

AGENDA

MILWAUKIE CITY COUNCIL JUNE 19, 2007

MILWAUKIE CITY HALL
10722 SE Main Street

2008th MEETING

REGULAR SESSION – 7:00 p.m.

- I. **CALL TO ORDER**
Pledge of Allegiance
2. **PROCLAMATIONS, COMMENDATIONS, SPECIAL REPORTS, AND AWARDS**
 - A. **Drive Less/Save More Campaign (Pam Peck, Metro)**
 - B. **Transportation System Plan Update (Katie Mangle)**
3. **CONSENT AGENDA** *(These items are considered to be routine, and therefore, will not be allotted Council discussion time on the agenda. The items may be passed by the Council in one blanket motion. Any Council member may remove an item from the "Consent" portion of the agenda for discussion or questions by requesting such action prior to consideration of that portion of the agenda.)*
 - A. **City Council Minutes**
 1. **May 1, 2007 Work Session**
 2. **May 1, 2007 Regular Session**
 3. **May 15, 2007 Work Session**
 - B. **OLCC Application, Widmer Brothers Brewing Company, 1750 SE Ochoco Street**
 - C. **2007 – 2008 Blanket Purchase Orders -- Resolution**
 - D. **Annual Fee Schedule Update – Resolution**
4. **AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION** *(The Presiding Officer will call for statements from citizens regarding issues relating to the City. Pursuant to Section 2.04.140, Milwaukie Municipal Code, only issues that are "not on the agenda" may be raised. In addition, issues that await a Council decision and for which the record is closed may not be discussed. Persons wishing to address the Council shall first complete a comment card and return it to the City Recorder. Pursuant to Section 2.04.360, Milwaukie Municipal Code, "all remarks shall be directed to the whole Council, and the Presiding Officer may limit comments or refuse recognition if the remarks become irrelevant, repetitious, personal, impertinent, or slanderous." The Presiding Officer may limit the time permitted for presentations and may request that a spokesperson be selected for a group of persons wishing to speak.)*

5. **PUBLIC HEARING** *(Public Comment will be allowed on items appearing on this portion of the agenda following a brief staff report presenting the item and action requested. The Mayor may limit testimony.)*

Motion to Consider Continuation of Amendments to Milwaukie Municipal Code (MMC) Section 19.321.7 and 19.321.3 (Mike Swanson)

6. **OTHER BUSINESS** *(These items will be presented individually by staff or other appropriate individuals. A synopsis of each item together with a brief statement of the action being requested shall be made by those appearing on behalf of an agenda item.)*

- A. **Set Date for First Council Meeting in July 2007 – Resolution (Mike Swanson)**
B. **Council Reports**

7. **INFORMATION**

Riverfront Board Minutes of June 4, 2007

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

Public Information

- Executive Session: The Milwaukie City Council may meet in executive session immediately following adjournment pursuant to ORS 192.660(2).

All discussions are confidential and those present may disclose nothing from the Session. Representatives of the news media are allowed to attend Executive Sessions as provided by ORS 192.660(3) but must not disclose any information discussed. No Executive Session may be held for the purpose of taking any final action or making any final decision. Executive Sessions are closed to the public.

- For assistance/service per the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), please dial TDD 503.786.7555
- The Council requests that all pagers and cell phones be either set on silent mode or turned off during the meeting.



To: Mayor and City Council

Through: Mike Swanson, City Manager
Kenny Asher, Community Development and Public Works Director

From: Katie Mangle, Planning Director

Subject: Transportation System Plan Update Project Briefing

Date: June 8, 2007 for June 19, 2007 Regular Session

Action Requested

This is the third Council briefing on the City's current Transportation System Plan (TSP) Update project, and is for information only. No action is requested at this time

Background

TSP Update Project

The Transportation System Plan (TSP) is the City's long-term plan for transportation improvements in the city and includes a list of projects that could be implemented through the Capital Improvement Plan, development review, or grant funding. This TSP planning process has been a great opportunity for the community to define its transportation goals, and discuss how the whole transportation system can be improved to support livability in Milwaukie.

The process began in November 2006, and is approximately half of the way through.

Activities Update

Over the past few months, the project has made significant progress as the Advisory Committee, Working Groups, and City departments continue to gather and discuss the future of Milwaukie. Activity will continue at full-speed through the end of June, by which time all of the working groups will have made their recommendations on policies and projects to include in the TSP.

The following update summarizes some highlights of work completed since the last update: forecasting population and traffic growth, Working Group activity, and drafting of TSP chapters.

Forecasting Future Conditions

The Milwaukie Transportation System Plan (TSP) update addresses existing system needs and additional facilities that may be required to serve future growth. All Metro-area TSPs use Metro’s urban area transportation forecast model to determine future traffic volumes. This forecast model translates assumed land uses (as adopted in the City and County Comprehensive Plans) into person trips, selects travel modes, and assigns motor vehicles to the roadway network. Traffic engineers then use these traffic volume projections to identify potential roadway deficiencies, and evaluate alternative circulation improvements.

Land use is a key factor in developing a functional transportation system. The amount of land that is to be developed, the type of land uses, and how the land uses are mixed together directly relate to expected demands on the transportation system. Table 1 below summarizes anticipated growth in Milwaukie, based on land use assumptions for 2005 and 2030. These figures indicate that significant employment growth (approximately 3,400 jobs) is expected within the City of Milwaukie in the next 20 years. The model forecasts that most of these jobs will be located in existing commercially-zoned areas that are currently underutilized (downtown, the area around Providence hospital, and the King Road corridor). Table 2 summarizes the anticipated growth in households in the North Clackamas County area. Table 3 summarizes the anticipated growth in employment in the North Clackamas County area.

Table 1: Anticipated Growth in Milwaukie

Land Use	2005	2030	Increase	Percent Increase	Percent Increase per Year
Households	9,209	10,791	1,582	17%	<1%
Retail Employees	1,697	2,313	616	36%	1.4%
Service Employees	2,769	4,627	1,858	67%	2.7%
Other Employees	7,643	8,531	888	12%	0.5%

SOURCE: Metro

Table 2: Anticipated Growth in North Clackamas County Households

Households	2005	2030	Growth	% Growth
Milwaukie / Gladstone	14,324	16,152	1,828	13%
Clackamas Reg. Center	8,569	12,689	4,120	48%
East Sunnyside Road	4,157	5,067	910	22%
Clackamas Industrial Area	2,767	4,781	2,014	73%
Happy Valley	237	1,606	1,369	578%
Damascus / Boring	1,636	5,345	3,709	227%

SOURCE: Metro

Table 3: Anticipated Growth in North Clackamas County Employment

Employment	2005	2030	Growth	% Growth
Milwaukie / Gladstone	14,601	19,370	4,769	33%
Clackamas Reg. Center	26,303	42,647	16,344	62%
East Sunnyside Road	1,362	2,606	1,244	91%
Clackamas Industrial Area	11,602	23,124	11,522	99%
Happy Valley	85	387	302	355%
Damascus / Boring	1,278	9,762	8,484	664%

Assuming the anticipated growth shown in Tables 1 through 3, DKS, the City's consultant, then used the Metro traffic model to calculate forecasted internal, external, and through trips for all roadways within the City of Milwaukie in 2005 and 2030 (see Table 4). The much larger number of external than internal trips represents people who either live outside of Milwaukie and work in the city, or people who live in Milwaukie but work outside of the city.

Table 4: Milwaukie Vehicle Trip Distribution (2-Hour PM Period)

Trip Type	2005	2030	Delta
Internal (I – I)	9%	7%	- 2%
External (X– I or I - X)	46%	43%	- 3%
Through (X - X)	45%	50%	+ 5%

SOURCE: DKS Associates/Metro Regional Travel Demand Model

The next step in the process will be for DKS to examine the City's transportation system in detail. Assuming the forecasted changes, as outlined above, DKS will identify problem areas and assess which types of changes and investments will be needed to respond to the forecasted growth in traffic. The TSP Advisory Committee and Traffic

and Auto Circulation Working Group will review this work and advise the City on alternative investments.

Working Groups and Workshops

The TSP planning process includes six mode-specific Working Groups and Workshops. Work is underway for the following groups, but the following list summarizes some of the key issues addressed by each group and some key preliminary recommendations:

Pedestrian Solutions –

- Issues Discussed: The group discussed funding priorities with a primary focus on filling gaps in the sidewalk network throughout the city, but especially near schools.
- Key Recommendations: Participants developed a Pedestrian Master Plan of capital and operational investments the city should make to improve pedestrian access and safety.

Bicycle Solutions –

- Issues Discussed: The group discussed the desire to establish “bicycle boulevards,” a network of comfortable, connected bicycle routes on low traffic streets, improve connections to the Springwater Trail, and to improve signage and wayfinding on existing and new routes.
- Key Recommendations: Participants developed a Bicycle Master Plan list of capital and operational investments the city should make to improve bicycle access and safety.

Street Design Alternatives –

- Issues Discussed: Participants learned about Milwaukie’s need for more street design options and the wide variety of options available to the City (e.g. green streets, skinny streets, and traffic calming). They considered the pros and cons of different street treatments and participated in a visual preference survey to identify what they liked and disliked.
- Key Recommendations: Recommendations will include where different treatments should be applied and under what circumstances. They will also review and refine policies and action items related to street design.

Downtown Parking –

- Issues Discussed: Participants agreed that the City should adopt the Guiding Principles from the 2003 Downtown Parking and Traffic Management Plan into the TSP. They concurred with the policy that the priority for on-street parking is to serve visitors and customers to downtown Milwaukie.
- Key Recommendations: Recommendations will include code amendments that change the city’s parking requirements for development downtown, and policies about planning for a parking structure.

Transit Solutions –

- **Issues Discussed:** The Transit Solutions Working Group has focused on improvements that would significantly raise the quality of the downtown transit facilities and provide better east-west bus service, especially for the Hector Campbell neighborhood.
- **Key Recommendations:** New bus routes will be recommended for Railroad Avenue and Johnson Creek Boulevard, and frequent service is envisioned for Highway 224. The group is also discussing a recommendation about commuter rail or other transit options for crossing the Willamette in south Multnomah or north Clackamas county.

Freight Access –

- **Issues Discussed:** At the first meeting, participants reviewed the existing conditions map and commented on the relevant TSP goals. At a second meeting in May, participants provided comments on a problem and goal statement for possible improvements to freight access to the Milwaukie North Industrial area.
- **Key Recommendations:** Developing recommendations to improve freight access, particularly in the Hwy 99E/ Ochoco Street area.

Traffic & Auto Circulation Solutions –

- **Issues Discussed:** Participants reviewed the goals and policies related to the street network existing street network conditions including traffic volumes and intersection performance. They discussed the results of the forecast modeling for the year 2030, and considered alternative strategies for system improvements.
- **Key Recommendations:** The group will make recommendations regarding any changes to street classifications and street connectivity, and alternative approaches to managing traffic growth on Highway 224.

Draft Chapters of the Plan

DKS, the City's consultant, is currently working with staff to draft mode-specific chapters of the TSP, based on input from the Advisory Committee and Working Groups. All of the chapters will include the following elements to address the mode of transportation:

- A Master Plan that outlines all desired capital and operational improvements,
- A fiscally-constrained Action Plan that identifies high-priority improvements that are most likely to be achieved within forecasted funding sources,

A draft of each mode-specific chapter will be completed by June 30th (see Table 5 below for the status of TSP chapter preparation).

Table 5 - Milwaukie 2007 TSP Table of Contents

Chapter Title		City Review	Advisory Committee Review	Draft Posted on City Website
Chapter 1	User's Guide			
Chapter 2	Transportation Goals, Plans and Policies	√	√	√
Chapter 3	Existing Conditions	√	√	Pending
Chapter 4	Future Demand and Land Use	√	√	√
Chapter 5	Pedestrian Plan	√		
Chapter 6	Bicycle Plan	√		
Chapter 7	Public Transit Plan			
Chapter 8	Auto/Street Network Plan			
Chapter 9	Freight and Other Modes Plan (Air, Rail, Water, Pipeline)			
Chapter 10	Street Design	Pending		
Chapter 11	Neighborhood Traffic Management	Pending		
Chapter 12	Parking	√		
Chapter 13	Funding and Implementation Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definition of Financial and Regulatory Resources • Priorities 			
Chapter 14	Plan Implementation Recommendations for ordinance amendments (zoning, subdivision, public works construction standards)			

Upcoming Activities

In the next two months, staff will work with DKS, the City's consultant, to develop the following elements of the TSP:

- Identify needs for transportation programs and projects.
- Identify potential solutions for each transportation mode.
- Prepare draft Master Plans and Action Plans.
- Prepare for a public open house on July 12th to display the recommended Master Plans.
- Prioritize investments.

The TSP, which is an ancillary document to the Comprehensive Plan, is scheduled to come before the City Council for adoption at a public hearing in December 2007.

Concurrence

There is no action with which to concur.

Fiscal Impact

None. Staffing for the project is being managed within the adopted FY06-07 budget.

Work Load Impacts

Multiple departments are contributing to this project. Significant staff time will continue to be required to attain the high quality of public involvement that is necessary.

Alternatives

None at this time.

MINUTES

MILWAUKIE CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION

May 1, 2007

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

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

Staff Present: City Manager Mike Swanson, Community Development/Public Works Director Kenny Asher, Planning Director Katie Mangle

Cash Spot/South Downtown Redevelopment Discussion

Mr. Asher said the intent of this discussion was to consider the long-term vision for the Cash Spot site and development on the south end of downtown. There were a number of projects on that end of town that came into play including the Robert Kronberg Park improvements, the Kellogg Creek Restoration Project, the Riverfront Park design and development, light rail, and the Farmers' Market relocation. The property itself was being considered for a short-term lease arrangement with the operator of the Sternwheeler Rose. He discussed the importance of pedestrian and bike connections between the green spaces and downtown and noted the Cash Spot might be the hinge for all the projects.

Councilor Collette thought of that end of town in much the same way as it was shown on the Downtown Plan. With the Cash Spot site being below the level of Main Street there was potential for a parking structure of perhaps two stories. The Sternwheeler could have its offices on the on the McLoughlin Boulevard side along with other commercial. On the Main Street side at about the third level she saw a potential for a grocery store or other retail and possible a Farmers' Market with roll-up doors. She liked the idea of a plaza, and she talked with Mike Richardson about a downtown comic museum and creative niche spaces. She saw a potential for very nice condos that overlooked and connected to the park by a walkway and underpass. She pointed out potential locations for light rail stations.

Councilor Stone had an issue with a prime location like the Cash Spot being used for a parking garage because it might serve a better use. She was not adverse to a parking garage elsewhere in the downtown that was not on prime riverfront property. She liked the idea of the plaza but thought it might be more appropriate in the center of town. She supported linking the green spaces and having access to the Riverfront Park. She did not wish to put all outdoor activities at one end of town and would hope to spread it out a little more.

Councilor Loomis agreed with Councilor Collette and was in favor of taking advantage of two levels of parking. It would be overflow parking for Robert Kronberg Park, Riverfront Park, and the Farmers' Market. He would like to see commercial along 99E and access to the park.

Mayor Bernard's concepts were similar to Councilor Collette's, and he liked the idea of two-stories of parking. He hoped someday the Farmers' Market could afford something like the plaza and roll-up doors, but it was difficult for those kinds of operations to survive. Visibility from McLoughlin Boulevard was key, and putting it up in that area might be a problem. He still had a vision of putting the

Market on the riverfront and hoped that would work someday. He recommended working with the other business owner and hoped the City could sign a 3 to 5 year agreement with the Sternwheeler Rose.

Mr. Asher visited Dr. Boulari whom he found to be agreeable to being involved and at least talking with the City. He did like the location, and he had invested quite a bit of money in his building. Dr. Boulari understood the long-term vision would also include his corner and hoped to be involved.

Councilor Barnes liked much of what Councilor Collette had said; however, she would not be in favor of having a grocery store at that end of town. The big picture for her was the plaza with a water feature in the middle; the Farmers' Market vendors could set up around it. At other times of the year it could be a center for community events. She would like the City to find a niche that made sense and said this was Milwaukie.

Councilor Collette communicated with Dolly Macken-Hambright about having a cluster of small museums in Milwaukie. It was important to have a community discussion about what to do around the plaza.

Mr. Asher said anything would go through a community process, and this was the beginning of forming a collective vision in order to get the necessary funding.

Councilor Stone asked how many parking spaces there would be at the Cash Spot. Her concern was that as the downtown redeveloped parking needed to be figured out. Would there be a parking structure at the north end as well?

Mr. Asher did not believe the Downtown Plan showed the Cash Spot as structured parking. The light rail plan showed it as a 275-space parking structure, but he thought it would need to be more than that through a shared arrangement. One of the most critical things was site control and ownership. A private property owner would not build a public parking garage to replace the free on-street parking that existed right now. There was also the grade change from McLoughlin Boulevard to Main Street that opened up a number of possibilities. It made parking there a little more feasible than acquiring a site elsewhere. The economics would drive some of the decision-making, and a structure in that area could be an asset.

Mayor Bernard thought it was important to begin thinking about how to raise the money for building such a structure. He noted access to the parking structure would likely need to be on Main Street and not on Washington.

Mr. Asher added a lot would be learned through the SDEIS process for the light rail project. No one knew at this time where the park-and-ride would end up on the alignment, but this was one that would be studied for traffic impacts and access issues. The next parking workshop would be on May 31, and he encouraged people to attend.

Councilor Collette suggested extending the third level, which was about even with Main Street all the way to McLoughlin Boulevard. The parking could be hidden by a narrow strip of commercial.

MOU Negotiations with Metro and Main Street Partners Regarding Redevelopment of the Town Center Site

Mr. Asher felt the Council would learn a lot from this presentation, and he wanted to know from the Council what it cared most about as the parties entered into negotiations. There were 10 points the Advisory Committee wanted staff to follow up on with the developer, and the Council added four more at its previous

meeting. He urged Council to probe those areas it cared most about so they would get the proper attention.

Mr. Swanson and Mr. Asher reviewed what had taken place at the previous Council meeting, and one of the things they talked about was the Committee process. Sitting through the developers' presentations before the Committee was a unique experience because it helped him understand. The reason he got it was because of their approach, and Main Street Partners' was a unique response to a unique piece of property. It was not a pattern that a thousand other people had done. Mr. Swanson had seen the uniqueness of this proposal and its relationship to City Hall and everything else surrounding it. Mr. Kemper and Mr. Skov handed over the vision to the Myhre Group that translated it into what he considered an exciting project.

Mr. Kemper was frustrated at the previous Council meeting because he had not been able to share his vision of the project. People had differing views about how well North Main Village came out, and there were certainly some things he would change going forward. His sense was that he would like to build on that success, and in few more months the rest of the units would be sold and space leased. He asked for feedback from the Council on what it might do differently. The new project would be all a for sale ownership project and would be a step up from the North Main Village project in a major way.

