

**CITY OF MILWAUKIE  
CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
October 2, 2007**

**CALL TO ORDER**

**Mayor Bernard** called the 2015<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Milwaukie City Council to order at 7:00 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers.

Present: Mayor James Bernard and Councilors Deborah Barnes, Carlotta Collette, Joe Loomis, and Susan Stone

Staff present: City Manager Mike Swanson, Community Development & Public Works Director, and Finance Director Valerie Warner

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**PROCLAMATIONS, COMMENDATION, SPECIAL REPORTS AND AWARDS**

**A. National Fire Prevention Week Proclamation**

**Mayor Bernard** read a proclamation naming October 7 – 13, 2007 as *Fire Prevention Week*.

**B. National Walk a Child to School Day, October 3, 2007**

**Councilor Barnes** read a proclamation recognizing October 3, 2007 as *National Walk a Child to School Day*.

**Mr. Swanson** announced the City Attorney was excused pursuant to Resolution 9-2003.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

**A. City Council Minutes of August 21, 2007 Work Session**

**B. Resolution 60-2007: A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Milwaukie, Oregon, Amending the City's Intergovernmental Agreement with the Metropolitan Area Communication Commission (MACC) to Allow MACC Staff to Negotiate a Cable Franchise with Qwest Broadband Services**

It was moved by Councilor Barnes and seconded by Councilor Collette to adopt the consent agenda. Motion passed unanimously. [5:0]

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION**

- **Ed Parecki, Milwaukie business owner**

**Mr. Parecki** talked about public area improvements as required by the Downtown Plan, his current situation with the planning department, and the progress on his project on the corner of Main and Monroe. Right now there was no progress. It was halted. He felt it was halted for all the wrong reasons. He hoped the City Council could do something to expedite a building permit so he could continue with the renovation of the building. The building department granted basically all the approvals based on the drawings he submitted. He was waiting for word from the planning department to tell him how much he would be responsible for in public area improvements. He had not been given a number. They expected him to give them a number. He gave them a

**CITY COUNCIL REGULAR SESSION – OCTOBER 2, 2007**

**APPROVED MINUTES**

Page 1 of 10

number, and they basically rejected it. The code read that they expected him to do all the public area improvements on Main and Monroe. To him that was like signing an open blank check and saying, "sure I'll do everything you require me to do." He did not even know what the outcome could be. He referred to case law, *Armstrong v. United States*. One of the purposes of the takings clause was to bar government from forcing some people alone to bear public burdens which in all fairness and justice should be borne by the public as a whole. His view of the public area improvement was that they were public, and they were for the public. Therefore, they should be paid for by the public. Right now the way the City formulated its Downtown Plan, businesses and developers were expected to make improvements to the City. This Downtown Plan was implemented in 2000, and since 2000 there were only 4 public area improvements imposed on people. At this rate the City would have its Downtown Plan implemented in about 30 years. It did not make any sense for him to set a vision and expect it to be instigated and implemented in such in a piecemeal manner where it was practically impossible for it to be adopted. It was extremely counterproductive, and he did not think it made any sense. He offered the City planning department 10% of the total improvement value that he expected to make. That came up to \$22,500 which he was more than happy to put toward some kind of improvements, and he was waiting to hear from them about which improvements they would like to see. They were going back and forth and could not come to an agreement. He did not know how long this was going to take, but every week that goes by costs money. There was a very ugly building waiting to get beautiful. He was ready and willing to do it. He was trying to comply with all the Downtown Plan ideas that were envisioned back in 2000, and it felt like he was being hampered. It was all because someone wrote something in the code that really made very little sense. He had to figure out how to make it work. Mr. Parecki noted the Mayor was smiling and wanted to hear some of his comments.

**Mayor Bernard** thought it was funny that Mr. Parecki was telling the Council just a few weeks ago that it had to adhere to the code. The code said you had to spend so much money on public improvements.

