

MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING
FOR THE CITY OF MAYWOOD PARK
22 October 2018

CITY COUNCIL MEETING

The City Council Meeting was called to order at approximately 7:00 pm.

Present at the meeting were Councilman Matthew Castor, Councilman Jim Akers, and Councilman Brian Davey.

Also present: Wendy Irwin, City Treasurer; Bonnie Davey, City Recorder. Stephanie Hallock, Levee Ready Columbia; Eryn Mitchell, Levee Ready Columbia, Colin Rowan, Levee Ready Columbia.

Residents present: Michelle Montross, Nathan Montross, Chris Williams, Linda Hardin, Kathy Nims, Sue Price, Lisa Higgins, Mike Reynolds, William Lindsley, Ed Johnson, Jayatuwani Dissanayake, Robert Burrow, Alex Neerman, Claire Haack, Kevin Cassady, Connie Cassady, Mike Taylor, Joyce Lind, Stacey Stein.

Approval of the October 8, 2018 City Council minutes. Approved as presented.

Castor: Thanks everyone for coming, Mark Hardie won't be here tonight, we'll start with the Sheriff's report.

SHERIFF'S REPORT

Satterthwaite: There were 2 break-ins in occupied houses, I was on vacation so I'm not sure what happened but they came in and grabbed some stuff through unlocked doors. I encourage everyone to lock their doors. Total calls for service 46, previous month 44, 8 traffic stops, 8 suspicious subjects and vehicles. We had a vandalism call, and 12 vacation home checks. We did have some civil issues about parking issues, we talked to them and we are in contact with the Mayor about how to resolve issues in and around the college.

LEEVE READY COLUMBIA PRESENTATION

Castor: Tonight we have a presentation by Eryn, Stephanie and Colin from Levee Ready Columbia.

Stephanie Hallock: It's so wonderful to see everyone involved in government. Maywood is so beautiful. We are not the bearers of good news tonight, but we want to make sure you know what we have been working on since 2012 that may impact this community. A refresher on the problem we are trying to solve: We're talking about the leveed areas along the Columbia corridor about 27 miles. A lot has changed since the levees were built, they now protect the Port of Portland, the airport, the freeway system of I-5, I-84, 205, so it's a transportation hub that is protected as well. There is about \$16 billion in annual economic activity in this area, 8000 residents and 48,000 jobs. After hurricane Katrina in 2005 the federal government promulgated new laws regarding levees. The way the system works is the federal government through FEMA and the US Army Corps of Engineers has to certify and accredit levee systems. So

when they promulgated new regulations the Columbia levee system has to come up to the new standards. In 2012 the Port of Portland and City of Portland and Metro got together and decided, we needed to look at this holistically. The flood control system is looked at by the US Army Corps of engineers as a holistic system, it's not 4 separate drainage districts. They went to the governor because the airport is a regional and statewide resource about meeting the federal standards and asked for help. The governor designated Levee Ready Columbia an Oregon Solutions Project. I am the facilitator for Oregon Solutions for this project. It's based at PSU and funded by the Higher Ed budget to help facilitate community-based problem solving. The partners will help fund the work. Charlie Hales and Jules Bailey were the co-conveners of the project team. The project partners for Levee Ready Columbia are Troutdale, Fairview, Gresham and Portland, which are the 4 drainage districts along that 27 miles; Metro, Port of Portland and Multnomah County. Also representatives from the business community, environmental groups, the feds and neighborhood associations. Maywood Park and Wood Village declined to be a part when invited, so we wanted to reach out to you so you all know what is going on. In an Oregon Solutions Project, all the partners sign a declaration of cooperation. It's not legally binding but they spell out their goals. Their goal in this case is federal accreditation for this levee system. That current agreement expires June 30th of next year and they are in the process of committing to a new agreement from July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2024.

Any questions before I turn it over?

Nathan Montross: This has been going on since 2012, has any funding been secured?

Hallock: Yes, there has been about \$5.5 million from the state, and we were successful as a partnership in getting the legislature to commit \$15 million to Business Oregon's finance authority for levee systems statewide, this system has gotten about \$5.5 million of that. Congress invested \$3 million in the regional office of the Army Corps here to work with us on the feasibility of the work. We will ask for another \$10 million.

N. Montross: Will that be enough?

Hallock: It won't be enough to fully fund the project. The \$3 million investment in this region by the Army Corps opens the door to the \$22 million that congress will have available. That's why it is so significant that the Corps is investing in this project. It can't be done without federal dollars but the community will also need to step up for the funds.

Burrow: Is the objective to update the system of Levees along the south shore of the Columbia river so they will meet a standard that hasn't been met yet?

Hallock: Correct. There are 4 drainage districts, and there are projects needed in all districts and cross levees.

Burrow: The PEN-1 would be the area that was affected by the Vanport flood.

Hallock: Yes, that's correct. We are working closely with the Vanport project on that.

Alex Neerman: Is it too late to get involved? The project has been going on since 2012 with no Maywood Park involvement?

Hallock: Absolutely not too late. Yes, there have been 2 directors of this project before me and there has been no Maywood Park involvement that I'm aware of.

Castor: This project is actually new to me as well. How are the current government partners involved, what actions are they taking to participate?

Hallock: They are going to a lot of meetings. They also have skin in the game, there is a \$700,000 budget for next year and the cities are contributing to fund the project work. Everybody is contributing, all the partners. And the State has been contributing, up until now, and we have a request in to Governor Brown for a million dollars to continue the state's contribution to get us to accreditation. That won't be for construction, just to keep us together to create a new government structure and a new fee structure to pay for it.

Colin Rowan: As far as Maywood Park's involvement, it doesn't have to be a financial partner, just sitting at the table for the partner meetings, there are other environmental, economic development, and community organizations who are involved like that.

Hallock: There are jurisdictions who will have to levy a new utility fee in their districts, but lots of people just come and listen and you would be welcome to come and do that.

Castor: We'd like to learn more and get involved. We are pretty limited from a financial standpoint, we have a small tax base, just 307 homes, but we can discuss other ways we can be involved.