Mike McLaughlin, Myhre Group, described the project and the site in relationship to the rest of the downtown. There were vehicular issues relating to McLoughlin Boulevard and Harrison Street. The scale along Main Street was much more pedestrian oriented with City Hall directly across the street. The primary views were to the west and southwest, and the higher up in the building there would be view opportunities to the east. There were commercial areas on the first level and residential above. He felt it was important to step the building down toward Main Street to fit with the scale and significance of City Hall. McLoughlin Boulevard was a very busy road, so it made sense to put the mass along that side of the project as well as take advantage of some of the Willamette River views. This was a full-block project, and it was clear to him this needed to be a 3-dimensional design solution that was interesting from all sides. To step back from that, Milwaukie did not have full-block projects at this scale. A monolithic building on this site would not fit in, so he wanted to break down the scale to fit with the existing downtown buildings. The design put the significant bar along McLoughlin Boulevard with its four-story element with a step back to the fifth floor. From a pedestrian experience he wanted it perceived as one building, and from the Main Street side it would be perceived as two separate buildings to break the scale down and relate to City Hall. He showed a 'bird's eye view' of the design that showed plaza space on the roof of the fourth floor accessible from the penthouse level. It had a common courtyard that happened on the second floor. The structure was terraced down on both ends to provide a visual connection from the sidewalk to the courtyard and from the courtyard to the sidewalk. His intent was to make this a 3-dimensional building with no front or back. There was retail on Main Street and commercial interest along McLoughlin Boulevard. Access to the resident parking lot was from Jackson Street only. The condos were two-level townhouse styles and others were flats with the living space all on one level. The fifth floor was four penthouse units with outdoor spaces surrounding them. He showed a perspective from Main and Jackson of how the design stepped down from McLoughlin Boulevard to Main Street. Stepping the fifth floor back minimized the visual impact.

Mr. McLaughlin discussed the Main Street side of the buildings. City Hall was very symmetrical, and the façade of the Town Center development was also designed in that manner. One unit was pulled out to provide some relief and public space and widen the sidewalk. Right on axis with the entry point to City Hall, there was a landscaped focal point and public access with outdoor seating. That broke down the scale of the building into something more comparable in width to City Hall. Each of the elements was articulated in a series of five volumes similar to City Hall, and some cues were picked up from the windows that were divided into thirds.

In this plan there were entry points on all four sides of the building that helped add to the 3-dimensional interest. There were retail entrances along Main Street and commercial entrances on McLoughlin Boulevard. The residential entrances were on Harrison and Jackson Streets. He pointed out the breezeway and courtyard which was 12-feet from the property line and 18-feet wide. Mr. McLaughlin wanted to give the building a proud presence but did not want it to be overbearing, so he pulled the foreground elements off the corner and used them to accent the residential entry point. Between the flats and the two-story townhomes on Main Street the terrace stepped down to the public sidewalk. The rectangular element was skewed slightly to acknowledge the view upstream. In the solar analysis it was found that by stepping the building down to Main Street there was negligible difference between the 3-story element as far as how much light was cast on the Main Street sidewalk.

Main Street Partners had done some additional development since the RFP, and he showed the character study of the Main Street public space that was pushed back 12-feet and was 18-feet wide to provide the focal point on axis with City Hall. There would be a similar treatment with the landscape and water feature that came off the roof.

Mayor Bernard understood the public space could be used by a store or restaurant for outdoor seating.

Mr. McLaughlin said the facing materials were concrete and wood. The courtyard would be for the tenants, but he wanted a strong visual connection from the sidewalk to the private space. The water features would collect rainwater from the roof and take them through the courtyard at either end and cascade down the terraced elements. The blocks shown in the drawing were placeholders for art elements. The final board was a hardline drawing of the first floor in more detail and showed more right-of-way improvements. He was looking into the opportunity of angle parking to help add more stalls. The lane widths would be reduced but would not be less than what existed on Harrison Street, plus it could slow traffic. That was just a discussion item. Finally, he showed a series of Main Street photographs stitched together to show how the building would fit in. He discussed breaking down the mass from the pedestrians' perspective.

Mayor Bernard appreciated the presentation because it gave him a better idea of how the building would fit with City Hall and Main Street.

Councilor Stone asked if the concrete was textured. That was not her favorite element of the project – just the plain concrete. She would prefer something like stone to warm it up a little.

Mr. Kemper said there had been a discussion of doing stone up to a certain level to create a better feel. The inspiration was several buildings in the Pearl that had the concrete face. That was why North Main Village was done the way it was.

He understood architecture was a difficult issue because everyone had different opinions making it difficult to reach consensus. Over the years North Main Partners had gravitated toward modern architecture. In creating housing units there were two key elements – high ceilings and big windows. The units at North Main Village felt much larger than they actually were because of that. Materials to mitigate what some saw as the bluntness of modern architecture could be discussed. It would be a cost issue to work through. There will be a lot of process to go through with the Design and Landmarks Committee, Planning Commission, and City Council having to do with some proposed code changes. He did not want the City Council to lose sight of the articulation with different shapes and structures. Modern architecture allowed one to do that more than a traditional venue.

Mr. McLaughlin added there was a view opportunity to the east from the upper floors. Keeping the roof forms relatively low helped take advantage of the views from the fourth and fifth floors. The roofs were low-sloped – not flat -- and offered a more appealing view from the upper floors. It was a functional issue of people being able to look to the east and not have to look down on true flat roofs. The roof form along Main Street helped tie back into what one saw in the geometry of City Hall across the street. Regarding the eaves, the design guidelines addressed interesting silhouettes on the buildings. In his opinion having those pop out added a lot of visual interest to the form of the building.

Councilor Stone did not want Milwaukie to become a mini-Pearl District. It was a unique town, and the downtown was prime real estate. She felt it should be as unique as possible and not be a transplant of something else. It needed to be in a scale that fit with the acreage of downtown. She had some concerns about the scale of the project on the McLoughlin Boulevard side. She did not want it to overpower the block. It was something to keep in mind.

Mr. Kemper replied from Main Street Partners' standpoint one of the charges was to come up with enough density in a mixed use village. The place to put the density was along McLoughlin Boulevard primarily because of the views. Main Street Partners did not want to create an overpowering structure across the street from City Hall. If they were going to push density, then they were going to push it on McLoughlin Boulevard.

Councilor Stone thought that would still obstruct the view from City Hall.

Mr. Kemper said the intent was to protect and be respectful of Main Street since it was the center of downtown. That was the purpose in pushing the mass to the other side.

Councilor Stone liked the idea of keeping it pushed down so the river views were open all along McLoughlin Boulevard and Main Street. Back from that one could increase height. This was not the last of downtown development, and she did not want to block River views.

Councilor Collette understood Councilor Stone wanted the height behind 21st Avenue, but that would almost mean parking lots or one-story buildings all along McLoughlin Boulevard.

Mr. Kemper noted that the zoning code required 3-stories along McLoughlin Boulevard. In his mind given what McLoughlin Boulevard was it made sense to push density against it. Main Street Partners was trying to create a pedestrian feeling along Main Street. It would be difficult to do any kind of pedestrian-oriented development on McLoughlin Boulevard. It was his personal view that people would not want to sit outside along McLoughlin Boulevard. He felt people

would live along McLoughlin Boulevard for the views. There were windows that blunted the sound and systems to muffle the traffic noise. The view will be fantastic, and he commented on the view from the 4th floor apartment at North Main Village. From a developer's perspective, he felt density should be created where there was that kind of view.

Councilor Stone was looking 20 years down the road and what would be downtown. If things were tall enough in the east there would still be an opportunity for a view.

Councilor Loomis appreciated the presentation, and it was very helpful to have Main Street Partners step through the process and soften the blow. He was not too sure about the overhangs. He asked if there would be a model.

Mr. Kemper replied it was a function of how much Myhre would charge him.

Councilor Loomis was concerned about having a signature, landmark building. He wanted something one did not see everywhere else. He asked if this building would be like an avocado green refrigerator in 20 years.

Mr. Kemper had talked with Dark Horse about a large cartoon character on the building that related to their business and then put their museum activity on the ground floor. He asked how signature a landmark the Council was willing to accept.

Councilor Loomis thought Mr. Kemper was on the right track but there needed to be discussion. He would want something that was attractive and interesting.

Councilor Collette thought the Dark Horse horse's head might be a beautiful sculpture if the company decided to have a museum there.

Mr. Asher said one of the items on his list was to ensure there was Council check in, and he recommended doing one in June before the final proposed MOU came before Council. The MOU was basically a letter of intent expressing the business terms.

Mr. Kemper was trying to think of the best way to present the vertical housing element to the Council.

Mr. Asher suggested doing that as part of the check-in. He did not anticipate anything radically different in this design from what was allowed, but there would be a pre-application with the planners.

Mr. Kemper discussed the CC&Rs about what people could put on their balconies and suggested the Council could make some conditions.

Mayor Bernard adjourned the work session at 6:57 p.m.

Pat DuVal, City Recorder

**CITY OF MILWAUKIE
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
May 1, 2007**

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Bernard called the 2005th meeting of the Milwaukie City Council to order at 7:00 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers.

Present: Council President Susan Stone and Councilors Deborah Barnes, Carlotta Collette, and Joe Loomis

Staff present: City Manager Mike Swanson, Planning Director Katie Mangle, Community Services Director JoAnn Herrigel, Community Development & Public Works Director Kenny Asher, Library Director Joe Sandfort.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Swanson announced that the City Attorney had been excused from the meeting pursuant to Resolution 09-2003.

PROCLAMATIONS, COMMENDATION, SPECIAL REPORTS AND AWARDS

A. Safety Break Proclamation

Mayor Bernard read a proclamation recognizing May 10, 2007 as Workplace Safety Awareness Day.

B. Recognize Offgoing Board and Commission Members

The City Council recognized Pat Lent and Pat Healy for their service to the community as members of the Library Board. Ms. Lent served from September 2003 to April 2007, and Mr. Healy served from May 1999 to April 2007.

C. Transportation System Plan Update

Ms. Mangle reported she would review the results of the March Transportation System Plan (TSP) survey and provide an overview of the new TSP goals. Many of the questions in the survey had to do identifying the goals and what the vision of a great transportation system would mean for the City. The TSP was a 20-year transportation plan for the City that was being done through extensive community outreach that began in the fall. There was an advisory committee that included 15 citizens and business owners as well as seven working groups. For those not able to attend meetings, a web-based survey was posted during the month of March. There were also paper copies available, but none were returned. The Library had a terminal dedicated to those wishing to take the survey online. 158 people responded to the 12-question survey.

She reviewed the outreach efforts. This was not a scientific survey, and a self-selecting group completed it. The intent was to identify the goals, what a great transporaton system should look like, and how the City should spend its money. Most of the respondents (85%) lived in the 97222 zip code. There was a good spread of responses from all areas of the City. 37% of the respondents were under 35 years of age which

was not a demographic that came to a lot of the meetings. The number of men and women respondents was about equal. Half of the respondents owned property in the City, and only 4% were renters. Most of the respondents got around by car and traveled six miles or more meaning they left the City. People identified the need for improvement in the alternative transportation modes – biking, transit, or walking. Few respondents felt dissatisfied with the transportation system. Question 9 asked what the three highest priorities should be for the City. The highest priorities were improving the alternative modes – enhanced transit and completing existing streets by adding improvements to pedestrian access and drainage. Question 10 was the essay question and full responses were in the appendix. Question 11 asked people how they would spend \$10 on transportation. People identified completing the existing system for alternative modes, building light rail, enhancing pedestrian and bike connections, and revitalizing downtown with a parking structure. Question 12, an essay question, asked people how they would know if a good job was done. The survey results plus other information would be presented to the Advisory Committee on May 16.

Councilor Barnes noted this echoed Mr. Hales' survey, and it was rewarding to see consistency in the comments. It seemed the City was getting good data from which to work.

Ms. Mangle reported the TSP update effort was funded by a grant from the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), and it was scheduled for City Council adoption in December. The Advisory Committee included residents and business owners, and it would meet again on May 16. The group spent a lot of time talking about goals for the TSP. In the 1997 Plan there were goals for each mode such as walking and biking. The purpose of transportation was to serve other needs, so the goals were revised to fit with the theme of what a great transportation system would mean for Milwaukie. Sidewalks, for example, were built to make the community more livable and to offer more transportation choices. She reviewed the nine goals, which were not in priority order: livability, safety, provide travel choices, quality design that supported community character, reliability and mobility, sustainability, efficient and innovative funding, compatibility, and economic vitality. All of the goals would be incorporated in Chapter 2 of the TSP and supported by more detailed policies. The working groups and Advisory Committee were using these nine points as guidelines as they considered the transportation system in more detail.

Ms. Mangle referred to Attachment 3 that was a series of maps showing existing conditions. The next round of maps would show future conditions. Figure 3-1b showed the intersection study areas. The next map showed the sidewalk inventory that would be a helpful tool for connecting existing sidewalk. Figure 3-5 indicated transit routes and shelters and showed pockets that were under-served meaning they were more than ¼-mile from the nearest bus stop. Figure 3-8 showed the posted speed inventory, and she noted that most streets were 25 mph. Figure 3-11c showed the historic comparison of some of the 24-hour count volumes over the past 10 years. All of this work was being used and reviewed by the various working groups. Members were interested in learning about the backgrounds and technical information and offered a lot of creative ideas and suggestions. The bike/pedestrian group, for example, looked at the TSP and noted many of the connections had not been made, but people showed up with a lot of positive energy and creative ideas. Many of the cycling projects were not capital projects and had more to do with signage. The working groups would continue meeting through the end of June, and shortly after that there would be an open house. Growth in Clackamas County would also be a factor. Projects would be prioritized based on available funding. All meetings have been open to the public. The City received a generous grant in excess of \$125,000 that allowed this kind of in depth work, and the consultant had to complete the bulk of his work by June 30.

Councilor Loomis appreciated the sidewalk inventory, and he was surprised the City did not have it before.

Councilor Stone also liked the maps and especially the sidewalk one. They were all very interesting and showed what work needed to be done in the future. She noted King Road and 32 Avenue were not included in 24-hour volume counts. She asked if the traffic count locations were similar.

Ms. Mangle replied those locations were chosen because the data was easy to find, and she thought the methodology would be the same. There was 24-hour data as well as full intersection data for many more intersections that she would share.

Councilor Stone asked if the goals were in order of importance. If they had to be in order of importance she would add sustainability and compatibility. Livability and safety were her top priorities.

Ms. Mangle responded the goals were not in order of importance, and the Committee, although the members understood that might be the perception, it was not the intent.

Councilor Collette noted the livability goal referred to Milwaukie's established neighborhoods and business community. While new development in the downtown area was in the Historic Milwaukie Neighborhood, she saw those as new neighborhoods. She suggested deleting the word 'established' and simply refer to Milwaukie's neighborhoods. In goal 6 she was not clear about what it meant to facilitate the needs of future generations. She suggested shortening it to 'meet present and future needs'. Other than those comments, she felt the goals were very good.

Councilor Loomis noted the 24-hour count went down on Johnson Creek Boulevard. One of his pet peeves was the island put in at the Springwater Trail because traffic backed up. A majority of cars were turning onto Johnson Creek Boulevard toward 82nd Avenue. That one little island prevented people from turning to keep the flow of traffic going. There was less traffic but more backups.

Councilor Stone agreed there needed to be a right-turn lane.

Councilor Loomis commented that there used to be a good flow of traffic for people who wanted to turn right, but they cannot get around now because of the painting on the opposite side of the street at the stop light. People were pushed too far to the right. There was room for two lanes, and it would give traffic a better flow.

D. Clackamas Community College Harmony Campus Update

Shelly Parini, Clackamas Community College Foundation Director and Dean of College Advancement, talked about the School's successes. The College was about to celebrate its 40th year of service and had over 31,000 students with only 5,000 full-time. Many students worked and went to school part time, and there were a growing number of non-credit students interested in customized training and community education.

Nicole Hoffman was a nursing student at Clackamas Community College and would graduate this year. She discussed the programs and quality training opportunities available through the health sciences department at affordable prices. She hoped the Milwaukie City Council would support the Harmony Campus expansion plan. There was a growing need to train health care professionals to accommodate retirements.

Ms. Parini addressed the facility needs and talked in detail about the health care needs. The current building was constructed in 1952 and was acquired by Clackamas Community College in 1989. The structure was about at the end of its useful, efficient life. The Clackamas Health Care Blue Ribbon Committee was formed to develop a 20-year road map for growing the health care industry in Clackamas County. The health care profession urged the College to help address the workforce issues in a critical

CITY COUNCIL REGULAR SESSION – MAY 1, 2007

DRAFT MINUTES

Page 3 of 9

manner. This facility would be in a concentrated area that included Kaiser Permanente, Providence Milwaukie, Legacy, and Willamette Falls.

Kurt Pherson reported construction of the 3-story 47,000 square foot building would begin this summer. The first floor would house student services, a computerized testing lab, and faculty offices. On the second floor there would be a nursing lab with 12 patient beds. He pointed out the existing site with the aquatic center, OIT, and Toys R Us with the Phase 1 building in the center. It would connect with the Phase 2 building via a sky bridge. The building would include features for energy savings in electrical and mechanical systems.

Ms. Parini said the College took a \$20 million loan to build the 3-story building and would honor its obligations to nursing and allied health. They would be looking at Phase 2 in the future to address customized training. The allied health building would open fall 2008. She discussed the outreach program with the Linwood Neighborhood, County Planning Organizations (CPO), the Chamber of Commerce, and groundbreaking on May 19.

CONSENT AGENDA

It was moved by Councilor Barnes and seconded by Councilor Collette to approve the consent agenda that consisted of the City Council Minutes of March 20, 2007 Regular Session. Motion passed unanimously. [5:0]

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

- **Carol Damm, Portland**

Ms. Damm, Portland Waldorf School Board Vice President, talked about the transportation system project. For the record the School strongly supported public transportation; however, it was very concerned about the proposal to have light rail go directly behind the School. They asked that the City in conjunction with Metro consider an alternative alignment to the proposed alignment and that this be included in the environmental impact study. She looked forward to continuing to work with the neighborhoods and the City on the best solution for bringing light rail to Milwaukie. She provided the Council with a detailed position statement from the Board as well as the questions submitted to Metro. The Board had not heard back from Metro as yet.

- **Beth Wasko, Milwaukie**

Ms. Wasko lived in the Lake Road community and supported public transportation. She was interested in the continued study of what was best for Milwaukie. That was where her heart was. She was at the recent community meeting and was surprised how far into the process we already were. She did not know that. She talked to her Lake Road neighbors, and whether or not they should be aware, they were not. They did not get it. People thought they were going to get to vote again, and she was not clear that was how it was going to proceed. She asked that there be time to discuss other alternatives other than the locally preferred alternative (LPA). She would like to see whatever was chosen for public transportation to stay on McLoughlin Boulevard all the way through the City. That was not being considered right now. The Lake Road Neighborhood had not had time to discuss that and would like to have time. She was not there to represent any opinions. The only consensus was, 'wow what is going on?'

- **Larry Werre, Milwaukie**

Mr. Werre resided at North Main Village, and he had two issues. He had concerns about teen activity in the Park, and he had seen them going behind the rock wall that

used to be a fountain to do drugs and drink. They were underage kids being given liquor by people who were old enough to buy it. His main concern was the parking on the west side of the complex. Nelson's Nautilus and the Library both had issues as did the apartment. At the time he purchased his townhouse nothing was said about the apartments being affordable housing or low-income housing. In the earlier presentation they said people who bought the condos would have restrictions on what they could put on their decks, but how could they do that when they could not police the apartments? He lived there and enjoyed it. He moved to Milwaukie from Lake Oswego. He wanted Milwaukie because it was the place to be. These people have taken the happiness away from the area he chose to live in because of the abuse the apartment people were allowing to go on. It was not being maintained or managed properly. In the presentation it was nice to hear about the new building downtown, but there was never any mention about parking. Parking was a big issue. Out of a 130 comments more than 25 addressed parking issues in downtown Milwaukie. By building the proposed unit without adequate parking – and this was the modern day in age when most people had one car. Each affordable apartment had one allotted parking space, but people played musical parking spaces. They parked at Nelson's; they parked at the Library and on the streets. They knew exactly how to run the system because it is not being managed. If this new complex were not managed, it would have the same problem. Downtown Milwaukie was a hidden spot. It had a lot of potential but only if people worked together to meet that potential and were concerned about one another. He did not think the mixture of the low-income units with townhouses that cost \$350,000 was working. He was actually subsidizing people living in those units. He did not know it when he moved in. There were no brochures on affordable housing mixed in with condos, flats, and townhouses. He knew the new area being developed would not be affordable housing. He thought the affordable housing would be for one-year like the Pearl District and then turned over, but this was a 40-year program. Managed and maintained it could work but only if that was done. It would behoove everyone to work together to see that these problems did not occur. He understood the developer knew there were going to be parking problems and could have corrected that in the beginning by having a few less apartments but chose not to do so. He was afraid that would also happen in the new area if not policed by the City Council.

