

**CITY OF MILWAUKIE  
CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
JANUARY 19, 1999**

The one thousand eight hundred and seventh meeting of the Milwaukie City Council was called to order by Mayor Tomei at 6:05 p.m. in the Public Safety Building Community Meeting Room. The following Councilors were present:

Rob Kappa  
Mary King

Larry Lancaster  
Jeff Marshall

Also present:

Dan Bartlett,  
City Manager

Jim Coleman,  
City Attorney

Charlene Richards,  
Assistant City Manager

Martha Bennett,  
Assistant City Manager

Jan Gehlen,  
Finance Director

Jim Brink,  
Public Works Director

Janet Wright,  
Assistant Planner

Susan Heiser,  
Planning Director

John Gessner,  
Associate Planner

**PROCLAMATIONS COMMENDATIONS, SPECIAL REPORTS AND AWARDS**

**Recognize Susan Heiser**

**Mayor Tomei** presented a certificate of appreciation to Susan Heiser for her dedicated work in the City Planning Department.

**Milwaukie Downtown Development Association (MDDA) Quarterly Report**

**Dodie Linder**, Director, and **Jim Bernard**, Board President, presented the Association's fourth quarter progress report. Highlights of the report included: the Economic Improvement District (EID) and Business License Surcharge renewal process; the Niche Committee's "Taste of Milwaukie" event in September; the Image Committee's tree planting project; Share the Lights partnership; and continued work with the business community to enhance the Association's involvement in solving problems such as litter, landscaping, and parking. Council appointed Linder to the Riverfront Board, and she will act as a communication agent with the MDDA during the project. The Board is beginning its goal setting process and is looking for input from businesses and property owners. Linder provided a year-end financial report.

**Councilor Lancaster** referred to the EID assessment methodology. He asked how the MDDA established the criteria for improvement levels.

**Bernard** described the three levels upon which assessments were based: bare land, one story, and two story improvements. The residential element was also a factor in determining the assessment.

**Councilor Kappa** asked when the proposed Business Forum would take place.

**Linder** said the Business Forum proposal was a recommendation of the Problem Solving Partnership (PSP), and the MDDA wants to be an active partner in the event. She understood from the PSP financial reports that there were some funds available for the event.

**Councilor Lancaster** was concerned, after looking at the financial statement, that there was a severe lack of accountability in the past. He felt the Board should develop a clearly-defined business plan. He also commented that overhead was about 67% of the Association's budget.

**Linder** agreed that the budget did appear top-heavy in administration. This will be an issue for the Board to consider when looking at the draft budget.

**Councilor Kappa** asked Linder if she believed downtown business and property owners would support the Riverfront project.

**Linder** noted that two Board members had specifically asked to be kept informed of what was taking place with the Riverfront Board. She felt it was very important to keep downtown business and property owners informed and identify a way for them to access meetings and provide input.

**Councilor Kappa** asked if the goal setting session was only for Board members.

**Linder** indicated the meeting was going to be in a private home and suggested interested parties call her for information.

**Councilor Lancaster** was concerned with the power the MDDA had to contribute to either a business's success or failure. He did not want promotion of new or expanded businesses to detract from older, anchor businesses. He used the example of a recent MDDA newsletter article highlighting The Glass Shop's expansion. He felt the MDDA should promote businesses on an equal basis and not expend funds to promote a competitor.

**Bernard** explained that all businesses within the District are encouraged to put information in the newsletter, and, in this case, The Glass Shop responded with expansion information.

**Linder** added the Association was listening to this type of concern; however, it is important to recognize downtown expansion activities.

**Bernard** said the Association hopes to promote all businesses that submit material to the newsletter. There are plans for a downtown directory later this year.

**Councilor Lancaster** hoped to avoid negative activity. His other issue was that The Glass Shop expansion took place on Bernard's property, and he was concerned there might be a perception of conflict of interest or prejudicial business practices.

**Linder** had not, at this time, looked into the legal ramifications, and, if needed, this issue could be moved forward to the Board.

**Councilor Lancaster** suggested the MDDA might wish to get involved with the Milwaukie Middle School script program.

**Linder** thanked Lancaster for the suggestion and briefly discussed the concept for a "Downtowners Club" that offered small discounts. She provided the MDDA phone number and e-mail address for those seeking information or wishing to provide input.

**Mayor Tomei** suggested Linder include administrative activities such as citizen and business and property owner contacts in the next quarterly report.

