



SCAPPOOSE *Oregon*

MONDAY, MARCH 15, 2021

INTERVIEWS FOR THE GRABHORN PARK AD HOC COMMITTEE, 6:00 PM

CITY COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA REGULAR MEETING TO FOLLOW INTERVIEWS

ITEM AGENDA TOPIC

Action

Call to Order

Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call

Approval of the Agenda

Public Comments Due to COVID19 the City of Scappoose will be accepting public comments by email or you may call in. Please contact City Recorder Susan Reeves at sreeves@cityofscappoose.org or by phone at 503-543-7146, for more information. All written public comments will need to be received no later than 5:00 pm on the day of the meeting. We appreciate your understanding with this matter. Thank you!

1. Consent Agenda ~ March 1, 2021 Interviews and March 1, 2021 City Council meeting minutes

Old Business

2. Pool Cost Public Outreach Campaign ~ Survey Draft Update

Staff: Interim City Manager Alexandra Rains, Program Analyst Huell White, and Program Analyst Intern Isaac Butman

New Business

3. Waste Management Composting Rates

Approval

Dean Kampf, Waste Management

4. Res No. 21-03: A Resolution Establishing Fees for Street Renaming Applications

Staff: City Planner Laurie Oliver Joseph

Public Hearing/Approval

5. Purchase of Public Works Vehicles

Approval

Staff: Public Works Director Dave Sukau

WORK SESSION

6. Discussion on Road Projects

Staff: Public Works Director Dave Sukau

Announcements ~ information only

7. Calendar

City Manager, Police Chief, Councilors, and Mayor

Executive Session ~ ORS 192.660 (2) (a) Employment of Manager or Attorney

Open Session

Adjournment **PLEASE NOTE: IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK WITH CITY STAFF ABOUT A PARTICULAR AGENDA ITEM, PLEASE CALL CITY RECORDER SUSAN REEVES 503-543-7146, EXT. 224, NO LATER THAN 3:00 P.M. ON MONDAY, MARCH 15, 2021**

This meeting will be conducted in a handicap accessible room. If special accommodations are needed, please contact City Recorder, Susan Reeves at (503) 543-7146, ext. 224 in advance.

TTY 1-503-378-5938

MONDAY, MARCH 1, 2021
REVIEW OF THE GRABHORN PARK AD HOC COMMITTEE, 6:00 PM

Mayor Burge called the work session to order at 6:02 p.m.

Present: Mayor Scott Burge, Council President Megan Greisen, Councilor Joel Haugen, Councilor Josh Poling, Councilor Brandon Lesowske, Councilor Pete McHugh, Councilor Tyler Miller, City Recorder Susan Reeves, City Planner Laurie Oliver Joseph, Program Analyst Huell White, and Legal Counsel Peter Watts.

Remote: Interim City Manager Alexandra Rains and Program Analyst Intern Isaac Butman.

Interim City Manager Rains explained in front of Council this evening are the applications that have been received for the Grabhorn Park ad hoc committee for your review and discussion. She explained if there are some that Council would like to interview staff will schedule those for March 15, 2021.

Mayor Burge explained he has separated the applications out in the different categories. He stated it is great the number of applications and new people with great ideas, as well as representatives from the DOG Park, softball and soccer organizations applying.

Councilor Haugen explained one person doesn't qualify because they reside outside the City.

Councilor Lesowske stated he would like to recommend that this is an opportunity to get new community members to be engaged within the community's outreach process so if there are applicants that hold other appointed positions from a different committee that maybe we provide the opportunity to others who aren't currently participating to be considered in those positions.

Council President Greisen explained she is under the impression that whether you applied or are just an interested community member, you are still allowed to attend the ad hoc meetings. She explained Council is just whittling it down to the voting members, and everybody's opinion is valued and welcomed, and we want them to be a part of this process.

Program Analyst Huell White explained we will have the meetings recorded and posted on the City's website, as well as the City's YouTube page following the meetings.

Mayor Burge explained he will appoint Jim Lykins as the Dog Park representative, Rocky Schwalge as the representative for Soccer Club, and Nicole Ferreira as the representative for Scappoose Bay Watershed.

Council reviewed the applications and would like to interview Monica Ahlers, Brenda Hodges, Brian Hoag, Anne Marie Milicich, Kevin Chavez, and Paul Liner.

Mayor Burge explained the interviews will be on March 15, 2021, starting at 6:00 p.m.

City Recorder Reeves will get ahold of the applicants and set up the interviews.

Council discussed the questions to be asked at the interviews.

Councilor Lesowske explained one of the biggest challenges he thinks is finding consensus in any project that we try to complete. He stated bringing this group of stakeholders and ad hoc committee members together, he just wants to focus on the potential outcome being something that brings us closer together rather than potential roadblocks or personal opinions that holds this process up. He does believe in open dialog and he wants a healthy debate to take place between these people when they see there is a difference, but he always wants it to be productive because he does feel as though this is something that we as a Council need to deliver on. He wants to ensure that they have that guidance and support to work through this process because it will be a task and he wants to see that we are effective in trying to do the engagement that we seek to accomplish.

Councilor Haugen stated he feels really comfortable with this because Huell and Isaac have done a really good job of creating this context as we go forward.

Councilor McHugh talked about the 100-year celebration and having a grand marshal for the parade.

Councilor Haugen suggested having two grand marshals.

Mayor Burge stated at some point they need to trust the 100-year committee. He stated if the committee feels it is a good pick, he supports the committee.

Adjournment

Mayor Burge adjourned the work session at 6:46 p.m.

Mayor Scott Burge

Attest:

City Recorder Susan M. Reeves, MMC

**MONDAY, MARCH 1, 2021
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
Regular meeting 7:00 p.m.**

Call to Order

Mayor Burge called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call

Scott Burge	Mayor	Norm Miller	Police Chief
Megan Greisen	Council President	Susan Reeves	City Recorder
Joel Haugen	Councilor	Laurie Oliver Joseph	City Planner
Josh Poling	Councilor	Huell White	Program Analyst
Brandon Lesowske	Councilor		
Pete McHugh	Councilor		
Tyler Miller	Councilor		

Legal Counsel Peter Watts

Press: none

Remote: Interim City Manager Alexandra Rains and Program Analyst Intern Isaac Butman.

Approval of the Agenda

Councilor Haugen moved, and Councilor Poling seconded the motion to approve the agenda. Motion passed (7-0). Mayor Burge, aye; Council President Greisen, aye; Councilor Haugen, aye, Councilor Poling, aye; Councilor Lesowske, aye; Councilor McHugh, aye and Councilor Miller, aye.

Public Comments

There were no public comments received.

