

**City of Hood River
City Council Work Session
February 22, 2021**

Council: Mayor Kate McBride, Mark Zanmiller, Megan Saunders, Tim Counihan, Jessica Metta, Erick Haynie

Staff: City Manager Rachael Fuller, Finance Director/ACM Will Norris, City Attorney Dan Kearns, Fire Chief Leonard Damian, Police Chief Neal Holste, Public Works Director Mark Janeck, City Engineer Wade Seaborn, City Recorder Jennifer Gray, GIS Analyst Jonathan Skloven-Gill

Absent: Gladys Rivera

I CALL TO ORDER – Cell Phone Reminder – 6:00 p.m.

Land Acknowledgement Statement and Pledge of Allegiance

II BUSINESS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Dan Ball, Chair of City Tree Committee – announce that Hood River is being recognized for the 9th consecutive year as a Tree City USA. This award is given each year through the National Arbor Foundation; 69 cities in Oregon have been given this award this year. One of the requirements to obtain the award is having the Mayor proclaim Arbor Day for Hood River. Last year Mayor McBride proclaimed April 24, 2020 as Arbor Day. Arbor Day celebrations last year were canceled due to COVID-19. The Tree Committee will once again make the Arbor Day proclamation request. The Tree Committee will be in contact with Mayor McBride to make a formal request. Ball added he believes the Tree Committee will be able to make progress this year by recognizing and protecting trees in the urban forest environment. He asked Council to let them know what they can do to support the City.

Susan Crowley, Hood River, OR – she wanted Council to know people are aware of the good work Council is doing. She thanked Council for all the discussion they have had to take concrete steps with regard to land acquisition, for parks and trails. That is wonderful news. She has been following what has been going on and how much work has gone into this. As land becomes more residentially dense and there is fewer space for parks this work will be important. She wanted to mention the idea that was floated by the Mayor of a shadow plan, to make things more concrete and approaching possible interested landowners. She believes it is a wonderful idea and a great thing to start.

III PRESENTATIONS

1. Mid-Columbia Housing Authority and Columbia Cascade Housing Cooperation, Joel Madsen

Madsen presented information on the services they provide. The PowerPoint presentation was added to the record.

Their two organizations work together to promote and administer affordable housing solutions throughout the Mid-Columbia Region. While there is a complexity of this organizations structure, they try to break that down with the people they work with. The organizations work together with the common mission of promoting affordable housing. They value their work in the affordable homes they create to help children in learning, help parents earning and help families provide a better future. Their primary lines of business are administer rent assistant programs, work with program participants in residents in their properties, they are a housing developer and work in the home ownership realm with current and future homeowners. Their housing voucher program is one of the largest rent assistance programs administer throughout the region. They serve over any given month over 180 households and invest over \$480,000 in rent assistance. In Hood River County, there are 93 households participating in the housing voucher program. They have over 160 households on the waitlist. He noted this is a low number of participations. In Wasco County, there are over 400 households participating in Wasco County. Madsen reviewed other State and local rent assistance programs. They work closely with Mid-Columbia Center for Living to work with people who are identified as having mental illness and provide direct rent assistances to that population. During the last 10 months, they have been involved with COIVID-19 response. They have been able to attract additional federal housing choice vouchers which is significant; 110 additional vouchers. They partnered with local governments for the administration of SB1 Funds. They collaborated with Mid-Columbia Community Action Council on two COVID-19 tenant base relief plans. Today they have been able to invest \$1.5 million in the private rental market serving over 150 households that experienced financial hardship due to COIVID-19. They are working with the State on administrating the land-lord compensation fund. It is a State program that will assist landlords with back paying rent, throughout the region. Madsen highlighted other services and programs they are involved with, included in the PowerPoint.

