

## REGULAR MEETING

June 26, 2000

### 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, June 26, 2000, at 7:10 p.m.

Mayor Drake noted that they were starting the meeting later than usual that evening because they had held the annual joint meeting with Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue (TVF&R) prior to this meeting.

### ROLL CALL:

Present were Mayor Drake, Counc. Evelyn Brzezinski, Dennis Doyle, Fred Ruby, Forrest Soth, and Cathy Stanton. Chief of Staff Linda Adlard was excused. Also present were City Attorney Mark Pilliod, Human Resources Director Sandra Miller, Finance Director Patrick O'Claire, Community Development Director Joe Grillo, Engineering Director Tom Ramish, Operations/Maintenance Director Steve Baker, Police Chief David Bishop, Library Director Shirley George, Building Official Brad Roast, Cross Connection Inspector Lyle Heilman, Senior Planner Barbara Fryer, Support Specialist III Robyn Lampa, HR Analyst Gemma Smith, Library Clerk Tony LeMay and Project Engineer Jim Brink, Support Specialist II Sheila Lee and City Recorder Darleen Cogburn.

### CITIZEN COMMUNICATION:

Barbara Wilson, 12820 SW 20<sup>th</sup> Ct., Beaverton, OR 97008, said the Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation Department (THPRD) passed their \$25.9 million bond measure in 1994. She suggested that after a year or two had passed, she became alarmed that the District had not complied with their plan for acquisition of new park property. She mentioned since then the City had been involved in the Moshofsky and the Polygon property and she appreciated the City support. She noted that on June 28, 2000, there would be a public hearing on the budget for THPRD, which was for a total of \$22 million, and reported there was not one penny for land acquisition. She noted that Coun. Doyle was on the THPRD budget committee and did not raise any objection to this issue. She said THPRD felt like they had emptied their cupboard with the purchase of 22 acres when they had to borrow \$1.6 million and went into debt on the Certificates of Participation (COPs). She stated that if THPRD had bought the property years ago it would not have been in this

situation. She suggested that THPRD needed to give more consideration to the environmental issues rather than the sports facilities. She said she had asked Ron Willoughby (THPRD General Manager) how would he address the commitment to the 20-year plan. She stated that his reply was to pass a bond measure for acquisition.

Coun. Soth asked if they had brought this to the attention of the Board of the THPRD.

Wilson said she had expressed her feelings and she mentioned that she had been to most of the board meetings since the bond measure passed. She said she was at the public hearing and she spoke to them as she has spoken to the Council, on the same issues.

Coun. Soth asked if she had appeared during the budget discussions. He questioned if they had heard her speak in the same manner.

Wilson said she was not as elaborate. She added people were concerned by the COPs, which she said cost \$125,000 a year, and taking that out of the budget was not that large of an amount.

Mayor Drake commented that hopefully the Homebuilders would not win on the System Development Charges (SDC) issue. He mentioned THPRD had a large amount of money sitting in escrow waiting for a decision.

Patrick O'Claire, Finance Director, noted that the City and Washington County collected SDCs for THPRD and they each turned over \$30,000 to \$40,000 per month.

Mayor Drake noted the money in escrow was \$1.7 million, which would be a start. He said development continued broadly within THPRD, the City and the unincorporated area within the THPRD.

Wilson said the "Make Our Park Whole" committee was very appreciative of the support by the Council.

#### COUNCIL ITEMS:

Coun. Brzezinski noted that on June 12, 2000 agenda AB 00-217 came into the meeting with an incorrect number and needed to be changed to AB 00-219. She asked if a motion was needed.

Mark Pilliod, City Attorney said they did not need a motion if the Council agreed to the change.

There was consensus to make the change.

Coun Brzezinski reported that at the joint meeting with TVF&R it had been announced that TVF&R had won a prestigious award for 1999. She

explained that it was an award of excellence from the International Association of Fire Chiefs, and was only presented to one fire department in the world each year, and TVF&R got the award. She noted TVF&R had been among the ten finalists for three years. She displayed the replica of the award, which TVF&R presented to the City in recognition of the positive working relationship they had.

