



February 3, 2021

Regular Meeting | 7:00 p.m.

Troutdale Police Community Center – Kellogg Room
234 SE Kendall Ct, Troutdale, OR 97060

Public comments are welcome at any time during the meeting.

Agenda

1. Call to Order, Roll Call, & Pledge of Allegiance
2. Review and Approval of Minutes
 - a. November 4, 2020 Regular Meeting
 - b. January 6, 2021 Regular Meeting
3. Discussion Items
 - a. CAC Website Updates
 - b. Rent Burden Survey Data
 - c. Financial Literacy & the City Budget
4. Staff Communications
5. Committee Member Comments
6. Adjournment

Participation

The public may attend the meeting in person or via Zoom. Please email comdev@troutdaleoregon.gov to request Zoom meeting access credentials. Due to public health requirements related to COVID-19, not more than ten (10) people may be physically in the meeting room at any time.

This meeting location is accessible to persons with disabilities. A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired or for other accommodations for persons with disabilities should be made at least 48 hours prior to the meeting to the City of Troutdale (comdev@troutdaleoregon.gov or 503-665-5175).

Citizens Advisory Committee Minutes

Wednesday, November 4, 2020 | 7:00 p.m.

Troutdale Police Community Center – Kellogg Room

234 SW Kendall Ct – Troutdale, OR 97060

Held in-person and virtually via Zoom

Public comments are welcome at any time during the meeting.

1. Call to Order, Roll Call, & Pledge of Allegiance

Present: Will Knight (Chair)
David Wheaton
Timothy Erich
Alexander Lumiere
Shelly Reynolds
Kyle Schwab
Jon Brown
Diane Castillo
Victoria Rizzo
Heidi Hinshaw

Absent: Chris Barney

Staff: Chris Damgen, Community Development Director
Amber Shackelford, Assistant Planner
Joe Storagee, Code Compliance Officer
Melissa S. Bocarde, Independent Contractor/Transcriptionist

Members of
the Public: Marko Lescanec
Nicole Lawrence
Tanney Staffenson
Paul Wilcox

2. Public Comment

Chair Knight asked if there was any public comment on a non-agenda item. There was none.

The following comments were incorporated after reopening the record when the meeting minutes were reviewed at the February 3, 2021 CAC meeting:

Mr. Wilcox followed up during the meeting with an email copied to all CAC members that read: “I had intended this as public comment at your 11/4/20 meeting, but I wasn’t quick enough with the unmute button. Written is probably easier to absorb anyway.

I’d start with the following quote from an e-mail to staff and Council from CAC Chairperson Knight, dated 9/22/20, which you were all copied to. The Council was discussing and considering revisions to the TMC related to committees and commissions.

“I believe the concept of #5 was lost on the council when they recently added a ballot measure in direct opposition to an overwhelming majority of the CAC and against the will of the citizens they serve.” – Will Knight

The CAC vote being referred to is of course what was to become Measure 26-212 on the ballot. In case any of you have not followed the election results, that Measure currently stands at 58% approval. I would contrast that with the CAC’s 8-3 vote, which would be 27%, and the Council’s 5-2 vote, which would be 72%. Which group came closer to the election results? This would belie the statement by Chairperson Knight that the Council’s action was “against the will of the citizens they serve”. I believe the Council referred the Measure to the ballot because they didn’t consider the CAC’s vote and recommendation “representative” of the citizens “they” serve, but rather a biased opinion that wasn’t taking into consideration what the general public might prefer to at least be asked their preference about. I think the CAC took a very large hit to its credibility by forwarding that vote and recommendation to the Council.”

He sent a follow-up email that read: “I also meant to mention that the election results reflect a very high level of interest in Measure 26-212, indicated by the fact that more votes were cast for and against the Measure than were cast for the two Mayoral candidates. I would have of course preferred a higher proportion of support, but I was also encouraged by the high level of participation. The turnout was well over twice what it was for the Old City Hall bond measure.”

Chair Knight suggested beginning with the discussion item related to keeping chickens.

3. Discussion Items

i. Ordinance on Chickens

Chair Knight recognized Staff members Chris Damgen and Amber Shackelford. Mr. Damgen, who is the Community Development Director, explained that he would show a slide presentation covering why Staff are seeking input regarding an ordinance on owning chickens within the City limits.

He explained that at tonight’s discussion, the CAC would discuss whether or not Troutdale residents can keep chickens and, if yes, what are the appropriate standards that should be put in place, if any, to regulate chickens. As part of that discussion, a few residents will offer testimony about their experiences with keeping chickens in Troutdale. At the end of this meeting, the City Council is asking for a recommendation. This matter has already come to City Council and is now being referred to CAC, so they would like to get the group’s recommendation tonight. However, that will not mean the conversation is over since there will need to be a second hearing at the City Council, but they are very interested in hearing the CAC’s recommendation.

Mr. Damgen said that the reason they were talking about chickens is because there currently are no City-specific standards. Troutdale’s standards are to defer to the Multnomah County code and for years that’s worked fine. However, Multnomah County’s code now says to check with your local city for city-specific standards and every city in Multnomah County has developed their own standards, but not Troutdale. As a result, when Staff get inquiries about chickens, they have nothing to say about this. That has become somewhat problematic since there are good chicken owners and problematic chicken owners in the city, and Staff wants to be able to help people who are genuinely interested in keeping chickens and doing a good job with it. Because of this, the Staff developed some of their own language and took it to Council, largely copying and pasting language from Gresham’s chicken ordinance. The Council heard from several people, two of whom are attending tonight, who offered some very thought-provoking testimony.

An important caveat is that if a chicken code is approved by Council, it doesn't necessarily pertain to your own neighborhood since certain neighborhoods have strict ordinances that prohibit chickens altogether. Also, for people who currently keep chickens, there will be a period of time for them to come into compliance with the new ordinances if they currently are not, probably the typical period of 6-12 months.

Mr. Damgen asked if there were any questions. Mr. Wheaton said he had a few questions regarding 6.08.040 of the ordinance called "enclosures." He feels it implies that the City wants an offset away from the house and from adjoining lot lines and it says they want it on a "different lot" but not necessarily from the owner. This sounds like you can put your coop on someone else's property, and he doesn't feel that would be appropriate, or that it is the intent. Second, under 6.08.050 under inspections, it uses the word "manager" and Mr. Wheaton says it should include "manager or designate". Chair Knight suggested they revisit these issues after having the discussion about whether they want to have chickens or not.