Consent Agenda ~ February 16, 2021 Work Session minutes and February 16, 2021 City Council meeting minutes

Councilor Haugen moved, and Councilor Lesowske seconded the motion to approve the Consent Agenda ~ February 16, 2021 Work Session minutes and February 16, 2021 City Council meeting minutes. Motion passed (7-0). Mayor Burge, aye; Council President Greisen, aye; Councilor Haugen, aye, Councilor Poling, aye; Councilor Lesowske, aye; Councilor McHugh, aye and Councilor Miller, aye.

Old Business

Ordinance No. 896: An Ordinance Amending Scappoose Municipal Code Title 12, Adding Chapter 12.24 Street Renaming

Mayor Burge explained this is on second reading. He read the title for a second time ~ Ordinance No. 896: An Ordinance Amending Scappoose Municipal Code Title 12, Adding Chapter 12.24 Street Renaming. He asked City Planner Laurie Oliver Joseph if she has anything to add.

City Planner Laurie Oliver Joseph replied she does not.

Mayor Burge asked if there was any discussion by Council, seeing none he asked for a vote.

Motion passed (5-2). Council President Greisen, aye; Councilor Haugen, aye, Councilor Poling, aye; Councilor Lesowske, aye, and Councilor Miller, aye. Mayor Burge, nay, and Councilor McHugh, nay.

Councilor McHugh stated he does appreciate everyone's work on that, and he know it's a lot of work to do what they did.

Mayor Burge explained he just kind of agreed with Councilor McHugh, he made very good arguments.

City Planner Laurie Oliver Joseph replied thank you. She did just have one quick comment not in relation to the code itself, but we did propose setting the fee, this was included in your packet last time it also is on page 29 in this packet. She explained really what we were going for is cost recovery of staff time and that's what the proposed fee is based on. She explained there is a breakout of the explanation for that. She stated her question then for Council tonight is, did you want to have a discussion during the next meeting about that or did you want her to just bring the fee resolution and be ready to adopt?

Mayor Burge replied there will be discussion during the adoption of the resolution and he is fine with it being brought to Council at the next meeting.

New Business

2021-2022 Council Goals

Interim City Manager Alexandra Rains went over the staff report. The staff report explains on Saturday, February 6th, 2021, City Council held a Goal Setting Session to develop Annual Goals for the 2021-2022 Fiscal Year. In advance of this meeting, City Staff provided Council with copies of the annual goal lists from the Parks and Recreation Committee, Economic Development Committee and City Staff, as well as the results of the Annual Town Meeting Survey. During the session, each Councilor was given the opportunity to propose new goals for the upcoming Fiscal Year and was then asked to help refine the combined list by voting for a maximum of six (6) goals. The refined list of new goals is included below.

Goals receiving two (2) or more votes. These have been added to the draft 2021-2022 Goal List:

- Sidewalk Plan
- Annual One-on-One meetings with neighboring local leaders – School District, County, Fire, Port, OMIC, Senior Center, 911 District

- Complete an Operational Needs Analysis for the Police Department
- Support Trail to Tillamook Project
- Community Pool – determine construction and operation and maintenance costs
- Identify Park Property on the East/South side of the City
- Continue Communication Outreach – focus on additional transparency and use of social media
- Design Downtown Revitalization Program

Goals receiving only one (1) vote. These have not been added to the list but are provided here for discussion, along with some applicable notes from Staff:

- Update security system for Water Treatment Plant
 - o Currently underway in FY 20-21
- Work with 911 to assist with radio coverage issues
 - o Could be addressed as part of the Annual One-on-One meetings with neighboring local leaders
- Invest more in the Senior Center (\$10K per year)
 - o Could be addressed through the City's Community Enhancement Program
- Move marketing and branding to short term goal list
 - o Could be completed after the development of a Downtown Revitalization Program as this process may help define the City's "brand"
- Purchase/Commission piece of art for the 100 year event
- Partner with local university to study tree canopy
 - o Could be part/subtask of 50-Year Visioning Process
- Support for local restaurants, grants & information
- Re-review food cart ordinance
- Review Development Code
 - o Review of several Development Code Chapters is included as part of the 50-Year Visioning Process
- Council to review chapters of SMC
- Alternative Financing for the City
- Increase support for the SBWC

ATTACHMENTS:

- Attachment A – Draft 2021-2022 Council Goals, Original Format (Format A) **This version reflects the same format and organization as past years and includes the approximate year each goal was added to the list
- Attachment B – Draft 2021-2022 Council Goals, Modified Format (Format B) **This version includes the same content, including the approximate year each goal was added, but has been re-organized. It features a section for both Ongoing Goals, those that Council intends to continue indefinitely, and Long Term Goals, those Council has identified for completion in future years
- Attachment C – Color coded version of the 2021-2022 Council Goals **This version highlights the formatting changes between versions A and B.

Mayor Burge asked Council if they have any questions?

Council President Greisen explained, in regards to the format, she is in favor of attachment B, she likes the modified format versus the original.

Councilor Haugen stated he is fine either way, but he does like the original.

Mayor Burge stated he does like attachment B.

Councilor Poling stated he also likes attachment B.

Council President Greisen acknowledged Interim City Manager Rains for her time and energy she put into this to make it so clear for Council, in addition to acknowledging everyone's input, even though it didn't make the highest sticker count.

Councilor Lesowske moved, and Councilor Miller seconded the motion that Council that Council adopt the 2021-2022 Council Goals as presented in format B. Motion passed (7-0). Mayor Burge, aye; Council President Greisen, aye; Councilor Haugen, aye, Councilor Poling, aye; Councilor Lesowske, aye; Councilor McHugh, aye and Councilor Miller, aye.

Resolution No. 21-02: A Resolution Approving the Establishment of a Temporary Permit to Allow Outdoor Seating/Displays for Businesses Affected by the COVID-19 Emergency

City Planner Laurie Oliver Joseph went over the staff report. She explained the City was recently contacted by a local restaurant owner with a request to set up a temporary tented and heated outdoor seating area. Since outdoor seating is listed as a conditional use in the Scappoose Development Code and it would take time and money to process a conditional use application, staff considered what options were available to quickly respond to the restaurant owner's request. The State of Oregon has issued orders that restrict the seating at bars, restaurants and other eating establishments in an effort to reduce the spread of Covid-19. Currently, these businesses may allow seating indoors at a reduced capacity; however, based on the number of new Covid cases/risk level, that is subject to change when Columbia County is reviewed again by the Oregon Health Authority (occurs every two weeks). City staff have reviewed the approach of other municipalities to allowing temporary outdoor seating areas with tents and, as a result, drafted the attached Temporary Outdoor Dining/Display Permit (Exhibit 1 in packet), modeled after Bend, Oregon's policy. The proposed permit would allow a business to have an outdoor tented area for either seating or display of merchandise so that proper space between patrons can be achieved and so that when indoor seating is not allowed based on the County's risk level, businesses can still operate and sell merchandise or food and drinks. The Temporary Outdoor Dining/Display Permit is intended to be in effect as long as the City's emergency declaration related to Covid-19 is in force. When the emergency declaration has ended, the City would notify all businesses who have been issued the temporary permit letting them know that they have 5 days to return the outdoor tented area to its previous condition. City staff did not include the right of way as a permissible location for the temporary tents as some cities have done. The reason for this is that unlike in some other cities, the City of Scappoose development code requires that adequate on-site parking be provided for each use/business, meaning that in most