STAFF ITEMS:        There were none

PRESENTATION:

00-220        Award and Recognition Program (C.O.R.E. Creating Opportunities for Recognizing Employees)

Mayor Drake noted that a team of employees helped craft the program and they would present it to the Council.

Gemma Smith, Human Resources consultant and project manager for the project, noted that it had been a pleasure for her and thanked the Council and Mayor for giving them the authorization to go ahead on this project. She thanked the Department Heads and Council for the work.

Smith said they gathered information from across the country and found out that there were not many programs that had lasted for a long time. She reported there was not a lot of employee support so they decided to develop a committee. She stated they put together an employee Advisory Committee to develop the program. She said the Advisory Committee was comprised of a management and a represented employee from each of the departments, and Robyn Lampa, from Community Development chaired the committee. She said the Advisory Committee was divided into two sub committees; one group worked on the Awards program, chaired by Bill Kirby and the second sub committee was chaired by Jim Brink for the performance appraisal committee.

Robyn Lampa, Support Specialist III, Advisory Committee Chair, thanked the Council for allowing them to make the presentation and said she was delighted to present Creating Opportunities for Recognizing Employees (CORE). She pointed out that the title was created by Sheila Lee from the City Attorneys office. She explained the Advisory Committee developed a reward recognition program and a performance appraisal system that motivated employees to provide excellence in their responsibilities. She stated the CORE values were designed and formalized by the Mayor and Department Heads. She related the CORE values were customer service, a highly productive work force, organizational ownership, and leadership. She reported other than the CORE values, data research was collected from staff, and all City staff participated in an employee survey. She stated there was a fifteen-member focus group with a paid facilitator; the Advisory Committee who brainstormed and worked with Department Heads. She said the feedback she received from the employees was that they wanted a

program that would reward excellence. She said they wanted the program fair, timely and consistent across departments, and the rewards needed to be provided close to the performance, as well as be motivating and meaningful.

Lampa reported on the feedback from the Department Heads, and noted that they supported the CORE values, and wanted the awards to be linked to the performance appraisal; to recognize excellence, both team and individual; make managers accountable; with an easy process; clear and fair criteria; flexibility; and recognition immediate.

Lampa reviewed the awards portion of the program, and said the committee was made up of nine members (one from each department). She said the objectives used for this program were to promote the CORE values and motivate towards excellence. She pointed out that the criteria needed to be objective, the selection process needed to be fair, the awards should be timely and meaningful, simple to administer, fiscally responsible, and should recognize both team and individuals. She added the need to recognize cross department teams, need to be linked to the performance appraisal, and the need for the recipient to have a choice of awards.

Lampa reported the Advisory Committee reviewed the objectives and the feed back and narrowed down the wide array of possibilities into five categories of awards. She listed them as: employee to employee, supervisor to employee, department to employee, City to employee and referral incentive.

Lampa stated employee recognition was to encourage recognition of a job done above and beyond the norm. She said it would be virtually a thank you note that was formalized. She added this was available to all employees, extra help, department heads, and elected officials. She stated nominations could come from anyone, and each time a person received formal recognition their name would be entered into a monthly drawing at the department level. She noted that since there was a dollar figure for these drawings, elected officials were not eligible. She explained that it was a \$10 monthly drawing award, with nine departments, twelve times a year, so the total funds available were \$1,080.

Lampa said the next award was the Supervisor-to-Employee award, which was to award employees who exceed expected standards of performance in the CORE values. She stated regular employees including department heads were eligible, but extra help and elected officials were not eligible. She said nominations could come from anyone and the immediate supervisor of the nominee would make the decision. She said the supervisor would document the reason for the award on a Citywide form. She said each of these awards were \$10 and were given when earned and approved by a supervisor. She added the total funds available were \$10,000.

Tony Lemay, Library Clerk, presented the information for the next two levels, which would have much more detailed in criteria. He said the quarterly department area awards would consist of three different areas. He stated they were the outstanding individual employee of the quarter, the outstanding department team of the quarter, and the outstanding cross-department team of the quarter. He explained the nominations could come from any employee, department head, or elected official, and a committee would decide the award. He clarified that the awards criteria were based on the cities four CORE values, and the committee would score the nominations using the award metrics criteria.

