

Madison said she did not have a definite opinion, and her street would be the first to be done, so it would depend more on what her neighbors wanted.

Coun. Soth commented that he did not think people drove any faster on an overlaid street than they did when it was full of potholes.

Madison pointed out that they already had more parking on the street, and people cutting over from Allen Blvd. during rush hour, so if the street were wider, more people would cut through.

Rick DaCosta, 11875 SW 13th Street, said it was clearly stated at the original meeting that the funding was covered except for private plumbing from the properties to the storm drain on the road. He continued that the neighbors were given an opinion survey, and the survey was returned to the City when most still had the understanding that everything was covered. He said subsequently there had been a lot of confusion and discussion about where this funding was coming from. He expressed his concern that there was a report with a lot of opinions in it, but their opinions were not really valid, and the citizens were not really informed about the funding.

Mayor Drake said he had talked to staff about that issue, and staff could not commit to funding in advance because the budget wasn't done, and the City Council would ultimately make that decision. He said it sounded like there was some confusion, but the City was not authorized to make that commitment.

DaCosta said he was not trying to cause an argument, but at least 12 or more walked away from that meeting with that impression.

Coun. Brzezinski stated that she thought he was saying not to count on the survey results on page 9 of the report. She explained that was why they were asking for their input now, and would also have another meeting with any new information and have a similar kind of analysis of what they all wanted. She said when they filled out the forms they were operating under one set of beliefs which may or may still be true.

DaCosta said Bertrand did a good job of expressing things and noted that his property was one that did not meet the 20-foot variance. He reported that his setback was about 17 feet and he had property corner markers to allow him to accurately determine that, so another three feet would go through a tree and landscaping that he had in front. He stated that the biggest problem was they would be down to about 14 feet in front of their house, and he would not voluntarily give up that three feet of property.

Mayor Drake asked DaCosta if he preferred Option #3.

DaCosta said that was his preference.

Mayor Drake noted he did not think staff was proposing an LID with Option #3.

DaCosta remarked that the issue of "temporary" was vague, since the current "temporary" had been 50 years. He said his drainage problem did not start until the last overlay on the street. He reported that in the 20 years he had lived there, the only thing that had been done was one overlay after another which raised the crown of the street. He explained that now the runoff went more to the sides and kept going more to the sides, with none flowing down to Alger, where some of it went before.

Coun. Soth asked DaCosta if he was saying that if some of the payment were removed, the drainage problem would not exist, or not so much.

DaCosta stated his personal drainage problem would not exist, but others might still experience drainage problems. He said they wanted help with the drainage situation and they felt that Option #3 would do it very well.

Mayor Drake commented that he also liked the feel of their streets, and although sidewalks were nice, there was more of a feel of rural charm there. He agreed that as several people mentioned, the trees were mature, and right or wrong however they had grown, in the ROW or not,

the neighborhood was roughly 50 years old and that was important. He noted that the ownership of many of the homes had changed many times but if everything was "safe," the neighbors were comfortable.

DaCosta said they definitely liked the way it presently was, and noted that someone said earlier that this improvement would give them a new, modern, City-type subdivision with older homes. She stated that many residents don't want a new, modern subdivision.

Carol Hendricks, 11650 SW 13th, said they had lived there since 1985, but plan to sell their house in July. She stated that no one in their right mind would buy it with the potential assessment coming along. She noted they did not have much of a problem with the water since their house was on a hump. She expressed her support for her neighbors, and wanted to help solve their problems, and related that how her neighbor had water inside her ductwork and could not heat her house at one point in the winter. She said she was not excited about an LID, for her own personal financial reasons, and would like to know how much this would cost per year. She reported that she was one of the people who went to the earlier meeting and left with the impression that there were funding opportunities. She stated that she did not think it should cost this outrageous amount. Her said sidewalks sounded great, and that was the basis she was operating on when she responded to the survey. She stated that she would lean towards Option #3 if it was either #3 or #4, and personally would prefer nothing. She reiterated her frustration related to this issue and trying to sell her house.