**Councilor Lancaster** agreed that would help quantify the intangible.

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

**It was moved by Councilor Marshall and seconded by Councilor King to pull item III.B -- Lease Electric-Powered Vehicle for discussion. Motion passed unanimously.**

**Councilor Lancaster** commended Kelly Somers for coming in under budget on the Public Works vehicles.

**It was moved by Councilor King and seconded by Councilor Marshall to adopt the Consent Agenda that consisted of:**

- 1. City Council minutes of January 4 & 5, 1999; and**
- 2. Purchase Public Works Vehicles.**

**Motion passed 4 - 0 - 1 with the following vote: Mayor Tomei, Councilor King, Councilor Lancaster, and Councilor Marshall aye; no nays; Councilor Kappa abstained because he had not attended the City Council meetings of January 4 and 5.**

## **AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION**

**Art Lewellan**, 3205 SE 8<sup>th</sup> #9, Portland. He addressed the City Council regarding the South Willamette River Crossing Study and recommended that Milwaukie make the Ross Island Bridge its number one priority for improvements rather than increasing Sellwood Bridge capacity.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

### **Economic Improvement District**

**Mayor Tomei** reopened the hearing on the Economic Improvement District assessments that was continued from November 17, 1998, at 6:50 p.m.

The purpose of the hearing was to allow persons owning property in Milwaukie's economic improvement district the opportunity to support or object to the assessment. **Mayor Tomei** reviewed the conduct of the hearing.

Staff Report: **Bartlett** reported that Dark Horse and Nelson's Nautilus withdrew their earlier remonstrances bringing the objection percentage to 22.1. Those who submitted written remonstrances will not be assessed, so the Milwaukie Downtown Development Association (MDDA) can expect approximately a \$19,000 turn over. He added that Ordinance 1845 does not have a provision for a civil infraction to collect funds.

Correspondence: None.

Audience Testimony: **George Van Bergen**, 12366 SE Guilford Drive, continued to support his remonstrance letter because he felt the assessment methodology was faulty. He did believe, however, that the MDDA had done an incredible job with limited funds and noted that administrative expenses appear higher in a small budget.

**Councilor Kappa** asked Van Bergen if he felt there was support for the Riverfront project.

**Van Bergen** felt the bigger issue was the relative value of the contract.

**Bernard** responded to Van Bergen's concern with the assessment methodology and explained the process was changed because of Measure 5 legal requirements.

**Bartlett** added that, although still an option, experience has shown that renewal assessments on an ad valorem basis had a higher remonstrance rate than those with a voluntary assessment.

Additional Staff Comments: None.

Questions of Clarification: None.

**Mayor Tomei** closed the public hearing at 7:10 p.m.

Council Discussion: **Councilor King** was impressed with how hard people were working to increase both downtown and neighborhood involvement.

**Mayor Tomei** concurred and felt that the MDDA, its Director, and the business and property owners were becoming increasingly involved with improving the downtown climate. She felt the MDDA was a viable organization.

**It was moved by Councilor Marshall and seconded by Councilor Kappa that the assessment roll would stand and assessments levied in accordance with Ordinance 1845. Motion passed unanimously.**

#### **Wichita Park Master Plan -- CPA-98-04**

**Mayor Tomei** opened the public hearing on the proposed Comprehensive Plan and map amendment at 7:13 p.m. This was a de novo hearing, and all persons were recognized to speak.

The purpose of the hearing was to consider the Planning Commission's recommendation to approve the Wichita Park Master Plan as an Ancillary Document to the Milwaukie Comprehensive Plan and redesignate the site from medium density residential to public. Mayor Tomei reviewed the order of business.

The applicant has the burden of proving that the amendments conform to all applicable criteria of the City's Comprehensive Plan. All testimony and evidence had to be directed toward the applicable substantive criteria listed in the staff report. Failure to address a criterion or raise any other issue with sufficient detail precluded an appeal based on that criterion or issue. Any party with standing may appeal the decision of the City Council to the State Land Use Board of Appeals according to the rules adopted by that Board. Persons with standing are those who testify or sign the City Council attendance sheet.

Site Visits: All members of Council had visited the site.

Ex-parte Contacts or Conflicts of Interest: None were declared.

Challenges to Impartiality: No member of the audience challenged any Council member's impartiality or ability to participate in the decision.

Jurisdictional Issues: There were no objections to the Council's jurisdiction to consider the matter.