cases, there is ample space to set up a tented area within a privately owned lot rather than having to resort to using the street right of way. Businesses would then utilize on-street parking while the parking lot is temporarily being used for the tented seating area. In a situation where it did make sense to allow the use of the right of way for tents/outdoor seating because there is not adequate space on-site, an owner could apply directly to Council for use of the right of way, as specified in SMC 12.08 – Obstruction of Streets, Alleys and Public Places. The Temporary Outdoor Dining/Display Permit has been coordinated between the Community Development Center, Public Works Department, Police Department, and the Fire District. The Fire Code governs the requirements for temporary structures¹ including the types of tents that many restaurants have utilized during the Covid-19 pandemic to allow outdoor seating. For this reason, staff have included a check box whereby City staff can verify that the Fire District has issued their own permit and completed the required tent inspection prior to the City granting the Temporary Outdoor Dining/Display Permit. The Temporary Outdoor Dining/Display Permit does not have a fee associated with it. The City would incur the cost of staff time to process the permit, which is an unknown amount at this time.

Councilor Miller stated he sees that it is required for Scappoose Fire to do an inspection. He asked if they have a form? He stated he doesn't see any note to the application that proof of inspection has to be submitted with the actual application.

City Planner Laurie Oliver Joseph replied she did work with Chief Pricher regarding this and he is developing a permit. She explained the check box that she added to the form makes staff check with the Fire District to make sure they have signed off on this. She explained our permits are separate and different, but we just want to cross check to make sure the other person has already done that check.

Mayor Burge stated hopefully we can get this out of the code, it bothers him that it is in there and to him it doesn't make any sense.

City Planner Laurie Oliver Joseph replied it doesn't make any sense and she is very comfortable writing findings to support that use in the meantime.

Councilor Poling moved, and Council President Greisen seconded the motion that Council adopt Resolution No. 21-02: A Resolution Approving the Establishment of a Temporary Permit to Allow Outdoor Seating/Displays for Businesses Affected by the COVID-19 Emergency. Motion passed (7-0). Mayor Burge, aye; Council President Greisen, aye; Councilor Haugen, aye, Councilor Poling, aye; Councilor Lesowske, aye; Councilor McHugh, aye and Councilor Miller, aye.

Pool Cost Public Outreach Campaign

Interim City Manager Alexandra Rains explained you will see in your packet this evening we have included several items for your review.

Program Analyst Huell White explained the survey development and how staff got there. He explained as far as funding mechanisms are concerned, there are two different categories here, there is construction and then there's operation and maintenance. He explained they require different funding mechanisms as far as the ballot is concerned, they are different types of funding mechanisms that require different types of approval. He explained the construction obviously is only one part of the question here and you'll notice that there's quite a large range for costs. He explained on the low end that construction cost is about \$1,000,000, that's very close to the estimate that came in for the pool that was part of the original Grabhorn conceptual plan 10% engineering documents. He explained then on the high end we had estimated \$10,000,000 for an indoor pool. He explained City Attorney Peter Watts had mentioned he has seen \$15,000,000 for a somewhat similar project that's happening out in Eastern Oregon. He explained there's quite a range there depending on a variety of factors, whether that be site constraints or specific context to the site, the design of the facility, the size of facility. He explained switching over to the operation and maintenance costs and if you have any specific questions about the math, Isaac is available to answer those questions, but we determined that \$500,000 in operating costs was a pretty comfortable number based on the pool research that Isaac did, which is attached, and titled "staff research on pool costs in Oregon". He explained in terms of the construction costs those could be funded through a general obligation bond. He explained the general obligation bonds are debt that is incurred by the City, but they must be approved by the voters. He explained that bonded debt could have different terms, typically there 10, 20 or 30 years with lower terms on lower amounts of debt and higher terms on higher amounts of debt but they are paid back through property taxes. He explained for operation those would be funded by a local option levy, more specifically an operating levy. He explained operating levies in the State of Oregon for operations and maintenance specifically and they must be renewed every five years. He stated that's something to keep in mind in terms of a hypothetical pool in the future, constructing it is only half of the story here. He stated once a facility is constructed, you have to continue funding the operation and maintenance for that facility and it raises the question of every five years returning to the voters and asking if they'd be willing to reauthorize an operating levy on their property taxes to pay for the facility. He explained in terms of the survey, to put it bluntly, this is a very complex topic to try to describe in a one-page survey whether this be to folks that work in in this profession or to the layperson who doesn't know what assessed value is or property tax compression or general obligation bonds. Staff is specifically seeking Councils feedback on the draft survey to make sure that this is something that's comprehensible to the general public, but also conveys the information that we need to convey.

Councilor Miller stated he thinks the draft survey is actually written very well; he thinks staff did a really good job on it. He stated the only thing that I noticed is that in paragraph 3 first sentence, he would just encourage maybe some rewording of that because it says City Council will use this information to decide if a pool will be built. He stated we are using the information to decide if we're going to proceed with putting something on the ballot.

Legal Counsel Peter Watts stated we have the \$1,000,000 estimate for the outdoor pool, and he thinks what we've compared that to is the Carlton pool, so we're not talking about a 25-meter X 25-meter pool - which he thinks is everyone's expectations. He stated as far as he can tell from his research, a 25-meter X 25-meter pool as well as a deck, you would probably need bathrooms as well for the lifeguards, is really going to be just a bare bones minimum \$2,600,000 and they