Coun. Stanton stated that she thought if they could get everyone to agree, they could push out the construction schedule to start July, 1999.

Lynelle Mekediak, 11625 SW 12th, (corner of Alger and 12th), said she was proud of her home and neighborhood, and thanked the Council for the time they had invested in the neighborhood. She stated that she did not think Option #3 was a complete answer, but was not happy with the option provided in #4, and would like to see something between #3 and #4. She noted that was because, as they had heard, Option #3 was temporary, and did not think it was a wise use of funds to have to rip it out in a few years and redo it. She urged the Council to consider Option #3, but find a way to make it a permanent solution, not another patch on the street. She said they needed to lower the street level, since it was higher than the houses. She stated that having swales rather than sidewalks and lighting, was not a good match with the nature of the neighborhood, but disagreed that Option #4 was an adequate package. She said they had adequate lighting and parking and would not want to see that change. She reported that she did not have a serious enough problem to attend previous meetings, but had a minor problem with water in her driveway. She stated that her front yard was small and was concerned about losing part of it. She said she agreed with Bertrand's comments.

Coun. Doyle remarked that he also liked the neighborhood. He noted that

he had gone door to door five or six years ago, and it was a fun place to visit.

Gene Burney, 11655 SW 11th, reported that he went door-to-door on 11th to inquire if anyone had a drainage problem that fixing the street would fix, but no one told him that they did. He noted that there was one unoccupied house that he thought had a problem, when in a heavy rainstorm the water got into the garage. He stated that no one he talked with was having any problem with water getting into their heating ducts or under their houses. He said that he also understood that funding was arranged, and was concerned because he now understood that there might be a \$3,000 assessment on his property. He noted that had caused his opinion on what needs to be done to change drastically. He said had told his neighbors the funding was in place, so he had misinformed his neighbors. He said he did not see any reason to do anything to 11th Street at this time since they were happy with what they had.

Mayor Drake thanked Burney for attending the meeting and for walking his street to talk to his neighbors. He asked Burney if he met any neighbors he had not known.

Burney indicated that he had.

Mayor Drake commented that he had often said there needed to be a crisis in every neighborhood, to get everyone together to talk.

Ken Condit, 11625 SW 11th Street, said was originally leaning towards the sidewalk improvement from a safety standpoint and was not as partial to a look of rough berms as some people. He stated that he was not in favor of sidewalks if it would widen the ROW. He noted that on 13th Street, east of Alger, the sidewalks were about four feet from the curb, but cars routinely block the sidewalks when parked in the driveways. He said on 9th Street, the sidewalks were closer to the curb, and that seemed better. He stated that he did not see much of a problem on 11th Street, so if they were considering a non-City standard improvement, maybe it wasn't cost effective to talk about making the Option #3 improvement there, or at least not soon. He suggested that it could be done with the schedule of improvements for water and sewer on 11th. He noted that if it could be done, he thought it might make sense to do it all at once.

Coun. Stanton said she heard from staff that the least amount of flooding was on 13th Street and it went downhill.

Mayor Drake explained that 13th Street was the highest, and the point of doing it first was that water runs downhill.

Condit noted that most of the problems were on 11th Street. He reported that one concern was that with the sidewalk improvement on Alger the sidewalks were built up eight inches, which helped impound the water in his yard since he was right on Alger.

Mayor Drake noted that Beaverton had a high water table anyway, and normally got about 30 inches of rain a year in the area. He recalled that in 1996 it was 62 inches, in 1997 it was 55 inches. He used the analogy of trying to put 16 ounces in a 12-ounce cup, and said the whole City had drainage problems in general, even with a great storm drain system. He said when they have that amount of rainfall, the system could only absorb so much of it at a time.