Staff Report: **Wright** presented the staff report in which the Council was requested to consider and adopt an ordinance amending the Comprehensive Plan and Map 7 to redesignate the Wichita Park site from Medium Density Residential (MD) to Public (P). The Planning Commission held a public hearing on December 8, 1998, and voted unanimously to recommend the Wichita Park Master Plan to the Council for adoption. The staff report contained the findings upon which the Commission based its recommendation.

The site itself is .95 acres and is proposed to be designed as a neighborhood park that will be accessed by foot or bicycle. There will be no parking or restroom facilities. The North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District (NCPRD) worked with the Linwood Neighborhood District Association (NDA) on the design. Proposed improvements include a sidewalk on Monroe Street; a concrete walkway through the park with a soft path around the perimeter; a tot lot and play structure for elementary school-age users; half-court basketball; drinking fountain; automatic irrigation systems; bike racks; benches and ADA accessible picnic tables; and new trees and other plantings.

Correspondence: None.

Public Testimony: None.

Staff Comments: None.

Questions from Council: **Councilor Lancaster** was concerned that Monroe was not a user friendly street and particularly noted the grade near the park site.

**Wright** responded that the Planning Commission had address that concern in its Conditions of Community Service Overlay (CSO) Approval. She referred to staff report page V.B.21, Condition 10 that provided for a gravel shoulder for pedestrian access from the park to 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue and for installation of "Children at Play" traffic signs.

**Mayor Tomei** closed the public testimony portion of the hearing at 7:20 p.m.

Council Discussion: No further discussion.

**It was moved by Councilor Kappa and seconded by Councilor King to read the ordinance adopting the Wichita Park Master Plan as an ancillary document to the Comprehensive Plan and amending Map 7 to redesignate the site from medium density to public for the first time by title only.**

**Councilor Kappa** felt the neighborhood/pocket park approach served the community well and hoped the City would continue that philosophy.

**Motion passed unanimously. The ordinance was read for the first time by title only.**

**It was moved by Councilor King and seconded by Councilor Kappa to read the ordinance adopting the Wichita Park Master Plan as an ancillary document to the Comprehensive Plan and amending Map 7 to redesignate the site from medium density to public for the second time by title only. Motion passed unanimously. The ordinance was read for the second time by title only.**

It was moved by Mayor Tomei and seconded by Councilor Kappa to adopt the ordinance adopting the Wichita Park Master Plan as an ancillary document to the Comprehensive Plan and amending Map 7 to redesignate the site from medium density to public. Motion passed unanimously.

**ORDINANCE NO. 1851:**

**AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF MILWAUKIE, OREGON, AMENDING THE CITY OF MILWAUKIE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN BY ADOPTING THE WICHITA PARK MASTER PLAN AS AN ANCILLARY DOCUMENT AND CHANGING MAP #7 TO REDESIGNATE THE WICHITA PARK SITE FROM MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (MD) TO PUBLIC (P). CPA-98-04.**

**OTHER BUSINESS**

**Protest of Nuisance and Abate Order on Property Located at 4206 SE Bowman**

**Gessner** presented the staff report in which the City Council was requested to sustain staff's Declaration of Nuisance and Requirement to Abate issued December 31, 1998, for structural failure of a concrete block retaining wall at 4206 SE Bowman. Community Development staff believes that the failure of the wall demonstrates a significant threat to public health, safety, and welfare. Evidence and argument of nuisance related to structural failure, fill movement, potential to cause harm, and zoning violation.

The staff report included six exhibits: site location; site plan with location of retaining wall approved under building permit #97-350 and the extent of the wall built; photo survey demonstrating in visual terms staff's concerns; Declaration of Nuisance dated December 31, 1998; Notice of Violation dated December 31, 1998; and Uniform Citation dated January 15, 1999.

**Gessner** noted a scrivener's error on the Declaration of Nuisance and the need to change Municipal Code reference from Chapter 15.05.180 to 15.04.180.

The structure was a declared nuisance by virtue of the Municipal Code and poses a threat to public safety. Zoning violations are also declared a nuisance by Code.

**Gessner** referred to Exhibit 2 -- Site Plan that indicated portions of the wall were constructed in excess of six feet in height as had been specified in the building permit originally issued. He reviewed the arguments in support of staff's decision.

**Brink** discussed Public Works' belief that the wall, in its current condition, presents a continuing safety hazard. Two evident, horizontal cracks in the fill running parallel to the wall indicate the fill is moving toward the wall which may result in additional structural failure. Additionally, staff was confident the structural integrity was diminished

because walls over four feet needed engineering plans. In reviewing the plans, it appears that items, such as sufficient Geogrid, which would normally ensure structural integrity were not present. Several engineering issues need verification. In Brink's opinion, the wall constituted a nuisance, and there were a number of indicators that the remainder of the wall might fail.