Madsen spoke about the affordable housing communities built by Columbia Cascade Housing Cooperation. There is a steady waitlist for this housing in Hood River. The one bedroom waitlist has 120, 184 for a two bedroom and 63 for a three-bedroom waitlist. They continue to look for development opportunities, have partner with local jurisdictions in the past and look forward to more in the future to create more affordable homes. They also work with future and current homeowners through a variety of different programs. In 2020, they assisted over 30 people purchase homes, 8 of the 30 being within the City limits. The assistance comes through a variety of programs.

Council asked follow up questions to Madsen regarding the information presented.

2. Big River Land Trust, Anne Medenbach and Bill Irving

Medenbach is the founder and president of Big River Land Trust. She thanked Council for the letter that was used for their 501c3 application. They were successful in obtaining that status in January. She presented information on the services they provide. The PowerPoint presentation was added to the record.

Big River Land Trust is a group that holds land for the benefit of the community. Their goal is to provide secure and affordable access to homeownership for residence. They serve Hood River and Klickitat County. They serve low to middle income owners; 80-120% of medium family income. Their mission is to develop the steward and stable supply of permanently affordable sustainably built homes for sale.

What is the problem and how can the City help?

There is an affordability problem in the Columbia Gorge. Medenbach explained what people make and what people can afford, there is a large gap between those two. In Klickitat County for a medium income earner, there is a \$72,000 gap between what they make and what they can afford for a home. For Hood River County that number is \$160,000. As everyone knows, that is a big issue. The affordability issue has not been solved. They are trying to help people understand CLT is a tool that can help solve that problem. In the community toolbox, they want to be the tool people reach for help with affordable home ownership, which is their singular focus for medium income earners in the Gorge. The CLT secures the land. They can secure raw land and develop it, or they can secure homes that already exist. They do that through donations, land leases, or purchases to secure that asset in many ways. If the land is raw, they would develop it and build homes. The goal is to sell those homes to someone making between 80-120% of medium family income. They don't sell the land, they keep the land in trust for the community for future home ownership. The land lease to the homeowner is 99 years. It is inheritable and it is renewable. The CLT retains ownership and that is where the power of CLT is. They are there for the long-term to hold the land in trust for affordability. The depreciation is kept, so the homeowner still appreciates the value of the home and can take advantage of that, but it is not appreciating at the same rate as the rest of the market. It is capped. Many CLT's use a shared equity models, either exclusively or on a project basis. That is the goal of Hood River, to use that model on a project basis. The CLT facilitates a sale to another income eligible buyer once the original buyer has moved on. Perpetual affordability, as a municipality the City would subsidize a development and they make sure that subsidy would last as long as it can and the affordability is stretched out over as many ownerships as possible. That can be accomplished by deed restrictions, depending on how it is structured. Have a third party to ensure when the house sells again, it goes to someone who makes the required range. Depending on how it is structured, make sure the appreciation is not happening too fast. If that house needs subsidy later, who is going to provide it. The CLT model addresses those things and they are responsible for the land and its affordability for the long-term. Their 501c3 status is based on them meeting those income requirements. Additionally, their application is capped, so they can only make a certain amount per year which keeps the home affordable for longer. Medenbach reviewed homeowner benefits. Some are concerned about the appreciation that the homeowner is going to gain with a CLT model. Think of the CLT as a bridge between a renter and an owner. The application is capped, but they are still gaining appreciation within the home. Six out of ten CLT homeowners will move on to a market rate home and leave the CLT for another family to move into. CLT help owner's breakout from renting to owning. She shared information on how they make homes affordable. The cost for land is removed from the price of the home, and the size of the home is reduced.

They received their 501c3 this year. 2020 was a building year. They have a 100% volunteer staff. They have put together some great processes and organizational structures that will set the way they will operate. They have created strengthened partnerships and continue to work on partnerships. Their goal this year is to secure land, kick off their initial project, develop three homes and sell them. Over the next 10 years, their goal is to have 100 CLT homes, within the Gorge area.

Medenbach thanked Council for including them in the discussions of opportunities as a stakeholder. She asked for that to continue. They would like land donated from Rand Road to develop homes on, once the City is ready. They would like to be in line to develop those lots. They are looking for potential SDC reductions, help in permit fees to help their homes to move forward, density bonus's and help Council understand more about what a CLT can do and how they can help address the current housing crisis.

