Regular City Council Meeting
April 12, 2016
MEETING MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER Mayor Pete Edison called to order the Regular Meeting of the Banks City Council at 7:06 PM.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

ROLL CALL
Present were: Mayor Pete Edison, Mark Gregg, Brian Biehl, Mark Walsh, and Michael Nelson. Teri Branstitre and Dan Keller were excused.

Staff present: City Manager Jolynn Becker, City Planner Stacey Goldstein, City Recorder Angie Lanter, and City Attorney Dan Kearns.

APPEARANCE OF INTERESTED CITIZENS – There were none.

Mayor Edison noted a motion was needed to move Item 13 Resolutions for Budget Changes and Updates (CL 2016-22) from the Business Agenda to the Consent Calendar as discussed in work session.

Councilor Biehl moved to approve the change to the Consent Calendar. Councilor Nelson seconded the motion. MOTION CARRIED 4-0. Ayes: Gregg, Biehl, Walsh, and Nelson; Nays: None.

CEREMONIAL PRESENTATIONS & PROCLAMATIONS –

1. Arbor Day Proclamation - Mayor Edison read the Proclamation confirming the City of Banks' commitment to protect and enhance its urban forest.
2. Tree City USA Recertification Award 2015 - Kevin Nelson, with the Oregon Department of Forestry, presented the City with its 10th Tree City USA Recertification Award on behalf the Arbor Day Foundation and State Forester Doug Decker.
3. 2016 National Drinking Water Week Proclamation - Mayor Edison read the Proclamation designating May 1-7, 2016 as National Drinking Water week.

BRIEFINGS AND PROGRAMS
Mayor Edison recognized Deputy Hanlon's heroic actions in pulling people from the burning wreckage of a vehicle accident on Saturday night, which was his night off.

4. Police Monthly Briefing –Deputy Hanlon presented the police report for March 2016.
5. Planning Commission Liaison – City Manager Becker reported that Planning Commission had a public hearing regarding a non-conforming use for a brewery, which was approved. The brewery also planned to offer food and will open mid-summer or fall.
6. Economic Development Commission Liaison – Councilor Nelson reported on the April 5, 2016, Economic Development Commission's (EDC's) meeting, stating that work continued on the draft Strategic Plan. Review of Initiatives 1 and 2 would be completed at the next meeting after which the EDC would submit the Strategic Plan to Council in June.

CITY REPORTS

7. City Manager Report – City Manager Becker presented the City Manager Report via PowerPoint, which was included in the meeting packet, and answered clarifying questions from Council. She stated that during the work session in May, the Council would discuss the process the City would go through to declare an emergency with the State. She noted the next Salmonberry Trail Intergovernmental Agency Board Meeting would be held at the fire station in Banks on June 3, 2016. The Interagency Application Review Team

would recommend to the Water Resources Commission that the City's proposed water study be funded by a $200,000 50/50 matching grant. The City's portion would be $100,000 of which $70,000 was already available. The City would contribute $30,000 cash, if approved by Council.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

8. City Council Meeting Minutes – March 9, 2016.

The following item was moved from the Business Agenda to the Consent Calendar as discussed in work session with subsequent agenda items renumbered accordingly:

9. Shall the City Council approve and adopt the following Resolutions for Budget Changes and Updates? (CL 2016-22)
    a. Shall the City Council adopt Resolution #2016-08 transferring appropriations for Library Fund #03?
    b. Shall the City Council adopt Resolution #2016-09 to receive unanticipated revenues and authorizing the appropriation of $20,000.00 to Capital Outlay?
    c. Shall the City Council adopt Resolution #2016-10 to re-establish the Water Depreciation Reserve Fund?
    d. Shall the City Council adopt Resolution #2016-11 establishing the Transportation Development Charge Reserve Fund and renaming Fund 12 from “Government Capital Equipment Reserve Fund” to “Transportation System Development Charge Reserve Fund”?
    e. Shall the City Council adopt Resolution #2016-12 authorizing staff to close Fund 15 Water Utility Equipment Reserve Fund?

