

**CANBY CITY COUNCIL  
WORK SESSION MINUTES  
April 29, 2016**

**Presiding:** Mayor Brian Hodson.

**Council Present:** Todd Rocha, Greg Parker, Traci Hensley, Tim Dale, Tracie Heidt, and Clint Coleman.

**Staff Present:** Rick Robinson, City Administrator; Joseph Lindsay, City Attorney; Mark Gunter, Public Works Director; Kim Scheafer, City Recorder; Haley Fish, Finance Director; Bryan Brown, Planning Director; Renate Mengelberg, Economic Development Director; Amanda Zeiber, Asst. City Administrator/HR Director; Matilda Deas, Senior Planner; and Jamie Stickel, Main Street Manager.

**Others Present:** Trip Goodall, Canby School District Superintendent

Mayor Hodson called the Work Session to order at 8:30 a.m. at Pappy's Greasy Spoon Restaurant.

Rick Robinson, City Administrator, spoke about the opportunities and challenges of a city/school partnership and park operations and funding options. Some of the important issues were how to operate the parks we have, how to spend the money generated through SDCs, how to expand and maintain park land, and how to expand park programs. He thought the focus should be on what we can accomplish, not what we want to have. He had been discussing with the School District about the opportunities that could exist with a city and school partnership around things both wanted to accomplish that would benefit the community. One of the common visions was to improve access to services that were parks and recreation oriented. He thought resources could be leveraged together to do something bigger than only one agency would be able to accomplish.

Trip Goodall, Canby School District Superintendent, discussed the need for institutional trust and establishing strong partnerships. There needed to be a common vision around the partnerships. One was a community recreation center, especially for after school recreation programs. He discussed federal grants for an after school program. The school district had had informal conversations about a partnership with the city to provide recreational opportunities for children.

Mr. Robinson thought they had failed in the relationship with the school district in the lease agreement of the Swim Center and Adult Center. They had to find a way to meet both agencies' needs and priorities. The City wanted parks and the schools wanted a recreation program and they would have to work together. Mr. Goodall gave examples of working partnerships. He was there to get the conversation going and would come back and tell the school board what was discussed.

There was discussion regarding how the school district and the city could partner for parks and how to better fund parks.

Mr. Robinson said the City could build parks with the funding they had, but there were no funds to maintain anymore parks than what they were already maintaining. They could continue to work independently and focus on maintaining the current parks. If the City did it alone, they would have to find a way to pay for park expansion or accept that what they could only do in the future was

what they had been doing in the past. They needed to pick goals and objective that were achievable. His recommendations for park operations were:

- Pursue local partnership options
- Develop draft IGA to include:
  - Available capital resources to potentially include:
    - SDCs
    - Voter approved bonding for large capital projects
    - State/Federal grant programs
- Defined program areas
- Maintenance and operation Strategy to include:
  - Identification of maintenance and operational activities
  - Funding strategy to potentially include:
    - Local option levy
    - Agency contributions
    - State/Federal funds to support operations
    - Other

There was discussion regarding the use of SDCs, using Ackerman Middle School as a community center, and after school programs. Mr. Robinson said he would initially focus on the pursuing partnerships beginning with the school district. If he was successful, he would bring back a list of recommendations to define the role and relationship.

Council consensus was to have Mr. Robinson pursue the recommendations.

Mr. Robinson spoke about City streets and the opportunities and challenges surrounding them. Some of the issues were: County responsible streets in the City limits and bringing those into the City, and Street Maintenance Fee projects. He had directed staff to pursue the more stringent standard regarding ADA requirements for streets. He had also directed staff to use the local gas tax funds for the ADA upgrades. The Street Maintenance Fee would only be used for street maintenance.

He then spoke about the City and County joint effort to improve County roads in the City. He would be meeting with the County next week to discuss what the steps would be. His recommendations were:

- Update cost estimates to upgrade County roads to a city standard.
- Develop a ten year scenario to transfer County roads within the City to the City.
- Meet with County public works representatives to discuss long term IGA to facilitate street improvements with County responsible for:
  - Engineering and design
  - Right-of-way acquisition
- Evaluate potential funding sources
  - Have conversation regarding increasing the Street Maintenance Fee to \$6, allocating \$1 to improving the county Streets to City standard
  - Review SDC eligible streets
  - Bond for improvement
  - Encourage County Commission to use bond money for repairs

Mr. Robinson said the County had no incentive to help the City and he was looking at what the County could do in-house. This was a ten year strategy.

There was discussion regarding the County not maintaining the roads and how to make the agreement with the County work.

Mr. Robinson suggested to continue spending the Street Maintenance Fee and gas tax, not used for the ADA improvements, for maintenance based on street needs and what was planned to be done in the next five years. He also suggested to create a ten year scenario to transfer County roads to City jurisdiction. He hoped the County would do the engineering, design, and right-of-way acquisition and City staff could evaluate potential funding sources. One possibility was increasing the Street Maintenance Fee to \$6 and allocating \$1 to improving County streets to City standards with the intention to bring them into the City. The extra \$1 would sunset when the streets were brought into the system. Another option was to review SDC eligible streets.

Councilor Dale thought they might need to have the discussion regarding the increase in the Street Maintenance Fee due to inflation.

Mr. Robinson said he wanted to pursue having conversations with the County and if they did not want to work with the City, then he could come back to the Council. He thought the County would lend staffing services to the City. He also wanted to have a work session with the Council regarding the gas tax and Street Maintenance Fee.

The Council Work Session was recessed for lunch at 11:55 a.m. and resumed at 12:35 p.m.

Mr. Robinson discussed the City's role in regard to housing. He then spoke about the goals for a city block mixed use development. The challenges that were being faced right now were the selling of individual properties if the City did not proceed with a block development and losing the opportunity to add value downtown and finding a solution to the gap between apartment rental income and construction costs. He had spoken with Ms. Hanlon and one way to make the development agreement work was to have the URD assume responsibility for the SDCs. It might add one year to the repayment period for the URD. He was planning to pursue it further and bring it back to the Council as a proposal. The building would need to be five story apartments to meet the income requirement for payback and had to meet all the City's building standards. The Canby Utility building was now going to be under contract with Hanlon Development and they could count on it for development. He explained the next steps to move forward with the project.

There was discussion regarding the challenges to bringing the project downtown.

Mr. Robinson said there had been questions regarding SB 1573 and SB 1533. SB 1573 said the legislative body shall annex territory without submitting the proposal to the electors of the city if: the territory was within the Urban Growth Boundary and it conformed to the Comprehensive Plan and all other requirements. The Council would be hearing three annexations in June and would need to make their decision based on that criteria.

SB 1533 allowed the City to adopt land use regulations on affordable housing units within certain parameters. He explained the incentives that could be offered for the program. It would only apply to new developments and required clear and objective standards to be created and met. They could enact a Construction Excise Tax as a fee to administer the program. He explained how the funding would work to provide affordable housing programs through the tax and how it would work in Canby. Mr. Robinson thought it would be difficult for a small community like Canby

where there was not enough staff to support this and the cost to administer the program would not be worth it. He recommended not adopting the program. He thought they should look at making single family homes more available by reducing construction costs. This would require well planned housing developments focused on smaller homes and smaller lots.

There was discussion regarding the cost of the program, housing in the City, how planned housing development communities worked, and examples of these types of developments.

Mayor Hodson adjourned the Work Session at 2:20 p.m.

Kimberly Scheafer, MMC  
City Recorder

Brian Hodson  
Mayor

Assisted with Preparation of Minutes - Susan Wood