Terri Tregaskis, 11800 SW 13th Street, said she had lived there since 1953, and noted that her parents bought the house, and when they retired, she liked the neighborhood so well she bought their house. She reported that they had not had a huge drainage problem until about the last four years, which was at about the same time the road was upgraded. She said she did not know if that was what actually caused the problem. She stated that she would like Option #3, because she liked the area and the way it was laid out, with a nice homey-feeling, which she thought would be lost if they added the sidewalks and all the improvements. She feels they have adequate streetlights.

Gerard Davis, 11770 SW 12th Street, said he had lived there since 1985. He reported that the street was overlaid two years ago, and since then, the water had been more of a problem than previously. He suggested they consider lowering the street a little bit, and was definitely in favor of Option 3. He said Option 4 would destroy the look of their neighborhood, since there were many huge trees that would be right up next to the sidewalk if they put one in. He stated that the whole issue was the drainage problem, and they never wanted to deal with sidewalks.

Coun. Soth pointed out that several people had said that the overlay a couple of years ago seemed to contribute to the situation, and it was coincidental, he thought, that the last two years were also nearly double rainfall in a short span of time.

Davis said there was a serious crown in the center of the road since the overlay, and the water drained into the yards, so if there was a pooling spot in the yard, there would be five or six inches of standing water. He reported that he used pea gravel to make a berm across the front of his driveway so the water would run past his residence and down the street.

Randal Elliott, 11855 SW 13th St., thanked Bertrand and Graham for fronting this effort for the last two years, and pronounced that they had done a good job with it. He said that regarding Options #3 and #4, he was initially for Option #4 if it would fit into the present 40 foot ROW and not exceed it. He reported that he and his roommate took a tape measure and measured from the centerline marks down the street up to almost everybody's house on the street, and it was an average of around 18 feet for the setback. He said his and the DaCosta's houses were at around 17 feet, and there was one house near Alger that was closer to 16 feet. He noted that they would lose three more feet with the sidewalks, and it would

put the sidewalk up against his Hawthorne tree. He said had talked to Williams about the possibility of adjusting the street standard to make it fit their neighborhood, but withdrew the suggestion after objections from his neighbor across the street. He stated that many neighbors did not have the money to spend on the improvements. He said the issue had become worse over the last several years, because of the street level being raised, and the water had nowhere to go but into his driveway. He reported that he tilled a ditch in front of his house in order to get the water out of his driveway and carport. He said he was for Option #3 because it saved money and would not encroach on his property.

Coun. Soth asked Elliott how long he had lived there.

Elliott said he had been there eight years.

Coun. Soth said he has lived in Beaverton since 1950, and it appeared that one of two things had happened, either the ROW standard of 40 feet either was widened after the homes were built, or they were built closer to the ROW than the 20 foot set-back standard. He wondered if Elliott knew which it was or had heard any of the "war stories" from any of the older residents there.

Elliot said he did not know, and had not found anyone who remembered that far back with much detail of who the builders were or who was running the City government at that time, approving the plans.

Phillip Mekediak, 11625 SW 12th Street, said he would go with Option #3, but would like to see the street be lowered enough that the water would drain from the yards into the street. He noted that if they were going to have any improvements to their yards and this water problem, the street would have to be lowered. He reported that he could lay down in his yard and see the top of the street at a higher level.

Mayor Drake reminded them that with Option #3 there would be a swale that would catch the water when it came off the street and from their front yards. He explained that It would be pitched down 8 inches, with a funnel, and storm drains at points along the street where the water in the swale would drop down towards Alger.

Mekediak asked if he needed to slope his driveway, would he have eight inches to do it.

Righellis explained that there would be a swale about eight inches deep, but the road would not be lowered. He noted that some yards were below street grade, some were above, and some were even, so only certain yards might not be able to get to the swales because they were not high enough.

Coun. Brzezinski clarified that there was no guarantee that it would take what was from the front yard into the swale, but it would be sufficient to

take what was on the road and keep it from going into the front yard.

Mekediak did not think that would solve the problem at their house.