**Mr. Parecki** responded it did not. It said up to 10% or more which meant anywhere between zero and an upper limit which was endless because 'or more' did not give him any cap.

**Mayor Bernard** thought a certain percentage had to be spent on the improvements around the property.

**Mr. Parecki** had to spend up to 10% or more, which was pretty meaningless to him because it did not tell him how much he could spend. That was why he was going back and forth. How much did he need to spend? Give him a number. If he agreed to it, he would go on. Otherwise he would have to go on to whatever next thing. He was here telling the City Council it should keep to the code because there were a lot of codes that were not being enforced. The City chose to adhere to some codes and not to others. That did not seem fair. If the City was going to quote the code and say it had to administer the code, then do it across the board and not just to certain people at certain times. The code says if the development permit value was less than 50% of the value of the land and existing improvements as determined by the county assessor then an amount equal to least 10% of the development value shall be utilized to meet the public area requirements. He offered 10%.

**Mr. Asher** had been tracking this matter because Mr. Parecki's was an important project he wanted to see built as soon as possible. Ms. Mangle and City Attorney Monahan had been working to come up with the appropriate code interpretation and the appropriate public area requirements. He concurred with some of what Mr. Parecki said. It was going slower than people wished. It was an important project and a

building everyone wanted to see done and get beautiful. He did differ with Mr. Parecki's interpretation of the code and the allegations that the planning department or anyone on staff was dragging their feet or being arbitrary. The issue boiled down to the value of this building permit as compared to the value of the property. Mr. Parecki was talking about a 10% contribution, and the code did say if the value of building permit was less than 50% of the value of property, then that was what the City would require the applicant to do. The code read any renovation, expansion, or alteration of an existing building that had a development permit value that exceeded 50% of the value of the land and existing improvements as determined by the County Assessor shall comply with the public area requirements. The building official determines the building permit value. The operative phrase was "shall comply." There was a book that said what those were. Staff provided that book and those requirements to Mr. Parecki because indeed his project was 60% of the value of the property. The length of time that passed was because staff believed "shall comply with the public area requirements" was a very general statement. The public areas requirements were fairly extensive. Staff was continuing a daily dialogue about this matter and trying to assess the appropriate level. The City was not quite there yet, and Mr. Asher believed the planning staff was within days of making the proposal. Staff asked Mr. Parecki for his assessment, and he came back with 10%. The code did not put this in the 10% category.

**Mayor Bernard** commented on the remodel work at Key Bank that triggered the sidewalk improvements.

**Mr. Asher** said that was a 10% case. This was the first project in that category of code. Part of the mutual struggle was that the code was not written perfectly and did not anticipate everything. It was going slowly because this was a unique situation.

**Councilor Collette** asked if Mr. Parecki could not move forward on the interior remodel.

**Mr. Parecki** did not have a permit and would not start without one. He did begin with the roof because he was granted a permit to pull that out of the overall project. He was postponing it because of the weather; it could have been done two weeks ago. He did not want to do any interior remodeling to happen until the roof was done. He and Mr. Asher were talking daily, and he met with Ms. Mangle and talked on the phone. There was frustration on his part that he could not move ahead. All he really needed was for the City to grant the permit subject to figuring this out, and he could continue. He could do it. Hold off on the final occupancy permit that could take 3 or 4 months to complete. Within that time they could figure out what this code really was trying to say. One of the problems he had was that the value of property based on the assessor's value was over 10 years old. The improvements he was doing were over 50% of a 10-year old assessed value and not of the current value or what he paid for it. That was a problem with the code. It was punishing people because of increased value. Mr. Asher said market value. That was where the ambiguity came in. Mr. Asher said market value; Mr. Parecki was listening very carefully. Then Mr. Asher read the proper one, which said "assessed value." It was right there; people heard that.