Mr. Schwab asked if there had been a back story to this discussion, such as a substantial amount of people complaining about chickens. Mr. Damgen said that Staff receive regular inquiries about whether residents can keep chickens. There also was a recent rodent infestation that the Code Officer feels was the result of badly kept chicken coops, and he will testify about that tonight. Finally, it's a blind spot in the code since every other City in the County has one that addresses chickens.

Mr. Damgen returned to Staff's slide presentation and the first issue concerning whether to cap the number of chickens allowed. A number of cities do this, so Staff's proposal is for 3 chickens that are greater than 4 months old and no roosters. This matches the City of Gresham standards and other similar jurisdictions, though other cities are higher or lower. Also, most area cities prohibit roosters.

The pros for these limitations are that they discourage any potential negative impacts from too many chickens and it keeps the ordinance in line with those in other cities in the area. Staff feel that there needs to be adequate room for the chickens along with other things commonly found in residential yards, like tool sheds and swing sets, and this recommendation would match the space allowed in a typical yard.

The cons to limiting chickens are that there may be people who have a greater number of chickens currently, and this would negatively affect them. It also restricts backyard farming and homegrown options, and they will hear testimony about this.

Mr. Damgen turned to his next slide about site and dimensional standards which are closely modeled on Gresham's, although they have doubled the space requirements for coops and runs. The proposed coop hours are from 9 p.m.-7 a.m. and while these might not be enforceable, at least there would be expectations in place, similar to those governing construction site hours. They are also proposing there be chicken feed storage standards to prevent problems.

Staff feel that the pros for the recommendations they are making include having some type of standards, as do other cities, and that they allow twice as much space for coops and runs as does Gresham. The con is that it may affect existing keepers of chickens who are no longer in compliance. Additionally, there has been research that shows that free range chickens are happier and healthier than chickens kept in coops.

The third and final issue that Staff wants the CAC to discuss is the permitting process. The proposal is a two-year permit with a fee to be determined by Council, perhaps \$100. There would be inspection of the space upon application submittal but it would not be repeated regularly. Future inspections would be complaint-driven. The main reason for the permit process is that Staff knows where people are keeping chickens so that they are aware if there is a problem. However, permits can also protect the owner from

frivolous complaints or lawsuits from neighbors who don't like chickens. It protects the City because Staff are able to revoke the permit if it does become a problem in the future

The cons are that there is staff work associated with any permit. It also could dissuade people from keeping chickens who don't want to deal with obtaining a permit.

Chair Knight asked if there were any questions from CAC members for Mr. Damgen. Ms. Castillo asked how they could limit the number of chickens when there will be new chicks, and Mr. Damgen explained they are only limiting the number of full-grown hens. She asked if their proposal would allow the chicken run to be movable. Mr. Damgen said yes, they could be. She asked about the appeal process in 6.06.06 and when that would come into play. Mr. Damgen said there could be unusually sized properties, such as when there's a larger front yard than back yard, and they could do a variance to allow for chickens in the front yard instead. She asked if in Gresham, they specify the number of total property size needed to keep chickens, and Mr. Damgen said that they did not.

Ms. Hinshaw asked if the Staff's proposal only allowed single family homes to keep chickens. He answered that this was correct, and Ms. Hinshaw said she had a problem with that. She feels that if people who are living in a duplex and have room to do it should be able to keep chickens. Also, if apartment communities agree that they are all right with someone keeping chickens, they should be allowed to do so. Mr. Damgen said that if you removed the word "detached," you could allow for duplexes but it would still be single-family units. He said that since Staff had basically cut and pasted Gresham's ordinances, he didn't know the justification behind them, but this is where Ms. Hinshaw and other CAC members can contribute guidance.

Mr. Lumiere commented that he agreed with Ms. Hinshaw that many duplexes have adequate room for chickens, and he thinks they should remove the word "detached." He also feels that a \$100 fee is too high for someone who is also purchasing chickens and the necessary items for raising them. Often people are keeping chickens because they are low-income and are trying to farm their own eggs.

Mr. Schwab asked if by requiring a permit, the City opens itself to any liability because they have authorized someone to keep chickens if something happens as a result, such as them attracting a coyote. Mr. Damgen said that he feels they are more likely to be liable for negligence by not having a code since there can be rodent infestations as a result, and rats damaging people's cars.

Mr. Erich commented that he is concerned that they are over-regulating. He understands having a basic ordinance because there is one and to include a fee, but Troutdale is near the gorge and farmland. He asked if someone has a very large property such as half an acre, if these standards would still apply. Mr. Damgen said that they could do that. Mr. Lumiere answered there should be allowance made for varying sizes of properties. He wants to encourage people to have chickens unless there is a problem, and then they can deal with it.

Mr. Lumiere asked Mr. Damgen what types of problems are typically faced by Cities that allow chickens, and Mr. Damgen answered that this would be addressed in public comment.

Mr. Brown said that he has kept four chickens before in a rollable coop and that he has never had any issues with raccoons or neighbors. However, he is a very good chicken farmer. He thinks a code is fine, but doesn't recommend fees. He also thinks not having roosters is a good idea. He doesn't think the City should over-regulate in this area. Also, his home insurance would have taken care of any issues, but he was responsible about things like keeping the feed secure. Mr. Lumiere asked Mr. Brown if they stayed out all winter. Mr. Brown said his coop wasn't very big, but he had a floodlight and he would provide

extra hay and keep them protected from the east wind. During a storm, he checked on them every two hours and covered the coop with a tarp.

Chair Knight opened public comment beginning with Mr. Storagee, the Code Compliance Officer for the City of Troutdale. He is invested in the City of Troutdale and brought this forward for quality of life reasons. He also personally has had chickens and doesn't believe that having them attracts rats, but the feed does. He predicts that people who keep clean chicken coops will not hear from him. Having a chicken ordinance is actually a tool for him to regulate rats. They are prolific breeders and also can smell previous rat's trails and will return. They are very attracted to feed on the ground, and he has had more calls about rats than about bad chicken owners, including five or six recently which include \$700 worth of damage to someone's new pickup truck. Basically, what he has learned is to keep the coops off the ground, to keep the nests tighter than a half an inch, keep the feed in a metal container, put away the food and water at night, and the rats will stay away because they won't be attracted to available food and water at night when they forage.

In his experience, including as a police officer, when neighbors begin feuding against a neighbor, it's advantageous for that person to be able to point to being in compliance with the City's code so that it is dismissed as a frivolous complaint.