Colin Rowan: I'm the Levee Ready Columbia Program Director and led a lot of the engineering studies. As Stephanie noted, this is a big system, and in 1948 when the Vanport flood happened in the PEN-1, when it flooded 3 of the drainage district had breaches, and during that time it was before the Portland International Airport was constructed and it was called the Portland Super Port, the precursor to the current airport. The runway there and the hanger were flooded. The flood risk is real for us and it comes two directions, it comes downstream as well as from the Willamette river backing up into the Columbia river. That is what happened in 1948, when the railroad embankment on the western side of the system failed, it was the pressure from the Willamette river. We take this very seriously, and the Army Corps have worked to make sure the levees are operating correctly, but there have been changes how levees are managed in urban areas. There is a massive amount of commercial, residential and industrial uses happening behind the levees. Plus, more than 20 million passengers going in and out of PDX. In these urban levee environments, the Army Corps requires new standards. For the first time, starting in 2013, we were required to do comprehensive engineering studies, which required putting holes in the levees to test them. It tells us what they're made of and how they

are compacted and we can change the water level to see how they react. We have completed that for all districts and we found what deficiencies we have. There are 7 major deficiencies, mostly on the western side of the system where there were historic issues, but also the way the flooding happens it is a risk for the whole system. There is the replacement of the railroad berm on that western side needs to be done, that could be as much as a \$20million project. There are a few low spots in the system, most of those are smaller fixes, but they total up to a million or million and a half. Driving on Marine Drive and you see sod cover and it looks like a natural environment, but it's an engineered system. It's no different than driving on a bridge, it's an engineered levee, and it functions as a linear damn, with similar consequences behind it. In this area there is a cross levee, to introduce redundancy to the system, and one needs to be rebuilt, by NE 33rd, on the eastern side of the system there are some areas that need to be re-graded. In total we are talking about \$45-50 million dollars in projects just to get to certification. Why is certification important? Not only does it give us an understanding of how well the levees will function but it's necessary for accreditation. That area behind the levees where the new Amazon facility is, the FedEx facility, the airport, that's an economic engine for this region. If the levees aren't certified they aren't accredited by FEMA and it means those areas can't be used anymore and it would change our entire economy. As a region we saw value in levee modernization. The levees are about 100 years old and we want them to be ready for another 100 years. It's about \$100 million dollars of projects that need to be done. It's a lot of money, especially for our smaller levee districts, it's way beyond our capacity to do it. That's where the Army Corps study comes in. It will be a 3-year study and it will identify what projects are needed. That will be about a 65% or 75% cost share with the federal government, so that would reduce our need, but it's still a big price tag for our region to bear.

Claire Haack: The you're saying the design timeline for updates is for 100 years, so there is what's needed for accreditation, but then there is deluxe. So above what's needed is deluxe. There's ranges. So if it's the deluxe would it surpass the 100-year design-line? There are significant investments as you upgrade each one. Does the population get a longer design-line if it goes past those requirements? So reinvestment would be 100 years from now.

Rowan: The FEMA standards are insurance standards. California standards are 200 years. We haven't made a decision about what the appropriate level of protection would be. We're working with the Army Corps, they use something different, the it's called a design water surface elevation and it varies a little more, but it's looking at future river conditions, that's both operations of the river from the Columbia River Treaty, and it's also looking for future environmental conditions, if we're going to have more rain on snow events, more uncontrolled water flow, are the levees appropriately sized for that. I wouldn't necessarily call it deluxe, but more-so responsive to the future conditions. As far as the design, design life of levees is about 50 years, so we hope we have the right design and then we can maintain them, modernizing the pumping systems as well, getting it up to standard throughout.

Evyn Mitchell: As Colin mentioned, we, as the individual drainage districts couldn't take this on alone. A lot of partners came to the table to work through the technical issues, and as they began to do this work they talked about the governance issue these drainage districts face.

These districts were established in 1917, they are not babies, they were created when the land was mostly farmland and timberland, so there has been a lot of discussion about updating the system and what that would look like. The drainage districts are created by statute and can only do what the statute says which is pretty narrow and requires a lot of collaboration with City and County, and they also don't have enough funding. They also currently manage a good amount of storm water coming from the Alameda ridge. As all this other technical work was going on the group commissioned several studies, including an economic impact study, which looked at how much the region of the drainage districts affected the state and found the economic benefit is experienced most in Multnomah County, so they used that to narrow in on a financing and governance structure. They talked to local legislators about the challenges, one suggested working with the legislature to create a new government structure. We are currently working on a bill for 2019 that would create a new governing structure for the drainage districts to expand the boundaries of the districts and create a new governing board. A two tier governing board, first appointed and ultimately moving to an elected board. There is a lot of discussion happening around that bill and the financing of the new district.

Burrow: This new district would replace the existing four districts, is that correct? You're not introducing a new layer.

Mitchell: Yes, there would be a transition period, but it would absorb the new districts.

Rowan: The financing plan is really important because we have a lot of big projects and we also have these regional assets, so we consulted with a group out of Seattle called FCS group to help us think through some different scenarios. We needed solid numbers on what the draining districts mean to the region. They started doing an economic analysis and found that about 80% of the economic activity in the district benefits Multnomah County. They also looked at a way to update our assessment based methodology. Right now if you have one acre of land and your neighbor has 1 acre of land regardless of your house value you pay the same assessment in our current set up. It also is based on impervious surface and tax compression so in large public and open space in the districts we can't change the assessment on that. It's been locked in since the 1990's. We have all these big projects and we have benefits for the region, so we looked into changing from an assessment to a utility. A utility has to be based on the cost you incur from someone else, or the benefit you receive, and it has to be avoidable. This is with the project partners, facilitated by the consultant, are looking at ways to tackle this issue. The first option would be - all of the operations and maintenance costs should be paid by people in the districts. There is also a look at including a watershed utility based on the fact that 70% of the costs incurred by the drainage districts right now just go to electricity. Another option is a second tier that includes the watershed. The third, and probably the most important, is a tier that is all of Multnomah County within the urban growth boundary to help us fund capital projects. It would allow us to go for a general obligation bond, asking the voters for support. If they say yes it would give us access to the funds to modernize the system. The idea would be one big lift to modernize. Right now we don't have any sort of preferred option, but it will most likely look like something that all operation or maintenance will be shared with the districts, or a portion is shared with the watershed, and everyone within Multnomah County would be asked via ballot

if they wanted to support the general obligation bond, but they would effectively be a part of this district for that capital need. It's a big change and that's why we're here today, the legislature hasn't made any decisions but we want to make sure Maywood Park is aware of the changes and to solicit your ideas and also to ask you back to the table.

Michelle Montross: I've heard you talk about where the financing could come from. Is the railroad contributing?

