

## MINUTES

### MILWAUKIE CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION MAY 5, 2003

**Mayor Bernard** called the work session to order at 5:30 p.m. in the City Hall Conference Room.

Councilors present: Barnes, Lancaster, Loomis, and Stone.

Staff present: City Manager Mike Swanson, Community Development/Public Works Director Alice Rouyer, and Civil Engineer Brion Barnett.

#### Information Sharing

**Rouyer** informed Council the recently adopted resolution establishing sewer charges for customers receiving service from the City of Portland would be revised on a future Council agenda.

The group discussed correspondence from Gene Hatlelid and other Johnson Creek Boulevard residents to Senator Kate Brown regarding the road improvement project.

#### Downtown Parking and Traffic Management Plan

**Barnett** introduced project consultants Beth Wemple, Kittelson & Associates, Inc., and Rick Williams, Melvin Mark Companies.

**Barnett** said the desired outcome of this work session is Council direction on this project. He provided a brief project background for recently elected Councilors and then focused on the tools needed to protect the downtown and neighborhoods from future traffic and parking impacts.

When the downtown plan was adopted, the City Council and Planning Commission were concerned about what would happen as the plan evolved. Staff was given specific direction to address potential parking and traffic impacts as development occurs. At the beginning of the project, a stakeholder committee was formed that included engineering and planning staff, the consultant team, residents, downtown business interests, and library representatives.

The first step of the project was to identify the guiding principles that broadly frame the project and what stakeholders hoped to accomplish. The guiding principles set the tone and priority for the outcome. Briefly, the goal is to focus on accommodating downtown visitors and short-term customers rather than providing cheap parking for people commuting elsewhere.

**Wemple** added there was an emphasis on infrastructure including improved lighting to make the downtown more vibrant and to help users feel more secure.

**Barnett** said there were concerns that some of the lots were not being utilized because people do not feel safe. Dark Horse emphasized this by saying the downtown plan is great, but people will not use the parking lots if they do not feel safe. This was noted in the guidelines by recognizing the need for quality infrastructure.

The second part of the project was taking those guiding principles and refining them into operating principles. These are in 3 parts as outlined in staff report attachment A. The parking infrastructure operating principles state that both on- and off-street parking will be safe, convenient, economical, and link strategically to the pedestrian system.

The central business district operating principles address on- and off-street public parking. The central business district is defined as Scott Street on the north, McLoughlin Boulevard on the west, 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue on the east, and Lake Road on the south. This was perceived as the area that had the greatest need for parking and traffic management. The purpose is to enhance and support the vitality of the retail core by giving priority to short-term parking which is defined as 4 hours or less. Parking should be convenient, economical and user-friendly. Additionally, there would be no un-regulated on-street parking in the central business district and would eventually transition to short-term visitor parking only. Off-street parking in the central business district will be regulated and managed to provide a mix of short- and long-term parking for visitors, residents, and downtown employees. Over time it is desirable for off-street parking to serve a higher mix of short-term demands.

Outside the central business district, the operating principle states this zone exists to meet the demands of that zone. It is un-regulated, and there is no residential parking permit program. If the South Corridor Project is extended to Milwaukie and a parking structure is built on the current Cash Spot location, the residential permit system will be an option to address spillover parking.

**Barnett** said, based on the data collected, traffic speed and volume in the downtown area is consistent with other downtown zones. Vehicles are traveling within about 10 mph of the posted speed, which is 25 mph. Residents and business owners have a vested interest in ensuring those speeds do not get out of hand. He discussed different traffic calming measures on Monroe and Washington Streets that would discourage cut through traffic. The Transportation System Plan (TSP) shows bike lanes on both streets, and because of existing curb-to-curb widths these would be negated. Implementing traffic calming would be beyond the TSP in terms of accommodating bike lanes. The Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP) sets the guidelines for citywide traffic calming, and only Washington Street would qualify for the

4631

**Minimum Fine Ordinance**

**Swanson** will prepare an ordinance adopting minimum fine amount for the next agenda. In order to adopt a minimum fine, the City will have to adopt the state traffic code as the City code.

**Mayor Bernard** discussed truck weight fines.

**Mayor Bernard** adjourned the work session at 8:00 p.m.

*Pat DuVal*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Pat DuVal, Recorder

preserve this structure, they are the ones who did not discharge their responsibilities. He will not take responsibility for what they failed to do.