Chair Knight asked if Mr. Storagee could speak of the photos he's taken of rat damage. Mr. Storagee answered that he had invited the resident involved to speak to the issue tonight. Chair Knight asked Mr. Storagee what his recommendations would be to keep rats from bothering people's chickens. Mr. Storagee answered that it's common sense things like keeping the chicken feed in a metal container. He acknowledged that chicken owners don't want rats either.

Mr. Erich commented that maybe the CAC should look at ordinances that specifically deal with preventing rats instead of focusing on keeping chickens. For example, if people are leaving food out at night, that attracts vultures and rats, and there could be an ordinance dealing with that issue. Mr. Storagee answered that there is currently statute 8 within the Nuisance Code that addresses this and also things like keeping the grass cut short so as not to harbor vectors. Mr. Erich said he appreciated knowing that since he does want to address quality of life issues such as preventing rats while also keeping up the country atmosphere that attracts many people to Troutdale in the first place. He also appreciated the civil tone of the discussion.

Mr. Storagee commented that if Troutdale adds any more development like Morgan Meadows, the increased density could lead to discord between neighbors.

Ms. Castillo asked Mr. Storagee if there had been other complaints besides rats that are related to people keeping chickens. He answered that there have been complaints about people keeping chickens too close to the property line and also about the noise that they make. Ms. Castillo asked how many complaints he's had and Mr. Storagee said that he hasn't counted them but there were probably five of them in one of those pictures. Ms. Castillo asked if Mr. Storagee considered five complaints to be objectionable, and he said that he did feel that it was. She asked him if things like keeping food in metal containers are already covered in the nuisance ordinance and about bringing food inside in the evenings.

Mr. Damgen replied that in 6.08.040, there's a reference that any sort of feed must be stored in a sealed container although it doesn't specify the exact material type. There are also restrictions mentioned in Item G. Ms. Castillo said that she personally has friends who keeps chickens and has them in mind. She also personally loves chickens and that she loves the idea of keeping them because they are a very healthy food choice. Also, organic free-range eggs are much more expensive in the store and so keeping them in

your backyard is a frugal alternative. People used to also keep Victory Gardens during wartime and share produce with other families. She would suggest adding a definition of the required amount of square feet the property must have.

Ms. Castillo asked the Code Officer if he had any other suggestions based on his experience for what this code should contain. He said no, but there needs to be a tool. He spoke to someone last week who would like to buy a home and bring his chickens, and there is no restriction on that at this time.

Chair Knight then called on Marko Lescanec, a resident of Troutdale. He lives next door to a home where several people are living as part of one household, and one couple decided to buy chickens. The chickens have often been seen roaming the streets and he and his wife have advised the household of this, but they are not receptive to his feedback. Like many of his neighbors, he has lived there for a very long time—33 years—and he has noticed many problems on his street since these neighbors moved in. Also, the chickens have been digging holes, and the digging has led to more dust. They are also very noisy early in the morning. Finally, his neighbor noticed rats, and this is a problem that wasn't around before, and he believed that it was because of the chickens and suggested that Mr. Lescanec contact Mr. Storagee, which he did. He appreciates the CAC addressing this issue on behalf of him and his neighbors. He thinks that the rats are coming because they smell the food inside the chicken's cages and will not keep the chicken feed in the garage.

Chair Knight thanked Mr. Lescanec for attending the CAC meeting and acknowledged how frustrating the situation must be for him and his neighbors. He asked if he would support people being able to keep chickens if the City addressed the concerns that he'd raised, and he said he definitely would. He also has friends who have chickens in a coop that are well cared for and kept clean, so the rats do not bother them.

Chair Knight recognized Nicole Lawrence, a resident of Troutdale. She submitted a letter and pictures of her coop ahead of the meeting. She keeps six chickens and has kept them since last spring, right after Covid and the shut-down when it became more difficult to find groceries reliably. She has 3 children that eat constantly and she realized that she wanted to control her family food spending, especially for meat.

She says she is not a big fan of confining chickens. She's found it works well to let them be free range and roam for portions of the day, especially since they eat weeds and other healthy greens and clean out her yard, and this also means their eggs and meat have more nutritional value. They are also great at providing pest and environmental control. Also, when they are confined to their coops for long periods of time, they get bored and peck at each other and go after the eggs. She said that her husband is opposed to the permits, but after attending tonight's meeting, she feels that they've made good arguments for permits, though not \$100. A fee would encourage people to take raising chickens seriously instead of impulsively adopting some and then becoming tired of it.

She suggested changing the 7 a.m. – 9 p.m. rule to from dawn to dusk. In her experience, chickens wake up early and need to be fed. They get very angry, and so as a chicken owner, you need to be willing to get up and care for them which also contributes to noise. As a result, she hasn't had any complaints about noise or cleanliness. They had one bird escape once, but in general, she is respectful and kind towards her neighbors and they are towards her as well.

She read the City of Portland's ordinance which has a vaguer suggestion about sanitation and then shows examples of appropriate types of coops and feeding systems. Also, Ms. Castillo's testimony, she has only seen one rodent even though she lives close to the hoarding property. There are also several cats and dogs in the neighborhood, and she has not seen an uptick of rodents. Also, every chicken owner should clean their coop at least weekly.

She keeps her coop very close to her house, about 15 feet. They have been very responsible, and they are not directly under someone's bedroom window. If they needed to come into compliance with the proposed ordinance, they would need to keep them in the middle of the yard, which would be a real eyesore. Keeping theirs against the house protects them against the wind and it also looks much more like a shed. Also, she would like the CAC to know that she and her husband have invested a great deal of time and money into keeping chickens.

Chair Knight asked if she had Mr. Lescanec's neighbor, what would she suggest as a chicken owner to help them get back to being a good chicken owner. She said they need to mind their chickens. Free range doesn't mean they are never supervised by people since we are in a city, not on a large farm. They also maintain the yard so they have grass, and maybe their yard isn't in good enough shape and that's why the chickens are digging. She thinks there are other issues going on.

Chair Knight asked how she felt about the proposed number of chickens. She felt that there were too many chickens in that coop, and there are standards for how many can live comfortably in a coop. She has six chickens and the run is 12x5 and the coop is 5x5. Mr. Damgen said that sounded like about 4 square feet per chicken in the coop.

Regarding the number of chickens, six is good for her family since not all of them lay every day. A friend of her says you need a chicken per person in your family, but they have 8 people in their family.

