



City Council Meeting Agenda

Tuesday, July 14, 2026

5:30 p.m. – Work Session Meeting

7:00 p.m. – City Council Regular Meeting

EXECUTIVE SESSION – to immediately follow the URA Meeting (CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC)

Welcome! This meeting will be a hybrid (in-person & Zoom) Meeting. However, if you are not feeling well, please stay home and take care of yourself.

The public is strongly encouraged to relay concerns and comments to the Council in one of five ways:

- **Pre-register** using the online form here:

<https://www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov/citycouncil/webform/public-comment-card> (Registration **OPENS** at 5:00 p.m. on the day the agenda is posted, one week before the meeting and **CLOSES** at 12:00 p.m. the day **BEFORE** the meeting // (Any form submitted outside this window will not be addressed);

- **Written comments** may be submitted to the City Recorder Team any time up to **12:00 p.m. the day BEFORE** the meeting and mailed to (McMinnville City Hall, c/o City Recorder Team, 230 NE Second Street, McMinnville, OR, 97128);
- **Digital comments (email)** may be submitted to the City Recorder Team any time up to **12:00 p.m. the day BEFORE** the meeting to CityRecorderTeam@mcminnvilleoregon.gov;
- Fill out a **physical public comment card** found at McMinnville City Hall; any time up to **12:00 p.m. the day BEFORE** the meeting, but **not before 5:00 p.m.** on the day the agenda is posted for the following week;
 - Attend **in person** and fill out a public comment card.

You can live broadcast the City Council Meeting on cable channels Xfinity 11 and 331, Frontier 29 or webstream here:

mcm11.org/live

CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION & CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING:

You may join online via Zoom Webinar Meeting:

<https://mcminnvilleoregon.zoom.us/j/84200790841?pwd=RNTpIBnjYQlnabKzPTBxZDTL4lnabb.1>

Or you can call in and listen via Zoom: 1-253- 215- 8782

Webinar ID: 842 0079 0841

5:30 PM – WORK SESSION MEETING – VIA ZOOM AND SEATING AT CIVIC HALL

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. OPSIS AND PENCE FOR CPR BOND CONTINUED DISCUSSION
3. ADJOURNMENT OF WORK SESSION

7:00 PM – REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING – VIA ZOOM AND SEATING AT CIVIC HALL

1. CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL
2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. INVITATION TO COMMUNITY MEMBERS FOR PUBLIC COMMENT –

The Mayor will announce that any interested audience members are invited to provide comments. Anyone may speak on any topic other than: a matter in litigation, a quasi-judicial land use matter; or a matter scheduled for public hearing at some future date. The Mayor may limit comments to 4 minutes per person for a total of 32 minutes. The Mayor will read comments emailed to the City Recorder and then call on anyone who has signed up to provide public comment.

4. PUBLIC HEARING

- a. Public Hearing to consider **Resolution No. 2026-25**: A Resolution adopting the 2026 Building Fee Schedule and repealing all previous resolutions adopting building fee schedules on the effective date of this fee schedule.

5. CONSENT AGENDA

- a. Consider the request from Duffy’s Deli, LLC for Limited On-Premises Sales, OLCC Liquor License located at 350 NE Baker Creek Road.
- b. Consider the draft minutes of the March 24, 2026 City Council Work Session & City Council Regular Meeting.
- c. Consider the draft minutes of the April 08, 2026 Special Called City Council Meeting.
- d. Consider the draft minutes of the April 14, 2026 City Council Work Session & City Council Regular Meeting.

6. RESOLUTION

- a. Consider **Resolution No. 2026-25**: A Resolution adopting the 2026 Building Fee Schedule and repealing all previous resolutions adopting building fee schedules on the effective date of this fee schedule.

7. ADVICE/ INFORMATION ITEMS

- a. Reports from Councilors on Committee & Board Assignments
- b. Department Head Reports

8. ADJOURNMENT OF REGULAR MEETING

CITY COUNCIL EXECUTIVE SESSION – IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING THE URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY MEETING (NOT OPEN TO THE PUBLIC)

1. CALL TO ORDER

- 2. **EXECUTIVE SESSION PURSUANT TO ORS 192.660(2)(h)**: To consult with counsel concerning the legal rights and duties of a public body with regard to current litigation or litigation likely to be filed.

3. ADJOURNMENT OF EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mark Davis

████████████████████
McMinnville, OR 97128

June 22, 2026

McMinnville City Council
230 NE Second Street
McMinnville, OR 97128

Dear Mayor Morris and Members of the City Council:

At your work session on June 17th the presentation by staff on the Wastewater Plan was based on a population projection issued in 2017. I believe this is inappropriate for the following reasons:

- 1. It Is Outdated Data.** It makes no sense to base a project on incorrect data. You certainly aren't basing the future needs of the system based on its physical condition in 2017. You need to have a realistic estimate of how many people it will serve in the next 20 years.
- 2. It Does Not Meet Legal Requirements.** Documents like this that are to be adopted as part of the land use process are required by law to use the most current population projection available.
- 3. It Inflates the Overall Cost of the Project.** By claiming to be building the system for population growth that is not expected to happen, you would be raising rates and extracting money from local residents that is not needed to cover future capital needs.

I support the goals of the Wastewater Plan, but it needs to be based on a realistic assessment of what we will need over the next 20 years.

Thank you for considering my input on this issue.

Mark Davis

Mark Davis

From: [Shawn Treasure](#)
To: [City Recorder Team](#)
Subject: City Council Comments 06/23
Date: Monday, June 29, 2026 8:55:59 AM

This message originated outside of the City of McMinnville.

Dear Council Members,

Thank you for holding the meeting on June 23 to discuss the proposed recreation center for McMinnville. As a newer resident of McMinnville, having moved here one year ago today, I am excited about the prospect of this project and what it could mean for the community. I also bring a professional background in architectural project planning and commercial interior design, as well as personal experience using recreation centers regularly while living in a state where they were readily available. I understand firsthand the value these facilities provide to residents of all ages and believe a new recreation center would be a tremendous asset for our city.

I wanted to offer a few thoughts for your consideration.

During the discussion, several follow-up items were requested for the design team, including details such as wall design concepts between the lap pool and rec pool areas, as well as locations for washers, dryers, and other operational elements. While these are certainly important considerations that should be incorporated into the overall programming and design of the facility, I wonder if some of these discussions may be occurring at a level of detail that is premature for this stage of the project.

I completely understand the need to evaluate larger programmatic decisions, such as the cost implications of additional community space or a 10-lane lap pool. Those are significant considerations that directly impact the scope and budget of the project.

My intent in writing is simply to encourage the Council to maintain a high-level focus on the key decisions necessary to move this project forward and place it before voters as soon as possible. Delays can lead to increased construction costs, which may ultimately require additional value engineering and could reduce the community benefits originally envisioned for the facility.

As someone who works in the design industry, I recognize there will be ample opportunity to refine details, evaluate operational needs, and make design decisions as the project progresses. At this stage, maintaining momentum toward a ballot measure may be one of the most important factors in preserving both the project's scope and affordability.

I appreciate the time, effort, and dedication that the Council, staff, and project team are investing in this process. I am excited to see McMinnville continue to grow and invest in amenities that will serve residents for generations to come.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Shawn Treasure
McMinnville Resident

Michael Uren



7/6/2026

City Recorder Team
McMinnville City Hall
230 NE Second Street
McMinnville, OR 97128

Subject: Proposed Amendment to MMC Chapter 8.10.260 Regarding Illegal Fireworks Enforcement

Dear Mayor and Members of the City Council,

Please accept this letter as formal public comment to be entered into the public record for the upcoming City Council meeting. I am writing to address the critical public safety and noise issue of illegal fireworks and the inherent barriers to local enforcement. Currently, local enforcement is severely restricted because state law requires law enforcement officers to physically witness a suspect commit the crime—meaning they must see the specific individual light the firework to issue a citation. This standard creates an impossible bottleneck for the McMinnville Police Department. To solve this, I suggest shifting the enforcement framework from state statute restrictions to a local municipal property liability model. Specifically, the city should amend McMinnville Municipal Code [MMC Chapter 8.10.260 \(Noise\)](#) to hold the homeowner or tenant civilly liable for any illegal fireworks detonated from their place of residence.

Enforcement should function exactly like existing residential noise complaints, such as a loud band playing in a backyard party. Officers do not need to witness the guitarist pluck a string to issue a citation; they simply verify which address the noise is originating from. Firework noise and safety hazards should be treated with the same residential accountability.

Other Oregon cities have successfully closed this enforcement loophole with property-based ordinances:

- **Tigard Municipal Code Chapter 7.84 (Firework Regulation):** Establishes that a person commits an offense if they permit illegal firework conduct to occur on real property they own or control. It establishes a rebuttable presumption of liability if the owner or tenant is present.
- **Eugene Municipal Code Sections 4.670 & 4.672 (Unruly Gatherings / Social Host Ordinance):** Holds individuals and property owners criminally and civilly liable for hosting or allowing unruly events. This code explicitly integrates a provision holding hosts accountable for the unauthorized use of fireworks.

Adopting these established legal strategies will empower our officers to issue citations based on the location of the offense, keeping McMinnville neighborhoods safe and peaceful. Thank you for your time, leadership, and consideration of this municipal amendment.

Let's give our law enforcement officers and city attorney's some teeth to finally take care of this problem.

Sincerely,

Michael Uren

From: [MARTHA VILLALOBOS](#)
To: [City Recorder Team](#)
Subject: Meeting July 14th
Date: Monday, July 6, 2026 5:10:33 PM
Importance: High

This message originated outside of the City of McMinnville.

Hello,

I would like to submit a comment regarding your meeting scheduled for July 14th, specifically to address the mayor on that day I will be attending in person

Mayor Morris,

My name is Martha Villalobos, and I have been a lifelong resident of McMinnville. I wish to bring to your attention a recent event: on Sunday, July 5th, ICE detained an individual from our county. My question is, how prepared is the city to respond to such situations? I respectfully ask you to consider the profound pain experienced by the detainee's family. I am urging you to take measures to protect the Hispanic community. While I understand that there are individuals who may act unlawfully, it is troubling that those who are simply working to support their families and contribute to our community are subjected to arrest.

Today, I am requesting that you begin developing a plan to safeguard and prevent the arrest of hardworking Hispanic residents who contribute so much to McMinnville and our country. Please reflect on the families who have been separated and the lasting impact this has on our community. I urge you to prioritize the development of a strategy to protect the people of McMinnville.

Thank you very much for your attention to this important matter.

/s/ Martha Villalobos
Martha Villalobos | Paralegal
Vanesa Pancic
George Senft
Alan Biedermann
Juana Castro- Certified Bankruptcy Assistant
PANCIC LAW
Attorneys at Law
[REDACTED]
Hillsboro, OR 97123
[REDACTED]
Vancouver, WA 98863

Phone: [REDACTED]

Fax ([REDACTED])

[REDACTED]

www.paniclaw.com



STAFF REPORT

DATE: July 14, 2026
TO: Adam Garvin, Interim City Manager
SUBMITTED BY: Heather Richards, Community Development Director
WRITTEN BY: Stuart Ramsing, Building Official
SUBJECT: FY 26/27 Building Fee Schedule, Resolution No. 2026-25

1. A Resolution adopting the 2026 Building Fee Schedule and repealing all previous resolutions adopting building fee schedules on the effective date of this fee schedule.

Report in Brief:

This is a request to adopt an updated Building Fee Schedule effective August 1, 2026. The proposed update applies a 2.9 percent increase to existing fees based on the January 2025 to January 2026 Consumer Price Index for Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers (CPI-W). No changes are proposed to the structure of the fee schedule.

Background:

The Building Division administers the State of Oregon Building Codes within the City of McMinnville, except for electrical permits which are administered by Yamhill County.

The Building program is intended to operate on a full cost recovery basis as authorized by ORS 455.210. The City has historically updated building permit fees periodically to reflect changes in operating costs and inflation. Annual adjustments have typically been applied using a uniform percentage across fee categories.

The current fee schedule was adopted effective August 1, 2025 under Resolution No. 2025-20.

