



SCAPPOOSE

SCAPPOOSE PLANNING COMMISSION

Council Chambers at City Hall
33568 East Columbia Avenue

Thursday, February 9th, 2017 at 7:00 p.m.

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

Chair Kulp called the Scappoose Planning Commission workshop to order at 7:02 p.m.

2.0 ROLL CALL

Planning Commission:

Carmen Kulp	Chair
Scott Jensen	Commissioner
Bruce Shoemaker	Commissioner
Rita Bernhard	Commissioner
Tim Connell	Alternate Commissioner

Staff:

Laurie Oliver	City Planner
Elizabeth Happala	CDC Office Administrator III
Ben Tolles	R.A.R.E. Participant

EXCUSED:

Bill Blank	Commissioner
Jim Dahla	Commissioner
Derrick Vargason	Commissioner

3.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3.1 December 29th, 2016 meeting

Commissioner Bernhard moved and Vice Chair Jensen seconded the motion to approve the December 29th, 2016 Planning Commission meeting minutes. Motioned passed (5-0).

AYES: Chair Kulp, Vice Chair Jensen, Commissioner Shoemaker, and Commissioner Bernhard.

NAYS: None

4.0 CITIZEN INPUT

There was none.

5.0 NEW BUSINESS

5.1 WORK SESSION; Work session to discuss amendments to the development code text.

City Planner Oliver began by stating that she had discussed our sign code with the City's Legal Counsel Shelby Rihala; since the Scappoose sign code regulates on content it is unconstitutional therefore requires changes. Legal Counsel Rihala crossed off sections of our code that she did not feel were appropriate, which are in your packets. She also represents the City of Troutdale, adding that they had just updated their sign code which is also included in tonight's packet. Stating that the City of Troutdale code is much easier to read than our code; then asked the commissioners if they had anything to share or add; and that we might also want to reconsider the size of signs that are permitted here in Scappoose.

Commissioner Shoemaker stated that he read both codes and agrees that the City of Troutdale code is much easier to read and understand as our code uses Legal-Ease and sometimes he had to re-read our code to understand it especially when it discussed flags. Asking if there is a way we could do a small survey of our

town to see if they would be interested in adopting something totally new; adding that the sign code would only apply to new signs not existing.

City Planner Oliver suggested we scrap our code completely and start with the City of Troutdale code then amend it as needed. Adding that the maximum sign area for commercial zones is nearly the same as our code; in most cases it's fairly similar. Stating that the one thing that the City of Troutdale does not allow, which we do, is roof mounted signs.

Chair Kulp agreed that she wanted to bring up roof mounted signs, as she was also looking at the City of Fairview, City of St. Helens and City of Prineville; there are several of them that have items listed which were not listed in the City of Troutdale code. She also agrees that we need feedback from our commercial businesses to see what they think our streets should look like for signage. She does like the City of Troutdale code to use as our base then add a few things; for example shopping centers, not the content but looking into the structure of the sign. Asking do we want them on the roof.

Commissioner Shoemaker stated that our roof top signage was loosely structured; it was confusing.

Chair Kulp added that she could better visualize what the other sign codes were conveying but very challenging when reading our code in comparison.

Commissioner Shoemaker pointed out #2 on the last page of the City of Troutdale code which had a few misprinted words; but he did have a question on our code as our code was based on frontage and percentage but their code was based on a 10% factor.

City Planner Oliver replied that it was just for the wall signs specifically; ours does not specify a difference.

Commissioner Jensen stated that our code exempts paint so you could paint an entire wall sign.

City Planner Oliver replied that in most districts it is limited by 10%. Adding that we would also want to take out the search lights as that is not appropriate for Scappoose.

Commissioner Jensen added that it is not appropriate for the airport specifically.

City Planner Oliver stated their code is a good starting point; adding that the other item she liked is on page 35 of 48 of the packet at the top which discusses sign face area. It breaks it down on how to interpret the area of the sign based on how it's constructed, which would make it much easier for her to analyze an application.

Commissioner Shoemaker stated that in the following section under "sign permit exceptions"; it puts a number on each sign.

Commissioner Jensen replied that it was only political signs; so you could only have two.

City Planner Oliver replied that language prevented people from having 10 little candidate signs in their front yard.

Chair Kulp stated that could also impact yard sale signs; so it would to reduce the clutter.