**Mayor Tomei** noted the discrepancy between the length and height of the constructed wall and the dimensions called for in the original permit.

**Councilor Marshall** asked, for clarification, if there was or was not an engineering plan provided at the time of application.

**Brink** said there was not. Any wall over four feet in height would require an engineering plan, and one was not submitted for this project.

**Councilor Marshall** asked why Lown was not issued an erosion control permit in conjunction with the building permit.

**Brink** said he could not answer that question specifically. There were some unclear issues at the time such as the amount of fill behind the wall and the amount of disturbance. An erosion control permit for that type of wall would usually be required because of the steepness of the terrain.

**Councilor Marshall** asked how the City would ensure this wall was installed in a manner that protected the interest of its citizens.

**Brink** said an installer would normally have called for the appropriate inspections, but it had not happened in that sequence. There was no initial, interim, or final inspections of the wall.

**Councilor Marshall** asked if the person applying for the permit had been given a set of criteria and disregarded the steps necessary to carry out the requirements and had built a wall other than that approved.

**Brink** said Lown submitted minimal plans with the application, and no inspections were done during construction.

**Councilor King** asked if the applicant had the burden of calling for inspections.

**Brink** said that was the normal process; however, the issue under consideration at this meeting was the structural integrity of the wall.

**William Lown**, 4206 SE Bowman, felt there was a misunderstanding of how things had happened. He provided copies of the original permit and supplementary documentation. When he originally applied for the permit, he provided information on the wall system. The City had asked about Geogrid which he purchased based on the advice of an installer.

**Lown** believed Wong may have signed-off on the permit, and J. Bennett and Roeger may have been there when he picked up the permit. When he paid his fee, he asked what inspections were needed, and he was told that none would be necessary if the wall was built to those specifications. He admitted he had inadvertently built the wall up to ten feet in some areas. He did not, however, know about the need for an engineering plan for walls higher than four feet.

**Lown** continued. J. Bennett came to the site in October and addressed issues of a broken curb, filled catchbasin, and the need for a railing. Lown admitted he did not have a permit for a ten-foot wall. He discussed the excavation that would be required on his neighbor's property for a driveway and understood he would not be allowed to cut the roots of the cedar tree. The permit indicated at this point that the wall was not structural. He had no idea the wall would fail.

**Councilor Kappa** asked how the bricks were laid together.

**Lown** said each block has tabs, and, as they are stacked, the wall tapers back to lend structural integrity. The fill material was compacted soil and gravel. After J. Bennett brought up the fact that the wall was too high, he and Newman, his neighbor, began working on the issue together. He also had an arborist look at the cedar, and it was determined the tree was not healthy and would likely die within seven years. He felt the tree could be removed, and he and Newman would build a wall that would make the City happy. They were looking for a commitment from the Planning Department on setbacks.

**Councilor Marshall** asked Lown if he received an inspection card with his building permit.

**Lown** responded he was told he did not need inspections. He did not feel he could be held responsible for the City not enforcing its own building code. He added he had receipts for the fill material, Geogrid, and compactor rental.

**Mayor Tomei** noted the October 12, 1998, Warning of Violation letter, giving Lown notice of violations that needed correcting.

**Lown** said Gessner suggested a meeting with engineering, planning, and building to discuss the issues. There was a meeting in December that included Newman, and since that time, the area was surveyed and an arborist evaluated the cedar tree. Gessner had suspended zoning enforcement action while he and Newman worked together on a plan. He felt it was at a point where the project could work for everyone. The top blocks could be removed to make a six-foot wall and reduce other impacts on the site.

**Lown** expressed concern with the process because the underlying rules apparently kept changing. He stated he could not anticipate what the City should have told him.

**Councilor Marshall** asked Lown how long he had been a general contractor, and **Lown** responded about twenty years.

**Lown** said he had been cited on two issues, so he hoped to resolve those. He was anticipating the need to have a geotechnical report prepared. On January 5, 1999, he asked Gessner and J. Bennett if the fill and Geogrid could be inspected and was told this was not something building or engineering could do.

The Council recessed at 8:20 p.m. to consult with legal counsel in executive session pursuant to ORS 192.660 (h) -- legal rights and duties. Council reconvened the session at 8:35 p.m.