Discussion:

The proposed update applies a 2.9 percent increase to all applicable fee categories. The adjustment is based on the CPI-W using a January-to-January comparison, which showed a 2.9 percent increase from January 2025 to January 2026.

The increase is applied uniformly to both valuation-based fees and flat or hourly fees. The underlying fee structure, including valuation thresholds and calculation formulas, remains unchanged.

To maintain consistency over time, fees are calculated using full precision values and rounded only at the final step for publication. This approach avoids cumulative rounding effects that can occur if rounded values are reused in subsequent calculations. Valuation-based fees are published to the nearest cent, while flat and hourly fees may be rounded to the nearest whole dollar for ease of communication.

No policy changes are proposed with this update. The intent is to maintain alignment between fee revenue and the cost of administering the building program.

Notice of the proposed fee schedule was provided to the Oregon Building Codes Division at least 45 days prior to the date of adoption, consistent with OAR 918-020-0220.

Public notice of the proposed fee schedule and public hearing will be provided locally consistent with ORS 294.160.

Attachments:

1. Attachment A: 2025 vs. 2026 Fee Comparison
2. Attachment B: Fee Adjustment Methodology
3. Resolution No. 2026-25
 - a. Exhibit A: FY 26/27 Building Fee Schedule

Fiscal Impact:

The proposed adjustment is intended to maintain cost recovery for Building Division services. The 2.9 percent increase reflects general inflation and is not expected to generate revenue beyond the cost of providing services.

Actual revenue impacts will depend on permit volume, which varies annually based on development activity.

Alternatives:

Alternative 1 [Staff Recommendation]: Adopt the attached resolution to update the Building fee schedules.

Alternative 2: Reject the attached resolution. Current Building Fee Schedules will remain in effect.

Alternative 3: The Council may consider any other alternative not presented by staff.

Attachment A – 2025 vs. 2026 Fee Comparison

Fee Item	2025 Adopted Fee	2026 Proposed Fee
Structural Permit \$1 - \$500	\$20.25	\$20.84
Structural Permit \$501 - \$2,000	\$20.25 for the first \$500 plus \$2.63 for each additional \$100 or fraction thereof, to and including \$2,000	\$20.84 for the first \$500 plus \$2.71 for each additional \$100 or fraction thereof, to and including \$2,000
Structural Permit \$2,001 - \$25,000	\$59.70 for the first \$2,000 plus \$12.06 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$25,000	\$61.49 for the first \$2,000 plus \$12.41 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$25,000
Structural Permit \$25,001 - \$100,000	\$337.08 for the first \$25,000 plus \$6.03 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$100,000	\$346.92 for the first \$25,000 plus \$6.20 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$100,000
Structural Permit \$100,001 - \$500,000	\$789.33 for the first \$100,000 plus \$4.55 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$500,000	\$811.92 for the first \$100,000 plus \$4.68 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$500,000
Structural Permit \$500,001 - \$1,000,000	\$2,609.33 for the first \$500,000 plus \$4.07 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$1,000,000	\$2,683.92 for the first \$500,000 plus \$4.19 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$1,000,000
Structural Permit \$1,000,001 and above	\$4,644.33 for the first \$1,000,000 plus \$3.14 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof	\$4,778.92 for the first \$1,000,000 plus \$3.23 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof
Additional Plan Review after initial review	\$92	\$94
Reinspection – per each	\$92	\$94
Each additional inspection, above allowable – per each	\$92	\$94

Appendix A – 2025 vs. 2026 Fee Comparison

Fee Item	2025 Adopted Fee	2026 Proposed Fee
Inspections for which no fee is specifically indicated (as required) - hourly	\$92/hour	\$94/hour
Structural demolition – complete demolition, not subject to State Surcharge	\$133	\$137
Temporary Certificate of Occupancy	\$191	\$197
Change of Occupancy minimum charge	\$321	\$330
Structural Minimum Permit Fee	\$161	\$165
Solar Permit – Prescriptive Path System, fee includes initial plan review	\$184	\$190
Investigation Fee – hourly	\$92/hour	\$94/hour
Structural Plan Review	65% of structural permit fee	65% of structural permit fee
Fire Life Safety Plan Review	40% of structural permit fee	40% of structural permit fee
Deferred Submittal Plan Review Fee – minimum	65% of structural permit fee calculated using the valuation of the deferred portion of the project, with a minimum fee of \$183	65% of structural permit fee calculated using the valuation of the deferred portion of the project, with a minimum fee of \$188
Phased Project Plan Review Fee – minimum	\$317 minimum per phase plus 10% of the TOTAL project building permit fee not to exceed \$1,500.00 per phase	\$326 minimum per phase plus 10% of the TOTAL project building permit fee not to exceed \$1,500.00 per phase
Structural alteration	Fee as per Structural Permit Fee table by valuation.	Fee as per Structural Permit Fee table by valuation.
Seismic Hazard Plan Check Fee	1% of total structure and mechanical specialty code fees for essential and hazardous facilities, and major and special occupancy structures.	1% of total structure and mechanical specialty code fees for essential and hazardous facilities, and major and special occupancy structures.

Appendix A – 2025 vs. 2026 Fee Comparison

Fee Item	2025 Adopted Fee	2026 Proposed Fee
Residential Fire Suppression: 0–2,000 sq ft	\$220	\$226
Residential Fire Suppression: 2,001–3,600 sq ft	\$311	\$320
Residential Fire Suppression: 3,601–7,200 sq ft	\$331	\$341
Residential Fire Suppression: 7,201+ sq ft	\$385	\$396
Commercial Fire Suppression and/or alarm	Fee as per Structural Permit Fee table by valuation of suppression system	Fee as per Structural Permit Fee table by valuation of suppression system
Solar Permit – Non-Prescriptive Path System	Fee as per Structural Permit Fee table by valuation to include the solar panels, racking, mounting elements, rails, and the cost of labor to install.	Fee as per Structural Permit Fee table by valuation to include the solar panels, racking, mounting elements, rails, and the cost of labor to install.
Manufactured Dwelling Placement Fee	\$272	\$280
State Code Development and Training and Monitoring fee	\$30	\$30
Investigation Fee – hourly	\$92/hour	\$94/hour
Manufactured Home Accessory Buildings or Structures	Fee as per Structural Permit Fee table by valuation; incurs State Surcharge	Fee as per Structural Permit Fee table by valuation; incurs State Surcharge
Manufactured Home Alteration	Fee as per Structural Permit Fee table by valuation; incurs State Surcharge	Fee as per Structural Permit Fee table by valuation; incurs State Surcharge
Manufactured Dwelling/RV Parks – ADP	See structural permit fee table applied to OAR valuation table.	See structural permit fee table applied to OAR valuation table.
Gas fuel piping outlets – 1 to 4 outlets	\$64	\$66
Gas fuel piping outlets – each additional outlet over 4	\$18	\$19
Air conditioner	\$64	\$66

Appendix A – 2025 vs. 2026 Fee Comparison

Fee Item	2025 Adopted Fee	2026 Proposed Fee
Air handling unit of up to 10000 cfm	\$64	\$66
Air handling unit 10001 cfm and over	\$64	\$66
Appliance or piece of equipment not classified elsewhere	\$64	\$66
Attic or crawl space fans	\$64	\$66
Chimney/liner/flue/vent	\$64	\$66
Clothes dryer exhaust	\$64	\$66
Decorative gas fireplace	\$64	\$66
Evaporative cooler other than portable	\$64	\$66
Floor furnace, including vent	\$64	\$66
Flue vent for water heater or gas fireplace	\$64	\$66
Furnace – greater than 100000 BTU	\$64	\$66
Furnace – up to 100000 BTU	\$64	\$66
Furnace/burner including duct work/vent/liner	\$64	\$66
Gas or wood fireplace/insert	\$64	\$66
Heat pump	\$64	\$66
Hood served by mechanical exhaust, including ducts for hood	\$64	\$66
Hydronic hot water system	\$64	\$66
Installation or relocation domestic/type incinerator	\$64	\$66
Mini split system	\$64	\$66
Oil tank/gas diesel generators	\$64	\$66
Pool or spa heater, kiln	\$64	\$66
Range hood/other kitchen equipment	\$64	\$66
Repair, alteration, or addition to mechanical appliance including installation of controls	\$64	\$66
Suspended heater, recessed wall heater, or floor mounted heater	\$64	\$66
Ventilation fan connected to single duct	\$64	\$66
Ventilation system not a portion of heating or air-conditioning system authorized by permit	\$64	\$66
Water heater	\$64	\$66

Appendix A – 2025 vs. 2026 Fee Comparison

Fee Item	2025 Adopted Fee	2026 Proposed Fee
Wood/pellet stove	\$64	\$66
Other heating/cooling	\$64	\$66
Other fuel appliance	\$64	\$66
Other environment exhaust/ventilation	\$64	\$66
Ductwork – no appliance/fixture	\$64	\$66
Radon mitigation	\$64	\$66
If a plan check is required	65% of mechanical permit fee	65% of mechanical permit fee
Commercial Mechanical Permit \$1-\$1,000	\$66.82	\$68.76
Commercial Mechanical Permit \$1,001-\$5,000	\$66.82 for the first \$1,000 plus \$1.94 for each additional \$100 or fraction thereof, to and including \$5,000	\$68.76 for the first \$1,000 plus \$2.00 for each additional \$100 or fraction thereof, to and including \$5,000
Commercial Mechanical Permit \$5,001-\$10,000	\$144.62 for the first \$5,000 plus \$12.15 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$10,000	\$148.76 for the first \$5,000 plus \$12.50 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$10,000
Commercial Mechanical Permit \$10,001-\$50,000	\$205.38 for the first \$10,000 plus \$10.94 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$50,000	\$211.26 for the first \$10,000 plus \$11.26 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$50,000
Commercial Mechanical Permit \$50,001-\$100,000	\$642.91 for the first \$50,000 plus \$9.72 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$100,000	\$661.66 for the first \$50,000 plus \$10.01 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$100,000
Commercial Mechanical Permit \$100,001 and above	\$1,129.11 for the first \$100,000 plus \$9.72 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof	\$1,162.16 for the first \$100,000 plus \$10.01 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof
Mechanical Plan Review	65% of mechanical permit fee	65% of mechanical permit fee

Appendix A – 2025 vs. 2026 Fee Comparison

Fee Item	2025 Adopted Fee	2026 Proposed Fee
Additional Plan Review – per hour	\$92/hour	\$94/hour
Reinspection – per each	\$92	\$94
Each additional inspection, above allowable – per each	\$92	\$94
Inspection not otherwise specified – hourly	\$92/hour	\$94/hour
Investigation Fee – hourly	\$92/hour	\$94/hour
Mechanical Minimum Permit Fee	\$66.82	\$68.76
1 Bath, one kitchen	\$92	\$94
2 Bath, one kitchen	\$138	\$142
3 Bath, one kitchen	\$184	\$190
Additional Bathroom	\$45	\$47
Additional Kitchen	\$45	\$47
Sanitary Sewer – first 100 feet or less	\$50	\$52
Sanitary Sewer – each additional 100 feet or fraction thereof	\$42	\$43
Storm – first 100 feet or less	\$50	\$52
Storm – each additional 100 feet or fraction thereof	\$42	\$43
Water – first 100 feet or less	\$50	\$52
Water – each additional 100 feet or fraction thereof	\$42	\$43
Absorption valve	\$64	\$66
Backflow preventer	\$64	\$66
Backwater valve	\$64	\$66
Catch basin or area drain	\$64	\$66
Clothes washer	\$64	\$66
Dishwasher	\$64	\$66
Drinking fountain	\$64	\$66
Ejectors/sump pump	\$64	\$66
Expansion tank	\$64	\$66
Fixture cap	\$64	\$66
Floor drain/floor sink/hub drain	\$64	\$66
Garbage disposal	\$64	\$66
Hose bib	\$64	\$66
Ice maker	\$64	\$66

