

REGULAR MEETING

September 10, 2001

CALL TO ORDER:

A regular meeting of the Beaverton City Council was called to order by Mayor Rob Drake in the Beaverton Library, 12375 SW Fifth, Beaverton, Oregon, on Monday, September 10, 2001 at 6:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Present were Mayor Drake, Couns. Dennis Doyle, Forrest Soth, and Cathy Stanton. Couns. Brzezinski and Ruby were excused. Also present were Chief of Staff Linda Adlard, Assistant City Attorney Bill Scheiderich, Human Resources Director Sandra Miller, Finance Director Patrick O'Claire, Police Chief David Bishop, Library Director Ed House, Development Service Manager Steve Sparks, Associate Planner Scott Whyte, City Transportation Engineer Randy Wooley, Landscape and Interim Forestry Supervisor Steve Brennan, Senior Planner Margaret Middleton, Support Specialist II Deborah Baidenmann, and Acting City Recorder Sue Nelson.

CITIZEN COMMUNICATION:

Margaret Croom, Beaverton, introduced the Christian Women's Job Corp. She explained the program assisted women to progress from dependency to self-sufficiency by providing life skill classes, as well as educational and career counseling. She added there was a mentor for every participant and she explained how one could become involved with the program.

Coun. Stanton asked about a contact phone number.

Croom replied that the phone number was 503-644-2572.

Rod Franklin, Beaverton, said he came before Council that evening to discuss a situation concerning his property in relation to the Beaverton Farmer's Market. He noted that the original Market booths were placed directly next to his property until he contacted the police to have them moved. He said there were still booths by the side of his property, which he understood was supposed to be a temporary situation until the new Library was completed. He noted that his family decided to sell a food item called Elephant Ears on his property where the booths had been authorized by the City of Beaverton for the Market. He reported that he had brought several issues to the City's attention in July 2001, which included noise, trash and booth locations in violation of the original Market permit. He said after he complained he received a call from the City

stating he was in violation of the City Ordinances by selling Elephant Ears on his front lawn. He stated he had to deal with the Farmer's Market every Saturday for six months out of the year and he discussed licensing requirements (in record). He questioned the City's authority regarding business licenses.

Mayor Drake stated Franklin's issue would not be debated at the Council meeting.

Franklin stated that the street zoning in the area of his residence was R-1 and in violation of the Comprehensive Plan the City allowed booths to be placed on Washington Ave., which was a vacated street and part of the park. He said that under State law a street that became vacated would revert to its original zoning, which was R-1. He commented that the City had allowed Farmer's Market booths to be on his front lawn, but he was not allowed to do business on his front lawn.

COUNCIL ITEMS:

Coun. Stanton reported on the Beaverton Library one-year anniversary celebration on September 9, 2001. She said it was a great event and was well attended

Mayor Drake recognized Beaverton citizen Bob Hamlin as the Good Neighbor of the Year and thanked him for all the work he had done for the City.

Coun. Soth noted that he had worked with both Bob and his wife Sue Hamlin over the years and thanked them both for their continued support of the City.

Coun. Doyle thanked the Hamlins for all of their hard work for the City. He said it was good neighbors like the Hamlins that made it a great honor to serve on the City Council and it was also why the City had continued to flourish and grow when other areas might have more problems.

Coun. Stanton noted the Hamlins had been honored in the Taste of Beaverton Festival Parade and at the Washington County Fair. She thanked them both.

Hamlin replied by commending the Council for all the hours they gave to the City.

STAFF ITEMS:

There were none.

CONSENT AGENDA:

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

Minutes of the regular meetings of April 2, and June 4, 2001

01279 A Resolution of Intent to Condemn Properties Abutting Central Interceptor Storm Drainage Project No. 6 for Use as Public Utility Easement

01280 Recognition of Bob Hamlin – 2001 Good Neighbor of the Year

01281 Boards and Commissions Appointments

01282 Authorize the Mayor to Enter Into an Intergovernmental Agreement with the Oregon Department of Transportation for the Hall Blvd. Bike Lanes Project

01283 Authorize the Mayor to Enter into an Intergovernmental Agreement with Washington County for the Fanno Creek Multi-Use Path Project

01284 Merlo Station Area Plan Implementing Amendments (CPA 2001-0011, CPA 2001-0012, TA 2001-0006, RZ 2001-0013)

01285 Bid Award - Teal/Osprey Drainage Remediation Project

Contract Review Board:

01286 Contract Award – Development Code Review Services

Question called on the motion. Couns. Stanton, Soth and Doyle voting AYE. The motion CARRIED unanimously. (3-0)

Mayor Drake noted that there were boy scouts in the audience and asked for one of the boys to introduce the troop.

