
Hood River City Council
211 Second St.
Hood River, OR 97031
(541) 386-1488
www.cityofhoodriver.gov

February 8, 2021

AGENDA

6:00 p.m.

Councilors: Kate McBride, Mayor
Mark Zanmiller (President) Megan Saunders Tim Counihan
Jessica Metta Erick Haynie Gladys Rivera

All public meeting locations are accessible. Please let the City Recorder know if you will need any special accommodations to attend any meeting. Call (541) 387-5212 for more information. Oregon Relay Service 1-800-735-2900

The City of Hood River is taking steps to limit exposure and spread of COVID-19 (novel coronavirus). In support of state and federal guidelines for social distancing, the City of Hood River will hold this meeting by using Zoom Conferencing.

Please use the following phone number or video link:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87475696829>

(253) 215 8782

Meeting ID: 874 7569 6829

Members of City Council and City staff will participate by Zoom, they will not be on site at City Hall during the meeting. The audio recording of the meeting will be posted shortly after the meeting on the City's website. Please check the City's website for the most current status of planned public meetings. <https://cityofhoodriver.gov/administration/meetings/>

I CALL TO ORDER

Land Acknowledgement Statement and Pledge of Allegiance

RECESS TO CONSIDER URBAN RENEWAL AGENDA

II BUSINESS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Hood River City Council encourages community members to talk about issues important to them. If you wish to speak during "Business from the Audience", there are two options to choose from:

1. Submit written comments to the City Recorder at j.gray@cityofhoodriver.gov by Monday, February 8, no later than 12 noon in order to distribute to the City Council in one packet for review by 3pm. All comments will be added to the record.
2. To address Council during Business for the Audience, email the request (name of speaker and topic) to j.gray@cityofhoodriver.gov by Monday, February 8, no later than 12 noon. Please specify the topic your testimony addresses. Testimony will go in order of requests received. Attendees that have registered will be unmuted by the IT Administrator for 3 minutes to address Council. Public comment will be by audio only. At the Mayors discretion, public comments may be received prior to a specific topic of relevance during the meeting.

III PRESENTATIONS

1. SafeSpace Childrens' Advocacy Center of the Gorge, Beatriz Lynch (20 mins)

WORK SESSION

IV OPEN WORK SESSION

V AGENDA ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS

VI DISCUSSION ITEMS

VII ADJOURN WORK SESSION

REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING

I OPEN REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING

II AGENDA ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS

III CONSENT AGENDA

These items are considered routine and/or have been discussed by Council in Work Session. They will be adopted by one motion unless a Councilor or person in the audience requests, before the vote on the motion, to have an item considered at its regular place on the agenda.

1. Council Meeting Minutes – January 11, 2021 PAGES 3-15
2. Oregon Public Works Cooperative Assistance Agreement, M. Janeck PAGES 16-25
3. Fee Waiver Request from Gorge Grown for Farmer's Market, R. Fuller PAGES 26-29
4. F-350 Vehicle Replacement, M. Janeck PAGES 30-39
5. Acceptance of the Urban Renewal Agency Annual Statement, W. Norris PAGES 40-43

IV REGULAR BUSINESS ITEMS

1. 2nd Quarter Financial Performance Report, W. Norris (20 mins) PAGES 44-46

V ORGANIZATIONAL UPDATES

- A. Department Heads

VI MAYOR

1. Landmarks Board Member Reappointment (5 mins) PAGES 47

VII COUNCIL CALL

VIII ADJOURN REGULAR MEETING

**City of Hood River
City Council Work Session
January 11, 2021**

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

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, Senior Project Manager Wade Seaborn, City Recorder Jennifer Gray, GIS Analyst Jonathan Skloven-Gill

Absent:

I CALL TO ORDER – 6:00 p.m.

Oaths of Office will be administered to Mayor Kate McBride, Councilors Mark Zanmiller, Megan Saunders, and Gladys Rivera

Land Acknowledgement Statement and Pledge of Allegiance

RECESS TO CONSIDER URBAN RENEWAL AGENDA - 6:09p.m. – 6:38p.m.

II BUSINESS FROM THE AUDIENCE

MariRuth Petzing, Hood River, OR – she asked that Council not approve the draft RFP for a new police facility. “The draft RFP itself acknowledges that “there is a wide range of opinions on the location, necessary functionality, and even the near-term need for a police station within the community and among elected leadership.” But instead of taking time to engage with that seriously, the City seems poised to move forward with an RFP that requests a “decision-making process” led by an architectural firm, but then expresses the foregone conclusion of a “successful bond campaign.” Ask for input now, have a decision-making process that involves the community now, when the important decisions are to be made. I’m not interested in an online survey (in English) about what color to paint the entrance. In fact, when the community was asked for their input into priorities, housing and transportation and green space were overwhelmingly identified. I expect there are many new priorities needs due to COVID.” Petzing full statement has been added to the record.

Peter Fink, Hood River, OR – he stated when he found out the City was considering building a Police facility, he was flabbergasted and shocked due to the things that have happened in the past year regarding lack of accountability in the police and racial injustice. He said it is time to make good choices and the consideration of a police facility is ridiculous. The police are not serving our community and they claim they keep communities safe. The City should be focused on spending more money towards transportation and the mental health system.

Heather Staten, Executive Director of Thrive Hood River – Hood River needs more housing. Ever increasing home prices are a function of supply and demand. There are too many people chasing far too little demand. The 2015 Housing Needs Analysis anticipated a production of 100 dwelling a year in order to meet population growth. Production has been about half of that. Is it any wonder that housing costs continue to go up. To make matters worse, market forces have made it economically attractive to construct large expensive new homes. Hood River embarked on the Missing Middle Code as a way to provide greater diversity of housing types, to meet the needs of your changing population while still building homes that are compatible and look and feel to existing neighborhoods. The essential truth is that the City of Hood River does not build homes. Developer build homes. If the City wants more diverse and plentiful housing, not only do you need code that gives developers the right to build the units wanted, but incentives them to build them. She stated the options before Council both have problems. If you want builders to create smaller homes, the right incentive is letting them build a greater number of units, than the current code allows on a given piece of property. She spoke about what the City of Portland has been doing. Staten recommends approval of the ordinance on frontage improvements and street extractions. The previous code stopped low impact and highly beneficial projects. She is very encouraged to see the City kicking off 2021 with this level of attention, to make impact an on housing. She hopes this is the year to get some things done.

III PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Ordinance 2060 Personal Services Contracts - amendment to HRMC 2.32.060, D. Kearns,

Mayor McBride opened the public hearing at 6:51 p.m.

An Ordinance amending Title 2 (Administration and Personnel) Chapter 32.02 (Public Contracting), Section 2.32.060 (Personal Services Contracts) of the Hood River Municipal Code, to make the City's procurement procedures for Personal Services Contracts consistent with current state law.

This is a proposed amendment to the Hood River Municipal Code that is not part of the City's land use regulations. The purpose of the hearing is to accept any and all public testimony or comment on this proposal – for, against and neutral.

Kearns presented the staff report.

The City's public bidding and procurement procedures are codified in HRMC chapter 2.32 (Public Contracting) and are currently consistent with state law reflected in ORS Chapters 279A, 279B and 279C. However, since the time the city first adopted this code chapter, state law has been expanded to allow for alternative solicitation procedures for personal service contracts, has significantly raised the dollar limits for the different solicitation procedures, and now allows the local government to consider pricing when evaluating professional services proposals. In this amendment, the City is amending its Public Contracting code chapter so that the city can use the alternative solicitation procedures for Personal Services Contracts now allowed by state law, but we are not seeking to raise the dollar limits for these procedures.

The proposed amendment would allow for expedited procedures during times of a declared emergency and allow the city to take into account pricing in the award of professional services contracts. When the City's current code provisions were adopted, state law did not allow local governments to take into account pricing and required the city to base the award of professional

services contracts only on the proposers' qualifications, irrespective of pricing.

Council Action: Amendment of the Hood River Municipal Code, Chapter 2.32 (Public Contracting), Section 2.32.060 (Personal Services Contracts) as reflected in the attached Ordinance No. 2060.

Members of Council confirmed they have not received additional correspondence regarding this item.

Mayor McBride opened the public testimony portion of the hearing and read the rules regarding public hearing conduct.

There was no testimony for or against the ordinance. There was no staff rebuttal.

Mayor McBride closed the oral argument and public testimony portion of the public hearing. There were no deliberations.

Motion: I move to place Ordinance No. 2060 on the City Recorder's report of tonight's main agenda for approval and first reading by title only.
First: Saunders
Second: Metta
Discussion: None
Vote: Motion passed (roll called)
Ayes: McBride, Zanmiller, Saunders, Counihan, Metta, Haynie, Rivera
Nays: None
Abstentions: None
Excused: None

Mayor McBride adjourned the public hearing at 7:03 p.m.

2. Ordinance 2059 Frontage Improvements and Street Exactions, M. Janeck,

Mayor McBride opened the public hearing at 7:03 p.m.

An Ordinance amending Title 15 (Buildings and Construction) Chapter 15.16 (Building Permits), of the Hood River Municipal Code, to bring the City's authority to exact street frontage improvements as a condition of building permit issuance into compliance with current state law.

This is a proposed amendment to the Hood River Municipal Code that is not part of the City's land use regulations. The purpose of the hearing is to accept any and all public testimony or comment on this proposal – for, against and neutral.

Janeck presented the staff report.

Street frontage improvements have been a part of City regulations for numerous years. As part of the Permitting Enhancement Project (PEP), code improvements to create a more efficient and fair process were targeted to be considered by the City Council.

Frontage improvements refer to and can include, partial or full construction of sidewalk, curb, gutter, roadway, and parkways within the City. Street frontage improvement language was included in the

Code in order to assist the City with updating public right of ways. Currently, most building permit work within the City can require some or all of these construction improvements, no matter how small or large the project is; for instance, there is no differentiation relative to requested residential or non-residential frontage improvements. These improvement requirements can be extremely expensive, often costing more than the construction proposed within a building permit.

The intent of the proposed Code alterations in Chapter 15 is to update our regulations to match current Oregon land use law. The existing Code language concerning street frontage improvements as required as part of a building permit does not meet the State legal standard of proportionate share when the impact of the proposed construction is taken into account. For example, the same street frontage improvements can be required if there is a 100 square foot addition proposed or a 400 square foot addition. Similarly, a residential 2 lot subdivision project can require the same frontage improvements as a 1000 square foot commercial addition or expansion into an existing space.

In order to rectify these issues, the proposed Code language reflects what the State of Oregon courts have determined as rational relative to the impacts represented by a proposed property improvement represented by a building permit. The authority for requesting street frontage requirements is more typically allowed when a land use change is proposed, not a building permit. The proposed language has been created by the City attorney for this Code alteration.

Members of Council confirmed they have not received additional correspondence regarding this item.