Mayor Drake said it sounded like some of the houses were below the original street grade and asked Righellis if he knew if that was correct.

Righellis said what usually happens for those properties where the front yard won't be able to drain directly into the swale, it would drain back to the house. He explained that there was no reason that as the connections were made from the house to the street, field inlets couldn't be placed up against the house or at a low point of the yard within the private property. He noted that was not as optimum as what lowering the road would do, but Option #3 wasn't intended to do all of that.

Mekediak asked if they had the option of the drainage [field inlets] to the street from their property.

Righellis commented that the intention was that each property would have a pipe stub to it, and those drainpipes would be three to four feet below street grade.

Mayor Drake explained that there would be a pipe coming from the street to the edge of the property and the homeowners could run their own pipe out to that.

Crutcher asked if they were not going to resurface the street with Option #3, how they would get the culverts under it.

Mayor Drake stated that they were going to resurface the street, but the whole street would not be dug up, and the storm drain would be on the sides of the street.

Crutcher asked if that meant the street would be still higher.

Mayor Drake pointed out that happened anytime an overlay was done, but they would get a swale that would catch the water coming off the street.

Crutcher said his yard was over eight inches below the street level, so he would either have to raise his front yard or take his gutter drain above the ground so it would run to the storm drain.

Righellis compared it to a bowling alley with the bowling lane being the street, and the bowling alley gutters the swales, so if the yard were lower on the outside, there would still be the full shape of the bowling alley gutter to catch the water off the street. He noted that for the water in the yard, the opportunity would be through the pipe that they would stub to each property; they could put a field drain in the yard and tie it in.

Mayor Drake explained that this would give them an outlet from the street

side and they had the option of installing one from their house down to the stub.

Marlys Davis, 11770 SW 12th Street, stated she had been for Option #4, because she thought it was probably time that the sewer lines and everything underneath need to be looked at. She said she would like to see a full street construction with swales, even though it was not one of the options.

Bertrand asked if there was a possibility of lowering the street with Option #3, and if it had to be exactly how the plan was proposed.

Mayor Drake said they he would have the engineers discuss that, but said that would mean a total redo of the street, with higher costs.

Bertrand suggested that if there was \$92,000 they could work with out of the \$250,000 per year, maybe they could just lower the highest spots without total reconstruction.

Mayor Drake said it sounded like her fear was the crown, and the swale would catch the water that the crown was causing to come down. He discussed the way it would work.

Bertrand said she could picture that and thought it would be effective, but she was concerned with it being an interim project, and wanted the best situation for the dollars spent.

Mayor Drake said overlays with slurry sealing spread the life of the road over 20 to 25 years, depending on the condition of the street originally, how much traffic it got, the weather, etc. He noted that with the crown on it, there would be no standing water on it, which reduced the likelihood of an early disintegration. He asked for staff's comments.

Williams said the Mayor was correct in his comments. He noted that when they estimated the cost of Option #3 they did not estimate the cost of rebuilding the streets, they did include an overlay over the entire surface to put on a final finish after they put in all the utilities and patched it. He explained that there were two reasons for the overlay: to make sure everything fit together, and it would add structural strength and longevity to the roadway. He said the increase would be probably an inch and a half at the crown.

Bertrand thanked them for their openness in trying to look at this reasonably.

Mayor Drake closed the hearing.

Coun. Doyle remarked that he thought they had heard that Option #3 was the choice of the majority present. He asked about the 11th Street comments, since they were of interest to him in terms of stewardship of

funds, regardless of what the source was. He suggested that based on the testimony they had heard, they probably needed to revisit that. He said he would like staff to take a look at Option #3 to see what was really involved, and make sure everybody involved knew what the private plumbing situation was.

Mayor Drake said those were good suggestions.