actually are coming closer to \$5,000,000. He stated if we're talking about a comp between the indoor pool and the outdoor pool where we're probably looking at \$5,000,000 to \$10,000,000. He explained \$1,000,000 would get us a pool and a deck and a fence and lifeguards needing to leave the complex and use restrooms in other portions of the park, same thing for the patrons. He explained in his mind, it's probably not the outcome that people have in mind, so he suggested despite the earlier estimate of about \$1,000,000 if that's not realistic and Carlton paid \$1,500,000 to rebuild theirs, he suggests we move that number to where we would actually be able to do the project because the goal is for the public to be as fully and accurately informed as possible. He stated to build the pool and to fund its operations would require two separate votes, as staff has indicated, one for the general obligation bond and the other for the five-year operating levy. He stated the only other way that this could be done would be through formation of a parks or another special district that had a permanent levy rate. He explained there would be a series of things we need to do to form that district and there would have to be a public vote to fund that operating levy. He stated if a pool is to be built there is going to be one or more votes on this that would need to take place. He stated as far as the sentence of paragraph three, you could say City Council uses information to decide whether there is enough community support to ask voters for authorization. He thinks that the \$8,852.89 is a little bit confusing and he would recommend striking that. He thinks he would just have the next sentence state, "the privately funded pool donations totaling \$48,330.62 will remain set aside for an aquatics related amenity regardless of the City Council decision", and that's because we would absolutely need to go to the Attorney General's Charitable Division in order to get authorization to spend that. He stated it might be able to be spent on like a splash pad or some other amenity that has water and cools people down during the summer. He explained we would just need to get their sign off in order to authorize it, which is why he uses the term "water related amenity". He thinks this is a very complex topic, but he thinks that this survey is distilled down to a point where the average voter is going to understand it and understand how it impacts them. He explained there was a little discussion about whether to try and explain assessed value versus real market value and the amount of time that it takes in order to do that explanation just makes it less likely that someone's going to be able to get through this, so his recommendation was that we not do that. He stated those are big numbers and we can have the compression discussion later. He stated if these were to go on the ballot and they were to pass, we likely wouldn't compress but it would absolutely impact other special districts and others ability to go out and get their own operating levies and so we would want to closely coordinate with them in advance. He stated his guess is this could really impact the School District for a future ask. He stated the Fire Department has already indicated they want to go out, as well as our ability to go out for a levy for parks or for law enforcement or for any of the other things that might be a community priority (more so than a pool). He stated so it's just helping people understand that this does have future impacts if we do it.

Mayor Burge explained when the Parks District put out the pool on the ballot for \$10,000,000 with operating costs, it lost 75/25.

Councilor Haugen stated the bottom line here is we want to find out the level of support of the community willing to pay \$300 a year for their outdoor pool or \$700 a year for an indoor pool, at a minimum. He stated he wouldn't worry about compression at this point, because you want to make it as simple as possible, because you want to get that cross-section demographic to determine what is the level of community support and are they willing to shell the money out or

not, that is the bottom line. He stated if we lose that in translation then we are spinning our wheels.

Mayor Burge stated he thinks \$1,000,000 is way too low and he thinks that we should go with 25-meter X 25-meter, padded, and something that we would actually build, not somebody's backyard pool with a fence around it.

Councilor McHugh stated he would just like to say that he'd be surprised if we could build one for \$1,000,000. He stated he thinks what is before them is really good, but when you look at it there's just too many words and nothing stands out and not everybody is going to read all that. His suggestion is to state in summary, the net effect to the taxpayer is....., so that stands out.

Isaac Butman stated he wanted to make a quick note about special districts. He explained when you form a special district it eats into the base rate for the permanent rate for the other taxing districts. He explained they don't actually generate their own base rate; they pull from the other taxing districts.

Councilor Lesowske stated going back to Councilor Miller's comment about the first sentence of the third paragraph on the survey, it says that Council will use this to information to decide and he thinks that is a little too strong and maybe we would want to suggest that this information will inform Councilor's on our funding options, if we were to move forward with building a pool. He stated, he also does think that all the information is there and it's great and it's very informative in the survey, but he would almost think of it as providing prompts between the questions of the survey that kind of helps them inform their answer because he thinks that it is a little heavy on the front end of the reading. He stated so putting those in between the actual survey questions may support that, but he does think that between Isaac and Huell and other staff that put time in on this, this is exactly the type of information that he needs to make an informed decision. He stated there is some contrast in the information that's been provided for proponents of it and people that feel as though the City can't move forward in funding of this size. He thinks for Council, it gives them a lot of information to digest because there is some emotion here, but he thinks what they need is to know the citizens feelings towards what that funding mechanism would be. He thinks that this will help them in that decision making process.

Mayor Burge stated he thinks on question four we need to rework the construction cost to something that's much more likely to be built as the outdoor pool.

Council discussed the outdoor pool being closer to \$3,500,000.

Councilor Poling stated the \$3,500,000 is a better number and the only other thing he would say is he actually kind of likes the firmer wording to it only because we want people to understand that we are trying to make a decision moving forward and not something we are just continually putting off.

Council President Greisen asked if all of the exhibits are going to be available on the pool tab on the website because some of the summary is important.

Program Analyst Huell White replied yes, the information will be available online.

Councilor Lesowske asked Isaac, in his research, was there any examples of where the bond passed but the operation levy failed so people essentially have an unoccupied facility.

Program Analyst Intern Isaac Butman replied, not specifically, however, as with any operation of a facility through a levy that is always a threat and a concern.

Program Analyst Huell White asked just to confirm, is the \$10,000,000 for an indoor pool okay, or should it be higher?

Mayor Burge replied he thinks that's the cheapest you're going to get.

Councilor Haugen stated he thinks we want to be realistic and bump that up just a bit.

Mayor Burge stated he would increase that to \$11,000,000.

Councilor Miller asked do we need to make any statement about these numbers being just approximate numbers, because as we dive into this it could be a lot more and that could upset some people.

Interim City Manager Alexandra Rains replied, the survey does say it is an estimate, but we could certainly repeat that or and maybe put it in bold or highlight it in some way.

Legal Counsel Peter Watts stated staff could say, “estimates based on recently constructed projects in other jurisdictions”.

Interim City Manager Alexandra Rains stated it sounds like staff is changing the range, \$3,500,000 to \$11,000,000, and stating these are approximate costs based on recently constructed projects in other jurisdictions. She stated she heard different input on the language, Council will decide or that this will guide Councils decision. She asked, is there a consensus on how Council would like to proceed?

Councilor Haugen stated what Councilor Lesowske stated, “inform a decision”, is a good way of saying it, it just softens it.

Interim City Manager Alexandra Rains asked Council if they are comfortable enough to have this going out in the next addition of the newsletter, or do they want to give it some more thought and have staff bring it back to them.

Councilor McHugh would like to have it brought back for Council to look at it again. Mayor Burge stated bring it back at the next meeting.

Announcements ~ information only Calendar

Mayor Burge went over the calendar.

City Manager, Police Chief, Councilors, and Mayor

Interim City Manager Alexandra Rains explained the interior drainage analysis that the SDIC had performed that we had addressed some concerns with, we are currently contracted with West Consulting to take another look at that. She just wanted to let Council know that is still moving forward.

Chief Miller explained staff has confirmed interviews with all nine of the City Manager candidates.

Councilor Miller thanked staff for putting together a great packet.

Council President Greisen thanked Isaac, Huell, and Alex for the quick turnaround on all the pool information. She stated it is just amazing how tight this team is. She thanked Susan for the great communication and organization. She thanked Chief Miller for all his work with the interviews and getting us going with that. She is just really proud of the team we have here.

Councilor Haugen stated, happy March.

Councilor Poling stated staff is doing an amazing job. He thanked Pete and Joel for doing an amazing job with the 100-year celebration.

Councilor Lesowske stated March is Women's History month and so he is hoping we can all take the opportunity to look at all the work and struggles that women have done for us to make our communities better.