Mayor McBride opened the public testimony portion of the hearing and read the rules regarding public hearing conduct.

There was no testimony for or against the ordinance. There was no staff rebuttal.

Mayor McBride closed the oral argument and public testimony portion of the public hearing. There were no deliberations.

Motion: I move to place Ordinance No. 2059 on the City Recorder's report of tonight's main agenda for approval and first reading by title only.
First: Rivera
Second: Saunders
Discussion: None
Vote: Motion passed (roll called)
Ayes: McBride, Zanmiller, Saunders, Counihan, Metta, Haynie, Rivera
Nays: None
Abstentions: None
Excused: None

Mayor McBride adjourned the public hearing at 7:18 p.m.

WORK SESSION

IV OPEN WORK SESSION – 7:18 p.m.

V AGENDA ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS

VI DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Missing Middle Housing Code Amendments, D. Nilsen
Nilsen presented a PowerPoint presentation. It was added to the record.

Developing code language for missing middle housing types (duplexes, triplexes and small cottages) is a project on the City Council 2020 workplan. The purpose of this project is to establish a clear process and regulatory framework to allow greater diversity of housing types and needed housing types. These include small attached and detached homes in clusters, as an alternative to standard development subdivisions.

Code amendments were identified as housing strategies in the City's Comprehensive Plan and Housing Needs Analysis as opportunities to provide a needed housing type and to make efficient use of the City's limited buildable land inventory. Project and Technical advisory groups evaluated frameworks of similar amendments in 2018.

Other public information efforts included articles in the City's newsletter in Spanish and English, project specific webpage, social media, other stakeholder outreach.

On December 21st, Planning Commission began its technical review of the draft code. From a technical perspective, the code permits smaller housing types that are compatible in scale to an existing neighborhood. There are no major technical issues to resolve before bringing the code forward to Council for adoption.

Staff is seeking final Council direction on two issues have been raised:

1. Parking requirements
2. Consistency between the proposed missing middle code and the townhouse code

Parking requirements

Parking requirements add cost to developments, increase unit size, and reduce the amount of land available for development of housing. One option is to reduce parking requirements for certain types of development. Staff will articulate the options and tradeoffs associated with this issue and seek Council input.

Consistency and compatibility

The missing middle code is scaled for compatibility with existing neighborhoods, meaning the units are smaller in both size and height. Townhouses are also considered a part of the missing middle housing product, however, the City's code currently allows for a townhouse that is considerably larger in scale than is anticipated in the missing middle housing code. This size discrepancy has been identified as an issue and disincentive that will negatively impact developer's willingness to build these types of smaller units. Staff recommends that as a follow up, Council discuss options to reduce the disincentives to building smaller units including whether to amend the townhouse code to reduce the scale of the product. An alternative to a townhouse code amendment would be to increase the size of the missing middle houses.

Based on Council direction on these issues, staff will return to the Planning Commission to finalize the code draft that will come back to Council for a public hearing, deliberation, and implementation

Staff recommends that Council provide direction on parking requirements and consistency with the missing middle housing code.

Council asked clarification questions to Nilsen.

Councilor Metta stated she is in favor of reducing the parking. Some of the samples where it is one and a half over a certain size, she is fine with but she does not know what that size would be. She is good with what is being proposed.

Councilor Rivera said she would imagine it would be challenging, but she would like to see option of building up higher.

Councilor Coughlin asked if staff is seeking input from developers? Nilsen confirmed staff has been in conversation with several developers both locally, as well as the consultant who is a professional architecture firm in Portland, to broaden that reach. The marketability question that was talked about came from the real-estate development team. That has been some of the commentary. There has been outreach.

Councilor Coughlin stated reducing the parking requirements makes sense but it would be great to go into that with their eyes wide open. Be aware of the consequences and appetite for particular neighborhoods to absorb that type of pressure.

Councilor McBride stated she is in favor of reducing the numbers, especially for small units. If the unit is going to be 1200-1500 sq ft, maybe it should be one and half. If it is a large frontage lot on the street with large units, there would be opportunity for people to park on the streets. Taking those things into consideration and possibly building up. She is not against building up depending on the situation. They should be around 1,500 sq ft but not 5,000 sq ft. so they can get more units. Maybe one and half spaces per unit would be required. She is fine with going with a small number of parking spaces.

Councilor Saunders stated she is willing to try the one space per unit.

Mayor McBride noted there was public testimony received today and reviewed by Council.

Nilsen presented images on a PowerPoint. PowerPoint has been added to the record. The draft code intends to provide more compact units and is illustrated in the slides. They do see varying degrees in building gaps. Nilsen's question to Council is do they support narrowing the gap through adjustments to the Missing Middle Housing Code or some other means.

Councilor Metta stated the question before Council is do, they want to change the townhouses because what they are talking about is still not going to incentivize people to develop missing middle housing. She believes the answer is yes. Nilsen has shown Council a couple of photos today how townhouses are not consistent with neighborhoods. She agrees with Nilsen's idea of reducing the gap between what is allowed, the townhouse and what is allowed in the housing square footage. She does not know what that is but that is why they have Nilsen and the Planning Commission. She does not see the need for them to disincentivize large home builds.

Councilor Zanmiller stated he is concerned if they disincentive the current profit margin for townhouses and tiny houses even less, builders are just going to build big houses. He would rather have the City say what other “sugar” can be added to the small house. Whether it be more square footage or flexibility on how to configure to get multiple units. They will want to meet the market demand. Otherwise, they will keep getting more of what they got. He thinks there are other incentives they can use, besides this code. They can talk more about parking, SDC’s or roads.

Councilor Rivera would like to limit the size of the townhomes because they are currently half a million-dollar homes. She would like to see them get to Option B, six units.

Mayor McBride would like to get to a place with more units on a lot; up to 1500 sq ft. range. If they limit the townhomes, they will see more large homes built. She does not prefer large townhomes, but she less prefers a 6,000 sq ft single family home. There could be three units on a lot, even if they are large. She is afraid if they limit that, they will just get more single homes. They can try it and see how it goes. The City can talk to the builders to get their input on this. They are the ones that are going to build them.

Nilsen will take Councils input, continue his work and report back at a later date.

2. Trees on Private Property, H. Ellett

Ellett presented a PowerPoint. PowerPoint has been added to the record.

Public Purpose: The purpose of this item is to gain Council input on the next steps for the 2020 Work Plan Project regarding Trees on Private Property. The project falls under the Council Goal of creating a more environmentally sustainable community.

Background: At the June 8, 2020 Council Meeting, when the Trees on Private Property project scope was discussed, Council provided direction that Staff research options for and focus on an incentive- based program for private tree regulation and preservation.

Based on research completed for how other Cities regulate trees on private property and conversations with the development community Staff has created the attached matrix outlining multiple potential next steps for the implementation of regulation changes and incentives that promote tree preservation on private property. The first option posed discusses the disincentivizing liability present in the current development process as developers must mark trees on the development site and then be responsible for those trees throughout the process. The second and third options discuss the implementation of incentives for tree protection and the regulation of private tree removal. Multiple options presented in this matrix may be pursued.

Staff Recommendation: If Council wants to remove the current standard regulatory protection of trees, Staff will draft an update to the Land Use Review process that removes the portion of the process requiring developers to mark trees on a development site and then protect those trees during the development process.

If Council wants to consider an incentive approach, Staff recommends incorporating tree preservation incentives into other upcoming code improvement projects.

If Council wants to regulate private tree removal, Staff will pursue the creation of a City-wide tree removal regulation program.

Councilor Zanmiller believes they should see if there is a way to do a low implementation of the third option, but certainly do the first two options.

Councilor Saunders stated given the current landscape of the regulation only during the land use process, does seem to create an incentive for people to cut everything down ahead of time. It would be an improvement if they removed the liability in the first one. This is not her highest priority item this year, but she is open to talking about incentives as they talk about incentives for other things. She does not believe there is an easy way to do regulation on all trees in the City, or a certain size of tree in the City. She is not interested in doing that at this time on, nor does she want to put staff and resources toward it.

Councilor Metta stated she is in line with Councilor Saunders. There is a part of her that worries about taking away any kind of protection of trees during a land use review process, but she recognizes this is causing some of the trees to be removed. She likes the idea of incentives. She is not excited about regulating protection of all trees. It can be addressed later if it is not working out. She also does not want staff time put towards this right now.

Mayor McBride's agrees with Councilor Saunders. She would like to remove liability. She would like incentives created for trees of certain size or larger. That would be for details later. She does not want to regulate all trees.

Councilor Coughlin has reservations about eliminating liability. He is in favor of adding incentives. Regarding regulating all trees, he questioned if there could be a regulation on the number of trees that one can removed, at any one time.

Councilor Rivera stated this is not a priority for her this year. She rather have staff working on housing, transportation or other things. She does agree with some type of incentive.

VIII ADJOURN WORK SESSION – 8:39 p.m.

REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING

I OPEN REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING – 8:47 p.m.

II AGENDA ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS

III CONSENT AGENDA

1. Council Meeting Minutes – December 14 and 18, 2020
2. OLCC Permit Application Approval –
Common House, FishPeople Seafood, and Wildwood
3. Annual Taxi Business Permit Renewals, J. Gray
4. Waterfront Stormwater Line Financing –

Resolution 2021-02, W. Norris

Councilor Saunders had edits to the minutes on page 53, 64 and 66. Gray will make the edits noted by Saunders.

Motion: I move to approve the Consent Agenda with the minute edits requested by Councilor Saunders.
First: Metta
Second: Saunders
Discussion: None
Vote: Motion passed (roll called)
Ayes: McBride, Zanmiller, Saunders, Counihan, Metta, Haynie, Rivera
Nays: None
Abstentions: None
Excused: None

IV REGULAR BUSINESS ITEMS

1. Public Safety Building – Solicitation Reviews & Approval, W. Norris

The City Council directed staff on September 28th to develop a solicitation for a joint City/County public safety building and a city-only police facility. The intent is to gather cost proposals to help the County decide whether to participate in a joint project and keep a city-led alternative should the County decline. Both projects include office space for Safe Space Children’s Advocacy Center (formally Columbia Gorge Children’s Advocacy Center) and a net increase to downtown parking availability. A draft solicitation for these two projects is included in the meeting packet.

The City of Hood River has no record of its Police Department ever occupying a purpose-built facility. Operations are housed in the basement of the 100-year-old City Hall that was originally a fire engine bay. The space is crowded and lacks basic functionalities for policing like ventilated evidence processing, emergency power, sally port, professional meeting spaces, “soft” victim interview rooms, and secure/IT equipped suspect interview rooms.

The City of Hood River attempted to site and design a police station in the 1990s (standalone) and 2000s (Police/Fire/EMS), but in both cases abandoned the project prior to bond elections or final designs. The City Council reprioritized planning for a police facility in 2018. Mackenzie Architecture (Mackenzie) was selected by competitive solicitation to perform the work.