She also suggested creating a welcome packet to hand to new chicken owners so they can learn and get connected with other resources. She personally read a lot to understand what she was about to do and believes that most people want to do the right thing. She hopes that responsible chicken owners won't suffer as a result of an ordinance.

Ms. Rizzo asked how many hours a day she lets her chickens out of the coop. Ms. Lawrence replied that she lets them out for an hour to two hours per day and they seem happy with that amount of time. Ms. Castillo asked if she was there while they were outside and Ms. Lawrence said she was close by but not standing with them the entire time. Ms. Castillo asked if she clipped her chickens' wings and Ms. Lawrence answered that she did not though she was aware that some people did. Ms. Castillo asked about the size of Ms. Lawrence's backyard. **(Her answer was inaudible.)** Ms. Castillo asked when they laid eggs, and Ms. Lawrence answered that they don't just lay eggs in the morning and that it depends on the chicken's preference. She has one that is an early layer and the others are spaced throughout the day.

Chair Knight asked if there were any other questions from CAC members. He thanked Ms. Lawrence for speaking and asked if she had attended the Council meeting, which she had. He asked how she knew of meetings since the CAC is trying to track how to get the word out, and she said a neighbor had told her the Council would be discussing the topic of chickens.

Next, Mr. Damgen pointed out to Chair Knight that Mr. Wilcox had submitted a comment. Chair Knight acknowledged this and asked Mr. Wilcox if he had any other comments. He then asked the CAC members if they had questions or comments for Mr. Wilcox and they did not.

Chair Knight returned to Mr. Damgen's questions. First, should they allow chickens? Second, they needed to look at number of chickens allowed, siting standards, and the permit process. He asked for a consensus from the group regarding whether people should be allowed to keep chickens. Mr. Damgen summarized the vote; a large majority favored keeping chickens.

Chair Knight opened discussion about the Staff's cut and pasted sample chicken ordinance. Ms. Rizzo said she agreed that the code should specify from "dawn to dusk." Also, she thinks 3 is too little of a

number. Also, for people that have them already and some of them are part of the family, she would like to grandfather in the households so they can keep them. She is also very against the fee since people are raising chickens to help supplement their food. She asked if it would be possible to do a no-fee permit. Mr. Damgen said yes, but then there is no incentive to get a permit. They do currently have permit applications with no fees attached, but he thinks that the main reason to have them is so the City is aware that somebody has started keeping chickens and Mr. Storagee inspects the property.

He also mentioned that it's easy for someone to apply now from the web site instead of needing to make a trip to Staff's offices, and there's also not a paper burden for Staff to manage. He reminded them that this is only a recommendation.

Ms. Reynolds asked if there is a code and a fine for not complying with it, would their need to be a permit? Mr. Damgen answered that the permit offers some protection to the chicken owner from neighbors who complain, assuming they are taking good care of the chickens. They are able to show that they have a City permit to do so. Chair Knight suggested that even without a permit, if the Code Officer was called and inspected the property, he could find that the complaint was frivolous. Mr. Damgen replied that this was true but a permit would offer further protection if the case ended up in mediation. Staff has seen this happen before in other cases.

Mr. Wheaton commented that he thought there should be a small but reasonable cost to keep the bad actors at bay. He is torn between the small town feel and thinking about 20 years into the future. He was on the Town Center committee and they addressed this issue, and no one talked about chickens. They did talk about increasing density and growth and over time, the more people in a smaller space, the more problems you will have like this. He feels that there should be a minimum lot size to have chickens and second, if development occurs and that minimum size isn't attainable then chickens shouldn't be allowed. He thinks that unfortunately it only takes one bad actor to mess up a neighborhood as they go into the future and be less concerned about what's happened in the past.

Ms. Castillo suggested that they have a one-time \$25 fee that includes a welcome packet with information about raising chickens. That way people have the information they need to be a good neighbor. Also, later on, if there becomes a density issue that this could be addressed at a later time. For now, she feels that if chicken owners are being responsible about things like where food is kept at night, cleaning the coop weekly, that things could be fine. All of these things could be included in the code so that people's yards aren't infested with rats, for example. She isn't sure that it needs to be repeated every two years, however.

Mr. Damgen said that maybe Gresham includes the renewal because otherwise there's the question of if the permit belongs to the person who originally applied for it or to the property owner during the period it's active. For example, the original applicant could have moved. Ms. Castillo says she feels that the permit belongs to the applicant and not to the property. Mr. Damgen compared this to a business who resides in one location and then moves out and still has the permit to operate, and he said this could be a red flag.

Chair Knight asked Ms. Castillo if she thought there should only be one permit one time, and she said that she did, but the permit holder would also have contact information so they could reach out to the city with questions.

Mr. Wheaton asked if the fee could be based on how many chickens a person kept, such as a \$25 per chicken fee. Mr. Damgen answered this is possible. Mr. Wheaton said he feels this would allow it but discourage use over time so that people would tend to have less and not more.

Mr. Schwab said he feels that current chicken owners should be grandfathered into the ordinance. Also, it makes sense to him that the number of chickens someone has is limited by the size of their property. It makes sense to him to have a permit and to have it renewed and that it can be free if it doesn't eat up staff time. It's as much for the chicken owner as for the staff's use since it allows the chicken owner to become aware of what is required of them.

Ms. Reynolds said that chickens are flock birds. She was raised with chickens. You really need a minimum of two but three is better. Charging by chickens after the first 3 chickens might help people keep desires down to have a lot of chickens. Also, she has a problem with grandfathering this in because there are people who are not good chicken owners who need to change. If they are grandfathered in, then they will not need to follow the code. She suggested that if you're already a chicken owner, you have one year to come into compliance with the city code. She agrees that chickens have a lot of personality and can become family members but the likelihood that you're attached to all ten chickens is slim.

Ms. Castillo said she'd like to address the issue that Ms. Lawrence raised of chickens needing to roam for one to two hours per day while being supervised. She asked that this be included in the ordinance.

Ms. Rizzo commented that she is all right with grandfathering in the number of chickens owned by current chicken owners kept but they would still need to come into compliance with the code immediately. However, she doesn't want to take away any kid's pets. She feels that the number of chickens in the future would be on the honor system.