Adjournment ~ Mayor Burge adjourned the meeting at 8:24 p.m.

Mayor Scott Burge

Attest:

City Recorder Susan M. Reeves. MMC

CITY OF SCAPPOOSE

Council Action & Status Report

Date Submitted: March 9, 2021

Agenda Date Requested: March 15, 2021

To: Scappoose City Council

From: Alex Rains, Interim City Manager
Huell White, Program Analyst
Isaac Butman, Program Analyst Intern

Subject: Pool Cost Public Outreach Campaign – Survey Draft Update

TYPE OF ACTION REQUESTED:

☐ Resolution

☐ Ordinance

☒ Formal Action

☐ Report Only

ISSUE: At the March 1, 2021 City Council Meeting, Council directed City Staff to update the draft pool cost survey to reflect the format and content changes requested by Council.

ANALYSIS:

Introduction

This report contains a background summary, a detailed explanation of the survey's development, updated pool cost and levy calculations, and an updated outreach timeline.

Exhibit A – Draft Survey Version 2
Exhibit B – Updated Timeline

Draft Survey Updates

During the March 1, 2021 Council meeting, Council expressed concern that the estimated construction cost of the outdoor pool was too low. City legal counsel agreed and cited two examples of public outdoor pools in small Oregon communities that cost between \$2,000,000 and \$5,000,000 to either construct or renovate. As such, Council and the City

Attorney determined that \$3,500,000 would be a more appropriate construction estimate for an outdoor pool. The City Attorney also cautioned the Council that an indoor pool could cost between \$10,000,000 and \$15,000,000. Council asked staff to update the construction cost estimate on the survey to account for an \$11,000,000 construction value.

To reflect the updated construction cost estimates, the following construction bond and operating levy rates are as follows:

Outdoor Pool

- General Obligation Bond Amount: \$3,500,000
- Bond levy rate (10-year amortization): \$0.40 per \$1,000 of assessed value
- Operating levy rate: \$0.69 per \$1,000 of assessed value

Indoor Pool

- General Obligation Bond amount: \$11,000,000
- Bond levy rate (10-year amortization): \$1.34 per \$1,000 of assessed value
- Operating levy rate: \$0.69 per \$1,000 of assessed value

Additionally, staff clarified the language in paragraphs one and three of the draft survey's introduction. Changes or additions were made in grey highlights. Some portions were bolded for emphasis.

Survey Distribution

Survey availability:

- Online via the City website and social media from March/April through July, 2021.
- In paper form May 25, 2021 through July 2021 through the City's June and July newsletter editions.

Survey advertisement:

- On Facebook through scheduled postings for the duration of the survey period.
- Through the newsletter during the duration of the survey period.
- On the website.
- On the City App.

Next Steps – Options for Consideration

1. Approve draft survey as presented
2. Approve draft survey with modifications

Suggested Motion: I move that City Council approve the draft survey and direct staff to release the survey to the public.

DRAFT SURVEY – Version 2 (updates highlighted)

The Scappoose City Council would like your feedback on how to fund the construction and operation of a pool in Scappoose. While all members of City Council would like to see a community pool, the reality is that the City cannot afford to build or operate such an expensive facility with current funding. Based on pools recently built in other Oregon cities, an outdoor pool is *estimated* to cost \$3,500,000. An indoor pool is *estimated* to cost \$11,000,000. Operating a public pool would cost approximately \$500,000 each year.

To build and operate a pool, the City would need voter approval for property tax increases. City staff has worked with the County Assessor to understand how much in additional property taxes Scappoose residents would need to pay to make a pool a reality. Considering the cost to build and operate a pool, City Council wants your feedback on whether or not you are comfortable paying the additional property taxes needed to fund a pool.

City Council will use this information to guide and inform possible pool funding options. **The privately funded pool donations, totaling \$48,330.63, will remain set aside for an aquatics-related amenity, regardless of any decisions made by City Council.**

More information on the Pool Funds and Costs can be found at: *<insert QR-code and hyperlink here>*

This survey does not collect your personal information. Your responses will remain anonymous.

1. Do you live within Scappoose city limits? <Y/N>
2. What is your age range? *<insert list from Annual Town Meeting survey>*
3. Do you have children under the age of 18? <Y/N>
4. To pay for bonds for an approximately **\$3,500,000 outdoor pool**, you would pay additional property taxes of **\$0.40 per \$1,000** of assessed value for construction **and \$0.69 per \$1,000** of assessed value for operation and maintenance. For a home with an assessed value of \$300,000, the annual property tax increase would be **\$327**. Would you be willing to pay the additional property taxes to build and operate an indoor pool? <Y/N>
5. To pay for bonds for an approximately **\$11,00,000 indoor pool**, you would pay additional property taxes of **\$1.34 per \$1,000** of assessed value for construction **and \$0.69 per \$1,000** of assessed value for operation and maintenance. For a home with an assessed value of \$300,000, the annual property tax increase would be **\$609**. Would you be willing to pay the additional property taxes to build and operate an indoor pool? <Y/N>
6. Is there any other feedback that you would like to provide to the City Council?

TIMELINE

Date	Task
March 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City Council Work Session on draft survey and outreach materials. Include pool cost research data from 11/16/2020 Council packet.
March 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City Council reviews draft survey with updates from March 1 Online survey could go live at any point after City Council approves
March / April ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Online survey goes live. First scheduled Facebook page posting.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> April Newsletter arrives in utility customers' mailboxes. Paper survey included in newsletter, also to feature a QR-code that will link directly to the online survey.
April 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May Newsletter submittal deadline.
April 25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May Newsletter arrives in utility customers' mailboxes. Paper survey included in newsletter, also to feature a QR-code that will link directly to the online survey.
May 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> June Newsletter submittal deadline
May 25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Second round of paper survey.
June 25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Survey closes. Staff analyzes response data and prepares report.
July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City Council – GPAHC joint session (pending approval from Council) on survey results.

<i>If Council directs staff to proceed with drafting code amendment:</i>	
August	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff drafts ordinance amendment. Legal counsel reviews draft.
August	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City Council first reading of ordinance amendment. City Council directs staff to make changes or updates, if necessary.
September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City Council second reading and potential approval of ordinance amendment.

CITY OF SCAPPOOSE

Council Action & Status Report

Date Submitted:	March 10, 2021
Agenda Date Requested:	March 15, 2021
To:	Scappoose City Council
From:	Alexandra Rains, Interim City Manager
Subject:	Waste Management Composting Rates

TYPE OF ACTION REQUESTED:

☐ Resolution

☐ Ordinance

☒ Formal Action

☐ Report Only

ANALYSIS: At the City Council meeting on February 1st, 2021, Council renewed Waste Management's Franchise Agreement for another five (5) year period. At that meeting, Council also discussed the possibility of amending the Franchise Agreement to include composting and requested further discussion at a meeting in the near future. This staff report and attachments are the continuation of that discussion.