Mackenzie performed a programming workshop in early 2019. This work resulted in an initial space program of 16,124 sq. ft. After receiving the preliminary space program, the project team toured example police facilities in Canby, Gresham, and Sandy. After the tours, the project team reduced the preliminary building size to 13,178. This final space program was accepted by the City Council on August 12, 2019 leading to the next step of site evaluations.

Seven sites were evaluated and ranked. The highest-ranking site is the 60,000 sq. ft. Columbia Lot. This site requires structured parking, and the lot is large enough to accommodate both a police facility and parking garage. Before moving forward with preliminary design on the Columbia Lot, the City Council expressed a desire to reengage with Hood River County on a joint facility after the success of the county-wide public safety operating levy had stabilized county finances. County Commissioners expressed interest in a joint facility at their September 21st meeting but could not commit until the cost of the planning project was better understood.

Following County input, the City Council directed staff to gather proposals and costs for a joint City/County public safety building and police facility.

A draft solicitation to gather proposals for both a City/County joint project ("Project A") and city-led project ("Project B") is included with the meeting packet for City Council's review and approval to issue. Both projects follow the standard facility planning process as shown in the diagram below. Project A is a full restart of the process while Project B picks up where Mackenzie left off in November with the addition of a parking garage and Safe Space Children's Advocacy Center (SPCAC) offices.

The Hood River Police department will benefit from a purpose-built facility as soon as one is available. The upcoming expiration of the Fire Station General Obligation Bonds in 2022 creates a natural opportunity to forward a construction levy to voters that will not result in a net tax increase. It is advisable to run a bond election before 2022 so that if it is initially unsuccessful the City can reconfigure the project and run a revised bond election before the Fire Station levy expires.

Councilor Rivera stated she is not interested in pursuing a police facility of our (City) own. This is not a priority project for her for the year 2021. She would consider moving forward if the County is interested from the beginning; everyone is involved. She wants the designer to be working with community partners to help guide them. Leaving it up to consultants is not the best. She appreciates staff time into this, but it is not a priority for her. She stated they are all elected officials and have been put here by constituents. She would encourage Council to think about if they willing to put their time, effort, and their name on this.

Councilor Saunders stated she does not see anyway they are going out for a bond this year or 2022. She is not interested in pursuing a standalone facility right now. She acknowledges the current facility does not sufficiently serve the community. It would be important to the community (City and County) to give a joint facility a real opportunity to build partnership and get to a point with a joint facility, with other community partners. To do that well, it will take a lot of time. She is open to seeing that move forward this year. She would like to pursue forward with the County. She believes they are interested based on conversations she has had, but she is not sure the order of operations to move forward.

Mayor McBride noted during Operational Updates later this evening, Fuller is going to speak about community services presentations that will be coming to Council. Mayor McBride believes these presentations will provide information to Council about what is going on and what is needed in the community. She believes that is what Councilor Rivera and Saunders are referring too; services that might benefit from this facility. Mayor McBride believes getting as much information as they can, prior to moving forward with an RFP.

Councilor Zanmiller believes this RFP is 80% final text. Before it goes out, the City needs to have a discussion with the County, otherwise they are going to have to repeat it. He is interested in having that discussion with the County. He suggested not putting this plan on a shelf but begin the discussions. This is nothing against the process to date. If a City and County collaboration building is the goal, how does that look. His suggested to wait on moving forward until there is movement on discussions with the County.

Mayor McBride stated this facility is not necessarily to add more police officers. Have a facility that makes it flexible for the type of staff needed. Do not get stuck with one structure, that will not work for numerous possibilities. She has heard people say they need to take more time to

be more thoughtful on the front end. She knows the community has likely heard more officers are going to be hired. That is not necessarily true. That is not what this building will necessarily be for. They need to be able to articulate that fact to the public.

Councilor Metta understands what her fellow Councilors have stated, but at the same time she is worried. The need for a new facility was discussed 20 years ago and nothing happened. She does not believe the current facility is adequate. It is not protecting victims, suspects, and it is not serving the community. If they are putting a hold, she believes they still need to make this a priority even if it is prioritizing having conversations now. They need to get moving on something. Knowing even if they have conversations now, it is going to take time to pass a bond and finish the design. The current facility is not serving the community. They could do an RFP and talk about designing a flexible space. She can see the conversations happening at the same time.

Councilor Counihan believes slowing the process down and having conversations is going to allow more opportunities. He feels this conversation is affirming some of the uneasiness that he's been feeling, as they proceeded through the final stages of this process. Council was not having the discussion they needed to have. Certainly, with the County and exploring that partnership but also trying to follow through with some of the things in the City equity resolution.

Councilor McBride summarized what she has heard from most Councils. There is not support about going forward with a city-led project "Project B" or at least starting it right now. There is more interest for both a City/County joint project "Project A", depending on conversations with the County. In general, for "Project A" there is a consensus Council would like more robust conversations and other partners that could be involved, prior to looking into space needs.

Mayor McBride agrees trying to get a bond through without doing more work ahead of time, would not be a good idea. She would rather do a City County facility together and it would be best but does not believe it will pass in the current atmosphere. If they do the work, it could pass in a couple years. Looking at the demographics of the votes for the County that happened last year, the City voters passed it. If they are going full County, there will need to be a big push to get it done. All those things would need to be looked at in more depth. Doing the work ahead of time will be more helpful.

Mayor McBride will work with Fuller and the County on potentially scheduling facilitated meetings with the County Commission.

2. Q2 Supplemental Budget - Beginning Balance Review – Resolution 2021-01, W. Norris

The City of Hood River's Financial Policies Resolution 2020-07 requires that, "Each year, the City Council shall review the actual beginning fund balances shown in the external audit. If the General Fund amount is in excess of the budgeted amount, the City Council shall determine the disposition of the excess."

Beginning Fund Balances represent a point in time snapshot of the City's cash, investments, and short-term receivables net of short-term liabilities attributable to each of the City's eight (8) Funds. Fiscal year beginning fund balances are calculated after all outstanding invoices and revenues are received for the prior fiscal year and the transactions are reviewed by an external auditor.

Actual Beginning Fund Balances differ from Budgeted Beginning Fund Balances because budgets are set prospectively based on forecasting assumptions. The difference in timing is why it is useful to routinely compare Actual against Budgeted Fund Balances as the City's financial policy requires (Res. 2020-07).

The Second Quarter (Q2) Supplemental Budget adjusts budgeted beginning balances to audited amounts. The graph below summarizes the differences between budgeted and final audited Beginning Fund Balances for the City's eight (8) funds for Fiscal Year 2020-21. All Public Works related funds began the year with higher than budgeted beginning balances. This is due to capital project timing. Adjustments to project timing do not alter the City's long-term financial plans as the capital project expenditures will still occur.

The Internal Service Fund, Restricted Revenue, and Reserves Funds' actual beginning balances were less than budget but within common variances and within available budgeted contingency. The large carryforward amounts in the Sewer and Water Funds. Where actual beginning fund balances exceed budget, the supplemental budget leaves the additional resources unallocated. These funds will carryforward for the FY2021-22 budget process.

Actual FY2020-21 Beginning Fund Balances have been incorporated into current financial projections and will be integrated into the FY2021-22 budget process.

Motion: I move that City Council approve Resolution 2021-01, to make appropriations and adjust the Adopted Budget for Fiscal Year 2020-21.
First: Metta
Second: Saunders
Discussion: None
Vote: Motion passed (roll called)
Ayes: McBride, Zanmiller, Saunders, Counihan, Metta, Haynie, Rivera
Nays: None
Abstentions: None
Excused: None

V ORGANIZATIONAL UPDATES

A. Department Heads

1. Community Services Presentations, R. Fuller

Fuller stated in the coming months, several people will be presenting to Council about the services they provide to the community and what the needs are.

B. City Recorder

1. Reading of Ordinance 2059 (Street Frontage Improvements) for the first and second time by title only

Motion: To read Ordinance 2059 for the first and second time by title only.
First: Saunders
Second: Metta
Discussion: None
Vote: Motion passed (roll called)
Ayes: McBride, Zanmiller, Saunders, Counihan, Metta, Haynie, Rivera
Nays: None

Abstentions: None
Excused: None

Gray read the ordinance by title only. The Mayor announced that Ordinance 2059 had passed its first and second reading and would become law in 30 days.

2. Reading of Ordinance 2060 (Professional Service Contracts) for the first and second time by title only

Motion: To read Ordinance 2060 for the first and second time by title only.
First: Saunders
Second: Rivera
Discussion: None
Vote: Motion passed (roll called)
Ayes: McBride, Zanmiller, Saunders, Counihan, Metta, Haynie, Rivera
Nays: None
Abstentions: None
Excused: None

Gray read the ordinance by title only. The Mayor announced that Ordinance 2060 had passed its first and second reading and would become law in 30 days.

VI MAYOR

1. Council President Appointment

Mayor McBride announced Councilor Zanmiller will continue as Council President. Council agreed with the Mayors appointment.

VII COUNCIL CALL

VIII EXECUTIVE SESSION – 9:56p.m. – 10:52p.m.

Oregon Revised Statute 192.660 1 (h) To consult with counsel concerning the legal rights and duties of a public body with regard to current litigation or litigation likely to be filed.

Oregon Revised Statute 192.660 1 (e) To conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to negotiate real property transactions.

IX ADJOURN – Adjourned by unanimous consent at 9:56 p.m.

Kate McBride, Mayor

Jennifer Gray, City Recorder

Approved by City Council on _____

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET

DATE: February 8, 2021
TO: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
FROM: Mark Janeck, Director of Public Works
RE: Oregon Public Works Cooperative Assistance Agreement

Public Purpose:

Background:

The City is currently participating in a cooperative assistance Agreement through the state of Oregon, that permits the sharing of Public Works personnel, material, and machinery assets during emergency operations. To my knowledge, no mutual assistance has been requested by or for Hood River during the past five (5) years, which is the term of the existing mutual aid Agreement. Public Works is requesting consideration by the Council to approve the renewal of this Agreement for an additional five (5) years.

Discussion:

Participation in this proposed Agreement binds the City and all other participating entities to assist one another, if requested, during emergencies or disasters, where necessary operations are too large for one entity to handle. The exchange of mutual aid could be personnel, equipment, material, or a combination of these. The intention is to supplement the operational abilities of a requesting entity, not supplant the existing personnel. Incident command is assumed to be the responsibility of the requesting entity, but flexibility exists for that role depending on the situation. Any responding entity is expected to be responsible for the costs associated with a response, however the responder is expected to receive compensation for costs associated with any personnel, equipment, or materials used in the emergency operation.

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) manages the subject Agreement and a list of its participants, but has no other general obligations relative to its use by member entities.