Lemay said the Outstanding Individual Employee award was for outstanding performance or conduct of an employee, which exceeded expectations of the core values. He noted that all regular employees were eligible excluding extra help, department heads and elected officials. He said the individual had a choice of cash or time off, and there was a total of \$800 available annually for this part of the program.

Lemay explained the Outstanding Team was for outstanding performance or conduct of two or more employees, and was for working together and exceeding the expectations of the CORE values. He added all regular employees were eligible, excluding extra help, department heads and elected officials. He said the team members had a choice of a \$50 cash award or three hours off per team member. He stated this was given quarterly and that \$9,000 was available annually. He added there would be one award per department regardless of size.

Lemay said the Cross Department Team award was developed to recognize the fact that departments cooperate on projects or problems. He explained two or more people from different departments working together would be the definition of a Cross Department Team. He added any regular employee was eligible, excluding extra help, department heads or elected officials. He said the award was \$50 per person or three hours time off per member, and was limited to a maximum of two teams per quarter four times per year. He stated the total funds available were \$2,000 annually.

Lemay explained that the Annual City Employee awards were somewhat different since they were based on the scoring of the performance appraisals. He said it would be anyone who rated outstanding on the annual performance evaluation, and would be available to all regular employees, excluding extra help, department heads and elected officials. He noted that the nominations would come from supervisors and managers, and the award would be \$250 per employee or twelve hours off, with total funds available annually of \$5,000.

Lemay said the Referral Incentive award was focused to address hard-to-fill positions within the City, and promoted organizational ownership. He stated the Human Resource Department would determine the eligibility

for the award, and was available to all regular employees, excluding extra help, department heads, elected officials and the people involved in the recruitment for that particular position. He reported an employee who referred an applicant to the City and was hired, received an award and then there was an additional award if the person made it through their six months probation and through a full year. He said the total funds for this award were \$750.

Lemay thanked Smith for leading the process and said it was very thorough and very interesting. He said he really did not think there was another way to get the same kind of impact and change in the culture of the City.

Jim Brink, Project Engineer, said he had served on the performance appraisal piece and noted that it was an opportunity to get to know seven other people on staff and said they worked diligently to reach a decision. He said the awards program was based on the four CORE values, and each of the core values had at least one performance expectation. He explained this program took a list of goals and tasks, and associates them with the CORE values. He reported that each of the CORE values received a rating and there would be the mandatory written comments by both the person doing the rating and the person being rated. He specified that *outstanding* and *exceeds* were the first two ratings, and explained that the committee decided the difference between *outstanding* and *exceeds* was the difference between an A and B student. He said the next two categories were *meets* and *does not meet* and this would be categorized as C and D students. He noted the last category was *not rated* which had to do with poor factors beyond the control of the employee. He said the performance appraisal included an overall rating which was a composite of the four CORE values. He added within the performance appraisal there was an area for acknowledgement of special accomplishments. He mentioned these special accomplishments were achievements that would not fit within the four values. He cited the length between the performance appraisal and the awards program was the outstanding rating. He verified an employee that received an outstanding rating became eligible for the honor roll award.

Mayor Drake thanked them for the clear concise presentation.

Coun. Soth asked about performance and if someone was doing an adequate job for some time and if then exceeded to the point that he was recommended for an award, what would you do at the next appraisal period. He asked if they expected the person to continue to work at the higher level and get no recognition for it, or were they expected to succeed to a higher level or do they revert to their performance of their job description.

Smith clarified that the awards were separate from the performance appraisal except for the honor roll award. She said over a quarter, a team would get an award for an outstanding project, and the City

expected the behavior to continue. She added that it was designed to provide as much opportunity for as many people as possible who reached the outstanding performance, to receive an award.

Coun. Soth asked if the people who received the awards were not expected to perform at the higher level in all cases.

Smith said it was for the quarterly project. She said the purpose of the program was to gear employees towards achievement.

Lemay said the second part of this program would be like a rising tide that would raise all ships. He said the entire staff would be performing at a higher level.

Coun. Soth asked at what point did the evaluation for the program take place.

Smith said they designed evaluation procedures for each part of the program, for both the performance appraisal side and the award side. She said they encouraged employees to provide feed back throughout the year. She explained they would look at it no later than a year and maybe sooner, and said they implemented focus groups and reviewed the various employee survey.

