

## MINUTES

## MILWAUKIE CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION

December 19, 2006

**Mayor Bernard** called the work session to order at 5:45 p.m. in the City Hall Conference Room.

Council Present: Councilors Barnes, Collette, Loomis, and Stone.

Staff Present: City Manager Mike Swanson, City Attorney Gary Firestone, Community Services Director JoAnn Herrigel, Community Development/Public Works Director Kenny Asher, Planning Director Katie Mangle, Code Compliance Coordinator Tim Salyers, Resource and Economic Development Specialist Alex Campbell, Engineering Director Gary Parkin, and Public Information Officer Grady Wheeler.

Downtown Parking Update

**Ms. Mangle** updated the Council on the work that was underway and provided maps showing the inventory of downtown parking and how it was being used. The lots shown in red were greater than 85% full, and the green that were almost empty. Staff counted cars in August and October and again after North Main Village was occupied between 11:00 and 11:30 a.m. to determine how the spots were being utilized. Parking specialist consultant Rick Williams who helped with the 2003 parking plan was hired to help synthesize the data in order to draw some conclusions. The inventory was still evolving as changes occurred downtown such as the curb extensions constructed by Key Bank that would add a few spaces by changing from parallel to angle parking. Parking in downtown continues to be dynamic. Since the 2003 plan the Safeway lot was taken out of the permits system and the McLoughlin Boulevard project resulted in some changes to on-street parking. The North Main Village project actually added back a lot of parking into the system, and the Waldorf School built its lot. Several blocks now have angled parking that added new spaces.

The inventory showed 1,687 spaces in the downtown. About 679 of those were available to the public meaning they were either free, on-street spaces or permitted off-street spaces. Utilization counts have shown that 51% of the 1,687 were full on a typical day. The 679 public spaces were about 63% full. The Kittelson Study identified the peak time as 11:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. and was confirmed by the City's parking enforcement personnel. She suggested another afternoon count be done in January. It was easy to say the lots were half utilized over all of downtown, but parking was very specific to the businesses next to it. There were several blocks in the core area that were effectively full and over the 85% threshold and interviews corroborate that. In some areas there was not as much parking as the storefronts would like.

Public parking was managed by a permit system. In October and November only 80% of the available permits were sold. Right now there were 36 permits available if businesses or employees would like to buy them, so there was capacity in the system. Of the permits being sold about 1/3 were being sold to people using the downtown as a park-and-ride and taking the bus elsewhere.

One of the key strategies in the 2003 parking plan was that 85% was the threshold that would trigger a discussion of other solutions. In the core area the City needed to look for different approaches for managing and allocating that parking. It was important for the City to manage the parking more effectively to ensure resources were being maximized. She referred to the map that showed a lot of areas that were underutilized. The City needed to find a way to encourage people to use those areas and the permit system more effectively to meet employees' needs. She had been working closely with parking enforcement and doing some outreach. Some ideas on improved management included a more flexible that might include packs of ten daily permits. The City might look at allocating more long-term parking outside the current core area. Mayor Bernard had suggested looking at a residential parking permit program for the neighborhoods that were starting to feel a little encroachment. In talking with the permit management company, there would not be a lot of overhead for the City, so it could be done when the neighborhood was ready.

**Councilor Stone** understood it would not be a cost to the neighbors and was just a way to mark the cars so people knew they belonged there.

**Ms. Mangle** said typically there would be a cost to the neighbors.

**Councilor Stone** did not like that.

**Ms. Mangle** said there was a cost to the program that included enforcement and signage. That would have to be discussed if there were thoughts of implementing such a program.

**Mayor Bernard** suggested it because one of the neighborhoods actually offered to be a test project.

**Councilor Stone** was under the impression when cars in a neighborhood were permitted it designated the one that needed to be there because they belonged there. They actually have residences there as opposed to cars that might be utilizing a business that might be parking in that neighborhood that should not be there. That was always her interpretation of a neighborhood permit system, and it does not cost the residents anything. The City should be trying to do everything it can to protect their parking in front of their homes, and it should not cost them.

**Ms. Mangle** said in other cities there was an annual cost, but this was one of many things the City could move forward on. The neighborhoods would need to be included and covering the program costs would need to be discussed. This was an idea that had not been developed yet.