Appendix A – 2025 vs. 2026 Fee Comparison

Fee Item	2025 Adopted Fee	2026 Proposed Fee
Primer	\$64	\$66
Sink/basin/lavatory	\$64	\$66
Stormwater facility	\$64	\$66
Swimming pool piping	\$64	\$66
Tub/shower/shower pan	\$64	\$66
Urinal	\$64	\$66
Water closet	\$64	\$66
Water heater	\$64	\$66
Other – plumbing	\$64	\$66
Alternate potable water heating system	\$64	\$66
Interceptor/grease trap	\$64	\$66
Manholes	\$64	\$66
Roof drain (commercial)	\$64	\$66
Trench drain	\$64	\$66
Medical Gas Permit \$1-\$1,000	\$66.82	\$68.76
Medical Gas Permit \$1,001-\$5,000	\$66.82 for the first \$1,000 plus \$1.94 for each additional \$100 or fraction thereof, to and including \$5,000	\$68.76 for the first \$1,000 plus \$2.00 for each additional \$100 or fraction thereof, to and including \$5,000
Medical Gas Permit \$5,001-\$10,000	\$144.42 for the first \$5,000 plus \$12.15 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$10,000	\$148.76 for the first \$5,000 plus \$12.50 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$10,000
Medical Gas Permit \$10,001-\$50,000	\$205.38 for the first \$10,000 plus \$10.94 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$50,000	\$211.26 for the first \$10,000 plus \$11.26 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$50,000
Medical Gas Permit \$50,001-\$100,000	\$642.91 for the first \$50,000 plus \$9.72 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$100,000	\$661.66 for the first \$50,000 plus \$10.01 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$100,000

Appendix A – 2025 vs. 2026 Fee Comparison

Fee Item	2025 Adopted Fee	2026 Proposed Fee
Medical Gas Permit \$100,001 and above	\$1,129.11 for the first \$100,000 plus \$9.72 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof	\$1,162.16 for the first \$100,000 plus \$10.01 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof
Residential Fire Suppression – 0–2,000 sq ft	\$220	\$226
Residential Fire Suppression – 2,001–3,600 sq ft	\$311	\$320
Residential Fire Suppression – 3,601–7,200 sq ft	\$331	\$341
Residential Fire Suppression – More than 7,201 sq ft	\$385	\$396
Med-Gas McMinnville Inspection surcharge	\$224 per inspection	\$231 per inspection
1 & 2 Family repiping – first floor incl. basement	\$184	\$190
1 & 2 Family repiping – each additional story excluding basement	\$46	\$48
Additional Plan Review – per hour	\$92/hour	\$94/hour
Reinspection – per each	\$92	\$94
Each additional inspection, above allowable – per each	\$92	\$94
Inspection not otherwise specified – hourly	\$92/hour	\$94/hour
Investigation Fee – hourly	\$92/hour	\$94/hour
Plumbing Minimum Permit Fee	\$64	\$66
If a plan review is required	65% of plumbing permit fee with a minimum of \$252	65% of plumbing permit fee with a minimum of \$259
Grading Plan Review 1 to 10,000 cubic yards	\$167.73	Removed at direction from the State

Appendix A – 2025 vs. 2026 Fee Comparison

Fee Item	2025 Adopted Fee	2026 Proposed Fee
Grading Plan Review 10,001 to 100,000 cubic yards	\$167.73 for the first 10,000 cubic yards plus \$54.54 for each additional 10,000 cubic yards or fraction thereof	Removed at direction from the State
Grading Plan Review 100,001 cubic yards or more	\$658.59 for the first 100,000 cubic yards plus \$11.32 for each additional 10,000 cubic yards or fraction thereof	Removed at direction from the State
Grading Permit 50 cubic yards or less	\$84.38	Removed at direction from the State
Grading Permit 51 to 100 cubic yards	\$95.70	Removed at direction from the State
Grading Permit 101 to 1,000 cubic yards	\$174.93	Removed at direction from the State
Grading Permit 1,001 cubic yards or more	\$174.93 for the first 1,000 cubic yards plus \$22.64 for each additional 1,000 cubic yards or fraction thereof	Removed at direction from the State
Permit renewal fee for an expired permit with no change to the previously approved plans	One half the fee for a new permit plus the state surcharge.	One half the fee for a new permit plus the state surcharge.
Investigation Fee – hourly	\$92	\$94
Inspection outside of normal business hours – per hour	\$138/hour	\$142/hour
Permit Extension fee – to extend expiration on active permit	\$92	\$94
Copy fees (up to 11”x17”) – each side	\$0.25 each side	\$0.25 each side
Digitizing paper plans – per hour	\$92/hour	\$94/hour
Master Plans – Structural – setup fee	\$368	\$379
Refund processing fee – not subject to State Surcharge	\$92	\$94
Address fee for new or changed address	\$39/address	\$40/address
House relocation permit application	\$562	\$578

Appendix A – 2025 vs. 2026 Fee Comparison

Fee Item	2025 Adopted Fee	2026 Proposed Fee
Refundable deposit for house relocation permit	\$5,618	\$5,781
Copy fees (oversized prints)	Time & materials	Time & materials
Returned Check fee (NSF)	Refer to City policy	Refer to City policy
Master Plans – Structural – Initial review	65% of structural permit fee	65% of structural permit fee
Master Plans – Structural – second and subsequent reviews	20% of structural permit fee	20% of structural permit fee
Seismic Surcharge – Structural/Mechanical	1% of building permit fee	1% of building permit fee
Scanning & oversized prints	Time & materials	Time & materials

Attachment B—Fee Adjustment Methodology

The Building Fee Schedule is adjusted annually to maintain alignment with program costs and inflation. The adjustment is based on the Consumer Price Index for Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers (CPI-W), using a January-to-January comparison.

For the 2026 update, the CPI-W increased by 2.9 percent from January 2025 to January 2026. A uniform 2.9 percent adjustment is applied to all applicable fee categories consistent with this index and prior Council-adopted practice of periodic inflationary adjustments.

The updated fee schedule is adopted with an effective date of August 1, 2026.

The percentage adjustment is applied uniformly across all fee categories, including valuation-based fees and flat or hourly fees, while maintaining the existing fee structure and calculation methodology. No changes are made to the underlying fee structure, valuation thresholds, or calculation formulas.

To maintain accuracy over time, fee calculations are performed using full precision values. Each fee is calculated using the exact mathematical result of the applied percentage increase. The resulting value is then rounded for publication in the adopted fee schedule. Rounding is applied only at the final step and does not influence subsequent annual calculations.

This approach avoids cumulative rounding bias that can occur if rounded values are reused in future calculations. By retaining full precision internally, small fractional increases are preserved and reflected in future updates. As a result, fees adjust gradually and consistently over time rather than remaining static for multiple years and then increasing in larger increments.

The methodology can be illustrated as follows:

Step	Value
Prior adopted fee	\$20.25
Adjusted by 2.9 percent	\$20.83725
Published fee (rounded)	\$20.84

Valuation-based fees are published to the nearest cent. Flat and hourly fees may be rounded to the nearest whole dollar for ease of communication. These rounding conventions are applied consistently across the fee schedule.

This methodology is intended to provide consistent, transparent, and repeatable annual updates while preserving the integrity of the adopted fee schedule over time. The full calculation workbook used to derive the adopted fees is available upon request.

RESOLUTION NO. 2026-25

A Resolution adopting the 2026 Building Fee Schedule and repealing all previous resolutions adopting building fee schedules on the effective date of this fee schedule.

RECITALS:

WHEREAS, per ORS 455.210, the City of McMinnville is authorized to establish full cost recovery fees to administer and manage a building program in the City of McMinnville; and

WHEREAS, the City desires to adjust fees annually in response to inflationary and program changes; and

WHEREAS, the State of Oregon, Building Codes Division was provided the necessary notice of fee change more than 45 days in advance of the scheduled adoption date.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF McMINNVILLE, OREGON, as follows:

1. That the City of McMinnville’s Building Fee Schedule will be as established by the fee schedule attached to this Resolution.
2. That this fee schedule will take effect August 1, 2026.

Adopted by the Council of the City of McMinnville at a regular meeting held the 14th day of July, 2026 by the following votes:

Ayes: _____

Nays: _____

Approved July 14, 2026.

MAYOR

Approved as to form:

Attest:

City Attorney

City Recorder

EXHIBITS:

- A: Building Fee Schedule (Effective August 1, 2026)

Exhibit A – 2026 Fee Schedule

Category	Section	Fee Item	2026 Fee
Structural	Structural Permit	\$1 - \$500	\$20.84
Structural	Structural Permit	\$501 - \$2,000	\$20.84 for the first \$500, plus \$2.71 for each additional \$100 or fraction thereof, to and including \$2,000
Structural	Structural Permit	\$2,001 - \$25,000	\$61.49 for the first \$2,000, plus \$12.41 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$25,000
Structural	Structural Permit	\$25,001 - \$100,000	\$346.92 for the first \$25,000, plus \$6.20 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$100,000
Structural	Structural Permit	\$100,001 - \$500,000	\$811.92 for the first \$100,000, plus \$4.68 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$500,000
Structural	Structural Permit	\$500,001 - \$1,000,000	\$2,683.92 for the first \$500,000, plus \$4.19 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$1,000,000
Structural	Structural Permit	\$1,000,001 and above	\$4,778.92 for the first \$1,000,000, plus \$3.23 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof
Structural	Other Structural Fees	Additional Plan Review after initial review	\$94 per hour
Structural	Other Structural Fees	Reinspection	\$94 per each
Structural	Other Structural Fees	Inspection outside of normal business hours (minimum of 2 hours)	\$142 per hour
Structural	Other Structural Fees	Each additional inspection above allowable	\$94 per each
Structural	Other Structural Fees	Inspections for which no fee is specifically indicated (as required)	\$94 per hour
Structural	Other Structural Fees	Structural demolition – complete removal of building, not subject to State Surcharge	\$137
Structural	Other Structural Fees	Temporary Certificate of Occupancy – not to exceed 180 days	\$197
Structural	Other Structural Fees	Change of Occupancy with no building changes	\$330
Structural	Other Structural Fees	Structural Minimum Permit Fee	\$165
Structural	Other Structural Fees	Solar Permit – Prescriptive Path System, fee includes initial plan review	\$190

Exhibit A – 2026 Fee Schedule

Structural	Other Structural Fees	Solar Permit – Non-Prescriptive Path System	Fee as per structural permit fee table by valuation to include solar panels, racking, mounting elements, rails, and labor for installation
Structural	Other Structural Fees	Investigation Fee	\$94 per hour
Structural	Other Structural Fees	Structural Plan Review	65% of structural permit fee
Structural	Other Structural Fees	Fire Life Safety Plan Review	40% of structural permit fee
Structural	Other Structural Fees	Deferred Submittal Review and Coordination Fee – minimum	65% of structural permit fee calculated using the valuation of the deferred portion of the project, with a minimum fee of \$188
Structural	Other Structural Fees	Phased Project Review and Coordination Fee – minimum	\$326 minimum per phase plus 10% of the total project building permit fee, not to exceed \$1,500 per phase
Structural	Other Structural Fees	Structural alteration	Fee as per structural permit fee table by valuation
Structural	Other Structural Fees	Seismic Hazard Plan Check Fee	1% of total structural and mechanical specialty code fees for essential and hazardous facilities, and major and special occupancy structures
Structural	Fire Suppression	Residential Fire Suppression – Standalone System, fee includes plan review [See Plumbing Fee section for Continuous Loop/Multipurpose System] – 0–2,000 sq ft	\$226
Structural	Fire Suppression	Residential Fire Suppression – Standalone System, fee includes plan review [See Plumbing Fee section for Continuous Loop/Multipurpose System] – 2,001–3,600 sq ft	\$320
Structural	Fire Suppression	Residential Fire Suppression – Standalone System, fee includes plan review [See Plumbing Fee section for Continuous Loop/Multipurpose System] – 3,601–7,200 sq ft	\$341
Structural	Fire Suppression	Residential Fire Suppression – Standalone System, fee includes plan review [See Plumbing Fee section for Continuous Loop/Multipurpose System] – 7,201+ sq ft	\$396

Exhibit A – 2026 Fee Schedule

Structural	Fire Suppression	Commercial Fire Suppression and/or alarm	Fee as per structural permit fee table by valuation of suppression system
Structural	Manufactured Dwelling Fees	Manufactured Dwelling Placement Fee - Includes the concrete slab, runners or foundations that are prescriptive, electrical feeder and plumbing connections and all cross-over connections and up to 30 lineal feet of site utilities. Decks, other accessory structures, and foundations that are not prescriptive, utility connections beyond 30 lineal feet, new electrical services or additional branch circuits, and new plumbing may require separate permits. All decks 30 inches above ground, carports, garages, porches, and patios are based on valuation and may also require separate permits.	\$280
Structural	Manufactured Dwelling Fees	State Code Development and Training and Monitoring fee	\$30
Structural	Manufactured Dwelling Fees	Investigation Fee	\$94 per hour
Structural	Manufactured Dwelling Fees	Manufactured Home Accessory Buildings or Structures	Fee as per structural permit fee table by valuation; incurs state surcharge
Structural	Manufactured Dwelling Fees	Manufactured Home Alteration	Fee as per structural permit fee table by valuation; incurs state surcharge
Structural	Manufactured Dwelling Fees	Manufactured Dwelling/RV Parks – Area Development Permit	See structural permit fee table as applied to OAR valuation table. - The Area Development Permit fee to be calculated based on the valuations shown in Table 2 of OAR 918-600-0030 for Manufactured Dwelling/Mobile Home Parks and Table 2 of OAR 918-650-0030 for Recreational Park & Organizational Camp – and applying the valuation amount to the Structural Permit Fee table included in this schedule.