- **Ed Parecki, Milwaukie business owner**

Mr. Parecki had begun demolition on the interior of a Main Street building. He had many of the same concerns as Mr. Werre about the proposed Town Center project. It was important that the City hear his questions. He hoped the City Council would address his questions and come up with answers that meant something and create some solutions. He went through his questions for the record. He received a letter from the City this evening at 7 p.m. but had not had a chance to read through it. He did not want the issues to die just because he received a response. He wanted his questions to spark some interest in the community. Question #1 – if Main Street Partners was offering \$250,000 for the purchase of the land, will the City transfer its existing liability for any environmental cleanup to the Main Street Partners? As people were aware the IGA (intergovernmental agency [sic] agreement) put the City at risk for any environmental impact on that site. He received an environmental impact report from the building he just purchased, and that site was contaminated. There was an existing tank still on the old Texaco site. Most people were not aware of that fact, and he could show people the report he received for his building. Renderings of the McLoughlin Boulevard side of the project showed autos on the street. Was Main Street Partners going to increase the width of the street to allow for parking? Number 3 was has there been a traffic study performed to ascertain the overall impact on City streets and throughways? There would be at a minimum an additional 983 daily trips generated in the immediate area. Would the intersections be able to handle the increase in volume? Why would a

CITY COUNCIL REGULAR SESSION – MAY 1, 2007

DRAFT MINUTES

Page 5 of 9

traffic study not be done before even considering any kind of project at that site to see what the impact could be/would be? Question 4 was what procedure would the developer go through to acquire variances on existing code? How many variances will be required? Will the City create yet another special zone so the developer could do as he wished? It was very easy to develop property when you just meet the code. You do not need to ask for variances. How many handicapped spaces would be included in the parking space proposal? How would building a five-story building on McLoughlin Boulevard and only a three-story building on Main Street be respecting City Hall? What will be the impact to Main and McLoughlin Boulevard intersections with autos entering and leaving mid-block on Jackson and Harrison? What part of the downtown plan did this project address? We already lost a TriMet bus transit center to the North Main Project. We can no longer establish a grocery store anchor as planned per the downtown plan. He did not see how the Main Street plaza zone could be built with the ownership of that block. Main Street Partners' current retail spaces remained vacant after six months. Advantis Credit Union's Main Street retail space remained vacant for over three years and was finally leased as ground floor office. What made Main Street Partners think this project would be any different? Main Street Partners started asking \$20 per square foot for retail space; they are now asking \$15. He did not know how much lower it could go, but it was not good. Was it ever asked if there needed to be development on this site? Did public input play any part in the City Council's decision to proceed? Has anyone looked at the North Main Village renderings and compared them to the real thing? Pretty pictures were just pictures. The real thing was what really counted. Could this discrepancy happen again especially since this was the same developer? Why would Metro spend over \$750,000 of public money to purchase the site and accept only \$250,000 from the developer? If according to Mr. Asher it was customary for developers not to pay for land, why would Main Street Partners offer the \$250,000? What did the City gain by giving away its land for this development? What effect did tax abatement have on the City's revenue? What was the impact to the Sunday Market and would Main Street Partners have to mitigate the impact in any way? What was the impact of displacing the existing parking spaces and would Main Street Partners be required to mitigate that impact? Please consider those questions thoughtfully when talking about the MOU and get some answers that meant something.

Mayor Bernard noted that Tory Miller of Nelson's Nautilus had signed up to speak but had left the meeting. He and Mr. Miller had talked about the need to repair the fence and how to do that in partnership with Mr. Werre. Mr. Miller also had problems with people parking in his lot, and Mayor Bernard understood Nelson's would aggressively tow cars.

- **Scott Churchill, Milwaukie**

Mr. Churchill spoke on behalf of the Historic Milwaukie Neighborhood District Association (NDA). Chair Dion Shepard was in Texas and asked Mr. Churchill to read the NDA position statement on her behalf as chair. "After last Thursday night's light rail meeting at the Portland Waldorf School, the Historic Milwaukie Neighborhood Association members have had an opportunity to better understand what is being considered by the City of Milwaukie, Metro, and TriMet with this current proposal to bring light rail into Milwaukie. The proposed alignment through our neighborhood created a grave concern for all of us impacting both the safety and livability of our neighborhood. The consensus of the residents of the Neighborhood Association was that light rail should stop north of downtown along McLoughlin/99 and Hwy 224 making it easily accessible to riders while also preserving the historic nature of the community. We strongly encourage the City of Milwaukie and its regional partners to consider other alternative alignments such as Hwy 99 McLoughlin using existing transportation

corridors as well as other alternatives to light rail. Respectfully, Dion Shepard, Chair of the Historic Milwaukie Neighborhood Association.”

- **Susanna Pai, Milwaukie**

Lake Road Neighborhood Association Chair Debby Patten was ill and asked that Ms. Pai comment on the light rail meeting last Thursday. The members want a study, but did they really understand the question. Ms. Patten had been sick a lot because she worked downtown near the light rail construction. She said that the noise and dust tremendously impacted her. They talked to the neighbors but did not have a good chance to take a survey. They wanted to ask them to hold off on the study and give them a chance to talk to their neighbors. As Ms. Wasko said a lot of the neighbors do not know what was going on. She did not intend to point fingers at anyone. Metro and TriMet had been trying really hard to improve the environment. However, was their thinking compatible to what residents were thinking? They wanted a chance to talk to the neighbors and in their way take a survey and ask a lot of people who did not come forward and speak up to at least put down what they wanted to do. Hopefully they would not waste a lot of time doing a lot of surveys that had no impact to the neighborhood and of no understanding.

Mayor Bernard commented there was a display of the alternatives at the Farmers’ Market community booth for the entire summer, but now no one seemed to know where the preferred alternative was.

Ms. Pai said people did not really understand. The whole point was that a lot of citizens in Lake Road did not understand. They had no concept that this would go on Lake Road. They were not trying to point fingers at anyone. A lot of people were not good communicators. They did not understand and were not speaking up as they should. You can tell from the Neighborhood meetings that a lot of them were not showing up. They were not like us who were actually participating. They really did not understand. Instead of letting them get angry and frustrated, they would like to have a chance to do a survey. They had a plan in mind and would run through it in the May meeting. She hoped to get the survey out and knock on each door and have them fill out the survey. Hopefully some of them would actually speak up and understand what they were doing.

Mayor Bernard said he was still confused. He had worked the Farmers’ Market all summer long, walked the entire neighborhood, and talked to people in almost every household during his political campaigns. He had been to numerous events. There was a survey. He gave citizens credit for being intelligent and understanding what was going on. It was typical that someone comes up and says they did not hear about something. Thousands go through the Farmers’ Market on a weekend, and hundreds stop at the community booth. The information was posted, and Ms. Pai had volunteered at the booth.

Ms. Pai worked at the Market, but there were a lot of people who were not happy with the light rail. Half of the people who completed the TSP survey were driving. There was a reason why they were driving. They were not happy with the transportation system. There was a way to make alternative transportation work without having to put in light rail and tearing up the streets.

Councilor Collette understood Ms. Pai’s comments that many people did not know what was going on. She was concerned that a survey would not necessarily inform people; it was like a vote. She knew people had asked for a vote, but all one could do was to say ‘yes’ or ‘no’ about something one still did not really understand. The purpose of both the TSP process and all those meetings and SDEIS was to get the information out, listen to the people, find out the impacts, and study the alternatives. That was the whole point of the study and was why it took so long to get the information

out and work with the community and neighborhoods. You do not get it just looking at a map. To just ask people if they want this big scary thing without giving information probably would have most people saying they did not want it.

Ms. Pai said the point was that if it scared them, then why would we want to do it.

Councilor Collette said change is not always just about us. Change was about the future and giving options to people who were afraid of change. Sometimes decisions needed to be made for the next several generations.

Ms. Pai said the point was we all live happily together. If the neighbors do not want that change, then why are they being forced to change.

Councilor Collette replied many people would not be here in 20 to 30 years.

Ms. Pai said then those who are here should have the choice to make that change. If they are here, then they are the right to make the choice. She was concerned about the street being torn up for 5 – 10 years, and those people living here have to suffer through that. That was why they were not happy with that.

Councilor Stone agreed with Councilor Collette that unless there was a presentation, people would not have a lot of information.

Ms. Pai did not intend to do that. She wanted to make people aware that it was important to speak up.

Councilor Stone suggested making people aware of upcoming meetings.

Ms. Pai replied the whole idea was to make people understand this would affect them, and they needed to speak up.

Councilor Collette added it was important to let people know they needed to be informed by coming to the meetings.

Councilor Barnes suggested if people in those NDAs did not feel they had enough information there was staff that would be more than willing to present facts and information. Instead of a survey, she recommended inviting staff to come to a meeting.

Ms. Pai wanted to do both. People needed to know so they would have a choice. There was so much information around, but they were just not getting it. They needed to come to the meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING – None scheduled.

OTHER BUSINESS

A. Naming for North Clackamas Park Stream

Ms. Herrigel requested that the City Council approve a proposed name for a stream located at North Clackamas Park. One of the natural features in the Park was a small creeklette that separated the north and south areas of the site. She provided a map of the Park and indicated the creeklette that for many years had been referred to as a ditch or swale. During the ballfield construction, this segment got a lot of attention from the Friends of North Clackamas Park. Dick and Sally Shook recommended that the creeklette be named so it was not overlooked. The Park and Recreation Board (PARB), Lake Road NDA, the Friends group, and the Stewardship Committee all supported the renaming proposal. If the Milwaukie City Council approved the proposal, the Shooks would take the proposal to the District Advisory Board. After that it would go to the Oregon Geographic Names Board.

It was moved by Councilor Barnes and seconded by Councilor Collette to approve a proposed name 'Camas Creek' for a stream located at North Clackamas Park. Motion passed unanimously. [5:0]

Mr. Shook said the Ms. Shook was on the Stewardship Committee that would be helping with master planning the north half. They were considering the Camas Creek stream bed as the featured wetland.

B. Council Reports

Councilor Loomis reported on the grand opening of the North Clackamas Park ballfields.

Councilor Stone attended the Site Selection Committee meeting for the wastewater treatment plant, and the group hoped to have a site selected by June/July 2008. She attended a farewell reception for Providence Milwaukie Hospital CEO Jackie Gaines. She attended the South Corridor Phase 2 meeting at the guitar store, the ballfield grand opening, and City Hall day at the State Capitol. The Council had another teambuilding retreat with Dr. Bill Grace on Saturday. She would attend a luncheon benefiting the Children's Center of Clackamas County. The Neighborhood cleanup was May 5, and Ardenwald was planning for its 3rd Annual Secret Garden Tour on June 30.

Councilor Collette had done many of the same things and was reviewing candidates for Clackamas Community College president. She attended the Blue Ribbon Health Committee meetings related to the Harmony Campus, light rail public meetings, and leadership training.

Councilor Barnes represented Milwaukie at the regional wastewater meeting, policy review committee, and Ms. Gaines' going away party.

Mayor Bernard had begun working on the Farmers' Market, attended the joint Clackamas County/Washington County Business Alliance, filmed the Mayor's Minute for cable, and attended the ballfield opening.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved by Councilor Barnes and seconded by Councilor Stone to adjourn the meeting. Motion passed unanimously. [5:0]

Mayor Bernard adjourned the regular session at 8:47 p.m.

Pat DuVal, Recorder

MINUTES

MILWAUKIE CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION

May 15, 2007

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

Council Present: Councilors Barnes, Collette, and Stone.

Staff Present: City Manager Mike Swanson, Community Development/Public Works Director Kenny Asher, Engineering Director Gary Parkin, Planning Director Katie Mangle, Assistant Planner Brett Kolver

Citizens Utility Advisory Board Work Plan

Mr. Parkin explained the Citizens Utility Advisory Board (CUAB) currently had 4 members who reviewed utility plans and other public works projects. There is currently one vacancy on the Board. They were involved with developing the Street Surface Maintenance Plan and would continue to monitor and evaluate it. As staff proposed projects year by year the Board would review the lists. The CUAB typically had one meeting per month with some homework. The major elements of the work plan were the wastewater master plan, the water master plan, and oversight of the street surface maintenance program. The CUAB was involved in reviewing and helping update the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) annually. Finally, the Board was involved with the neighborhood safety program that included traffic safety issues, sidewalks, crosswalks, and lighting.

Bob Hatz, CUAB Chair, hoped to recruit another member for the Board because there was a lot of work that needed to be done. He enjoyed his time on the Board and found the work challenging. He noted that the said it is a very good board to be on. He explained that the CUAB was advisory and made recommendations to the City Council.

Mayor Bernard said the Budget Committee talked about having a list of CIP projects that were completed and noting any that might be delayed.

Mr. Parkin replied that would be incorporated into the CIP.

Councilor Stone commented this was one of the hardest working citizen advisory groups in the City and particularly appreciated its work on the street maintenance funding program. She was glad to see wastewater extension annexation for Johnson Creek on the list.

Mr. Parkin responded the CUAB looked forward to dealing with that issue.

Councilor Stone said looking for alternate funding was a good idea. Would the CUAB work on the neighborhood traffic management program or did it fall into the traffic safety board arena, which the City no longer had.

Mr. Parkin said the Board would not actually participate but would assist in setting up the program. He thought it was within the CUAB's prevue as long as there was time.

Councilor Stone asked if the City got a lot of street lighting requests.

Mr. Parkin replied they did get a few, and it was a huge issue in terms of budget. He would like to have some process for dealing with the requests. Most of the requests

and complaints that come to the City have to do with too much light or not enough light in particular areas.

Planning Commission Work Plan

Ms. Mangle reported the Planning Commission had put a lot of work into developing an achievable work plan within budget and staff constraints. She referred to page 2 and identified 4 priorities. Highest priority was to conduct sound public hearings and arrive at decisions that would pass muster at the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA). Second was adoption of the Transportation System Plan (TSP) by the end of 2007. Third was to update the master plan for the Hwy 224 commercial triangle area and looking at rezoning the Murphy and MacFarlane sites. The consultant budget for Planning Commission would cover that task.

Mayor Bernard would like to see that area more pedestrian and bike friendly. He thought the Gramor project would have been better next to the sidewalk.

Ms. Mangle said fourth were several priorities identified in last year's work plan and development to trigger transportation improvements.

Planning Commission Chair Jeff Klein said he received a lot of e-mails about the sign code and complaints about the recently installed billboards at Hwy 224 and 99E. The Commission would be taking a closer look at the code.

Mayor Bernard noted the potential for Measure 37 claims.

Mr. Klein felt the City should state its expectations and let people decide if they want to fight them. He commented that North Main Village had more stringent standards than the City regarding signs.

Ms. Mangle said Measure 37 applied only if there were no property transfers, so regulations would be applicable at some time in the future.

Planning Commissioner Lisa Batey stated that although the City might face Measure 37 claims, she felt it was important to send the message that the community had standards that could be protested.

Councilor Collette agreed that setting standards was a key.

Planning Commissioner Scott Churchill added that signage was an important visual quality and a way in which to judge the environment.

Planning Commissioner Teresa Bresaw felt the City should be more strict on flag lot landscaping requirements.

Mayor Bernard asked if there was a permitting process for paving over lawn.

Ms. Mangle replied there are landscaping standards for new development so it might be a code compliance issue.

Ms. Bresaw thought 30% of the property had to be landscape. She was also concerned with storm water runoff.

Ms. Mangle said the goal after December would be to deal with something other than transportation. She asked the Council if it had any direction or comments on the proposed work plan.

Councilor Stone asked if the code was as strict as possible when it came to flaglots.

Ms. Mangle replied flag lot standards had become stricter over time, but Milwaukie still has a lot of large lots that would qualify under the current code for flag lots.

Councilor Stone said that one thing that made Milwaukie so unique was that people actually had back yards. She felt they should be preserved instead of just putting in some kind of structure. It should be harder to add a mobile home.

Ms. Mangle responded that the standards for manufactured housing were statewide. She discussed the issue of landlocked properties.

Mayor Bernard noted one of the first things he did on Council with Jeff Marshall was to change the standards in order to reduce the number of flaglots.

Ms. Bresaw did not think it was being enforced.

Mr. Klein said on Logus Road there are people with large lots who were interested in partitioning. There were four backyards so the logical thing to do would be to create a cul-de-sac. These owners are looking at financial gain for retirement.

Councilor Stone replied that was a good point, and the standards should not restrict a property owner's ability to develop. She noted there were manufactured homes that sat sideways on a property and do not face the street.

Mr. Klein said someday the value of the land would be such that something other than a manufactured home would be better. That will inevitably cure itself.

Councilor Stone knew people who live in them and there can be some beautiful manufactured homes, but these do not help the look of the neighborhood.

Mr. Churchill said the planning tools were developed to try to hold the urban growth boundary, which is important to do, but it is creating some serious conditions. Portland Planning is encouraging less than 5-foot setbacks, but firefighters are concerned because they cannot erect ladders to fight fires in that limited space.

Mr. Klein looks at worst-case scenario that the City was willing to accept, and everything else will be better than that.

Ms. Mangle looked forward to staff's helping the Planning Commission be more visionary.

Mayor Bernard commented on the need to discuss the tree ordinance.

Ms. Mangle heard a lot of comments about trees in Milwaukie, and there were different types of regulations that the City could consider. It is starting at the staff level slowly by doing research and they will do education outreach in the neighborhoods.

Mayor Bernard suggested looking at Lake Oswego's tree code.

Councilor Collette asked the commission if they were familiar with graphic oriented code based on what you want to see and not the negative. Like what was done with downtown vision and design guidelines. In Astoria, she asked how to keep those things fresh and vibrant with turnover in staff and population, and they suggested ongoing workshops while adjusting codes. How do you keep people bought into a plan as people came in and things changed. That was exactly what one might want to do with the Hwy 224 triangle.

Mr. Churchill was from Marin county where there are very strict tree ordinances and view corridor concerns. When it comes to planning code that area had max build out. You have to look at how create a volume in a building form that had appearance of less mass and bulk. Graphic tools provide guidelines for applicants to get and accept the concept.

Mayor Bernard asked about updating the downtown plan.

Ms. Mangle replied that was considered in attachment 1 under current planning and permitting hearings of the Planning Commission and they listed out some of the anticipated projects.

Mr. Klein said the goal this year was to determine what could realistically be accomplished and gains made. Ms. Mangle and staff had done a fantastic job and the focus is on this list.

Ms. Mangle said there are grants available from the state and they might be able to tackle some of the other projects.

Mr. Klein wanted to add regarding the improvements to 42nd Avenue. Since the improvements have been made he has noticed the residents had made a difference on what the street looked like and many houses have been cleaned up. He applauded 42nd Avenue residents.

Councilor Barnes asked what was envisioned with the project at Ardenwald and Linwood Schools.

Ms. Mangle replied that is related to the School District bond measure. Ardenwald possible demolition and reconstruction, Linwood get a new bus turnaround and a gym, and other projects at Rowe Middle School, Milwaukie High School and Lewelling.

Mr. Klein said there are a lot of good projects that were needed in Milwaukie Schools. About \$14 million being put in these schools in addition to Ardenwald.

Design and Landmarks Committee

Barb Cartmill, Andrew Tull, and Patty Wisner were all present members of the DLC.