Council asked follow up questions to Medenbach regarding the information presented.

WORK SESSION

- IV OPEN WORK SESSION – 7:02 p.m.
- V AGENDA ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS
- VI DISCUSSION ITEMS
- VII ADJOURN WORK SESSION – 7:02 p.m.

REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING

- I OPEN REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING – 7:02 p.m.
- II AGENDA ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS
Correction – Regular Business Items No. 4 and No. 5 attachments in the packet were reversed.
- III CONSENT AGENDA
 1. Council Meeting Minutes – January 15, 25, February 6, 8, 2021
 2. Adventure Lodge Penalty & Interest Waiver, W. Norris
 3. Request Support for HB 2398, Hood River County Energy Council

Motion: To approve the Consent Agenda.

First: Metta

Second: Counihan

Discussion: None

Vote: Motion passed (roll called)

Ayes: McBride, Zanmiller, Saunders, Counihan, Metta, Haynie

Nays: None

Abstentions: None

Excused: Rivera

IV REGULAR BUSINESS ITEMS

1. Request for Fee Waiver from Hood River Lions Club, R. Fuller

The Hood River Lions Club presented to City Council a plan to construct a roof structure over the stage at Jackson Park over a year ago. The project is near completion. In past years, the Hood River County School District hosted Families in the Park at Jackson Park during the month of August. HRCSD is not in the position to take this event on this year. The Hood River Lions Club has received permission from HRSCD to host the concerts every Thursday evening, during the month of August.

The Hood River Lions Club is requesting a fee waiver for the special event permit and the usage of Jackson Park for the Families in the Park concert series. The City is not scheduling any events yet and will continue to follow the Oregon Health Authority Guidelines.

After a brief Council discussion, Council agreed to the fee waiver request if the event is allowed by the Governans order and health guidelines.

Motion: I move COIVD rules allowing to approve the fee waiver request by the Hood River Lions Club for Families in the Park.
First: Zanmiller
Second: Haynie
Discussion: None
Vote: Motion passed (roll called)
Ayes: McBride, Zanmiller, Saunders, Counihan, Metta, Haynie
Nays: None
Abstentions: None
Excused: Rivera

2. Hood River City Council 2021 Work Plan, R. Fuller

The 2021 City of Hood River Annual Work Plan provides direction to the organization by identifying priority projects for the upcoming year. The work plan helps ensure that the organization is aligned with Council's goals and priorities for the community. In addition, the document clearly communicates the Council's priorities to the community. Following approval of the document, the work plan will be published on the City website.

Each year, the City Council's annual work plan session provides an opportunity to revisit high-level goals and identify key strategies, action items and projects to be undertaken by the organization.

The 2021 work plan incorporates input and direction from the City Council throughout the year. In addition, projects are proposed by City staff, projects emerge from regulatory requirements and mandates and, this year, standing Council committees and the public provided input.

In fall, 2020, the organization sought input from the public via an electronic and paper form. The opportunity was promoted on the City website and social media channels, in the local media, and via a direct email and through community channels.

The work plan was proposed and refined during the City Council's workshop on Saturday, February 6, 2021.

If approved, staff will develop an implementation plan including associated actions, staff assignments and timelines for the projects.

The work plan represents high priority projects for the City Council. The City also provides a wide range of day-to-day services and operations including: emergency response (Police, Fire, and EMS), permitting services, public facility maintenance, utilities (water, wastewater and stormwater) and other essential functions to meet the needs of the community.

Councilor Zanmiller stated some of the comments from their work plan discussion show up on Page 59 in the list of operation for projects, but they do not show up in the narrative. A couple of things were the tree preservation ordinance, the environmental section and the EV plug in beyond City staff and continuing with the parking plan. He was hoping from the discussion, there would be a mentioned in the page related to those projects. He asked about the communication strategy. He is anticipating the questions he would get from the public and he would like to be able to point them in the right direction.