**Councilor Loomis** knew once the park-and-ride was open it would alleviate people parking in the neighborhood.

**Ms. Mangle** replied right now permits were available but downtown businesses were not buying them. People using the downtown lots for park-and-ride could be asked to use the Odd Fellows lot. The Southgate park-and-ride would take a lot of pressure from the downtown. The permit system was all done by mail, and it was pretty straightforward.

**Mr. Salyers** said one could come to City Hall and obtain a short-term permit.

**Ms. Mangle** understood part of the issue was making sure it was easy for employees and businesses to use the system and know where parking was available. Some of these measures will be implemented soon after speaking with businesses and others affected by some of the options. Staff would do that

in two ways. When Mr. Campbell completed the street funding project, he would increase efforts to work one-on-one with downtown businesses on this issue and others. Staff would also take advantage of the Transportation System Plan (TSP) project to address downtown parking. A chapter of the TSP would specifically cover downtown parking, and there will be a workshop or two devoted to downtown parking which will be a way to talk about immediate changes and think about the long-term plan and anticipate changes. The grant will help facilitate these discussions and move things forward. She provided copies of the TSP Working Groups and workshop flyer that summarized the efforts. In summary, the maps and inventory helped increase the understanding of the parking resources available and how they were being used. There was a good supply of parking, and it was a matter of managing it better. Creative ideas were welcome.

**Councilor Barnes** asked when North Main Village would be occupied.

**Mayor Bernard** said people were starting to move into the apartments at 15% occupancy.

**Councilor Barnes** wanted to know to track how many cars there were per dwelling because when Council made the decision, there were a certain number of cars per unit. When they start having visitors that entire section of downtown will be overloaded. If it goes over that point then there will be a bigger problem. It might mean that the City would have to talk to the people renting the apartments and buying the condos about enforcement.

**Councilor Loomis** sent Mr. Swanson an e-mail about that very issue and asked if there was a way to cross reference with DMV once people took occupancy.

**Ms. Mangle** observed code enforcement walking the streets twice daily, so the City could pay attention to that issue and stay on top of it.

**Councilor Stone** asked if it might be feasible to track the new vehicles in the downtown by using a permit process so code enforcement could spot them and know they lived at North Main. This could be part of data collection.

**Ms. Mangle** was interested in having the Parking Working Group and eventually Council look at policies for residents downtown since that was not really addressed in 2003.

**Councilor Collette** noted in looking at the maps there were a lot of private parking areas near the North Main Village area, so there might be opportunities. As far as she knew there were no policies about how many vehicles a North Main resident might have but only that there was only one parking place.

**Ms. Mangle** heard anecdotally that near North Main Village and at the south end of town property owners were selling parking spaces to other users outside the City system.

**Mayor Bernard** suggested the City look at Adams Street and contact the owner as soon as possible because the cement bumpers were being broken up and there was a sinkhole.

### TriMet Bus/Park-and-Ride Update

**Mr. Swanson** said this was intended to be an update and informational discussion having to do with the transit center situation. He noted that the TriMet's efforts at interlining were improving this situation that has been around since 1983.

**Mr. Asher** said in preparing for this discussion he looked at policy framework to find out what the Comprehensive Plan said about buses downtown. It said this was a transit center and people needed access to and from it. The City was blessed with a lot of bus service but not a lot of real estate. He felt the Council would hear an honest effort on TriMet's part to follow up on this old issue, to acknowledge the problem, and perhaps think out of the box a bit on where to put these large vehicles.

**Mr. Swanson** thought it was important to focus on the Comprehensive Plan and the provisions relating to buses in the downtown. A transit center as used in this region served two functions simultaneously which was layover for buses for scheduling purposes, driver breaks, and rider transfers from one line to another.

**Mr. Selinger, TriMet Project Planning Director**, reported TriMet had been working on establishing a park-and-ride at the north end of downtown. The Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) came to a decision that affirmed the City's land use decision about a week ago. The appeal period was a total of 21 days. The theater building was being removed and would be done in about three weeks. One hurdle was that when TriMet was developing its current year budget the cost of completing that project was deferred to the FY08 budget. The original budget for the project was \$3.1 million, and TriMet purchased the property for \$2 million. With the review, design, and other related costs there was \$600,000 left to actually build the lot, and the last estimate for the project was \$1.4 million. If that \$800,000 were approved in the FY08 budget the park-and-ride could begin construction July 1, 2007. Contracts have been lined up, so TriMet would be ready to turn dirt in July.