Rowan: That is a great question, No, they don't have to. They say the railroads only have to answer to their board of directors and God and they don't even call God back. They have very little regulation and at the same time, it's on balance, they are a huge economic asset for our region. We have asked them to contribute and the Army Corps and the local partnership is looking at how to rebuild that embankment on the other side and it needs to be modernized. It was a thing of convenience the Army Corps did in the 1930's and they need to step up and cost share for that. The embankment was already there and full or rubble and they saw it as a convenient place to link up their engineered levees.

Sue Price: Is the state of Washington involved?

Rowan: No, that's a great point. It's a shared economic engine and almost a quarter of the 50,000 people who work in the district live in Washington State. 1300 people that live within this zip code work in the district. We have reached out to Washington legislature, and they are aware of our requests to the Army Corps of Engineers. They didn't sign any letters of support or anything like that. They are aware of the work but aren't supporting it financially. There is not a very good mechanism for them to do so other than this federal study.

Resident: Do they have levees over there?

Rowan: They do have a few small ones. There is one by the Port of Camas and the Port of Vancouver has a very short levee.

Burrows: Is it a law of nature that north of the equator the left bank of the river is less susceptible to flood, so Oregon is more in danger in the case of the Columbia. Plus the hill is steeper on the WA side.

Rowan: You're right.

Price: So if we do have the new levees and there was a big flood we would be okay?

Rowan: Risk accrues downstream. Most of the water would be downstream, it used to be a flood plain but now it builds up against there and pushes in, if our levees work properly, we send the risk to Sauvie Island and Scappoose and St. Helens and it's an unfortunate condition of how those are built.

Price: Do they have levees?

Rowan: Yes, mostly agricultural.

Castor: Why are they not included in the upgrade and the partnership?

Rowan: It's because of what's behind the levees. Sauvie Island is in Multnomah County and they lost certification. Army Corps will go on and re-certify and re-accredit but they don't have the assets behind the levees, they don't have the risk behind it and the costs.

Hallock: As I mentioned on the funding, that is available statewide. There are other communities that have to deal with this issue and want that money as well.

Mitchell: We are working on legislation to make that money available as grants instead of loans, which will benefit us here in Portland, but also benefit smaller communities.

Hallock: The position nationally on the railroad this is that railroad trestles are not levees. They do not want to be designated as a levee anywhere. The Corps is aware of this and they could consider breaching the railroad levees. If that is done the next level of protection is I-5 and you get into a discussion about how you deal with interstate 5 that is protective of the system. Whoever asked about the State of Washington, they'd probably be interested in that conversation. So it's pretty complex.

Alex Neerman: Can I ask one more quick question? When you are working on the engineering aspect, are you mitigating for more modern environmental regulations?

Rowan: It depends on the project, some levees have low spots that need to be raised up, but it depends on their original design. Though the Army Corps study we will also be doing an environmental impact study on what needs to be done. Based on the study there will probably be mitigation necessary. What I think is really exciting is that the project partners are interested in recertifying the levees but also there is a declaration of cooperation that has directed them to take a look at possible environmental and recreation impacts and benefits. We've been convening a group that is assessing how to do multi-benefit projects, and a risk assessment that says if we do this kind of a project can we also have habitat restoration done and if we rebuild a levee without a recreational path can we make one, so it has a regional benefit that people can use as a multi-use path. We are looking at expanding what this area can do.

OLD BUSINESS

Castor: Quick status update on 102nd, obviously Mark's not here, but I can update on what I know. The company we used to do road counts, all of the photos and video data is still being processed, it's a few weeks out but we do have the traffic counts back. PBOT had never done any studies about how these lane adjustment projects in the rest of Portland affect adjacent neighborhoods. We insisted they gather that data so we would go back and see what impact

there has been. We contracted with Quality Count, and we had it scheduled for a Friday, and PBOT showed up and added some additional counters without letting us know beforehand. But in any case, that's good, it's all data. We gathered both count and speed data on all of the streets going through Maywood Park. We also had Quality Counts add stop sign cameras. On high traffic afternoons there is a lot of cut through traffic, speeders and running stop signs, so we wanted to gather data on that. We also did a road count on 102nd on the northbound lane to get a sense of volume of traffic, as an eye-opening figure, in 24-hour period 10,700 vehicles went by on the northbound 2 lanes. Pretty high volume. The also did on O/D study on 102nd photographing every license plate, as well as 96th and Prescott and 99th and Prescott, logging cars exiting Maywood.

Resident: So you did this over 6 months?

Castor: No. This was over peak periods.

Resident: So just a few days. Because that's a tiny sample size. You can't really expand that out to a longer period.

Castor: We did the study we could afford to do. A study of that size, over that period would probably cost about \$500,000-\$600,000.

Resident: When you sign the agreement for the pilot program do you take the data from that?

Castor: What we are trying to do with PBOT is to pool our data, and look at a baseline and the traffic volume we're seeing, the speeds people are moving. Some of the data on 102nd, there wasn't a high volume of speeding, but the people that were were going fast. The speeders only accounted for 2 or 3% of the cars that went by, but those were going 50 or 60 mph. So there is obviously a significant issue there, which we all know. The other thing we are trying to do with that O/D study is identify, are people diverting through Maywood Park as a detour?

Burrows: Did you count the left turns?

Castor: Yeah, that's what that O/D study does, it photographs the license plates going by and the license plates leaving Maywood Park and they correlate from that.

Carlberg: So, do you have counts back on that?

Castor: On the video stuff we don't have any data back. They have to send that out to some other firm, it takes about three weeks.

Burrows: Will that tell you how many people turned into Maywood Park on each street?

Castor: Correct, if they turned left onto any of our streets they got counted. We are trying to gather this baseline data then meet with PBOT at the end of the month and see what makes

sense to implement. PBOT is proposing a pilot program, based on what they are doing in this section, it looks like the majority is just road striping which would be reversible. Then we could re-do traffic count studies and see if there had been an impact. That's one thing that we stressed to them over and over and over, the projects they were presenting to us were kind of an apples and oranges situation, the case studies where they had shown success that they had originally given us were in areas that had a different commuter flow than 102nd. And again, Clay admitted that their team had never done any studies to look at the before and after impact of the adjacent neighborhoods. We as a municipality are all for promoting safety in the 102nd area, we all want our community and families and kids to be safe. But we won't want to fix a problem on 102nd and divert that problem into the adjacent neighborhoods, both us and Parkrose. We want to work methodically with them to make sure we are looking at the best solution and making sure it's not going to have any negative impacts.