Staff Recommendation:

The Public Works Director recommends participation in the attached Oregon Public Works Cooperative Assistance Agreement for the specified five (5) year period.

Suggested Motion:

I move that we authorize the City Manager to agree to participation and sign the attached Oregon Public Works Cooperative Assistance Agreement.

Alternatives:

Decline participation in the Oregon Public Works Cooperative Assistance Agreement.

Fiscal Impact:

No current or expected fiscal impact.

Environmental Impact:

Attachment:

Oregon Public Works Cooperative Assistance Agreement



Oregon

Kate Brown, Governor

Department of Transportation
Maintenance & Operations Branch
455 Airport Rd. SE, Bldg K
Salem, OR 97301
Phone: (503) 986-7915
Fax: (503) 986-3055

December 30, 2020

Dear Public Works Director:

Your jurisdiction's participation in the Oregon Public Works Emergency Response Cooperative Assistance Agreement is up for renewal. The agreement is valid for five years from the date you sign it. Your agency's commitment to the agreement has either expired or will expire shortly.

The mutual aid agreement:

- Enables public works agencies to support each other during an emergency.
- Provides the mechanism for immediate response for requests and offers of mutual aid.
- Sets up the documentation needed to seek maximum reimbursement possible.

Public works agencies in Oregon may sign the agreement or cancel their participation as they wish. The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) maintains the list of all parties to the agreement. Any agency may cancel its participation by giving written notice and submitting it to the addresses listed below.

To renew or cancel your agency's participation in the agreement, email the completed signature page to:
Emergency.Operations@odot.state.or.us

If you would prefer to mail the signature page, please send it to:
Emergency Operations, PWA
ODOT Maintenance and Operations Branch
455 Airport Road, SE Bldg. K
Salem, OR 97301

If you have any questions about the agreement, please call Christina LeClerc, ODOT Statewide Emergency Operations Manager, at (503) 986-4488.

Sincerely,

Luci Moore
State Maintenance Engineer

OREGON PUBLIC WORKS EMERGENCY RESPONSE

COOPERATIVE ASSISTANCE AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT is between the government agencies (local, county, or state) that have executed the Agreement, as indicated by the signatures at the end of this document.

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, parties to this agreement are responsible for the construction and maintenance of public facilities such as street, road, highway, sewer, water, and related systems during routine and emergency conditions; and

WHEREAS, each of the parties owns and maintains equipment, and employs personnel who are trained to provide service in the construction and maintenance of street, road, highway, sewer, water, and related systems and other support;

WHEREAS, in the event of a major emergency or disaster as defined in ORS 40 1.025 (5), the parties who have executed this Agreement may need assistance to provide supplemental personnel, equipment, or other support; and

WHEREAS, the parties have the necessary personnel and equipment to provide such services in the event of an emergency; and

WHEREAS, it is necessary and desirable that this Agreement be executed for the exchange of mutual assistance, with the intent to supplement not supplant agency personnel;

WHEREAS, an Agreement would help provide documentation needed to seek the maximum reimbursement possible from appropriate federal agencies during emergencies;

WHEREAS, ORS Chapter 402.010 provides for Cooperative Assistance Agreement among public and private agencies for reciprocal emergency aid and resources; and

WHEREAS, ORS Chapter 190 provides for intergovernmental agreements and the apportionment among the parties of the responsibility for providing funds to pay for expenses incurred in the performance of the agreed upon functions or activities;

NOW THEREFORE, the parties agree as follows:

1. Request

If confronted with an emergency situation requiring personnel, equipment or material not available to it, the requesting party (Requestor) may request assistance from any of the other parties who have executed this Agreement.

2. Response

Upon receipt of such request, the party receiving the request (Responder) shall immediately take the following action:

- A. Determine whether it has the personnel, equipment, or material available to respond to the request.
- B. Determine what available personnel and equipment should be dispatched and/or what material should be supplied.
- C. Dispatch available and appropriate personnel and equipment to the location designated by the Requestor.
- D. Provide appropriate access to the available material.
- E. Advise the Requestor immediately in the event all or some of the requested personnel, equipment, or material is not available.

NOTE: It is understood that the integrity of dedicated funds needs to be protected. Therefore, agencies funded with road funds are limited to providing services for road activities, sewer funds are limited to providing services for sewer activities and so on.

3. Incident Commander

The Incident Commander of the emergency shall be designated by the Requestor, and shall be in overall command of the operations under whom the personnel and equipment of the Responder shall serve. The personnel and equipment of the Responder shall be under the immediate control of a supervisor of the Responder. If the Incident Commander specifically requests a supervisor of the Responder to assume command, the Incident Commander shall not, by relinquishing command, relieve the Requestor of responsibility for the incident.

4. Documentation

Documentation of hours worked, and equipment or materials used or provided will be maintained on a shift by shift basis by the Responder, and provided to the Requestor as needed.

5. Release of Personnel and Equipment

All personnel, equipment, and unused material provided under this Agreement shall be returned to the Responder upon release by the Requestor, or on demand by the Responder.

6. Compensation

It is hereby understood that the Responder will be reimbursed (e.g. labor, equipment, materials and other related expenses as applicable, including loss or damage to equipment) at its adopted usual and customary rates. Compensation may include:

- A. Compensation for workers at the Responder's current pay structure, including call back, overtime, and benefits.
- B. Compensation for equipment at Responder's established rental rate.
- C. Compensation for materials, at Responder's cost. Materials may be replaced at Requestor's discretion in lieu of cash payment upon approval by the Responder for such replacement.
- D. Without prejudice to a Responder's right to indemnification under Section 7.A. herein, compensation for damages to equipment occurring during the emergency incident shall be paid by the Requestor, subject to the following limitations:
 - 1) Maximum liability shall not **exceed** the cost of repair or cost of replacement, whichever is less.
 - 2) No compensation will be paid for equipment damage or loss attributable to natural disasters or acts of God not related to the emergency incident.
 - 3) To the extent of any payment under this section, Requestor will have the right of subrogation for all claims against parties other than parties to this agreement who may be responsible in whole or in part for damage to the equipment.

- 4) Requestor shall not be liable for damage caused by the neglect of the Responder's operators.

Within 30 days after presentation of bills by Responder entitled to compensation under this section, Requestor will either pay or make mutually acceptable arrangements for payment.

7. Indemnification

This provision applies to all parties only when a Requestor requests and a Responder provides personnel, equipment, or material under the terms of this Agreement. A Responder's act of withdrawing personnel, equipment, or material provided is not considered a party's activity under this Agreement for purposes of this provision.

To the extent permitted by Article XI of the Oregon Constitution and by the Oregon Tort Claims Act, each party shall indemnify, within the limits of the Tort Claims Act, the other parties against liability for damage to life or property arising from the indemnifying party's own activities under this Agreement, provided that a party will not be required to indemnify another party for any such liability arising out of the wrongful acts of employees or agents of that other party.

8. Workers Compensation Withholdings and Employer Liability

Each party shall remain fully responsible as employer for all taxes, assessments, fees, premiums, wages, withholdings, workers compensation and other direct and indirect compensation, benefits, and related obligations with respect to its own employees. Likewise, each party shall insure, self-insure, or both, its own employees as required by Oregon Revised Statutes.

9. Pre-Incident Plans

The parties may develop pre-incident plans for the type and locations of problem areas where emergency assistance may be needed, the types of personnel and equipment to be dispatched, and the training to be conducted to ensure efficient operations. Such plans shall take into consideration the proper protection by the Responder of its own geographical area.

10. The Agreement

- A. It is understood that all parties may not execute this Agreement at the same time. It is the intention of the parties that any governmental entity in the State of Oregon may enter into this Agreement and that all parties who execute this Agreement will be

considered to be equal parties to the Agreement. The individual parties to this Agreement may be "Requestor" or "Responder's" as referred to in Section 1. and 2. above, to all others who have entered this Agreement.

- B. The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Maintenance and Operations Branch shall maintain the master copy of this Agreement, including a list of all those governmental entities that have executed this Cooperative Assistance Agreement. ODOT will make the list of participants available to any entity that has signed the Agreement. Whenever an entity executes the agreement, ODOT shall notify all others who have executed the Agreement of the new participant. Except as specifically provided in this paragraph, ODOT has no obligations to give notice nor does it have any other or additional obligations than any other party.
- C. This Agreement shall be effective upon approval by two or more parties and shall remain in effect as to a specific party for five years after the date that party executes this Agreement unless sooner terminated as provided in this paragraph. Any party may terminate its participation in this Agreement prior to expiration as follows:
 - 1) Written notice of intent to terminate this Agreement must be given to all other parties on the master list of parties at least 30 days prior to termination date. This notice shall automatically terminate the Agreement as to the terminating party on the date set out in the notice unless rescinded by that party in writing prior to that date.
 - 2) Termination will not affect a party's obligations for payment arising prior to the termination of this Agreement.

11. Non-exclusive

This Agreement is not intended to be exclusive among the parties. Any party may enter into separate cooperative assistance or mutual aid agreements with any other entity. No such separate Agreement shall terminate any responsibility under this Agreement.

12. Parties to This Agreement

Participants in this Agreement are indicated on the following pages, one party per page.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this Agreement for Public Works Cooperative Assistance to be executed by duly authorized representatives as of the date of their signatures.

STATE OF OREGON
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION



December 30, 2020

Luci Moore
Statewide Maintenance Engineer

Date

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this Agreement for Public Works Cooperative Assistance to be executed by duly authorized representatives as of the date of their signatures.

Agency

County, Oregon

Authorized Representative

Date

Designated Primary Contact:		
<u>Office:</u>	<u>Contact:</u>	<u>Phone Number:</u>
_____	_____	_____
Emergency 24 Hour Phone Number:		Fax Number:
_____		_____
E-mail address (if available):		

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET

DATE: February 8, 2021

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council

FROM: Rachael Fuller, City Manager

RE: Request for Fee Wavier to Support Hood River Farmers Market SNAP Match Program

Background: Gorge Grown Food Network is requesting a waiver of fees for their special event permit and parking lot usage for 2021 Hood River Farmers Market located at the east side of the Columbia Lot. The wavier of the fees will help support the SNAP Match Program. More information is provided in the attached letter.

The Hood River City Council has granted a complete fee waiver for the past 3 years and a partial waiver was given during their first two years at the Columbia Lot, 2016 and 2017.

Staff Recommendation: Consider the request from Gorge Grown.

Suggested Motion: I move to approve the request to waive 2021 permit and parking lot usage fees for Gorge Grown Food Network in support of the SNAP Match Program.

Alternatives: Do not approve the request to waive fees.

Fiscal Impact: Waiver of Event Permit fee (\$73) and parking lot usage fees (\$344 each Saturday, May 1 through November 20, 2021).