There have been discussions since 1983 about replacing the interim transit center in downtown Milwaukie with a more permanent facility, and TriMet has been working to do that. There were proposals in the past few years TriMet made to the City, and together tried to advance those. Once upon a time there was a proposal for the Safeway site and more recently the Kellogg Lake site. TriMet was continuing to reshape bus operations. With the Working Group process the concept came out of breaking up the transit center so it would not really be a transit center anymore. There were only a few buses that ended their routes in downtown Milwaukie. Some went through the City, so that was not an issue, but some needed to terminate here. TriMet needed a parking place for as many as six buses. On first chart one could see the need for layovers in the downtown were reduced in the past few years by interlining some of the buses. By dividing the bus stop where the passengers interact with the service from the place where the operators need to recover their schedules and take a break hopefully the impact and footprint can be reduced.

The goal of this process was to reconfigure bus operations in the downtown in a way that reduced impacts to local business and redevelopment while at the same time improving the environment at and around bus stops for patrons and others using Milwaukie's downtown. There were objectives for riders, the community, and bus operations. TriMet had to do all those things at once. Riders of course were very important to TriMet and included Milwaukians and others in Clackamas County. The objective was to provide convenient bus access to and from the transit center with convenient access for bus riders, pedestrians, and bicyclists around the downtown. TriMet wanted to make sure there was minimal impact on the community. TriMet did not want to displace more parking than necessary. It wanted to reduce bus noise and emissions, minimize the real or perceived view that transit patrons were a nuisance by providing lighting and security, and reduce visual impacts. TriMet wanted the bus stops to be compatible with and

**CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION – DECEMBER 19, 2006**

Approved Minutes

Page 4 of 9

help implement the City's vision for its downtown through design. Buses needed a good place to recover schedules in a cost efficient manner. TriMet wanted to have at least a pair of bus stops in the downtown with a full set of amenities and information people need to use the system. Milwaukie was a natural hub for bus activities just as it grew up as a market town at one time. Just as it was a crossroads for commerce and automobiles it is a crossroads for transit.

Bus stops require 70-feet of tangent curb. The recovery function would need space for up to six buses, and whatever was done would need to be of some permanence and preferably even independent from the current work on the South Corridor Phase 2 project to address this need. There were two siting issues. The first was the bus layover and the second was the full-featured bus stop. Four layover locations were identified; however, TriMet had not talked to any property owners or neighbors. He would like to hear the Council's ideas and reactions to these suggestions. The four options were (1) do nothing; (2) the parking strip between Monroe and Washington Streets behind Milwaukie Lumber with a one-way loop and restroom; (3) the Milwaukie Southgate park-and-ride using the same approach as the semi trucks; this option would take up a total of 30 parking spaces; and (4) the triangular site Main Street and Lake Road with a fairly efficient jughandle arrangement. The site behind the lumberyard was owned by the railroad, and the City had a lease agreement with the railroad. With a change of use and user it would have to be determined if that was a simple change in the agreement or if there would be a monetary transaction. Option #4 also includes railroad and private properties. The buses were typically parked for about 20 minutes.

**Councilor Collette** asked if these buses would idle or be turned off.

**Mr. Selinger** replied there was a two-minutes rule. If they were parked more than two minutes, then the drivers cut the engines. Restrooms would be constructed unless some arrangement was made with a nearby business. He referred to a chart that explained the need by route for six layover spaces. In the off-peak six spaces were needed and in the peak four were needed. There was a series of three maps that indicated general bus circulation, and how many buses traveled on each block in Milwaukie's downtown in a given hour.

**Councilor Collette** asked how many buses would serve the park-and-ride.

**Mr. Selinger** replied all of the buses going north on Main would go to the park-and-ride. There were 23 per hour at peak and 14 per hour at non-peak. There would be 329 spaces at the Southgate park-and-ride minus 40 if the layover area were located there. He referred to a table that compared the four potential bus layover locations. He included the number of public parking spaces that would be affected by the options, park-and-ride spaces, traffic impacts, and estimates of operating and capital costs. The do nothing scenario would use 28 side street parking spaces in the downtown core, there would be no park-and-ride impacts, downtown circulation would be the same, and there were no additional operating or capital costs. When one thought about the buses coming to the current transit center the block around City Hall was ground zero and the point at which getting buses in and out of downtown was minimal. From an operational standpoint, this was the perfect location because shuttling the buses from the remote location made up the estimated operating costs. The parking strip behind the lumberyard would impact 30 lightly used spaces some of which were used by de facto park-and-riders. Because of the layout the buses would need to make an acute turn to get in and out of the site and because of its location would add \$100,000 annually in operating costs. The rough capital estimate was \$600,000 that