Councilor Biehl moved to approve the Consent Calendar. Councilor Gregg seconded the motion. MOTION CARRIED 4-0. Ayes: Gregg, Biehl, Walsh, and Nelson; Nays: None.

PUBLIC HEARING –

10. Transportation System Development Charge
    a. Shall the City Council adopt Resolution #2016-07 adopting a Transportation Facilities Plan and System Development Charge for the City’s Transportation System? Stacey Goldstein, City Planner, presented the Staff report, reviewing the purpose of the project and the public outreach conducted. She noted that at the Listening Post in late March, there were two questions she was unable to answer so representatives from the Homebuilders Association were present to reiterate their questions. She believed one was a general question related to the overall methodology to ensure the public and Council understood the Transportation System Development Charge (TSDC) methodology. She believed the second question pertained to household populations and whether the TSDC would extend to 2025 or 2035. She confirmed that if adopted by Council, implementation of the resolution would take effect in 30-days.

Anthony Martin, FCS Group, confirmed Council had chosen Scenario B, and that Capital Project List was at the back of the packet.

Mayor Edison opened the public hearing for Resolution #2016-07 at 7:43 pm and called for public comment.

John Kloor, Government Relations Coordinator, Home Builders Association of Metro Portland, 11005 Chantal Court NE, Donald, OR 97020, said he was befuddled by the City's public process surrounding the SDC methodologies. In January, he received a 90-day notice from the City that indicated two public hearings would be held, one on April 12th and one on May 10th. Some weeks later, he received the City's 60-day notice for the TSDC methodology, which indicated a public hearing would be held on April 12th, but did not indicate the May 10th hearing would take place. He asked why the City chose to cancel the May 10th public hearing. He attended the March 17th Open House on behalf of the Home Builders Association and a number of property owners representing the Van Dyke property and Quail Valley Golf Course were also present. He had a good, lengthy conversation with the City Manager and Planning Director addressing a number of concerns and questions regarding the methodology. Unfortunately, the FCS consultant from was not present to help answer some of the questions. He left the meeting under the impression that Staff would follow-up with FCS Group and answers to his and others’ questions would be relayed back to them. Now, more than 25 days after the Open House he had not received any answers to the questions raised.

- His first, most basic question regarded the number of housing units the City of Banks projected to accommodate by 2035. According to the $45 million Capital Project List, it seemed the City would need as many as 6,000 new, single-family residences by 2035 for the SDC to be able to fully pay for all the items on the Scenario B project list. He was curious about the other types of new development that might also come in and pay SDC's. Also, how would the eligible SDC allotment for specific individual projects be calculated. For example, how much of a new project would be allocated to SDC's versus how much would be allocated to other funding mechanisms such as bonding, local improvement districts, etc.
- He acknowledged credit policies were often up to a jurisdiction, but asked whether developers, who would in all likelihood be doing some percentage, if not the majority of this transportation infrastructure development, were going to receive credits for the full SDC project costs, or if they were going to receive credits based on their costs. Because private development was not subjected to Bureau of Labor and Industries (BOLI) wages, projects can often be built by developers between 20-30 percent less than what the public might need to pay.
- Many jurisdictions like to review the SDC methodologies every five or ten years and he was not sure why the Council was choosing a 20-year time horizon. There had been no discussion about a potential phase-in of the SDC, so if the Council chose to adopt the full amount, he suggested they implement the SDC over the course of two, three or five years as some other jurisdictions have done. He was unaware discussion had taken place regarding a phase-in.
- Another question he raised to Staff regarded the affordability aspects of the SDC. As a representative of private development, he wanted to ensure Council was aware that the cost of the SDC would get passed on to the new home buyer. A $7,100 or $7,300 SDC would be paid by the future residents of Banks.
- He strongly urged Council to consider delaying any adoption of the Resolution until they have had an opportunity to address some of these questions with Staff. He clarified that he had raised these questions at the Open House, not other people, and that he had received no response.