Attachments have been provided by Waste Management and include the following:

1. Attachment A – Composting Rates
2. Attachment B – Description of Yard Debris and Food Waste Collection Options

FISCAL IMPACT: Please see Attachment A.

OPTIONS AND MOTIONS FOR COUNCIL CONSIDERATION:

1. Direct Staff to prepare an ordinance amendment for the City's Waste Management Franchise agreement to include composting
**I move Council direct City staff to prepare an ordinance amendment for the*

Request for Council Action

Waste Management Franchise agreement to include composting option number _____.

2. Request additional information from Waste Management be presented at the next Council Meeting
**I move Council request additional information from Waste Management to be considered at the next Council Meeting*
3. Take no action
**No motion necessary*

ATTACHMENT A

City of Scappoose - Waste Management Proposal for Yard Debris Service Options

January 1, 2021

Options	1	2	3	4	5
	Subscription YD - Existing 64 Gal carts Yard Debris Only EOW Current Rates	Bundled YD - New 64 Gal Carts Yard Debris Only EOW	Bundled YD - New 64 Gal Carts Yard Debris Only Weekly	Bundled YD - New 64 Gal Carts Yard Debris + Food Waste EOW	Bundled YD - New 64 Gal Carts Yard Debris + Food Waste Weekly
Service Rates					
20 Gallon	\$ 20.46	\$ 28.32	\$ 32.05	\$ 30.03	\$ 34.97
35 Gallon - EOW	\$ 17.51	\$ 25.37	\$ 29.10	\$ 27.08	\$ 32.02
35 Gallon - Weekly	\$ 22.59	\$ 30.45	\$ 34.18	\$ 32.16	\$ 37.10
64 Gallon - Weekly	\$ 32.94	\$ 40.80	\$ 44.53	\$ 42.51	\$ 47.45
96 Gallon - weekly	\$ 42.71	\$ 50.57	\$ 54.30	\$ 52.28	\$ 57.22

64 Gallon - Commingle Recycling - EOW	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included
14 Gallon Bin Glass - EOW	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included
64 Gallon - Yard Debris - Optional (Subscription)	\$ 7.83				
65 Gallon Yard Debris - Included (Bundled)	X	\$ 7.86	\$ 11.59	\$ 9.57	\$ 14.51

Note: Rates are based on disposal and processing charges currently in place.

Terms;

Subscription	Customer has the option to add the service for a fee
Bundled	Service is included with the base fee
YD	Yard Debris - yard trimmings, grass, pruning's, floral
Food Waste	All organic material - Meat, Fish, Chicken, Grains, Cheese, Bakery, and other
EOW	Service frequency - Every other week collection
Weekly	Service frequency - Every week collection

City of Scappoose Yard Debris and Food Waste Collection Options

The City of Scappoose has asked for some enhanced yard debris and food waste collection options to consider. The following information will give a brief description of the five different options to consider;

- 1) Current program - Subscription;** The current yard debris collection program is provided by a subscription-based offering. This means the customer has the choice if they want the added service by signing up for every other week collection of Yard debris with a Waste Management provided 64-gallon roll cart with lid, handle, and wheels. WM has 48.2% of the customers currently signed up for this service. The Yard debris material description includes anything that grew in your yard; weeds, leaves, vines, grass, clippings, house plants, flowers, branches less than 4 inches and shorter than 36 inches in length.
- 2) Yard Debris Collection – Bundled Every Other Week;** this program is provided to all customers and the rate is included in the base service charge. This service is collected every other week with a 64-gallon cart including the same yard debris material as above.
- 3) Yard Debris Collection – Bundled Every Week;** this program is the same as #2 above collected every week.
- 4) Yard Debris plus Food Waste Collection – Bundled Every Other Week;** this program adds food waste to the yard debris. The food waste includes; beans, bones, bread, coffee grounds, dairy, eggshells, fruits, meat, pasta, plate scraps, poultry, rice, grains, seafood, and vegetables. This service is included in the base service charge and collected every other week in a 64-gallon cart.
- 5) Yard Debris plus Food Waste Collection – Bundled Every Week;** this program is the same as #4 above except the yard debris and food waste carts are serviced weekly.

Your Food Scraps make a difference!

Nearly 26 percent of the garbage coming from the City of Scappoose is organic material that can be composted.

Composting food scraps creates a nutrient-rich soil amendment and reduces carbon emissions that occur when food breaks down in the landfill.

Benefits of Composting

A Better Choice: Climate Change Benefits of Recycling & Composting

Composting is an effective way to reduce greenhouse gases.

By composting, the generation of greenhouse gases, particularly methane, is avoided. Backyard composting and well-run industrial compost operations will produce negligible greenhouse gas emissions (mostly from the operation of tractors and other equipment).

Composting also has “upstream” benefits, which further conserve our resources and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

When this compost is used on fields, it displaces synthetic chemical fertilizers. Fertilizer production requires intensive fossil fuel energy and seriously impacts human and environmental health.

By using compost:

- The greenhouse gas emissions related to fertilizer production are avoided.
- There is significant reduction in the use of pesticides (avoiding emissions associated with their production).
- Improves health and workability of soils, resulting in less fuel consumption to till the soil.
- Helps soils hold or sequester carbon dioxide.



In addition to emission reductions, compost replenishes and revitalizes exhausted farm soils by replacing trace minerals and organic material, reduces soil erosion and helps prevent storm water runoff.

Compost is Great for Plants, Lawns, and Gardens

Applying compost to your soil makes for happy plants and a better time tending your garden. Here are some of the reasons why:

Compost

- Increases organic matter in your soil.
- Helps plants absorb nutrients already in your soil and provides some extra nutrients too.
- Makes clay soils airier and helps them drain better.
- Makes clay and other soils more friable, which means they'll be easier to crumble and dig in.
- Helps sandy soils retain water that normally runs through.
- Helps balance the pH of your soil.
- Can extend the growing season by moderating soil temperature.
- Can even help control soil erosion!

Yard Debris & Food Scraps



Yard Debris

Weeds, leaves, vines, grass clippings, house plants, flowers, branches less than 4 inches in diameter and shorter than 36 inches in length



Food scraps

Include all food (beans, bones, bread, coffee grounds, dairy, eggshells, fruits, meat, pasta, plate scraps, poultry, rice, grains, seafood, vegetables) and food-soiled paper (coffee filters, newspaper, paper napkins, paper towels, pizza delivery

**City of Scappoose
Council Action & Status Report**

Date Submitted: March 9, 2021

Agenda Date Requested: March 15, 2021

To: Scappoose City Council

From: Laurie Oliver Joseph, Planning Department
Supervisor & Isaac Butman, Program Analyst Intern

Subject: Resolution 21-03, Establishing Fees for Street
Renaming Applications

Type of Action Requested:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X <input type="checkbox"/>	Resolution	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Ordinance
<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Formal Action	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Report Only

ISSUE: Ordinance 896, adopted by Council on March 1, 2021, established Chapter 12.24 – Street Renaming, in the SMC (Scappoose Municipal Code). Prior to accepting an application to rename a street, appropriate fees must be established for an application of this type.