Dane Bowman, Beaverton, introduced Troop 207 from Cedar Park Middle School.

WORK SESSION:

01287 Draft 2020 Transportation System Plan (TSP)

Randy Wooley, City Transportation Engineer introduced Senior Transportation Planner Margaret Middleton and Randy McCourt from DKS Associates. He explained that DKS Associates had done the technical work on the Transportation System Plan and staff as well as DKS had been working on the Transportation Plan update since November 2000. He said the purpose of the plan was to update the Comprehensive Plan, which would lead to changes in the Development Code, review of the Capitol Improvement Program and funding for Transportation. He noted that the 2015 Plan had been updated to the 2020 plan and that was being done in order to comply with the regional plan and to include the areas that

had been annexed to Beaverton since the last plan was started. He said they were not asking to adopt any new code at this point and they were looking for feedback before writing the code amendments. He said the code amendments would be written, the Planning Commission (PC) would hold workshops and finally hold hearings on adopting the changes.

Wooley explained that the PC was concerned about wanting better transit service for Beaverton and they were disappointed that Beaverton was not moving as quickly as they would like. He said the PC was a bit depressed to see all of the City's needs and how much funding was actually available and the fact that it looked like a momentous task to fund all the improvement needs for the next twenty years. He said there was discussion about the regional change in outlook at Level of Service (LOS). He noted that the region decided that LOS D (that had been aimed for previously) could not be afforded and it also changed the regional standards. He said the PC also wanted to make sure that just because that expectation of LOS had diminished that the City would not just sit and wait for the LOS to get to that diminished level, but that as development occurred the City would make improvements and each development would do its share. He said it was important to put off the LOS deterioration as long as possible. He noted that the City had promised to research alternatives to that deterioration in terms of changes to the Development Code, Development Fees and to bring those back to the PC when Code amendments were ready to be discussed.

Wooley noted that the region would tolerate (in the most congested hour) LOS E or LOS F, depending on where it was located. He said LOS E would be tolerated in the second most congested hour. He said it was fortunate that the City's first and second hours were close together that basically meant LOS E in most locations. He described the current standard as LOS D, with LOS E at signalized intersections. He reported the signalized intersections were usually the control points, so LOS E was the current standard. He said the difference was that as traffic kept increasing in the next five years, more intersections approached that LOS E.

Coun. Soth referred to the lack of sufficient capacity of major roads in the expanded Beaverton Urban Service Boundary. He gave an example as the proposed widening of Walker Road and asked if the City was anticipating sufficient capacity at all hours of the day or what they might expect in the next 15 years with the projected population increase. He asked if an analysis had been made regarding north/south connections.

Wooley replied that the proposed widening of Walker Road was still in the plan as well as widening other streets. He said that towards that twenty-year horizon (in regards to north/south routes) grade separations would need to be addressed, especially on streets with intersections like Murray and Tualatin Valley Highway where there was also a railroad crossing. He noted that there would have to be long-term improvements to address the north/south congestion.

Coun. Soth noted that through the years he had seen a number of projections and plans, which looked good on paper, but fell apart during the implementation stage usually due to lack of funding. He asked if a periodic update with Washington County, Metro and others was intended to see if projections and plans would be able to be implemented.

Wooley confirmed there would be periodic updates and he noted that the shortfalls in funding issues would be discussed for many years.

Coun. Stanton questioned Levels of Service (LOS) and the differences between the adopted 2015 TSP and the draft 2020 TSP. She noted that under LOS standards of analysis the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the two-hour standards acceptable LOS F and E as adopted by Metro and subsequently by the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT). She stated the Beaverton Transportation System Plan (TSP) had to be consistent with the new standards and asked if the standards had to be identical or could they be at a higher level.

Middleton explained that the City could chose to have a higher LOS standard if there were no negative downstream effects on the rest of the system. She added that was an option and they could take advantage of it through implementing amendments.