Commissioner Shoemaker wondered why they picked the number 2 for consecutive days; depending on the elections and positions running.

Commissioner Bernhard stated that some housing developments have rules against any political signs in their yards.

Chair Kulp stated our current code limits political signs to ten days.

City Planner Oliver stated that their sign code does not specify how many days in advance to the election that one could put up a sign, but our code does.

Chair Kulp stated that some codes she read did specify the number of days; for example 120 days but they must be removed 5 days after the election and non-profits could put signs up for 7 days.

City Planner Laurie Oliver pointed out the bottom of page 38 of 48, “#3: *Temporary signs shall be removed within 14 day after the election, sales, rental, lease or conclusion of event*”. But it does not specify how many days in advance like ours does; we allow 45 days in advance of the event.

Commissioner Shoemaker stated that there are a couple clauses since our legal counsel reviewed both these codes; asking if that impedes on freedom of speech for putting limits.

City Planner Oliver stated that on page 39, we would remove the freeway sign references since ODOT has jurisdiction of Highway 30.

Commissioner Shoemaker pointed out page 37 of 48 related to temporary signs; #4 seemed strange as it states it cannot be illuminated, so you can't have a light shining on your signs.

City Planner Oliver replied that there might not be enforcement if someone had a light on a temporary sign; it seems to be more about hard wiring the sign.

Commissioner Jensen stated that it would probably be more complaint driven.

Alternate Planning Commissioner Connelly mentioned that you could limit the wattage.

Commissioner Shoemaker stated that he thought they mentioned wattage in the code; especially related to neon lights.

City Planner Oliver stated that typically the sign manufacturer will submit the sign application and provides quite a bit of detail in the plan. She also pointed out on page 38 of 48; Item B Wall signs, 5th point down that they allow the wall sign to project no more than 18” but our states only 12”, which seems more reasonable.

Vice Chair Jensen stated that fits the size of what is here in our community, Troutdale has massive buildings.

City Planner Oliver explained that if they had an attached wall sign it can't stick out more than 12” here but their code allows 18”.

Chair Kulp asked if they had more setbacks there.

City Planner Oliver replied no it's just from the wall.

Chair Kulp asked if they were allowing it to stick out more because they have a greater setback.

City Planner Oliver stated she would have to look into the setbacks for each of their districts.

Commissioner Jensen stated that he would guess it is the maximum setback of the buildings; since they are a larger city they would have larger buildings where it would not look off to have the additional 6" projections.

Alternate Planning Commissioner Connelly asked if it took into account how high off the ground they are if there were sidewalks or walking areas under the sign.

City Planner Oliver replied that if you read the part about projecting signs, which is on page 39 item F; #2 the lowest portion of a projecting sign shall be no less than 7.5' above the ground beneath the sign. To her understanding it is not to code; ours is 8' above which would need to be changed.

Commissioner Bernhard stated that she likes the format of the City of Troutdale code; it's so easy to read.

City Planner Oliver agreed and most of our code can be completely reformatted; and would make so much more sense. Adding she understands their feelings about our code as she reads our code all day long.

Chair Kulp asked if they were going to look into code assistance.

City Planner Oliver stated that they would not re-write our whole code for us; it was only specific to walkable neighborhoods.

Chair Kulp asked if there was something else they had discussed related to a program to use.

City Planner Oliver replied that they would start the budgeting process in the next month; then asked our current R.A.R.E Participant, Ben Tolles, to discuss it further.

R.A.R.E. Participant Ben Tolles state that he reviewed many codes from other jurisdictions and noticed their codes were online, also easier to read and access the codes you wanted; rather than flipping through our binder. Adding that there are several companies that do it specifically in Oregon and he is getting quotes; they take your code and re-format it then put it online and help you with the ordinances that get amended, which takes a lot of work off the city and makes it easier to access for the community. Adding that we currently have quotes from 4-5 companies which are all very similar but it just comes down to using their on-line software and deciding which one we like best.

City Planner Oliver stated she still needed to talk to the City Manager as far as plugging that into the budget every year; it is an ongoing cost but if we increase our current planning fees; that would offset the cost.

Chair Kulp stated that it's what City of St. Helens uses.

City Planner Oliver replied that they did get a quote from them and would be interested in using them.

Chair Kulp stated that many of the other cities use it like the City of Prineville; and we could reach out to them to see what they think.