**Mayor Bernard** has taken every effort to keep the family informed and encouraged them to apply pressure, but still nothing happened.

**Swanson** will proceed to get bids to abate the nuisance starting Wednesday. There will be a 15-day process during which Emmert may act to abate the nuisance himself. The reasonable avenue is to secure a reconveyance of those 5 feet, and he is willing to work with Emmert if that happens.

**Councilor Barnes** is concerned about administrative expenses given the amount of time staff has put in with little or no regard from Emmert's company. She asked if he could be billed for expenses from this point forward.

**Swanson** said the City Recorder will track the all the expenses, which will become a lien against the property. This is a valid lien that will ultimately become a battle between Mr. Peterson and Mr. Emmert on one hand and the Union Pacific Railroad on the other. Although kept informed, the railroad has shown no interest. Swanson does not believe Peterson assigned his lease to Emmert and understands the lease was automatically extended for lack of action on Peterson's part. The party who moved the house from the School District property has demanded return of his timbers and moving equipment. There has also been a change in Union Pacific staff, and the current person is not very relaxed about the situation.

### **Waiver of City Fees**

**Swanson** said this came up because of several issues. One was the Reich case and the non-waiver waiver of fees. Then there is also the question about neighborhood associations and their securing right-of-way permits for the Centennial tree planting project. He referred to resolution 15-1997, which represents good policy on development permit fees. It is helpful for staff to have a policy when asked to waive a fee. He is recommending allowances for the neighborhood associations since it is mostly a matter of City money from one pocket to another. He asked if there was interest in updating the 1997 resolution. He was directed to draft a carefully written policy.

### **Date for Final Adoption of the Budget**

The group agreed to hold a special meeting on June 16 for the budget hearing.

**Councilor Stone** understood the initial property was not long enough or deep enough.

**Swanson** said when a person knowingly commits to a piece of property with a problem, that is a problem. A variance is not something that is granted when one causes the hardship oneself.

**Councilor Stone** understands the first piece of property was the best. We are trying to save this architecturally significant structure that has been around for 85 years, so she thought an overlay should be applied. The house is special, and this is Milwaukie's Centennial year. She does not mean variances should be granted to everyone; this is a special case.

**Swanson** said in order for something to be defined as a special case it must be done so under the code. Milwaukie does not have any classification for that under the code. People have tried to say this house is different and should get special treatment, but there is nothing under the code that would justify that.

**Councilor Stone** asked why we do not have that kind of classification.

**Swanson** said people have argued the house is historical while others have argued it is not. If the City Council wishes, it could carve out exceptions for historical houses, but at the time this was presented there was no such exception. The City must look at the code and identify the extent of its authority. People may think the City has a great deal of discretion, but it is certainly not unbridled.

**Councilor Stone** remembered Councilor Lancaster's comments that night about the letter and the spirit of the law. She felt the City should look at the spirit of the law and not just the letter of the law. We are human beings making a decision on a piece of our City's history, and, if it can be saved, we need to try to do everything we can to do that.

**Swanson** felt the discussion was about responsibility, and the City took on a great deal. It was perhaps not a well-reasoned decision, but it was taken on. Oftentimes, when something does not work out, we tend to blame ourselves and not look at the fact that someone else may not have discharged his responsibility. In this case, a couple of people from the outside either wanted to slide by on the cheap, wanted to do things the easy way, or had other things to do, so the deadlines were not met. The City is a good target with its pesky regulations. These regulations are designed to protect 20,700 people – not just one. Although he does not take an oath like the Council, he does take his job and responsibilities seriously. Other people had responsibilities they did not discharge. He will not apologize because staff did everything it could. Others, not elected or on staff, did not do their jobs, and if they really intended to

### Update on Nuisance Abatement on House at 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue and Lake Road

**Swanson** reviewed previous actions. On January 21, 2003, the City Council found a nuisance did exist and was held in abeyance until April 27, which has passed. The nuisance is still there. The code provides for a 10-day period after the finding of a nuisance, so technically time runs out on May 7.

In that period of time, he is given the power under the municipal code to abate the nuisance. He may deconstruct or otherwise demolish the house. Staff will solicit bids for a 10 - 15 day period, so realistically that does add several days. During that time, it is certainly possible for Mr. Emmert to have the house removed. Once the bids are in and a contractor is selected the time will have grown short, and the City will act.