included a restroom and development requirements. That was based on the assumption that TriMet could just pick up the City's agreement with the railroad. The restroom would be for bus operators only and would be architecturally designed. There would be some pavement and sidewalk improvements and saw tooth curbing. The estimate did not assume a lot of landscaping, so TriMet would need to talk to City staff about design requirements. The park-and-ride option would not impact public parking spaces, but 40 park-and-ride spaces would be lost. Collectively the 40 parking spaces would cost \$474,400. The \$627,000 capital cost excluded those 40 spaces but included pavement upgrade. The lot pavement was designed for automobiles and not 40-foot buses, so there was a \$200,000 premium to get the pavement up the standard with some longevity could support a bus. That could be taken out to reduce the costs; however, the pavement might only last a couple of years. The semi-trucks on the pavement today were not helping. TriMet assumed there would be an upgrade in that section of the lot for buses. The Lake Road Triangle option did not take any public parking spaces, and there would be no park-and-ride impacts. Traffic circulation should be decent, but there might need to be some kind of traffic control devices so the buses can pull out and make a left turn onto Main Street northbound. The operating cost was about the same as the lumberyard option, but the capital costs were high because TriMet assumed the privately owned portion would have to be purchased.

Those were the options TriMet thought were workable. TriMet recommended either option 2 or 4 because of the travel distance between downtown and the Southgate was about .5 miles. TriMet really did not want to lose the 40 park-and-ride spaces because the parking did fill up. Mr. Selinger thought there was a demand for the 329 and then some. The parking strip behind the lumberyard would be the most expedient depending on the development requirements. Probably the best design site and greatest longevity would be the Lake Road Triangle.

**Mr. Selinger** addressed the improved downtown bus stops. TriMet thought it was still important to have some prominent improved bus stops. During the Working Group process a pair of bus stops were proposed in front of City Hall that would be developed in full recognition of the City's streetscape design standards. With the former Texaco site being redeveloped TriMet understood that may not be as workable. The second option was to put improved bus stops around the corner on the south side of City Hall. The first option on Main Street would take eight spaces. Another option was to look further south on Main Street, but that was the heart of the retail district and would displace diagonal parking. TriMet was assuming that would not be a desirable. If the City wanted those stops improved to the desired standards and to construct high capacity shelters, then there would be some capital costs involved. He provided photos of downtown Portland stops.

The grant language for the park-and-ride lot indicated that if TriMet were to put the bus layover facility at Southgate then it would have to come in as a completely new project from both the land use and federal review standpoint. TriMet told the federal government that the facility would have 331 spaces so they would have to get permission to take out those 40 spaces. There was a process, but it was not impossible.

**Councilor Stone** asked if it were likely the federal government would have a problem.

**Mr. Selinger** said the worst case was that the federal government would require those 40 spaces to be recreated elsewhere.

**Mr. Firestone** said for clarification that the stops on Main would be only to drop off and pick up passengers, so they would not spend any time laying over.

**Councilor Collette** understood essentially there would only be two stops downtown. One going north and one going south.

**Mr. Selinger** stated all the turn movements could be made and minimized bus blocks of travel downtown, so it was an efficient location.

**Councilor Loomis** how many parking spots were freed up.

**Mr. Selinger** replied it would free up 20 spaces. The bus stop would be like an extra long curb extension that would allow about 1.5 buses. TriMet would use about .5 block beyond the driveway cuts.

**Mayor Bernard** would prefer option #3, but he sees that the parking lot behind the lumberyard was only half utilized. He suggested looking at the rental house to the east. Milwaukie Lumber does use it for employee parking and an occasional lumber truck.

**Councilor Collette** had the same concern with option #3 as she did on the Working Group. There were trucks going in and out, and now there would be buses added to the mix making it burdensome to the North Industrial businesses

**Councilor Stone** wanted to get back to her question of how many buses would be going in and out on a daily basis.

**Mr. Selinger** replied per weekday there were 240 buses using the layover facility from about 5 a.m. to midnight. That was about 10 per hour, and he referred to the diagram behind the text that showed the distribution.

