

**CITY OF MILWAUKIE  
CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION  
FEBRUARY 4, 1997**

**Mayor Lomnicki** called the work session to order at 4:40 p.m. in the second floor conference room in City Hall.

Present were Councilmembers Tomei, Schreiber, Kappa, and Trotter.

Also present: City Manager Dan Bartlett; Assistant to the City Manager Charlene Richards; and City Engineer Jim Brink.

**Information Sharing**

1. **Mayor Lomnicki** distributed information on light rail.
2. **Councilmember Kappa** discussed the feasibility of developing a recognition program for citizens other than those appointed to boards and commissions. He specifically noted Fr. Toll's involvement with *Milwaukie Together*.

Council directed staff to contact other cities such as West Linn or Lake Oswego about any existing programs and criteria for recognizing outstanding citizens. Council agreed they would like a report by the end of summer.

3. The Council agreed to hold a goal setting work session on Thursday, February 6 from 6:00 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.
4. **Bartlett** reminded the Council of the Budget Committee meeting on Wednesday, February 5, 1997, 7:00 p.m. in the Public Safety Building.
5. The group discussed the draft "*Communication Agreement*."

**Sherrett Street Sanitary Sewer Project**

**Brink** presented the report regarding issues with the Sherrett Street Sanitary Sewer Project. He discussed the January 15 meeting with affected property owners and summarized the remaining issues.

The first issue was the ability to waive the SDC charge. The City Attorney informed him the SDC could not be waived without amending the ordinance.

**Brink** said other issues were applicability of the SDC to long-time residents and the incentive for immediate hook-up to the system. He reviewed the alternatives: full compensation at \$893 per residence; reduction of each property owner's share by \$327; reduction of the owners' share by a percentage to be determined by the City Council; or provide no compensation to the property owner. Full compensation would cost \$12,500, and the second alternative would cost \$4,578. He added most, if not all, of the property owners would elect immediate hookup, and that would be a benefit to the City. The full compensation would be a 66/33 (City) split based on current project cost estimates, and the second option would be 72/28 (City).

**Councilmember Trotter** asked how this compared to what the City is now doing. **Bartlett** discussed taking the City's cost from the sewer fund and the Council's ability to increase participation at certain levels. **Councilmember Trotter** said the property owner would pay the SDC, and, on the other hand, receive a credit.

**Brink** said staff recommends option B. Residents would be eligible for compensation only if they hooked up within three months of project completion. This addressed the property owners' issues about living in an established neighborhood and having the ability to have hooked up many years ago. He discussed previous sewer projects and assessments in the area. Some of the properties were too low to gravity-feed into the system.

**Councilmember Trotter** asked Brink why staff recommended alternative B. **Brink** responded everyone would share responsibility for the future of the sanitary and storm system.

**Councilmember Schreiber** asked if staff had estimated the cost of any future development in the City and worked out some sort of SDC process.

**Mayor Lomnicki** felt this was an equity issue for the future.

**Brink** said the City's cost can be done on a case-by-case basis. He discussed pockets of homes near existing systems and areas of future annexation.

**Bartlett** discussed the Linwood/Stanley annexation that would be done in conjunction with Clackamas Service District and logical service provision. He also indicated that cities have less SDC flexibility because of tighter regulation. The last large project, Stanley/Willow, was done in concert with a block grant to help subsidize low income property owners.

**Councilmember Trotter** asked for the percentages for each alternative. **Brink** provided the following percentages: alternative A 67/33; alternative B 72/28; and alternative C 75/25.

**Councilmember Tomei** asked, for informational purposes, why the City should compensate these property owners. **Brink** said the compensation would give the

property owners incentive to hook up to the system immediately. This would benefit the City as a whole.

**Councilmember Tomei** asked how detrimental it would be to wait three years to hook up. **Brink** said the property owner would have to hook up if the cesspool fails or if the home is sold.

**Councilmember Schreiber** pointed out it was to the City's advantage to have as many residences as possible on the system. She asked why the City was not coming forward with a proposal for anyone adjacent or in close proximity to the existing line. **Brink** said the City has a system in place in which everyone pays the SDC but is allowed to pay it off over a long period of time.

**Bartlett** added the City had been moderately aggressive about everyone hooking up in the area.

**Councilmember Schreiber** said the residents who are not hooked up to the system are not paying a sewer fee. **Brink** said there were some who had been paying, but they were not any longer. **Councilmember Schreiber** asked how long it would take to pay back the sewer fund for the money expended. **Brink** said the \$14 a month is meant to maintain the existing infrastructure.