Chair Knight said that he feels they definitely have a problem with some chicken owners and they definitely need to have a standard that the Code Officer can use as an enforcement tool. He doesn't think there needs to be an inspection prior to getting a permit since if they are doing it well and the neighbors are OK with it, the City doesn't need to get involved, and that they need to achieve a balance of letting people do what they want while protecting homeowners with legitimate concerns, like Mr. Lescanec's. He did an informal Google search just now and found a wide variety of what other cities allow. For example, in Lake Oswego, they basically don't care what you do as long as the chickens and roosters aren't noisy. Corvallis is very similar about allowing chickens as long as they stay on your property. Beaverton also allows up to four hens at single-family homes and duplexes on lots at least 5,000 sq. ft. or greater, but no roosters are allowed within the city limits of Beaverton. City of Portland does not require a permit for fewer than 3 chickens but it does for more than 3 chickens. Salem's code also mentions honeybees. Eugene also lists several animals in its ordinance, including rabbits and pigs, so a chicken ordinance might just be the tip of the iceberg of regulating animals in residents' backyards. Mr. Damgen added that he agreed this would be the case. Chair Knight said that the small town feel really is the draw to the community and something that the Town Center Committee said it wanted to maintain.

Going over the consensus, he hears 4-6 chickens; that we should have some type of siting and dimensional standards; and regarding a permit, he personally would like to see a nominal fee of \$5. He remembers one time a friend went to a favorite outdoor recreation site with his kids and there were signs posted that he now needed a permit. When he asked about the reason why, he was told that he needed to pay for a permit so they could pay Staff to check and make sure he had a permit.

Chair Knight asked the group for their thoughts. Ms. Castillo said she would like to require someone to have at least 20,000 square feet. Mr. Damgen said that only 10% of the properties in Troutdale are that size and the majority of detached and semi-detached houses are between 7,000-10,000. Ms. Castillo said she wanted to withdraw that suggestion.

Mr. Lumiere commented that while he agrees with Chair Knight's suggestion to keep bureaucracy low, he sees requiring a permit as an opportunity to educate chicken owners about what will be involved.

Chair Knight asked for thoughts about detached vs. attached housing. He personally agrees with Ms. Hinshaw's earlier comment that anyone who is able to meet the siting standards and keep the goodwill of their neighbors should be allowed to keep chickens, even if they live in a duplex. Ms. Reynolds commented that apartment community and multi-family dwellings will establish their own regulations. Ms. Hinshaw said she agreed, but she wonders if they need to say anything in their regulation or can they leave that up to the apartment complexes? Ms. Reynolds clarified that she wants to implement the code and that she agrees about removing the word "detached" so that any household that meets the requirements is allowed to have chickens.

Chair Knight asked whether the group felt the chicken coop needs to be located 15 feet or 25 feet away from the home and also whether they should be located 10 feet from the property line. Mr. Damgen commented that these coops fall into the category of "accessory structures" even though they aren't regulated by the Development Code and typically sheds are allowed to go up to 3 feet of the property line. Ms. Hinshaw stated that she doesn't think they should nail down a number because it seems like a very case by case situation, depending on the property. Chair Knight said he agreed and thought that it could be left vague unless there are complaints by neighbors about a nuisance. Mr. Damgen said the default would be 3 feet off the property line. Ms. Reynolds said that what really needs to be addressed is that the chickens are kept away from the neighbor's property. When it is warm, there will definitely be smells and neighbors shouldn't be subjected to that.

Chair Knight asked if the group wanted to make a recommendation. He said to remember that if great chicken owners don't cause any complaints, no one is going to visit their home to make sure they meet the required number. On the other hand, if there is an issue of a bad chicken owner, there needs to be a standard that Mr. Storagee can enforce. Mr. Damgen reminded the group that this was only a recommendation they were making to the Council.

Ms. Hinshaw says she wants to make sure big houses are not prioritized over small houses. As Mr. Wheaton said, they are increasing density, but if people in small houses talk to their neighbors and they are OK with it, she wants them to be able to have chickens. She would default to Mr. Brown or Ms. Reynolds concerning how many chickens since they have owned chickens.

Mr. Damgen showed a slide summarizing recommendations (these were added to during discussion):

- Number of chickens: 6
- Detached/attached? Allow it for residential properties regardless of types, apartments/neighbors can self-regulate
- Siting: reducing from 25 to 15 feet from adjacent residence.
- Distance of property lines?
- Fee? - \$5
- Dusk to dawn
- Open air/free range allowed
- Chicken feed must be kept in a metal container.

Ms. Hinshaw said she liked the idea of a \$5 fee. She asked why the permit needed to expire. Chair Knight said that if it was renewed every 2 years, it would be on Mr. Storagee's radar. Also, Mr. Damgen added, if someone moves away and you have a bad actor who tries to use the permit from 10-15 years, there should

be a way to prevent this. Ms. Hinshaw said her recommendation is that there is a \$5 fee, that it's renewed every 2 years, and that it isn't portable because your new place will have its own new features. Mr. Damgen said that you would need to list the property on the application but Staff wants to avoid it being permanently part of the property forever. Ms. Hinshaw asked if \$5 was reasonable to pay for oversight and Staff costs. Mr. Damgen said that they might as well not charge anything at all if they are charging \$5, but the City isn't looking to profit from this. In fact, maybe some of the revenue from application fees could go to help people like Mr. Lescanec who had to repair property damage because of bad chicken owners. Chair Knight said the welcome packet could be sent electronically so there wouldn't be a cost of materials. Chair Knight asked about how the group felt about "3 for Free" fees, and Ms. Hinshaw said that would be difficult to enforce. Mr. Lumiere said he favors a flat fee. Chair Knight said they would add \$5 as the fee to the recommendation list. He also said he hadn't heard any concerns about chickens being able to roam as long as there aren't complaints.

He asked if there was a motion to make a recommendation to the City Council. Ms. Rizzo said she wanted to include the "dusk to dawn" language.

Ms. Castillo said she would like Chair Knight to attend the Council meeting to make sure their recommendation is understood. Mr. Damgen said that he can also report on the Council discussion to CAC members so that they know what is decided.

Chair Knight said that he wanted to make sure that metal cans were required and Mr. Damgen said he would make sure to include that in the draft. Chair Knight asked him to send a draft in advance.

Chair Knight asked if anyone would like to make a motion to make a recommendation to Council.

- Number of chickens: 6
- Detached/attached? Allow it for residential properties regardless of types, apartments/neighbors can self-regulate
- Siting: reducing from 25 to 15 feet from adjacent residence.
- Distance of property lines?
- Fee? - \$5
- Dusk to dawn
- Open air/free range allowed
- Chicken feed must be kept in a metal container.