Coun. Soth asked how it worked when an employee received a promotion and had received an award in the lower classification, where did the advancement take place as far as the awards and recommendations were concerned.

Smith said an employee was eligible even after the promotion for any of the awards. She explained a promotion did not preclude an employee from being illegible for an award.

Coun. Brzezinski asked what it meant by Department Heads and Managers need to be accountable.

Smith said one of the main focuses from the Department Heads and employees, was the timely completion of performance appraisals. She added the other concern was holding the employees accountable for the performance expectations. She said employees felt that the program needed to be fair and consistent.

Coun. Brzezinski said the agenda bill talked about the award matrix and she did not recognize it in the document. She said she saw the CORE award program matrix.

Smith said it was exhibit #3 and it talked about who actually made the decision about the awards, and who was eligible.

Coun. Brzezinski asked what the CORE value award matrix was.

Smith clarified that this was not included and it was the scoring mechanism they used. She said this was a list of all the CORE values with the bullet points. She stated committees from each department used the matrix, taking the information provided by the nominator then scored each core value. She stated to be eligible to receive the award the employee had to receive at least a score of 80 and they couldn't have more than 25 points in any one core value and they had to have at least ten in all core values.

Coun. Brzezinski questioned what the time frame was to put this together.

Smith said the awards committee spent approximately 12 hours per month, and the performance appraisal committee spent about 8-12 hours per month. She said the training started in January and the work was complete towards the end of April.

Coun. Brzezinski said it looked like they did an excellent job.

Coun. Stanton said she appreciated the whole philosophy of the performance evaluations done in a timely manner. She said she felt this was important to the employees. She was glad to see that management understood this and employees were able to stress this. She felt it was very disconcerting to think you were doing a good job and have no way of knowing because the feedback you got was not concrete enough. She questioned page 11 of handout (in record), the Referral Incentive Award. She wanted to know if it was \$750 per employee or for more than one referral.

Smith said, it was the total per year for the pool.

Coun. Stanton asked how often they dipped into the pool and how much was dispersed.

Smith said it was \$100, when the person was hired, \$50 at six months and \$50 at one year.

Coun. Doyle said he was impressed with the agenda bill and said the presentation was concise and right at the level he wanted. He expressed his hope that it would accomplish what had been desired for the City and for staff. He stated that staff struck him as hard working and the spirit they put into this had them on the right track to promote it. He said he looked forward to seeing the results.

Coun. Stanton congratulated Sheila Lee for creating the name for the program: *Creating Opportunities for Recognizing Employees*. She felt it was perfect.



Smith said Lee came up with this on the first day and the committee liked it and it stuck.

**ACTION ITEM:**

00-242 Authorization to Negotiate Implementation of the C.O.R.E. (Creating Opportunities for Recognizing Employees) Program

**Coun. Brzezinski MOVED, SECONDED by Coun. Doyle, to approve AB 00-242, Authorize Negotiation and Implementation of the C.O.R.E (Creating Opportunities for Recognizing Employees) Program.**

**There being no further discussion the vote was taken. Couns. Brzezinski, Doyle, Soth, Stanton and Ruby voting AYE, motion CARRIED unanimously. (5:0)**

**CONSENT AGENDA:**

Mayor Drake said AB 00-227 and AB 00-232 would be pulled for separate consideration.

**Coun. Brzezinski MOVED, SECONDED by Coun. Soth that the consent agenda be approved as follows:**

- 00-221 Liquor License: Du Kuh Bee – Additional Privilege
- 00-222 Liquor License: Westside U-Brew – Change of Ownership
- 00-223 A Resolution Stating the Official Results of the May 16, 2000, Primary Election
- 00-224 Bid Award – Pedestrian Path Lighting Improvement Project
- 00-225 Boards and Commissions Appointment
- 00-226 CPA 99-00005 Local Wetland Inventory and Riparian Assessment Map Layers and CPA 99-00006 Local Wetland Inventory and Riparian Assessment Supporting Documents
- 00-227 Management and Non-Represented Employees Fiscal Year 2000-01 Salary Range Increase Adjustment (Pulled for separate consideration.)
- 00-228 Bid Award - Westgate Sanitary Sewer Repair
- 00-229 Bid Award –Jenkins Road Sanitary Sewer Repair
- 00-230 Bid Award – Griffith Park Storm Sewer Line Cleaning Project
- 00-231 Bid Award - Restoration of City Hall Exterior Expansion Joints