**Councilmember Kappa** said alternative A offers the property owner the greatest incentive. **Brink** said the incentive in alternative B is that it will be less costly to hook up now than later.

**Councilmember Kappa** supported option A because it gives the property owner the greatest incentive for hooking up to the system.

**Councilmember Tomei** supported alternative B.

**Councilmember Schreiber** said there are ongoing costs to provide the service in addition to recouping the expenditure.

**Councilmember Schreiber** supported option B because reducing the owner's share by \$893 did not meet the commitment to the SDC.

**Councilmember Trotter** said, from a fairness standpoint, the City needs to have a methodology as it expands to its urban growth boundary. He also supported option B.

**Councilmember Schreiber** said she would like to see a statement including a timeline for developers coming into the City.

**Councilmember Kappa** remarked the percentage is not setting precedent, and it would not be applied in all situations.

**Councilmember Trotter** said the rationale of the reimbursable portion has merit.

**Councilmember Schreiber** said a process needs to be established.

**Councilmember Kappa** restated his support of option A.

**Brink** said this is the largest existing area of homes in the City that is not sewered. The others are only one or two residences. The City will probably not encounter this type of situation until annexations take place.

**Councilmember Trotter** said it seems the staff recommendation is acceptable at this time and asked when a public hearing was scheduled. **Brink** said the LID public hearing is scheduled for March 4. **Bartlett** added this would be a remonstrance hearing and property owners would be notified on February 21 of the impacts to their property. He discussed the remonstrance process.

**Brink** addressed the second issue. The property owners wanted to know if the cost of the private sewer connection would be included in the financing. Staff recommended that it be included if the property owner makes a request.

The third issue **Brink** addressed was giving credit for previous sewer assessments. City Council supported that position at the previous work session. He felt the credit should be 5% over the amount of the payments to correct the figure to today's dollars. One property owner, Mingo, had a unique situation in that utility payments were made as if the home had been connected.

**Councilmember Trotter** felt staff had responded with a fair way to deal with both the project and the property owners. He asked if there were other issues to consider.

**Brink** reviewed the final item regarding responsibility for change order expenses. Any change order due to unforeseen circumstances which were not a bid item should be included in the property owners' share of the costs. **Bartlett** said it is standard in each LID process to have a certain amount in contingency in the event of an engineering miscalculation.

**Councilmember Trotter** asked if distribution of any change order expenses would follow the percentage formula. **Brink** said it would follow the percentage established for the total project.

### **Park and Recreation Board Regarding Work Plan and Recommendations to NCPRD from the City for Fiscal Year 1997 - 1998 Budget**

**Richards** introduced the Park and Recreation Board (PARB) members present:

David Murray, PARB chair Jeff Marshall, and Jon Newman. She reviewed the process for submitting funding requests to the North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District (NCPRD). Each PARB member was asked to identify five issues and from those determine the most critical projects to accomplish.

**Thom Kaffun**, NCPRD, discussed the 1996 - 1997 proposals that included: Furnberg Park Master Plan; Dogwood Park irrigation system and concrete picnic table pads; and Century Park playground. Public meetings will begin in February and March to begin work on the Water Tower Park Master Plan. Work on Scott Park was delayed until decisions are made on light rail.

**Marshall** discussed the PARB's first priority which was land acquisition. The reason for this was increasing pressure for the use of open space in a growing area. The City currently has little available open space, and land prices are escalating. Acquiring land in the Hector Campbell Neighborhood has the highest priority since it does not have one at this time. The Lewelling and Island Station Neighborhoods are second and third priorities for locating parks. The group discussed the potential development of Spring Park. Another element of the recommendation was to work in concert with NCPRD to develop an acquisition referral process and to coordinate master planning projects with Neighborhood Land Use Committees.

**Councilmember Kappa** said in the past the City Council's main objective was to acquire as much riverfront property as possible. He asked how this priority fit with riverfront development. **Marshall** said the riverfront would be a regional park facility, and the PARB was looking at parks for individual neighborhoods.

**Councilmember Kappa** commented on the accessibility of the riverfront to the Island Station Neighborhood. **Councilmember Tomei** responded many parents do not allow their children to go to Elk Rock or near the Kellogg Treatment plant because of crime.

**Councilmember Trotter** said the recommendation contained both a budget request and a work plan for the PARB. He commended the board on its work.

**Councilmember Tomei** said the Island Station Neighborhood might support improving Spring Park instead of acquiring more property.

**Kaffun** commented the Elk Rock Island Master Plan called for a small pocket park at the entrance with parking, walking path, and play area.