Commissioner Shoemaker stated that their code has a section for permit cost; but ours does not mention it.

City Planner Oliver replied that it had to do with enforcement not permit costs; our code does have a chapter in the development code specifically for enforcement of any violation.

Commissioner Shoemaker asked if there would be a difference in the amount of work that would need to be done for each permit.

City Planner Oliver replied that there would not be changes to the amount of work as she would still review the application in the same way; adding that there really aren't that many differences between the two codes, their code is just much clearer. Adding that there are a few differences in the code, for example page 38 Temporary signs at the bottom of the page it deals with commercial and industrial zones specifically; "*Maximum sign area for a temporary portable sign, wall sign or free standing sign shall not exceed 32 square feet*". Stating that is an 8'x4' sign which is really big; asking if that is appropriate for us. Then their code specifies the maximum sign area for a banner sign shall not exceed 96 square feet which is a 12'x8' banner; asking if that is appropriate for our community.

Audience comment from local developer Len Waggoner; the county lets them use their temporary sign which is 4'x4' for their Rotary events, adding that ODOT uses those signs for different emergencies or to advise drivers of walkers/runners/bicyclists near the roadway. Adding that they are great functioning signs as it uses LED lights; but if you limit that sign size then you would rule that sign out.

City Planner Oliver stated that those signs are different as they are placed in the right of way, not on private property.

Audience member/local developer Len Waggoner replied that they also use those signs on private property; stating that he almost won an election by putting those signs on private property near the intersection of Havlik & Hwy. 30 near Fred Meyer. Re-stating that those signs are approximately 4'x4' or 4'x5'.

City Planner Oliver stated that the code they are looking at is for a sign size of 8'x 4' not 4'x4'.

Audience member/local developer Len Waggoner didn't realize the size she mentioned and agreed an 8'x4' would be too big.

Chair Kulp asked if the code restriction was for a sign that was on the side of a large building.

Commissioner Shoemaker stated he could visualize an 8'x4' sign being used temporarily on a construction site.

Chair Kulp added that those signs are helpful in advising people that they are doing construction.

City Planner Oliver pointed out in our code, page 26 of 48, "*C. The following signs shall be exempt from application, permit and fee requirements of this title; impermanent construction and subdivision signs not exceeding thirty-two square feet in area.*" Adding that if they are not regulating content then maybe it is appropriate.

Commissioner Shoemaker stated that we could make some small changes in the code that don't make sense or are not relevant.

City Planer Oliver introduced the City's R.A.R.E Participant Ben Tolles; he replaced Nick Sund from last year. Stating that she invited him tonight since he will be taking on some of the code amendments once he wraps up the Annual Town Meeting; and they could bring back an edited version of the City of Troutdale's code for you to review as a starting point.

Commissioner Shoemaker stated that Chair Kulp had some ideas from other jurisdictions that would make great additions.

Chair Kulp replied that she did like the way some of the other codes were laid out, they made it easier to visualize.

Commissioner Shoemaker stated that his comfort level would be to compare 4 other codes; then putting it online or in the local paper so our business owners can review it and give us feedback which would make it easily adoptable with the public feedback.

R.A.R.E. Participant Ben Tolles asked if we get a lot of complaints about our existing sign code.

City Planner Oliver replied no but the political signs are always a hot topic.

Audience member/local developer Len Waggoner stated the he has traveled to other municipalities and one thing he has always wanted to see was address numbers illuminated for businesses; not just their business name. Adding that if you are driving through a community at 30-40 mph you would then have some idea of where you are if you are searching for an address.

Commissioner Shoemaker agreed since many business owners don't have an address number on their buildings.

Audience member/local developer Len Waggoner replied that most commercial buildings do not have addresses on them; the address number should be on their illuminated business signs.

City Planner Oliver replied that any changes would not apply to any existing signs.

Chair Kulp added that it would still help if only the new signs would have an address.

Commissioner Shoemaker stated that he always thought it was a fire code to have an address.

City Planner Oliver agreed it is fire code to have an address on the building; but not on the signs for businesses.

Vice Chair Jensen asked if he meant just on the highway not anywhere else.

Audience member/local developer Len Waggoner replied that it would be on the illuminated signs which are usually only found along the highway.

Vice Chair Jensen stated that they may also see that out at the airport but not on tall signs.