Mayor Edison asked if Staff had any questions and if Mr. Kloor's questions were understood. City Planner Goldstein responded she would like FCS to respond to the questions. She believed many had been discussed and addressed during the Listening Post, but maybe not to Mr. Kloor's satisfaction. She understood not responding to the one or two questions she had from the Home Builders was an oversight, but the list presented to Council tonight was much more extensive than that presented at the meeting. After FCS's response, Council could decide if the responses were sufficient and whether to postpone or move forward.

Mayor Edison stated Council would take all testimony first and then Anthony Martin could attempt to answer some of the questions.

Paul Grove, Director of Government Affairs, Home Builders Association of Metro Portland, 15555 SW Bangy Rd, Lake Oswego, OR, noted Mr. Kloor was point on this project and attended the Open House held in March. Mr. Kloor's questions were part and parcel of any discussion of SDC's in jurisdictions proposing them, particularly with new development. He was confident the issues were raised because this was not unique to the City of Banks and had been happening in other jurisdictions that were looking at transportation, park, or other SDC's. In conversations with the City of Banks and other jurisdictions, such fundamental questions allowed the Home Builders Association and its members to gain a degree of understanding and confidence with the methodology and the proposal moving forward. As noted, particularly given the potential development in Banks later this month, these costs would get shifted ultimately to the home buyer. Members of the Association, particularly West Hills Development, were very concerned about the rising costs of SDC's.

- He agreed with Mr. Kloor, but emphasized that the Home Builders Association wanted to have a conversation with the City of Banks and other jurisdictions and meaningful engagement with the development community if SDC's were being considered as the sole source to fund new infrastructure.
- He urged the Council to not act tonight to allow the Homeowners Association to meet with Arbor Homes and others to better understand the proposed TSDCs. He could not say if Scenario A, B, or C made sense for the Home Builders Association without further understanding. Tonight, they would say no, but they understood municipalities and jurisdictions have real infrastructure concerns and were

looking for a mechanism to pay for the infrastructure. He strongly believed the development community was prepared to be a partner in development, but they also wanted to be partners in the conversation before getting to this point.

Anthony Martin, FCS Group, said he would do his best to answer all the questions or comments and provide as much information as possible to the Council to help guide the decision-making process.

- He explained that the growth assumptions and methodology were based on the 2009 Banks Transportation System Plan (TSP), which was included Appendix C, as well as its trip growth. The PM peak hour trip growth for residential was approximately 1,043 trips, which was approximately 1,043 units. Projections were very approximate in TSP's and were a bit more focused on trip growth as opposed to growth of specific land use types. Trip growth was broken down by residential and non-residential in Appendix C.
- The underlying de facto question on how individual projects were considered SDC eligible was whether the project served growth, followed by whether it served exclusively growth. After discussions with City Staff, a majority of the projects would not be constructed if it were not for the projected growth. Many projects were at 100 percent because of that fact. Some projects were slightly less eligible, such as at 78.6 percent, which indicated the growth share or what the percentage of future trips would be of the total trips in 2035; so 78 percent of all trips on the road in 2035 would be new trips from 2015 on.
    - City Attorney Kearns noted the Transportation Capital Projects list (Exhibit B) indicated an SDC Transportation Development Tax (TDT) eligible percentage and the dollar amount.
- The SDC credit policy was something City Staff worked on. The State required certain minimums, which FCS group included in their report. FCS also recommended a credit policy that did not necessarily need to be obliged by the City, but that potential credit policy fell roughly in line with the TDT. He confirmed the State had a minimum credit policy that the City must comply with, so a de facto credit policy was in place.
- With regard to the growth horizon, the City might choose to revisit the SDC before 2035. FCS Group based the growth horizon on the TSP which encompassed the years 2009 to 2029. FCS projected the growth horizon to 2035 using those same growth numbers and incorporating growth that had occurred since 2009 based on the information received from Staff regarding the number of building permits issued.
- As far as phasing in the SDCs, FCS Group's job was to provide a maximum, defensible SDC the City could legally charge and a methodology that supported that legal charge. It was the City's discretion to charge anything below that amount, recognizing that a lower SDC would ultimately result in a revenue gap and consequently some level of funding gap.
- He stated he was not qualified to speak on affordability because FCS Group was focused on methodology.