Coun. Stanton asked for a definition of LOS F.

McCourt referred to pages 312 and 313 of the TSP and gave a description of LOS. He noted that LOS A, B, and C were the best Levels of Service and they represented where facilities were highly underutilized. He said typically LOS A, B, and C would be free flowing traffic without restriction in lane changes. He explained that LOS D meant delays upwards in the range of 25 to 40 seconds per vehicle as it went through an intersection. He said this meant not waiting for more than one green light, but it meant more restriction in the ability to maneuver. He noted that LOS E meant sitting in lines of traffic for 60 to 80 seconds of delay with much more restrictive ability to maneuver. He explained that also meant the system was providing full use out of every dollar that had been invested in transportation. He said that LOS F meant traffic would back up with multiple cycle lengths. He said just a handful of intersections in Beaverton were at LOS E, and some were in LOS D with the majority at LOS C.

Coun. Stanton said her biggest concern about adopting LOS E and F was that a tool was given up that could be used with new development to maintain LOS D. She said if LOS E and F were the standard and they were currently at LOS D and a new development came in with the LOS at E and F they could not ask for a dedicated right turn lane. She said an LOS of D was no longer a standard, even though it would be maintained at LOS D. She asked if that was correct.

Wooley said that issue troubled the PC and they had looked for a way for the Master Plan to be consistent with the Regional Plan and not fall into the trap that Coun. Stanton had described with development. He noted that when development came along improvements would need to be made to keep the LOS from falling into the E and F range.

Coun. Stanton asked if improvements could be required. She said that currently a LOS of E and F could be accepted, but could not be required.

Wooley replied that was true, because of the way the current Development Code was set up and they were looking for alternative ways to approach the issue.

Coun. Stanton related the philosophical desire of the City was to provide the highest LOS across the board. She said she was concerned that LOS D could be obtained if the LOS in a certain area was currently at LOS E or F. She said she would like to see LOS D written into the Development Code as a standard so it could be used as a tool in development.

McCourt commented (based on input from the PC) that they were looking at different options. He noted that one option might be that for pre-existing conditions that were at LOS D or better, there might be geographic standards in the City where certain conditions held at LOS D. He said there were other places (like Canyon Road for example) where LOS E was the current level.

Coun. Stanton commented that Hall Blvd. and Greenway would be a good example to examine.

McCourt said Hall Blvd. and Greenway was a good example of an intersection where one might be able to set a standard of LOS D. He said the intersection was already operating at LOS E, and with a development review application it would become non-compliant before the project came in. He said there might be different standards set on different roads depending on if pre-existing conditions were at or above LOS D. He said the idea would be to keep the LOS at D. He explained the standards language had to be phrased in such a way so as not create ambiguity and that it was clear and objective and created a standard that did not change from case to case. He noted that the key was to have improvements and not be boxed into a set standard. He added the standard could become a problem if it was held too rigidly.

Coun. Stanton stated LOS E and F were not acceptable and she wanted to see every mechanism and strategy put to work so that current LOS D would remain at that level. She added she did not want that opportunity lost.

Coun. Doyle referred to the TSP report and asked if the unfunded projects kept the LOS at their current levels.

McCourt said there was a substantial LOS C and when one looked at future conditions there were more LOS D with some E and F.

Coun. Soth asked how Tri-Met had reacted to their questions.

McCourt replied Tri-Met wanted to plan out the future. He reported they did not want to fiscally commit to services that they could not financially perform. He said they established planning routes for the future so that when road improvements were made they were compatible with transit improvements. He explained that Tri-Met had gone through a five-year planning process and their funds were somewhat limited. He added Tri-Met was enthusiastically working with the City, to modify routes to get the maximum amount of ridership.

Mayor Drake commented that the City's TSP numbers were high and he noted the failure at the ballot box last year on the gas tax. He said the future did not look good for transportation improvements.

McCourt commented that the groundwork must be laid before funding could be established. He said there was a gap between the public's recognition and their own, on the magnitude of the problem. He reported the gap was not with available dollars, but was a perception issue. He added the Regional Plan focused on regional routes and the project would be one step at a time.

RECESS:

Mayor Drake called for a brief recess at 7:25 p.m.