Ms. Mangle explained this has been a year of transition for the DLC and she wants continue in a positive way over the next year. A primary responsibility of the DLC is implementation of the design guidelines in the downtown. They also play a role in monitoring and regulation of historic resources. Over the last year they met quarterly or as the need arose. Over the next year there will be a lot of work this committee will be asked to do. Currently there are three members on the five person committee so the first priority was to recruit new DLC members. There are two anticipated projects that will go under a design review including the Transit Center project and Riverfront Park. There is a post decision design review of Church of the Movable Foundation on a few limited parts of the building. Ardenwald Elementary project when that goes forward. Some of the Code revision projects that were mentioned with the Planning Commission will definitely get input from the DLC. Anything with a sign codes especially relating to the downtown and downtown public area requirements.

Ms. Wisner explained there was slide show used as an orientation for new members. The slide show was lost and cannot be found. So in trying to create a new one the committees, divided the historic properties between them, and are taking digital pictures for a fresh updated version to be used in a PowerPoint presentation that she will put together. She wants to tell the story of early beginnings. It will be comprehensive on the properties with a nice look and feel.

Ms. Mangle said this would be a valuable resource and would be more accessible than the slide show.

Councilor Barnes suggested getting the information together for a senior to use for their Senior Seminar project and they could put together a video with all of the information.

Councilor Collette suggested working with Madalaine Bohl.

Ms. Wisner wanted to open each decade and weave in some photos of Milwaukie and show houses from each time period.

Councilor Collette said that she digitally photographed all the houses that were in the Ardenwald historic home tour.

Ms. Mangle said in addition to the historic properties she would like to show other valuable properties that were not on the registry, and others that had been covered up or demolished.

Mr. Tull said he recently moved to the area so this was a great learning experience. Milwaukie had beautiful homes hidden in the residential neighborhoods. It has really been interesting and he has met some great people.

Mr. Kolver passed out a copy of a postcard that the committee decided would be a good idea to send to people as a warning to know that the committee would be coming around taking photos.

Councilor Collette found when the focus is on a person's house then they begin focus on their house. They start taking better care of property when realizing it is context in history.

Mr. Kolver summarized that the main focus for the committee is getting up to full strength and to meet regularly, and to get the committee up to speed for the upcoming projects and strengthen relationship between the Planning Commission and DLC.

Mayor Bernard talked about design standards in Hwy 224 triangle. We need to look at whether a particular new house that is built fits in with the neighborhood. He would like to look at something like the assisted living house on Lake Road. That doesn't fit in to the neighborhood.

Ms. Mangle said that request was on the paramedic code fix list and depends on how difficult it is to do and the controversy it would create. They will look to DLC to work with Planning Commission on those types of code changes.

Ms. Wisner said a person interested in being on this committee would be a person who enjoys just living in a small town and preserve the best and working on projects that make it even better. A person struck by architecture, older homes and remodeling or historic preservation, has professional background in architecture, design or landscaping would be great for this committee.

Ms. Wisner said when she joined the DLC in 1997 she had no idea so many things were put on the preservation list and more will probably be added.

Councilor Stone added that she envisioned the DLC looking at, as downtown starts to develop, and art comes into the downtown that it goes to the DLC for them to determine what we want to see on the streets. Following up on the Committee discussion she loved the idea of having a PowerPoint presentation, but also likes the idea of a heritage tree program.

Mayor Bernard adjourned the work session at 6:38 p.m.

Pat DuVal, City Recorder



To: Mayor Bernard and Milwaukie City Council
Through: Mike Swanson, City Manager
From: Larry R. Kanzler, Chief of Police
Date: June 7, 2007
Subject: O.L.C.C. Application – Widmer Brothers Brewing Company – 1750 SE Ochoco Street

Action Requested:

It is respectfully requested the Council approve the O.L.C.C. Application To Obtain A Liquor License from Widmer Brothers Brewing Company – 1750 SE Ochoco Street.

Background:

We have conducted a background investigation and find no reason to deny the request for liquor license.

RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MILWAUKIE, ACTING AS THE LOCAL CONTRACT REVIEW BOARD, AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE CERTAIN CONTRACTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007 - 2008.

WHEREAS, the City of Milwaukie, by adopting Resolution 9-2005, has put into place public contracting rules; and

WHEREAS, the rules require City Council review of contracts for certain goods and services that have projected annual expenditures greater than \$25,000; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has reviewed the listed goods and services and the projected annual expenditures; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds such goods and services needed and vital to the operations of the City of Milwaukie;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Milwaukie, Oregon, acting as the Local Contract Review Board, as follows:

Section 1. The City Council authorizes the City Manager to execute purchase orders for the following goods and services.

Vendor	Services Provided	\$ Amount
American LaFrance	Parts and Services-Fire Trucks	30,000
ASAP Software	Computer Software	40,000
City County Insurance Services	Insurance Premiums	228,130
City of Lake Oswego	Dispatch Services – LOCOM IGA	300,553
City of Portland	Sewage Treatment Charges	300,000
City of Portland	Yearly Access Fees	17,852
City of Portland	800 KHz Repair & Maintenance	30,000
City of Portland	PPDS Access Fees	38,000
Clackamas Cable Access Board	Operation of Public Access Studio	30,000
Clackamas County Service District #1/WES	Sewer Treatment Charges	1,300,000
Clackamas County	Signal Repair & Street Striping	50,000
Clackamas River Water	Water Use per IGA	77,000
Craftsman Home Remodeling	Carpentry Work and Repairs	41,000
Craftsman Painting	Painting Services	40,000
Diversified Abilities (D & A Janitorial)	Janitorial Services	110,000
D.M. Excavation Inc	Wastewater	25,000
D.M. Excavation Inc	Stormwater	25,000
Don Thomas Petroleum	Unleaded & Diesel Fuel & Oil Products	175,000
Dryer Electric	Electrical Repairs and Services	50,000
E.W. Consulting	HVAC Maintenance & Services	10,000
E.W. Consulting	Mechanical Engineering Consulting	35,000
Goodyear Commercial Tire	Tires & Tire Repair	25,000
Grove, Mueller & Swank, P.C.	Audit Services	31,000
Harper, Houf, Peterson, Ragellis, Inc.	Engineering Services	51,000
Interactive Computer Designs	Incode Annual Software Maintenance	37,500
Joel Kay and Joyce St Arnaud	Installment Payments for 2215 SE Harrison	34,516
Les Schwab Tire Center	Tire Purchases for Fire Trucks & City Vehicles	35,000
Liberty Northwest Company	Worker's Compensation Insurance Premiums	155,574
Marsh USA Inc	Insurance Agent of Record	25,000
Metro Area Communication Com	Comcast Franchise Administration	45,000
NW Natural	Gas for City Facilities	40,000

Office Depot	Office Supplies	7,000
Office Depot	Office Supplies	8,000
Office Depot	Copier Paper JCB, PSB, & City Hall	4,200
Office Depot	Office Supplies for RIM & NST	5,000
Office Depot	Office Supplies	10,000
Portland General Electric	Electricity for City Facilities	625,000
Printing Today	PILOT Printer	26,800
Qwest	Telephone Service	80,000
Ramis, Crew, Corrigan & Bachrach, LLP	City Attorney Services	160,000
Ramis, Crew, Corrigan & Bachrach, LLP	Stanley Works Litigation	100,000
Rowe Bros	Body and Frame Repair	25,000
Selectron	Security Monitoring, Service & Installation	150,000
Shiels, Oblatz, Johnsen	Development Services	40,000
State of Oregon	Small Energy Loan Program #L-499	35,292
State of Oregon	Small Energy Loan Program #L-499B	7,140
State of Oregon	Small Energy Loan Program #L-602	15,480
US Postal Service	Postage for Utility Billing	16,200
US Postal Service	General postage	12,500
US Postal Service	Postage for PILOT, Other Permit #30 Mailings	25,000
Xerox Corporation	Rents & Leases for all Copiers	44,345
Xerox Corporation	Per Copy & Supplies Cost	14,500

Section 2. The effective date of this resolution is July 1, 2007.

Introduced and adopted by the City Council of the City of Milwaukie, Oregon, on June 5, 2007.

Mayor James Bernard

ATTEST:

Pat DuVal, City Recorder

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Ramis, Crew, Corrigan & Bachrach, LLP



To: Mayor and City Council

Through: Mike Swanson, City Manager, and
Kenny Asher, Community Development & Public Works Director

From: Alex Campbell, Resource & Economic Development Specialist;
Katie Mangle, Planning Director; and
Gary Parkin, Engineering Director

Subject: 2007-2008 Fee Schedule & Adopting SDC Indexing

Date: June 6, 2007 for June 19, 2007

Action Requested

Approve resolution adopting the fiscal year 2007-2008 fee schedule and providing for inflation indexing of System Development Charges (SDCs).

Background

1. Fee Schedule Update

Prior to the beginning of each fiscal year, City department managers review the schedule of fees and charges and recommend changes to reflect actual costs. The attached resolution implements changes in fees ranging from Planning Land Use Applications to rates for photocopies. The document is intended to be a complete and standard reference for all fees and charges across all departments.

The vast majority of the changes to the fee schedule are either cosmetic changes to improve readability; clarifications of what the fee is for or how it is to be calculated or collected; or small adjustments to rates. For example, the shipping and handling rate has been updated to more fully account for the cost of staff time and to include the flexibility to recover increased postage costs.

In this year's update, there are also a few more significant changes, including:

- An increase in the street opening deposit from \$1,000 to \$1,500 to ensure that the City can recover the cost of correcting inadequate repairs (as per the Street Surface Maintenance Program, Ordinance No. 1966).
- Upward adjustments to the billable rates for City staff time, to fully account for the cost of benefits.
- Inclusion of the System Development Charges as an integrated element of the fee schedule (see Part 2 of background below).
- The addition of a table of contents.

In addition, the Planning Department staff substantially overhauled the planning fees and charges, re-organizing the section, adding several new fees, and adjusting or clarifying others. In those cases where a new fee is being established, previous practice was either to charge a fee based on the most similar type of activity listed in the fee schedule, or not recover costs in cases where no reasonable parallel fee existed. The major format change is that Planning fees have been re-grouped according to the section of code from which they originate. This includes specific chapters of the Zoning Ordinance (Title 19), as well as for Titles 17 (Land Division) and 14 (Signs).

Other corrections and changes include:

- There had been previously no fees associated with Design Review. The update would establish fees for Design Review, depending upon the complexity involved, from \$130 to \$1,500.
- Previously, there was only one Water Quality Resource review fee (\$750), but the Municipal Code outlines three possible levels of review (Type I, Type II, and Minor Quasi-Judicial). The new schedule includes a range of fees from \$130 to \$1,500.
- A new fee was added for a Type I Transportation Plan Review (\$150). Type II TPR was increased from \$565 to \$750. The base fee for a Minor Quasi Judicial TPR was decreased to \$750, with an additional \$750 deposit required to cover possible additional staff work.
- Last year, annexation fees were reduced from \$3,210 to \$100 to remove a possible financial disincentive for property owners interested in annexing to the city. This change did not account for the high level of staff time required if a zone change is requested along with annexation. The proposed fees more clearly reflect the actual staff time associated with the various annexation application types. Two new categories for non-expedited Annexation applications were added to clarify the previously existing line item of "Annexation/Initial Zoning/Comp Plan land use or Other Boundary Change."
- A provision was added to allow Community Service Use Sign Reviews to be charged actual cost (rather than a full CSU review charge).

- A new fee was created for review of an application for a Variance from Clear Vision Standards (\$1,500).
- Minor adjustments were also made to a number of document costs.

2. Indexing System Development Charges (SDCs)

As described for Council at the April 18, 2006 Regular Session, the City has the authority to index SDC rates annually for inflation. The authority is provided by ORS 223.304, which states that a “...change in the amount of a reimbursement fee or an improvement fee is not a modification of the system development charge methodology if the change in amount is ... periodic application of one or more specific cost indexes...” Such cost indexing must employ cost data published by a recognized authority and be either included in the original SDC calculation methodology or be adopted by separate ordinance or resolution. The data source, as defined in the proposed resolution, would be the Engineering News Record (ENR) Construction Cost Index (CCI) for the City of Seattle. (An equivalent index is not available for Portland.)

Using that index to update current SDCs would result in the following changes:

- The Transportation SDC, adopted late 2004, would increase from \$1511.50 per peak trip to \$1,596.52.
- The Stormwater SDC, adopted spring 2006, would increase from \$1,105 per impervious surface unit (1 residential property or 2706 square feet) to \$1,127.93.
- The residential water meter SDC, also adopted spring 2006, would be increased from \$970 to \$990.13. (A full schedule of the inflation-indexed SDCs, including the various rates for different water meter sizes, is included as an exhibit to the SDC Resolution.)

By the same method, the wastewater/sanitary sewer SDC would be increased from \$893 per unit to \$1,323.70, because this rate was originally set in 1994. Staff is not recommending adjusting this rate for inflation at this time; it would be a challenge to justify such an increase given that the methodology and list of projects is dated. An update of the calculation method will be completed in the upcoming fiscal year following a master plan update.

(Park SDC rates are set by the North Clackamas Parks District.)

The attached Resolution on SDC indexing provides for annual inflation-based adjustments to SDC rates. If adopted, SDCs would be adjusted each year in concert with the annual fee schedule update.

Concurrence

The City Manager and Department Directors concur with the proposed fee schedule resolution. Engineering, Finance and the Citizens Utility Advisory Board have all concurred with the policy and method of SDC indexing.

Fiscal Impact

No appreciable impacts to budgeted expenditures or revenues are expected.

Work Load Impacts

Minimal work is required to update the fee schedule.

Alternatives

Either the update of the fee schedule or the SDC indexing resolution could be adopted independently of the other. The Council has the option of adopting the 2007-2008 fee schedule with changes. Non-action on either proposed resolution would leave the prior rates in effect.

Attachments

Attachment 1:	2007-2008 Fee Schedule Adoption Resolution
Exhibit A.	2006-2007 Fee Schedule with changes tracked
Exhibit B.	2007-2008 Fee Schedule (clean version)
Attachment 2:	SDC Indexing Resolution
Exhibit A.	2006-2007 SDC Schedule with changes
Exhibit B.	2007-2008 SDC Schedule (clean version)

RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MILWAUKIE, OREGON, SETTING FEES FOR SERVICES; AND CLASSIFYING THE FEES IMPOSED BY THIS RESOLUTION AS NOT SUBJECT TO ARTICLE XI, SECTION 11B OF THE OREGON CONSTITUTION.

WHEREAS, The City completed a formal Cost of Services Study and User Fee Analysis in Fiscal Year 1994 – 1995 and updated the Study in Fiscal Year 1995- 1996; and

WHEREAS, The City Council reviewed all costs of services and user fee structures; and

WHEREAS, Affected departments annually review labor costs as well as compare fees with other local jurisdictions and adjust accordingly; and

WHEREAS, The fees set forth in the attached "Fees and Charges" are set at a level to cover the costs of providing the services for which the fees are charged but to not generate any excess income for the City; and

WHEREAS, Fees are set by City Council resolution;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Milwaukie, Oregon, determines that the fees, herewith attached as "Fees & Charges", are effective July 1, 2007, and:

Section 1. The attached document (Exhibit B) entitled "Fees and Charges" is adopted as the official fee schedule of the City of Milwaukie.

Section 2. The fees imposed by this Resolution are not taxes subject to the property limitations of Article XI. Section 11(b) of the Oregon Constitution.

Section 3. Any previously adopted fee for which a fee or charge is stated in the attached "Fees and Charges" is amended to conform to the amount stated in the "Fees and Charges". Any previously adopted fee for which a fee or charge is not stated in the attached "Fees and Charges" shall remain at its present amount.

Introduced and adopted by the City Council on June 19, 2007.

This resolution is effective on July 1, 2007.

James Bernard, Mayor

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
Ramis, Crew, & Corrigan, LLP

Pat DuVal, City Recorder

City Attorney



CITY HALL
10722 SE Main
MILWAUKIE, OREGON 97222

PHONE: (503) 786-7555
FAX: (503) 652-4433

Fees & Charges

Yellow = Deletions **Blue** = Additions
Adopted June 19, 2007—Resolution #??-2007 (except as noted)
Effective July 1, 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLANNING	2
Land Use Applications.....	2
Reviews, Inspections, and Preapplication Conferences.....	4
Materials.....	5
BUILDING	6
Section I. Residential Building Permits.....	6
Section II. Commercial/Industrial Building Permits.....	8
Section III. Permit Related Fees.....	10
Section IV. In-Fill and Grading.....	11
ENGINEERING	12
Inspections and Permits.....	12
Materials (Engineering).....	12
Printed and Electronic Maps (GIS).....	12
Erosion Control.....	13
WATER	13
Service and Equipment.....	13
Equipment.....	13
Miscellaneous.....	13
SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGES	14
Transportation System Development Charge.....	14
Stormwater System Development Charge.....	14
Wastewater System Development Charge.....	14
Water System Development Charge.....	14
Parks and Recreation System Development Charge.....	14
BUSINESS REGISTRATION	16
PARKING	16
POLICE	16
Permits/Licenses.....	16
Police Reports.....	16
Police Services.....	16
LIBRARY	18
Charges.....	18
Fines.....	18
MISCELLANEOUS	19
Photocopies.....	19
Other Copying/Service.....	19
Photographs.....	19
Financial Reports.....	19
Miscellaneous.....	19
RECYCLING	19
Down to Earth Day.....	19
TELECOMMUNICATIONS	19
BILLABLE HOURLY RATES	20
Community Development and Public Works Administration.....	20
Engineering.....	20
Planning.....	20
Building.....	20
Operations.....	20

Code Compliance20

PLANNING

Land Use Applications

Title 19 Zoning

Chapter 19.300 Use Zones

CSC Community Shopping Commercial Review	\$1,500
CSU Community Service Use	\$1,500 (max.) or Actual Cost *
CSU Community Service Use—Wireless Communication Facility (Type II review)	\$750
CSU Community Service Use—Wireless Communication Facility (Minor Quasi-Judicial review)	Actual Cost *
Reserve deposit	\$1,000
DR Design Review (Type I review, without Building Permit).....	\$130
DR Design Review (Type I review, with Building Permit).....	Incl. w/cost of Major Building Permit Review
DR Design Review (Type II review)	\$800
DR Design Review (Minor Quasi-Judicial review)	\$1,500
HR Historic Resource Alteration (Type I review).....	\$500
HR Historic Resource Alteration (Minor Quasi-Judicial review)	\$1,500
HR Historic Resource Deletion.....	\$2,035
HR Historic Resource Demolition	\$2,035
HR Historic Resource Designation.....	\$0
Minor Alteration Review.....	\$1,500
MU Mixed Use Overlay Review.....	\$1,500
PD Planned Development (Preliminary Plan Review)	\$2,615
PD Planned Development (Final Plan Review).....	\$3,245
WG Willamette Greenway Review	\$1,500
WQR Water Quality Resource (Type I review, without Building Permit).....	\$130 **
WQR Water Quality Resource (Type I review, w/Building Permit)	Incl. w/cost of Major Bldg. Permit Review **
WQR Water Quality Resource (Type II review)	\$750 **
Additional reserve deposit.....	\$750
WQR Water Quality Resource (Minor Quasi-Judicial review).....	\$1,500 **

Chapter 19.400 Supplementary Regulations

ADU Accessory Dwelling Unit, Type 1	\$860
TAR Transition Area Review	\$1,500
TS Temporary Structure (Type I review).....	\$50
TS Temporary Structure (Minor Quasi-Judicial review)	\$1,010