- 00-232 Management and Non-Represented Employees Market Factor Recommendation (Pulled for separate consideration.)
- 00-233 Contract Award - Intrusion Alarm System at City Hall, Operations and Library

Contract Review Board:

- 00-234 Contract Renewal for Building Code Plan Review Services
- 00-235 Contract Renewal for Temporary Inspection Services
- 00-236 Bid Award – Sewer Scanning Camera, Transporter and Portable Reel Assembly
- 00-237 Contract Award – Right-of-Way Appraisal and Acquisition Services for the MSTIP 2 Bikeway Project
- 00-238 Retainer Agreements for Professional Services in Support of the FY 2000/01 and 2001/02 Capital Improvements Plan
- 00-239 Contract Award – Right-of-Way Appraisal and Acquisition Services for the Fanno Creek Multi-use Path Project
- 00-240 Consultant Contract Amendment – Approval of Additional Funds for On-call Right-of-way Services

Coun. Doyle asked about AB 00-222 and who was the new owner. He asked if there was someone different taking the business.

Bishop replied that there was a new business owner.

Coun. Stanton noted AB 00-233, Contract Award – Panic Alert and Intrusion Security System for City Hall and Operations Building, that the system at the current library had been removed from the scope of work and there was a decrease of \$4,136. She questioned the last paragraph in the "Information for Consideration." She asked if the system coming in through Heery International came in at the decrease amount of \$4,136.

Mayor Drake answered that was not correct and turned it over to Patrick O'Claire, Finance Director.

O'Claire noted that the \$4,136 was for the old library and the new library had more pinnacles. He explained the new library also had more security for doors, windows and rooftop access.

Coun. Stanton asked if this required another change order.

O'Claire answered yes. He replied they worked with the project manager and the architect to make sure the technology was consistent with the Library and the Operations building.

Coun. Stanton asked for the completion time for the change order.

O'Claire answered prior to the opening to the Library.

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

Mayor Drake noted that the Council had seen the material on the tentative agreement with OPEU, AB 00-243, and asked if they needed an executive session. Council agreed they did not need more information.

#### ACTION ITEM

00-243 Ratify Tentative Contract Agreement with OPEU

**Coun.Brzezinski MOVED, SECONDED by Coun. Stanton to approve AB 00-243 and Ratify the Tentative Contract Agreement with OPEU.**

**There being no discussion, the vote was called. Couns. Brzezinski, Stanton, Ruby, Doyle and Soth voting Aye, motion CARRIED unanimously. (5:0)**

Separate Consideration:

00-227 Management and Non-Represented Employees Fiscal Year 2000-01 Salary Range Increase Adjustment

**Coun. Doyle MOVED, SECONDED by Coun. Soth, to approve AB 00-227, Management and Non-Represented Employees Fiscal Year 2000-01 Salary Range Increase Adjustment**

**There being no discussion, the vote was called. Couns. Doyle, Soth, Brzezinski, Ruby and Stanton voting Aye, motion CARRIED unanimously. (5:0)**

00-232 Management and Non-Represented Employees Market Factor Recommendation

**Coun. Ruby MOVED, SECONDED by Coun. Doyle to approve AB 00-232, Management and Non-Represented Employees Market Factor Recommendation.**

**There being no discussion the vote was taken. Couns. Ruby, Doyle, Stanton, Soth and Brzezinski voting AYE, the motion CARRIED unanimous. (5.0)**

RECESS: Mayor Drake called for a brief recess at 8:13 p.m.

RECONVENED:

The regular meeting reconvened at 8:25 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING:

00-241 A Resolution Adopting a Budget for Fiscal Year Commencing July 1, 2000.

O'Claire thanked them for the opportunity to have the hearing for the budget, and noted that the budget in AB 00-241, was exactly the same as approved by the Budget Committee. He asked that the Council amend the proposed budget to reflect the salary increases they had just approved.

Coun. Soth asked where that transfer would come from.

O'Claire said it would come from the salary and wages. He commented there were transfers and revenue increases.