Ms. Castillo moved and Ms. Rizzo seconded to present the recommendation to the Council The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Knight suggested forgoing the web site update in the interest in time.

4. Review & Approval of Minutes

i. September 2, 2020 Meeting Minutes

The transcriptionist made the correction of a speaker's name to the September 2 minutes. Mr. Schwab had a grammatical change suggestion. Ms. Shackelford made the changes. There were no other corrections.

Ms. Rizzo moved to accept the amended September 2, 2020 minutes and Ms. Castillo seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

ii. October 7, 2020 Meeting Minutes

Moving to the October minutes, Ms. Hinshaw clarified that she was not trying to make disparaging remarks about Sugarpine and clarified better wording. Chair Knight suggested a grammatical change. Mr. Lumiere clarified that he was not included in the list of the attendees. Ms. Shackelford made the changes. There were no other corrections.

Ms. Rizzo moved to accept the minutes of October 7, 2020 as corrected and Ms. Hinshaw seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Return to Discussion Items

iii. Rent-Burdened Meeting

Ms. Shackelford said that the Planning Commission will also attend the meeting. She said that regarding discussion of whether there can be a potluck as in years past, Staff would make the room available but would not be present for it and will not be responsible for the cleanup. This will also mean that the potluck will start at 6 p.m. and the Rent Burden Meeting will start at 7 p.m. Ms. Hinshaw said she unfortunately thought that the potluck was not a good idea this year due to Covid and Chair Knight agreed.

Chair Knight asked how many people would attend and how to handle seating. Mr. Damgen said that the group capacity is what can be allowed with social distancing, so he thinks about 20 people can attend. Chair Knight asked if Staff could ask for RSVPs to make sure all can be accommodated in the room while understanding informally that some of them may end up sitting in the lobby. Ms. Shackelford said they do want to get people really engaged with it and going beyond what is required by State law. They are thinking of ways they can gather residents' data about their experiences, such as having an online form people can fill out and advertising in social media. Also, last year they sent postcards reminding people in multi-family housing about the meeting and they can do that again. She asked if there are other ideas from CAC members about how to get people involved.

Mr. Schwab said that at work and other community meetings he's attended, people can type into chat and the moderator can call on people in that order. Ms. Hinshaw asked what the meeting is about. Ms. Shackelford explained that when a large portion of residents are paying over 30% of their income on rent, they are required to host a meeting on the topic. Mr. Damgen said that the meetings have been valuable. For example, they learned that they needed to do a new housing needs analysis as a result of that rent burden meeting. Troutdale is number three in the Metro region in terms of rent burden which often surprises many people. The meeting is held at the end of the year to help City Staff and the Planning Commission address the issue of rent burden and quality of life in the upcoming year.

Returning to how to get the word out, Ms. Hinshaw said that communications should make it clear that this is a chance for residents to have a voice in their community. Chair Knight suggested also posting it on the Nextdoor app. He also wants to make sure that all Zoom information for City meetings is posted publicly on the website. Chair Knight said he also thought it was important, like Ms. Hinshaw said, to make sure residents understood this is a chance to be heard.

Mr. Tanney Staffenson, Chair of the Planning Commission, introduced himself. He explained that the Planning Commission had a housing needs committee that included a realtor, a housing advocate, a commercial banker, developer, someone who studied the issue and now works for the State. They had 5 meetings and at the end of it, they came up with an extensive 94-page document that contained all of the

technical data. He thinks it's important to know that the cost burden rate for Troutdale is 38%. 55% of these are renters and 26% are homeowners. This is compared to Gresham at 40% and 44% in Multnomah County whereas Portland is at 37%. Also, this is a document that every city of Troutdale's size has to do, and he thanks Staff for putting forth the resources and direction to get ahead of this before the State mandated it.

Mr. Staffenson explained there's a deficit in housing of 611 units for the \$0-35,000 income group, and in the \$35,000-100,000 range, there is a housing surplus, but there is a 1,054 deficit for those earning \$100,000+. So there are two markets we are not effectively handling. He said the long document is a technical document, and then there is an Executive Summary containing the objectives and policies. That document has not been adopted yet and is still very much a working document.

Mr. Staffenson said they're scheduled to add 720 new dwelling units between now and 2040. We already have 350 of those that need to be constructed or are under-construction at this time. As Mr. Wheaton said earlier this evening, density is going to be an issue. The City will be able to address some of this with the Confluence project, but they will need to look at density in other areas as well. On behalf of the Housing Committee, they really appreciate the opportunity to partner with the CAC to do what we can to make things work for everybody. Also, it's great to have something online for them to fill out, but if we're able to get people to engage at the meeting, even via Zoom, it's very impactful because the tenants and landlords are always very respectful of each other and in the real world, the landlord needs the tenant as much as the tenant needs the landlord. Chair Knight thanked Mr. Staffenson for his comments.

Ms. Hinshaw suggested having breakout groups on the Zoom call if there are lots of people attending so it's easier for people to talk. Ms. Rizzo said the problem with that is that they would not be able to record these and the meeting needs to be recorded. Chair Staffenson said that would be possible.

6. Department Report

Ms. Farrell is headed on family leave next week and says she wishes you all the best in her absence. She shared an update for the Sandy River Trail project. It's moving along. They've completed the RFP for the structural engineering design and the City has selected a firm to help with the design. They've hired APFF of Beaverton to design a multi-use trail along the Sandy River. The landscape architect attended the last Parks Advisory Meeting. There was discussion about a potential nature play area and the trail is set to be named Wabun.

Also, the Town Center Plan will be concluded soon. We hope to have a meeting at the end of the month on it and we're hoping to have a plan before City Council in December. Also, December 1 will be the mid-year budget update for the City and the time of the meeting will be available on the City web site. Finally, an update from the Economic Development Coordinator. The Saturday after Thanksgiving is Small Business Saturday and everyone is encouraged to support small businesses that day. Artist Sunday is the following day when you can support your local artists.

Chair Knight asked if there had been conversations about river access. Mr. Damgen said that from the landscape architect's point of view, direct river access will present design challenges, but they have talked about the idea of using an opportunity site to create a mile-long trail.

7. Committee Comments

Mr. Wheaton said he has talked with Mr. Damgen about river access. He doesn't remember the architect getting into detail at the meeting to discuss those features.

Ms. Reynolds says Paul Wilcox had left a comment that a member of the public wasn't able to comment. Ms. Shackelford will follow up and send the email to the transcriptionist.