Neerman: So would that be then, mitigating...because 102nd's gotta happen. It needs to be dropped down to one lane each way, I mean, it's just inevitable there will be a speed limit drop. So are they going to mitigate for (inaudible)... I used to live in an area where they did that and they did actually study and they had to go through and mitigate after the fact, they dropped the ball.

Castor: Well, that's the thing, they said they had never gathered data prior. That's what she told me. So they have no baseline.

Neerman: They did go back in and do it, put in traffic diversions, and it worked great.

Castor: Yeah.

Carlberg: They have been intentional about gathering data this time around.

Castor: Well, at our insistence. I demanded at the first meeting and Clay admitted they had not taken it and that they would try to do that moving forward. That is why they are doing it this time around. The one thing that we are taking with them about is not necessarily saying "this is a yes, this is a no" but what is the design that will have the best impact. Clay's team has come back and said that it isn't the same way they would typically do a different project. They had done a project on Rosa Parks and there were some positive impacts there. It's just not the exact same as dealing with this volume of commuter traffic, and not just Maywood Park, but commuter traffic, people leaving the freeway system and getting off on 102nd and coming down a residential thoroughfare to try to beat some traffic. So it's a unique situation for their team as well. And so, they have told us outright this is not necessarily what we have used other places and not necessarily the right design for this. That's why we're trying to figure out what that right design is.

Neerman: We're on board for the pilot project at least.

Carlberg: That's what it sounds like, are you guys committing to the pilot project?

Castor: No one has committed to any design, that's what we are getting together to discuss, what the design will look like. There has not been a rejection, or a specific commitment.

Resident: It won't look like the picture in the flyer? Of the design?

Castor: Not necessarily.

Neerman: It does look pretty great. I mean, 102nd is a terrible road.

Castor: That's the thing, Again, we aren't rejecting this to say "we aren't in favor of public safety", because we are. We all have the same concerns. My son started at Prescott Elementary and we are crossing that street too. I'm just trying to make sure that... they have talked about having it reduced to 1 lane each way in certain portions and it widens out in other areas to help the flow. The one thing they haven't been willing to do, you know we put in that flashing light at Skidmore as a mitigation to help slow things down. Mechanical things like that they don't want to commit to because of the expense. They'll do painting primarily.

Carlberg: That's not what I understand from Clay, I have information that they are interested in putting in pedestrian islands. I have information I'll pass out.

Castor: But not necessarily between Fremont and Prescott. She has talked to us in the past about doing that in other areas, because this project extends from Halsey all the way to Sandy.

Carlberg: Right, and as I understand that's because of our concerns about congestion and wanting to make sure that those blocks actually remain.

Castor: I think one of the challenges is that they are having conversations with us and you are having a side conversation with Clay and I think there are miscommunications that are happening. That's why we are getting together with them to talk through the design.

Resident: Will there be any residents at that meeting?

Castor: No, this is primarily between the councilors and a couple people from their team.

Carlberg: Is there anyone who is not a city council person who will be present?

Castor: Not at this meeting, no.

Resident: I was told there was going to be one resident present.

Castor: Well that's news to me.

Resident: So if there is one resident that is against the project can there be one pro so the filters are...

Castor: Well, I think that was why originally it was just going to be us and their team, as not to make this a political discourse over I'm for this/I'm against-

Carlberg: Unfortunately, Mark did that very strongly in the newsletter, coming out very strongly in opposition to this project. So everything you are currently saying I really appreciate, because it's in opposition what Mark, who unfortunately is not here, said in the newsletter. That was a little frustrating for us who would like to see the pilot program.

(Many residents talking at once)

Castor: If I can respond, Mark did reply to your comment, and said

Carlberg: I know, but I'd like that said publicly, communication is important.

Castor: I'm happy to do that. So it had been brought up about his communication in the newsletter, and Mark admitted that he had not heard back from their team and had not had certain discussions with them prior to that being mailed. Maybe that isn't 100% accurate view of our position. The city has not committed 100% one way or the other to agreeing or disagreeing because we haven't seen a final design. Clay has said openly that the design is in flux, it is evolving, that's what we're talking about.

Susanne Neerman: What would it mean if the city disagreed with the pilot project?

Castor: The city's jurisdiction goes out to the center line of 102nd. So, regardless of the City's position one way or another, if we disagree with the project, PBOT is well within their rights to go ahead with the project on their side of the street, which is the Northbound side, which is the side that has the most impact on commuter traffic. It seems silly to split it up that way since we want to improve safety all around for our residents, and not just our residents, but of Parkrose as well.

Burrows: It's what they did on Prescott, improved the one side and not the other. Because that's theirs and the other side is ours.

Castor: Yes.

Sue Price: I went to PBOT's website and the way they had it worded said that they were meeting with Maywood Park and that Maywood would be signing an agreement in November and then a pilot thing would happen.

Carlberg: This is a document from PBOT related to that issue, it's a document they created specifically for Maywood Park, because of our concerns and what they are looking for with the design as far as addressing our concerns. I'm going to pass this out while you guys are talking. I was here a couple weeks ago and you guys put up with me while I was learning about the

project, but also as a little (inaudible). So I reached out to PBOT and they actually answered to each concern that you guys brought.

Resident: When you all meet with PBOT, I thought you were just going to decide, so I'm a little surprised in a good way, but I was wondering what the goals are. Obviously you want to slow down 102nd, and this is coming – I commute to Clackamas, so it will change things for me, but I'm happy to have a little extra time commuting to make that street safer. But our worry is for the neighborhood, right? So we want to limit cut through and speeding through the neighborhood.

Castor: One of the things that had been a challenge, when they typically gather data, Clay said they try to avoid Mondays and Fridays for various reasons. People just coming back to work or people leaving early for vacations. So the sample size is most accurate Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday. So one of the things we had conveyed was that our biggest cut through problems seem to be Thursday and Friday afternoons between 3 and 6 pm. So that was one of those areas that they never had any data on. That's why we invited them to come and hang out with us in the City during that time, so you get a better first hand impression of what happens. It doesn't happen every Thursday or Friday, but it happens more frequently than we would like. You can sit on the corner of 96th and Campaign, or 99th and you can see people rolling through the stop sign and it goes on for hours and they aren't aware of that. We want them to witness it firsthand. We want them to understand the real nature of our problem so we are solving for both things at the same time. I know there a lot of kids playing in the streets on Skidmore and Failing and Shaver and people are barreling through there. I'm shocked no one's gotten hit yet. That's the goal, we want to give them a better understanding of our challenges and to be able to talk about the design and not just have a design based on some data that's just...