Chapter 19.600 Conditional Uses

ADU Accessory Dwelling Unit, Type 2	\$1,770
CU Conditional Use	\$1,500

Chapter 19.700 Variances, Exceptions, and Home Improvement Exceptions

E Use Exception	\$1,500
HIE Home Improvement Exception	\$800
VR Variance (Type II review).....	\$800
Additional reserve deposit.....	\$700
VR Variance (Minor Quasi-Judicial review).....	\$1,500

Chapter 19.800 Nonconforming Uses

DD Director's Determination of Nonconforming Situation	\$50
NCU Nonconforming Use/Structure (Type II review)	\$800
NCU Nonconforming Use/Structure (Minor Quasi-Judicial review)	\$1,500

Chapter 19.900 Amendments

CPA Comprehensive Plan/Map Amendment	\$3,210
ZA Zoning Ordinance Amendment.....	\$3,210
ZC Zoning Map Amendment (aka "Zone Change")	\$3,210
Ballot Measure 56 Notice (for Zone Amendment or Zone Change).....	Actual Cost (\$1 per affected property, \$35 minimum)
Reserve deposit	\$500

Chapter 19.1000 Administrative Provisions

AP Appeal to City Planning Commission/City Council	\$505
DI Planning Director Interpretation	\$100

Chapter 19.1400 Transportation Planning, Design Standards, and Procedures

Transportation Plan Review (Adjustment or Exception) (nonrefundable base fee)	\$750
Additional reserve deposit.....	\$750
TPR Transportation Plan Review (Type I review)	\$150 **
TPR Transportation Plan Review (Type II review)	\$565 \$750 **
TPR Transportation Plan Review (Minor Quasi-Judicial review)	\$1,160 \$750 **
Additional reserve deposit.....	\$750 **

Chapter 19.1500 Boundary Changes (Annexations)

A Annexation (Expedited).....	\$100
A Annexation (Nonexpedited with no Zone Change or Comp Plan Amendment)	\$100
A Annexation (Nonexpedited: Zone Change only).....	\$100
A Annexation (Nonexpedited: Zone Change and Comp Plan Amendment).....	\$3,210

Title 17 Land Division

DD Director's Determination of Legal Lot Status	\$50
ELD Expedited Land Division.....	\$4,125
FP Minor Land Partition (Final Plat)	\$150
FP Subdivision (Final Plat)	\$150
LC Lot Consolidation	\$250
Additional reserve deposit.....	\$250
MLP Minor Land Partition.....	\$750
Additional reserve deposit.....	\$1,000
PLA Property Line Adjustment.....	\$640
R Partition Replat.....	\$500
Additional reserve deposit.....	\$500
R Subdivision Replat	\$500
Additional reserve deposit.....	\$1,000
S Subdivision (Preliminary Plat)	\$2,630
SV Street or Plat Vacation.....	\$1,905
Extension of Planning Commission Approval.....	\$40
Variance (Subdivision).....	\$2,080

Title 14 Signs

Adjustment.....	\$1,500
Community Service Use Sign Review (Minor Quasi-Judicial review)	Actual Cost *
Sign Permit Review (see Reviews, Inspections, and Preapplication Conferences below)	

Other fees

M-37 Property Value Reduction Claims (Ballot Measure 37)	\$1,515
(Fee will be refunded if applicant prevails. If claim is denied, additional money may be required to cover contract-attorney or appraiser costs, as determined by City Manager.)	
TP Tree Permit (major pruning or removal of trees in the public right-of-way)	\$35
Technical Report Review (Traffic, Wetlands, Geotechnical, Hydrology, etc):	
• Scope of Work Preparation	Actual Cost *
Additional reserve deposit	\$1,000
• Review of Technical Report	Actual Cost *
Reserve deposit:	
• Traffic	\$2,500
• All others	\$1,000
Variance from Clear Vision Standards	\$1,500
Zoning Confirmation Letter	\$50

Discounts for Land Use Applications

Two or more applications No discount for most expensive application—50% discount for all others ***
 Senior citizens and low income citizens 25% discount (50% for appeals) ****
 NDA-sponsored land use applications related to parks Fees waived

Deposit Information

In some cases, reserve deposits are collected to ensure that the City’s actual costs are covered. Deposits will be refunded relative to actual costs, and additional money may be required if actual costs exceed the deposit amount. Deposits collected as part of Type II land division applications (such as Minor Land Partitions, Lot Consolidations, and Replats) are generally refunded if the application is not elevated to the level of Minor Quasi-Judicial review. However, part or all of the deposit may be kept (based on actual costs) if the application is deemed to warrant an extraordinary level of staff time and resources. This applies only to reserve deposits—base fees are nonrefundable.

Notes

- * Actual cost to be determined by Planning Director or Engineering Director
- ** Water Quality Resource and Transportation Plan Review applications may also require additional Technical Report Review.
- *** Applies to applications which relate to the same parcel of land and which will be considered at the same Planning Commission meeting.
- **** Seniors must be at least 62 years of age. Low-income citizens may qualify for reduced fees by filing the same application used to apply for reduced sewer and water rates.

Reviews, Inspections, and Preapplication Conferences

Building Permit Review (Short).....	\$25
Building Permit Review (Minor)	\$95
Building Permit Review (Major)	\$130
Planning Inspection Fee	\$50
Preapplication Conference	\$125
Preapplication Conference with Transportation Review	\$200
Sign Permit Review	\$95/sign type
Sign Permit Review (Daily Display or “sandwich board” sign)	\$25

Materials

Many materials are available online for free at www.ci.milwaukie.or.us/departments/planning/planning.html.
 Contact Planning staff for additional information.

Zoning Ordinance	\$15	\$13
Comprehensive Plan	\$18	\$15

Comprehensive Plan or Zoning Ordinance Map:

- 11x17 handout (Black & White/Color)..... No charge/\$2
- GIS maps (e.g., Zoning Map)..... Full sheet \$45; see Engineering fees for other sizes
- Bluelines (e.g., Zoning Map)..... All sizes \$5

Comprehensive Plan ancillary documents: (most not available online)

• Ardenwald Park Master Plan		\$2
• Downtown and Riverfront Land Use Framework Plan.....	\$18	\$25
• Elk Rock Island Natural Area Management Plan.....	\$7.50	\$8
• Furnberg Park Master Plan		\$5
• Homewood Park Master Plan		\$1
• Johnson Creek Resources Management Plan		\$15
• Lake Road Multimodal Plan	\$7.50	\$8
• Lewelling Community Park Master Plan		\$1
• North Clackamas PFP		\$25
• Town Center Master Plan		\$15
• Scott Park Master Plan		\$2
• Spring Park Master Plan		\$5
• Springwater Corridor Master Plan.....	\$7.50	\$8
• Transportation System Plan.....		\$32
• Water Tower Park Master Plan.....		\$2
• Wichita Park Master Plan.....		\$2
• Vision Statement (one page)		No charge

Sign Ordinance.....		\$5
Land Division Ordinance		\$5
Downtown Design Guidelines (Black & White/Color).....	\$10/\$25	\$35
Downtown and Riverfront Public Area Requirements	\$23	\$16
Other informational handouts (10 pages or less)		No charge
Other informational handouts (over 10 pages).....		At cost

BUILDING

Section I. Residential Building Permits

A. Structural Permits—Valuation shall be calculated using the most current ICBO Building Valuation Data Table for “good construction” and without the Oregon modifier. The square footage of a dwelling or addition shall be determined from outside exterior wall to outside exterior wall for each level. The square footage of garages, carports, covered porches or patios, and decks shall be calculated separately at the corresponding values from the most current ICBO Building Valuation Data Table. Permit fees for remodels and alterations shall be calculated using the valuation determined by the fair market value as determined by the Building Official, in accordance with OAR 918-050-0100.

1. Permit Fee

Permit fees from calculation of total valuation from the square footage of the improvement	
\$1-\$500.....	\$18.75
\$501-\$2,000.....	\$18.75 plus \$2.89 per \$C over \$5C to \$2K
\$2,001-\$25,000.....	\$62.10 plus \$11.54 per \$K over \$2K to \$25K
\$25,001-\$50,000.....	\$327.52 plus \$8.58 per \$K over \$25K to \$50K
\$50,001-\$100,000.....	\$542.02 plus \$5.77 per \$K over \$50K to \$100K
\$100,001 and up.....	\$830.52 plus \$4.88 per \$K over \$100K
Minimum permit fee.....	\$75.00

2. Initial Plan Review Fees 65% of the permit fee

3. Plan Review Fees Required/Requested by Changes, Additions, Revisions.....\$70.00/hr. (min. charge 1 hr.)

4. Third Party Plan Review Fee (for transfer of plan review to a third party)..... 10% of the permit fee (\$65.00 min.)

B. Mechanical Permits—Fees per current Mechanical Permit application

Minimum Permit Fee\$60.00

1. HVAC

For the installation of:

a. Air handling unit including ducts:	
Up to 10,000 cfm.....	\$23.00
Over 10,000 cfm.....	\$26.00
b. Air conditioning/heat pump (site plan required).....	\$40.00
c. Alteration of existing HVAC system.....	\$18.50
d. Boiler/compressor.....	\$18.50
e. Install/relocate/replace furnace/burner including ductwork and vent:	
Up to 100,000 BTU/H.....	\$18.50
Over 100,000 BTU/H.....	\$22.00
f. Install/relocate/replace heaters (room, suspended, wall- or floor-mounted).....	\$18.50
g. Vent for other than furnace.....	\$18.50

2. Environmental Exhaust and Ventilation

For the installation of:

a. Appliance vent.....	\$15.00
b. Dryer exhaust.....	\$12.00
c. Each hood that is served by a mechanical exhaust or air conditioning.....	\$10.00
d. Exhaust system with single duct (bath fan) each.....	\$8.50
e. Exhaust system apart from heating or air conditioning.....	\$12.00

3. Fuel Piping and Distribution

a. LPG-NG-Oil fuel piping:	
Up to 4 outlets (includes gas tag).....	\$22.00
Each additional outlet over 4.....	\$2.00

4. Other Listed Application or Equipment

- a. Decorative fireplace or insert \$35.00
- b. Woodstove/pellet stove \$47.00
- c. For each appliance or piece of equipment regulated by the code but not classed in other appliance categories, for which no other fee is listed in this code, or for which there is an alteration or extension of an existing mechanical system \$18.50

5. Stand-alone Fire Suppression Systems (requires a backflow device installed by licensed plumbing contractor or persons exempt from licensing)

- 0 sq. ft. to 2,000 sq. ft. \$90.00
- 2,001 sq. ft. to 3,600 sq. ft. \$135.00
- 3,601 sq. ft. to 7,200 sq. ft. \$169.00
- \$7,201 sq. ft. and greater \$315.00

C. Plumbing Permits—Fees per current Plumbing Permit application

1. Total Bathrooms Per Dwelling

- 1 bath dwelling (includes 1 kitchen) \$335.00
 - 2 bath dwelling (includes 1 kitchen) \$370.00
 - 3 bath dwelling (includes 1 kitchen) \$440.00
 - Additional bathroom/kitchen \$175.00
- Includes the first 100 ft. of water piping, sanitary and storm sewer lines, hose bibs, icemakers, underfloor low point drains, and rain drain packages that include the piping, gutters, downspouts, and perimeter system.

2. Additions, Alterations, and Repairs..... \$16.75/fixture

3. Building Sewer Connection..... \$57.00

4. Multipurpose or Continuous Loop Fire Suppression Systems

- 0 sq. ft. to 2,000 sq. ft. \$90.00
- 2,001 sq. ft. to 3,600 sq. ft. \$135.00
- 3,601 sq. ft. to 7,200 sq. ft. \$169.00
- \$7,201 sq. ft. and greater \$315.00

5. Minimum permit fee..... \$60.00

D. Other Inspections and Fees

**1. Inspections outside of normal business hours \$98.00/hr. (min. charge 2 hrs.)
 (Must be preapproved by applicant)**

**2. Inspections for which no fee is specifically indicated \$68.00/hr.
 (Must be preapproved by applicant)**

3. Reinspection fee \$58.00/hr.

4. Replacement sheets \$23.00/sheet

5. The minimum fee shall be..... \$50.00

6. Investigation fee Amount of subject permit fee

7. Temporary Certificate of Completion \$50.00

E. Manufactured Dwelling and Cabana Installation Permits— All jurisdictions in the Tri-County area shall charge a single fee for the installation and set-up of manufactured homes. This single fee shall include the concrete slab, runners, or foundations when they comply with the prescriptive requirements of the Oregon Manufactured Dwelling standard, electrical feeder and plumbing connections, and all cross-over connections.

- 1. **Installation permit**.....\$445.00
- 2. **Earthquake-resistant bracing**..... \$135.00
- 3. **Reinspection**\$135.00
- 4. **Statewide code development, training and monitoring fee** (in addition to all other manufactured dwelling fees and charges)..... \$30.00

Section II. Commercial/Industrial Building Permits

A. Structural Permits—Valuation shall be calculated using the most current ICBO Building Valuation Data Table, using the occupancy and construction type as determined by the Building Official, with no Oregon modifier, multiplied by the square footage of the structure to determine the valuation, or value as stated by the applicant, whichever is greater. When the construction or occupancy type does not fit the ICBO Building Valuation Data Table, the valuation shall be determined by the Building Official with input from the applicant, in accordance with OAR 918-050-0110.

- 1. **Permit Fee**
 Permit fees from calculation of total valuation from the square footage of the improvement
 \$1-\$500..... \$18.75
 \$501-\$2,000..... \$18.75 plus \$2.89 per \$C over \$5C to \$2K
 \$2,001-\$25,000..... \$62.10 plus \$11.54 per \$K over \$2K to \$25K
 \$25,001-\$50,000..... \$327.52 plus \$8.58 per \$K over \$25K to \$50K
 \$50,001-\$100,000..... \$542.02 plus \$5.77 per \$K over \$50K to \$100K
 \$100,001 and up..... \$830.52 plus \$4.88 per \$K over \$100K
 Minimum permit fee \$75.00
- 2. **Initial Plan Review Fees** 65% of the permit fee
- 3. **Plan Review Fees Required/Requested by Changes, Additions, Revisions**.....\$70.00/hr. (min. charge 1 hr.)
- 4. **Fire and Life Safety Plan Review Fee** (commercial only)40% of structural permit fee
 (Based on valuation of total improvements or \$50.00/hr. to review a Fire and Life Safety Master Plan)
 (Hourly charge must be approved by Applicant)
- 5. **Seismic Site Hazard Report Review** 1% of total structural and mechanical fees

B. Mechanical Permits—Valuation shall be calculated on the value of the equipment and installation costs.

- 1. **Use this section for commercial installation, replacement or relocation of nonportable mechanical equipment or mechanical work not covered previously. Indicate the value of all mechanical labor, materials, and equipment.**
 Permit Fee:
 \$1 to \$5,000..... \$60.00
 \$5,001 to \$10,000.....\$60.00 plus \$1.71 per \$C over \$5K
 \$10,001 to \$100,000.....\$145.50 plus \$10.50 per \$K over \$10K
 \$100,001 and up..... \$1,090.50 plus \$7.25 per \$K over \$100K
 Minimum permit fee \$60.00
- 2. **Plan review fee**..... 25% of mechanical permit fee
- 3. **Plan Review Fees Required/Requested by Changes, Additions, Revisions**.....\$70.00/hr. (min. charge 1 hr.)

C. Plumbing Permits

- 1. **Each fixture** \$16.75
- 2. **Utilities per 100 feet** \$62.00
 - a. Catch basin \$27.00
 - b. Drywells each \$27.00
 - c. Footing drain (per 100 lin. ft.) \$53.00
 - d. Rain drain connector \$27.00
 - e. Manholes each \$53.00
- 3. **Piping (per 100 lin. ft.)** \$62.00
- 4. **Building Sewers (per 100 lin. ft.)** \$62.00
- 5. **Initial Plan Review Fees** 30% of the Plumbing permit fees
- 6. **Plan Review Fees Required/requested by Changes, Additions, or Revisions** \$70.00/hr. for commercial
- 7. **Minimum permit fee** \$60.00
- 8. **Medical Gas Permits:** Valuation shall be calculated on the value of the equipment and installation costs.

Medical Gas Permit Fees:

- \$1-\$5,000 \$60.00
- \$5,001-\$10,000 \$60.00 plus \$1.71 per \$C over \$5K
- \$10,001-\$100,000 \$145.50 plus \$10.50 per \$K over \$10K
- \$100,001 and up \$1,090.50 plus \$7.25 per \$K over \$100K
- Minimum permit fee \$60.00

D. Other Inspections and Fees

- 1. **Inspections outside of normal business hours** \$98.00/hr. (min. charge 2 hrs.)
 (Must be preapproved by applicant)
- 2. **Inspections for which no fee is specifically indicated** \$68.00/hr.
 (Must be preapproved by applicant)
- 3. **Reinspection fee** \$58.00/hr.
- 4. **Replacement sheets** \$23.00/sheet
- 5. **The minimum fee shall be** \$50.00
- 6. **Investigation fee** Amount of subject permit fee
- 7. **Temporary Certificate of Occupancy** \$180.00
- 8. **Change of use/occupancy** \$300.00

E. Deferred Submittal Fee (in addition to project plan review fee)
 (OAR 918-050-0170) \$250.00 + 10% of deferred item permit fee
 per deferred submittal (minimum \$300.00)

F. Phased Permit Fee (in addition to project plan review fee)
 (OAR 918-050-0160) \$250.00 + 10% of total project permit fee per phase
 (minimum \$300.00, not to exceed \$1,500 per phase)

Section III. Permit Related Fees

- A. A State surcharge shall be collected in an amount as required by State law.
- B. Electrical permit fees shall be as adopted in Resolution 19-2003, adopted by the City Council on May 6, 2003 (effective July 1, 2003) with the following exceptions:
 - 1. The state surcharge shall be the amount required by State law as noted in Section III.A of this resolution.
 - 2. The Minor Labels program will be deleted as required by SB 512 and SB 587.
- C. **House Moving/Demolition Permits**
 - 2,000 sq. ft. or less\$78.00
 - Each additional 1,000 sq. ft.\$38.00
 - Plan Review Fee 65% of the permit fee
- D. **Prefabricated Structures**(Per current permit fees)
- E. **Temporary Structures**(Per current permit fees)
- F. **Manufactured Dwelling Parks and Mobile Home Parks** Per current State of Oregon permit fee (OAR. Division 650. Table 1) plus 30%
- G. **Recreational Parks and Organizational Camps** Per current State of Oregon permit fee (OAR. Division 650. Table 1) plus 30%
- H. **Miscellaneous Building Valuations**
 - 1. **Retaining Walls**
 - To 8 ft. high, including footing..... \$254.00/lin. ft.
 - Over 8 ft. high \$276.00/lin. ft.
 - 2. **Fences**
 - Over 6 ft. to 8 ft. high \$15.00/lin. ft.
 - 3. **Concrete Slabs on Grade Foundations**—For house moves, modular buildings, pole buildings, etc.
 - Plain concrete:
 - 4-in. slab \$3.00/sq. ft.
 - 5-in. slab \$3.10/sq. ft.
 - 6-in. slab \$3.25/sq. ft.
 - Reinforced concrete Add \$1.15/sq. ft.
 - 4. **Crawl Space Foundations**
 - For house moves, modular, etc. \$7.50/sq. ft.
 - 5. **Accessory Buildings**
 - With floor slab \$55.00/sq. ft.
 - Without floor slab \$28.00/sq. ft.
 - 6. **Pole Buildings**
 - Up to and including 14-ft. eave height..... \$32.00/sq. ft.
 - Over 14-ft. eave height \$45.00/sq. ft.
 - For insulation:
 - Roof—add \$.35/sq. ft.
 - Slab—add \$.35/sq. ft.
 - Wall—add..... \$.35/sq. ft.
 - For slabs on grade..... see Section III.H.3 for fees
 - 7. **Swimming Pools** (pool only/deck extra)
 - Concrete or gunite \$70.00/sq. ft.
 - Plastic below ground \$45.00/sq. ft.