Coun. Yuen added to Coun. Doyle's suggestions, and said they had heard many comments about how much it would cost to lower the street and rebuild it, essentially making Option #3 permanent instead of temporary. He said he thought they would probably all choke when they hear those figures. He noted there was not much interest in Option #4, partly because of cost, but also because it is was going to require acquisition of addition ROW. He said he thought they had discussed that they were applying current City street standards to this, and he had never been a real fan of the City's separated sidewalks. He suggested it would be good to have another evaluation of Option #4, or at least consider in future situations like this, not doing separated sidewalks. He noted that if they did that, the cross section would become something like 38 feet, which would fit in the existing ROW and not require any further dedication, which would accomplish everyone's goals. He explained they would have sidewalks, a safer neighborhood, and nobody would lose any more of their yard.

Coun. Stanton pointed out that only two who testified were from 11th Street, and she felt that they needed feedback from more people from that area. She voiced that she was not a fan of skinny streets, but the skinny street standards might apply there. She said she would like to see what it would cost to chew up and lower the street, and expressed her hope that the residents realized what a swale would look like.

Mayor Drake clarified that it was an asphalt swale.

Coun. Soth said he would like staff to bring back cost estimates on Option #3 without 11th Street, if what they had heard was reflective of the entire street. He noted that in terms of trying to reconstruct or lower the street, that it was a lot of material to remove and haul away, and in many such cases you would disrupt the underlying structure whatever it might be. He said he would not be enthusiastic about digging out the street, or taking the hump off, which would leave a thinner pavement section than it had. He stated that some of those things needed to be brought out at the neighborhood meeting for discussion, and perhaps at that time there might be a better idea of some of the funding options. He said there needed to be clarification of the funding options.

Mayor Drake said when some of the funding was discussed, they had not made public the recommendation for the CDBG funding, and noted there was an action item scheduled for the following week including next year's CDBG as a recommendation. He stated that based on the input they had

gotten along the way, they included that in the CDBG package for the next year.

Coun. Stanton asked, based on what she heard from different streets, how difficult would it be to do an individual street analysis. She pointed out that this was a neighborhood where the homes were 40 to 50 years old, and would suspect that they were not all built at the same time. (Neighbors agreed) She said she would suspect that "one size fits all" might not be the best approach. She wanted people to understand, in terms of the pipe stub going to the properties, that once the pipe stub was there to the storm drain, they had to tear up their own front yard to lay all the pipe down.

Mayor Drake remarked that the neighbors recognized that and that they would have some responsibility.

Coun. Stanton asked if they were getting information from OSU extension office on the best way to do this.

Coun. Brzezinski remarked that they had asked staff for lots of information and she trusted that they would not schedule the informational meeting for neighbors until they had the answers. She noted that those who testified represented about one-fifth of the total neighbors, and everyone needed to talk to their neighbors to make sure they had a good turnout at the meeting. She said she presumed they would have a good notice. She remarked that the more neighbors helping to make the decision would carry more weight with her when they were asked to make a decision.

Mayor Drake said he would suggest the neighborhood meeting be scheduled about five weeks out, and have the material about what questions could be answered out a week prior to that. He suggested the meeting be more questions and answers and assemble more information, if there was more. He felt they had answered a lot of questions at this meeting, but they would have the people available to answer their further questions. He asked to continue the hearing on the matter.

Pilliod commented that the purpose of the hearing was to have a work session with public input and not so formalized that they could not take further input once the record was closed.

Consensus was to have another Public Hearing on June 29, with a solid recommendation at that time based on information collected at this meeting and at the next neighborhood meeting.

Mayor Drake said they would send out a notice of the neighborhood meeting, and pointed out that if they were in agreement by that time they would not need to testify.

Coun. Doyle thanked the neighbors for being there and for their patience.

Mayor Drake noted that a follow-up letter had been sent by Bruce Cleeton to Brian Alan regarding his concerns about parking of recreational vehicles on Hart Road. He also noted a memo to the Council regarding the Interim Parking Control Program.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business to come before the council at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Darleen Cogburn, City Recorder

APPROVAL:

Approved this 13th day of July, 1998

Rob Drake, Mayor