**It was moved by Mayor Tomei and seconded by Councilor Marshall to sustain the Declaration of Nuisance and Requirement to Abate issued December 31, 1998, for structural failure of a concrete block retaining wall.**

**Mayor Tomei** said this brought a great deal of attention to issues that would need to be addressed. The City Council is responsible to its citizens, and, if the wall were allowed to remain, there was potential for personal injury or property damage.

The group agreed there was a nuisance, and it needed to be removed for citizen safety.

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Lown** said he had been prepared to have a report by January 15, 1999, attesting to the wall's integrity, but Gessner advised him to wait. He asked for a reasonable opportunity to prove the wall was stable or to reconstruct it in a manner that it would be.

**Mayor Tomei** said the Council had made its decision and recommended meeting with staff.

#### **Intergovernmental Agreement with Happy Valley for Interim Planning Director Services**

**Bennett** presented the staff report in which the City Council was requested to adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to sign an intergovernmental agreement with Happy Valley for Jim Crumley to provide interim Planning Director services.

**It was moved by Councilor Kappa and seconded by Councilor King to adopt the resolution authorizing the City Manager to sign the intergovernmental agreement with the City of Happy Valley for Interim Planning Director services. Motion passed unanimously.**

## RESOLUTION NO. 3-1999:

### A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MILWAUKIE, OREGON, APPROVING AN AGREEMENT WITH THE CITY OF HAPPY VALLEY, OREGON, UNDER ORS 190 FOR THE PROVISION OF INTERIM PLANNING DIRECTOR SERVICES.

#### Town Center Redesignation Request

**Heiser** and Chris Eaton, W&H Pacific, presented the staff report in which the City Council was requested to consider a draft letter asking the Metro Council to consider changing Milwaukie's designation from Regional Town Center to Special Town Center.

The term "special" was created by staff to indicate the City's unique role as a transportation hub. The goal would be for Milwaukie to continue its eligibility for Regional Center level points in Metro's Transportation Improvement Program funding evaluation.

The draft Growth Concept Map demonstrates that Milwaukie can maintain its target capacity on sites such as Murphy, McFarland, Pendleton, Proto Tool, and the downtown mixed use (MU) zone. The intent is to show that the area may be smaller, but the target can still be met. The Metro Council would ultimately make the decision. **Heiser** said it was important to stress that Milwaukie was requesting a downgrade to Town Center, but targets and goals would not change.

**Councilor Kappa** asked if the City could request a designation change in the future, and **Heiser** responded that could be done at any time.

**Mayor Tomei** said, in addition to changing the geographical boundaries, the City hopes to change the perception that it is trying to be something like the Clackamas Town Center.

**Councilor Lancaster** asked if this opened the door for different development and greater performance expectations.

**Heiser** said Metro has no standards developed for the term "special." She envisioned that Metro might wish to open a dialogue during the process and get input for developing standards. Based on Milwaukie's location, there is a need for transportation funding.

**Eaton** added that Milwaukie was stating its uniqueness in the region. The City is already at 90% capacity, and she suggested performance standards could include increased pedestrian access and connectivity between pedestrian, bike, auto, and mass transit. The most intense density would be in the downtown's MU zone.

**Councilor King** liked the statement about Milwaukie's being a built-out community.

**Councilor Marshall** felt these were good ideas. He was, however, concerned that there had been no work sessions to discuss possible ramifications and, perhaps, setting a policy tone the City Council did not necessarily support.

**Councilor Kappa** asked the timelines for this request to go before the Metro Council.

**Eaton** said Metro has not provided a schedule.

**Bartlett** expected it to be a rather long process because of the significant turnover of Metro Councilors. He suspected the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) would review the request before it went to the Council. He apologized for not having a work session on this issue.

**It was moved by Councilor King and seconded by Councilor Marshall to authorize the Mayor to sign a letter to Mike Burton, Metro Executive Officer, requesting that the Metro Council consider amending the Metro Growth Concept Map designation for Milwaukie from Regional Center to "Special Town Center" with a change to the date on page two. Motion passed unanimously.**

#### **Riverfront Consultant Contract**

**Bartlett** presented the staff report in which he requested authorization to sign a personal services agreement with Crandall Arambula, P.C., in the amount of \$234,596 to complete the Downtown/Riverfront Plan. He and Bennett provided a draft scope of work to Crandall, and most of the elements were incorporated. The goal is a long-term relationship with many small successes to celebrate along the way.

**Councilor Kappa** asked if the City Council had discussed the Riverfront Board's role in meetings he missed.

**Mayor Tomei** recalled that the Riverfront Board and other stakeholders would be heavily involved but would not be the main decision makers.