Ms. Hinshaw wished everyone good health and a happy Thanksgiving as did Mr. Schwab and Mr. Lumiere.

Ms. Rizzo asked if anyone knew about the Toy Drive. Chair Knight said he wasn't sure if Wal-Mart was going to allow it or not.

Chair Knight thanked everyone for being there. He appreciated the great discussion and problem solving around keeping chickens in the City.

8. Adjourn

Ms. Rizzo moved to adjourn the meeting and it was seconded by Ms. Reynolds. The motion passed unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 9:13 p.m.

Next Regular Meeting:

Wednesday, December 2, 2020 | 7:00 p.m. | Troutdale Police Community Center

Due to safety precautions regarding COVID-19, there will be a limit on public attendance in the Kellogg Room. The meeting will also be held virtually via Zoom. If members of the public wish to join, please email amber.shackelford@troutdaleoregon.gov for a link to the meeting.

Citizens Advisory Committee Minutes

Wednesday, January 6, 2021 | 7:00 p.m.

Troutdale Police Community Center – Kellogg Room

234 SW Kendall Ct – Troutdale, OR 97060

Held in-person and virtually via Zoom

Public comments are welcome at any time during the meeting.

1. Call to Order, Roll Call, & Pledge of Allegiance

Present: Will Knight (Chair)
David Wheaton
Timothy Erich
Alexander Lumiere
Shelly Reynolds
Kyle Schwab
Jon Brown
Diane Castillo
Victoria Rizzo
Heidi Hinshaw
Chris Barney

Staff: Amber Shackelford, Assistant Planner
Melissa S. Bocarde, Independent Contractor/Transcriptionist

Members of
the Public: Paul Wilcox

2. Public Comment

Chair Knight asked if there was any public comment on a non-agenda item.

Mr. Wilcox said he would like to check in with the 3 CAC members who were automatically given 6-month extensions to see if this was something that they wanted—Mr. Schwab, Mr. Brown, and Mr. Barney. Chair Knight explained that the City Council decided to extend terms without anyone needing to re-interview for their positions. Mr. Barney asked if he would need to reapply in 6 months, and Chair Knight answered yes. Ms. Rizzo said that anyone whose terms were up will be notified of it.

Ms. Hinshaw said that she was concerned that people in the Kellogg Room were not wearing their masks correctly. Chair Knight asked people to adjust their masks.

3. Review & Approval of Minutes

- i. November 4, 2020 Meeting Minutes

Chair Knight asked Ms. Shackelford how to include public comments from the last meeting that were submitted later by people who did not speak at the meeting and thus were not included in the meeting

audio for minutes. Ms. Shackelford said that Mr. Wilcox was unable to unmute himself at the November meeting and so he'd followed up by emailing his comments to Staff and the CAC. She said that the group could vote to re-open the record and for those comments to be included. Chair Knight asked if anyone wished to make a motion to re-open the record for November.

Mr. Erich said he would move to re-open the November meeting for adjustment of the minutes, and Ms. Rizzo seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Shackelford shared her screen to show Mr. Wilcox's comments that she had pasted into the copy of the minutes.

Mr. Erich moved to include Mr. Wilcox's comments in the public comment and Ms. Reynolds seconded.

Chair Knight added that he thought that Ms. Shackelford should paste the email she received from Mr. Wilcox into the minutes.

Mr. Erich said he accepted the friendly amendment that this public comment was added later because of technical problems. Ms. Reynolds seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Knight asked if there were any other corrections to the November minutes. Ms. Reynolds and Chair Knight had corrections including the identity of a woman who spoke without identifying herself for the record. Chair Knight said that Staff would make the changes and bring them back to the group for approval at the next meeting.

ii. December 2, 2020 Rent Burden Town Hall Meeting Minutes – Review Only

Ms. Shackelford explained that the Planning Commission will be the ones who need to approve the minutes even though they were distributed to the group. Ms. Reynolds noted that her name was spelled incorrectly. There were no other corrections.

4. Discussion Items

i. Appointment of Chair and Vice Chair

Chair Knight said there was a question regarding extensions of people's terms. Typically, in January, the CAC votes for Chair and Vice Chair appointments. However, he feels that it is awkward for people to vote for people that they don't know. He thinks it would be more appropriate and comfortable for people who are new to the CAC to spend 6 months with someone and then make a decision. He said that he supposed they would wait until this summer to make those changes as well. That way if his term starts in January and the group votes in July, that gives people some time to get to know him. Ms. Rizzo pointed out the changes would need to happen in 2022.

Mr. Erich asked if they had finished the reconsideration of the November meeting's minutes. Chair Knight explained that there were a number of changes that needed to be made to the minutes and so Staff would make those and they would be returned in February for review.

Returning to the appointment discussion, Chair Knight said that he might take a year off from chairing, so if there's anyone who would like to do that, he would like to open that discussion.

ii. CAC Website Updates

Ms. Shackelford said she can keep track of any changes that the group wishes to make and present these to the City's webmaster.

Mr. Schwab said that he and Ms. Hinshaw had put together a web site rough draft and a running list of things the CAC have worked on as a committee. The web site also allows names to be put to faces so that anyone in the community who is thinking about joining the CAC can easily access the site and navigate to the minutes and any documentation pertaining to any of the projects that the CAC has been a part of, like the Housing Needs Analysis, for example. Having a web site seemed like a good outreach tool for the group.

Chair Knight thanked Ms. Hinshaw and Mr. Schwab for their work. He asked if there were any questions or comments.

Mr. Barney said that on the second page, Ms. Hinshaw is listed as an alternate member. Mr. Schwab said that they had created the rough draft a few months ago, and Ms. Hinshaw agreed that it was in September 2020. Chair Knight commented that they could use this web site to promote the Rent Burden Meeting on a regular basis assuming they were still going to be its host. Also, he asked if this would be a place to list chicken resources available for residents. Ms. Shackelford said that information may be housed elsewhere on the City's web site.

Mr. Schwab said the municipal broadband information needs to be updated as well. The feasibility study came out after this was put together. Ms. Rizzo asked if it was possible to change or improve the current photos and Ms. Shackelford said that she had some editing ability of the City's website, and it isn't as easy as you think it might be, but they could certainly try. Mr. Schwab said those were the only photos he had available and they were from his phone.

Mr. Lumiere complimented Mr. Schwab and Ms. Hinshaw on its readability and how easy it is to locate information without needing to dig for it.

Chair Knight said that at future meetings, they can keep track of what new items should be added to the web site.