Mr. Emmert has identified a property at 3916 SE Jackson Street. The lots in that area are about 5,000 square feet with the exception of 3916 SE Jackson Street. A couple of year's ago, the western most 5 feet were conveyed to the adjoining property. Emmert is, he understands, trying to convey the property back, which would make the lot legal for placement of this house. He is doing this in the context of the City's obtaining bids on his responsibility to abate the nuisance. Swanson has stayed in contact with Mr. Emmert during the intervening months since the Council made its decision in January and has reminded him of upcoming deadlines.

**Councilor Lancaster** asked what is a reasonable expectation of a timeframe if the reconveyance can occur.

**Swanson** said if the reconveyance does occur, he will keep the fires burning. He would probably consider setting out a timeframe in which the permits can be obtained, and if any one of those dates is not met, Swanson will give a notice to proceed. The City got into this because of its interest in preserving the building, and he really believes the effort has been made. It has now been over a year. At this point he will move forward. Reconveyance is the best option, and if that does occur, firm timelines will be set.

**Councilor Stone** asked why the house has not been moved.

**Swanson** believes it is a case of not following through. The City has procedures and timeframes many of which are in place to notify people of pending actions that might affect them. When Rich Peterson owned the house, nothing occurred. With Emmert, it has always been a request for a variance, which are not a matter of right or given out because one is inconvenienced. Variances are for infrequent circumstances.

**Councilor Loomis** liked the idea of flexibility for the entire City that would recognize special needs if a good case is made. He does not believe this neighborhood is more special than his or others.

**Councilor Stone** did not necessarily agree because there needs to be some guidelines in terms of criteria. Give the streets all the same test. If a commitment is made to an area, then by all means the commitment must be met. Too much flexibility was a concern when the NTMP was drafted that would result in willy-nilly traffic calming with people paying for their own projects. It should not be random, and streets must qualify.

**Councilor Lancaster** said when the McLoughlin Boulevard project was discussed and the study required, there was consideration of expanding the study into the entire overlay zone under discussion. He asked what happened with that. There was discussion of expanding into a more comprehensive study to reduce costs somewhat.

**Barnett** said the design and planning for McLoughlin Boulevard looked only at that corridor. The proposed downtown parking and traffic management plan for Council direction does take into account impacts from the McLoughlin Boulevard project and the adopted downtown plan. In response to Lancaster's question, ODOT would not authorize the City to extend the scope of the study area.

**Mayor Bernard** believes the overlay zone is important because the streets are changing, and the City must be ready to react.

**David Aschenbrenner** asked if there was thought of any signage on McLoughlin Boulevard or Hwy 224 that directs people to enter the downtown area via certain streets.

**Barnett** said staff would look into that.

**Cornell** commented signage is important in reducing cut through traffic. The genesis of this downtown parking and traffic management plan was driven by adoption of the downtown plan. The commitment was that the situation is unique, and as redevelopment occurs downtown, there will be collateral damage in the neighborhood. While it may sound like a fairness issue, it really is not. Those streets would still be governed by the same NTMP, but it would give staff the tools to look at unique situations and react with flexibility. He urged the City Council to remember how this project began.

**Barnett** summarized the comments: the City Council endorses the proposed project operating principles and recommended neighborhood traffic management methods and parking management strategies. This would include the concept of an overlay zone to provide flexibility.

**Councilor Barnes** asked how this would be funded? The recommendation discusses funding from the neighborhood grant program much of which will be lost in the upcoming budget. She asked what other alternatives there were.

**Mayor Bernard** would like to see the downtown businesses contribute and noted setting the economic improvement district assessment rate at zero saved businesses money. He suggested implementing something based on the number of employees, which is data already collected in the business license system.

**Barnett** said, to address Barnes's concern, staff understands there is not a lot of money for big traffic calming projects. At this point, staff is asking for direction on how to proceed.

**Councilor Stone** certainly wants to see streets calmed but understands Loomis's comments. People will probably want to discuss why their area is not special too. She wants to look at the NTMP as it is now and then with the policy decision to change it from 85/7 to 85/5 to determine if the overlay zone is even needed. She believes that criteria would be more fair because it would be applied to every street in Milwaukie.