City Attorney Kearns stated during the recent recession many communities looked at SDC's across the board and arbitrarily lowered or deferred fees to facilitate or promote some development. He doubted the City would not review their SDC's before 2035. In 35 years, some projects might not be needed because growth went elsewhere, and some projects might become important because growth happened in an unexpected area. Several factors would influence where growth would occur. For example, the railroad line that bisected the city impeded transportation and that problem could be solved next year or in 20 years but either way it would impact where growth occurred in Banks. It was all very difficult to predict and he recommended the City frequently reexamine the SDC's and Capital Projects List because developers would look carefully at the size of SDC's in determining whether a project pencils out.

Mr. Martin noted FCS had previously provided a survey of the total SDC load for jurisdictions surrounding Banks for comparison in a prior PowerPoint presentation, which he agreed to access for Council.

- He responded to Mr. Kloor's comment that the City would need 6,000 new, single-family residences by 2035 for the SDCs to fully pay for all the items on the Scenario B project list as follows:
    - The recommendation was based off the TSP, which sized the projects and projects' costs based on the projected amount of development in the system plan. The amount of growth projected in the TSP was supposed to be commensurate with those project costs.
    - He added significant SDC increases were an issue across the metropolitan area as a result of green field developments, such as South Cooper Mountain, Tigard River Terrace, South Hillsboro,

North Bethany, Bonny Slope, all of which had a supplemental transportation SDC. The bottom line was that green field development and transportation were not cheap and cities were looking more at the TSDC as a method to fund them.

Mr. Kloor explained he calculated the need for 6,200 single-family homes by assuming 100 percent single-family development, it would take 6,200 single-family homes at $7,300 each to meet the $45 million project cost list, which was why he also asked what other types of new development were expected. The 1,000 homes that were pointed out were a drop in the bucket at about $7 million.

Mr. Martin clarified the total was $42 million, but the SDC that FCS recommended adjusts for TDT fund balance, so the $42 million was actually less another $24.8 million.

- He confirmed it was based on approximately $20 million, noting it was a conservative measure to avoid double-dipping, to make sure that when a developer paid the TDT, they were not also paying for that same capacity in an SDC, which would be unfair to the developer.

Mr. Kloor asked at $20 million with 1,000 projected households, where would the remaining $13 million in SDC revenue come from.

Mr. Martin replied the TSP projected non-residential growth of approximately 2,084 PM peak hour trips, but he would have to verify the number. He noted that plans change and the TSP was adopted six years ago.

City Attorney Kearns added that as far as obtaining the revenue, the City went through a similar exercise with the water system improvements, determining which projects were SDC eligible and discussing where to find additional funding. On a standard subdivision like Arbor Village, the developer was responsible for constructing all the needed on-site infrastructure, which was 100% developer-funded and did not come out of SDC's because the need for that infrastructure was a direct consequence of the development. The farther offsite, the less direct the causal connection was to an improvement and the less a developer was required to contribute to those offsite costs.

- Items on the City's project list would not be subdivision streets, but at some point a developer might want to develop the other side of the railroad tracks, for example. If there was no transportation corridor across the railroad tracks, the City could not make the first development 100 percent responsible for the cost of that corridor. But, the City might not be able to approve that development until the problem was fixed. The general theory was that which caused the need had to pay for it. The farther off-site the improvement, the more tenuous that connection was, raising questions about how to pay for them. There were a variety of potential funding mechanisms, but sometimes there was no funding option.

Mayor Edison asked the representatives of the Home Builders were satisfied with the answers or if there were something more the Council could provide.

Mr. Grove believed this was the kind of conversation, though probably in greater detail and nuance, that they typically would have had prior to a public forum and before a resolution came before Council. It would not have played out in this setting so that developers and potentially consultants could have that kind of nuanced conversation, not just the representatives of the Home Builders. He noted had a great deal of respect for the work Staff did which was very technical and difficult. Conversations like this should not just be in response to a question. Discussions about alternative funding mechanisms and phase-ins should not come at the 11th hour.