There was discussion regarding Councilor Zanmiller's question on communication for the items mentioned.

Fuller added the projects in the Council Work Plan are significant policy projects. The projects in the operational list are operation projects that may require input, or approval of a budget item. The policy work has largely been done on the projects.

Councilor Counihan suggested including a short paragraph explaining the difference between the two lists.

Mayor McBride agreed with including a couple of sentences that explain the operational list. There are documents for the work that has been done, and other items may need additional input or approval by Council. The work in the being of the document was policy. That might make it more clear for the public. She liked Fullers explanation.

Motion: I move to approve and adopt the 2021 City of Hood River work plan.
First: Haynie
Second: Saunders
Discussion: None
Vote: Motion passed (roll called)
Ayes: McBride, Zanmiller, Saunders, Counihan, Metta, Haynie, Rivera
Nays: None
Abstentions: None
Excused: None

3. Consolidated Fee Schedule, Rates, and Charges for FY2021-22
(Resolution No. 2021-03), W. Norris

Norris presented the staff report and PowerPoint.

Fee supported services typically benefit an individual, business, or group. Because these services provide a discreetly assignable benefit, communities often seek to recover costs through user charges. This allows general revenues to be directed to funding services performed for the community as a whole.

The City of Hood River annually adjusts user fees, rates and charges at this time each year in preparation for the budget process. Each department has reviewed their charges for services on the attached Consolidated Fee Schedule and requested revisions as appropriate for FY2021- 22.

Proposed changes to FY2021-22 Fees, Rates, and Charges include:

Inflation Adjustment

Consistent with Budget Preparation Resolution 2020-07, except where prohibited fees are increased by inflation based on the Western States Consumer Price Index for Urban Wage Earners (CPI-W) which was 1.5% in 2020. Increases to System Development Charges of 1.63% are based on the Engineering New-Record Construction Cost Index. Incrementally increasing fees in alignment with an appropriate inflation index helps charges remain stable on a real dollar basis over time and lessens the need for large periodic fee revisions.

Remove Municipal Court Payment Plan Fee

The City of Hood River charges \$55 to establish a payment plan for outstanding fines. This fee covers the staff time to create, track, and manage these payment plans. The City suspended payment plan charges at the outset of COVID-19 and staff now recommends making this change permanent. The elimination of payment plan fees will reduce City revenue by approximately \$4,750. This fee reduction/elimination most directly benefits lower income defendants consistent with the City's equity and affordability goals. In addition, the recent launch of an online payment plan form has reduced staff time associated with this work. Line Items(s) 132

Late Notice Change of Plea Fee

Many defendants for minor traffic and parking violations will initially plead "not guilty" in the hope that the citing Police Officer will not attend trial to testify and consequently their citation will be dismissed. These defendants then change their plea to "no contest" the morning of the trial when they see the Police Officer is in attendance. These Police Officers must often come in on their days off or stay up for 9am Court after an all-night shift. In either case, the City is charged a minimum of 3 hours of Police Officer overtime. If Court is during the Officer's normal shift it takes them away from answering calls for service. The FY2021-22 Consolidated Fee Schedule includes a \$95 fee to partially offset Police Officer pay when a defendant provides less than 24-hour notice of a change in plea. Line Items(s) 133

Parking In Lieu Res. 2020-18 Incorporated

The City Council passed Resolution 2020-18 on October 26th, 2020, setting a single Parking In Lieu Fee of \$3,000. This 2021-22 Consolidated Fee Schedule incorporates this change. Line Item(s) 201-205

Administrative Planning Decision Appeal Fee

The 2021-22 Consolidate Fee Schedule separates the appeals fees for Administrative and Quasi-Judicial Decisions. Both appeal types were set at "Equal to Application Fee". 2021-22's fee schedule sets an Administrative Decision Appeal at \$250 which is the maximum allowed under ORS 227.175. Line Items(s) 218