**Mr. Asher** said if he misspoke it was indeed assessed value. There was a market value that the assessor used which still was not the market value that one would transact. This was what we were down to. He wanted to be more specific about how close they were. It was not the best practice to grant conditional permits and figure things out later. That was done on occasion in the past, and it tended to make things more difficult. It was better to come to an agreement upfront. They had a list of all the improvements that was provided to Mr. Parecki. The list he provided the City did not meet with the code. They would meet tomorrow morning to come up with another list and provide it to Mr. Parecki in hopes of reaching some agreement upfront. They were trying to meet the spirit of the code, serve the customer, and do the right thing by the

Downtown Plan. He agreed with Mr. Parecki that the City opted not to fund its public area requirements downtown through urban renewal or any other mechanism. The Plan was pretty clear. The developers will provide those sidewalk improvements, the lights, the benches, and the street trees along with development. The City wanted to do that in a way that allowed the buildings to be redeveloped.

**Councilor Collette** thought this was an important project, and everyone would love to see the building as Mr. Parecki's drawing showed. She was comfortable having people move forward and see this get done. The sooner the better.

**Mr. Asher** added this was a Type 1 permit handled by the planning director and could be appealed to the Planning Commission and City Council. If the parties could not come to terms, Mr. Parecki's course of action would be to take it up with the Planning Commission. If still dissatisfied, then he could ask the City Council's opinion.

**Mr. Parecki** really wanted to avoid doing that because it took so much time. That meant he would be back before the City Council in 2 or 3 months. That was counterproductive and was why the conditional permit idea would work well. He was not going anywhere. He had 16 businesses to take care of and 4 of his own. This was where he landed. He felt he could do a lot more for the City if they could work together. It felt really ugly when someone said you would not get your permit unless you gave us money. Tell him how much the City wanted, and maybe it could be worked out. That was not a good way to conduct business. He did not have an open checkbook and did not plan to write a blank check. He just needed to know what it was. He was given a list that included absolutely everything possible, and he had no clue how much he might be liable for. He would not sign on this dotted line. Whatever they came up with he would appeal to whatever level he needed to appeal to. That was the problem. This was an open checkbook, and no one was giving him any figures on how much it would cost to do all of these enhancements to the City.

**Councilor Stone** had a question in terms of interpretation of the code. When she looked at the code and heard the term developers she thought of big developers like Gramor and people who had much deeper pots of money to do improvements in terms of City improvements and public improvements. Were there any concessions to private developers to help them so they were not so overwhelmed with doing public improvements? The list looked fairly extensive and did not know if everything on there was a reasonable thing to expect a private developer to do. Or was this more in line with a bigger developer taking care of these things?

**Mayor Bernard** did not believe one could classify big or small developers as things needed to be fair across the board. He agreed there were problems with parts of the code and its interpretation. He felt it needed to be more lax, but everyone needed to be treated equally. There were some things that affected him, and he would like to see a broader interpretation. He asked if Mr. Parecki's first project was before the Plan adoption because it looked like about 70% of the building.

**Mr. Parecki** replied it probably was. He guessed it was interpreted differently. The planning director had the ability to interpret the code anyway she wished. Back then it was interpreted one way, and now it was being interpreted a little more harshly or more to the letter of the current state of the rules.

**Councilor Stone** said in looking at the 3 sections, the Main Street frontage, the Monroe Street frontage, and the intersection a couple of things popped out at her as high end items. She did not know how a private developer could do this. Like the bulb out design transition for Monroe Street from 2 lanes to 3 lanes and 15-foot corner radius. Those were expensive. They were very expensive. She was looking at 7-foot parking strips, new curb and gutter, and 12-foot sidewalks. Was there any way that the City

could help private developers to offset some of these costs? These were public rights-of-way; they did not belong to the developer. She thought it seemed like the City should have some responsibility to do some of this.

**Councilor Collette** understood even residences had to make public improvements on sidewalks and the surrounding area to bring it up to standards and code.

**Councilor Stone** thought that was what blew the deal for Norm Scott in terms of developing because he could not afford to do the sidewalk improvements. She did not think the intention was to make it difficult for private developers to improve our City. We encourage that.