Resident: And I'm assuming pay for some thoughtful mitigation.

Castor: Well, if that becomes a necessary component then that will be part of the conversation as well. That's why we're trying to include Parkrose Neighborhood Association in this discussion as well, because it's not necessarily Maywood Park that's affected, it's the adjacent neighborhoods as well.

Jesse Culver: I want to make a comment that people should consider that if 102nd is slowed down lanes are reduced and it becomes a less attractive road to drive on people may choose to drive on 122nd or 82nd instead. I want people to think about that. It may not mean the same volume of traffic; people may choose to take different roads.

Castor: Well, the problem is much bigger than 102nd. The corridor of commuters going along 84 and 205 trying to get back to Washington is massive and that bottleneck is what's causing the problem. My child's daycare is off Airport Way, and frequently if I'm trying to come from my office to pick them up I cannot get to them going behind IKEA, or on Airport Way, or down Marx, If I can weave my way over to 122nd it will be backed up all the way from Airport Way to Marx. Two lanes, people using the center turn lane as a left turn lane onto Airport way. So this

is a much larger problem. You know, we're doing as best we can to try to solve our immediate problem.

Culver: I'd much rather live on a neighborhood street versus what we than live on now, which is like a 5 lane highway. For people that live on this road, you know, traffic may get worse or it may get better, that will have to be studied. But this is a much more attractive neighborhood road than what we currently live on, so I think it's a good thing for anybody that owns property next to it.

Castor: I definitely appreciate everyone's input.

Rory Calrberg: I would like it if you could make a safer walk to school.

Castor: Thanks Rory, we appreciate it and we'll try our best.

Amy Fellows: Have the surrounding neighborhoods, like Parkrose given their input on the project?

Castor: I know there have been a few anecdotal things mentioned, but I haven't heard an official position from Parkrose. I know they have all the same concerns we do, especially if you look at traffic backed up during those times on the adjacent streets, they are dealing with same issues, they want to see a good solution presented.

Burrows: Count the percentage of cars that have Washington plates on then, it's not a question of taking 122nd or 82nd, it's whether you're taking I-205 to get to the bridge. If you're trying to get to the bridge and you can't then they go up 102nd.

Neerman: This project would eliminate that.

Burrows: I don't think it would.

Neerman: I lived in a neighborhood where it was two lanes and they dropped it down and it worked.

Sara Carlberg: When the data does become available from your robust study, how we will access it?

Castor: I'll talk to Clay about how to present it because the way it comes in is kind of cryptic, it's an excel spreadsheet that doesn't make a whole lot of sense.

Carlberg: Sure, but your firm that's doing it should put some pretty charts together.

Castor: That's usually not what they do, but I'll talk to Clay and see. We're going to try to correlate their data and our data in a way that makes sense.

Resident: What does the city think about data with that small a sample size? Was it just one day?

Castor: It's not ideal, but the goal was to have some sort of baseline. The Origination/Destination study was one day but the traffic counts were for the better part of a week.

Resident: Thanks so much for putting out this information, it's really great to hear from the City. I just wanted to make sure that I understood correctly, the other adjoining neighborhoods haven't voiced concern or stated an opinion?

Castor: I know Mark reached out to people from the Parkrose Neighborhood Association and they did have concern. Through conversations with individuals a lot of people have expressed concerns about the impact the project could have on their neighborhood and for safety in general, like for walking to school.

Resident: But we are the only neighborhood/city putting up roadblocks?

Castor: Well, we're the only City. It's City of Portland and City of Maywood Park. The neighborhood association can express their concerns but we have a little more ability to partner and connect in a way that makes the most sense. We're relying on PBOT's expertise in some areas, but we're also trying to make sure that our concerns are heard, and giving them all the information they need to make informed decisions.

Resident: If the pilot program was done and we have the data and it's good and they make some changes, would it come to a city vote?

Castor: If there was an agreement it would just be between PBOT and city of Maywood Park. It wouldn't necessarily be a vote. Where I think we want to make sure that we are putting things into an agreement before we move forward is if there are mitigating devices that have a cost associated with them that maybe could be placed within the City of Maywood Park that we'd like to put them into the agreement before hand so PBOT would help with the costs for those devices. So it isn't a scenario where we have a limited fund base here and they've created a project that has created problems within our City and we're left holding the bag. I think that's where we're trying to be cautious and move forward methodically, to make sure we have the ability to make corrections to any kind of a program. So if there are issues we can resolve them.

Resident: So you could ask for a pot of money to be set aside for future...

Castor: Potentially. We could ask for that same kind of proposal. If you've designed this to look this way and function this way and it has this impact, what are your recommendations for mitigating those problems and how will you fund those or help fund those.

Amy Fellows: My other concern is that if Maywood Park decided not to do the project on our side of the street, we live right on the corner of 102nd, the impact of that is going to be more people pouring into our neighborhood.

Castor: The lanes on our side are southbound and most of the traffic problem is northbound. More questions?
(NO)

CABLE FRANCHISE/TREE TRIMMING ORDINANCE

Castor: Cable franchise is in progress. Jim, anything on tree trimming?

Akers: In progress.

Castor: Art wasn't able to attend and I don't have an update on zoning ordinances from him. Any updates on that Bonnie?

Bonnie: Just that we're scheduled to have a work session on that in November.

COMMONS LIGHTING

Castor: Brian, and updates on Common's lighting?

Davey: We're expecting the light fixture to come in next week and I have a quote from the electrician that seems reasonable, so as soon as that is in we'll schedule the electrician to hang the light fixture to start with. We also asked for a quote to put a light pole further back in the property. That quote and all the trenching will be under \$6000 if we want to do a send light pole back there. We'll get the first one installed and see how that affects the issues and we'll discuss whether we need a second pole back there.

Ed Johnson: My backyard faces Maywood Commons and I walked last night around 10pm to see how much light comes from the light that is already there, it's a motion sensor light that faces there and I was wondering what the purpose was for more light further into the park, but also if we want to entertain in our backyard and the neighbors to our left, with this motion light coming off and on and I'm trying to gather more information because I don't necessarily agree with it right now.