Environmental Impact:

Attachments:

1. Letter from Gorge Grown



WWW.GORGEGROWN.COM P.O. BOX 752, HOOD RIVER, OR 97031 (541) 490-6420

January 27, 2021

Hood River City Council
211 2nd Street
Hood River, OR 97031

Greetings,

On behalf of Hood River Farmers Market, I truly appreciate the support we received from the City this past season. The savings from our waived rental fee was more important than ever as we worked to respond to challenges and needs caused by the COVID-19 pandemic.

The nearly \$2,700 in savings from our lot rental fee allowed us to bolster our SNAP Match Program and ensure greater access to fresh, local food for more of our community members. I ask that the City again waive the rental fee for the 2021 season with the understanding that Gorge Grown will use the savings for the SNAP Match Program.

How it works: The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP, formerly known as food stamps) is a federally funded program that assists low-income individuals and families. For every federal benefit dollar a SNAP client spends at the market, Gorge Grown gives the customer an additional dollar (up to \$10). The SNAP benefits and incentives are then spent at the farmers market with local farmers and food producers.

Benefits: The SNAP Match Program is unique because it not only increases food security for low-income families and individuals, it simultaneously increases sales for family farmers. This program ensures federal benefits are spent with local businesses, builds a stronger local food system and local economy, and fosters a more inclusive market- where everyone has access to fresh, local food.

Data before the COVID-19 pandemic hit showed that one in three people in the Gorge did not have enough to eat. According to 2019-2020 data, 42% of students at May Street Elementary and 37% of students at Hood River Middle School received free or reduced lunch. Rates of economic and food insecurity are rising as a result of the pandemic and disproportionately affect BIPOC communities. Around a quarter of leisure and hospitality jobs in Hood River County have been lost already.

The SNAP Match Program has never been more important as we've seen the needs of our community grow due to challenges caused or exacerbated by the pandemic. We can help ensure that community members experiencing economic and food insecurity have access to local food with a robust SNAP Match program.

2021 SNAP Match Data:

GORGE GROWN BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Alma Gaeta - Courtney Jackson – Buck Jones – Edwina King – Paul Rygielwicz – Steve Seymour – Rachel Suits

- In 2020, our SNAP Sales (not including the Match) totaled \$9,280, nearly double from last year.
- Gorge Grown gave out more than \$4,000 in Match incentives, compared to \$2,600 given in 2019.
- Of the 130 customers who used their SNAP benefits at the market, 110 were either new SNAP recipients or new market shoppers in 2020.

From SNAP customer surveys conducted at the market, we know that:

- 100% of SNAP customers surveyed said that the amount of fruits and vegetables they buy has increased as a result of the SNAP Match program
- 50% of the SNAP customers surveyed said the amount of food they have in the house increased greatly as a result of the SNAP Match program
- 100% of SNAP customers surveyed said that the number of times they visited the farmers market had increased as a result of the SNAP Match Program

What people are saying about the SNAP Match Program:

"The SNAP matching program gives me the opportunity to buy great quality meats and vegetables from our community" – SNAP customer

"It has allowed me to spend much more money on local produce and products. I feel able to buy a nice variety of seasonal, nutritious produce without worrying about my ability to have enough food budget at the end of the month" – SNAP customer

"My daughter and I eat more fruits and vegetables and we have a greater variety of food in our diet"- SNAP Customer

Above all, SNAP customers expressed appreciation for the extra support consistently throughout the season. A few memorable experiences include: A senior made their only outing of the week to the market to use their SNAP benefits. A new mother filled her refrigerator and freezer up with fresh produce and meat in spring with the help of SNAP Match. A local family made the market their new weekly tradition as a safe outing where their kids could pick out a snack of fresh fruit.

In addition to our SNAP Match Success, 2020 was our most successful season, in many ways:

- With the support from the City staff, we were able to open the market in April, one month earlier than anticipated and in the height of the first COVID-19 lockdown and as grocery store shelves were becoming bare. In March 2020, Governor Kate Brown and the Oregon Department of Agriculture recognized farmers markets as essential grocery services to remain open through the pandemic.
 - With guidance from the ODA, Oregon Health Authority and Oregon Farmers Market Association, we developed and implemented a robust safety plan at the market. This plan has served as a model to other farmers markets across the Pacific Northwest.
 - From data collected at our first few markets in April, we know that 60% of customers came from Hood River, 38% came from surrounding communities like White Salmon, Mosier and Parkdale.
 - 91% of customers polled said they felt more safe shopping at the farmers market vs. the grocery store; 9% said they felt the same.
 - 83% of farmers and food producers surveyed reported losing restaurant sales this year. As a result, direct to customer sales at the market became even more important to their success.
- While our customer attendance was down 23%, the average customer spent significantly more money at the market this season
- Sales increased for our local farmers and small businesses at the market in 2020.
 - Gross sales increased 16% from 2019

GORGE GROWN BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Alma Gaeta -Courtney Jackson – Buck Jones – Edwina King – Paul Rygiewicz – Steve Seymour – Rachel Suits

- 2019 (May - Nov)- \$526,000 • 2020 (May - Nov)- \$611,500
- Vegetable sales grew by an amazing 50%
 - 2019- \$177,900 • 2020- \$267,000
- Meat sales grew by 77% for local ranchers and fisherpeople
 - 2019- \$91,520 • 2020- \$162,000

We're proud of our accomplishments this year but know there's still more to be done. As needs rise in our community, we've increased our SNAP Match for the winter market season from \$10 to \$15. We've already seen success in the first few months with the increased Match. We hope to continue a \$15 Match into our 2021 regular season starting in May, pending funding.

I ask that the City again waive the rental fee for the 2021 season with the understanding that Gorge Grown will use the savings for the SNAP Match Program.

Your support will help lower barriers to the market for more of our community members and help support our mission: to build a resilient and inclusive food system that improves the health and wellbeing of our community.

Again, we appreciate your support for the Hood River Farmers Market and SNAP Match Program.

Sincerely and Gratefully,

Hannah Ladwig
 Hood River Farmers Market Manager
 Gorge Grown Food Network

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET

DATE: February 8, 2021
TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council
FROM: Mark Janeck, Director of Public Works
RE: Purchase of new 2021 Ford F-350 4x4 Diesel Pickup Truck

Public Purpose:

Background:

The City's fleet includes five (5) F-350, one-ton pickup trucks. These vehicles are used daily for various Public Works operations, and importantly, are used for snow plowing during the winter season. It is important to note that due to the type of snow prevalent in this area, specifically heavy, high moisture content snow, it is absolutely necessary to have these larger pickup trucks in order to deal with snow operations, in conjunction with the larger plowing vehicles. The proposed F-350 for purchase is a diesel-powered vehicle, which has additional power and towing capacity when compared to a gas engine F-350. Currently only one of our F-350 trucks is diesel powered, and does not allow the flexibility of operational use when it is necessary to tow the mini-excavator, forklift, or other machinery. For example, the total weight of towing the mini-excavator is approximately 14,500lbs, while the gas powered F-350 can only tow a maximum of approximately 12,600lbs.

The Department of Public Works is aware of the City's interest in transitioning from strictly hydrocarbon-based vehicles to hybrid and electric vehicles when possible. Currently, the availability of alternative fuel heavy duty trucks that are used for emergency operations, such as snow events, are not being manufactured to the degree of safety that we believe is necessary. Because of the nature of our emergency operations, the immediate availability and long-term use (days at a time) of certain vehicles is absolutely necessary. Currently the department is concentrating on replacing the current smaller pickup trucks and administrative vehicles with hybrid and electric versions when possible. Investment in electric charging stations will also be necessary for this transition.

The vehicle proposed to be replaced was purchased in 2009, has surpassed its useful life as a front-line heavy duty pickup truck, and is scheduled for replacement during FY2021 through the City's vehicle replacement program. Historically, these types of trucks have followed a replacement schedule of 10 years, but staff improvements in specifying certain options and materials during the ordering process, enhanced preventive maintenance, and careful annual evaluations, have added additional years of use in a safe and economical way. This truck will be used this winter and will have been used for two (2) additional years after typical replacement life.

Public Works fleet personnel are satisfied with the operations and design improvements relative to the Ford F-350 vehicles.

The City will be purchasing the new Ford F-350 4x4 vehicle based on a contract price obtained by Landmark Ford Lincoln through the State of Oregon Contract Agreement 5550, a contract that reflects a competitive bidding process on behalf of various governmental agencies throughout the State. In this case, the State of Oregon has provided a public bid price for the Ford F-350 4x4 diesel pickup truck, which has been reduced by approximately 29% from the standard manufacturer's list price.

Public Works intends to trade in or auction the existing Ford F-350 4x4 truck in order to reduce funding outlays.

Staff Recommendation:

Landmark Ford Lincoln is a reputable car and truck dealer located in Tigard. The attached pickup truck specifications reflect those necessary for municipal operations Hood River, and do not contain superfluous features and options.

The Director of Public Works recommends purchase a new 2021 Ford F-350 4x4 Diesel Pickup Truck as described in attached contract.

Suggested Motion:

I move that we authorize the Public Works Director to purchase one (1) 2021 Ford F-350 4x4 Diesel Pickup Truck for a total not to exceed \$39,074.22. The vehicle dealer, Landmark Ford Lincoln of Tigard, has agreed to the purchase and additional work as indicated in the attached contract.

Alternatives:

Continue to operate the existing 2009 Ford F-350 for an additional one or two more years.

Fiscal Impact:

The publicly bid contract price for the proposed 2021 Ford F-350 is \$39,074.22 and there is \$28,213.00 set aside in the Vehicle Replacement Program for this purchase. Trade in value for the existing vehicle is expected to be \$9,000-\$12,500. The increased price of this truck is due to the change from a gas to diesel fuel engine. Combining the existing monies set aside for this vehicle, plus the expected trade in value, should result in a value close to the proposed purchase price.

Environmental Impact:

Attachment:

Attached is the contract and specifications associated with the proposed purchase. The purchased vehicle will receive City of Hood River specific decals.