ANALYSIS: During the January 19, 2021 Council work session on the topic of adopting street renaming code language, there was a discussion on how to set appropriate fees for street renaming applications. Council directed staff to set the fees based on a cost recovery approach, meaning the intent was to cover staff's time and materials cost to process an application. Program Analyst Intern, Isaac Butman, gathered estimates on the time it would take for the Planning Department and Public Works Department to fully vet and take through the adoption process a submitted street renaming application (including the cost of the required legal ads in the newspaper and the cost of mailing notices to neighbors and affected agencies). Additionally, a fee estimate was generated to address the actual time and materials cost for Public Works to order and install new street signs for an approved application. Please see **Exhibit A** for an explanation of the fees.

PROPOSED FEES: For a street renaming application, two fees would be collected; the initial street renaming application fee (to be collected at the time the application is submitted) and the re-signage fee (to be collected after the ordinance approving the application has passed).

The proposed street renaming application fee of \$2,680 would direct \$2,395 to the Planning Department and \$285 to the Public Works Department. The total re-signage fee would be based on the actual number of signs that need to be replaced (for more information, please refer to **Exhibit A**).

As proposed, no portion of the initial application fee would be refundable since staff time and the cost of public notices and mailings would be incurred regardless of whether the application was approved or not.

FINANCIAL IMPACT: The intent is to set the fees so that the City recovers the actual cost to process an application; therefore, we would not expect there to be a fiscal impact. One instance where there would be a fiscal impact is if the City is the applicant for a street renaming request or if Council waives the fees for a recognized neighborhood/non-profit organization. In that case, the fiscal impact would be staff time and materials costs to process the application.

In the event that Council waives the fees for a recognized neighborhood/non-profit organization, staff recommends that the re-signage fee still be collected so that it does not negatively impact the Public Works Department's budget. This could be addressed at the time the request to waive fees is made by one of these organizations and would not need to be decided at this time.

OPTIONS: 1: Adopt Resolution 21-03, as presented.

 2: Adopt Resolution 21-03, as amended.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that Council adopt Resolution 21-03, as presented.

SUGGESTED MOTION: I move that Council Adopt Resolution 21-03: A Resolution Establishing Street Renaming Fees for the City of Scappoose, as presented.

ATTACHED:

- Resolution 21-03
- Exhibit A – Street Renaming Fee Analysis

Resolution 21-03

A RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING STREET RENAMING FEES FOR THE CITY OF SCAPPOOSE

WHEREAS, the Scappoose Municipal Code authorizes the City Council to set and amend application fees by resolution; and

WHEREAS, the City recently adopted a new chapter of the Scappoose Municipal Code, Chapter 12.24 – Street Renaming, and a fee must be established prior to accepting an application; and

WHEREAS, the City Council desires to recover actual costs to review and process street renaming applications and the fees set forth in Section 1 below reflect those estimated actual costs.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED,

Section 1: The following fees are hereby established for Street Renaming Applications in the City of Scappoose:

A. Street Renaming Application fee (to be collected when application is submitted):

1. Planning Department fee: \$2,395
2. Public Works Department fee: \$285

B. Street Renaming Re-Signage fee (to be collected after Ordinance approval):

1. Public Works Department fee: Time and materials (actual cost of signs/labor)

Section 2: This resolution shall be effective immediately upon passage.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council this ____ day of March 2021 and signed by the Mayor and City Recorder in authentication of its passage.

CITY OF SCAPPOOSE, OREGON

Scott Burge, Mayor

Attest: _____
Susan M Reeves, MMC, City Recorder

Street Renaming Fee Analysis

There are three sets of fees currently considered for inclusion in the total fees related to street renaming:

1. Planning administrative fees.
2. Public Works administrative fees.
3. Public Works re-signage fees.

Each set of fees can be found below with explanatory statements and payment collection times.

Initial application fee, to be submitted with the Street Renaming Application:

Planning Administrative Fee: \$2,395

Public Works Administrative Fee: \$285

Total application fee: **\$2,680**

Re-signage fee (collected after approval of ordinance):

Total re-signage fee = \$248.24 + (# signs X \$172.60)

The re-signage fee will be based on the actual number of signs needing to be replaced, as determined by the Public Works Department. This fee is to reflect the actual cost of labor and materials at the time the signs are installed.

Planning Administrative Fees

Planning administrative fees are based on the billable rate for “Planning services manager research fee” found in the current fee resolution, Resolution 20-16. This rate is \$95/hour.

The City Planner estimated fees is as follows:

1. Application acceptance and review: **2 hours** (includes time to reach out to applicant for missing info)
2. Referral to PC, including noticing abutting property owners and newspaper: This will vary based on the # of people who require notice, but I’m estimating an average time of **2 hours** (includes time to draft the notice, stuff envelopes, email notice to newspaper, and stamp/mail notices to residents abutting street)
3. Present application to Planning Commission: **3 hours** (since I have to stay after regular hours, and I expect the meeting would take up to one hour)
4. 1st City Council meeting noticing abutting property owners and newspaper: This will vary based on the # of people who require notice, but I’m estimating an average time of **2 hours** (includes time to draft the notice, stuff envelopes, email notice to newspaper, and stamp/mail notices to residents)
5. 2nd City Council meeting noticing abutting property owners and newspaper: (This only applies if Council chooses to adopt an ordinance to change the street name). This will vary based on the # of people who require notice, but I’m estimating an average time of **2 hours** (includes time to draft the notice, stuff envelopes, email notice to newspaper, and stamp/mail notices to residents)
6. 1st Presentation to Council: **3 hours** (since I have to stay after regular hours, and I expect the meeting would take up to one hour). If Council chooses to adopt ordinance for approval of street name change, then:
7. 2nd Presentation to Council: **3 hours** (since I have to stay after regular hours, and I expect the meeting would take up to one hour)
8. Post decision noticing (if approved): **3 hours** (including verification of affected agencies, time to draft the notice, stuff envelopes, and stamp/mail to residents and all affected agencies)

Total Time = 20 Hours.

Total Cost: **20 Hours at \$95/hour = \$1,900**

Materials cost recovery: Additional cost recovery for noticing costs (paper, printing, postage, required advertising in newspaper) is also recommended by the City Planner.