**Mayor Bernard** said the community has told Council it wants to see development occur in the downtown area, and also that they do not want those cars in their neighborhoods. When the Safeway project at 42<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and King Road begins, the City will want to ensure parking and traffic does not expand into the neighborhoods. He would be happy to look at NTMP.

**Councilor Lancaster** understands Stone is talking about 2 separate issues. The overlay provides flexibility and broader scope. Stone is saying if the NTMP ratio is revisited, the local restrictions may be more effective and not trigger the need for an overlay. He thinks the overlay is needed for the big, unanticipated issues.

**Rouyer** has listened to the community for several years about downtown parking and traffic. When the downtown plan was adopted, the Planning Commission and City Council made a commitment to the Historic Milwaukie Neighborhood that its concerns would be addressed in a way unique to that area. This Plan addresses that and was the consultant's scope of work. The overlay zone gets back to that commitment. The City could establish the overlay zone and build review of the Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan into the engineering department's work plan. NTMP revisions, if made, for the broad area of the City could be applied to the overlay zone. She is somewhat concerned about going to a percentile without doing a comprehensive evaluation of the NTMP.

**Councilor Stone** thought applying criteria through a revised NTMP would be more fair to everyone and eliminate doubts about special treatment. Initially, when this plan was adopted in 1995, the group wanted the 85/5 but did not get it.

periodic review. In addition to getting a copy of the Plan, she suggested Loomis be provided with a copy of the criteria.

**Barnett** will provide copy. It is weighted heavily toward high volume, high speed streets, and to a lesser degree proximity to schools and physical restrictions. The street will not score well for traffic calming if the volume, speed, and accident history is not there.

**Councilor Loomis** asked if there were a waiting list of projects?

**Barnett** said there are 3 streets on the project list that potentially qualify and should be re-evaluated.

**Councilor Loomis** feels uncomfortable about saying one street qualifies while another does not and saying an area is special. He commented on Council's denial of Dorothy Snowhill's request for traffic calming several years ago. It seems as if there may be a problem with the Plan.

**Councilor Stone** said, if the 85/5 change were made, the Plan would be more in line in terms of Monroe and Washington Streets; however, she would have to review the criteria.

**Barnett** said the biggest thing to recognize is project was undertaken specifically for the downtown area. While the NTMP could be tweaked for the broader City, the overlay zone for just this area would provide the needed mechanism.

**Councilor Stone** asked if the overlay would be necessary if the NTMP were amended for the 85/5. She asked Barnett to speak to traffic volumes.

**Councilor Loomis** is in favor of traffic calming, but he wants to be fair.

**Hammang** added one of the reasons the Planning Commission wanted a broad general solution, like an overlay, was to deal with the unknown unknown. No one knows what it will be like in 10 years, so there needs to be flexibility. The issue may never be speed bumps or speed; it may be something entirely different. This provides the mechanism to manage traffic into the future.

**Barnett** felt the discussion of the NTMP should take place once people have copies of the Plan and can ask questions. Staff is looking for broad policy direction to be able to treat this area as unique.

**Mayor Bernard** endorsed the proposed operating principles, neighborhood traffic management methods, and the parking management strategies.

of diverting this cut through traffic by using traffic calming. Secondly, these streets are shared bikeways, and one cannot have bikeways with curb extensions sticking out into the street. When she priced curb extensions 5 – 6 years ago, they were \$15,000 a pair. The figures in this report indicate they are somewhat cheaper. She was concerned about making sure the street that is being traffic calmed is multi-modal friendly. This would certainly not be true of the curb extension solution. From what she knows about traffic calming, bicyclists negotiate the speed bumps pretty well.

**Barnett** said, being a cyclist, he does not like speed bumps. In a perfect world, there would be room for a dedicated bike lane on these streets. In a shared lane, he rides in the wheel path so drivers can see him and feels safer doing that than riding over speed bumps. That was his opinion, and others may feel differently.

**Councilor Stone** knows this has worked and has been used in Milwaukie and other areas around the region. Are speed bumps not an option?

**Barnett** said it is something that can be considered. What is being discussed now is the broad policy direction. Public input and available funding will drive traffic calming itself.

**Councilor Stone** would like the report to address speed bumps as an option because they are cost effective. In terms of policy, she understands Washington Street qualifies under the NTMP criteria.