Mr. Kloor stated they were not saying the methodology was wrong, just that they wanted to take time to make sure it was right.

Mr. Grove added and that all options be explored in terms of one, the funding mechanism and two, the implementations. There were two things to consider related to the methodology and inputs and getting a comfort level around those. Secondly, what did the implementation look like for the development community, whether or not it was all at once or there is a phase in, etc.

Mayor Edison noted the suggestion was made to delay the resolution to next month.

City Planner Goldstein said she agreed with having conversations and questions, but the report had been noticed for 60 days. The Home Builders Association had adequate time to review it and Staff had no contact up until the Listening Post. She took responsibility for not responding to the questions, but added she was not sure what the stay would achieve. The report had been sent to Arbor Homes and to everyone on the notice list and was also posted on the City's website and no comments were received to date. She believed the City had done its part and had reached out to the best of its abilities.

Mayor Edison asked why May 10th, which was cited in the 90-day notice, was eliminated in the 60-day notice.

City Manager Becker responded Staff initially believed this had to be done by ordinance which would require a first and second reading. Staff then discovered it could be done by resolution.

Mayor Edison confirmed that even though May 10th was eliminated, the City was still within the statute rules, which he wanted to be very clear about. He was satisfied with the answer.

City Attorney Kearns believed the conversation the Home Builders wanted was the one Council had when considering Scenarios A, B, and C. They had asked about the project, what would cause a demand for them, how they would be funded, etc. Having that detailed discussion about each project would take a while, but ultimately no definitive resolutions would be reached regarding when the projects would be needed, to what degree they would be attributable to new development, where they would be, by what schedule, etc.

- The City just needed to get the process started and put something in place. Banks had no building permits last year and one or two the previous year, then suddenly 33 this year. Such an explosion of building permits warped this kind of a gradual, consistent, planned process because it was hard to predict. Details regarding infrastructure related to new development were worked out on a project-by-project basis in cities the size of Banks, where one development could throw everything into imbalance.
- There was no easy solution to the problems the Home Builders had identified. He recommended that Council follow the process, get it adopted, and as development occurred, the City would work things out. If the City required a developer pay for an expensive, giant piece of infrastructure, they might not be able to do it and the project would not happen, which would not be good for the developer or Banks. Many times collaboration was needed to get things paid for because it was often one project at a time.
- Arbor Homes already had infrastructure in place, very little major infrastructure was needed for transportation, but these newly annexed areas were a whole different ball game. How infrastructure was paid for there and whether or not the railroad tracks were there was a big factor.
- He could not say how infrastructure would get paid for but the City needed motivated developers to come together. A minimum number of units would be needed to justify the construction of a railroad crossing. Another possibility was to wait until the railroad went away, which would make development easier and solutions to that problem much easier. Project-by-project decisions would almost always be needed in a city the size of Banks. It may not be very satisfying for the Home Builders or the development community, but sometimes there was just no way to map these things out with much precision.

Mr. Grove thanked Council for the opportunity, adding he knew the City had a process and a path. At the end of the day, the developers and jurisdictions were all partners. Growth was happening in Banks and elsewhere, and he believed the more engaged the Association members and others were in terms of project lists and earlier in the process instead of in 11th hour conversations, the better off everyone was.

Mayor Edison thanked Mr. Grove for his comments, adding his comments were duly noted.

Mayor Edison closed the public hearing at 8:18 pm and called for Council discussion. City Attorney Kearns clarified that once the resolution became effective, any building permits pulled after that date were subject to it. He recommended the TSDCs become effective prior to when the Arbor Village building permits were pulled, but he saw nothing that would warrant adopting the resolution right away. A public hearing would be held later this month to create the lots in Phase 9 of Arbor Village, so building permit applications were not expected before midsummer given the development and land use approval process.