Prepared for: Price Agreement 5550, Government Pricing
Price Agreement 5550

2021 F-350 4x4 SD Regular Cab 8' box 142" WB SRW XL (F3B)
Price Level: 115



Client Proposal

Prepared by:
Diane Pohl
Office: 503-639-1131
Date: 11/03/2020



Prepared for:

Price Agreement 5550, Government Pricing

Prepared by: Diane Pohl

11/03/2020

Landmark Ford Lincoln | 12000 S W 66th Ave Tigard Oregon | 972238599



2021 F-350 4x4 SD Regular Cab 8' box 142" WB SRW XL (F3B)

Price Level: 115

As Configured Vehicle

Code	Description	MSRP	Invoice
Base Vehicle			
F3B	Base Vehicle Price (F3B)	\$38,545.00	\$36,618.00
Packages			
610A	Order Code 610A <i>Includes:</i> - Engine: 6.2L 2-Valve SOHC EFI NA V8 Flex-Fuel - Transmission: TorqShift 10-Speed Automatic Includes SelectShift and selectable drive modes: normal, tow/haul, eco, deep sand/snow and slippery. - 3.73 Axle Ratio - GVWR: 10,400 lb Payload Package - Tires: LT245/75Rx17E BSW A/S (4) Spare may not be the same as road tire. - Wheels: 17" Argent Painted Steel Includes painted hub covers/center ornaments. - Radio: AM/FM Stereo w/MP3 Player Includes 4 speakers. - SYNC Communications & Entertainment System Includes enhanced voice recognition with 911 Assist, 4.2" LCD center stack screen, AppLink and 1 smart-charging USB-C port.	N/C	N/C
Powertrain			
996	Engine: 6.2L 2-Valve SOHC EFI NA V8 Flex-Fuel	Included	Included
44G	Transmission: TorqShift 10-Speed Automatic <i>Includes SelectShift and selectable drive modes: normal, tow/haul, eco, deep sand/snow and slippery.</i>	Included	Included
X37	3.73 Axle Ratio	Included	Included
STDGV	GVWR: 10,400 lb Payload Package	Included	Included
Wheels & Tires			
TD8	Tires: LT245/75Rx17E BSW A/S (4) <i>Spare may not be the same as road tire.</i>	Included	Included
64A	Wheels: 17" Argent Painted Steel <i>Includes painted hub covers/center ornaments.</i>	Included	Included
512	Spare Tire, Wheel, Carrier & Jack	\$295.00	\$269.00

Prices and content availability as shown are subject to change and should be treated as estimates only. Actual base vehicle, package and option pricing may vary from this estimate because of special local pricing, availability or pricing adjustments not reflected in the dealer's computer system. See salesperson for the most current information.

Prepared for:

Price Agreement 5550, Government Pricing

Prepared by: Diane Pohl

11/03/2020



Landmark Ford Lincoln | 12000 S W 66th Ave Tigard Oregon | 972238599

2021 F-350 4x4 SD Regular Cab 8' box 142" WB SRW XL (F3B)

Price Level: 115

As Configured Vehicle (cont'd)

Code	Description	MSRP	Invoice
	Spare tire is standard equipment; becomes optional when (66D) Pickup Box Delete is ordered.		
Seats & Seat Trim			
1	Cloth 40/20/40 Split Bench Seat <i>Includes center armrest, cupholder and driver's side manual lumbar.</i>	\$100.00	\$91.00
Other Options			
142WB	142" Wheelbase	STD	STD
PAINT	Monotone Paint Application	STD	STD
90L	Power Equipment Group <i>Deletes passenger-side lock cylinder. Includes upgraded door trim panel. Includes:</i> - Accessory Delay - Trailer Tow Mirrors w/Power Heated Glass <i>Includes manual folding, manually telescoping and heated convex spotter mirror.</i> - Advanced Security Pack <i>Includes SecuriLock Passive Anti-Theft System (PATS) and inclination/intrusion sensors.</i> - Power Locks - Power Tailgate Lock - Power Front Seat Windows <i>Includes 1-touch up/down driver/passenger window.</i> - Remote Keyless Entry	\$865.00	\$787.00
473	Snow Plow Prep Package Requires Extra Extra Heavy-Duty Alternator (67E) when ordered with Upfitter Switches (66S) and 110V/400W Outlet (43C). <i>Includes computer selected springs for snowplow application. NOTE 1: Restrictions apply; see Supplemental Reference or Body Builders Layout Book for details. NOTE 2: May result in deterioration of ride quality when vehicle is not equipped with snowplow.</i> <i>Includes:</i> - 200 Amp Alternator	\$250.00	\$228.00
66D	Pickup Box Delete <i>Deletes tie-down hooks, tailgate, rearview camera, 7/4 pin connector and center high-mounted stop lamp (CHMSL) (only on vehicles over 10,000 lbs. GVWR). Incomplete vehicle package - requires further manufacture and certification by a final stage manufacturer. In addition, Ford urges manufacturers to follow the recommendations of the Ford Incomplete Vehicle Manual and the Ford Truck Body Builder's Layout Book (and applicable supplements).</i> <i>Includes:</i> - Rear Bumper Delete - Spare Wheel, Tire, Carrier & Jack Delete	-\$625.00	-\$569.00
52B	Trailer Brake Controller <i>Verified to be compatible with select electric over hydraulic brakes. Includes smart trailer tow connector.</i>	\$270.00	\$245.00
59H	Center High-Mounted Stop Lamp (CHMSL) <i>CHMSL is deleted from vehicles over 10,000 lbs GVWR with 66D Pickup Box Delete; replaced with a black cover; to add CHMSL with 66D Pickup Box Delete select 59H. CHMSL is standard under all other conditions.</i>	N/C	N/C

Prices and content availability as shown are subject to change and should be treated as estimates only. Actual base vehicle, package and option pricing may vary from this estimate because of special local pricing, availability or pricing adjustments not reflected in the dealer's computer system. See salesperson for the most current information.



Prepared for:

Price Agreement 5550, Government Pricing

Prepared by: Diane Pohl

11/03/2020

Landmark Ford Lincoln | 12000 S W 66th Ave Tigard Oregon | 972238599

2021 F-350 4x4 SD Regular Cab 8' box 142" WB SRW XL (F3B)

Price Level: 115

As Configured Vehicle (cont'd)

Code	Description	MSRP	Invoice
587	Radio: AM/FM Stereo w/MP3 Player <i>Includes 4 speakers. Includes: - SYNC Communications & Entertainment System Includes enhanced voice recognition with 911 Assist, 4.2" LCD center stack screen, AppLink and 1 smart-charging USB-C port.</i>	Included	Included
Emissions			
425	50-State Emissions System	STD	STD
Interior Colors			
1S_02	Medium Earth Gray	N/C	N/C
Primary Colors			
Z1_01	Oxford White	N/C	N/C
SUBTOTAL		\$39,700.00	\$37,669.00
Destination Charge		\$1,695.00	\$1,695.00
TOTAL		\$41,395.00	\$39,364.00

Prices and content availability as shown are subject to change and should be treated as estimates only. Actual base vehicle, package and option pricing may vary from this estimate because of special local pricing, availability or pricing adjustments not reflected in the dealer's computer system. See salesperson for the most current information.

Prepared for:

Price Agreement 5550, Government Pricing

Prepared by: Diane Pohl

11/03/2020



Landmark Ford Lincoln | 12000 S W 66th Ave Tigard Oregon | 972238599

2021 F-350 4x4 SD Regular Cab 8' box 142" WB SRW XL (F3B)

Price Level: 115

Pricing Summary - Single Vehicle

MSRP

Vehicle Pricing

Base Vehicle Price	\$38,545.00
Options & Colors	\$1,155.00
Upfitting	\$0.00
Destination Charge	\$1,695.00
Subtotal	\$41,395.00

Pre-Tax Adjustments

Code	Description	
5550	State Contract 5550 Discount	-\$12,060.00
Subtotal		\$29,335.00

Sales Taxes

Code	Description	
CAT Tax	Oregon Corp Activity Tax	\$108.54
<small>This is a new tax imposed as of January 1st 2020.</small>		
PT	Oregon Privilege Tax	\$146.68
Subtotal		\$29,590.21

Post-Tax Adjustments

Code	Description	
E-Plates 2	E-Plates MPG 0-19	\$152.50
<small>We are a licensing dealer. If you would like Oregon Exempt License Plates at the time of delivery add \$147.50 After January 1st part of this number is based off MPG and this number could change.</small>		

Total **\$29,742.71**

**For Diesel add \$9,331.51
includes taxes**

Customer Signature

Acceptance Date

Prices and content availability as shown are subject to change and should be treated as estimates only. Actual base vehicle, package and option pricing may vary from this estimate because of special local pricing, availability or pricing adjustments not reflected in the dealer's computer system. See salesperson for the most current information.

Prepared for:

Price Agreement 5550, Government Pricing
 Prepared by: Diane Pohl
 11/03/2020



Landmark Ford Lincoln | 12000 S W 66th Ave Tigard Oregon | 972238559

2021 F-350 4x4 SD Regular Cab 8' box 142" WB SRW XL (F3B)

Price Level: 115

Major Equipment

(Based on selected options, shown at right)

- 6.2L V-8 SOHC w/SMP1 385hp
- TorqShift 10 speed automatic w/OD
- * 4-wheel ABS
- * Traction control
- * Battery with run down protection
- * Advance Trac w/Roll Stability Control
- * Tinted glass
- * Bluetooth streaming audio
- * Dual power remote heated mirrors
- * 17 x 7.5 steel wheels
- * Driver and front passenger seat mounted side airbags
- * Tachometer
- * Reclining front split-bench seats
- * Class V hitch
- * Rear axle capacity: 7280 lbs.
- * Rear spring rating: 6340 lbs.
- * Frame Yield Strength 50000 psi
- * Axle to end of frame: 47.6"
- Exterior: Oxford White
- Interior: Medium Earth Gray
- * Brake assistance
- * LT 245/75R17 E BSW AS S-rated tires
- * Firm suspension
- * Air conditioning
- * AM/FM stereo with seek-scan, external memory control
- * Daytime running
- * Variable intermittent wipers
- * Dual front airbags w/passenger cancel
- * SecurILock immobilizer
- * Message Center
- * Audio control on steering wheel
- * Front axle capacity: 6000 lbs.
- * Front spring rating: 5600 lbs.
- * Frame section modulus: 10.7 cu.in.
- * Cab to axle: 56.1"

Fuel Economy

As Configured Vehicle

MSRP

STANDARD VEHICLE PRICE	\$38,545.00
Order Code 610A	N/C
Engine: 6.2L 2-Valve SOHC EFI NA V8 Flex-Fuel	Included
Transmission: TorqShift 10-Speed Automatic	Included
3.73 Axle Ratio	Included
GVWR: 10,400 lb Payload Package	Included
Tires: LT245/75Rx17E BSW A/S (4)	Included
Wheels: 17" Argent Painted Steel	Included
142" Wheelbase	STD
Monotone Paint Application	STD
Radio: AM/FM Stereo w/Mp3 Player	Included
50-State Emissions System	STD
SYNC Communications & Entertainment System	Included
Oxford White	N/C
Medium Earth Gray	N/C
Cloth 40/20/40 Split Bench Seat	\$100.00
Power Equipment Group	\$865.00
Accessory Delay	Included
Trailer Tow Mirrors w/Power Heated Glass	Included

Prices and content availability as shown are subject to change and should be treated as estimates only. Actual base vehicle, package and option pricing may vary from this estimate because of special local pricing, availability or pricing adjustments not reflected in the dealer's computer system. See salesperson for the most current information.