**Barnett** replied Washington Street is the closest to qualifying.

**Councilor Stone** understood, then, that none of the 3 streets qualify under the criteria as written now. She knows several years ago, some wanted to see the 85 percentile speed as no more than 5 mph over the posted speed limit. This is something the Traffic Safety Board, before it was disbanded, wanted established instead of 7 mph. It certainly can make a difference in terms of streets qualifying, and there are not that many streets in Milwaukie that qualify for traffic calming. There are not a lot of high volume high speed neighborhood streets. That is something she hoped this Council would consider. Her other concern is Washington Street being a school zone area, and she thinks it is a great idea to put calming measures on those types of streets. Regarding the library's concerns and the option of using orange flags, she proposed a dedicated crosswalk made of pavers that looks different than the street with a bump on either side to ensure traffic slows before reaching the crosswalk.

**Councilor Loomis** asked for a brief history of the NTMP.

**Councilor Stone** said the NTMP was written in 1995 – 1996. The Plan has been before Council a couple of times. She believed the initial Plan stipulated a

**Barnett** added the citizens involved in the stakeholder group asked the feasibility of a mechanism that would pass the fee on to developers. While the concept is good, the law may not be behind the City's doing that.

**Councilor Stone** had a question about developers sharing the cost. She understood data would be collected annually, or at least every 2 years, for the monitoring program and asked the cost of these studies.

**Barnett** said there are several elements. It would probably cost \$500 - \$1,000 to determine how often people are parking. Since there is already a data system, the actual collection would probably be contracted out for about \$1,000. It is important to note that not a lot has changed in terms of volume.

**Mayor Bernard** added developers are required to provide traffic studies.

**Councilor Stone** commented there would certainly be parking and traffic concerns when the Safeway site develops, and she understands developers would be required to pay traffic study expenses. She had a clarification question regarding Hammang's comment about the NTMP being too restrictive and the recommendation for an overlay zone. Was that restrictive in the sense of that the NTMP does not include parking or restrictive in the sense of just traffic calming?

**Hammang** said the NTMP has certain standards for implementing traffic calming. There may be situations in the downtown area when traffic calming is desirable before that criterion is met.

**Councilor Stone** understands, then, that the NTMP qualifying criteria is too restrictive. She was a member of the Traffic Safety Commission and a member of the committee that drafted the Transportation System Plan (TSP) many years ago. The group was adamant that streets classified as arterials would be subject to traffic calming measures with City Council approval. She is concerned why, in this report, suggested traffic calming measures were expensive and would cost about \$35,000 to \$100,000 each for Harrison, Monroe, and Washington Streets. She asked why speed bumps were not included as a solution because they are effective and reasonably priced. Since they are more readily available in terms of budget, why were speed bumps not included?

**Barnett** explained the team did not believe speed bumps were the right choice because they could potentially divert traffic to other locations. The group felt the bulb-outs and median treatments would accomplish the desired effect without diverting traffic.

**Councilor Stone** said it depends on what is installed. There is a certain allowable diversion with speed bumps. Smaller bumps will divert traffic, and she understands that is what Cornell wants. It is a concern these streets are being used by cut through traffic. She thought it would be good to think along the lines

**Barnett** said that term is used broadly in the traffic sense because, as he mentioned, the NTMP would not allow anything in the way of traffic calming on the streets he discussed earlier. The overlay zone would give the ability to do something beyond what is allowed by the NTMP.

**Roger Cornell**, Monroe Street resident, said the stakeholder group felt the NTMP was too restrictive to use in the downtown area and wanted the ability to make decisions more or less restrictive based on the needs of that residential area and the business community. A flexible policy would be better for the future.

**Wemple** explained the overlay zone addresses cut through traffic and speed mitigation but does not relate to the parking management plan.

**Barnett** added adopting guiding principles, operating principles, and the 85% rule are more specific to the parking portion, but there are needed policy elements above and beyond what we have today. The overlay zone is specific to traffic and will potentially allow traffic calming measures. The final question has to do with going forward on steps to reduce cut through traffic. He pointed out the fiscal impact of potential traffic calming treatments on Monroe and Washington Streets. There are unfunded traffic calming projects listed in the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) that act as placeholders if money becomes available. Staff feels that Monroe Street should be done first because it is narrower and is more residential in nature. The curb-to-curb distance is less, so there could be an actual gateway treatment. It is important to remember Milwaukie Lumber, transit, and the North Clackamas School District must be involved in planning. The library was also represented on the stakeholder committee, and there is a lot of concern about pedestrian safety at Harrison Street and 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue. Although Kittelson identified this as a great location for a round about, this will not happen in the near future for financial and space reasons. An inexpensive safety measure used in other cities is for pedestrians to carry an orange flag when crossing.