Mayor Drake opened the public hearing.

There was no one present to testify.

Mayor Drake closed the public hearing.

**Coun. Doyle MOVED , Seconded by Coun. Soth to approve AB 00-241 as presented with modifications for the fiscal adjustments and transfers from the appropriate accounts to accomplish those adjustments.**

**There being no further discussion the vote was taken. Couns. Doyle, Soth, Ruby, Brzezinski, and Stanton voting AYE, the motion CARRIED unanimous. (5:0) (Couns. Stanton and Soth's following comments were noted for the record.)**

Coun. Stanton noted for the record, she thought the Council stipend that was being increased was too much.

Mayor Drake said he felt it would be difficult to split that portion out of the budget document and vote on it separately.

Coun. Soth remarked that he had abstained from voting on this at the budget committee and he agreed with Coun. Stanton, however he felt it was inappropriate to do anything at this point.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Mayor Drake said that Joe Grillo, Community Development Director, could explain the options related to the Haggen's appeals.

Grillo explained that Buck and Gordon, who represented Haggen's had issued two appeals both in regards to the aspects of the conditional use permit approval. He noted there was a third appeal presented by Jeff Klienman, representing the Neighbors for Livability (NFL). He stated Haggen's had requested their two appeals be heard on the record. He explained the default position where appeals heard before the Council were de novo. He asked if the Council wished to concur with the request by the Haggen's attorney. He commented the other appeal did not require any action.

Mayor Drake noted that the transcripts were thick and much had already been said on the subjects. He said he was comfortable either way.

Coun. Doyle asked if the appeals would be heard at the same time.

Grillo said they would hear all three and there could be more.

Coun. Doyle questioned if one was on the record and one was de novo, how would they keep it sorted out.

Grillo explained that because the rezoning issue was the pivotal issue, and would be de novo, they would need to decide early on, to uphold or not, the rezoning recommendation. He said the options were clearer on the Conditional Use Permits (CUP). He said when someone stepped up, and wanted to talk about both issues the only advice they had was that the CUP was on the record only.

Coun. Stanton asked them not do the NFL appeal first, separate from the Buck & Gordon appeals, because depending on how they went on the rezone, it could impact the others and make one part moot. She said it would be difficult to know what they were talking about.

Mayor Drake pointed out that the meetings had been noticed and they were handled together at the Planning Commission, with much of the same information at both meetings. He said it tested their mettle on each of them, and if they chose to do it on the record then they had to deal with just those issues.

Coun. Stanton asked if the rezone appeal was de novo because it was requested.

Mayor Drake answered yes.

Coun. Stanton asked how difficult it was be for anyone that testified to remember which issue they were speaking to as to whether or not it was on the record or de novo.

Mayor Drake commented for what it was worth Buck and Gordon appealed early and the NFL appealed later. He stated the one appeal came in quite a bit later.

Coun. Soth said he was comfortable with either way and said he knew that the Councilors read the material. He stated the record type of appeal restricted public testimony, and he would prefer to hear those two on the record and the other one de novo.

Coun. Doyle asked about the case in court. He questioned when that got resolved would that decision have any impact at what they were looking at.

Pilliod said there were different ways the court issue could go. He explained that the Court could affirm the decision, which would allow them to proceed on schedule and if the Court reversed or remanded it to the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA), then that decision was appealable to the Supreme Court. He said if it resulted in a remand to LUBA, it depended on LUBA handling the issues that the Court of Appeals had difficulties with. He said they would not have that information until way after July 17, 2000, and it was purposed to proceed even if there seemed to be an adverse ruling by the Court. He added it was not final at that stage.

Mayor Drake said the good news was both sides were well represented and would have honed the issues very well.

**Coun. Soth MOVED, SECONDED by Coun. Brzezinski, to hold the CUPs "on the record" and others de novo.**

**There being no further discussion the vote was taken. Couns. Soth, Brzezinski, Doyle and Ruby voting AYE, Coun. Stanton voting NAY, the motion CARRIED. (4:1)**

#### WORK SESSION:

00-244 Vacant City Library Facility – Work Session

Mayor Drake introduced Jill Showalter, Director of the Beaverton Police Activities League (PAL). He pointed out that the Council asked for public comment on the use of the facility and they would do that in the fall. He explained that there was an opportunity to use the current homework room for a computer center that Intel would supply with computers, and they were moving quickly because Intel had asked for feedback from Council. He mentioned it was wired properly and was a facility that could be properly locked and secured. He said Showalter could answer any questions about the grant.

