

CITY OF ALBANY  
CITY COUNCIL (WORK SESSION)  
Willamette Room  
Wednesday, February 4, 2009  
5:15 p.m.

**MINUTES**

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Sharon Konopa called the meeting to order at 5:15 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Councilors present: Councilors Ralph Reid Jr., Bill Coburn, Jeff Christman, Bessie Johnson, Dick Olsen, and Floyd Collins.

Councilors absent: None.

BUSINESS FROM THE PUBLIC

There was no business from the public.

PROJECT UPDATE

Civil Engineer III Jeni Richardson posted slides from a PowerPoint presentation on white boards (see agenda file). Richardson also distributed a Capital Projects Prioritization & Scheduling Tool (see agenda file).

Richardson and Transportation System Analyst Ron Irish took turns presenting the information.

Since the last meeting, staff has developed a list of corrections and changes to the TSP Project Information document based on Council's input. Once completed, a revised book with a list of revisions will be delivered to the Council.

POLICY DISCUSSION

The Financial Plan, System Development Charges (SDC) methodology, and other subjects were reviewed for Council input or consideration:

- Financial Plan: a model will be presented at this work session which may be a good decision making tool
- The proposed SDC Methodology was posted for consideration
- Other subjects:
  - Council can promote projects or encourage growth in certain areas through prioritization and funding mechanisms or on a project-by-project basis.
  - Wetland-related costs are currently reflected in the projects. The City may choose to pursue a system-wide bank.
  - Additional capacity beyond 2030 is included with the 53<sup>rd</sup> Avenue extension project. Future capacity needs on other major corridors is dependent on a fresh review of travel patterns incorporating the results of the Hwy 20 and I-5 interchange studies. This review will take place when the TSP is updated after a MPO (Metropolitan Planning Organization) is formed.
  - Some policies can be implemented in the Development Code, Albany Municipal Code, and/or Public Works policy documents.

A schematic showing total project cost, SDC eligible amount, and SDC fee levels was presented. The TSP project total is about \$250 million although this will change with the corrections to the TSP Project Information document. The SDC-i eligible amount per trip is around \$9,000 and the SDC-r is approximately \$415.

FINANCIAL PLAN EXAMPLE

Financial Consultant Debbie Gilardi reviewed a financial planning tool that was developed to assist the Council in making policy decisions. The underlying assumptions used to build the 10-year financial plan example were reviewed. In the example, a \$3000 SDC fee was assumed along with depressed trip growth in the beginning of the plan. Funding from existing and new sources was shown for all short and mid-term projects except L1, M2 and M6 and with long-term project L59 added. The limiting factor in this example is how to pay for the non-growth portion. Gilardi demonstrated how the SDC inputs and the scheduling and phasing of projects can be easily modified and then cash flow charts can be reviewed. The SDC cash flow chart does not account for revenue not received when SDC credits are paid out.

The Council discussed the new SDC fee, which is based on the "p.m. peak hour." The advantage of using peak hour over average daily trips is that it aligns with system impacts. The transportation system is designed using peak hour capacity since the travel demand model is a peak hour model. Model values would need to be adjusted to estimate average daily trips, sacrificing accuracy and lessening the current link between the model output and project development. The shift to p.m. peak will change the distribution of fees but not the fee level. The residential fee would not change and neither would the SDC for industries or a medical complex where trips are evenly distributed across the day. Commercial businesses with higher peak hour activity would see a change. It was suggested that

p.m. peak is a potential tool to encourage off-peak travel although there would also be enforcement issues.

Although new roads are considered 100% SDC eligible, the Council may chose to have developers fund the local share and limit SDC funding to the extra section depth and extra width of a “green field” road. This situation may change if the City decides to build the new road. Retaining the unfunded SDC-eligible portion in a separate category provides flexibility and choice for future Council decisions. The Council acknowledged that urban upgrades would require a different treatment from “green field” roads.

The SDC gap presents both flexibility advantages and community perception concerns. The Council’s message to the community may be to define the list of projects that can be built with a certain SDC fee (i.e. omit discussion about eligibility level). Some of the projects in the gap are ODOT projects that won’t be built (performance standards change after becoming a MPO) and other projects in the gap could be the local share of “green field” roads.

Parking on collector streets was discussed. The Development Code currently doesn’t require on-street parking on minor collectors. Some recent developments have included pocket parking. Adding on-street parking to project estimates for L19 and other minor collectors would increase the project cost by \$150 per foot for parking on one-side and \$300 per foot for parking on both sides.

Meandering streets may also be a Development Code policy to consider.

Some kind of option to phase in, ramp up, or continue with the existing SDC for a few years was generally acceptable. Before continuing the existing SDC, consider implications of the factors built into the 1997 SDC methodology that lessen non-residential SDC fees.

The next financial plan model will:

- Consider using the existing SDC funds first while the new SDC bank is building up.
- Consider a higher priority for I11 (34<sup>th</sup> Avenue & Marion Street intersection). Signal warrants won’t be met soon since they are tied to development in south Albany and the improvement is needed for other reasons.
- Place a high priority on state highway projects (I8 & I9) that are inexpensive and won’t require as much coordination as others (L60).
- Add L58 Oak Street to the 10-year project list.
- Construct L36 West Thornton Lake Road realignment with L6 North Albany Road.
- Test the sensitivity of funding 20% (or extra costs beyond a 24 foot width) of “green field” roads
- Add L33 Three Lakes Road alignment to the 10-year project list.
- Evaluate increasing priority to Timber Street and decreasing priority to Main Street.
- Define gap projects that the City doesn’t intend to build or fund.

Councilor Bessie Johnson would like to prioritize her top 20 projects for staff and suggested it would be a good exercise for all the Councilors. The Council agreed.

#### COUNCILOR COMMENTS

Councilor Ralph Reid passed out copies of a Travel Authorization Form which requires Council approval (see agenda file). He plans to travel to Washington DC for the National League of Cities (NLC) conference. Reid has been appointed to their National Transportation Steering Committee. The Committee will be meeting at the NLC Conference and three other times around the nation. Reid asked if the Council was interested in having Albany apply to be a host city for one of the meetings.

The Council consensus was to authorize Reid’s travel to the NLC Conference in Washington D.C., and for Reid to submit an application for Albany to host an NLC National Transportation Steering Committee.

#### CITY MANAGER REPORT

There was no business from the City Manager.

#### ADJOURNMENT

There being no other business, the Work Session adjourned at 7:19 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary A. Dibble, MMC  
Deputy City Clerk

Reviewed by,

Stewart Taylor  
Finance Director