City Planner Oliver stated that if we are telling them they have to have address numbers on their sign then we can't calculate that on their sign area.

Vice Chair Jensen stated that we could tell the applicant that they can have the address numbers on their sign but it would not count towards the total sign area therefore their sign could be a little larger. Adding that in some cities they have block numbers above the street signs.

Audience member/local developer Len Waggoner replied that those numbers can be small and hard to read as

you drive through a town.

Commissioner Shoemaker stated that we could add that into our code but in 5-10 years when it becomes irrelevant and our cars take us to the exact location; then we could remove it.

City Planner Oliver asked the commissioners if they were in favor of just bringing back the changes to the next available meeting; then modifying it from there.

Chair Kulp stated they could also bring the other codes to compare them; she will bring them next time.

Vice Chair Jensen recommended that Chair Kulp just send them to Liz so she can forward it to everyone; since the commissioners can't send it out to everyone.

Chair Kulp and City Planner Oliver agreed that would be best and save some time.

Commissioner Shoemaker added that they should just limit it to sign codes within Oregon; as our business owners won't go for the extreme changes that some places like Ohio have required with size limitations and a uniform look. Adding that they had nearly eliminated signs so much that business owners really grumbled about the city's sign code but they were not going to leave the city or their locations.

City Planner Oliver could understand that if a city started that way it could work but it would not be okay if you already had existing businesses following a different code, which would not be fair to the new businesses.

Vice Chair Jensen suggested that it could be an alternative; allowing that applicant to choose then it gives some advantages to shorter signs that could serve them better.

Commissioner Shoemaker added that there are so many different directions to go when it comes to signage.

Chair Kulp stated that in some areas there are so many signs you get lost; hopefully we can find a happy median.

Commissioner Shoemaker stated that he does a lot of driving and most of the time the signage is so uncontrolled it makes it overwhelming for drivers.

City Planner Oliver stated that they will bring back their first set of revisions as soon as possible; then asked the commissioners to turn to page 45 of 48 related to off street parking codes minimum requirements for multi-family developments. Adding that Scappoose is highlighted in yellow in the packet; noting that Albany should have 2 spaces per unit not 4 per unit but we are pretty much in line with everyone else except Stayton and Albany which required a visitor space for every 4 units. Asking the commissioners to keep in mind that the trend is going towards having less parking which ties into affordability of units as parking is a large cost to developers. Also looking at medical and dental buildings which is an issue for our OHSU business that still has parking concerns; to see what other cities are requiring per 1,000 sq. feet; some required fewer spaces but Lincoln City requires 5 which is one more than ours but their code also requires 1 space for each employee which could add up quickly.

Commissioner Shoemaker stated that Lincoln City might be addressing another issue since they are an ocean/vacation town with many visitors.

Vice Chair Jensen stated that it could be due to their very limited transportation options which is similar to our condition.

Commissioner Bernhard asked if there was any public transportation that travelled that far; (no one knew)

Vice Chair Jensen stated that might be the only reason they would add additional parking spaces.

City Planner Oliver added that the City of St. Helens is similar to ours but adds one more space than ours.

Commissioner Shoemaker added that it almost matches the one in Lincoln City minus the employee parking.

City Planner Oliver stated the the employee parking is significant if you think about how many employees OHSU has; they are currently considering putting their storm drainage swale underground which would add an additional 10-12 parking spaces.

Commissioner Shoemaker asked about St. Helens' code since it almost matched the City of Lincoln City minus the employee parking requirement.

City Planner Oliver stated our code is close as we are at 4 spaces, Albany is 4, Fairview is 3.9 which is strange; she had our planning intern Dakota Meyer gather all these numbers but he assured her that the Fairview is indeed at 3.9 adding that it is all quite close and everyone can discuss it more when we look at the code again but is open to everyone looking around at other parking codes.

Commissioner Shoemaker stated that he would not know where to look.

Vice Chair Jensen stated that his original thought was to have 1 visitor space per every 10 parking spaces; it might not get used that way but at least it is designated and it's a small change that could be easily adjusted later.

Commissioner Shoemaker agreed that does makes sense.

Vice Chair Jensen added that it would be simple to apply across the board since our biggest issue was the 2 bedrooms that only require 1.5 space per bedroom.