Rental of Public Works Vehicles/Equipment by Outside Agencies

Hood River County, the City of Cascade Locks, and/or other local government agencies sporadically request to use the City's specialized vehicles or heavy equipment. This practice saves the other governmental entities from purchasing these expensive vehicles which they rarely have a need for. The 2021-22 Consolidated Fee Schedule sets a nominal fee of \$175 per day to offset the minimal wear and tear on the vehicles/equipment when used by outside agencies. Only other governmental entities similarly insured by City/County Insurance Service (CIS) or Special Districts Association of Oregon may borrow City equipment. Line Items(s) 633

Temporary Disconnection/Reconnection

Hood River Municipal Code 12.02.090 allows utility customers to temporarily disconnect from services. This saves the monthly base water and sewer charges. Turning off or on a meter requires dispatching a public works employee to the property and taking them away from other duties. The 2020-21 Consolidate Fee Schedule adds a charge to reimburse Public Works for this time. Line Item(s) 641

Windmaster Manual Meter Read Surcharge

The City of Hood River provides extra-territorial sewer services to the Windmaster area. This service was mandated by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality in the 2000s to avoid

a public health issue associated with the over development of septic systems. Commercial sewer charges are partially based on water use and therefore require reading the property's water meter. The Windmaster area receives water from Ice Fountain Water District which has refused to provide the City with meter read data for these customers or attach radio read equipment so the City can remotely read the meters similarly to the City's other customers. The result is that a Public Works employee must physically read each commercial meter in the Windmaster area individually each month. The 2021-20 Consolidated Fee Schedule adds a \$2.20 per month surcharge to Commercial Windmaster sewer accounts to reimburse for Public Work's staff time. Line Item(s) 644

Lien Processing Fee

The City secures delinquent utility accounts with a lien on the property. Liens are placed on account balances that exceed \$1,000 where no payments have been made in the last three months or when an account reaches \$3,000 regardless of payment frequency. The Hood River County Assessor's Office charge for the lien is also added to the account. The 2020-21 Consolidated Fee Schedule includes this practice as an explicit fee. Line Item(s) 650

Council asked questions to Norris, no decisions or changes were made. There was one minor edit to the Resolution. The third WHEREAS, change 2020 to 2021.

- Motion:** I move that the City Council adopt Resolution 2021-03 with the correction mentioned by Councilor Metta, Adopting the Consolidated Schedule of Fees, Rates, and Charges for FY 2021-22
- First:** Saunders
- Second:** Zanmiller
- Discussion:** None
- Vote:** Motion passed (roll called)
Ayes: McBride, Zanmiller, Saunders, Counihan, Metta, Haynie
Nays: None
Abstentions: None
Excused: Rivera

4. System Development Charge Funding Request, R. Fuller

The purpose of this item is to prioritize funding for park property acquisition and trail expansion projects in the Hood River Urban Growth Boundary, consistent with the adopted Multi-Agency Parks and Recreation Master Plan. System Development Charges are fees paid by developers to pay for necessary infrastructure expansions, including parks. The City of Hood River does not charge a system development charge for parks and, instead, relies on the Hood River Valley Parks & Recreation District (HRVPRD) to do so. The City of Hood River collects these fees on behalf of HRVPRD.

In Hood River, multiple agencies provide park services and have adopted a Multi-Jurisdictional Parks & Recreation Master Plan that outlines the vision for parks services within the district boundaries. Projects are identified in the master plan that, over time, help the community realize the vision. The Parks & Recreation Master Plan states that, "The District should prioritize the usage of Parks SDCs to secure new park properties and finance park or trail development consistent with the priorities within this Plan." All park entities have a strong partnership and work cooperatively to address the park needs of the community.

The City of Hood River is developing a capital improvement plan for city-owned parks. Maintenance of existing parks is not an eligible SDC expense and parks maintenance and operations are funded with general fund dollars. The City capital improvement plan for parks would be consistent with the adopted Multi-Jurisdictional Parks & Recreation Master Plan. As contemplated in the master plan, the City would likely rely on collaboration, cooperation and funding from other entities to execute some projects in the capital improvement plan.