RECONVENED:

The regular meeting reconvened at 7:35 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING:

01288 APP 2001-0012 Murray Hills Christian Church; Appeal of Board of Design Review Determination (BDR 2000-0185)

Mayor Drake explained how the meeting would proceed (in record).

Steven Sparks, Development Service Manager read a prepared statement (in record).

Sparks commented that Council had previously heard an appeal on a related application with this site. He said the Board of Design Review (BDR) had a tie vote and did not render a decision on the application; therefore the applicant filed an appeal. He noted Agenda Bill 01288 summarized the notice of appeal and staff recommended approval of the project.

Mayor Drake referred to the recommended action in the staff report dated September 10, 2001, and asked for clarification on conditions 1-13 and how it compared to the draft order conditions 1-14.

Scott Whyte, Associate Planner, reported Condition 14 was redundant because it was the same as Condition 7.

Mayor Drake asked for comments from the appellant.

Jeff Kleinman, Attorney for Murray Hills Christian Church, noted that City staff had described the situation well. He explained that this was a component of an application that was before Council on a Conditional Use Appeal from prior months. He noted there were some overlapping issues and the firm that worked with the architect on the original Church building was the same firm doing the expansion. He reported the design review standards were in two components and there was a set of technical standards, which were reviewed by the Facilities Review Committee before the BDR. He explained there was compliance pertaining to drainage and the recommended conditions, which in turn staff had incorporated in its recommendation to Council. He introduced Joachim Grube and Jim Moore from Yost Grube Hall Architects and Ron Kampe, the senior Engineer at OTAK. He noted Landscape Architect John Lee was also there to answer any questions.

Grube said most Churches were located in residential neighborhoods and stressed this location had an advantage because it was a generous site. He said the architect could address the matter of scale and design a building that was compatible with the neighborhood. He explained that by putting the building in the center of the site it created an open landscape space and located the parking where it was the least objectionable to the neighbors. He commented the building was adapted to the site by creating a two-story cube of which 25 percent was buried so that from the uphill site the building appeared as a one-story building and from the downhill site the building appeared to be two-stories. He noted the roof was sloping over the Sanctuary and an elongated gable roof was over the Fellowship Hall. He added that the roof became the dominant feature of the new three-story addition. He explained by linking the wing rather than adding it straight to the existing building it became more compatible in scale and allowed trees to be saved. He added there were several three-story buildings on the hillside in the immediate proximity and the nature of the proposed landscaping screens made the building compatible to the neighborhood.

Jim Moore, Yost Grube Hall Architecture, reported he was there to explain the technical and design standards. He explained the design was in a location, which was the only logical location in terms of a safe and efficient circulation pattern. He stated the parking would remain as it was and they were not adding any new parking spaces. He noted they were purposing sixteen new evergreen trees to the south of the addition and an additional

nine Birch trees. He explained the growth of the trees would allow significant screening in the coming years. He referred to the drawings and explained the tree-screening concept (in record). He stated they would improve the detention pond and maintain the facilities. He noted they were going to set the building down two feet in the existing grade rather than re-grading the area. He explained that would reduce the visual height of the southern most face of the building. He said the wetland area was approximately 50,000 square feet and would remain an existing natural habitat. He noted there would be a 35-foot buffer at the top of the hill and the noxious vegetation would be removed. He said the project did not provide any adverse effects in regards to storm facilities to neighboring properties it met both City and Clean Water Services requirements.

Ron Kampe, OTAK, said the firm did a detailed analysis and the City's Development Code requirements had been met. He added there were no adverse effects due to storm water run off based on the proposed improvement.

Coun. Soth asked if a drawing that was presented and displayed by Murray Hills Christian Church was to scale.

Moore replied that it was to scale.

Coun. Soth asked if that included the slope of the building to the trees.

Moore said that was correct.

Coun. Soth asked if the addition would be an extension of the present building in terms of the configuration of the roofline.

Moore answered that was correct and that it was important to maintain the original design.

Coun. Soth asked if the same building colors would continue in the addition.

Moore replied that was correct.

Coun. Soth asked if the original design envisioned the addition.

Moore said the addition represented a proposed building concept that was part of the original church design.

Coun. Soth asked if the south entrance would be continued.

Moore answered that was correct.