Exhibit A – 2026 Fee Schedule

Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Gas fuel piping outlets – including first 4 outlets	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Gas fuel piping outlets – each additional outlet over 4	\$19
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Air conditioner	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Air handling unit of up to 10,000 cfm	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Air handling unit 10,001 cfm and over	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Appliance for which no fee is specifically indicated (as required)	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Attic or crawl space fans	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Chimney/liner/flue/vent	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Clothes dryer exhaust	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Decorative gas fireplace	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Evaporative cooler other than portable	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Floor furnace, including vent	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Flue vent for water heater or gas fireplace	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Furnace – greater than 100,000 BTU	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Furnace – up to 100,000 BTU	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Furnace/burner including duct work/vent/liner	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Gas or wood fireplace/insert	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Heat pump	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Hood served by mechanical exhaust, including ducts for hood	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Hydronic hot water system	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Installation or relocation domestic/type incinerator	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Mini split system	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Oil tank/gas diesel generators	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Pool or spa heater, kiln	\$66

Exhibit A – 2026 Fee Schedule

Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Range hood/other kitchen equipment	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Repair, alteration, or addition to mechanical appliance including installation of controls	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Suspended heater, recessed wall heater, or floor mounted heater	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Ventilation fan connected to single duct	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Ventilation system not a portion of heating or air-conditioning system authorized by permit	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Water heater	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Wood/pellet stove	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Other heating/cooling	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Other fuel appliance	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Other environment exhaust/ventilation	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Ductwork – no appliance/fixture	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	Radon mitigation	\$66
Mechanical	Residential Mechanical	If a plan check is required	65% of mechanical permit fee
Mechanical	Commercial Mechanical Permit Fees	\$1-\$1,000	\$68.76
Mechanical	Commercial Mechanical Permit Fees	\$1,001-\$5,000	\$68.76 for the first \$1,000, plus \$2.00 for each additional \$100 or fraction thereof, to and including \$5,000
Mechanical	Commercial Mechanical Permit Fees	\$5,001-\$10,000	\$148.76 for the first \$5,000, plus \$12.50 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$10,000
Mechanical	Commercial Mechanical Permit Fees	\$10,001-\$50,000	\$211.26 for the first \$10,000, plus \$11.26 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$50,000
Mechanical	Commercial Mechanical Permit Fees	\$50,001-\$100,000	\$661.66 for the first \$50,000, plus \$10.01 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$100,000

Exhibit A – 2026 Fee Schedule

Mechanical	Commercial Mechanical Permit Fees	\$100,001 and above	\$1,162.16 for the first \$100,000, plus \$10.01 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof
Mechanical	Other Mechanical Fees	Mechanical Plan Review	65% of mechanical permit fee
Mechanical	Other Mechanical Fees	Additional Plan Review	\$94 per hour
Mechanical	Other Mechanical Fees	Reinspection	\$94 per each
Mechanical	Other Mechanical Fees	Each additional inspection above allowable	\$94 per each
Mechanical	Other Mechanical Fees	Inspection for which no fee is specifically indicated (as required)	\$94 per hour
Mechanical	Other Mechanical Fees	Inspection outside of normal business hours (minimum of 2 hours)	\$142 per hour
Mechanical	Other Mechanical Fees	Investigation Fee	\$94 per hour
Mechanical	Other Mechanical Fees	Mechanical Minimum Permit Fee	\$68.76
Plumbing	Residential New Construction	1 Bath, one kitchen - Includes one kitchen, first 100 feet each of site utilities, hose bibbs, icemakers, underfloor low-point drains, and rain drain packages that include the piping, gutters, downspouts, and perimeter system. Half bath counted as whole	\$94
Plumbing	Residential New Construction	2 Bath, one kitchen - Includes one kitchen, first 100 feet each of site utilities, hose bibbs, icemakers, underfloor low-point drains, and rain drain packages that include the piping, gutters, downspouts, and perimeter system. Half bath counted as whole	\$142
Plumbing	Residential New Construction	3 Bath, one kitchen - Includes one kitchen, first 100 feet each of site utilities, hose bibbs, icemakers, underfloor low-point drains, and rain drain packages that include the piping, gutters, downspouts, and perimeter system. Half bath counted as whole	\$190
Plumbing	Residential New Construction	Additional Bathroom	\$47
Plumbing	Residential New Construction	Additional Kitchen	\$47
Plumbing	Commercial and Non-New Residential	Sanitary Sewer – first 100 feet or less	\$52

Exhibit A – 2026 Fee Schedule

Plumbing	Commercial and Non-New Residential	Sanitary Sewer – each additional 100 feet or fraction thereof	\$43
Plumbing	Commercial and Non-New Residential	Storm – first 100 feet or less	\$52
Plumbing	Commercial and Non-New Residential	Storm – each additional 100 feet or fraction thereof	\$43
Plumbing	Commercial and Non-New Residential	Water – first 100 feet or less	\$52
Plumbing	Commercial and Non-New Residential	Water – each additional 100 feet or fraction thereof	\$43
Plumbing	Fixtures – fee per each	Absorption valve	\$66
Plumbing	Fixtures – fee per each	Backflow preventer	\$66
Plumbing	Fixtures – fee per each	Backwater valve	\$66
Plumbing	Fixtures – fee per each	Catch basin or area drain	\$66
Plumbing	Fixtures – fee per each	Clothes washer	\$66
Plumbing	Fixtures – fee per each	Dishwasher	\$66
Plumbing	Fixtures – fee per each	Drinking fountain	\$66
Plumbing	Fixtures – fee per each	Ejectors/sump pump	\$66
Plumbing	Fixtures – fee per each	Expansion tank	\$66
Plumbing	Fixtures – fee per each	Fixture cap	\$66
Plumbing	Fixtures – fee per each	Floor drain/floor sink/hub drain	\$66
Plumbing	Fixtures – fee per each	Garbage disposal	\$66
Plumbing	Fixtures – fee per each	Hose bib	\$66
Plumbing	Fixtures – fee per each	Ice maker	\$66
Plumbing	Fixtures – fee per each	Primer	\$66
Plumbing	Fixtures – fee per each	Sink/basin/lavatory	\$66

Exhibit A – 2026 Fee Schedule

Plumbing	Fixtures – fee per each	Stormwater facility	\$66
Plumbing	Fixtures – fee per each	Swimming pool piping	\$66
Plumbing	Fixtures – fee per each	Tub/shower/shower pan	\$66
Plumbing	Fixtures – fee per each	Urinal	\$66
Plumbing	Fixtures – fee per each	Water closet	\$66
Plumbing	Fixtures – fee per each	Water heater	\$66
Plumbing	Fixtures – fee per each	Other – plumbing	\$66
Plumbing	Fixtures – fee per each	Alternate potable water heating system	\$66
Plumbing	Fixtures – fee per each	Interceptor/grease trap	\$66
Plumbing	Fixtures – fee per each	Manholes	\$66
Plumbing	Fixtures – fee per each	Roof drain (commercial)	\$66
Plumbing	Fixtures – fee per each	Trench drain	\$66
Plumbing	Medical Gas	\$1-\$1,000	\$68.76
Plumbing	Medical Gas	\$1,001-\$5,000	\$68.76 for the first \$1,000, plus \$2.00 for each additional \$100 or fraction thereof, to and including \$5,000
Plumbing	Medical Gas	\$5,001-\$10,000	\$148.76 for the first \$5,000, plus \$12.50 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$10,000
Plumbing	Medical Gas	\$10,001-\$50,000	\$211.26 for the first \$10,000, plus \$11.26 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$50,000
Plumbing	Medical Gas	\$50,001-\$100,000	\$661.66 for the first \$50,000, plus \$10.01 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$100,000
Plumbing	Medical Gas	\$100,001 and above	\$1,162.16 for the first \$100,000, plus \$10.01 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof
Plumbing	Other Plumbing Fees	Residential Fire Suppression – Multipurpose/Continuous Loop: 0–2,000 sq ft	\$226

Exhibit A – 2026 Fee Schedule

Plumbing	Other Plumbing Fees	Residential Fire Suppression – Multipurpose/Continuous Loop: 2,001–3,600 sq ft	\$320
Plumbing	Other Plumbing Fees	Residential Fire Suppression – Multipurpose/Continuous Loop: 3,601–7,200 sq ft	\$341
Plumbing	Other Plumbing Fees	Residential Fire Suppression – Multipurpose/Continuous Loop: 7,201+ sq ft	\$396
Plumbing	Other Plumbing Fees	Med-Gas McMinnville Inspection surcharge – per inspection	\$231 per inspection
Plumbing	Other Plumbing Fees	1 & 2 Family repiping – first story including basement	\$190
Plumbing	Other Plumbing Fees	1 & 2 Family repiping – each additional story excluding basement	\$48
Plumbing	Other Plumbing Fees	Additional Plan Review – per hour	\$94 per hour
Plumbing	Other Plumbing Fees	Reinspection	\$94 per each
Plumbing	Other Plumbing Fees	Each additional inspection above allowable	\$94 per each
Plumbing	Other Plumbing Fees	Inspection for which no fee is specifically indicated (as required)	\$94 per hour
Plumbing	Other Plumbing Fees	Inspection outside of normal business hours – per hour (minimum of 2 hours)	\$142 per hour
Plumbing	Other Plumbing Fees	Investigation Fee	\$94 per hour
Plumbing	Other Plumbing Fees	Plumbing Minimum Permit Fee	\$66
Plumbing	Other Plumbing Fees	If a plan review is required	65% of plumbing permit fee with a minimum of \$259
Miscellaneous	Misc Fees	Permit renewal fee for an expired permit with no change to the previously approved plans	One-half the fee for a new permit, plus the state surcharge
Miscellaneous	Misc Fees	Investigation Fee	\$94 per hour
Miscellaneous	Misc Fees	Permit Extension fee – to extend expiration on active permit	\$94
Miscellaneous	Misc Fees	Copy fees (up to 11"x17") – each side	\$0.25 each side
Miscellaneous	Misc Fees	Digitizing paper plans	\$94 per hour
Miscellaneous	Misc Fees	Master Plans – Structural – setup fee	\$379
Miscellaneous	Misc Fees	Refund processing fee – not subject to State Surcharge	\$94
Miscellaneous	Misc Fees	Address fee for new or changed address	\$40 per address
Miscellaneous	Misc Fees	House relocation permit application	\$578
Miscellaneous	Misc Fees	Refundable deposit for house relocation permit	\$5,781
Miscellaneous	Misc Fees	Copy fees (oversized prints)	Time and materials
Miscellaneous	Misc Fees	Returned Check fee (NSF)	Refer to City policy

Exhibit A – 2026 Fee Schedule

Miscellaneous	Misc Fees	Master Plans – Structural – Initial review	65% of structural permit fee
Miscellaneous	Misc Fees	Master Plans – Structural – second and subsequent reviews	20% of structural permit fee
Miscellaneous	Misc Fees	Seismic Surcharge – Structural & Mechanical only	1% of building permit fee
Miscellaneous	Misc Fees	Scanning & oversized prints	Time and materials



Final Action:

Approved Disapproved

Liquor License Recommendation

BUSINESS NAME / INDIVIDUAL: **Duffy's Deli, LLC**

BUSINESS LOCATION ADDRESS: **350 NE Baker Creek Road, McMinnville**

LIQUOR LICENSE TYPE: **Limited On-Premises Sales**

*** New License Application ***

Is the business at this location currently licensed by OLCC

Yes No

If yes, what is the name of the existing business:

Proposed business operations:

Retail On-Premises Sales & Consumption
Indoor Consumption
Outdoor Consumption

Tritech Records Management System Check: Yes No

Criminal Records Check: Yes No

Recommended Action: Approve Disapprove

Scott Fessler, Captain

Chief of Police / Designee

City Manager / Designee



Local Government Recommendation – Liquor License

Per OAR 845-005-0304(3): The Commission requires an applicant for issuance of a new license issued under ORS chapter 471, to provide written notice of the application to the local government in the form of a complete, accurate, and legible Commission form.