Prepared for:

Price Agreement 5550, Government Pricing

Prepared by: Diane Pohl

1/103/2020



Landmark Ford Lincoln | 12000 S W 66th Ave Tigard Oregon | 972238599

2021 F-350 4x4 SD Regular Cab 8' box 142" WB SRW XL (F3B)

Price Level: 115

Major Equipment

City
N/A



Hwy
N/A

As Configured Vehicle

MSRP

Advanced Security Pack	Included
Power Locks	Included
Power Tailgate Lock	Included
Power Front Seat Windows	Included
Remote Keyless Entry	Included
Pickup Box Delete	-\$625.00
Rear Bumper Delete	Included
Spare Wheel, Tire, Carrier & Jack Delete	Included
Snow Plow Prep Package	\$250.00
200 Amp Alternator	Included
Spare Tire, Wheel, Carrier & Jack	\$295.00
Trailer Brake Controller	\$270.00
Center High-Mounted Stop Lamp (CHMSL)	N/C
SUBTOTAL	\$39,700.00
Destination Charge	\$1,695.00
TOTAL	\$41,395.00

Prices and content availability as shown are subject to change and should be treated as estimates only. Actual base vehicle, package and option pricing may vary from this estimate because of special local pricing, availability or pricing adjustments not reflected in the dealer's computer system. See salesperson for the most current information.

F-350 SRW Super Duty® Pickup

F-350 XLT Crew Cab 4x4

CONVENTIONAL TOWING

MAXIMUM LOADED TRAILER WEIGHT (lbs.)

Towing capability will be reduced based on trim series, option content and payload. See dealer and reference "ResourceBook Job Aid" "Spec'ing F-Series Trucks for Towing"

Automatic Transmission	REGULAR CAB				SUPERCAB				CREW CAB			
	4x2 142" WB 8' Box	4x4 142" WB 8' Box	4x2 148" WB 6-3/4' Box	4x4 148" WB 6-3/4' Box	4x2 164" WB 8' Box	4x4 164" WB 8' Box	4x2 160" WB 6-3/4' Box	4x4 160" WB 6-3/4' Box	4x2 176" WB 8' Box	4x4 160" WB 6-3/4' Box	4x4 176" WB 8' Box	4x4 176" WB 8' Box
Engine	Max Wt	Max Wt	Max Wt	Max Wt	Max Wt	Max Wt	Max Wt	Max Wt	Max Wt	Max Wt	Max Wt	Max Wt
6.2L V8	13,000 ¹	12,700 ¹	12,800	12,800	12,700	12,400	12,400	12,300 ²	12,300 ²	12,700 ¹	12,500 ¹	12,000
4.30	13,000 ¹	12,600 ¹	12,800	12,800	12,700	12,400	12,400	12,300 ²	12,300 ²	12,600 ¹	12,400	12,200 ³
6.7L V8 Turbo Diesel	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000
3.55	14,000	15,000	14,000	15,000	15,000	14,000	15,000	20,000 ⁴	20,000 ⁴	15,000	18,200	20,000 ⁴
7.3L V8	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000
4.30	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000

¹8" All-Season Tires, ^{18"} and ^{20"} All-Terrain Tires, ^{17"} Tires with 6-speed transmission, ^{17"} Tires with 6-speed transmission. Requires ^{18"} All-Season or ^{20"} All-Terrain Tires. Optional 11,400-lb. GVWR Package (65L). ¹Remor Off-Road Package (17Y).

Notes: - Calculated with SAE J2867 method.
 - Trailer tongue (trailer king pin for 5th-wheel towing) load weight should be 10% (15% for 5th-wheel towing) of total loaded trailer weight. Make sure vehicle payload (reduce by option weight) will accommodate trailer tongue (trailer king pin for 5th-wheel towing) load weight and weight of passengers and cargo added to towing vehicle. Addition of trailer tongue (trailer king pin for 5th-wheel towing) load weight and weight of passengers and cargo must not cause vehicle weights to exceed rear GVWR or GVWR. These ratings can be found on the vehicle Safety Compliance Certification Label.

Maximum payload and towing capabilities are for properly equipped base vehicles with required equipment and a 150-lb. driver and vary based on cargo, vehicle configuration, accessories and number of passengers. See label on door jamb for carrying capacity of a specific vehicle. Horsepower, torque, payload and towing are independent attributes and may not be achieved simultaneously. For additional information, see your Ford Dealer.

Excavator 12,000 lbs
 Trailer 2,500 lbs
 14,500 lbs

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET

Meeting Date: February 8, 2021

To: Honorable Mayor and Hood River City Council

From: Will Norris, Finance Dir. / Asst. City Manager

Subject: Acceptance of the Urban Renewal Agency Annual Statement

Discussion:

Separate from the annual audit, ORS 457.460 prescribes a shortened annual financial statement that Urban Renewal Agencies must file with the government body of their municipality. The annual statement for the Urban Renewal Agency is attached to this report and is posted to the City's website at cityofhoodriver.gov/administration/finance-reports/.

Staff Recommendation:

Acknowledge receipt of the Urban Renewal Agency annual financial statement.

Proposed Motion:

"I move that the City Council receive the Urban Renewal Agency annual financial statement"

Attachments

Annual Financial Statement

**URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY OF THE CITY OF HOOD RIVER
ANNUAL STATEMENT
January, 2020**

Each year, urban renewal agencies in Oregon are required to prepare an annual statement summarizing certain financial information, which is then filed with the governing body of the municipality (ORS 457.460). A newer requirement added for 2020 also requires the report be distributed to each overlapping taxing district and to include maximum indebtedness for each urban renewal plan area, including amount of indebtedness incurred through end of the preceding fiscal year. This document is in addition to other audit and budget reporting requirements.

Property taxes are used by urban renewal agencies to pay for projects that improve urban renewal areas. In Oregon, there are two different processes for calculating property taxes for urban renewal. The first is the “division of tax” process. Under this process, overall property taxes remain the same. However, some property taxes that would have been received by the taxing districts (for example, a city or a county) are paid over to the urban renewal agency instead. Property owners are often confused when reading their tax statements because the amount distributed from the division of tax process to the agency is shown as a separate amount, even though it is not an additional tax.

The second process is an “urban renewal special levy.” Only certain urban renewal plans are eligible for this funding (specifically plans that were adopted prior to December 6, 1996). The special levy was created in order to protect existing plans from losing revenue when Measure 50 was enacted. The special levy is not required; it is optional. If approved, it becomes an additional tax that is billed to all taxpayers in the city or county that established the plan.

The Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Hood River has three plans; the Hood River Heights Plan (adopted in 2011), the Hood River Waterfront Plan (adopted in 2008) and the Columbia Cascade Plan (adopted in 1987). Since both the Heights and Waterfront Plans were created after December 6, 1996, they will receive property taxes from the division of tax process only. The Columbia Cascade Plan is a protected “Option 1” plan and is eligible to receive additional property tax funding by approving an optional special levy. However, the Columbia Cascade Plan did not assess the special levy this year, so all three plans will receive property tax funding based on the division of tax process only.

	Maximum Indebtedness		
	Columbia Cascades Plan	Waterfront Plan	Heights Plan
Authorized Maximum Indebtedness	19,298,192	5,750,000	8,495,650
Indebtedness Incurred Through 2019/20	14,599,280	3,318,565	331,981
Remaining Available Indebtedness	4,698,912	2,431,435	8,163,669

Narrative Report on Last Year's Activities and Next Year's Planned Activities

FY 2019/20

In FY 2019/20, the Agency received just under \$2.1 million in property taxes that, along with existing reserves, were used to repay debt from prior agency projects and continue current projects. Actual results for FY 2019/20 were as follows:

	General Fund	Columbia Cascades Plan	Waterfront Plan	Heights Plan
Resources				
Beginning Fund Balance	61,113	2,901,803	503,479	627,448
Tax Increment Revenues	-	1,179,108	696,783	218,303
Transfers In	6,000	-	-	-
Other	1,239	92,047	16,622	14,909
Total Resources	68,352	4,172,958	1,216,884	860,660
Requirements				
Materials & Services	8,794	55,753	301,538	95,255
Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-
Debt Service	-	-	115,785	-
Transfers Out	-	2,000	2,000	2,000
Total Requirements	8,794	57,753	419,323	97,255
Ending Fund Balance	59,558	4,115,205	797,561	763,405

FY 2020/21

In FY 2020/21, the Agency suspended division of tax across all three districts to assist overlapping districts during the COVID-19 pandemic. The Urban Renewal Agency will not receive any current taxes in FY2020/21 and estimates to receive approximately \$32,985 in property taxes attributable to prior years. The Waterfront URA will continue repaying a \$469,000 loan for odor control improvements to the Wastewater Treatment Plant and \$395,000 loan for the Nichols Basin Passive Park. The Heights District will continue work on an implementation plan for community project priorities identified in a series of community meetings and events in 2017 and 2018. The Columbia Cascade Plan is nearing the end of its expected lifespan. The district's tax increment may be returned to the tax rolls in FY2021/22. In the interim, district funds are being held for infrastructure investments.

The budget for FY 2019/20 includes the following:

	General Fund	Columbia Cascades Plan	Waterfront Plan	Heights Plan
Resources				
Beginning Fund Balance	58,905	4,203,015	866,750	725,684
Tax Increment Revenues	-	21,625	8,375	2,985
Transfers In	-	-	-	-
Other	802	88,224	5,208	7,725
Total Resources	59,707	4,312,864	880,333	736,394
Requirements				
Materials & Services	11,900	3,688,000	82,000	453,000
Capital Outlay	-	-	450,000	-
Debt Service	-	-	194,543	-
Transfers Out	-	-	2,000	-
Contingency	4,500	45,000	85,000	85,000
Total Requirements	16,400	3,733,000	813,543	538,000
Unappr. Ending Fund Balance	43,307	579,864	66,790	198,394

Division of Tax Process

The division of taxes process results in some property taxes that would have been received by the taxing districts that levy property taxes within the urban renewal area (for example, Hood River County or the City of Hood River) being paid over to the Agency instead. The taxing districts “forego” a share of the property tax income during the life of an urban renewal plan so that the urban renewal agencies can carry out activities that increase future property values.

The table below shows the property taxes raised in FY 2019/20 for the Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Hood River from the permanent rate levies of each of the taxing districts that levies property taxes within the urban renewal area.