This year, the Hood River Valley Parks & Recreation District requested system development charge project priorities from partner agencies. The City anticipates working with the Hood River Valley Parks & Recreation District on many future projects, including development of a park at 780 Rand Road in future years.

Based on the City's current needs, direction from Council to prioritize land acquisition and the parks & recreation master plan, the City has an opportunity to formally request that system development charges collected within the urban growth boundary be prioritized for land acquisition for future parks and trails. City staff would continue to cooperate and collaborate with parks & recreation staff to implement these projects. In addition, should it be approved by Council, the City could potentially provide access to capital for these acquisitions with SDCs being used as a payback source.

Motion: I move to direct staff to submit an SDC request form for two projects to the Hood River Valley Parks & Recreation District and to continue to collaborate with Parks district staff to implement the projects:

- Acquisition of 2-5 acres of land for parks within the urban growth boundary \$500,000, will be consistent with the parks & recreation master plan.
- Acquisition of trail easements and property consistent with the parks & recreation master plan \$150,000.

First: Metta

Second: Zanmiller

Discussion: None

Vote: Motion passed (roll called)

Ayes: McBride, Zanmiller, Saunders, Counihan, Metta, Haynie

Nays: None

Abstentions: None

Excused: Rivera

5. Request to Hood River Valley Parks & Recreation District for SDC Funded Projects, R. Fuller

Mark Hickock, Executive Director of Hood River Valley Parks & Recreation District addressed Council.

The collection agreement for System Development Charges (SDCs) between the City of Hood River and Hood River Valley Parks and Recreation District (HRVPRD) states that HRVPRD must obtain authorization from the Hood River City Council to spend SDC funds collected within the City on projects constructed outside the urban growth boundary. Per the agreement, HRVPR is seeking City Councils authorization to spend up to \$400,000 on two projects.

The last request from the parks district to use funds for a project outside of the urban growth boundary was for Golden Eagle Park.

Councilor Saunders asked how the money would be divided for the two projects.

Hickok stated it would be \$300,000 for the Westside property and \$100,000 for the trail. The money goes towards the planning, it is not being used to purchase the property or developing the property. They have been told by the State this is a great candidate for an acquisition grant. They would like to go for the grant, if they get the permit to build a park in the scenic area.

Councilor Zanmiller is supportive of the trail project. For the park project within the Master Parks Plan, it is a viable parks space for one of the four quadrant within the Westside Plan. It really reflects about 25% of allocation towards those parks. The \$300,000 cost for planning concerns him since they do not know if it is going to be approved. It sounds like a high cost on a bet, that may or may not happen. On a personal level he likes park project. He suggested more discussion about what the cost sharing and risk reduction for the initial step. What is the least amount of dollars to spend to get to the answer of yes, it can be an open space park?

Hickok stated not all of the money is going towards the study. Some of it will go towards securing it. They will have to purchase an option from both. The option costs around \$72,000, per year. They had to purchase that for two years, in order to make this work. The planning process to get a scenic area permit is about one year. They hired a consultant to go through the process. They asked the County if they could build a park with ball fields, restrooms, parking, etc. The County said they could not answer that and the only way to get an answer, was to take it through the scenic area permitting process. They have never seen a park of this scale and size built in the scenic area before. They want to do their homework well and get an approved permit. Rather than get stuck with a piece of property outright and finding out they cannot do what they had promised the voters. They have tried to keep the cost down as low as possible, but it is going to cost around \$300,000. They are confident they can get there with this and if they do, they can hopefully move towards the development of the property.

Mayor McBride stated she is trepidatious about the park property. She is on board for the Elliott Park property and trail, that is a good use for those funds. She is not even sure if the SDC's for the City would qualify for option money and planning. She is concerned about spending this type of money on a possibility, at this point. She worked for the Gorge Scenic Area for many years. She knows how difficult it is to get this type of project on a piece of property.