City Becker noted two building permits could be issued for two houses in town. She had notified the builder that the TSDC might be approved tonight, but if he pulled the permits prior to the 30-day delay, he would not incur TSDCs. Staff invited the builder to tonight's meeting and had been informing all potential developers about the resolution.

City Attorney Kearns explained that delaying the decision to next month would provide Council more time to consider items on the project list and the magnitude of the fee, but he was not sure anything would change much. As a small city, Banks did not have a standing development community so it was good that the Home Builders Association, which had broad experience in development and costs across jurisdictions, invested the time and energy to comment on the resolution. The Capital Project List for City's TSP would be funded by the proposed SDCs, and Council must be comfortable with Scenario B for the reasons they choose.

- He confirmed Council could reinitiate a revision to the resolution before it became effective. He also recommended reviewing that the project list be reviewed every couple years once more development was on the ground. TSDCs should be revisited periodically to gauge whether the fees might be affecting development shifts to other cities. SDCs must work for both the City and the developers.

Mayor Edison added the City started the process, which was hard to prolong once things got going.

Councilor Gregg noted that in light of the comparative analysis of other cities, Scenario B kept Banks mainstream with other cities and not toward the top end of other area SDCs being charged. Banks would not be any less competitive on total SDC dollars.

Councilor Nelson noted that SDCs were high in the different areas identified by FCS and that Scenario B put Banks right in the market place with other cities. Additionally, the resolution could be revisited at any time. He asked why adopting the resolution tonight seemed so dangerous from the Home Builders Associations' perspective.

Mr. Kloor believed comparing SDCs of jurisdictions was misleading as each had its own unique challenges, so comparing Banks to Hillsboro or Gresham was not an apples-to-apples comparison. Few cities in Washington County actually had a TSDC, most depended on the TDT to help fund transportation infrastructure. The only exceptions being Tigard, Sherwood, which cut their SDC in half a couple years ago to between $1,000 and $2,000, and North Plains, which was between $1,500 and $2,500. TSDCs in every other local jurisdiction were not citywide, but were used to fund a new specific concept area, such as in South Hillsboro, South Cooper Mountain, and River Terrace in Tigard. Certainly Banks was not the first, but having SDCs was not the norm in Washington County. For those same reasons, it was not fair to compare SDCs in Clackamas or Multnomah Counties because neither county had a countywide TDT. Each jurisdiction within those counties had to make that determination themselves like all other counties in the state. To his knowledge, only Washington County had a countywide TDT, so this would be an additional TSDC.

Councilor Nelson noted the comment that the developer would pass the TSDC costs onto potential homebuyers, and asked if the TSDCs would be pricing Banks out of development.

Mr. Kloor replied that was a very market-driven question. One could make the case that adopting this TSDC would, at minimum, increase the average home price in Banks by $7,300 plus the carrying cost of financing that SDC from the time it was paid to the time the home was sold.

Councilor Gregg noted a prior chart showed that of the total SDCs, Banks would be at about 24.6 percent of other jurisdictions. However, the City had almost no parks or water SDCs and the total SDC per lot was still pretty comparable. Due to the railroad track, only 33 percent of the city was being developed, so Banks had a unique situation.

Councilor Walsh noted the homebuyers would get what they pay for; it wasn't like they were not getting anything for that $7,300.

Councilor Gregg moved to approve Resolution #2016-07 adopting a Transportation Facilities Plan and System Development Charge for the City's Transportation System. Councilor Walsh seconded the motion. MOTION CARRIED 4-0. Ayes: Gregg, Biehl, Walsh, and Nelson; Nays: None.

Mayor Edison noted Resolution #2016-07 would take effect on May 12, 2016.