Section IV. In-Fill and Grading

A. In-Fill and Grading Permit Fees

50 cubic yards or less.....	No charge
51 to 100 cubic yards	\$35.00
101 to 1,000 cubic yards	\$45.00
1,001 to 10,000 cubic yards	\$65.00
10,001 cubic yards or more.....	Total hourly cost*

*Cost to include supervision, overhead, equipment, hourly wages, and benefits of employees involved

B. In-Fill and Grading Plan Review Fees

50 cubic yards or less.....	No charge
51 to 100 cubic yards	\$35.00
101 to 1,000 cubic yards	\$45.00
1,001 to 10,000 cubic yards	\$65.00
10,001 cubic yards or more.....	Total hourly cost*

*Cost to include supervision, overhead, equipment, hourly wages, and benefits of employees involved

C. Other Inspections and Fees

1. Inspections outside normal business hours \$75.00/hr. (min. charge 2 hrs.)
2. Reinspection fee.....\$75.00/hr.
3. Inspections for which no fee is specifically indicated\$75.00/hr.

ENGINEERING

Inspections and Permits

Right-of-Way Inspection Permit.....	\$135
Right-of-Way Use Permit.....	\$30
Subdivision Const. Inspect. (Street/Sewer/Water/Storm Sewer)	5.5% of Total Const. Cost (min. \$500)
Public Impvts. Const. Inspection (Comml./Ind./Misc. Dev.)	5.5% of Total Const. Cost (min. \$500)
Street Opening Inspection Fee.....	\$85
Right-of-way/Street Opening Reinspection (beyond standard of 2 for R-O-W and 1 for street opening).....	\$85
Street Opening Deposit	\$1,000 \$1,500 (Performance bond amount at discretion of City Engineer)
Right-of-Way Usage for Wireless Communication Facility.....	\$250/month per antenna per utility pole
Sewer Inspection (residential)	\$57
Sewer Dye Test	\$57
Moving Buildings.....	\$200 + \$65/hr. staff time + \$1,000 deposit

Materials (Engineering)

Public Works Standards	\$30
Transportation Design Manual	\$5
Aerial Maps (all sizes)	\$5
Bluelines (all sizes).....	\$5
Microfilm (all sizes)	\$5
Sewer TV Inspection Tape	\$25

Electronic Drawings

Paper—all sizes	\$5-\$45/hr. for additional work
Other format	\$7
Reproduction charges.....	\$1 for first page/\$.10 each additional page

Printed and Electronic Maps (GIS)

Standard selection of GIS maps

Full Sheet (34" x 44")	\$45
1/2 Sheet (22" x 34").....	\$35
1/4 Sheet (17" x 22").....	\$25
1/8 Sheet (11" x 17").....	\$15
Electronic file (via electronic mail in PDF, JPG, GIF or TIF formats)	\$15
Electronic file (for mailed media, which includes postage, handling and media charges)	\$22

Aerial maps

Full Sheet (34" x 44")	\$50
1/2 Sheet (22" x 34").....	\$40
1/4 Sheet (17" x 22").....	\$30
1/8 Sheet (11" x 17").....	\$20
Electronic file (via electronic mail in PDF, JPG, GIF or TIF formats)	\$15
Electronic file (for mailed media, which includes postage, handling and media charges)	\$22

GIS Maps (special request ADD \$50/hr over 1 hour)

Full Sheet.....	\$95
1/2 Sheet	\$85
1/4 Sheet	\$75
1/8 Sheet	\$65

Custom maps:

Flat charge per hour plus cost of materials	\$55
Electronic file (for mailed media, which includes postage, handling and media charges)	\$7

Erosion Control

Technical Guidance Handbook	No charge
Minimum Charge for Clearing/Construction*	\$75
Minimum charge applies if:	
• Over 500 sq. ft. of disturbed soil	
• Not in or around a sensitive area (NR Zone, wetlands, conservancies, and streams)	
• Value of structure/remodel doesn't exceed \$20,000	
Clearing/Construction for Single-Family Residential	\$380
Rate if certified in erosion control**	\$225
Clearing/Construction for Multifamily Residential	\$490
Rate if certified in erosion control**	\$335
	(additional \$40 per ½ acre over 1 acre)
Clearing/Construction for Subdivision/Commercial/Industrial	\$623
Rate if certified in erosion control**	\$467
	(additional \$40 per ½ acre over 1 acre)
Additional Site Visit (due to code enforcement)	\$65
*Erosion control certification discount does not apply	
**Certification requires 4 hours of training in erosion control every 2 years	

WATER

Service and Equipment

Connect Service 5/8" or 3/4" Residential Service	\$2,460
Connect Service 1"	\$2,547
Connect Service 1 1/2"	\$2,923
Connect Service 2"	\$3,067

Equipment

3/4" Meter	\$208
1" Meter	\$301
1 1/2" Meter	\$510
2" Meter	\$625
Hydrant Meter Deposit.....	\$579 \$2000
	(Refundable less water usage)

Miscellaneous

Delinquent Account—Past Due Notice.....	\$10
Delinquent Account—Notice of Termination	\$30
Failed Arrangement Shut-off	\$30
After-hours Restoration of Service	\$80
	(Monday-Friday 5:00-8:00 p.m.; Saturday and Sunday 8:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m.)
Accounts remaining delinquent more than 3 months	10 percent/year added to outstanding balance (to pay City's interest and collection costs)
Information Research	\$44/hr.
Reimbursement District Fee	To be determined by scope of project

SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGES

Transportation System Development Charge (adopted Res. 36-2004, October 4, 2004)

Trip generation rates for each land use type are derived from the Institute of Transportation (ITE) report Trip Generation (7th Edition, 2003). Trip rates are expressed as vehicle trips entering and leaving a property during the p.m. peak travel period.

Transportation SDC..... **\$1,511.50 per trip**

Stormwater System Development Charge (adopted Res. 15-2006, April 18, 2006)

Stormwater unit is equal to 2,706 square feet of impervious surface on the property. Each single-family residential property is 1 stormwater unit.

Stormwater SDC:

Reimbursement.....\$267 per stormwater unit
 Improvement.....\$759 per stormwater unit
 Administration.....\$79 per stormwater unit
TOTAL.....**\$1,105 per stormwater unit**

Wastewater System Development Charge (adopted Res. 44-1994, November 1, 1994)

A wastewater unit is equal to 16 fixture units derived from Table 7-3 of the Oregon Plumbing Specialty Code. Each residential dwelling unit is 1 wastewater unit.

Wastewater SDC:

Reimbursement.....\$327 per wastewater unit
 Improvement.....\$566 per wastewater unit
TOTAL.....**\$893 per wastewater unit**

Water System Development Charge (adopted Res. 16-2006, April 18, 2006)

Meter Size	Reimbursement	Improvement	Administration	TOTAL
5/8"x3/4"	\$492	\$409	\$69	\$970
3/4"x3/4"	\$738	\$613.50	\$103.50	\$1,455
1"	\$1,230	\$1,022.50	\$172.50	\$2,425
1.5"	\$2,460	\$2,045	\$345	\$4,850
2"	\$3,936	\$3,272	\$552	\$7,760
3"	\$7,872	\$6,544	\$1,104	\$15,520
4"	\$12,300	\$10,225	\$1,725	\$24,250
6"	\$24,600	\$20,450	\$3,450	\$48,500
8"	\$39,360	\$32,720	\$5,520	\$77,600
10"	\$56,580	\$47,035	\$7,935	\$111,550
12"	\$110,700	\$92,025	\$15,525	\$218,250

Parks and Recreation System Development Charge

Collected for the North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District for residential uses only.

Parks and Recreation SDC:

Single-Family Residential.....\$2,078 per dwelling unit

City of Milwaukie Fees & Charges

Adopted June 19, 2007/Effective July 1, 2007—Resolution #??-2007 (except as noted)

Page 15

Multifamily Residential	\$1,712 per dwelling unit
Manufactured Residence (in park).....	\$1,734 per dwelling unit

BUSINESS REGISTRATION

Standard base fee	\$100
Reduced standard base fee*	\$40
New business commencing between July 1 and December 31.....	\$50
Change in business ownership fee	\$10
Fee for each FTE.....	\$3
Penalty.....	\$10% of base fee each calendar month and fraction thereof delinquent
Temporary Business (2 weeks or less)	\$25
Business registration list.....	\$30
Duplicate receipt.....	\$10

*The purpose of the reduced standard base fee is to provide a cost benefit for small businesses already registered with the city. First time applicants and start-up businesses are not eligible. To qualify, a registered business must submit acceptable documentation showing annual gross income (receipts) from the business of less than \$10,000.00 in a calendar year. The only acceptable documentation is the one or two year's previous IRS Form 1040 together with a copy of Schedule C (home-based businesses) or Schedule E (rental properties). If the documents are presented in person, the city will not retain a copy. If the documents are mailed, the copies will be reviewed and shredded.

The reduced fee is only available to qualified businesses through January 31st of each renewal year. All renewals submitted after January 31st must pay the full standard base fee.

The reduced fee is only available to qualified businesses December 1 through January 31 of the renewal year. All renewals received and/or submitted after January 31 must pay the full standard base fee.

PARKING

Monthly Permit.....	\$25
6-month prepay permit	\$125
Parking without a permit	\$25
Overtime parking	\$15
Parking in disabled space.....	\$250 min./\$600 max.

POLICE

Permits/Licenses

Adult Business	\$372
Alarm Permit—Residential (seniors 60+ exempt from fee requirement)	\$15
Alarm Permit—Business.....	\$21
Gun Background Check	\$21
Liquor License (Original Application).....	\$108
Liquor License (Name or other change).....	\$83
Liquor License (Renewal Application)	\$36
Liquor License (Temporary License).....	\$10

Police Reports

Dispatch Tape Copy	\$26
Video Tape Copy.....	\$31
Police Report	\$15
Copy of Field Contact Report (FCR card)	\$5

Police Services

False Alarm Response (first three).....	No charge
False Alarm Response (each alarm after third)	\$160
Vehicle Impound.....	\$50

City of Milwaukie Fees & Charges

Adopted June 19, 2007/Effective July 1, 2007—Resolution #??-2007 (except as noted)

Page 17

Fingerprinting.....	\$10
Loud Party Response—first response.....	Warning
Loud Party Response—second response and/or each subsequent response in 24-hr. period	\$50

LIBRARY

Charges

Microfilm Copies	\$0.10
Photocopies:	
Black and White	\$0.10
Color	\$0.90

Fines

Overdue Fine (all materials)	\$0.25/day (\$3 max.)
Missing Barcode	\$1
Missing Book Jacket	\$2
Missing Barcode and Book Jacket	\$3
Books on Tape Cassette	\$7
Juvenile or Adult Books on Tape—Vinyl Case	\$5
Juvenile Kit—Plastic Bag	\$2
Media Cases:	
Cover sheet	\$1
Video Box	\$3 \$1
DVD Case	\$1
CD Case	\$1
CD-ROM and Audiobook Cases	\$2
Missing Pages and Booklets	Refer to Librarian
Lost Book	Actual Retail Cost
Damaged Material	Replacement Cost
Lost Library Card	\$1
Public Computer Printing	First 5 free then \$0.10 per page

MISCELLANEOUS

Photocopies

Staff Assisted/Research Required:	
Black and White	\$0.30
Color	\$1
Unassisted:	
Black and White	\$0.05
Color	\$0.75

Other Copying/Service

Audio tape.....	\$10
Video tape.....	\$20
Transcription (per hour)	\$20 \$30

Photographs

Photo CD	\$5 per disc
Color photos on photo quality paper	\$3 per page
Color photos on standard copy paper	\$1 per page

Financial Reports

Comprehensive Annual Financial Report.....	\$10 \$40
Annual Adopted Budget.....	\$10 \$40

Miscellaneous

Sidewalk Bench annual fee	\$74
Sidewalk Use—Vendor Fee	\$10
Major Community Event	Actual Direct Cost
Block Party—Misc. Event	Actual Direct Cost
Returned Check Charge	\$30
Lien Search.....	\$25
Postage and Handling	\$2 + postage cost

RECYCLING

Down to Earth Day

Automobile Load.....	\$2
Station Wagon	\$2
Small Pickup	\$5
Standard Pickup	\$6
Large Truck.....	\$8
Small Trailer.....	\$5
Large Trailer	\$6
Unmounted Tires (each).....	\$1.50
Residual Solid Waste Permit Registration.....	\$100
Residual Solid Waste Tonnage Fee.....	\$2.80/ton

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Registration fee.....	\$36
Franchise review deposit.....	\$5,000
Community Service Use—Wireless Communication Facility (see PLANNING fees)	
Right-of-Way Usage for Wireless Communication Facility (see ENGINEERING fees)	

BILLABLE HOURLY RATES

Hourly rates for employee services are billed at the actual cost per hour for that employee. The following is given as an estimate only of what the rate will be.

Community Development and Public Works Administration

Community Development and Public Works Director	\$60	\$73
Resource and Economic Development Specialist	\$35	\$44
Office Supervisor	\$35	\$38
Administrative Specialist III.....	\$35	\$34
Administrative Specialist II.....	\$30	\$31

Engineering

Engineering Director.....	\$60	\$64
Civil Engineer.....		\$50
Associate Engineer.....	\$45	\$41

Planning

Planning Director.....	\$60	\$64
Senior Planner.....		\$41
Associate Planner.....	\$40	\$44
Assistant Planner.....	\$35	\$39

Building

Building Official.....	\$50	\$55
Building Inspector.....	\$40	\$44
Permit Technician.....	\$35	\$34

Operations

Operations Director	\$60	\$64
Operations Supervisor.....	\$50	\$48
Fleet Supervisor.....	\$45	\$46
Facilities Maintenance Coordinator	\$40	\$41
Water Quality Coordinator.....	\$40	\$39
Asset Management Technician		\$38
Utility Specialist II.....	\$40	\$38
Mechanic	\$35	\$34
Utility Worker II	\$35	\$36
Utility Specialist I.....	\$30	\$31
Utility Worker I	\$30	\$31

Code Compliance

Code Compliance Coordinator	\$35	\$38
Code Compliance Assistant	\$30	\$31



CITY HALL
10722 SE Main
MILWAUKIE, OREGON 97222

PHONE: (503) 786-7555
FAX: (503) 652-4433

Fees & Charges

Adopted June 19, 2007—Resolution #??-2007 (except as noted)

Effective July 1, 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLANNING	2
Land Use Applications.....	2
Reviews, Inspections, and Preapplication Conferences	4
Materials	5
BUILDING	6
Section I. Residential Building Permits.....	6
Section II. Commercial/Industrial Building Permits	8
Section III. Permit Related Fees.....	9
Section IV. In-Fill and Grading.....	10
ENGINEERING	11
Inspections and Permits	11
Materials (Engineering)	11
Printed and Electronic Maps (GIS).....	11
Erosion Control.....	12
WATER	12
Service and Equipment	12
Equipment.....	12
Miscellaneous.....	12
SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGES	13
Transportation System Development Charge (adopted Res. 36-2004, October 4, 2004).....	13
Stormwater System Development Charge (adopted Res. 15-2006, April 18, 2006)	13
Wastewater System Development Charge (adopted Res. 44-1994, November 1, 1994)	13
Water System Development Charge (adopted Res. 16-2006, April 18, 2006)	13
Parks and Recreation System Development Charge.....	13
BUSINESS REGISTRATION	15
PARKING	15
POLICE	15
Permits/Licenses	15
Police Reports	15
Police Services	15
LIBRARY	16
Charges	16
Fines	16
MISCELLANEOUS	17
Photocopies	17
Other Copying/Service	17
Photographs	17
Financial Reports.....	17
Miscellaneous.....	17
RECYCLING	17
Down to Earth Day	17
TELECOMMUNICATIONS	17
BILLABLE HOURLY RATES	18
Community Development and Public Works Administration.....	18
Engineering.....	18
Planning.....	18
Building.....	18
Operations	18
Code Compliance	18

PLANNING

Land Use Applications

Title 19 Zoning

Chapter 19.300 Use Zones

CSC Community Shopping Commercial Review	\$1,500
CSU Community Service Use	\$1,500 (max.) or Actual Cost *
CSU Community Service Use—Wireless Communication Facility (Type II review)	\$750
CSU Community Service Use—Wireless Communication Facility (Minor Quasi-Judicial review)	Actual Cost *
Reserve deposit	\$1,000
DR Design Review (Type I review, without Building Permit).....	\$130
DR Design Review (Type I review, with Building Permit).....	Incl. w/cost of Major Building Permit Review
DR Design Review (Type II review)	\$800
DR Design Review (Minor Quasi-Judicial review)	\$1,500
HR Historic Resource Alteration (Type I review).....	\$500
HR Historic Resource Alteration (Minor Quasi-Judicial review)	\$1,500
HR Historic Resource Deletion.....	\$2,035
HR Historic Resource Demolition.....	\$2,035
HR Historic Resource Designation.....	\$0
MU Mixed Use Overlay Review.....	\$1,500
PD Planned Development (Preliminary Plan Review)	\$2,615
PD Planned Development (Final Plan Review).....	\$3,245
WG Willamette Greenway Review	\$1,500
WQR Water Quality Resource (Type I review, without Building Permit).....	\$130 **
WQR Water Quality Resource (Type I review, w/Building Permit)	Incl. w/cost of Major Bldg. Permit Review **
WQR Water Quality Resource (Type II review)	\$750 **
WQR Water Quality Resource (Minor Quasi-Judicial review).....	\$1,500 **

Chapter 19.400 Supplementary Regulations

ADU Accessory Dwelling Unit, Type 1	\$860
TAR Transition Area Review	\$1,500
TS Temporary Structure (Type I review)	\$50
TS Temporary Structure (Minor Quasi-Judicial review)	\$1,010

Chapter 19.600 Conditional Uses

ADU Accessory Dwelling Unit, Type 2	\$1,770
CU Conditional Use	\$1,500

Chapter 19.700 Variances, Exceptions, and Home Improvement Exceptions

E Use Exception	\$1,500
HIE Home Improvement Exception	\$800
VR Variance (Type II review).....	\$800
Additional reserve deposit.....	\$700
VR Variance (Minor Quasi-Judicial review).....	\$1,500

Chapter 19.800 Nonconforming Uses

DD Director's Determination of Nonconforming Situation	\$50
NCU Nonconforming Use/Structure (Type II review)	\$800
NCU Nonconforming Use/Structure (Minor Quasi-Judicial review)	\$1,500

Chapter 19.900 Amendments

CPA Comprehensive Plan/Map Amendment	\$3,210
ZA Zoning Ordinance Amendment.....	\$3,210
ZC Zoning Map Amendment (aka "Zone Change")	\$3,210
Ballot Measure 56 Notice (for Zone Amendment or Zone Change).....	Actual Cost (\$1 per affected property, \$35 minimum)
Reserve deposit	\$500

Chapter 19.1000 Administrative Provisions

AP Appeal to City Planning Commission/City Council	\$505
DI Planning Director Interpretation	\$100

Chapter 19.1400 Transportation Planning, Design Standards, and Procedures

TPR Transportation Plan Review (Type I review)	\$150 **
TPR Transportation Plan Review (Type II review)	\$750 **
TPR Transportation Plan Review (Minor Quasi-Judicial review)	\$750 **
Additional reserve deposit.....	\$750 **

Chapter 19.1500 Boundary Changes (Annexations)

A Annexation (Expedited).....	\$100
A Annexation (Nonexpedited with no Zone Change or Comp Plan Amendment)	\$100
A Annexation (Nonexpedited: Zone Change only).....	\$100
A Annexation (Nonexpedited: Zone Change and Comp Plan Amendment).....	\$3,210

Title 17 Land Division

DD Director's Determination of Legal Lot Status	\$50
ELD Expedited Land Division.....	\$4,125
FP Minor Land Partition (Final Plat)	\$150
FP Subdivision (Final Plat)	\$150
LC Lot Consolidation	\$250
Additional reserve deposit.....	\$250
MLP Minor Land Partition.....	\$750
Additional reserve deposit.....	\$1,000
PLA Property Line Adjustment.....	\$640
R Partition Replat.....	\$500
Additional reserve deposit.....	\$500
R Subdivision Replat	\$500
Additional reserve deposit.....	\$1,000
S Subdivision (Preliminary Plat)	\$2,630
SV Street or Plat Vacation.....	\$1,905
Extension of Planning Commission Approval.....	\$40

Title 14 Signs

Adjustment.....	\$1,500
Community Service Use Sign Review (Minor Quasi-Judicial review)	Actual Cost *
Sign Permit Review (see Reviews, Inspections, and Preapplication Conferences below)	

Other fees

M-37 Property Value Reduction Claims (Ballot Measure 37)	\$1,515
(Fee will be refunded if applicant prevails. If claim is denied, additional money may be required to cover contract-attorney or appraiser costs, as determined by City Manager.)	
TP Tree Permit (major pruning or removal of trees in the public right-of-way)	\$35
Technical Report Review (Traffic, Wetlands, Geotechnical, Hydrology, etc):	
• Scope of Work Preparation	Actual Cost *
Additional reserve deposit	\$1,000
• Review of Technical Report	Actual Cost *
Reserve deposit:	
• Traffic	\$2,500
• All others	\$1,000
Variance from Clear Vision Standards	\$1,500
Zoning Confirmation Letter	\$50

Discounts for Land Use Applications

Two or more applications	No discount for most expensive application—50% discount for all others ***
Senior citizens and low income citizens	25% discount (50% for appeals) ****
NDA-sponsored land use applications related to parks	Fees waived

Deposit Information

In some cases, reserve deposits are collected to ensure that the City’s actual costs are covered. Deposits will be refunded relative to actual costs, and additional money may be required if actual costs exceed the deposit amount. Deposits collected as part of Type II land division applications (such as Minor Land Partitions, Lot Consolidations, and Replats) are generally refunded if the application is not elevated to the level of Minor Quasi-Judicial review. However, part or all of the deposit may be kept (based on actual costs) if the application is deemed to warrant an extraordinary level of staff time and resources. This applies only to reserve deposits—base fees are nonrefundable.