Coun. Soth asked if the brush and trees at the South property line would be retained.

Moore replied that was the plan.

Coun. Soth commented that additional planting would enhance the landscaping.

Moore stated the vegetation at the south property line would remain and new plantings would be provided north of the existing plantings.

Coun. Soth asked if it was their intent to replace the Birch trees that were removed south of the present building.

Moore replied they would be replaced with nine new Birch trees and sixteen Evergreen trees.

Coun. Doyle asked if there had been any changes in the details in the last three months.

Moore stated they had enhanced the landscape plan and the building elevation to the south had been dropped into the ground to reduce the visual height. He added nothing had changed in building materials.

Coun. Stanton asked if all conditions had been met from the draft approval.

Moore answered that was correct.

Coun. Soth asked if there was a preservation of the present appearance at the south side of the building.

Moore said the wing would align on the east and the west side of the existing building.

Coun. Soth asked if they used a type of appearance that modified any perceptions of excessive height.

Moore said they had.

Coun. Stanton asked if the siding was vertical.

Moore said that was correct.

Support of the Applicant:

Margie Guppy, Beaverton, said she lived directly east of the Murray Hills Christian Church and shared a common property line with them. She commented she liked her property adjacent to the Church and her favorite design feature with the current building was the beautiful stained glass windows. She noted they were not able to attend the meetings on the proposed addition and was pleased the Church brought the information to

their doorstep. She noted she found them to be good neighbors and she supported the addition.

Support of the Appellant:

Dave Golder, Beaverton, said he lived immediately south and adjacent to the Church. He said he was concerned about flooding issues from the detention pond as well as the streambed that went through the Church property. He said nothing had been proposed on the water issues south of the detention pond and he felt the site service drainage and the onsite storage were going to have an adverse effect on his property. He said the Church structure was 42 feet in height and it would be approximately ten years before they would see adequate screening from any new plantings. He added he did not want to take issue with the Church as a neighbor. He asked the Church to comply with City code and design a structure that would not have an impact on his home and others in the area.

Coun. Soth asked if drainage problems came from the property to the southwest of the Church and not from the Church property itself.

Golder replied the issue was with water that came from the Church property. He said the streambed went through the Church property and connected to a 30-inch pipe, which was located on an easement on his property. He said the stream was part of the wetland and water came through that area and impacted his property.

Coun. Soth asked if he disagreed with the engineers on their remedy for run off and the detention pond.

Golder stated there were three areas of drainage and water problems identified. He noted the detention pond had been addressed, but there were two areas that had not been addressed. He said both areas were along the western property line where flooding occurred, and a small amount of the water came from the detention pond. He noted the majority of the streambed that went through the 30-inch pipe was not attached to the detention pond. He added he did not disagree with the findings of the experts, but felt not all of the problems were resolved.

Coun. Soth asked for clarification on the location.

Golder pointed to the areas in question on the display map.

Mayor Drake said the City was committed to monitoring the 30-inch pipe.

Golder said flooding could occur even with a brief amount of rain.

Ron Sattler, Beaverton, stated the size of the Church would more than double and the building would not be compatible with the neighborhood as proposed. He explained that to make it compatible it would need to follow the slope of the grade, which would be a stepping down of the structure

(not an extension horizontally) of the roofline. He added it would be quite some time before the landscaping began to screen the structure and he referred to photos presented by Yost Grube Hall Architects and did not find them to be accurate (in record).

Appellant Rebuttal:

Kleinman said he would not rebut what was in the appeal unless there were questions from Council.

Kampe explained that the detention pond along the west property line and the streambed issues had been in existence for some time. He pointed out that the proposed improvements complied and the detention pond would function properly and would not have an adverse effect on adjoining property. He added the other improvements would not have an impact on the property line or on the streambed itself.

Coun. Stanton asked if the work being done on the detention pond made it better for the south property owners.

Kleinman said the detention pond would not be an issue in the future because their work would improve that particular condition. He added that along the west property line was a natural wetland and improvements were not allowed in that area.

Coun. Soth asked if the Church efforts had any effect upon the connection to the 30-inch pipe. He added the pipe was a City function and not a Church responsibility.