	Billing Rate per \$1,000	Incremental Assessed Value	Division of Tax for Urban Renewal
Hood River County	\$ 1.41710	\$ 194,807,312	\$ 276,061
911 Communications District	0.56440	194,807,312	109,949
City of Hood River	2.81120	194,807,312	547,642
Port of Hood River	0.03320	194,807,312	6,468
Hood River Parks & Recreation District	0.34980	194,807,312	68,144
Hood River County Transit District	0.07230	194,807,312	14,085
Hood River County Library District	0.39000	194,807,312	75,975
Columbia Gorge Community College	0.27030	194,807,312	52,656
Columbia Gorge Educational School District	0.46780	194,807,312	91,131
Hood River County School District	4.81190	194,807,312	937,393
Total			\$ 2,179,504

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET

Meeting Date: February 8, 2021

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

From: Will Norris, Finance Dir. / Asst. City Manager

Subject: 2nd Quarter Financial Performance Report

Background:

The 2nd Quarter (Q2) Financial Report includes six months of financial data through one half of the 2020-21 Fiscal Year (FY). The attached report includes full-year estimates-to-close based on historical spending patterns and staff knowledge of upcoming expenditures. The attached projections are staff's best projections given financial data through December 31, 2020. The Q2 revenue and expenditure projections become the basis for constructing the FY2021-22 budget.

Discussion:

Yearend estimates-to-close become significantly firmer as the City passes the half-way mark of the fiscal year. As expected in this extraordinary global pandemic, individual revenue and expenditure sources have been challenging to predict. Thankfully changes have largely offset each other, and the City's overall financial picture is not substantially altered from the Q1 Report provided to City Council last Fall.

The net change between the ending fund balance estimates in the Q1 and Q2 Report is a downward revision of \$119,214 to \$2,465,812. After extracting one-time revenue sources and expenditures, the General Fund operating deficit is estimated at \$350,000 or 3.7%. This deficit is minimal given the global pandemic. Put into context, accumulated General Fund resources could maintain a deficit of this magnitude for 7-years. The takeaway is that the City continues to have time for the revenue environment to stabilize before initiating significant operational changes.

Individual items to note in the attached Q2 Financial Performance Report include:

Property Tax Exceeding Expectations – The Q2 Report benefits from November tax receipts. The City receives 90%-92% of total property tax receipts in November and December. Trends indicate that property taxes will come in roughly \$80,000 or 2.5% over budget. Approximately \$265 thousand of the \$3.1 Million in expected FY2020-21 property tax is attributable to the onetime “pause” in Heights and Waterfront Urban Renewal division of tax. This pause in urban renewal tax division which will not continue into FY2021-22

One-time Payments

FY2020-21 includes several one-time expenses to reduce ongoing liabilities. The largest is a \$1.64 million deposit into a PERS Side Account that drew an additional

\$410 Thousand in state matching funds. The General Fund's fair proportion of this deposit is \$736,601 as shown in the attached report. This investment will generate "rate credits" resulting in lower future PERS charges. The PERS Fund earned 7.66% in 2020. This compares to the 0.75% the City is earning on funds held in the Oregon Treasury's short-term bond fund.

Lodging, Parking, and Municipal Court Revenues Continue to Lag – Lodging taxes have recovered significantly from Spring lows but remained about 25% below normal in November and December. Parking and Municipal Court revenues are recovering even more sluggishly. Parking meter receipts remain stubbornly low at roughly 45% below normal.

Ambulance Revenues Exceeding Budget – A grim outcome from the COVID-19 pandemic is a bump in ambulance revenues from increased interfacility transports. Based solely on trend, ambulance revenues are on track to exceed \$1 Million. The Q2 Report anticipates ambulance revenues to slow as the vaccine is administered and case counts decline going into the summer months.

State Marijuana Taxes Diverted – The drug decriminalization voter initiative approved on the November ballot diverts the majority of state marijuana tax revenues for regional drug treatment facilities. The League of Oregon Cities estimates that cities will experience a 73% reduction in ongoing state marijuana tax distributions. This change does not impact local marijuana taxes.

Engineering Department Exceeding Budget – The general engineering department primarily serves development, either reviewing proposals or writing standards. Because of this, expenditures are driven largely by the pace of development. The department spent 89% of its full-year budget in the first half of FY2020-21 and is expected to need a budget adjustment before yearend. The new development review contract awarded by City Council on December 14th, 2020, and decision to bring the City Engineer position in-house is intended to better control Engineering Department costs going forward.

Gas Taxes Improving – Both state and local gas taxes are recovering, reaching pre-pandemic levels for the month of December. This resulted in an upward revision to yearend estimates as compared to the Q1 Report. However, both tax sources will end the year down due to lost revenue from the summer months.

Staff Recommendation:

Receive and file quarterly financial report for the period ending December 31, 2020.

Attachments

Quarterly Financial Report for the period ending December 31, 2020

GENERAL FUND REVENUE SUMMARY, Through December (50% of Fiscal Year)							
Resources	Budget	Actual Through Dec. 2020	Year End Estimate	Year End Estimate Over / (Under) Budget	Percent of Budget Received thru Dec. 2020	Fiscal Year 2019-20	
						Revenue thru Dec. 2019	Year-End Actual
Taxes							
Current Property Tax	3,062,665	2,846,398	3,141,717	79,052	93%	2,184,249	2,399,334
Previously Levied Tax	44,453	59,274	77,154	32,701	133%	55,582	74,312
Transient Room Tax	1,269,563	677,164	1,272,182	2,619	53%	865,771	1,225,526
Local Marijuana Tax	135,481	43,702	133,787	(1,694)	32%	37,022	109,606
CET - Admin	10,500	1,418	2,296	(8,204)	14%	5,173	8,377
Licenses & Permits							
Franchise Fees	791,843	250,457	740,540	(51,303)	32%	274,025	777,172
Utility Fees	614,690	321,477	619,523	4,833	52%	315,288	601,771
Parking Meter Receipts	572,050	215,271	390,644	(181,406)	38%	356,691	533,758
All Other	140,238	63,489	110,957	(29,281)	45%	76,457	121,723
Fines & Forfeitures							
Parking Fines	162,108	80,111	137,866	(24,242)	49%	126,777	169,597
Municipal Court Revenue	252,975	86,330	140,023	(112,952)	34%	172,919	227,922
All Other	32,000	12,224	24,348	(7,652)	38%	12,032	24,844
Intergovernmental							
Fed. COVID19 Relief	-	202,241	202,241	202,241		-	97,392
All Other	341,211	145,413	315,067	(26,144)	43%	-	331,506
Charges for Services							
Ambulance Revenues	822,186	507,233	958,300	136,114	62%	493,095	856,369
GEMT	57,484	83,016	129,713	72,229		57,990	57,419
All Other	197,343	114,810	205,163	7,820	58%	139,142	211,985
Interest Earnings	81,681	14,530	30,296	(51,385)	18%	48,721	89,819
Misc. Revenues	111,410	96,900	117,192	5,782	87%	94,286	119,491
REVENUE TOTAL	8,699,881	5,821,457	8,749,008	49,127	67%	5,315,219	8,037,922

GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURE SUMMARY, through December (50% of Fiscal Year)							
Department	Budget	Actual Through Dec. 2020	Year End Estimate	Year End Estimate Over / (Under) Budget	Percent of Budget Expended thru Dec. 2020	Fiscal Year 2019-20	
						Expenses thru Dec. 2019	Year-End Actual
Fire / EMS	3,926,354	2,006,043	3,882,224	(44,130)	51%	1,856,063	3,657,674
Police	2,693,486	1,272,877	2,447,211	(246,275)	47%	1,284,280	2,439,863
Parks	584,489	226,827	524,000	(60,489)	39%	243,339	460,663
Planning	651,888	266,112	609,323	(42,565)	41%	256,428	531,337
Parking	533,013	240,885	496,080	(36,933)	45%	214,903	411,976
Engineering	166,676	148,193	298,353	131,677	89%	119,976	345,819
Municipal Court	142,872	61,369	130,082	(12,790)	43%	66,114	131,982
City Council	24,745	4,448	9,423	(15,322)	18%	5,261	9,836
<i>Sub-total Department Expenditures</i>	<i>8,723,523</i>	<i>4,226,754</i>	<i>8,396,696</i>	<i>(326,827)</i>	<i>48%</i>	<i>4,046,365</i>	<i>7,989,151</i>
Non-Departmental							
Personnel	-	982	1,964	1,964		-	1,169
Materials & Services	470,850	290,836	337,411	(133,439)	62%	136,485	277,186
Contingency	243,000	-	55,000	(188,000)	0%	-	-
One-time FY2020-21 Transactions							
PERS Side Account Deposit	754,595	736,601	736,601	(17,994)	98%	-	-
Fire/EMS Comp. Absences	300,000	-	300,000	-	0%	-	-
TOTAL	10,491,968	5,255,173	9,827,672	(664,296)	50%	4,182,850	8,267,505

FY2020/21 Beginning Bal.	3,544,477
Proj. FY2020/21 Change in Fund Bal.	(1,078,664)
Proj. FY2020/21 Ending Bal.	2,465,812

Pooled Cash & Investments (All Funds, Including URA)	
Dec. 2019	29,190,342
Dec. 2020	26,485,524

OTHER MAJOR REVENUE SOURCES SUMMARY, through December (50% of Fiscal Year)							
Revenue	Budget	Actual Through Dec. 2020	Year End Estimate	Year End Estimate Over / (Under) Budget	Percent of Budget Received thru Dec. 2020	Fiscal Year 2019-20	
						Revenues thru Dec. 2019	Year-End Actual
Gas Tax - Local	371,761	157,365	330,835	(40,926)	42%	171,075	345,955
Gas Tax - State	655,597	240,030	551,798	(103,799)	37%	295,527	609,535
Utility Charges							
Water	2,895,169	1,594,487	2,928,320	33,151	55%	1,530,245	2,775,020
Sewer	4,226,385	2,117,768	4,173,592	(52,793)	50%	2,070,926	4,021,543
Storm	562,070	282,574	562,903	833	50%	274,423	546,096

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET

Meeting Date: February 8th, 2021
To: Honorable Mayor and City Council
From: Dustin Nilsen, Director of Planning
Subject: Landmarks Board Member Reappointment

Background:

The terms for Landmarks Board members Cindy Walbridge and Scott Sorensen will be completed this spring. Both Members have expressed interest to be reappointed to another three-year term, which would end in April 2024.

These positions are advertised under an open call for applications on the City's website along with another Landmark Board position vacancy which has remained unfilled since 2018. No candidates have applied to fill the vacancy and staff supports the reappointment of the current sitting members.

The 2011 Council Rules of Procedure authorize the Mayor to reappoint a Landmarks Board member with the consent of the Council.

10.3 Filling Vacancies on Other Committees.

a. Except as provided in Section 10.2 and except as may otherwise be provided by the Council when establishing other committees, the Mayor will appoint the members of Council to committees with the consent of Council. The Mayor may request assistance or recommendations from Councilors in making appointment recommendations.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends the reappointments of Cindy Walbridge and Scott Sorensen to the Landmarks Review Board.

Suggested Motion:

Move to request the Mayor reappoint Cindy Walbridge and Scott Sorensen to the Landmarks Board for 3-year terms.

Alternatives:

Re-advertise the position along with the current vacancy that has remained unfilled since 2018.