**Mr. Asher** thought that was an important question. In community development there was nothing he would like more than more tools to help people like Mr. Parecki get these projects done. This came down to money and who would pay for the new, envisioned Main Street that included lights, trees, benches, bulb outs, pedestrian improvements, and the wonderful environment this community envisioned in 2000 and still wholeheartedly bought into. The City had no tools to help other than its best efforts at making these projects go quickly and being smart about how the code was applied. The City had no subsidy or funds lying around to make it easier. The code did not begin to distinguish between developers with shallow pockets and developers with deep pockets. The City was somewhat handcuffed by what the code said. They were trying to get the street built. Someone needed to pay. They were trying to stay true to that without being overly onerous on the developers to the extent there was not any latitude at all. Council had more latitude than staff. If that bulb out were not built as part of this project, no one else would come forward build it. There was nothing in the street fund to do it with. It was an important question, and he would like to do more.

**Mayor Bernard** commented on the feasibility of tax increment financing (TIF) and noted people said in the past they did not want to do that.

**Mr. Parecki** observed that Councilor Stone made a very interesting point about the difference of leveling a City block or leveling 3 buildings versus restoring an existing building where the footprint was not larger and there was no additional height. Nothing was changing; only the building was being beautified. There was a huge difference. If one was going to level a City block then it should be rebuilt to standards in the Downtown Plan. If one were remodeling and beautifying an existing building, there was a huge difference.

**Councilor Stone** asked what the requirements were on the McLoughlin Building with Spring Creek.

**Mr. Parecki** did not remember. There was a public area requirement imposed on his last tenant to install bike racks.

**Mayor Bernard** noted the sidewalks were built as part of the ODOT improvements.

**Mr. Parecki** did not have to do the sidewalks because it was already being done as part of ODOT's money.

**Councilor Collette** thought ideally some of this could be phased.

**Mr. Parecki** would love to add lighting as it was critical. Okay, fine. He could call someone and ask how much for the post and those 2 lights. He would know what the costs would be, but he did not know how much a bulb out would cost.

**Mr. Asher** committed that staff would have items by the end of the week because the intent was not to let this drag on while the City was pondering it.

**Mayor Bernard** thought there might be neighborhood funding for a street light and suggested Mr. Parecki check with the Historic Milwaukie Neighborhood Association.

**Mr. Asher** stated a refined list would be forthcoming.

**Councilor Stone** said the way the code was written in terms of the developers, it was pretty generalized in terms of what the City wanted the developers to do. It was generalized in terms of big guys and little guys, big pots of money and little pots of money. She loved development that came from private money because it did not at all encroach on public funds. The public was not supporting it. This was a particular development with private money with absolutely no public subsidies in it at all, and no tax abatements. It would be revenue for the City. If it was anything like the success of the Spring Creek Coffee House it would be a wonderful amenity for the City. She would like to see everything done for any developer, not just Mr. Parecki, but any private developer to help them to revitalize the downtown and taking some of these old buildings and turning them into things of beauty again. She agreed with things like sidewalks; they were fine now unless they were all broken up, but she thought that would be the City's responsibility as well and that the City would own some of that. It was not like we were completely tearing down that block and starting over. Mr. Parecki brought up a good point.

**Councilor Collette** said there were some funds, and she gave Mr. Parecki the information, when she came back from a conference. There was some money from the Oregon Heritage Foundation, which was a State office that had money for this kind of restoration. She recalled talking with Mr. Parecki about it.

**Mr. Parecki** said he was not sure, but he was not asking for any money for the restoration. He was doing the restoration.

**Councilor Collette** understood, but it might help offset the cost of the public area requirements. This was all private money, and there may be government pots that could be tapped into. For the sake of the viewing public, she did not want this conversation to go on all night. There were other sources, and she could help Mr. Parecki by going through her files for the information. There were also some grant funds available for street area improvements.