Councilor Counihan asked if any of the potential landowners have been contacted about this park. Hickok stated the property owners have not been contacted recently but they were contacted in 2016 when they did a small study of the property. They will be contacting the property owners once again when they go through this process. There were mixed feelings among the property owners on the park idea. There was concern about park lighting, but he does not believe they would be going for a park with lights, at this location.

Councilor Saunders is struggling with the idea of this being covered by City SDC's and not some type of shared cost. She is concerned about putting a lot of money towards a possibility. She understands they need to answer these questions, if they want to have that possibility come to fruition. She does not like all the uncertainty being put on City residence SDC's. It would be spending about half of the money on things that are outside of the Urban Growth Boundary.

Mayor McBride stated its large burden for the City to have, on a large risk. If it was a smaller ask, with a lot more shared partners it would be easier to consider.

Councilor Metta believes the majority of the people that will use this park will be City residence. They have heard from the community this is something they really want. If this is what it is going to take to make it happen, she is support. It is not ideal, but she is supportive. She would like to see some more shared cost, if possible.

Councilor McBride stated if she knew for sure this money would give the approval by the Gorge Commission to develop the park, she would be supportive. She does not know if it is going to be approved. It's a very large risk.

Councilor Haynie agrees with Mayor McBride's comments on the risk. He also agrees with Councilor Metta comments. He asked what the question is before Council, at this time. Regardless of tonight's discussion, he would not want it to "chill" the progress to making the parks on the westside a reality.

Hickok stated they are looking to study this property. They would not make the decision to purchase the property until they receive the results of the Scenic Area permit. They are not asking the City to write a check; they have the money in the SDC account. They are asking the City for permission to spend SDC money collected by the City, outside the Urban Growth Boundary.

Councilor Zanmiller suggested allocating \$150,000 towards the park project with the understanding once the permissions are given, the remaining SDC investment could probably be applicable to the project. He would be comfortable with allowing \$150,000. It is a gamble, but he'd hate to see this project go away.

Hickok suggested he could come back at another date and ask for more if needed. If they plan to purchase the property, he will need to do that. He feels using City SDC money for this is fair, since the park is in close proximity to the City. He understands Councils concerns about the risk. Park and Rec has been in a situation where they have purchased property before and not been able to develop it to the level they wanted. They are trying to avoid that from happening.

Councilor Zanmiller stated with Council not approving all \$300,000 now, it does not say the ration will not be true after \$2 million is spent for the whole thing. This is a way to risk reduce the start of this process.

Motion: I move to approve the modified request by HRVPRD to spend up to \$250,000 of SDC funds for the two proposed projects.
First: Zanmiller
Second: Saunders

Discussion: None
Vote: Motion passed (roll called)
Ayes: McBride, Zanmiller, Saunders, Counihan, Metta, Haynie
Nays: None
Abstentions: None
Excused: Rivera

V ORGANIZATIONAL UPDATES

A. Department Heads

VI MAYOR

Mayor McBride went on Radio Tierra, it went very well. It was broadcast on Facebook live. There were lots of questions about housing. She suggested Joel Madsen go on the show next to answer housing questions.

Mayor McBride will be starting the Mayor Equity Listen Sessions in the next few weeks. The New Door is going to put together participants. The meeting will be scheduled during the best time for participants. At this point it will be a listening session to hear comments and concerns.


Mayor McBride shared the new Police Office, Ky Foley was sworn in last week. Foley past employer was Seattle Police Department.

VII COUNCIL CALL

VIII EXECUTIVE SESSION – 8:41pm – 10:08pm

Oregon Revised Statute 192.660 1 (i) To review and evaluate, pursuant to standards, criteria and policy directives adopted by the governing body, the employment related performance of the chief executive officer of any public body, a public officer, employee or staff member.

IX ADJOURN – Adjourned by unanimous consent at 10:08 p.m.



Kate McBride, Mayor



Jennifer Gray, City Recorder

Approved by City Council on 3/8/2021