Kleinman said the 30-inch pipe was off the Church property and resided in an easement on Golder's property and the addition on the Church property would not have an impact. He said any debris coming down the streamline and getting caught in the inlet would be observed and monitored by the Church and the City.

Coun. Stanton asked for clarification on where the trees and shrubbery had been removed.

Moore noted that plant removal had occurred. He said the Church had a landscape company that trimmed the trees and hedges, but there was still extensive vegetation. He referred to the display photographs and the shrubbery that had been removed from the Sattler's property. He said it was unfortunate, and the Church would plant any necessary material. He added that he did not feel that it was a major issue.

Mayor Drake asked if the plantings were part of the original Design Review approval or had they grown over time.

Moore replied it was not part of the original design and the shrubbery had just grown by itself.

Kleinman referred to duplicate Conditions 7 and 14, which defined leaving existing landscape in tack and said the shrubbery was not part of that landscaping.

Mayor Drake noted that was understood and it would be a Code Enforcement issue and separate from the hearing.

Moore said the issue of compatibility was important and he read from the Design Standards (in record). He stated their belief was that the proposed building prior to ten years of landscape growth would be compatible with the surroundings. He noted there were other three story structures along the property. He summarized by noting the dimensions and the set back of the building.

Coun. Soth asked if they could confirm the building would be approximately 106 feet from the south property line.

Moore said the drawings indicated 102 feet.

Coun. Doyle asked if the minimum height of new evergreen trees could be 12 to 14 feet rather than 8 to 12 feet.

Moore replied that was a design decision to create a varying scale of trees and depth of trees.

Mayor Drake noted the Council was serving as Design Review Board that evening and because the hearing was based on an appeal, Council had the authority and discretion to modify the landscape plan. He pointed out that what Coun. Doyle was asking for was a 12-foot minimum tree height.

Lee explained the ratio of the root mass to a foliage hedge was smaller when looking at a large tree than when planting a smaller tree. He reported three to four years down the road a smaller tree may be taller ultimately than the larger tree. He added a large tree would be for immediate effect, but a smaller tree had a better advantage of putting on growth sooner. He said their thought was to get a variety of heights in a spontaneous and natural setting.

Coun. Stanton asked for clarification on why this would be something they would not want to do.

Lee explained that the smaller trees would be healthier and would grow faster.

Kleinman explained that the landscape design was for screening and also to frame the architecture.

Coun. Doyle noted his concern on how this kind of planting would develop as a screen.

Lee noted it would be a heavy screen in approximately 10 years, both in height and density. He noted that the site was already heavily planted. He mentioned the diversity of the site, which included air circulation and sun light penetration and that denser parts of the property provided security from visual penetration.

Mayor Drake stated that removal of the brush was a new issue and would have to be dealt with in a separate action.

Coun. Soth commented that he had seen cases where there was inadequate root ball for proper growth in larger trees. He said that when smaller trees were planted there was less risk for non-healthy trees.

Mayor Drake closed the public hearing 9:10 p.m.

Sparks commented that the Council packet contained criteria for approval of the project.

Coun. Soth MOVED, SECONDED by Coun. Doyle that Council grant the appeal and incorporate the conditions of approval as outlined in the draft staff recommendation with the deletion of Condition 14, the inclusion of the findings as referenced by staff on page 133 as well as the conditions from the Facilities Review Board and that the attorneys be instructed to return with an ordinance or draft findings for Council.

Mayor Drake repeated the motion and asked if there was going to be a change in Condition 5 to increase height.

Coun. Soth specified that was not included because they would run the risk of having to replace the trees.

Coun. Soth stated the issues described by Golder and Sattler had been addressed by BDR and Engineering. He said the drainage and existing natural run off and the City's cooperation on the 30-inch pipe. He added that the design of the building was a continuation of an existing design, rather than something incompatible with the existing building.

Coun. Stanton stated she supported the motion. She noted this was an addition of an existing building, designed to continue the style and height. She added all of the requirements met the criteria.

Coun. Doyle said he supported the motion and had full faith the Church would take care of the screening.

Question called on the motion. Coun. Stanton, Doyle and Soth voting AYE, the motion CARRIED unanimously. (3:0)

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business to come before the Council at this time,
the meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Sue Nelson, Acting City Recorder

APPROVAL:

Approved this 19th day of November, 2001

Rob Drake, Mayor