Notes

- * Actual cost to be determined by Planning Director or Engineering Director
- ** Water Quality Resource and Transportation Plan Review applications may also require additional Technical Report Review.
- *** Applies to applications which relate to the same parcel of land and which will be considered at the same Planning Commission meeting.
- **** Seniors must be at least 62 years of age. Low-income citizens may qualify for reduced fees by filing the same application used to apply for reduced sewer and water rates.

Reviews, Inspections, and Preapplication Conferences

Building Permit Review (Short).....	\$25
Building Permit Review (Minor)	\$95
Building Permit Review (Major)	\$130
Planning Inspection Fee	\$50
Preapplication Conference	\$125
Preapplication Conference with Transportation Review	\$200
Sign Permit Review	\$95/sign type
Sign Permit Review (Daily Display or “sandwich board” sign)	\$25

Materials

Many materials are available online for free at www.ci.milwaukie.or.us/departments/planning/planning.html.
 Contact Planning staff for additional information.

Zoning Ordinance	\$13
Comprehensive Plan	\$15

Comprehensive Plan or Zoning Ordinance Map:

- 11x17 handout (Black & White/Color)..... No charge/\$2
- GIS maps (e.g., Zoning Map)..... Full sheet \$45; see Engineering fees for other sizes
- Bluelines (e.g., Zoning Map)..... All sizes \$5

Comprehensive Plan ancillary documents: (most not available online)

- Ardenwald Park Master Plan\$2
- Downtown and Riverfront Land Use Framework Plan.....\$25
- Elk Rock Island Natural Area Management Plan.....\$8
- Furnberg Park Master Plan.....\$5
- Homewood Park Master Plan\$1
- Johnson Creek Resources Management Plan\$15
- Lake Road Multimodal Plan\$8
- Lewelling Community Park Master Plan\$1
- North Clackamas PFP\$25
- Town Center Master Plan\$15
- Scott Park Master Plan\$2
- Spring Park Master Plan\$5
- Springwater Corridor Master Plan.....\$8
- Transportation System Plan.....\$32
- Water Tower Park Master Plan.....\$2
- Wichita Park Master Plan.....\$2
- Vision Statement (one page) No charge

Sign Ordinance.....	\$5
Land Division Ordinance	\$5
Downtown Design Guidelines (Black & White/Color).....	\$10/\$35
Downtown and Riverfront Public Area Requirements	\$16
Other informational handouts (10 pages or less)	No charge
Other informational handouts (over 10 pages).....	At cost

BUILDING

Section I. Residential Building Permits

A. Structural Permits—Valuation shall be calculated in accordance with OAR 918-050-0100.

1. Permit Fee

Permit fees from calculation of total valuation from the square footage of the improvement

\$1-\$500.....	\$18.75
\$501-\$2,000.....	\$18.75 plus \$2.89 per \$C over \$5C to \$2K
\$2,001-\$25,000.....	\$62.10 plus \$11.54 per \$K over \$2K to \$25K
\$25,001-\$50,000.....	\$327.52 plus \$8.58 per \$K over \$25K to \$50K
\$50,001-\$100,000.....	\$542.02 plus \$5.77 per \$K over \$50K to \$100K
\$100,001 and up.....	\$830.52 plus \$4.88 per \$K over \$100K
Minimum permit fee.....	\$75.00

- 2. **Initial Plan Review Fees** 65% of the permit fee
- 3. **Plan Review Fees Required/Requested by Changes, Additions, Revisions**..... \$70.00/hr. (min. charge 1 hr.)
- 4. **Third Party Plan Review Fee (for transfer of plan review to a third party)**..... 10% of the permit fee (\$65.00 min.)

B. Mechanical Permits—Fees per current Mechanical Permit application

Minimum Permit Fee \$60.00

1. HVAC

For the installation of:

a. Air handling unit including ducts:	
Up to 10,000 cfm.....	\$23.00
Over 10,000 cfm.....	\$26.00
b. Air conditioning/heat pump (site plan required)	\$40.00
c. Alteration of existing HVAC system	\$18.50
d. Boiler/compressor	\$18.50
e. Install/relocate/replace furnace/burner including ductwork and vent:	
Up to 100,000 BTU/H.....	\$18.50
Over 100,000 BTU/H	\$22.00
f. Install/relocate/replace heaters (room, suspended, wall- or floor-mounted)	\$18.50
g. Vent for other than furnace	\$18.50

2. Environmental Exhaust and Ventilation

For the installation of:

a. Appliance vent	\$15.00
b. Dryer exhaust.....	\$12.00
c. Each hood that is served by a mechanical exhaust or air conditioning.....	\$10.00
d. Exhaust system with single duct (bath fan) each	\$8.50
e. Exhaust system apart from heating or air conditioning.....	\$12.00

3. Fuel Piping and Distribution

a. LPG-NG-Oil fuel piping:	
Up to 4 outlets (includes gas tag)	\$22.00
Each additional outlet over 4	\$2.00

4. Other Listed Application or Equipment

a. Decorative fireplace or insert	\$35.00
b. Woodstove/pellet stove.....	\$47.00
c. For each appliance or piece of equipment regulated by the code but not classed in other appliance categories, for which no other fee is listed in this code, or for which there is an alteration or extension of an existing mechanical system.....	\$18.50

- 5. **Stand-alone Fire Suppression Systems (requires a backflow device installed by licensed plumbing contractor or persons exempt from licensing)**
 - 0 sq. ft. to 2,000 sq. ft. \$90.00
 - 2,001 sq. ft. to 3,600 sq. ft. \$135.00
 - 3,601 sq. ft. to 7,200 sq. ft. \$169.00
 - \$7,201 sq. ft. and greater \$315.00

C. Plumbing Permits—Fees per current Plumbing Permit application

- 1. **Total Bathrooms Per Dwelling**
 - 1 bath dwelling (includes 1 kitchen) \$335.00
 - 2 bath dwelling (includes 1 kitchen) \$370.00
 - 3 bath dwelling (includes 1 kitchen) \$440.00
 - Additional bathroom/kitchen \$175.00

Includes the first 100 ft. of water piping, sanitary and storm sewer lines, hose bibs, icemakers, underfloor low point drains, and rain drain packages that include the piping, gutters, downspouts, and perimeter system.
- 2. **Additions, Alterations, and Repairs**..... \$16.75/fixture
- 3. **Building Sewer Connection**..... \$57.00
- 4. **Multipurpose or Continuous Loop Fire Suppression Systems**
 - 0 sq. ft. to 2,000 sq. ft. \$90.00
 - 2,001 sq. ft. to 3,600 sq. ft. \$135.00
 - 3,601 sq. ft. to 7,200 sq. ft. \$169.00
 - \$7,201 sq. ft. and greater \$315.00
- 5. **Minimum permit fee**..... \$60.00

D. Other Inspections and Fees

- 1. **Inspections outside of normal business hours** \$98.00/hr. (min. charge 2 hrs.)
 (Must be preapproved by applicant)
- 2. **Inspections for which no fee is specifically indicated** \$68.00/hr.
 (Must be preapproved by applicant)
- 3. **Reinspection fee** \$58.00/hr.
- 4. **Replacement sheets** \$23.00/sheet
- 5. **The minimum fee shall be**..... \$50.00
- 6. **Investigation fee** Amount of subject permit fee
- 7. **Temporary Certificate of Completion** \$50.00

E. Manufactured Dwelling and Cabana Installation Permits— All jurisdictions in the Tri-County area shall charge a single fee for the installation and set-up of manufactured homes. This single fee shall include the concrete slab, runners, or foundations when they comply with the prescriptive requirements of the Oregon Manufactured Dwelling standard, electrical feeder and plumbing connections, and all cross-over connections.

- 1. **Installation permit**..... \$445.00
- 2. **Earthquake-resistant bracing**..... \$135.00
- 3. **Reinspection** \$135.00
- 4. **Statewide code development, training and monitoring fee** (in addition to all other manufactured dwelling fees and charges)..... \$30.00

Section II. Commercial/Industrial Building Permits

A. Structural Permits—Valuation shall be calculated in accordance with OAR 918-050-0110.

1. **Permit Fee**
 Permit fees from calculation of total valuation from the square footage of the improvement

\$1-\$500.....	\$18.75
\$501-\$2,000.....	\$18.75 plus \$2.89 per \$C over \$5C to \$2K
\$2,001-\$25,000.....	\$62.10 plus \$11.54 per \$K over \$2K to \$25K
\$25,001-\$50,000.....	\$327.52 plus \$8.58 per \$K over \$25K to \$50K
\$50,001-\$100,000.....	\$542.02 plus \$5.77 per \$K over \$50K to \$100K
\$100,001 and up.....	\$830.52 plus \$4.88 per \$K over \$100K
Minimum permit fee.....	\$75.00
2. **Initial Plan Review Fees** 65% of the permit fee
3. **Plan Review Fees Required/Requested by Changes, Additions, Revisions**..... \$70.00/hr. (min. charge 1 hr.)
4. **Fire and Life Safety Plan Review Fee** (commercial only)40% of structural permit fee
 (Based on valuation of total improvements or \$50.00/hr. to review a Fire and Life Safety Master Plan)
 (Hourly charge must be approved by Applicant)
5. **Seismic Site Hazard Report Review** 1% of total structural and mechanical fees

B. Mechanical Permits—Valuation shall be calculated on the value of the equipment and installation costs.

1. **Use this section for commercial installation, replacement or relocation of nonportable mechanical equipment or mechanical work not covered previously. Indicate the value of all mechanical labor, materials, and equipment.**
 Permit Fee:

\$1 to \$5,000.....	\$60.00
\$5,001 to \$10,000.....	\$60.00 plus \$1.71 per \$C over \$5K
\$10,001 to \$100,000.....	\$145.50 plus \$10.50 per \$K over \$10K
\$100,001 and up.....	\$1,090.50 plus \$7.25 per \$K over \$100K
Minimum permit fee.....	\$60.00
2. **Plan review fee**..... 25% of mechanical permit fee
3. **Plan Review Fees Required/Requested by Changes, Additions, Revisions**..... \$70.00/hr. (min. charge 1 hr.)

C. Plumbing Permits

1. **Each fixture** \$16.75
2. **Utilities per 100 feet**..... \$62.00
 - a. Catch basin..... \$27.00
 - b. Drywells each..... \$27.00
 - c. Footing drain (per 100 lin. ft.)..... \$53.00
 - d. Rain drain connector..... \$27.00
 - e. Manholes each..... \$53.00
3. **Piping (per 100 lin. ft.)**..... \$62.00
4. **Building Sewers (per 100 lin. ft.)**..... \$62.00
5. **Initial Plan Review Fees** 30% of the Plumbing permit fees
6. **Plan Review Fees Required/requested by Changes, Additions, or Revisions**\$70.00/hr. for commercial
7. **Minimum permit fee**..... \$60.00
8. **Medical Gas Permits:** Valuation shall be calculated on the value of the equipment and installation costs.
Medical Gas Permit Fees:

\$1-\$5,000.....	\$60.00
\$5,001-\$10,000.....	\$60.00 plus \$1.71 per \$C over \$5K
\$10,001-\$100,000.....	\$145.50 plus \$10.50 per \$K over \$10K
\$100,001 and up.....	\$1,090.50 plus \$7.25 per \$K over \$100K
Minimum permit fee.....	\$60.00

D. Other Inspections and Fees

- 1. **Inspections outside of normal business hours** \$98.00/hr. (min. charge 2 hrs.)
 (Must be preapproved by applicant)
- 2. **Inspections for which no fee is specifically indicated**\$68.00/hr.
 (Must be preapproved by applicant)
- 3. **Reinspection fee**.....\$58.00/hr.
- 4. **Replacement sheets**.....\$23.00/sheet
- 5. **The minimum fee shall be**.....\$50.00
- 6. **Investigation fee**Amount of subject permit fee
- 7. **Temporary Certificate of Occupancy**\$180.00
- 8. **Change of use/occupancy**.....\$300.00

E. Deferred Submittal Fee (in addition to project plan review fee)
 (OAR 918-050-0170).....\$250.00 + 10% of deferred item permit fee
 per deferred submittal (minimum \$300.00)

F. Phased Permit Fee (in addition to project plan review fee)
 (OAR 918-050-0160).....\$250.00 + 10% of total project permit fee per phase
 (minimum \$300.00, not to exceed \$1,500 per phase)

Section III. Permit Related Fees

- A. A State surcharge shall be collected in an amount as required by State law.**
- B. Electrical permit fees shall be as adopted in Resolution 19-2003, adopted by the City Council on May 6, 2003 (effective July 1, 2003) with the following exceptions:**
 - 1. **The state surcharge shall be the amount required by State law as noted in Section III.A of this resolution.**
 - 2. **The Minor Labels program will be deleted as required by SB 512 and SB 587.**

C. House Moving/Demolition Permits
 2,000 sq. ft. or less\$78.00
 Each additional 1,000 sq. ft.\$38.00
 Plan Review Fee 65% of the permit fee

D. Prefabricated Structures(Per current permit fees)

E. Temporary Structures.....(Per current permit fees)

F. Manufactured Dwelling Parks and Mobile Home Parks..... Per current State of Oregon permit fee
 (OAR. Division 650.Table 1) plus 30%

G. Recreational Parks and Organizational Camps..... Per current State of Oregon permit fee
 (OAR.Division 650.Table 1) plus 30%

H. Miscellaneous Building Valuations

- 1. Retaining Walls**
 To 8 ft. high, including footing..... \$254.00/lin. ft.
 Over 8 ft. high \$276.00/lin. ft.
- 2. Fences**
 Over 6 ft. to 8 ft. high \$15.00/lin. ft.
- 3. Concrete Slabs on Grade Foundations**—For house moves, modular buildings, pole buildings, etc.
 Plain concrete:
 4-in. slab \$3.00/sq. ft.
 5-in. slab \$3.10/sq. ft.
 6-in. slab \$3.25/sq. ft.
 Reinforced concrete Add \$1.15/sq. ft.
- 4. Crawl Space Foundations**
 For house moves, modular, etc. \$7.50/sq. ft.
- 5. Accessory Buildings**
 With floor slab \$55.00/sq. ft.
 Without floor slab \$28.00/sq. ft.
- 6. Pole Buildings**
 Up to and including 14-ft. eave height..... \$32.00/sq. ft.
 Over 14-ft. eave height \$45.00/sq. ft.
 For insulation:
 Roof—add \$.35/sq. ft.
 Slab—add \$.35/sq. ft.
 Wall—add \$.35/sq. ft.
 For slabs on grade see Section III.H.3 for fees
- 7. Swimming Pools** (pool only/deck extra)
 Concrete or gunite \$70.00/sq. ft.
 Plastic below ground \$45.00/sq. ft.

Section IV. In-Fill and Grading

- A. In-Fill and Grading Permit Fees**
 50 cubic yards or less..... No charge
 51 to 100 cubic yards \$35.00
 101 to 1,000 cubic yards \$45.00
 1,001 to 10,000 cubic yards \$65.00
 10,001 cubic yards or more..... Total hourly cost*
 *Cost to include supervision, overhead, equipment, hourly wages, and benefits of employees involved
- B. In-Fill and Grading Plan Review Fees**
 50 cubic yards or less..... No charge
 51 to 100 cubic yards \$35.00
 101 to 1,000 cubic yards \$45.00
 1,001 to 10,000 cubic yards \$65.00
 10,001 cubic yards or more..... Total hourly cost*
 *Cost to include supervision, overhead, equipment, hourly wages, and benefits of employees involved
- C. Other Inspections and Fees**
 - 1. Inspections outside normal business hours** \$75.00/hr. (min. charge 2 hrs.)
 - 2. Reinspection fee** \$75.00/hr.
 - 3. Inspections for which no fee is specifically indicated** \$75.00/hr.