The local government is as follows:

- (a) If the address of the premises proposed to be licensed is within a city's limits, the local government is the city.
- (b) If the address of the premises proposed to be licensed is not within a city's limits, the local government is the county.

INSTRUCTIONS:

Step 1: Applicant completes all of Section 1 (including top of Page 2).

Step 2: Applicant submits both pages of the form to the appropriate local government. NOTE: The local government may require additional forms and/or fees.

Step 3: Local government completes at least Section 2 and returns all pages of the form, or a copy thereof, to the applicant. The local government is allowed up to 45 days to complete Section 3.

Step 4: Applicant takes the form with at least Sections 1 and 2 completed and includes it with their CAMP application to meet the Local Government Recommendation document requirement. Submissions that do not have at least Sections 1 and 2 completed will not be accepted.

Step 5: The local government issues its final recommendation in Section 3 and returns the completed form to the applicant. If the applicant has already submitted their initial application via CAMP, they hold on to the final recommendation and provide it to their investigator, when requested. If they have not already submitted their application, they upload the fully completed Local Government Recommendation form with their initial application submission.

Applicants within the city of Portland ONLY: After completing the attached form, please follow these steps to complete the Local Government Recommendation process:

- Apply via the [City of Portland website](#).
- Once you have completed the application with the City of Portland, you will receive an email notifying you that your application has been accepted, usually within two business days. The email will contain an attachment titled "ABC Public Notice."
- Upload the ABC Public Notice document with your CAMP application to meet the Local Government Recommendation document requirement.

NOTE: This document only provides proof of submission. Once you receive your final recommendation from the City of Portland, you will need to provide that to your assigned OLCC investigator.



OREGON LIQUOR & CANNABIS COMMISSION
Local Government Recommendation – Liquor License

Annual Liquor License Types	
Off-Premises Sales	Brewery-Public House
Limited On-Premises Sales	Brewery
Full On-Premises, Caterer	Distillery
Full On-Premises, Commercial	Grower Sales Privilege
Full On-Premises, For Profit Private Club	Winery
Full On-Premises, Non Profit Private Club	Wholesale Malt Beverage & Wine
Full On-Premises, Other Public Location	Warehouse
Full On-Premises, Public Passenger Carrier	

Section 1 – Submission – To be completed by Applicant:

License Information

Legal Entity/Individual Applicant Name(s): Duffy's Deli, LLC

Proposed Trade Name: Duffy's Deli & Coffee

Premises Address: 350 NE Baker Creek Road Unit:

City: McMinnville County: Yamhill Zip: 97128

Application Type: New License Application Change of Ownership Change of Location

License Type: Limited On-Premises Sales Additional Location for an Existing License

Application Contact Information

Contact Name: Delaney Kizer Phone: [REDACTED]

Mailing Address: [REDACTED]

City: McMinnville State: OR Zip: 97128

Email Address: [REDACTED]

Business Details

Please check all that apply to your proposed business operations at this location:

Manufacturing/Production

Retail Off-Premises Sales

Retail On-Premises Sales & Consumption

If there will be On-Premises Consumption at this location:

Indoor Consumption Outdoor Consumption

Proposing to Allow Minors

Section 1 continued on next page



Local Government Recommendation – Liquor License

Section 1 Continued – Submission - To be completed by Applicant:

Legal Entity/Individual Applicant Name(s): Duffy's Deli, LLC

Proposed Trade Name: Duffy's Deli & Coffee

IMPORTANT: You MUST submit this form to the local government PRIOR to submitting to OLCC.
Section 2 must be completed **by the local government** for this form to be accepted with your CAMP application.

Section 2 – Acceptance - To be completed by Local Government:

Local Government Recommendation Proof of Acceptance

After accepting this form, please return a copy to the applicant with received and accepted information

City or County Name: McMinnville

Optional Date Received Stamp

Date Application Received: 06/13/2026

Received by: Laura Fitzgerald

Section 3 – Recommendation - To be completed by Local Government:

- Recommend this license be granted
- Recommend this license be denied (Please include documentation that meets [OAR 845-005-0308](#))
- No Recommendation/Neutral

Name of Reviewing Official:

Title:

Date:

Signature:

After providing your recommendation and signature, please return this form to the applicant.

CITY OF McMinnville
MINUTES OF CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION
Held via Zoom Video Conference and at the
Kent L. Taylor Civic Hall on Gormley Plaza
McMinnville, Oregon

Wednesday, March 24, 2026 at 5:30 p.m.

Presiding: Kim Morris, Mayor

Recording Secretary: Claudia Cisneros

Councilors:	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
	Sal Peralta, Council President	
	Zack Geary	
	Chris Chenoweth	
	Dan Tucholsky	
	Scott Cunningham	
	VACANT (Ward 3 position)	

Also present were City Recorder Claudia Cisneros, Interim City Manager Adam Garvin, City Attorney David Ligtenberg, Information Technology Director Scott Burke, Chief of Police Cord Wood, Public Works Director Geoff Hunsaker, Acting Planning Manager/Housing Planner Evan Hietpas, Community Development Director Heather Richards, Finance Director Katie Henry (*via Zoom*), Human Resources Director Vicki Hedges (*via Zoom*), and *members of the News Media – Phil Guzzo McMinnville Community Media.*

1. CALL TO ORDER: Mayor Morris called the meeting to order at 5:33 p.m. and welcomed all in attendance.

2. CONSTRUCTION EXCISE TAX PROGRAM:

Acting Planning Manager/Housing Planner Evan Hietpas and Community Development Director Heather Richards outlined that the work session would focus on implementation of the Construction Excise Tax (CET) program and seeking Council direction on a process for awarding CET funds. Staff reviewed the City's existing affordable housing incentives, including exemptions from wastewater and transportation system development charges, 50 percent reductions in planning, engineering, and building permit review fees for qualifying affordable housing projects, and the requirement that qualifying units remain affordable for 10 years or repay the value of the exemptions. Staff noted these measures were developed over many years to reduce barriers to affordable housing and were expanded beyond nonprofit providers to any qualifying project serving households at 80 percent of area median income or below.

Mr. Hietpas presented background on the CET program, adopted in 2022 under state authority, and explained that funds have been collected since July 1, 2022. The Affordable Housing Committee had recommended allowing the fund to grow before distribution and later developed the proposed award process. He explained that approximately \$1.25 million was now available, with eligible uses divided between developer incentives and affordable housing programs. He also reviewed statutory and local requirements, including administrative costs, funding for housing planning support, and the required 15 percent set-aside from residential collections for Oregon Housing and Community Services homeownership programs. Staff recommended that for fiscal year 2027, a greater share of CET resources be directed toward developer incentives because of identified needs in new housing production, while carrying forward roughly \$550,000 for affordable housing programs.

Staff presented a proposed annual funding cycle, with broad notice of funding availability, a 4- to 6-week application period, staff completeness review, selection subcommittee review, optional applicant interviews, and a recommendation to Council for final award. The proposed review process was expected to take approximately 50 to 65 days once applications were submitted, with an overall implementation timeline of roughly six months. Staff proposed a selection subcommittee of five to seven members, including city staff and city representatives, while excluding anyone with a conflict of interest.

Council discussion focused primarily on the proposed selection criteria and subcommittee structure. Several councilors raised concerns about bonus-point language related to historically marginalized populations and asked that wording be reviewed for legal compliance and fairness. Other comments supported retaining language acknowledging historically marginalized groups while ensuring it was appropriately framed. Council also questioned the use of bonus points generally, with some members preferring that important policy priorities, especially deeply affordable housing, be incorporated directly into the main criteria rather than treated as bonus points. Staff agreed to revise the criteria accordingly.

Council also discussed whether Yamhill County or Portland metro area median income assumptions best matched current affordable housing financing structures and whether those standards should be revisited in the future. Additional comments addressed the importance of evaluating builder qualifications and track record, ensuring the process remains clear for applicants, and limiting the number of Affordable Housing Committee members serving on the selection subcommittee because of potential conflicts of interest. Council indicated support for annual review of the CET program by the Affordable Housing Committee with recommendations returned to City Council.

Council provided general direction for staff to move forward with implementation of the CET application process, with revisions to the scoring criteria and legal review of protected-class wording and conflict-of-interest considerations.

3. ADJOURNMENT: Mayor Morris adjourned the meeting at 6:57 p.m.

Claudia Cisneros, City Recorder

DRAFT

CITY OF McMinnville
MINUTES OF CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING
Held via Zoom Video Conference and at the
Kent L. Taylor Civic Hall on Gormley Plaza
McMinnville, Oregon

Tuesday, March 24, 2026, at 7:00 p.m.

Presiding: Kim Morris, Mayor

Recording Secretary: Claudia Cisneros

Councilors:	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
	Sal Peralta, Council President	
	Zack Geary	
	Chris Chenoweth	
	Dan Tucholsky	
	Scott Cunningham	
	VACANT (Ward 3 position)	

Also present were City Recorder Claudia Cisneros, Interim City Manager Adam Garvin, City Attorney David Ligtenberg, Information Technology Director Scott Burke, Chief of Police Cord Wood, Public Works Director Geoff Hunsaker, Community Development Director Heather Richards, Finance Director Katie Henry (*via Zoom*), Human Resources Director Vicki Hedges (*via Zoom*), and *members of the News Media – Phil Guzzo McMinnville Community Media.*

1. CALL TO ORDER: Mayor Morris called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. and welcomed all in attendance.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mayor Morris led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. INVITATION TO COMMUNITY MEMBERS FOR PUBLIC COMMENT: Mayor Morris invited the public to comment.

Mark David, McMinnville Community Member, addressed the council regarding the CET selection subcommittee, recommending the inclusion of a private citizen not connected to the planning department or city council, such as a realtor, developer, or banker, to provide an outside perspective

Mayor Morris directed staff to share the comment with the appropriate staff members.

4. CONSENT AGENDA

- a. Consider the request from Dagger Daisy LLC for Change of Location - Winery, OLCC Liquor License located at 1421 NE Alpha Drive.
- b. Consider **Resolution No. 2026-18**: A Resolution to participate in the New National Opioids Settlement with Six Remnant Defendants, and authorizing the City Attorney to take all action to effectuate that participation.

*Councilor Cunningham MOVED to adopt the consent agenda as presented;
SECONDED by Councilor Geary*

*AYE: Councilors Chenoweth, Geary, Cunningham, Tucholsky, Peralta
NAY: NONE*

*The consent agenda has **PASSED** unanimously by a vote of 5-0.*

5. RESOLUTIONS

- 5.a. Consider **Resolution No. 2026-16**: A Resolution approving an employment agreement with Adam D. Garvin as City Manager.