Brian Davey: So, the light is being put in because we have had event where unwelcome guests are going into the bushes doing drugs and other things and the idea is that additional light shining in the area would deter people from going in there and doing things they shouldn't be doing. the motion sensor is good for up to about 100 feet and the sensitivity can be set for how ever we'd like, the light can be on at 30% power and go up to 100% power when it senses motion. When you're standing looking into the park, it will be pointed more toward the right side of the park, so I'm not sure how it will affect your backyard. There will have to be a

conversation about that; the way it is going to be oriented, it won't shine directly into the backyards that are back there.

Johnson: Well how do we know that? And what if disagree and we decide we don't want it back there? I mean, Jeff lives on my right if we're facing 205, and to the left the neighbors don't have a high fence so it will shine right into their backyard.

Castor: The goal isn't to illuminate the fence at the back of the property, but just to create a deterrent, so if someone comes into the park the light comes on and they know they're being watched. We don't want to impact your livability in your home wither, so if this gets installed and it's too much light for you please come back and give us feedback and we can adjust the aim or the direction and we can change the degrees of coverage on those lights. I know, Stacy you live on the other side, and you have had some issues and some other residents at the intersection and others with people coming in and doing unwelcome things after dark, and we want to discourage that behavior, but obviously not at the expensive of livability. SO, I know we are trying to engage you as well, if it's too much light, definitely let us know we'll try to reposition things, change light fixtures; we're just trying to find the best way to mitigate that problem.

Johnson: I feel like the decision has been made and no one sent me a message saying that a bright light will be shining in our back yard. You know, Jeff and Stacy were privy to this conversation and they showed up and we didn't. So I haven't received any mailers or anything and I know that all parks aren't all well-lit. There are 3 lights already there, a street light and a light that's on 24 hours a day and the light that's triggered in the park.

Castor: Are those lights having a negative effect on you guys?

Johnson: No, I think it's just fine. So I'm trying to figure out why you need more light in the park. And I hear you saying about drugs, but I was there at 10pm and night and I didn't see anyone there.

Castor: We'll it's kind of hit or miss.

Stacy: I will talk to you about this all day long, but I can tell you that I have called the sheriff 20 times this summer, I had two stolen cars parked in front of my house, and the guys across the street have a camera that points right there and you see somebody take a bag out of the car and run into the park and then you can't see anything because it's dark. However, I think we should talk about where the light is going and where it is facing. All I want is for it to be safe. I walk my dog at 11pm every night and all the lights come on and I couldn't be happier. I don't want to be scared when I go outside, anybody could be in the park, my kids have been there when people have been OD'ing on benches in the park. As far as I'm concerned, the more light the better, but I don't want it to impact you guys. There were no lights when I moved in, and I was the one who came and complained, and lights were added. But I couldn't agree more with communication in terms of people that live all around, how do we come together and figure out how we light it up.

Castor: Honestly, my apologies if we haven't included you up to this point at the conversation. I think Stacy and Jeff have been included because they happen to be at the meetings. The goal isn't to march in and say this is the way it's going to be, what we were trying to do is change the lighting incrementally to find the best solution at the lowest cost. Right now we have that existing power pole at the front of the park with the existing fixture on it. That's great, it provides some light. But that far back corner, which it sounds like abuts your and all of the hedges along the Steffen's property that are overly dark. The goal is not to make it look like a baseball stadium, but the goal is to change the light head and see if we can get more light back further in the back there in a more effective way. As Brian came up with, let's see if we can throw light far enough back to deter the problem without impacting everybody. If it does we'll look at the additional cost of trenching to the back and putting an additional light pole back there.

Johnson: That's what I would prefer.

Castor: Why we were trying this first is that it will cost about \$1000 to do this and trenching to the back would be \$6000 and we're just trying to be mindful of our cost. The light we are purchasing could actually be utilized on a pole at the back of the property, through all of your input, if everybody came together and said look, this still isn't working, then we'll go to that next step and reposition it and try the next thing. Brian met onsite with a lighting engineer to try to get a good solution, so we're going to try it and see how it works. Please give us feedback and let us know if it's too much and we'll respond.

Johnson: What is too much? How much influence do I have over something that's already installed?

Castor: Like I said, we've already established a next step if this isn't working. We're going to take the lower cost step first to try to mitigate the problem, and if it doesn't or has negative impact on any of the residents immediately around the park, then we'll revisit it with the next step. This isn't a "this is installed and it's forever. This is a "it's going to be installed and we want your input".

Davey: One of the reason we picked the light we did was that it could be relocated, so we don't have to go out and buy a whole new light and sensor if we take it off this pole and out it on in the back. So you're the one who determines if it's too much.

Kevin Cassiday: You can put shields on lights to block to certain levels. They can be installed after the fact. We're at the end of campaign at the cul-de-sac and there is not enough lighting there. There are cars, drugs, needles, even ammunition.

Akers: We budgeted this year to turn up the lights on certain identified streets, the council heard from you guys about it not being enough light and the lighting district gave us a cost for

turning the lights up and adding a light or changing the head. So that is something that is there, but we haven't gotten to that point.

Kevin: When cars park there in the cul-de-sac we can't see them. It's so dark.

Claire: Has the council thought about when there is a physical modification within the city limits that there is a flyer sent out to residents. When the tombstone was proposed years ago, it's a physical modification, was that proposed to the residents? Like the lighting, if you're physically impacted by it, you're notified, has the council ever considered that?

Castor: The council hasn't published every modification that we've proposed or done. And part of that comes from cost. We are operating on a limited tax base and every mailing, if it goes to all the residents, might be \$400-\$600, which doesn't seem like a lot but when we go through our budget cycle we try to identify how many mailing we will have for the year. Now we are trying to address those concerns as they happen in real time. I know more things are being announced on social media and some of our residents, like Linda with Friends of Maywood Park are great about helping to spread those things. If we have advance notice we try to include them in the bulletin, but it only comes out quarterly.

Claire: I was thinking that in those instances where if it was provided money may be saved. That the neighbors around be willing to contribute to the solution.

Castor: That's definitely a good point.

Connie: We've been here 30 years and I used to volunteer as a street monitor. Flyers aren't expensive and we have volunteers who walked flyers around for that. It didn't take that long, why don't we just do that again?

Castor: If we could get volunteers, I would love it. We've asked for support and people aren't showing up to do it.

Connie: I would do it.

Bonnie: We are trying to make an effort to make things more visible and communicate more by posting meeting minutes and upcoming meeting agendas on the website if you want more information.