BUSINESS AGENDA

11. Shall the City Council approve funding in the amount of $15,000.00 for DKS Consulting for their work on the Transportation Plan for East Banks? City Manager Becker clarified that after the cost analysis, the funding amount was corrected to $20,268. City Planner Goldstein noted why the consulting services were needed and introduced City Traffic Engineer, Randy Johnson of DKS Associates, who presented the Staff report and highlighted the scope of work for the East Banks Core Connections Project. Staff addressed questions about the project and potential street connections to East Banks as an alternative for potential development should no railroad crossing be constructed. Funding was available for the project this fiscal year, and funds would be available in next fiscal year, if needed. Transportation SDC funds could be used to pay for the study/additional planning. Discussion included a review of projects currently in the TSP, how the proposed work would affect the current TSP, the timeline, coordinating with ODOT and how working with agency partners could open funding options.

Councilor Nelson moved to approve funding in the amount of $20,268 for DKS Consulting for their work on the Transportation Plan for East Banks. Councilor Biehl seconded the motion. MOTION CARRIED 4-0. Ayes: Gregg, Biehl, Walsh, and Nelson; Nays: None.

12. Shall the City Council adopt Ordinance #2016-02-01 an Ordinance relating to the City of Banks Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (BPP), by amending the City of Banks Development Code, Section 152.052 (I) pertaining to cul-de-sacs of the Banks Code of Ordinances? (Second Reading and Final Adoption) (CL 2016-20)

Councilor Nelson moved to conduct Second Reading and adopt by title only Ordinance #2016-02-01. Councilor Gregg seconded the motion. MOTION CARRIED 4-0. Ayes: Gregg, Biehl, Walsh, and Nelson; Nays: None.

City Recorder Lanter conducted the Second Reading.

13. Shall the City Council adopt Ordinance #2016-04-01, amending Title 3 (Administration), Chapter 32 (City Organizations) of the Banks Code of Ordinances, amending the structure and functions of the Library Board, Budget Committee, Park, Recreation and Tree Board, and Planning Commission? (First Reading) (CL 2016-21) City Manager Becker briefly described the proposed amendments, noting Staff made some changes following input from the Library Board, which Staff reviewed, adding that the Library Board was the only board that submitted input.

Councilor Gregg moved to conduct First Reading and Consideration for Adoption by title only. Ordinance #2016-04-01 by title only. Councilor Biehl seconded the motion. MOTION CARRIED 4-0. Ayes: Gregg, Biehl, Walsh, and Nelson; Nays: None.

City Recorder Lanter conducted the First Reading of Ordinance #2016-04-01.

COUNCIL ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION

City Manager Becker updated that she heard from the Economic Development Commission meeting that lumber mill was no longer for sale because the price they wanted was too high, so the mill was taken off the market. The pellet mill went into bankruptcy, and she understood the bank had a buyer for the mill and the City would know who it was in the next couple of weeks so the water account could be moved into the new owner's name. Council briefly discussed various details regarding the lumber mill and potential buyers.

Mayor Edison stated he and City Manager Becker met with Senator Betsy Johnson. They discussed the Salmonberry Trail and the ideas the City had regarding the trail. Senator Johnson immediately called the person responsible for raising federal funds who said Banks had always been planned as the trailhead. Senator Johnson was working on the City's well issue and believed branding was a good idea. He updated that a proposal was expected from a branding expert soon create a process for pulling the best ideas from the community. Senator Johnson also believed that Banks' representative for the Regional Business Solutions Team was based in Tillamook, not Portland. He noted the credit union building was for sale and suggested it be considered as a community center.

City Manager Becker said the City had three projects on the MSTIP 150 percent list: Main St, Banks Rd, and the Banks Rd/Cedar Canyon/Hwy 47 intersection. Main St and the Hwy 47 intersection were identified on the list, but

Banks Rd was not seen as a priority. The next step was for the community was to have public outreach and an open house would be held, possibly in the Cornelius/Forest Grove area. Once she received the information, she would send a flier to the community and each City committee to encourage people to attend the open house and provide comments so the City's two projects stay on the list to possibly get the two projects funded in the next five years. She confirmed the flier inserted in the water bills and on Facebook for the MSTIP Open House could also be used as notification for the May 17th election and that the Voter's Pamphlet included election information as well.

ADJOURN The meeting adjourned at 9:09 PM

Submitted by:

_____

Angie Lanter – City Recorder