City Attorney David Ligtenberg presented the proposed employment agreement with Adam Garvin as City Manager, the agreement was modeled substantially on the prior city manager contract, with several notable updates. The Council discussed and agreed to extend the performance cure period from 45 to 60 days. The termination-without-cause severance was negotiated and settled at six months upon execution, increasing by one additional month per year of service, capped at twelve months. Residency requirements were modified from strict city limits residency to Yamhill County. The supermajority termination threshold proposed by Councilor Chenoweth was discussed but not adopted, with the City Attorney Ligtenberg advising it conflicted with the City Charter's majority-vote requirement for appointment. An ethics provision was added obligating the Council not to direct the City Manager to violate the ICMA Code of Ethics. Annual performance evaluations were established for the first four years, transitioning to biennial thereafter. The resolution authorized the Mayor to execute the finalized agreement after the City Attorney Ligtenberg incorporates the agreed-upon changes.

*Council President Peralta MOVED to **approve** Resolution No. 2026-16;
approving an employment agreement with Adam D. Garvin as City Manager;
SECONDED by Councilor Tucholsky.*

*AYE: Councilors Chenoweth, Cunningham, Tucholsky, Peralta
NAY: Councilor Geary*

*Resolution No. 2026-15 **PASSED** by a vote of 4-1.*

6. ORDINANCES

- 6.a. Consider the second reading of **Ordinance No. 5173**: An Ordinance approving a comprehensive plan map amendment (Docket CPA 1-25) and zone map amendment (Docket ZC 2-25) for approximately 26.07 acres, located at 2325 NE Three Mile Lane, 160 NE Atlantic Street, 2305, 2245, 2225, 2215, and 2205 NE Cumulus Avenue, and tax lot R4422CC 01102.

City Recorder Claudia Cisneros noted for the record that Ordinance No. 5173 did not pass with unanimous support at the March 14 meeting, necessitating this second reading. No additional discussion was held.

Mayor Morris said this was the second reading of the ordinance.

No Councilor present requested that the Ordinance be read in full.

City Attorney Ligtenberg read by title only Ordinance No. 5173.

*Councilor Geary MOVED to **adopt** Ordinance No. 5173, approving a comprehensive plan map amendment (Docket CPA 1-25) and zone map amendment (Docket ZC 2-25) for approximately 26.07 acres, located at 2325 NE Three Mile Lane, 160 NE Atlantic Street, 2305, 2245, 2225, 2215, and 2205 NE Cumulus Avenue, and tax lot R4422CC 01102; SECONDED by Councilor Cunningham. Motion **PASSED** 3-2 by the following vote:*

AYE: Councilors Geary, Cunningham, Peralta

NAY: Councilors Chenoweth, Tucholsky

7. ADVICE/ INFORMATION ITEMS

- 7.a. Reports from Councilors on Committee & Board Assignments

- 7.b. Department Head Reports

Chief of Police Cord Wood announced the upcoming launch of a bicycle patrol program funded by grants from McMinnville Industrial Promotions and Visit McMinnville, and welcomed returning lateral officer Justin James effective April 8th.

Public Works Director Geoff Hunsaker reported the Transportation System Plan consultant selection process is moving to interviews on April 1st, congratulated Erik Grimstead on his appointment as Wastewater Services Manager, and noted City Engineer James Lofton's departure to the City of Corvallis effective April 1st

Information Technology Director Scott Burke noted ongoing infrastructure and storage reconfiguration work.

City Recorder Claudia Cisneros reminded councilors of the April 15th Oregon Government Ethics Commission statement of economic interests deadline and noted Ward 3 applications are due Friday at 5 p.m., with interviews scheduled for a special meeting beginning at 5:30 p.m.

Councilor Cunningham reported that the Historic Landmarks Committee swore in Graham Mandel as a new member; he vacated the subsequent portion of that meeting due to a quasi-judicial demolition application. MCM11 is seeking new board members as one member has termed off. The Affordable Housing Committee did not meet, pending CET program approval.

Councilor Chenoweth reported that MEVLC adopted 2026 priorities including the Third Street Improvement Project, Northeast Gateway Redevelopment, McMinnville Landing Infrastructure, Public Infrastructure, Newberg–Dundee Bypass, and Housing, and adopted two new action items focused on a business concierge service model and a unifying community brand to attract investment. Also attended the Parkway Committee meeting, noting progress on the 2A interchange near Newberg and three new traffic lights expected within six months, and joined the Oregon Transportation Safety Action Plan update, which documented a steady increase in crashes since 2015 correlated with distracted driving and, potentially, marijuana legalization. He noted an upcoming Yamhill County Commissioners Forum on April 11 at the McMinnville Community Center.

Council President Peralta reported that the Mid-Willamette Valley Council of Governments elected new officers, Betsy Earls as chair and Kit Johnson as vice chair and adopted new member rates and received transportation plan updates from MWAC.

Mayor Morris reported attending a tour of Homeward Bound's new facility targeting a June opening, a McMinnville leadership community discussion meeting, the chamber greeters at the school district featuring the business pathways program, a ribbon cutting for the new Tractor Supply store, the wine and food classic, the monthly Water and Light Commission meeting (the last in its current facility prior to a major renovation and relocation), and a school visit with Superintendent Kourtney Ferrua and Lafayette Hilary Mayor Malcomson in connection with the "We Care About Kids" community campaign. Reminded Council to send any proposed questions to City Recorder Cisneros for the Ward 3 candidates by the end of the day Monday, and to respond if any are interested in attending Aquatic tours.

Councilor Geary reported Visit McMinnville met online and mostly business; MURAC has not met. Provided kudos to aquatic staff he volunteered and participated in the third-grade survival swim program at the city pool, and the experience was a great one. Also commended outgoing City Engineer James Lofton for his work, including facilitating a citizen-initiated four-way stop at the intersection of Cows and Fourth.

Councilor Tucholsky noted the Airport Commission meets on the 31st.

Councilor Chenoweth also wanted to note he toured the library and provided kudos to the staff.

Interim City Manager Adam Garvin reported on round 2 budget meetings, stakeholder meetings with stable table partners regarding the MEVLC addendum, coordination with McMinnville Water and Light on surplus furniture and vehicles, a lunch with state lobbyist Doug Riggs regarding the legislative session, and the receipt of the community center appraisal.

City Attorney David Ligtenberg had nothing to report.

Community Development Director Heather Richards reported that code compliance had closed 37 of 53 open cases and noted several quasi-judicial projects progressing through the landmarks committee and planning commission that may eventually reach council on appeal; she advised councilors not to engage with public communications about those projects and to forward any such communications to staff for the public record.

Finance Director Katie Henry (*via Zoom*) reported municipal court disruptions due to a family emergency affecting the judge, with a return expected April 1 and pro tem judges secured for coverage. She reported a breakthrough in transparency software integration but ongoing errors in budget report generation.

6.c. February 2026 Cash and Investment Report (in packet)

Mayor Morris noted the February 2026 cash and investment reports were included in the packet. No council members raised questions about the cash and investment reports.

7. ADJOURNMENT: Mayor Morris adjourned the meeting at 8:43 p.m.

Claudia Cisneros, City Recorder

CITY OF McMinnville
MINUTES OF SPECIAL CALLED CITY COUNCIL MEETING
Held via Zoom Video Conference and at the
Kent L. Taylor Civic Hall on Gormley Plaza
McMinnville, Oregon

Tuesday, April 08, 2026 at 5:30 p.m.

Presiding: Kim Morris, Mayor

Recording Secretary: Claudia Cisneros

Councilors:	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
	Sal Peralta, Council President	
	Zack Geary	
	Chris Chenoweth @ 5:38 p.m.	
	Dan Tucholsky	
	Scott Cunningham	
	VACANT (Ward 3 position)	

Also present were City Manager Adam Garvin, City Recorder Claudia Cisneros, City Attorney David Ligtenberg, Community Development Director Heather Richards, Finance Director Katie Henry, Public Works Director Geoff Hunsaker, Chief of Police Cord Wood, Human Resources Director Vicki Hedges (*via Zoom*), and *members of the News Media – Phil Guzzo McMinnville Community Media.*

1. CALL TO ORDER: Mayor Morris called the special called meeting to order at 5:32 p.m. and welcomed all in attendance.

2. PUBLIC HEARING

2.a. Public Hearing to consider Ordinance No. 5174: An Ordinance memorializing the City Council’s decision for the McMinnville Industrial Promotions appeal of the Planning Commission’s approval of MP 6-25.

Mayor Morris outlined the procedural order for the quasi-judicial public hearing concerning Ordinance No. 5174.

Mayor Morris opened the public hearing at 5:33 p.m. She asked if any Councilor objected to the jurisdiction of the City Council to hear this matter. There was none.

Mayor Morris asked if any Councilor needed to declare a potential conflict of interest or recuse themselves from the hearing.

Mayor Morris disclosed that Councilors Tuchosky, Geary and she had visited the site.

Mayor Morris asked if any councilors needed to declare ex parte communications.

Councilor Cunningham noted personal conversations with someone involved but not about the specific matter. Land Use Legal Counsel Melissa Ryan (via Zoom) confirmed that such communications did not qualify as ex parte contact.

Community Development Director Heather Richards presented the background of this appeal case. McMinnville Industrial Promotions (MIP) had applied for a minor partition in October 2025 to divide a 26-acre industrial property into two parcels. The original director's decision included condition of approval #5 requiring MIP to build the full width of Miller Street and secure proportional share costs from neighboring property. MIP appealed this condition successfully to the Planning Commission.

At the Planning Commission hearing, MIP's legal counsel raised additional concerns about sidewalk requirements in conditions #5 and #12. The Planning Commission addressed MIP's original appeal concerns but declined to remove sidewalk requirements. MIP then appealed the Planning Commission's decision specifically regarding required sidewalks on the east side of the street.

Director Richards explained the city's code interpretation dispute centers on Municipal Code section 17.53.153, which lists improvements required at the expense of "the subdivider." The city's legal interpretation, confirmed by three different attorneys over several years, is that this section applies to all land divisions, including minor partitions, not just subdivisions. The code requires various improvements including pedestrian ways (sidewalks), and if deferred, requires a deferment agreement with surety bonds. She detailed the city's historical practice of requiring sidewalks as conditions of approval but not enforcing them before final plat recording, creating inconsistency with code requirements. Recent legal advice emphasized the city cannot ignore code provisions and must either require improvements or properly defer them with surety. She cited ADA compliance concerns and recent Oregon judgments against cities that failed to follow their own sidewalk codes.

The staff position is that the code requires these improvements for land divisions, and legal counsel has advised they cannot selectively ignore code provisions based on future alternative enforcement mechanisms.

Attorney Kate Gowell, representing MIP, argued that the city's interpretation incorrectly applies subdivision requirements to minor partitions. She emphasized MIP's 70-year partnership with the city and their mission to promote industrial development. She contended that the code uses specific terminology - "applicant" for lot line adjustments, "partitioner" for partitions, and "subdivider" for subdivisions - indicating different requirements for different land division types. She argued applying subdivision standards to a simple two-parcel partition creates unreasonable barriers to industrial development. MIP's position is that sidewalks should be required at building permit stage rather than partition approval, as the current requirement forces speculative industrial developers to install improvements that may be

damaged or need reconfiguration when actual development occurs. Attorney Gowell noted the isolated location would create sidewalks "from nowhere to nowhere" with no connectivity to existing pedestrian infrastructure. She also addressed previous deferment costs, correcting staff's figure and stating MIP paid \$2,800 annually for six years on their previous bond, making deferment expensive for potentially decades-long industrial holdings.

Public Testimony in **Support**

Mike Morris (the Mayor's husband, speaking as a private citizen) testified in support of MIP, emphasizing the organization's 70-year partnership with the city and conservative approach to development.

Mayor Morris disclosed the relationship and recused herself from voting.

Doug Hurl, MIP President, provided context about the project's complexity, including utility conflicts and topographical challenges. He expressed disagreement with the city's code interpretation while maintaining MIP's commitment to building the road regardless of the decision.

Councilors asked detailed questions about code interpretation, legal precedents, and practical implications. Councilor Peralta inquired about the narrowest possible motion to address only sidewalk requirements without affecting other improvements. Councilor Tucholsky asked about creating industrial-specific code provisions.

Legal Counsel Missy Ryan explained statutory construction principles limiting the council's ability to insert language not present in the code, while noting the council ultimately has authority to interpret its own code provisions.