Resident: Are upcoming meeting agendas on the website?

Bonnie: Yes, I've been posting agendas typically Friday morning before the meeting. They're on the website and also on the City of Maywood Park Facebook page.

Resident: If there was an ordinance that was going to be passed in an upcoming meeting that information would be available ahead of time?

Bonnie: The Friday before is when it would be announced through the agenda. We are moving towards it; it's been occurring for the last few months.

Res: You've been doing a good job.

Bonnie: Thank you.

SOCAL MEDIA POLICY

Castor: Bonnie, you have an update on the social media policy?

Bonnie: There have been some minor changes to the social media policy, mostly grammatical things, it's in front of you again for your consideration to vote on. For everyone who isn't aware, since we have a City of Maywood Park Facebook page that we are trying to use to communicate with and we have been creating a social media policy for how we use the city Facebook page for informational purposes, how employees can use it. We've been putting information on there to try to reach a wider audience in the City.

Castor: I don't know that I'd want to vote on that tonight, I'd like to spend a little more time looking at it and talking to Chris, so please table it.

Bonnie: Okay.

Stacy: I have a quick question about that, does it include things like the definition and usage of other Facebook pages and NextDoor and things like that?

Bonnie: No, because those aren't government sponsored pages, those are resident pages and we want those to just be resident pages so the conversations can happen. Ours will just be a location where we can put information out there but our website will still be the primary mode of posting information.

Stacy: I think we should define how people use each one. I mean, I get Next Door all day long, but I would not usually look at a Facebook page. I'm just saying, I think defining what folks should expect, where to go, I mean if Sara always goes to Friends of Maywood Facebook and Linda is always posting on NextDoor or you guys are posting on the City of Maywood Park site, there is just so much going on. Then there are people who have different Facebook pages for when they are pissed about something and they want a negative thing. There is just so much going on, one piece is just defining the policy and just officially saying like we're not going to post on NextDoor or Twitter or whatever, but at the same time defining the brand of Maywood Park. If someone googled it and they found all this stuff I mean, they'd be like which one do I go to?

Castor: That is essentially what we are trying to do. We don't have the staffing to monitor and control the conversation on 6 different social media platforms that are not actually administered

by us. That's the goal, to consolidate that and say, look, the City has a Facebook page, the City has a website, the City has contact emails. These are the appropriate places to come in and have contact with the City. Linda has been great about grabbing notices that Bonnie posts and reposting them on other community sites to make sure everybody is informed. Other people have done the same thing, Maywood Mamas, NextDoor. We're basically in the position where we need to consolidate. The policy will be clear, this is where you come for official information, but then we'll encourage you, if you want to re-blog, re-share, re-post, that's great, that's the position we're trying to take up.

Stacy: So submitting agenda items for the City would be through the website, not on Facebook, not on NextDoor, it's the community building on the outside and to funnel into the city through the page only.

Bonnie: So the ideal would be to be on the website and on the City Facebook page. I want to speak to the confusion, that was my fault because when I first came on I was still learning about all the different rules and policies, and I just want to reach out to people so I was using Facebook and NextDoor and getting on the groups personally. That's probably not the best practice so I reached out to other cities to find out how they are doing it to help me understand the policies and the regulations around it, but I probably caused some confusion with the best intent when I first started reaching out, and then I pulled back to try to get in more aligned with what other cities are really doing.

Stacy: I think it's a great idea to have a policy set, but it has to encompass all of the different things that people are using, as well as from a communications perspective, people that don't want to touch social media and they want a flyer that tells them where to be or when to be wherever to understand what happens in the City.

Claire Haack: Sorry to ask but we only have a few minutes and I don't know if we're going to have time for a new agenda item, so I just wanted a couple minutes.

Castor: Okay, Wendy, do you have a treasurer's report tonight?

Wendy: No, I did it last meeting.

Castor: Okay, then yes Claire.

Haack: I'm gathering information in regards to the vacation rental policy and I understand that 30 days for leasing and an ordinance was passed in March. And thank you Bonnie, you were amazing. And I was reading through the meeting minutes that Bonnie provided as well as information and it looks like there was a lot of things that were tied into the overall lumping of, I would say vacation rentals, but it really has to do with leasing, like how long a lease can last, which is 30 days. It was tied into small businesses with the community, it was tied into, there's like 5 different tie-ins and I go through the meeting minutes and the dialogue that occurred and it was very unclear until the last couple of stages really what was being talked about and then

all of a sudden it was passed and the door shut on the ordinance. It wasn't communicated out into the neighborhood. I know that ADU's were, everybody read about it, but it was tied to that overall policy as well, that ordinance, and so I was wanting to discuss with the City Council, I know there is some very strong opinions and I'm okay with that, and then there is some strong for and strong against. I think my main concern is that it wasn't well advertised to the community, I understand that there are some amazing people here that are passionate about it and are able to come every time and even more than once a year, but others are not able to. So I was wanting to hear more of a discussion and dialogue just to bring in a broader array of the community so that it's widely discussed and agreed upon.

Castor: Aside from obviously what you feel are the communication issues, are there specific things related to short term rentals that you want to discuss right now?

Claire: I think from the dialogue in the meeting notes, being able to get it as a discussion on the agenda, I now Mike and Joyce have brought it up, and I have several other people here that are interested in learning more and understand it. I think that in the time we have tonight there really isn't room for more of a discussion.

Castor: My immediate response would be that this had been discussed Jan-March and maybe you weren't available to come, and it's unfortunate that you hadn't been able to attend those meetings. A great place to start would be to put your concerns down in writing and send them to Bonnie so we could distribute them to the council so we can have a clear understanding of what your concerns were and what you wanted to discuss and then we could potentially either respond to that or, if we felt it warranted additional discussion we dedicate agenda time for it.

Claire: Okay.

Mike: I was here at the last meeting and I brought up the AirBnB thing, and the mayor said bring some people who are either pro or con and we'll re-open it.

Castor: Mike, I apologize I wasn't able to be at the last meeting so I don't know what...

Mike: I understand but it's right there in the minutes! That's exactly what they Mayor said, he said bring the people and we can re-open it. So I'm confused.

Castor: So, essentially, I don't know what the issues are, so it's hard for us to know how much time to allot, and to your point, 5 minutes is not enough, so I would suggest, put those things down in writing and send them to the City so we can see what there are.

Joyce: It's one issue, it's short-term rental.