**Wemple** commented these flags have been effective in other communities like Ketchum, Idaho, and Kirkland, Washington.

**Barnett** explained there are not a lot of cost effective measures to make crossing Harrison Street safe because it is an arterial. Installing a stop sign and the resultant queuing would likely be an enforcement issue.

**Cornell** commented the guiding principles for parking are very effective in setting program management trigger points. Traffic is unique in that the neighborhood is between Hwy 224 and Hwy 99E, so there are not many ways to move traffic out of the neighborhood. He does support the idea of establishing a unique overlay zone.

**Williams** said the general rule of thumb in these situations is that someone still needs to monitor the meters. The decision to go to paid parking would be one of the options to consider when capacity hits 85%. It is really too early at this time. The City would have the ability to buy back some capacity without charging by simply regulating who may and may not have a permit.

**Barnett** reviewed the mid-term management plan that included signage changes on 99E and City-owned lots. With that is improving the infrastructure in the downtown area through streetscaping, better maintenance, and lighting. Parking utilization will continue to be monitored. Since the transit center will be moved, talks will begin with businesses, transit users, and Tri-Met to consider downtown transit stop locations. There were no questions about the mid-term strategies.

The long-term management recommendations deal with 2-plus years in the future. Infrastructure will be consistent with the downtown plan in terms of lighting and lot improvements. New supply is important since the Safeway will shortly be developed. Data shows the supply will still be adequate, but it will be important to identify future supply. The strategy says ideally core parking will be for short-term customers with longer term parking on either end of town. The residential permit would be the last line of defense to keep parking from spilling into the neighborhoods. The concept is to let the residents know what this system entails and what kind of management effort it would take to make it function.

**Williams** added the overall plan is a matter of timing, and the first thing to do is understand who is parking to appropriately capture existing system capacity as needed. Going to a new supply will be a significant investment. The front-end knowledge base and an understanding of where to locate new facilities is crucial. After that, the program should start taking care of itself. It cannot be overemphasized that the residential permit program is the last line of defense. The plan is consistent with alternative mode development and getting everything possible out of the existing system before looking for new supply.

**Hammang** agrees with staff that traffic management is far too complicated for mere humans to understand. The goal is to provide tools early on and provide flexibility by identifying a downtown overlay zone to stay ahead of the 85 percentile. The purpose is to protect parking for businesses as well as not impinging on the neighborhood. He does not want to see micro-political struggles in the future. In most cities in the United States, there is residential development next to downtown shopping areas. Parking permits may have to happen in the future, and he would want those pieces in place now.

**Councilor Lancaster** understands Hammang to say an overlay mechanism is necessary for what will need to be done in the future.

**Mayor Bernard** said most of the employees downtown would not walk a block to work. They would rather park in front of the business and move their cars every 2 hours.

**Williams** said an option would be to leave the parking spaces at 2 to 4 hours. With the data, one would know how many permits to allow in those zones and post "2 hours unless by permit." A balance could be found with the businesses to determine how many stalls could be allowed with permits. When the utilization hits 85%, then the City could start to attrition the permits down. Several stakeholders did have the same concern, so this is another option to eliminate moving to evade. This option is outlined in the detailed plan.

**Barnett** said information would be in *The Pilot* to keep people informed. Even on the south end, only portions of the block will be changed.

**Councilor Stone** had a question regarding the permit system. Is there a plan to charge people for a permit to park?

**Williams** said the system is first established to get an idea of who is and who is not a downtown employee. He believes there is a lot of capacity in the system; many drivers are parking their cars and jumping off to another location. The first part of the permit system may only cover expenses. When it is time to ramp up the program, more data will be gathered. Those seeking parking permits that are not downtown employees would be on a waiting list. The first step is to gather data for good management.

**Councilor Stone** referred to staff report page 21 that says the data quantifying the number of downtown employees and park-and-riders using the Safeway lot and other parking areas downtown is not available. Was this not in the scope of the study?

**Williams** said there is a portion of the 70% utilization where the City could immediately gain additional capacity. The only way of doing that is to gather data by finding out where people work, and there may or may not be a parking fee. The City will be able to buy capacity by implementing the next phase.