Showalter reported that they got through the Intel process rapidly and Intel agreed to do what needed to be done.

Coun. Stanton asked what was the amount of the grant.

Showalter answered it was a total of \$150,000. She related it was \$65,000 in cash and the rest in computers and software.

Coun. Soth said this did not apply to the Intel offer, but he would like to know what the property was appraised at, and if Intel would agree, on a one-year occupancy. He stated his concern was that after the new Library open the Council would need to decide on the future of the current library building. He asked if this was to be a permanent place for them.

Showalter reported Intel was looking for a permanent agency to host the program, and the permanent agency had to guarantee that there was 1000 SF to use, and also had to guarantee security. She noted that the library facility met those requirements and by getting this award, PAL would be illegible to get a second year grant. She added that as an agency PAL agreed to finance and host the future of that program.

Coun. Soth asked if after the second year, would Intel be responsible for changes in the technology.

Showalter explained this reaped the benefits of a long-term partnership that would be maximized for future technical upgrades.

Coun. Soth asked if a proposal came forth to use the building for some other purpose, would Intel maintain the relationship.

Showalter explained that PAL and Intel hoped for stability, and not a month-to-month option. She clarified that nothing was a "done deal," PAL was asking for a room, and there was still debate about what the whole building would host.

Coun. Brzezinski noted she was supportive of the funding, but was not happy with the proposal to move all of PAL to the library. She said they had made a commitment to the community, that they would open it up to the community for input about how the building would be used.

Pilliod clarified that this was a work session, and they did not have to take action.

Coun. Brzezinski pointed out that the agenda bill asked for a commitment from the Council.

Pilliod replied it would be unusual for a work session to do that. He commented that since this was a City asset, it would be a year-to-year opportunity.

Mayor Drake stated Intel was interested in hosting this for the first year. He mentioned coming back in the fall to get public input. He said at that time they would see who was interested and the Council could decide on what should be done. He explained that they were at a difficult point on the Intel grant and thought it would be difficult for the City to turn this down for a one-year commitment.

Couns. Brzezinski asked when they learned of this opportunity.

Showalter stated this was a very quick process and it began in April. She explained Intel was placing only a certain number of these centers across the nation and only one in Oregon. She said Intel had intended for this program to begin in August, and the reason they need a decision was because Intel had held off to make their award, since they had another city/agency under consideration, also. She said they held off till July 1, 2000, because they had training in Boston on July 10, 2000.

Coun. Brzezinski stated that she felt the Council was “between a rock and a hard place” and PAL should have brought this to the Council in April. She expressed her concern that there was nothing in the budget for insurance.

Showalter clarified that PAL had insurance and that was one of the things they would incur as the host agency.

Coun. Brzezinski asked for verification that for use of the homework room, there would be no cost to the City.

Showalter said that was correct

Mayor Drake clarified that when this came up in April they did not know they had to have a decision by June.

Coun. Brzezinski noted that on page five of the proposal it said, the multi-program youth service building is not only a goal of PAL but also the City of Beaverton. She stated that the Council should have had some involvement in agreeing that being written.

Mayor Drake said he did not see the application until that day, so he was unable to speak on how that sentence came about. He pointed out that the City as well as himself was supportive of PAL.

Coun. Doyle said to reiterate on the overall use of the soon-to-be former library space, there was no obligation beyond this classroom, and noted that this would take less than 10% of the building. He verified the space was under 2000 SF, said he would not turn it down, but agreed that he would liked to have been in the information earlier.

Coun. Stanton said it was a short time, with a very small window, but if they only looked at the opportunities with a long window, they would miss



opportunities like this. She stated the space was being utilized and citizens would be served and there would be use for the building that otherwise would be sitting there. She pointed out that they were working under Intel's timeframe and not their own. She added she agreed with this and felt comfortable with this even if it was a temporary measure. She commented that she did not see much money in the budget for remodeling. She reiterated she was comfortable with this at this time.