Ms. Shackelford said that she would take the draft and their comments to the Staff's webmaster. Chair Knight asked for other thoughts or comments. Ms. Castillo asked if the Staff would be reviewing the content of the web site draft to make sure there was not any conflict with existing City policies, and Ms. Shackelford said they would do that. She said that she adds some of the event information, such as committee meetings. Chair Knight asked her if this web site could be a place where she adds the Zoom invitation to join CAC meetings. Ms. Shackelford said yes, and they did add the Zoom link information about the Rent Burden meeting.

Chair Knight thanked Ms. Hinshaw and Mr. Schwab for their excellent work.

Ms. Hinshaw asked if people would like to submit photos to put next to their names. Ms. Shackelford said she would check to see if this is something that Staff can do.

Chair Knight asked if everyone had a chance to review the chicken code and if there were comments or questions. Ms. Rizzo asked about the amount of the fee. Ms. Shackelford said that her understanding is there is not a set fee yet. Ms. Rizzo commented that maybe it is because they could change it at any time, so they are not going to put it in there.

Chair Knight said that he would like to discuss the definitions of C, D, and E and that those words don't show up anywhere else in the entire code.

Ms. Castillo that she was disappointed to see a \$1000 fee for violating the Chicken Code since that seems high. She commented that most of the councilors didn't object to that fee but that two of them did.

Ms. Reynolds said she was unable to find where the Code addressed people who already own chickens and need to come into compliance with the code. She asked if anyone else had noticed that section. Mr. Erich said he hadn't seen it in the document, but he did remember some discussion about giving people time to make some adjustments under normal circumstances. Mr. Wheaton said he did not remember talking about that in their discussion, but he did remember Mr. Damgen talking about when the new ordinance went into effect, and that people would have time to come into compliance.

Mr. Barney commented the only place in the Chicken Code where he saw detached single family dwellings mentioned was in the definition section and not anywhere else in the Chicken Code.

5. Department Report

Ms. Shackelford reported that the Town Center Plan will be brought to the Planning Commission at the December 20th meeting. In addition to that, Staff is finalizing the scope for the grant and the RFP process is about to begin later this month. Ms. Castillo asked if she knew what the additions and changes to power lines during Covid had been and if they were related to 5G.

6. Committee Comments

Ms. Reynolds thanked Ms. Hinshaw and Mr. Schwab for their work on the web site. She asked Chair Knight if he had said that he wanted to take a year off. He said yes, from chairing since he's done it for a couple of years. Also, he really missed pre-Covid when they were able to meet together as a group and the energy, and so he would be fine with someone else taking over now. Ms. Reynolds said that this would make her very sad, but maybe there was an alternative, like when Mr. Schwab had taken over during Chair Knight's break, and she really appreciates his leadership.

Mr. Erich commented that as a future topic, he would like to spend more time on budgets, taxes, and the financial side of things. He is on the separate Budget Committee, but for this last cycle, they met only once. He feels that the CAC has a unique ability to look at all sides of an issue. It's the middle of winter, and they have only now reactivated the ability to offer assistance to people who have fallen behind on their utility bills. The numbers of people falling behind on mortgages and property taxes are increasing. In the middle of the pandemic, they raised the City's budget by 10%, and he wonders if they are in time with what is happening in the community. He would like to discuss whether to take this on at the next CAC meeting. He thinks the Budget Committee would appreciate any insights. Chair Knight asked if he meant for the CAC to discuss an issue and make recommendations to the Budget Committee. Mr. Erich said he was open, but he has seen that other cities that have a bit of success can over-expand and when there's a contraction, everything falls apart. He does not want that to happen in Troutdale. He said he would think about some specific things. Chair Knight said finding out about utility bills and where people are at with falling behind corresponds to what they've discussed about financial literacy, and it could be included on the web site. Chair Knight said regarding constraints for projects, they will plan a program and put energy and effort into it, they need to find creative ways to fund these. He asked if there were any comments or questions.

Mr. Wheaton said he liked Mr. Erich's train of thought, but budget and finance for a City are a huge

issue because the City gets guidance not only from their own City Council, but also from groups like the League of Cities, and *de facto* policies on how government should operate to show public accounting.

He would love to get into this more.

Chair Knight made a comment about how they should keep an eye out for new funding sources as funding for additional projects. Mr. Lumiere said that he had a few comments, beginning with whether it would be possible for Chair Knight to co-Chair and that would alleviate some of the responsibility. Also, he wonders what progress has been made by the City with the broadband issue. Ms. Shackelford said that she hasn't heard anything new about it. Mr. Lumiere asked if there was anything they could do to move that forward. Finally, he hopes that they can all look forward and not behind.

Mr. Schwab said that he would like to discuss goals at the February meeting and what they can do in 2021. Also, regarding finances, he likes the idea of taking one of those capital projects that the Council approved and budgeted for and been in the queue for a long time, and the CAC writing a proposal that would convince them to let the CAC use the appropriated funds for one of our projects. Since these get carried over to the next year, could they take the money from that public project and put it towards a project that CAC could manage. Chair Knight said they could proactively lobby for 2022 this year. Mr. Schwab said the Budget Committee meets in April, and that will give them enough time to work on a proposal. Ms. Rizzo commented that everyone is welcome to attend the Budget Committee meeting and offer input, and she encourages people to attend and speak. However, she doesn't think the CAC will have time to formulate a project before then, at least not a big project. Mr. Schwab agreed it would need to be a very solid ask together before mid-April. He has the last two years of budget documents, but if there is a single line item that's in all five, he would suggest starting with that one. Ms. Rizzo said that some of the topics that are carried over every year are because budgetary emergencies happen.

Ms. Castillo wished everyone a happy new year. She believes that the CAC does play an important role in helping Council. Recently, there were comments on social media by the City about clean-up kits available from SOLV and she asked Ms. Shackelford to check to see if they're still available. Ms. Rizzo said she liked Ms. Castillo's idea.

Mr. Barney commented that for future meetings, he would prefer to stick to Agenda items.

Chair Knight wished everyone a happy new year.

7. Adjourn

The meeting ended at 8:23 p.m.

Next Regular Meeting:

Wednesday, February 3, 2020 | 7:00 p.m. | Troutdale Police Community Center **Due to safety precautions regarding COVID-19, there will be a limit on public attendance in the Kellogg Room. The meeting will also be held virtually via Zoom. If members of the public wish to join, please email amber.shackelford@troutdaleoregon.gov for a link to the meeting.**