- Estimated amounts are .55 cents for each notice (including cost of paper, printing and postage) + \$110 per legal ad (this is the ballpark cost for each ad we are required to place in the newspaper prior to a public hearing at Planning Commission/City Council). Therefore, for 100 notices, the cost would be $.55 \times 100 = \$55$ + \$110 per legal ad = **\$165/noticing action**.
- Each street renaming request requires up to 3 hearings (initial Planning Commission hearing, and two more if Council approves and an ordinance is adopted), thus **$\$165 \times 3 = \495 for noticing costs/street renaming request (if approved)**

Total for Planning Fees:

Planning Services: \$1,900

Noticing Costs: \$495

Total Planning Fees: $\$1,900 + \$495 = \$2,395$

The City Planner indicated that this fee should be paid at the time an application for street renaming is accepted as these costs will be generated during the renaming process from the time the City accepts an application.

Public Works Administrative Fees

Public Works administrative fees are based on the billable rate for "Planning services manager research fee" found in the current fee resolution at the request of the Public Works Director. This is the lowest hourly rate currently in the fee schedule. This rate is \$95/hour.

The Public Works Director indicated that three hours of administrative work would initially be required for each street renaming undertaking. Because the re-signage costs will be generated by the public works administrative work, the Public Works Director requested that this fee be assessed at the same time as the Planning Administrative Fees.

Public Works Administrative Hours = 3

Total Public Works Administrative Fees: 3 Hours at \$95/hour = \$285

Public Works Re-Signage Fees

Public Works Re-Signage Fees are based on a time and materials cost basis as follows (these fees are based on the current Public Works hourly rates and equipment operation costs and are subject to change based on the actual cost at the time of installation):

Total re-signage fee:

Total re-signage fee = Base Fee + (number of signs X (sign cost + sign install cost))

Total re-signage fee = \$248.24 + (# signs X (\$86.68 + \$85.92))

Total re-signage fee = \$248.24 + (# signs X \$172.60)

Breakdown of costs for base fee, cost per sign, and installation cost per sign, used in the calculation above:**Base fee cost:**

Administrative = \$76.40

Travel time for retrieval of signs = \$121.84

Equipment time for the retrieval of signs = \$50.00

Base fee = \$76.40 + \$121.84 + \$50.00 = \$248.24

Sign cost (per sign):

\$86.68 per physical sign. Based on the actual sign cost for one sign.

Sign install cost (per sign):

Each sign costs one hour of install time at \$60.92, and one hour of equipment at \$25.00.

Total cost to install one sign = \$60.92 + \$25.00 = \$85.92

CITY OF SCAPPOOSE

Council Action & Status Report

Date Submitted: 3/9/2021

Agenda Date Requested: 3/15/2021

To: Scappoose City Council

From: Dave Sukau, Public Works Director

Subject: Purchase of Public Works Vehicles

TYPE OF ACTION REQUESTED:

☐ Resolution

☐ Ordinance

☒ Formal Action

☐ Report Only

ISSUE: Scappoose Public Works is seeking the addition of two vehicles to its fleet.

ANALYSIS: Public Works Staff received three competitive quotes for the purchase of two F150 pickups. The Ford brand was chosen as they are the only manufacturer to offer a longbox truck in a half ton version. Three dealerships were given the same request and the City received the following quotes:

Gresham Ford	\$30,643.27 each
Northside Ford	\$30,690.16 each
Landmark Ford	\$31,958.83 each

FISCAL IMPACT: Public Works budgeted \$35,000 per vehicle in the approved 2020-21 Water and Wastewater Budgets.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends Council authorize Interim City Manager Rains to purchase the two new vehicles from Gresham Ford for \$30,643.27 each.

SUGGESTED MOTION: I motion Council authorize Interim City Manager Rains to purchase the two proposed Public Works vehicles from Gresham Ford.

6.

City of Scappoose

Street Fund Budget & Project Update

Agenda

- Funding Sources
- 2020-21 Streets Budget
- Sidewalk Program
- Project Status
- Proposed Plan
- Questions / Discussion

Funding Sources for Streets

- Interest Earned
- Inspection Fees
- State Fuel Tax
- Local Fuel Tax
- Surface Transportation Funds

****Note – Streets are not funded by Property Taxes**

Federal Gas Tax

A.K.A. - Surface Transportation Fund

Can only be used for ODOT approved capital* projects
City receives approximately \$75,000 per year into this Fund
Current balance of \$517,756+/-
City is building the fund in plans of larger paving projects

***What is a capital project? The City of Scappoose recognizes “capital” as an investment into its assets or infrastructure that exceeds \$5,000**

2020-21 Streets Budget

Revenue

State Gas Tax	\$568,155
Local Gas Tax	\$250,000
Misc. Income	<u>\$36,000</u>
	\$854,155 (not including STP Funds)

Expenses

Personal Services	\$301,659
Materials and Services	\$233,454
Capital / Equipment	\$250,000
Contingency	<u>\$69,042</u>
	\$854,155
Surface Trans. Prog.	<u>\$517,756</u>
	Total \$1,371,911

*Note: This is not the complete Budget and some numbers are estimated projections

Sidewalk Program

- **Program launched in March of 2020**
- **City has received 8 Applications**
- **Five Applications have been accepted and completed**
- **Three of the Applications are pending**
- **City continues to receive periodic inquiries into Program**

Street & Sidewalk Projects

Completed

Sidewalk Repairs along Highway 30
ADA Ramp replacement along SE 6th
Sidewalk Infill along SE 6th

Planned

Continued Annual Crack Sealing
Old Portland Road Sidewalk Infill (plans complete)
SE 3rd Place Sidewalk Construction (plans at 10%)
SE Vine St. Sidewalk Construction (plans at 10%)
ADA Ramp Replacement (City-wide in phases)
Pavement Overlays (begin in NW portion of City after utility repairs)
Partnerships with Development

Proposed Plan

- Continue to accrue STP Funds for larger projects
- Continue to offer and promote Sidewalk Program
- Continue with Streetlight Improvements
- Move forward with Old Portland Road Project in phases (2-3 phases)
- Pursue alternative funding sources for School Zone Projects
- Partner with development when possible
- Dedicate \$200,000 of Local Fuel Tax revenue to sidewalks annually

Questions?



CITY OF SCAPPOOSE

7.

March 2021						
Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
	1 City Council 7pm	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11 100-year Celebration ad hoc committee 2pm	12	13
14	15 Council Work Session 6pm City Council 7pm	16	17	18 Park & Rec Committee 6pm	19	20
21	22	23	24	25 Planning Commission 7pm	26	27
28	29	30	31			

CITY OF SCAPPOOSE

April 2021

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
				1 Grabhorn Park ad hoc committee 6pm	2	3
4	5 Work Session, 6pm City Council 7pm	6	7	8 100-year Celebration ad hoc committee 2pm Planning Commission 7pm	9	10
11	12	13	14	15 EDC ~ noon Park & Rec Committee 5:45pm Grabhorn Park ad hoc committee 6pm	16	17
18	19 Work Session, 6pm City Council 7pm	20	21	22 Planning Commission 7pm	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	