**Councilor Stone** thought that seemed high. She asked about the amenities for the full-fledged bus stops. She understood there would be two but would there be other stops in the downtown core where people could catch a bus. Would that be 240 buses going through the downtown in one day?

**Mr. Selinger** said stops would be approximately four blocks apart, and the blocks were short. There were more than 240 buses going through Milwaukie in a day. Bus #33 was the most frequent, but it did not have a layover. None of the proposals changed the number of buses to downtown Milwaukie. A little bit of bus service was lost when the Sellwood Bridge had its problems.

**Mayor Bernard** understood that part of South Corridor Phase 1 was that there would be a transit center built for Milwaukie. Was there no funding set aside for that structure in the appropriations in Phase 1.

**Mr. Selinger** replied there was no funding set aside for the study or project at all at that point. It was a recommendation to move forward and secure funding for all of those things.

**Mr. Swanson** would have to go back to the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA), but he recalled the language was that the on-street Milwaukie transit center had to be moved within Phase 1 construction. They had talked about identifying a date, but he believed the language addressed relocation of the on-street Milwaukie transit center during Phase 1.

**Mr. Selinger** added that TriMet had proposed working with staff to apply for Connect Oregon dollars to do the Kellogg Lake transit center scenario. When

that option was taken off the table, TriMet did a partnership with Gresham. That project was on the pending list for that funding. He presumed the state would come around again with another round of Connect Oregon funding, so that would be an opportunity for a co-sponsorship to get this happening.

**Mayor Bernard** would like to see that happen. Right now there was one spot where all the buses go. There would be a park-and-ride making it two spots, and now there might be a third spot added. The park-and-ride will help the downtown, but he was concerned about adding another.

**Mr. Swanson** right now the buses layover on the downtown streets. This goal was to take the layover piece off the street and identify parking for six buses.

**Mr. Asher** noted that option #1 already grouped all of those functions, and that was the least costly alternative. The buses have to convene in the downtown because that was where the activities were. Now the question was what was the minimal impact. How were the visual impacts and perceived nuisance minimized? He did not necessarily believe it had to do with grouping or ungrouping. He thought it was being smart about serving each function.

**Mayor Bernard** did not disagree, but he wanted to ensure the neighborhoods and downtown businesses were included in the discussion. At some time he recommended the City consider a downtown business neighborhood association because property owners did not have the same kind of access.

**Councilor Stone** asked if people could get out of their cars and get on the buses if option #3 was chosen.

**Mr. Selinger** said the buses going downtown were through buses and would not use that layover. Although it was a good question he did not believe that was an important connection for those people. Before the bus pulled out of the lot there could be a stop to allow that to happen.

**Councilor Stone** said Millwaukie has wanted the buses out of its downtown core as the downtown developed and wanted it physically beautiful. Buses sitting around did not make it physically beautiful. She was looking down the road many, many years in terms of a permanent solution to the transit issue. She wanted people to think about this as a permanent thing and put it where it really needed to go so that it enhanced the City rather than detracted from it and enhanced the neighborhood. Those were all the kinds of things she was considering. She was interested in finding out why the operational costs seemed so much greater to put it at Southgate rather than to put it at the triangle.

**Mr. Selinger** replied it was .5 miles versus several hundred feet.

**Councilor Barnes** noted that Councilor Collette had discussed an arts center at the south end of town, and she pictured buses there as part of the revitalization. She would rather not see the buses at the industrial end because the City has seen the economic base grow with more jobs and businesses. North Industrial already made it clear the buses probably had an impact on all the trucks in that area. She would not like to see it on that end of town at all because there was enough congestion. There was a state study going on, and there was too much in that area.

**Mr. Asher** said TriMet was at a stopping point because the options needed to be narrowed and there needed to be some consensus on a couple of the options from the Council in order to move forward and supply more information. He suggested a follow-up work session to keep the conversation going.

6373

**Mr. Swanson** suggested a follow up work session on January 2, 2007. He urged the Council to review the staff report and TriMet's report.

Mr. Swanson announced the Council would go back into executive session pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(h) to discuss litigation.

**Mayor Bernard** adjourned the work session 6:54 p.m.

*Pat DuVal*

---

Pat DuVal, City Recorder