**Mr. Parecki** said that was where he would like to go.

**Mayor Bernard** suggested contacting the Oregon Downtown Development Association (ODDA).

**Mr. Asher** summarized. Mr. Parecki was not really asking where to go to get the funds. He did not hear Councilor Stone trying to figure out where to go for the funds. There seemed to be a real issue being raised here by Mr. Parecki and Councilor Stone about the City's code and the way it was written. The planning department would likely agree that this and other sections of the code were not written in the best way. The City did not have that discretion to begin to apply it on an ad hoc basis depending on who staff was dealing with. People were doing their best, especially in this climate, to be as consistent as they could be in applying the code. That required staff to interpret it in a certain way. The Planning Commission and City Council were sitting in a place, if they wished to reinterpret it or overturn judgments made by the planning director and staff, then that could happen. However, staff could not do that. He could come back to the very next work session to talk about things the City could do to raise public funds to help in a situation like this.

**Councilor Stone** was concerned about having a code that was subject to interpretation. To her a code was something that should be spelled out very clearly. If the Council can interpret it and if someone else can interpret it as Mr. Asher was suggesting in another

way and could overturn what was interpreted that told her there was some flaws in the code and how it was written. Maybe it needed to be a lot more specific.

**Mr. Asher** responded staff would not disagree.

**Mayor Bernard** noted people were interpreting the Constitution since it was written.

- **John Otsyula, Milwaukee**

**Mr. Otsyula** followed up on what he asked one month ago about the Supplemental Draft Impact Statement (SDEIS). From what he read in *The Pilot* it was underway. He never did get a response from the City, so he had to go ahead and talk with the FTA. He was wondering if there was any response at all.

**Councilor Collette** said the City responded in writing and at the meeting in a discussion with Mr. Otsyula. The City responded with the information from Metro. She understood the City responded on several levels to Mr. Otsyula in writing.

**Mr. Otsyula** said, 'no.' As a matter of fact he wanted to make a correction. The last time he was at a City Council meeting, he picked up what was supposed to have been a response to him. Councilor Barnes gave it to him. If the City responded by mail, it never came to him. There was never a section that said a copy was sent to him. He had not received anything. That was a misrepresentation. He did not receive even that one. He did receive a copy from Councilor Barnes. The Mayor had stated that a copy had been sent to him. There was no copy sent to him. It was one thing to have amnesia about issues, but the reality was alternatives needed to be included in the SDEIS. The City Council had no authority. Even Metro was here saying the City Council had no authority to remove viable alternatives. This project had gone on for over 10 years, and things have changed dramatically in 10 years. Even prices have changed. Even the previous EIS written over 10 years ago did not address the full range of alternatives. Even Metro agreed that whatever token effort they did in assisting the City to invalidly reject alternatives was not a complete scoping process. Just because Metro had done this over and over again did not mean they were really right. It was like someone running a red light all the time. Maybe no one called them on that. In this case, he just wanted to assist the City in not making as grievous mistake as happened with the Kronberg property where his acquaintances keep asking if the City was still trying to get the property from that lady and take it away by false efforts. Mr. Otsyula says 'no' and tries to defend it all the time. The director said he would make sure a response was sent. Councilor Stone did ask that he get a copy of the response.

**Mayor Bernard** asked that a copy be sent.

**Mr. Asher** committed he would follow up with Metro and make sure Mr. Otsyula had a copy. Ms. Wieghart would brief the Council on the project in 2 weeks. He asked explicitly that she address the questions raised about NEPA and requested something in writing for his Council. She committed to doing that if not before the meeting but certainly by the time of the meeting. It would be copied for Mr. Otsyula. He was not sure if that would necessarily address the concerns that Mr. Otsyula raised, but it was in Metro's court. There would be something forthcoming, and Mr. Asher was working to shepherd it along.

**Mr. Otsyula** clarified his concerns had to do with the alternatives. He added it was nice to see that Councilor Stone was back, and from the public point of view, he felt sorry for her at the last Council meeting.