**Councilmember Schreiber** said she would like a statement about the City's development policy concerning recreational facilities for multi-family developments. **Councilmember Trotter** felt the PARB had fulfilled what the City Council asked, but he also suggested the PARB could look at this issue during the neighborhood planning process.

**Kaffun** reviewed upgrade projects for existing facilities. These included completing the next phase of Furnberg Park and the first phase of Water Tower Park; developing a Dogwood Park Master Plan; evaluating the best use of the Century Park tennis courts; and developing a Wichita Park Master Plan. He also discussed the Dogwood Park/McLoughlin property master plan that included a footbridge across Kellogg Lake to access the other portion of land.

**Councilmember Kappa** expressed concern this might be a problem for police. **Bartlett** said that issue would be addressed during the master plan.

**Kaffun** continued his discussion of Century Park. Staff will work with the Lake Road Neighborhood to find out what kind of facility would be most beneficial.

**Councilmember Trotter** suggested evaluating the entire park and not just the tennis court.

**Kaffun** discussed Wichita Park on Monroe and said, due to Measure 47 constraints, the master plan would probably be done in-house.

**Councilmember Kappa** asked if the PARB had discussed the possibility of neighborhoods being responsible for park maintenance and policing.

**Councilmember Trotter** commented that developing a master plan should be consistent throughout the neighborhoods.

**Richards** said priority 3 was to maintain existing facilities and programs consistent with the level of service the NCPRD agreed to in the IGA with City of Milwaukie.

**Councilmember Kappa** expressed his concern about Measure 47 impacts on this priority.

**Newman** reviewed priority #4 which was to develop youth facilities through partnerships with citizens and public and private entities. The goal would be to work with at-risk youth and provide safer neighborhoods. He discussed the need for a skateboard park and other youth facilities in the Milwaukie area.

**Councilmember Trotter** asked if this element was in the recommendation for funding or was part of the work plan. **Richards** responded it could be included as both since there could be a cost involved.

**Councilmember Kappa** was concerned about skateboard park maintenance. **Kaffun** expressed the hope users would maintain the park. **Richards** added it was not clear at this time who would operate such a facility.

**Councilmember Trotter** said he did not feel City of Milwaukie money should be spent on a regional facility. **Richards** said the recommendation was to develop a master plan. The focus is on at-risk youth.

**Councilmember Trotter** pointed out this item was in the funding section of the resolution. **Marshall** said the message was to develop facilities. He felt it was important to build a regional skateboard park before developing one in a neighborhood. He discussed the potential for one in Century Park.

**Councilmember Schreiber** said she might recommend putting priority #4 into "other recommendations" rather than in the funding area.

**Murray** discussed priority #5 regarding improved communications through intergovernmental cooperation, marketing, and promotional activities. Key elements were distribution through Neighborhood District Associations, the City newsletter, interactive bulletin board, and Home Page.

**Councilmember Tomei** asked if the communication element would require funding. **Murray** indicated most of it could be accomplished without funding. He added this was a work plan element for the PARB.

### **Center/Community Advisory Board Interview**

The City Council interviewed Audrey Parsons for a vacant position on the Center/Community Advisory Board.

### **Report of Senior Center Standards Self-Assessment and Identified Issues**

**Joan Young**, Center Director, discussed the information on the Senior Center Standards and Self-Assessment. She reviewed the sections of the assessment developed by the National Council on Aging (NCOA). The assessment provides a reference tool for senior centers to strengthen their operations. Senior centers need to be a focal point for service delivery with a broad range of services and programs.

**Young** discussed the nine ad hoc committees set up to assess different areas. Those interested in participating were trained in the assessment process. She discussed the new mission, goals, and objectives recently adopted by the C/CAB.

The process took eighteen months, and the results will go to the NCOA for review and comment. This was a very appropriate undertaking for the Milwaukie Center, and it helped provide a vision into the future.

**Councilmember Tomei** commended Young on the level and extent of public involvement.

**Councilmember Schreiber** said the focus of the Milwaukie Center was clarified in the process. It is a senior center rather than a community center.

**Councilmember Trotter** briefly discussed revisions to the bylaws in the *Consent Agenda* portion of the packet.

**Kaffun** discussed the impacts of Measure 47 and gave an update on the Rose Garden construction.

**Councilmember Kappa** asked if there would be any changes in the CIP because of Measure 47. **Kaffun** said the CIP would remain the same; however, projects may not be funded in the same time increments.

**Council President Trotter** adjourned the work session at 6:50 p.m.

---

Pat DuVal, City Recorder