Coun. Brzezinski noted that in the fall they might all decide that was where they wanted PAL to go, but the Council wanted the option.

Coun. Stanton commented that in the fall they could decide to sell. She added in that case the Intel computer club would have less long term liability at that location but it would not be out the door the next month because the process for transferring the property and going through the development process would take six months. She added that gave PAL and Intel ample time to find a new location.

Mayor Drake noted there would be no shortage of people wanting the property, and commented that he has had many requests.

Coun. Soth noted that a permanent restriction on the property was that it couldn't be a grocery store. He noted that he did not have any problem with it as long as it was for just the one room, since in many cases after a short while it can get out of hand. He asked about the small rooms next to the room being considered.

Showalter said that would be for the office space that was required by the grant for staff.

**Coun. Doyle MOVED, SECONDED by Coun. Stanton, that Council authorize the use of the old library facility as discussed that evening, for the Beaverton PAL Computer Center per the Intel grant.**

Mayor Drake clarified that the intention was to use the current homework center and the adjoining rooms, not the large room (Library).

Coun. Soth asked to add an amendment to restrict the use of the one room and the adjoining office.

Coun. Doyle clarified that his motion encompassed the small portion of rooms that they talked about.

Coun. Brzezinski asked if the motion included the one-year life of the grant.

Coun. Doyle answered that was the intent.

**There being no further discussion the vote was taken. Couns. Doyle, Stanton, Soth, Ruby and Brzezinski voting AYE, motion CARRIED unanimous. (5:0)**

ORDINANCE:  
Suspend Rules:

**Coun. Soth MOVED, SECONDED by Coun. Brzezinski that the rules be suspended, and that the ordinance embodied in AB 00-245 be read for the first time by title only at this meeting, and for the second time by title only at the next regular meeting of the Council and the ordinance embodied in AB 00-246 be read for the first and second time by title only at this meeting. Couns. Brzezinski, Doyle, Ruby, Soth and Stanton voting AYE, the motion CARRIED unanimously. (5:0)**

Coun. Soth asked if, since this ordinance was in regard to State Shared Revenues related to the budget for 2000-001, he wondered if it had to be completed before the end of the fiscal year.

Darleen Cogburn, City Recorder, said it did not need to have the Second Reading prior to the next fiscal year. She explained that it had to be submitted by the deadline of July 31, 2000, which gave adequate time.

First Reading:

00-245 An Ordinance Expressing the City of Beaverton's Election to Receive Distribution of a Share of Certain Revenues of the State of Oregon for Fiscal year 2000-2001, Pursuant to ORS 221.760

First and Second Reading and Passage:

**Coun. Soth MOVED, SECONDED by Coun. Stanton to suspend the rules and read the ordinance embodied in AB 00-245 in full at this meeting and the second time by title only at the next regular meeting of the Council. Couns. Soth, Stanton, Brzezinski, Doyle and Ruby voting AYE, motion CARRIED unanimous. (5:0)**

Pilliod read the following ordinance in full for the first time and by title only the second time:

00-246 An Ordinance Amending Section 6.10.015 of the Beaverton Code, Specifically the Definition of "Truck Route," to Correct the Definition, and Declaring an Emergency

**Coun. Soth MOVED, SECONDED by Coun. Brzezinski, that the ordinance embodied in AB 00-246 now pass. Roll call vote. Couns. Brzezinski, Soth, Doyle, Stanton and Ruby voting AYE, motion CARRIED unanimously. (5:0)**

RECESS: Mayor Drake called for a brief recess at 9:15 p.m.

EXECUTIVE SESSION:

**Coun. Soth MOVED, SECONDED by Coun. Brzezinski that Council move into executive session in accordance with ORS 192.660 (1) (g), to discuss the legal rights and duties of the governing body with regard to litigation or litigation likely to be filed. Couns. Brzezinski, Doyle, Ruby, Soth and Stanton voting AYE, the motion CARRIED unanimously. (5:0)**

Executive session convened at 9:15 p.m.

The executive session adjourned at 9:32 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business to come before the Council at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 9:32 p.m.

---

Darleen Cogburn, City Recorder

APPROVAL:

Approved this 7<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2000

---

Rob Drake, Mayor