**Councilor Stone** said he should not feel sorry for her because she was the one who got re-elected. She ran for office. She was looking through some things and did not see a response particularly to him. There was an August 27 letter from the City to Ms. Wieghart, Metro Project Manager, and then there was a letter from Mr. Otsyula to Mr.

**CITY COUNCIL REGULAR SESSION – OCTOBER 2, 2007**

**APPROVED MINUTES**

**Page 7 of 10**

Krochalis, the Region X Administrator, and a September 18 e-mail from Mr. Asher with an update to the City Council on this issue. She did not see any other response.

**Mr. Asher** said it was his understanding that the first letter was the Council's response to Mr. Otsyula.

**Councilor Collette** recalled the request was to forward his recommendation to Metro which was what the Council did in that letter which was handed to Mr. Otsyula at the last meeting.

**Councilor Stone** said all of this went to Ms. Wieghart about a month ago, so the City Council was waiting for her response.

**Mr. Otsyula** said a copy of that was not sent to him.

**Councilor Barnes** gave him her copy that night at the Council meeting.

**Mr. Otsyula** did get the copy from Councilor Barnes, but the Mayor said that night that a copy had been sent to him. He was clarifying.

**Councilor Stone** said he was only saying a copy had not been sent to him. The correspondence had not been getting to him contrary to popular belief.

**Councilor Collette** would make sure a copy was mailed.

**Mr. Otsyula** offered to pick it up at City Hall.

- **Rosemary Crites, Clackamas County**

**Ms. Crites** wanted to clarify the development in downtown Milwaukie. She was a commercial broker and had been behind both of the Parecki buildings. She felt strongly about private investment. Private investment was very expensive especially when there was no federal or state money or whatever. When you were dealing with Metro, they had really deep pockets. She would say to look at what you really want in Milwaukie. She went back to the original plan. Do you want it more institutionalized or do you want the private money and some really unique architecture plan? If you do, then those codes – she was being redundant – they needed to be tightened up now. She was looking at another project. When you negotiate the deal, it was very expensive. When you come to an agreement and the investors were in there but you do not have that final equation about the other permits, etc. that put a developer into a very bad position of going back and saying it was going to cost x amount of dollars. Was that clear? Going forward with the next project that will probably not include any government money, if those codes could be tightened so people would know exactly what was going to be required. When people got to the final agreement they knew what they were dealing with. She knew the City did not have any money. It was really important to get the right businesses in this town. One of the hottest neighborhoods around was N. Mississippi; it was hot and had some life to it. They had PDC money. She did not know what the City could come up with because it did not have the money. What can we do to help people? She was not here for Mr. Parecki. He did not know she was coming tonight. She was not teaming up with him. She was teaming up because she believed in this town. Help all of us to have a really concrete formula on how to reach their objectives so the City can reach its objectives and visualize the final project.

**Mayor Bernard** thought the City needed to look at an economic improvement district or tax increment financing (TIF). When someone bought a piece of land, they put in for a building permit and were handed the list of public improvements if it met the dollar threshold. Do people do that before they buy the property? When he talked about the North Main Village he recalled penciling out the how much the public improvements would cost before the property was purchased. The buyer knew he had to have a

certain amount of money. Is that not what happens when one walks into the department?

**Mr. Asher** wished it happened more regularly and with more diligence. It may happen more than we know because there was not a lot of downtown development. Part of the reason may be that there was not a lot of help to offer people downtown. In most places like Milwaukie there were more tools. More Main Streets had more public funds to help with the public part. Milwaukie's Plans said these improvements will come on the developer's nickel. He was not sure people realized that in a way Mayor Bernard suggested they might. He was not sure Mr. Parecki knew he would be in the other category that said it was not 10%. He was putting a lot of value into the building compared to what was there today, throwing him into the other category. There was a pre-application process that Mr. Parecki went through. This was presented to him months and months ago. As Milwaukie became more attractive to Ms. Crites's clients there will be more of that kind of dialogue between the City and prospective developers. Each new project brought more and more people interested in doing things here, and it cannot be prohibitive. On the other hand if we just got private development and nice architecture in these buildings and the state of Main Street stayed the same with dying trees and broken street grates and no shelters and so forth and the public realm was not improved by somebody or some combination, then the vision for this town would not happen, and the private investment would not happen. After all no one benefited more from those public area requirements than the private investors. Usually there was more of a dialogue. In Milwaukie it was not done a lot yet, and the City was not bringing a lot to the dance. Maybe the time was ripe for refining the way things were done.