**Bartlett** added that Crandall will conduct stakeholder meetings this spring, and the Board can expect to be heavily involved June through September.

**Councilor Marshall** wanted to be sure that major property owners were included in the process. He also urged that a Design Review Board be established as soon as possible so the members would have the opportunity to participate in the process and have the historical background to help future decision making.

**Councilor King** wanted assurance that Milwaukie's youth and senior population would be represented.

**It was moved by Councilor Marshall and seconded by Councilor King to authorize the City Manager to sign a personal services agreement with Crandall Arambula, P.C., in the amount of \$234,596 to complete the Downtown/Riverfront Plan. Motion passed unanimously.**

### **Lease of Electric Powered Ford Pick Up**

**Bartlett** said this proposal was indicative of the major effort of fleets, particularly public ones, to respond to the Clean Air Act and the Energy Policy Act. The vehicle under consideration would be used by the Code Enforcement Officer and was appropriate for short trips.

**Councilor King** asked the cost of the electricity to power the vehicle, and **Bartlett** responded he did not have that information.

**Councilor Lancaster** asked the useful life of this type of vehicle, and **Bartlett** responded it was estimated at five to eight years.

**Councilor Marshall** had concerns with the ecological impact of electric vehicles and noted that electricity was being shown not to be the once thought of clean and cheap power source. As everyone knows, dams are becoming an issue, and, if hydroelectric power had to be abandoned, we could be looking at going back to more pollution-generating methods of generating electricity. He requested staff provide information on a dual fuel, propane-powered vehicle. Propane is clean, and conversion costs are minimal. He felt this option might be more financially responsible while meeting Clean Air Act requirements.

**Bennett** said there were to issues with propane and natural gas: availability and potential hazards.

**Bartlett** said the City had investigated a propane vehicle in the past, but the fueling station costs were prohibitive for a single vehicle. He suggested staff provide an economic analysis addressing these various issues.

**Councilor Lancaster** pointed out that the City should not ignore reducing the number of trips.

**Mayor Tomei** supported the lease of the electric vehicles and was delighted that staff was looking at alternatives to gasoline.

### **INFORMATION**

1. **Councilor King** called attention to the new permit posting sign.
2. **Councilor King** announced a wetland planting in a park near the Milwaukie Center on Saturday.

3. **Councilor King** announced that the Milwaukie City Council had nominated Mart Hughes for a Metro volunteer award.
4. **Councilor King** announced that Milwaukie High School has both the Oregon Principal and Vice-Principal of the Year, Kelly Hood and Frank Hernandez. She suggested the City Council recognize them at an upcoming meeting.
5. **Councilor King** announced that "Slow Down" signs were available from Clackamas County by contacting Ron Oberg.
6. **Mayor Tomei** announced a Metro listening post on January 21 addressing transportation alternatives.
7. **Mayor Tomei** participated in recognizing Scott Brosius of the World Series winning New York Yankees at a Rex Putnam High School function.
8. **Mayor Tomei** also experienced the Clackamas County jail as an observer.
9. **Councilor Kappa** suggested the City Council meet with the Traffic Safety and Transportation Board (TSTB) to give direction. **Councilor Marshall** recommended the Council meet on the issues prior to scheduling a work session with the Board.
10. **Councilor Kappa** announced he would be a co-moderator on transportation issues in "Partnership Matters."
11. **Councilor Marshall** requested a work session on the public hearing process and Robert's Rules of Order.
12. **Councilor Marshall** asked for a discussion of the Council retreat draft agenda. **Bartlett** provided an overview of the session. It will be purely a training activity to identify personal styles and how these impact communication.
13. **Bartlett** discussed publication of the South/North Light Rail Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) and the City's role in what is contained in the Federal Record. This is the final step of the contract since there is no funding.
14. **Bartlett** said the League of Oregon Cities would like to have Milwaukie Council members participate in a Legislative Reception in February.
15. **Bartlett** noted that Customer Service Training with Dr. Bud Kass will begin this week.
16. The group discussed goal setting sessions tentatively scheduled February 3 and 10 from 5:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.

17. **Councilor Marshall** cited a recent Oregonian article and suggested Milwaukie apply for a tourism grant.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**It was moved by Councilor Lancaster and seconded by Mayor Tomei to adjourn the meeting. Motion passed unanimously.**

**Mayor Tomei** adjourned the meeting at 9:40 p.m.

---

Pat DuVal, Recorder