**Councilor Stone** noted the suggestion of creating the position of parking manager and remarked Steve Campbell and Les Hall handle the parking responsibilities at this time. Did the discussion include installing parking meters rather than having people monitor the system?

**Barnett** said meters and pay-and-park were discussed, and the conclusion was that the time is not right. The City is small enough and can be handled by staff. At this time, it is more cost effective particularly since the success of meters is unknown.

The near-term recommendations are to formalize the parking permit program; to install signage on 99E directing drivers to the central business district; to reassign some of the parking areas giving priority to short-term parking; to work with Tri-Met to identify alternate locations for bus staging; and to begin planning for new supply

**Mayor Bernard** suggested talking to Tri-Met about putting a new fare zone in between Southgate and downtown Milwaukie. The purpose would be to encourage parking north of town by making the fares lower. He asked how 10 hour parking slots would be regulated if there are employees parked there. He knows there are employees who move their cars several times a day.

**Williams** said the recommendation is to convert some zones on the south end to a longer period because they are under utilized. Staff will not know if park-and-riders or employees are using these since utilization will still be under 85%. At 85%, the plan will be to implement downtown employee permit parking, and the first people to go will be the park-and-rider users.

**Barnett** added that was not to say staff does not care if there are park-and-rider users there. It is that on-street parking is still underutilized.

**Mayor Bernard** would like the plan to include some kind of funding mechanism. He suggested downtown business and property owners contribute to new signage and perhaps implement parking permits on the south end sooner. He asked how frequently the utilization percentage is updated?

**Barnett** said utilization would be updated annually.

**Mayor Bernard** favors the permitting program. Many business managers want their employees to work rather than spending time moving their cars.

**Councilor Loomis** commented on changing the signage from 2 to 8 hours because it appears there are not a lot of businesses on that end of downtown. He knows in the past those businesses went to a lot of effort to get the time limit changed to 2 hours. He felt their needs should be considered.

**Barnett** did speak with those businesses about 1 year ago. There have had problems with high school students using those spaces, but that problem has subsided since the high school built its new parking lot. Staff will continue to work with those businesses to reach a happy medium.

**Mayor Bernard** felt in this case the permit system would work well. Employees would have permits, and the high school students would not.

**Councilor Loomis** is concerned about the customers in that scenario.

Program because of speeds. The NTMP guidelines indicate no significant problem so there is no ability to consider or implement traffic calming within the existing framework.

**Barnett** discussed policy direction on whether or not to do something beyond the NTMP that would allow the City to construct traffic calming measures on Monroe and Washington Streets. Staff attended the February 25, 2003 Planning Commission meeting to pose this policy question. The Commission indicated it was in favor of doing more than the NTMP with a broad concept of creating a traffic overlay zone.

In addition to speeds, there is a concern with volumes and what could be implemented to get vehicles off 99E by a direct link to Hwy 224. After talking with ODOT, it was apparent an extensive region wide study would be required, and funding would likely not be available. This, however, is probably the only thing that would significantly reduce cut through traffic. The cut through traffic has not actually been quantified, and additional data collection would be necessary.

The last part of project is the parking management. The consultant and stakeholder team worked on management strategies for the short-, mid-, and long-term. The group looked at the parking baseline and what would happen in the next 10 years using information in the downtown plan. After 10 years, Milwaukie would still have an adequate supply of parking which is defined at 85% of capacity.

**Wemple** explained the 85% rule has to do with the supply and what percentage is utilized. 85% is what is defined as capacity above which parking spaces are hard to find and may not be visible.

**Williams** added the 85% rule also indicates a movement toward a higher demand level, and the 15% buffer allows time to discuss planning strategies.

**Barnett** said even in 10 years Milwaukie should have adequate supply of on-street parking. Future options could be a parking structure or shared use agreements with businesses for underutilized lots.

Each of the strategies being considered requires broad policy recommendations. These include adopting the 85% utilization in peak hours as the standard monitoring device; creating the position of parking manager to ensure monitoring; adopting the guiding principles; and adopting the parking management zones and operating principles. These will help staff do the day-to-day management by allowing flexibility in signage, ability to negotiate shared use agreements, and collaboration with Tri-Met and businesses in anticipation of the transit center's moving. In the future, the City can focus on identifying dedicated locations for downtown employees and making more spots available for short-term parking.