Director Richards and Public Works Director Hunsaker discussed the complex web of different code sections that would be affected by various interpretations, noting uncertainty about how other infrastructure requirements would be captured if the partition improvement section were deemed inapplicable.

When deliberations revealed the complexity of crafting appropriate findings, MIP's attorney offered to extend the 120-day decision deadline to May 15th to allow staff time to prepare written findings supporting whatever decision the council reached.

Mayor Morris closed the public hearing at 7:37 p.m.

7. ORDINANCES

- 7.a. Consider the first reading with a possible second reading of Ordinance No. 5174: An Ordinance memorializing the City Council's decision for the

McMinnville Industrial Promotions appeal of the Planning Commission's approval of MP 6-25.

Mayor Morris asked if any Councilor needed to declare any actual or potential conflicts of interest or recuse themselves regarding this ordinance.

Mayor Morris noted prior contact disclosures from earlier proceedings and confirmed no conflicts of interest existed.

No Councilor present requested that the Ordinance be read in full.

City Attorney Ligtenberg read by title only Ordinance No. 5174.

Staff noted a correction needed to fill in the blank date (April 1) in the fifth "whereas" clause.

After extensive deliberation about the appropriate legal findings to support their decision, Council engaged in detailed discussion about the code interpretation dispute. Councilor Chenoweth articulated two potential findings: either that the council agreed with the applicant's interpretation that the subdivision improvement requirements don't apply to partitions, or that section 17.53.153 doesn't apply to minor partitions based on dictionary definitions requiring "several" (more than two) parts for subdivision.

Councilor Chenoweth MOVED to pass Ordinance No. 5174 striking all requirements for sidewalks based on finding that section 17.53.153 does not apply to minor partitions; SECONDED by Councilor Tucholsky.

The motion was clarified to strike the entire improvements section 17.53.153 as not applicable to minor partitions, which would affect not just sidewalks but all eight categories of improvements listed. Staff noted this would be precedent-setting for future partition applications and advised they would need to research how other code sections might capture these requirements.

*Motion **PASSED 4-1** by the following vote:*

AYE: Councilors Cunningham, Tucholsky, Chenoweth, Peralta

NAY: Councilor Geary

ABSTAIN: Mayor Morris

The ordinance would be brought back for second reading at the May 12, 2026, meeting with an extension to the May 15th deadline, allowing staff time to prepare written findings supporting the council's decision.

4.

INTERVIEWS FOR CITY COUNCIL WARD 3 VACANCY

The council conducted interviews for the vacant Ward 3 council position, with each candidate answering the same nine questions about their preparation, community involvement, decision-making experience, budget

priorities, key issues, handling criticism, document review capabilities, and election intentions.

4.a. Carson Benner (Pages 311 – 315)

Carson Benner emphasized his 30+ years in McMinnville, extensive board service including 18 years with the school board and leadership roles with Habitat for Humanity and Economic Vitality Leadership Council. He identified housing, budget constraints, and major development projects as key issues, expressing support for Third Street improvements and McMinnville Landing.

4.b. Richard Smith (Pages 316 – 317)

Richard Smith highlighted his service on the Affordable Housing Commission and Southwest Area Plan advisory group, combined with his business ownership and urban planning studies at Portland State University. He advocated for increased density while maintaining community character, revenue diversification through public utilities, and support for parks and services.

4.c. Artimus Johnson (Pages 318 – 321)

Artimus Johnson described involvement with various committees, volunteer firefighting, and community organizations. As the youngest candidate, he acknowledged limited experience with large document review but expressed eagerness to learn and focus on affordable housing, youth engagement, and community safety.

4.d. Josh Dillon (Pages 322 – 326)

Josh Dillon, a recent McMinnville transplant, brought corporate management experience and highlighted his role as an Airbnb host and Tool Library volunteer. He proposed revenue enhancement through increased transient lodging taxes and identified climate preparedness, commercial development, and housing resources as priorities.

4.e. Katie Russ (Pages 327 – 330)

Katie Russ leveraged her decade-plus real estate experience to demonstrate familiarity with zoning and development issues. As a mother of school-age children, she emphasized family-friendly amenities, employment opportunities that support homeownership, and maintaining public safety investments.

5. DELIBERATIONS ON INTERVIEWS:

Council members discussed their evaluation criteria, focusing on community involvement, board experience, and what perspectives might best

complement the existing council composition. Several councilors noted the importance of finding candidates who bring different viewpoints and experiences to enhance decision-making.

Councilor Tucholsky specifically addressed the gender composition of the council, noting that with Councilor Payne's departure, the council consisted of five men and emphasized the value of female perspective on community issues. Councilor Chenoweth supported this observation, highlighting the practical knowledge that Councilor Payne's real estate expertise had brought to previous housing and development discussions.

The councilors identified their top candidates through an informal ranking process, with Carson Benner receiving support from all five councilors, while Katie Russ, Josh Dillon, and Richard Smith also received multiple mentions.

6. COUNCIL APPOINTMENT:

6.a. Motion to appoint a candidate to fill Ward 3 vacant position.

After deliberations weighing experience, community involvement, and diverse perspectives, the council focused their discussion primarily on Carson Benner and Katie Russ as the top candidates.

Councilor Peralta emphasized Benner's extensive public service record, including his role in passing previous bond measures, which could prove valuable given the upcoming recreation bond. Councilor Tucholsky advocated for Russ, highlighting her real estate expertise, parenting perspective, and the importance of female representation on the council.

Council President MOVED to appoint Carson Benner to fill the Ward 3 vacant position; SECONDED by Councilor Geary

AYE: Councilors Geary, Cunningham, Peralta

NAY: Councilors Tucholsky, Chenoweth

ABSTAIN: Mayor Morris

*The consent agenda has **PASSED** unanimously by a vote of 3-2.*

7. ADJOURNMENT: Mayor Morris adjourned the special-called meeting at 9:47 p.m., thanking all interview candidates for their participation and encouraging continued community involvement.

Claudia Cisneros, City Recorder

CITY OF McMinnville
MINUTES OF CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION
Held via Zoom Video Conference and at the
Kent L. Taylor Civic Hall on Gormley Plaza
McMinnville, Oregon

Wednesday, April 14, 2026 at 6:00 p.m.

Presiding: Kim Morris, Mayor

Recording Secretary: Claudia Cisneros

Councilors:	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
	Sal Peralta, Council President	
	Zack Geary	
	Chris Chenoweth	
	Dan Tucholsky	
	Scott Cunningham	
	VACANT (Ward 3 position)	

Also present were City Recorder Claudia Cisneros, City Manager Adam Garvin, City Attorney David Ligtenberg, Information Technology Director Scott Burke, Chief of Police Cord Wood, Public Works Director Geoff Hunsaker, Community Development Director Heather Richards, Special Project Manager Jody Christensen, Finance Director Katie Henry, Library Director / Parks & Recreation Director Jenny Berg (*via Zoom*), Human Resources Director Vicki Hedges (*via Zoom*), and *members of the News Media – Kyle Dauterman McMinnville Community Media.*

1. CALL TO ORDER: Mayor Morris called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m. and welcomed all in attendance.

2. WORK SESSION: LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE – FY27-29 OREGON ('27 LONG SESSION) AND FY28 FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS:

Special Projects Manager Jody Christensen and State Lobbyist Doug Riggs presented a review of the FY26 legislative session outcomes and proposed priority projects for the FY27 long session and FY28 federal appropriations cycle. The FY26 session yielded notable successes, including a \$1.5 million allocation for the Northeast Gateway Alpine Avenue Street Improvement Project Phase 2 and \$1 million in federal funds for the Housing Authority of Yamhill County's McMinnville Rehabilitation Program. The Council was informed that the City has secured a multi-year track record of successful project delivery, strengthening its position for future asks. Staff recommended that the Council consider pursuing larger requests in the FY27 long session given this history. Three priority projects were proposed: the Northeast Gateway Wastewater and Stormwater Upgrade (\$1.5M ask, design underway, city match secured); the Three Mile Lane Area Pump Station and Conveyance

System (\$5–10M ask, supported by multiple adopted plans and private investment); and the Lower Income Neighborhood Accessibility Project Phase 1 (focused on the Janina/Byrd Streets neighborhood).

The Council expressed consensus support for all three priorities and indicated a desire to add a fourth project from the parks and recreation category, most notably the Senior Center, to provide a more diverse portfolio. Staff noted that the full project list, spanning ten categories including transportation, housing, Third Street improvement, parks, and public facilities repurposing, would continue to guide ongoing legislative coordination and outreach. The Council accepted the proposed project list and priority recommendations, directing staff and the lobbyist to proceed with outreach to Representative Elmer, Senator Starr, and the federal delegation.

The work session concluded with a recognition of Special Projects Manager Jody Christensen upon her retirement, acknowledging her significant contributions to the City's legislative and project management work over many years.

3. ADJOURNMENT: Mayor Morris adjourned the meeting at 7:05 p.m.

Claudia Cisneros, City Recorder

CITY OF McMinnville
MINUTES OF CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING
Held via Zoom Video Conference and at the
Kent L. Taylor Civic Hall on Gormley Plaza
McMinnville, Oregon

Tuesday, April 14, 2026, at 7:00 p.m.

Presiding: Kim Morris, Mayor

Recording Secretary: Claudia Cisneros

Councilors:	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
	Sal Peralta, Council President	
	Zack Geary	
	Chris Chenoweth	
	Dan Tucholsky	
	Scott Cunningham	
	Carson Benner	

Also present were City Recorder Claudia Cisneros, City Manager Adam Garvin, City Attorney David Ligtenberg, Information Technology Director Scott Burke, Chief of Police Cord Wood, Public Works Director Geoff Hunsaker, Community Development Director Heather Richards, Finance Director Katie Henry, Communications & Engagement Manager Noelle Amaya, Library Director / Parks & Recreation Director Jenny Berg (*via Zoom*), Human Resources Director Vicki Hedges (*via Zoom*), and *members of the News Media – Kyle Dauterman McMinnville Community Media.*

1. CALL TO ORDER: Mayor Morris called the meeting to order at 7:11 p.m. and welcomed all in attendance.
2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
Mayor Morris led the Pledge of Allegiance.
3. SWEAR IN FOR CITY COUNCILOR WARD 3 POSITION
Judge Arnold Poole administered the oath of office to Carson Benner as City Councilor for Ward 3. The full Council was present for a group photograph following the swearing-in.
4. PROCLAMATION
- 4.a. Arbor Day Proclamation

Mayor Morris read the proclamation declaring Friday, April 24, 2026, as Arbor Day in the City of McMinnville, in recognition of the City's 29th consecutive year as a certified Tree City USA.

5. INVITATION TO COMMUNITY MEMBERS FOR PUBLIC COMMENT:
Mayor Morris invited the public to comment.

City Recorder Claudia Cisneros noted for the record the written letter from Marie Frugia for public comment already emailed to the City Council and will be made part of the amended packet posted tomorrow.

Gabrielle Humlie, McMinnville Community Member, addressed the Council, speaking in recognition of April as Child Abuse Prevention Month and Sexual Assault Awareness Month. She shared a personal experience with the legal system, encouraged the Council to consider the impact of decisions on vulnerable community members, and invited Council members to connect with Henderson House and sign the Start by Believing pledge.

6. PRESENTATION

- 6.a. Oregon Air Show Presentation – Oregon Air Show President Eric Corning & McMinnville Area Chamber of Commerce President & CEO John Olson.

Oregon Air Show President Eric Corning and McMinnville Area Chamber of Commerce President and CEO John Olson presented on the growing partnership between the Oregon International Air Show and the McMinnville community. Highlights included expanding opportunities for local restaurants, breweries, wineries, and nonprofits to participate on-site; workforce development through the air show's charitable foundation; and efforts to connect visitors with downtown McMinnville. The 2026 show will feature the Blue Angels. The 2027 show is scheduled for August 27–29 with the U.S. Air Force Thunderbirds and a potential Friday evening night show.