City Planner Oliver asked what the commissioners thought about the one visitor space per 10 required parking stalls; think about that and we can revisit it later. Adding that it would be a quick change to make when we start doing some of these housekeeping amendment code changes; so it could be implemented then adjusted later if needed.

Vice Chair Jensen asked if a developer really had an issued with it, would they be able to ask for a variance or come before us to explain their issues.

City Planner Oliver replied that one of the changes the TSP made to the code was that it did allow for changes to required parking. Giving the example if they were near a designated bus stop they could put in extra bicycle parking or motorcycle parking, but this would still be up to the Planning Commission's discretion and the applicant has to request a change to the required parking.

Vice Chair Jensen added that there might have been something about alternative shifts.

Chair Kulp replied that they are only looking at housing parking right now; and stated if there is multi-family housing located within our downtown section then parking seems to be the hardest but not in the other areas of town.

City Planner Oliver replied that multi-family is typically located closer to downtown; so it takes care of itself in a way as it applies more to the multi-family sites.

Vice Chair Jensen added that this is 20-50 years out; it's not the first building that goes into an area but it's when the fifth building goes in.

Chair Kulp agreed that it's not today but as this place becomes more populated we need to make sure there are still enough parking for their customers as well when there is multi-family mixed in with residential like the unit across from City Hall.

Vice Chair Jensen stated that he does like the mixed commercial residential since it's actually very efficient for parking.

Chair Kulp added that she does too but then they have to be careful that their tenants don't take up the customers parking since we don't have a city parking lot.

City Planner Oliver agreed, adding that we don't have a lot of mixed-use buildings.

Audience member/local developer Len Waggoner added that typically the developers will still want more parking so if our codes says 1.5 they might still put in 2 spaces to make sure everyone is accommodated.

Vice Chair Jensen agrees especially for developers that develop to own versus developers that build to just sell which aren't concerned about the long term viability unless it is in our code.

Commissioner Shoemaker agrees that developers will be looking at the finite number.

Audience member/local developer Len Waggoner agreed that the investor/buyers will be looking at that number too, to ensure their parking is adequate for their \$5 million dollar project and to ensure their clients' needs are met.

Alternate Commissioner Tim Connell asked if the state or federal uniform building code addressed parking.

City Planner Oliver replied that they only regulate ADA parking but not the number of parking spaces which is up to the local jurisdiction. Recapping that she is hearing they like the 1 additional space per 10 required spaces, to be labelled "visitor" and then asked what changes they wanted to see for medical/dental.

Vice Chair Jensen asked how likely any of that would develop in order for this to be applicable; someone would have to develop a new medical/dental facility.

Chair Kulp agreed, probably not in the near future.

Vice Chair Jensen stated that we may want to wait on this one for the time being as it could easily be another 5-10 years; we could defer to advising a developer that they may want to consider more space.

Chair Kulp agreed so it could allow more time to get feedback from our businesses as well.

Commissioner Shoemaker agreed that the developer would want more space depending on their situation.

City Planner Oliver agreed that they could revisit medical/dental and they will draft what the changes might look like in our code for the 1 to 10 parking ratio.

Vice Chair Jensen stated there is a subheading in our code for multi-family so it could go there.

City Planner Oliver agreed or it could be as simple as inserting an asterisk.

5.2 TEAM AGREEMENT - Team Agreement review and adoption.

City Planner Oliver went over the team agreement adding that it is something that City Council does every year; asking if anyone wanted to read it out loud or you can read it on your own.

Vice Chair Jensen suggested that under number 1, it should have Liz's position/title there instead of her name in case she leaves the position.

City Planner Oliver stated that would be an easy fix; adding that once they have read through it they just need to make a motion to adopt it.

Commissioner Bernhard stated that much of this team agreement is just common sense.

City Planner Oliver added that on item #8 Planning Commission meetings are televised live which requires Planning Commissioners to act professionally; so the side conversations should cease especially when some conversations go off topic.

Vice Chair Jensen stated that item #12 might read better if the word "made" is inserted between "Information" and "Available".

City Planner Oliver re-read it to confirm the change; *"Information made available to one Planning Commissioner will be available to all, in a timely manner"*.

Commissioner Shoemaker moved and Commissioner Bernard seconded the motion to approve the 2017 Team Agreement with the suggested corrections. Motioned passed (5-0).

Chair Kulp asked if our R.A.R.E Participant, Ben Tolles, was going to begin working on the changes to the code at 12pm after the Annual Town Meeting and who she should send her code suggestions to.