Castor: But what about short-term rentals?

Kevin: It was voted on by a small number of people and it affects every person here whether you come to the meetings or not. After talking with these two I see it's a great idea, we want to travel and we could travel more, it could help pay my taxes, it could help keep somebody in the house, so you don't have to worry about somebody breaking in and crashing there for the night or the week, which has happened in Maywood Park, and it's pretty hard to get them out once they get in there.

Burrows: You get people in there for 2 or 3 days and you're going to have problems.

Mike: Well that's here we need the discussion.

Burrows: Well when you rent your house for a week and someone has 300 kids come in-

Castor: Before we get into a debate, Bonnie?

Bonnie: I know that I heard you say is that you would like to ask questions of the council about their reasoning for limiting the rentals to 30 days, and that could be a question the council could answer and that could be a brief discussion point at that time. The phrasing of re-opening the ordinance to a re-vote, that's not actually something we would do in a council meeting, that has its own separate procedure, to do like a referendum, to do petitions, I sent that info to Claire, I know that she has it and for anyone else who is interested in that process I can provide a link to the State Secretary for that. I'm not sure that discussion about a re-vote is really what we would do, but certainly, if you have a question about the mindset of the council at that time, I think you could ask that and I think you could get an answer.

Claire: So ten people voted for 300-something households, and I understand, there were limited people that were in attendance, there was limited discussion, I understand that aspect. I was surprised about the petition, but that's what I need to know. What do I need to know and do as a citizen, because we bring people to the City Council meeting to say there are people in support, almost the same number as the people that voted on it-

Bonnie: Actually, citizens don't vote on ordinances, that's a council decision. It's always been a council-

Resident: We voted on the chicken ordinance.

Mike: But by your own admission, we probably didn't get the notice to the meetings because there weren't any flyers. You said that last time I was here, that you probably didn't get the notice.

Bonnie: There have been notices sent out about council meetings consistently and the agenda has been added to the website-

Mike: Yeah, recently. But it's confusing because we did what the Mayor said and now...

Castor: I apologize. Honestly, I'd love to hear each of your viewpoints on it, if you have express concerns and there are specific points on what you want to see on an ordinance, please send them in. Just so we have a better understanding of what...just saying yes or no doesn't solve anything. You're going to have the residents who say yes, I want it because I want to make money off of my property. And we can have the debate on the differences between short term rentals vs long term rentals or businesses in the City or not in the City, but until we get into the specifics, there are a lot of major cities around the country that have had significant issues with short term rentals and they have a lot more resources to try to manage those things than we do. We have to look at the concerns of your adjacent neighbors and their feeling about security and safety. We have to look at housing prices and how it impacts housing prices and how it decreases affordable rents in housing, I mean, there is a lot of factors. Some cities have done some interesting things to try to limit the number of days a year a 30 day less rental can be had, there are a million different ways to approach this. I think in general we looked at what positive impacts it could bring and what negative impacts it could bring and the resources we had available to manage those things and that's primarily the decision that was arrived at. It was trying to find something that would preserve the security, safety and character of our community the best way that we could at the time with the resources we had.

Mike: Sure, I'm not arguing that. I just want to know the process. You said get certain things in and we can begin to open up the discussion.

Castor: To Bonnie's point, we can't just have a re-vote here. If you can give us a clear understanding of specifically what you want to do with your property and why you want to do that, how you would that, how you would address the concerns of the neighbors around you, that would at least give us a better understanding of your position.

Johnson: Sometimes it depends on how people want to communicate, and what I hear you saying can be a barrier to citizens in this community, it can be hard for them to express themselves. Some people aren't good at sending in an email and articulating all of their thoughts down. We just want an opportunity to have 20 minutes on the agenda to say this is what I'm talking about. And the Council can say that, you can make that decision tonight, you can say let's set 20 minutes aside and from that conversation could be some articulate points and you could take those down and have a small ad-hoc committee do it. So I think that if there is back and forth happening you could wind it down and that's all they want is an audience. I haven't heard anyone back here saying they are going to send an email and you want them to do that. All they want to do is talk.

Castor: The reason I'm asking for a little bit of upfront of information is that as you can see, we have an agenda of a lot of other things that need time as well. Tonight we didn't have a lot of other things that needed attention, if we had a budget we needed to review and approve. I'm trying to be mindful of the time, so if we had a better understanding of what the concerns were we could say like look, this is going to be a 30 minute discussion, let's schedule this for December or March, but what I don't want to do is have a situation where we say you guys can come in and discuss it, let's put some time on the agenda, like has happened tonight. Mark

obviously said that you guys could come in and discuss things but I don't know that at the time he was aware that we had another presentation and the Sheriff's discussion tonight and a PBOT discussion was in order as well. The reason I want to try to get insight into how much ground we have to cover is so we can give you the right amount of time to talk.

Mike: In response to that, he said just bring people in and we can discuss putting it on the agenda.

Castor: If we want to have a more open dialogue about it again I'm more than happy-

Claire: Then I request 20 minutes to have it on the agenda before the end of the year.

Castor: I doubt that will happen before the end of the year, but we'll look at the schedule and see if we can do that.

Res: Can I make a more open-ended request? If we start talking about when an ordinance to be passed, say, that you can't have honeybees in your yard, that there is a set structure, a comment period and a way for the whole community to...I mean, I'm relatively new, approaching a year, but I hear from people who complain a lot about I can't do this, I can't do that, and this is my first meeting too, but if we can have a way that you can't just pass an ordinance and it has to have a comment period and a certain amount of time.

Castor: And to your point that's honestly why you are seeing more of those things in the bulletin, we're trying to get the word out and change the procedure and the way that is done.

Bonnie: We're really working on that.

Res: And don't just put it on the Facebook page, we have one neighbor who has lived in this neighborhood for 60 years and she doesn't have the capability to be on the internet. She doesn't have Facebook. You leave the seniors out and that's not fair.

Castor: That's why we're trying to put those into the bulletin.

Resident: I just wanted to say that you could put a little bulletin board type thing in Maywood Commons.

Castor: We have one there actually.

Bonnie: I have started posting agendas on that board, and I will continue to do that.

Resident: Thank you.

Castor: Apologies, we're not perfect, we are trying to move in a better direction and we are trying to be more proactive about getting that information out. We hear your feedback. Any new business?

Bonnie: No.

Meeting adjourned at 9:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Lisa Higgins

FINAL