**Councilor Stone** said whatever was done the City needed to take into account the private developer to encourage that kind of thing. Ms. Crites made a really good point. It was about envisioning the unique types of businesses that we want down here or everything could be cookie cut. People wanted some beautiful unique features to these buildings and unique businesses.

**Mr. Asher** understood people wanted that. He could speak from experience having shepherded the Town Center project through a year and one-half of planning and taking that committee through the process that the public wanted public space. Everyone on the committee recognized that no matter how the building turned out – gorgeous or funky or something else – they wanted public space with sidewalks that were wide with big, beautiful street trees and places to sit and meet. All of his negotiating on that deal was about getting the public space into the requirements with the expectation that the development would pay for all of that. The City had a good design review process that ensured some of that would happen. The public improvements were not as clear. They were desired in the community, and now the rubber was meeting the road about who would put them into place. It was painful for those who had to foot the bill because there were a lot of them. The Main Street plan was expensive. The Plan envisioned a nice, beautiful Main Street, and code tells us to try to implement it.

**Councilor Stone** asked, since the assessment was 10 years old, if a current assessment could be used since the application was already in the process.

**Mr. Asher** had Mr. Campbell checking into the datedness of the assessment. More problematic was whether or not some other methodology could be used. Mr. Parecki suggested appraised value rather than assessed value, but that was not promising. The code clearly said 'assessed value.' Staff was being responsive to some of the ideas being brought forward by Mr. Parecki, so that effort was slowing the process. He thought staff would have an answer from the City Attorney tomorrow.

**Mayor Bernard** said it was a common story of an old building that probably needed to be gutted and remodeled. Once you reached a certain point, the sidewalks and other

amenities needed to added. When he bought his building and gutted it, he had to rebuild the sidewalks and plant trees. His advantage was that he only had the frontage. Mr. Parecki was on the corner and had to do it all.

**Councilor Collette** said in some communities downtown business associations had funding access, and perhaps the Milwaukie Downtown Development Association (MDDA) might be reactivated. They had access to funds through the membership and downtown business associations.

**Mayor Bernard** added the MDDA was a taxing entity, and it was dissolved because the businesses did not feel they were getting anything out of it.

**Mr. Asher** said Mr. Campbell was getting businesses talking in downtown to discuss common interests. The City also had its Riverfront Park that needed funding, and there was no developer to turn to there.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

None scheduled.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **Council Reports**

**Councilor Collette** attended the League of Oregon Cities (LOC) Conference, and she commented on things she learned about downtown redevelopment and financing efforts around the state. She attended the Harmony Road Visioning session last week.

**Councilor Stone** attended the LOC conference in Bend and the Site Steering Committee for wastewater treatment.

**Councilor Loomis** attended the LOC conference and toured the Norm Scott property.

**Councilor Barnes** attended LOC Conference and met with County Administrator Mantay and County Commission Peterson regarding wastewater treatment.

**Mayor Bernard** attended the LOC Conference and was on a panel that discussed street maintenance funding. He would walk in the Portland Marathon next weekend and challenged residents to join him next year and lose weight for better health in 2008.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**It was moved by Councilor Collette and seconded by Councilor Stone to adjourn the meeting. Motion passed unanimously**

**Mayor Bernard** adjourned the regular session at 7:59 p.m.

*Pat DuVal*

---

Pat DuVal, Recorder