R.A.R.E Participant, Ben Tolles, replied that he would work through the weekend as all his work hours count.

City Planner Oliver replied that the commissioners should email their suggestions to our CDC Office Administrator, Liz who could then distribute; adding that our R.A.R.E Participant, Ben Tolles, has some wrap up to do with the input we receive from the Annual Town Meeting so the code changes might come back to you sometime in March.

Vice Chair Jensen asked for a copy of the agenda for Saturday's Annual Town Meeting; to see if there is a part that he might be more interested in attending.

R.A.R.E Participant, Ben Tolles, replied that the agenda is on the website under “events” which is under one of the top tabs.

Commissioner Bernhard asked what the 8:30AM topic was.

City Planner Oliver replied that 8:30AM is arrival, eat bagels and coffee; it kicks off at 9AM.

Vice Chair Jensen reminded everyone that there was still a motion on the floor that required a vote for the team agreement;

AYES: Chair Kulp, Commissioner Shoemaker, Commissioner Jensen and Commissioner Bernhard.

NAYS: None

6.0 COMMUNICATIONS

6.1 Calendar Check

City Planner Oliver went over the items on the February calendar. Adding that she was unsure if the Planning Commission would meet again in February as the Planning Dept. is very backed up. Stating that we did receive the application for the entire east airport industrial subdivision; they are proposing 16 lots of varying sizes that encompass 350 acres which should make it to Planning Commission in approx. 3 months. Adding that on March 9th the city has lined up Mike Ard the transportation engineer from Lancaster Engineering to be here to do a training on traffic studies; how to interpret them, limits of conditions of approval you can attach to projects, and discussing the analysis process for the traffic impact of developments which will be very helpful and insightful. If he presents anything in writing she will be sure to share with anyone that can't make it but hopes everyone can attend.

CDC Office Administrator Liz Happala added that we will have the video recording as well as the minutes.

City Planner Oliver stated that she has invited Columbia City and City of St. Helens planning commissioners to join us if they would like, as it would be helpful to everyone. Advising that Mike Ard was recently here discussing the traffic at the airport. Adding that she does have some outstanding applications that will come to Planning Commission soon, possibly March 23rd; for the multi-family just across the street from the one that just went in on the corner of E. Columbia and Westlane Rd., there is an existing vacant home on the site.

Vice Chair Jensen stated that we might want to let the other City's know that the March 9th training might constitute a public meeting for them also; they might want to consider how they would manage/follow all the public meeting rules.

City Planner Oliver replied that it would still be in a public meeting setting and we would be taking minutes for it but they might have to advertise on their end as well, but she would ask our Legal Counsel.

Vice Chair Jensen stated they they might have to open their meeting and close it as it seemed to be based on the number of members that attend.

Commissioner Bernhard and Chair Kulp stated that they shouldn't be required to open a meeting for a training; maybe they just need to advertise that they are going to a training.

Vice Chair Jensen added that he just wants to make sure that the training does not cause any problems for them.

6.2 Commission Comments

Chair Kulp welcomed the new alternate planning commissioner Tim Connell.

Vice Chair Jensen asked if the city was looking into a transportation TGM grant.

City Planner Oliver replied that she was not sure but she did get the the form in the mail; although can't take it on right now as she is over capacity; adding that we have several grants going on for the Westlane frontage and the OMIC site off Westlane has scheduled a pre-application for their project.

6.3 Staff Comments

City Planner Oliver already went over her notes about the subdivision application and the pre-apps; adding that our R.A.R.E. participant, Ben Tolles, has put in a lot of work planning the Annual Town Meeting. Stating that Comcast donated \$4,000 for the city to purchase automatic clickers that instantly show voting results and everyone will get to vote.

R.A.R.E. Participant, Ben Tolles, stated that we tested them out and had a lot of fun answering questions.

7.0 ADJOURNMENT

Chair Kulp closed the meeting at 8:10PM



Chair Carmen Kulp

Attest:



Elizabeth Happala, Office Administrator III

This is an open meeting and the public is welcome. The City of Scappoose does not discriminate on the basis of handicap status in its programs and activities. If special accommodations are required, please contact Susan M. Reeves, MMC, City Recorder, in advance, at 543-7146, ext 224. TTY 1-503-378-5938