7. CONSENT AGENDA

- a. Consider the request from Chipotle Mexican Grill Inc. for Limited On-Premises Sales, OLCC Liquor License located at 2696 NE Hwy 99W.
- b. Consider the request from Turley Bird LLC dba Hazel's Wine Shop for Limited On-Premises Sales, OLCC Liquor License located at 636 NE Baker Street.
- c. Consider a request to permit a waiver of the noise ordinance from Virna Darling for live music for two Charity Garden Concert events on June 28, 2026 & July 26, 2026.
- d. Consider **Resolution No. 2026-21**: A Resolution approving code compliance liens on properties to recover unpaid abatements and civil penalty citations.
- e. Consider **Resolution No. 2026-22**: A Resolution amending the allocation of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds.

- f. Consider **Resolution No. 2026-23**: A Resolution authorizing the City Manager to execute a contract for the 2026 Pavement Patching project, Project 2026-1, with K&E Paving, Inc. dba H&H Paving.

Councilor Cunningham requested item d. Resolution No. 2026-21 be removed from the consent agenda.

Councilor Geary MOVED to adopt the consent agenda with item 7.d. removed; SECONDED by Councilor Cunningham.

*AYE: Councilors Cunningham, Tucholsky, Chenoweth, Benner, Geary, Peralta
NAY: NONE*

Motion PASSED unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

7. ITEMS REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA

- 7.d. Consider **Resolution No. 2026-21**: A Resolution approving code compliance liens on properties to recover unpaid abatements and civil penalty citations.

Councilor Cunningham requested this item be removed from the consent agenda and requested clarification on whether graffiti-related violations could result in liens against property owners who were victims of vandalism. Community Development Director Heather Richards confirmed that no liens on the current list pertain to graffiti, that voluntary compliance is achieved in approximately 90–95% of cases, and that the City maintains arrangements with local businesses to assist property owners with graffiti abatement supplies at cost

Councilor Cunningham MOVED to approve Resolution No. 2026-21; approving code compliance liens on properties to recover unpaid abatements and civil penalty citations; SECONDED by Councilor Tucholsky.

*AYE: Councilors Cunningham, Tucholsky, Chenoweth, Benner, Geary, Peralta
NAY: NONE*

Resolution No. 2026-21 PASSED unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

8. RESOLUTIONS

The next two Resolutions were read under one staff report but were voted on separately.

- 8.a. Consider **Resolution No. 2026-24**: A Resolution directing staff to pursue the sale of City-owned air easements affecting certain properties between NW 25th Street and Tice Park.

City Attorney David Ligtenberg and Community Development Director Heather Richards presented background on the air easements held by the City over the rear 100 feet of properties adjacent to Tice Park along NW 25th Street. The easements, which restrict construction above 10 feet and render the back lots unbuildable, originated from the original sale of Tice Park and accompanying property transactions. An appraisal indicated that release of the easements would increase underlying property values by approximately \$40,000–\$85,000 per parcel. Following Council discussion, consensus was reached to authorize the sale of the easements on an opt-in, per-request basis, priced at 10% of the appraised value increase as reflected in the current appraisal, with that pricing valid for five years before a new appraisal would be required. Proceeds were directed to be designated for Tice Park improvements. All properties, including the one at 131 NW 25th Street where a structure exists within the easement area, were to be treated under the same terms. Resolution No. 2026-04 was not advanced; the Council instead directed staff to proceed under Resolution No. 2026-24 and return with a formal public hearing and implementing documents.

Councilor Chenoweth MOVED directing staff to pursue the sale of City-owned air easements affecting certain properties between NW 25th Street and Tice Park, per the terms discussed; SECONDED by Councilor Geary.

*AYE: Councilors Cunningham, Tucholsky, Chenoweth, Benner, Geary, Peralta
NAY: NONE*

Resolution No. 2026-24 PASSED unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

- 8.b. Consider **Resolution No. 2026-04**: A Resolution authorizing the City Manager to release air easements affecting certain properties adjacent to Tice Park along NW 25th St.

The resolution was not advanced to move forward.

9. ORDINANCES

- 9.a. Consider the first reading with a possible second reading of **Ordinance No. 5176**: An Ordinance awarding a lease and operating contract for Fixed Base Operator services with Trimble Aviation at the McMinnville Municipal Airport.

Mayor Morris asked if any Councilor needed to declare any conflict of interest or recuse themselves. There was none.

No Councilor present requested that the Ordinance be read in full.

City Attorney David Ligtenberg read by title only Ordinance No. 5176.

Public Works Director Geoff Hunsaker presented on behalf of Airport Manager John Paskell. Trimble Aviation was unanimously selected from three proposals following a Request For Proposal (RFP) process. Key lease terms include a 30-year term with a 10-year extension option, monthly lease revenue double the expiring contract with 3% annual increases after year five, a 50/50 split on overnight parking fees, fuel flowage fees expected to at least double, and a planned investment of \$350,000–\$750,000 for a new general aviation terminal. The City will own all improvements at lease termination. Councilors expressed support for Trimble Aviation as an established and invested airport partner and noted the Council's shared view of the airport as an underutilized asset with significant development potential.

*Councilor Cunningham MOVED to **pass** Ordinance No. 5176 to a second reading; SECONDED by Councilor Benner. Motion **PASSED** 6-0 by the following vote:*

*AYE: Councilors Cunningham, Tucholsky, Chenoweth, Benner, Geary, Peralta
NAY: NONE*

City Attorney David Ligtenberg read by title only for a second time Ordinance No. 5176.

*Councilor Chenoweth MOVED to **adopt** Ordinance No. 5176, awarding a lease and operating contract for Fixed Base Operator services with Trimble Aviation at the McMinnville Municipal Airport; SECONDED by Councilor Tucholsky. Motion **PASSED** 6-0 by the following vote:*

*AYE: Councilors Cunningham, Tucholsky, Chenoweth, Benner, Geary, Peralta
NAY: NONE*

- 9.b. Consider the first reading with a possible second reading of **Ordinance No. 5177**: An Ordinance authorizing a Supplemental Lease Agreement with the Federal Aviation Administration at the McMinnville Municipal Airport.

Mayor Morris asked if any Councilor needed to declare any conflict of interest or recuse themselves. There was none.

No Councilor present requested that the Ordinance be read in full.

City Attorney David Ligtenberg read by title only Ordinance No. 5177.

Director Hunsaker presented this item as a straightforward ten-year extension of the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA's) existing lease of approximately 616 square feet of office space at the airport, backdated to the lease's expiration in September 2025. The below-market rate was noted as consistent with aviation-use leasing standards.

*Councilor Tucholsky MOVED to **pass** Ordinance No. 5177 to a second reading; SECONDED by Councilor Cunningham. Motion **PASSED** 6-0 by the following vote:*

*AYE: Councilors Cunningham, Tucholsky, Chenoweth, Benner, Geary, Peralta
NAY: NONE*

City Attorney David Ligtenberg read by title only for a second time Ordinance No. 5177.

*Councilor Geary MOVED to **adopt** Ordinance No. 5177, authorizing a Supplemental Lease Agreement with the Federal Aviation Administration at the McMinnville Municipal Airport; SECONDED by Councilor Tucholsky. Motion **PASSED** 6-0 by the following vote:*

*AYE: Councilors Cunningham, Tucholsky, Chenoweth, Benner, Geary, Peralta
NAY: NONE*

10. ADVICE/ INFORMATION ITEMS

10.a. Reports from Councilors on Committee & Board Assignments

10.b. Department Head Reports

Finance Director Katie Henry reported that budget book preparation is ongoing and that court software implementation is set to begin the following Tuesday.

Community Development Director Heather Richards reported three current department vacancies under active recruitment, with 90 applications received for the planning analyst position and 50 for code enforcement; she also reported the issuance of three building permits for the West Side mixed-use development.

City Attorney David Ligtenberg had nothing to report.

City Manager Adam Garvin reported on attendance at a Governor's Office Prosperity Council meeting, a GIS software pilot program discussion, and noted that the Parks and Recreation Director recruitment closed April 12th with a strong applicant pool.

Mayor Morris noted Councilor Benner had not been assigned to any committees yet and looking to assign those at the next City Council meeting.

Councilor Benner declined to report.

Councilor Tucholsky deferred his airport liaison report given that the topic had been covered.

Councilor Geary reported participation in all park and recreation facility tours and noted upcoming Visit McMinnville and MURAC liaison meetings.

Mayor Morris provided an extensive report covering the Stratus Village grand opening, chamber events, a ribbon cutting at One Peak Medical primary care facility, the city-county dinner, aquatic center tours, a legislative forum with Rep. Elmer, Rep. Sharp, and Senator Starr, a swearing-in ceremony for Officer Justin James, meetings with Commissioner Johnston and Superintendent Ferrua, participation in a Lafayette "If I Were Mayor" pizza event, and a meeting with YCAP representative Laverne Pitts regarding expanded navigation center hours, rapid testing, and improvements at the Turnkey housing facility.

Council President Peralta noted he's in between meetings and had nothing to report.

Councilor Chenoweth reported on the Southwest Area Plan third meeting with a future joint session with the Planning Commission on April 22nd, attended the city-county dinner, the Mid-Willamette Valley Area Commission on Transportation (MWACT) met in Silverton with regional transportation priority projects noted, attended the aquatic tours, the legislative town hall event, attended the MEVLC meeting where Patty Herzog from MEDP presented on the upcoming Opportunity Zones 2.0, and lastly met with Superintendent Kourtney Ferrua.

Councilor Cunningham reported in between committee assignments but was able to participate in the various things everyone else did the last few weeks.

City Recorder Claudia Cisneros had nothing to report.

Information Technology Director Scott Burke is helping Director Henry with the court software implementation.

Public Works Director Geoff Hunsaker reported on a notice of intent to award the Transportation System Plan (TSP) contract to Kittelson & Associates, staff leadership training, wastewater plant seasonal preparations, street sweeper demonstrations, and confirmed receipt of the Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with ODOT for the Third Street design project.

Chief of Police Cord Wood reported Officer Justin James's return to MPD, the onboarding of new management support staff Laura Fitzgerald, Officer Jeffrey Freeman's upcoming DPSST graduation, active hiring with multiple candidates in process, two recent sergeant promotions to be introduced at the next meeting, and continued YCOM executive board discussions on membership agreement revisions.

City Manager Adam Garvin provided a social media update noting approximately 88,000 organic views in the past 30 days, a 229% increase, and ongoing work on the City's 150th anniversary branding.

10.c.

Park and Recreation Facility Tour Recap

City Manager Garvin opened a Council discussion of the April 3rd Redmond and April 8th Lake Oswego, Woodburn, and Chehalem facility tours, held in compliance with Oregon public meeting law. Councilors and staff who attended the tours shared extensive observations. Key themes included the importance of a high-quality dry side (fitness, courts, multipurpose rooms) as a revenue driver to support aquatic operations; the need for right-sizing the facility relative to budget; the value of an owner's representative during design and construction; the importance of proven construction methods and materials over untested products; adequate deck space, spectator seating, and storage; design prioritizing lifeguard sight lines and operational efficiency; a child watch (not childcare) area; flexible multipurpose rooms; competitive pool standards sufficient for district and potential NCAA meets; and ample parking including bus accommodation. Councilor Chenoweth highlighted the Woodburn renovation model as revelatory at approximately \$22 million for a single pool, while noting that the full cost comparison with the City's aging infrastructure remains unclear. Staff compiled input from tour participants, including aquatics coach Murillo and parks and recreation staff, and presented a consensus recommendation favoring a new integrated facility over renovation, citing risks of unknown infrastructure conditions, potential extended closures, and long-term operational advantages of a purpose-built facility.

The Council provided general consensus direction to target a facility of approximately 50,000–55,000 square feet with a bond ask in the range of \$75–80 million, with staff directed to refine programming and cost estimates for presentation at the April 28 meeting, including updated information on retrofitting the existing aquatic center and an appraisal of the community center building.

Mayor Morris noted the City Council will be going into the conference room for closed-to-the-public executive session pursuant to: ORS 192.660(2)(h) To consult with counsel concerning the legal rights and duties of a public body with regard to current litigation or litigation likely to be filed and asked if any Councilor needed to declare an actual or potential conflict of interest or recuse themselves regarding this executive session for the record. There was none

11.

ADJOURNMENT: Mayor Morris adjourned the meeting at 9:49 p.m.

Claudia Cisneros, City Recorder