ENGINEERING

Inspections and Permits

Right-of-Way Inspection Permit.....	\$135
Right-of-Way Use Permit.....	\$30
Subdivision Const. Inspect. (Street/Sewer/Water/Storm Sewer)	5.5% of Total Const. Cost (min. \$500)
Public Impvts. Const. Inspection (Comml./Ind./Misc. Dev.)	5.5% of Total Const. Cost (min. \$500)
Street Opening Inspection Fee.....	\$85
Right-of-way/Street Opening Reinspection (beyond standard of 2 for R-O-W and 1 for street opening).....	\$85
Street Opening Deposit	\$1,500 (Performance bond amount at discretion of City Engineer)
Right-of-Way Usage for Wireless Communication Facility.....	\$250/month per antenna per utility pole
Sewer Inspection (residential)	\$57
Sewer Dye Test	\$57
Moving Buildings.....	\$200 + \$65/hr. staff time + \$1,000 deposit

Materials (Engineering)

Public Works Standards	\$30
Transportation Design Manual	\$5
Aerial Maps (all sizes)	\$5
Bluelines (all sizes).....	\$5
Microfilm (all sizes)	\$5
Sewer TV Inspection Tape	\$25

Electronic Drawings

Paper—all sizes	\$5-\$45/hr. for additional work
Other format	\$7
Reproduction charges.....	\$1 for first page/\$.10 each additional page

Printed and Electronic Maps (GIS)

Standard selection of GIS maps

Full Sheet (34" x 44")	\$45
1/2 Sheet (22" x 34").....	\$35
1/4 Sheet (17" x 22").....	\$25
1/8 Sheet (11" x 17").....	\$15
Electronic file (via electronic mail in PDF, JPG, GIF or TIF formats)	\$15
Electronic file (for mailed media, which includes postage, handling and media charges).....	\$22

Aerial maps

Full Sheet (34" x 44").....	\$50
1/2 Sheet (22" x 34").....	\$40
1/4 Sheet (17" x 22").....	\$30
1/8 Sheet (11" x 17").....	\$20
Electronic file (via electronic mail in PDF, JPG, GIF or TIF formats)	\$15
Electronic file (for mailed media, which includes postage, handling and media charges).....	\$22

Custom maps:

Flat charge per hour plus cost of materials	\$55
Electronic file (for mailed media, which includes postage, handling and media charges).....	\$7

Erosion Control

Technical Guidance Handbook	No charge
Minimum Charge for Clearing/Construction*	\$75
Minimum charge applies if:	
• Over 500 sq. ft. of disturbed soil	
• Not in or around a sensitive area (NR Zone, wetlands, conservancies, and streams)	
• Value of structure/remodel doesn't exceed \$20,000	
Clearing/Construction for Single-Family Residential	\$380
Rate if certified in erosion control**	\$225
Clearing/Construction for Multifamily Residential	\$490
Rate if certified in erosion control**	\$335
	(additional \$40 per ½ acre over 1 acre)
Clearing/Construction for Subdivision/Commercial/Industrial	\$623
Rate if certified in erosion control**	\$467
	(additional \$40 per ½ acre over 1 acre)
Additional Site Visit (due to code enforcement)	\$65

*Erosion control certification discount does not apply
 **Certification requires 4 hours of training in erosion control every 2 years

WATER

Service and Equipment

Connect Service 5/8" or 3/4" Residential Service	\$2,460
Connect Service 1"	\$2,547
Connect Service 1 1/2"	\$2,923
Connect Service 2"	\$3,067

Equipment

3/4" Meter	\$208
1" Meter	\$301
1 1/2" Meter	\$510
2" Meter	\$625
Hydrant Meter Deposit.....	\$2000
	(Refundable less water usage)

Miscellaneous

Delinquent Account—Past Due Notice.....	\$10
Delinquent Account—Notice of Termination	\$30
Failed Arrangement Shut-off	\$30
After-hours Restoration of Service	\$80
	(Monday-Friday 5:00-8:00 p.m.; Saturday and Sunday 8:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m.)
Information Research	\$44/hr.
Reimbursement District Fee	To be determined by scope of project

SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGES

Transportation System Development Charge (adopted Res. 36-2004, October 4, 2004)

Trip generation rates for each land use type are derived from the Institute of Transportation (ITE) report Trip Generation (7th Edition, 2003). Trip rates are expressed as vehicle trips entering and leaving a property during the p.m. peak travel period.

Transportation SDC..... **\$1,511.50 per trip**

Stormwater System Development Charge (adopted Res. 15-2006, April 18, 2006)

Stormwater unit is equal to 2,706 square feet of impervious surface on the property. Each single-family residential property is 1 stormwater unit.

Stormwater SDC:

Reimbursement.....\$267 per stormwater unit
 Improvement.....\$759 per stormwater unit
 Administration.....\$79 per stormwater unit
TOTAL.....**\$1,105 per stormwater unit**

Wastewater System Development Charge (adopted Res. 44-1994, November 1, 1994)

A wastewater unit is equal to 16 fixture units derived from Table 7-3 of the Oregon Plumbing Specialty Code. Each residential dwelling unit is 1 wastewater unit.

Wastewater SDC:

Reimbursement.....\$327 per wastewater unit
 Improvement.....\$566 per wastewater unit
TOTAL.....**\$893 per wastewater unit**

Water System Development Charge (adopted Res. 16-2006, April 18, 2006)

Meter Size	Reimbursement	Improvement	Administration	TOTAL
5/8"x3/4"	\$492	\$409	\$69	\$970
3/4"x3/4"	\$738	\$613.50	\$103.50	\$1,455
1"	\$1,230	\$1,022.50	\$172.50	\$2,425
1.5"	\$2,460	\$2,045	\$345	\$4,850
2"	\$3,936	\$3,272	\$552	\$7,760
3"	\$7,872	\$6,544	\$1,104	\$15,520
4"	\$12,300	\$10,225	\$1,725	\$24,250
6"	\$24,600	\$20,450	\$3,450	\$48,500
8"	\$39,360	\$32,720	\$5,520	\$77,600
10"	\$56,580	\$47,035	\$7,935	\$111,550
12"	\$110,700	\$92,025	\$15,525	\$218,250

Parks and Recreation System Development Charge

Collected for the North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District for residential uses only.

Parks and Recreation SDC:

Single-Family Residential.....\$2,078 per dwelling unit

City of Milwaukie Fees & Charges

Adopted June 19, 2007/Effective July 1, 2007—Resolution #??-2007 (except as noted)

Page 14

Multifamily Residential	\$1,712 per dwelling unit
Manufactured Residence (in park).....	\$1,734 per dwelling unit

BUSINESS REGISTRATION

Standard base fee	\$100
Reduced standard base fee*	\$40
New business commencing between July 1 and December 31.....	\$50
Change in business ownership fee	\$10
Fee for each FTE.....	\$3
Penalty.....	\$10% of base fee each calendar month and fraction thereof delinquent
Temporary Business (2 weeks or less)	\$25
Duplicate receipt.....	\$10

*The purpose of the reduced standard base fee is to provide a cost benefit for small businesses already registered with the city. First time applicants and start-up businesses are not eligible. To qualify, a registered business must submit acceptable documentation showing annual gross income (receipts) from the business of less than \$10,000.00 in a calendar year. The only acceptable documentation is the one or two year's previous IRS Form 1040 together with a copy of Schedule C (home-based businesses) or Schedule E (rental properties). If the documents are presented in person, the city will not retain a copy. If the documents are mailed, the copies will be reviewed and shredded.

The reduced fee is only available to qualified businesses December 1 through January 31 of the renewal year. All renewals received and/or submitted after January 31 must pay the full standard base fee.

PARKING

Monthly Permit.....	\$25
6-month prepay permit	\$125
Parking without a permit.....	\$25
Overtime parking	\$15
Parking in disabled space.....	\$250 min./\$600 max.

POLICE

Permits/Licenses

Adult Business	\$372
Alarm Permit—Residential (seniors 60+ exempt from fee requirement)	\$15
Alarm Permit—Business.....	\$21
Gun Background Check	\$21
Liquor License (Original Application).....	\$108
Liquor License (Name or other change).....	\$83
Liquor License (Renewal Application)	\$36
Liquor License (Temporary License).....	\$10

Police Reports

Dispatch Tape Copy	\$26
Video Tape Copy.....	\$31
Police Report	\$15
Copy of Field Contact Report (FCR card)	\$5

Police Services

False Alarm Response (first three).....	No charge
False Alarm Response (each alarm after third)	\$160
Vehicle Impound.....	\$50
Fingerprinting.....	\$10
Loud Party Response—first response.....	Warning
Loud Party Response—second response and/or each subsequent response in 24-hr. period	\$50

LIBRARY

Charges

Microfilm Copies	\$0.10
Photocopies:	
Black and White	\$0.10
Color	\$0.90

Fines

Overdue Fine (all materials)	\$0.25/day (\$3 max.)
Missing Barcode	\$1
Missing Book Jacket	\$2
Missing Barcode and Book Jacket	\$3
Books on Tape Cassette	\$7
Juvenile or Adult Books on Tape—Vinyl Case	\$5
Juvenile Kit—Plastic Bag	\$2
Media Cases:	
Cover sheet	\$1
Video Box	\$1
DVD Case	\$1
CD Case	\$1
CD-ROM and Audiobook Cases	\$2
Missing Pages and Booklets	Refer to Librarian
Lost Book	Actual Retail Cost
Damaged Material	Replacement Cost
Lost Library Card	\$1
Public Computer Printing	First 5 free then \$0.10 per page

MISCELLANEOUS

Photocopies

Staff Assisted/Research Required:	
Black and White	\$0.30
Color.....	\$1
Unassisted:	
Black and White	\$0.05
Color.....	\$0.75

Other Copying/Service

Audio tape.....	\$10
Video tape.....	\$20
Transcription (per hour).....	\$30

Photographs

Photo CD	\$5 per disc
Color photos on photo quality paper	\$3 per page
Color photos on standard copy paper	\$1 per page

Financial Reports

Comprehensive Annual Financial Report.....	\$40
Annual Adopted Budget.....	\$40

Miscellaneous

Sidewalk Bench annual fee	\$74
Sidewalk Use—Vendor Fee	\$10
Major Community Event	Actual Direct Cost
Block Party—Misc. Event	Actual Direct Cost
Returned Check Charge.....	\$30
Lien Search.....	\$25
Postage and Handling	\$2 + postage cost

RECYCLING

Down to Earth Day

Automobile Load.....	\$2
Station Wagon	\$2
Small Pickup	\$5
Standard Pickup	\$6
Large Truck.....	\$8
Small Trailer.....	\$5
Large Trailer	\$6
Unmounted Tires (each).....	\$1.50
Residual Solid Waste Permit Registration.....	\$100
Residual Solid Waste Tonnage Fee.....	\$2.80/ton

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Registration fee.....	\$36
Franchise review deposit.....	\$5,000
Community Service Use—Wireless Communication Facility (see PLANNING fees)	
Right-of-Way Usage for Wireless Communication Facility (see ENGINEERING fees)	

BILLABLE HOURLY RATES

Hourly rates for employee services are billed at the actual cost per hour for that employee. The following is given as an estimate only of what the rate will be.

Community Development and Public Works Administration

Community Development and Public Works Director	\$73
Resource and Economic Development Specialist	\$44
Office Supervisor	\$38
Administrative Specialist III.....	\$34
Administrative Specialist II.....	\$31

Engineering

Engineering Director.....	\$64
Civil Engineer.....	\$50
Associate Engineer.....	\$41

Planning

Planning Director.....	\$64
Senior Planner.....	\$41
Associate Planner.....	\$44
Assistant Planner.....	\$39

Building

Building Official.....	\$55
Building Inspector.....	\$44
Permit Technician.....	\$34

Operations

Operations Director	\$64
Operations Supervisor.....	\$48
Fleet Supervisor.....	\$46
Facilities Maintenance Coordinator	\$41
Water Quality Coordinator	\$39
Asset Management Technician	\$38
Utility Specialist II.....	\$38
Mechanic	\$34
Utility Worker II	\$36
Utility Specialist I.....	\$31
Utility Worker I	\$31

Code Compliance

Code Compliance Coordinator	\$38
Code Compliance Assistant	\$31

RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MILWAUKIE, OREGON, DETERMINING THE FIRST REGULAR COUNCIL SESSION IN JULY 2007 WILL BE CALLED TO ORDER AT _____ IN THE _____ ON JULY ____; THE WORK SESSION WILL BE CALLED TO ORDER AT _____.

WHEREAS, Municipal Code Chapter 2.04.070 states that the City Council must provide notice of any changes to its regularly scheduled meeting times and locations;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Milwaukie, Oregon, that the City Council will hold its first regular July 2007 session on July _____ and will call it to order at _____; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Council will hold its first July 2007 work session on July _____.

Introduced and adopted by the City Council on June 19, 2007.

This resolution is effective on June 19, 2007.

James Bernard, Mayor

ATTEST:

Pat DuVal, City Recorder

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Ramis, Crew & Corrigan, LLP

June 4, 2007
Meeting of the Riverfront Board
Draft Minutes

Members Present: Seagler, Wall, Green, Stacey, Martin, St.Clair, Klein
Guests: Councilors Stone and Collette and 30-40 visitors
Bridget Wieghart, Metro and Sean Batty, Tri Met

Minutes:

Martin motioned to approve the minutes from the May 8 meeting. Stacey seconded and motion passed 4-0-2 (two abstaining and St Clair not present when vote taken.)

South Corridor Phase II Alignment Discussion

Herrigel began by summarizing the meetings held in the City to date on the South Corridor Phase II. She noted that during and between the Open House and the three segment meetings, City staff and Council have received requests from members of the Waldorf School, Historic Milwaukie NDA, Lake Rd NDA and other schools in the downtown area that the project team consider an additional alignment in the SDEIS, which would go along McLoughlin and/or Main Street. The three alignments currently approved for evaluation in the SDEIS travel along the Tillamook rail line through the downtown area. As a result of these requests, the Mayor has asked for four groups to weigh in on whether this fourth alignment should be taken into the SDEIS. These groups include the Riverfront Board, the Planning Commission, the Downtown Businesses, and the North Industrial Businesses. She said that tonight's discussion was to focus on whether that fourth alignment should be included in the SDEIS so that the Board could deliver a recommendation to the Mayor on this question.

Green acknowledged that there was a large audience and asked the Board how they felt the audience might participate at the meeting. Klein suggested that the Board hear the presentation, have some discussion, ask questions and then hear from the guests afterward. Green said he concurred with this approach and suggested that questions or comments from the audience, specific to the presentation, be taken after the Board had had a chance to ask questions. All Board members agreed to this approach.

Bridget Weighart, Project Manager from Metro, went over the history of the South Corridor project, noting that the Portland to Milwaukie line is Phase II and the I-205 line, currently under construction, is Phase I. She briefly described the three alignments already in the SDEIS, namely the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA), the LPA with a tail running to Park Ave and the Working Group alignment with a tail to Park. She then introduced Sean Batty from Tri Met who would describe the potential Mcloughlin/Main alignment in more detail.

Batty went over a table of contents for a booklet Metro and Tri Met are developing on the Main/McLoughlin alignment. He said he would follow this format roughly for his presentation. He began by showing the Board concept plans of the LPA along the

Tillamook line. He then showed three concepts for possible and feasible alignments involving McLoughlin and Main: 1) McLoughlin (West side running), 2) McLoughlin (Center running) and 3) McLoughlin /Main Couplet. Following are some of the features described for each:

1) McLoughlin (West side running)

- Double tracks
- Bridge and abutment at 224 reconstructed
- 5 buildings displaced
- Signalized crossing on McLoughlin for track to cross McLoughlin from east side
- 29-40 feet of space removed from Riverfront Park (from back of sidewalk)
- Right turn pocket required for entering park
- 275 space Park and Ride at cash Spot
- Stations would be straddle entrance to Park
- 29 foot track only
- 40 foot station and turn lane

For tail to Park:

- Reconstruct rail road bridge south of Kellogg
 - Reconstruct bridge over Kellogg at 99E
- (noted that Tillamook alignment would not affect railroad bridge or Island Station intersections since rail touches down south of this area)

2) McLoughlin (Center running)

- From 224 to Harrison – same affect as West running
- Bridge and abutment at 224 reconstructed
- 5 buildings displaced
- Signalized crossing on McLoughlin for track to cross McLoughlin to center median
- Track would run along center median of McLoughlin
- Left turn lane onto 17th taken up by station at Monroe
- Reconstruct Kellogg Creek bridge at 99E
- Continue center run to Park
- Reconstruct rail road bridge south of Kellogg

Green noted that he'd participated in the CAC for the McLoughlin project and the left turn lane pocket length had been a very important issue to ODOT during that process. He said he was skeptical that ODOT would be of a different mind for this project. Batty acknowledged that they had not met with ODOT on any of these concept plans and he agreed that ODOT might have some issues with mitigation for this design. He noted that if this center running option was not feasible within ODOT's standards, then the side running options would need to be pursued.

Klein asked which option Batty thought affected traffic on Harrison the most. Batty said he thought the center running option did.

3)McLoughlin/Main Couplet

- Single track runs down McLoughlin on west side
- Turn left on Washington (southside)
- Turn left on Main St (east side)
- Terminus track would be in south part of Riverfront on McLoughlin
- 275 car Park and Ride at Cash Spot
- Access to P+R from Main only
- Grade steep on Washington
- Looked at a center and east side run on Main St
- All angled parking would be removed on Main
- 4 new stop lights would replace signed intersections
- Area between 12 and 21 feet of Riverfront to be displaced
- Double and single tracking actually uses similar amount of space since turning and other road elements must be accommodated
- 35 parking spaces would be lost on Main

Stacey asked to look at the overhead of the LPA. Batty noted that the Tillamook alignment had 100 feet of right of way available and three gated street crossings (at Harrison, Monroe and Washington)

Seagler asked if all alternatives have to stop at Lake Rd and then later be extended to Park. Weighart said that the SDEIS would look at either Lake or Park as a terminus but whichever was selected would be built all at once, they wouldn't be phased.

St. Clair asked why they were even looking at alternatives to the Tillamook alignments. Batty noted that community members had requested they look at Main/McLoughlin.

St. Clair asked if an eastside option on McLoughlin was feasible. Batty responded that an eastside run would cause each turn from McLoughlin into downtown to cross two tracks. He said this was hard to reconcile with required mitigation. He said even with safety protections people tend to jump gates or lights to turn right. He also noted that with an east side run business accesses off of McLoughlin would have to be consolidated or closed.

Green noted that despite the amount of space taken up in the Park by each of these options, he had concerns about either single or double tracks along McLoughlin and Main causing additional barriers between downtown and the Riverfront. He noted that one of the Board's main goals was to connect the Park to downtown Milwaukie.

Seagler noted that when you compared the Tillamook alignment to the options presented tonight, the Main/McLoughlin options didn't seem worth it.

Wall said he felt that our resource (the Riverfront) continued to dwindle.

Green noted that we lost some footage from the Park with the McLoughlin enhancements.

Stacey said he felt they'd fought too long and hard for what we have to balance of parking and green space.

Klein asked if the train could run in the street and what about changing streets to one-way? Batty answered that the tracks can run in the street but that they are on tracks so they don't share lanes with cars. He also noted that making streets one-way is possible but the Milwaukie downtown movements would be complicated.

St Clair said he thought the Main/McLoughlin couplet would be okay but we really are tight on space right now.

Klein asked if there was a way to move the terminus track on the couplet option. Batty said that there might be a way to move it to Main St but they'd need more ROW on Main.

Klein noted that any extra wall near Johnson Creek would not be attractive and he noted that there is an outlet there for water from the creek at the Waldorf School.

St Clair suggested they could move the McLoughlin station in the couplet option toward the sewer plant site and that would save some Park space.

Green asked if Sean had looked at a Main/21st couplet. Batty said he had but that the ROW to the north on Main got very thin so the connection to the north was difficult.

Klein asked about using a single tracked system (trains running north and south on the same track). Batty said Tri Met has built this type of track but has always gone back and rebuilt double tracks later to reduce bottlenecks and run time delays.

Seagler asked if this single track idea would prevent extending to Oregon City. Batty noted that it wouldn't prevent it but they would ultimately have to come back and rebuild as a double track if they extended to Oregon City.

St Clair asked about the timeline for light rail. Weighart clarified that the SDEIS would be done in July 2008. Preliminary engineering and final design would then take place and construction would begin in 2011 at the earliest. The line would open in 2014-15.

Klein noted the requirements of the Oregon Marine Board to pay back funds for projects modified or removed and wondered if the light rail project would pay these funds back for the City if the Riverfront was modified. Batty said that this would be evaluated in the SDEIS if this alignment went forward.

Green said that many of the Riverfront Board members have spent the better part of a decade working on this Park and they were protective of every square foot. He said their

mission was to reconnect the downtown to the Riverfront and they wanted to increase that connection rather than decrease it.

Green asked if there were people in the audience that had questions.

Jerry Foy of Westwood Construction and St. John the Baptist Church

- Your missing an opportunity if you don't think light rail would be an attraction
- If I was a business person in Milwaukie I wouldn't like the Tillamook alternative since it's too far away from downtown
- Seems like access issues to the Riverfront are just as bad when the light rail is on Main/McLoughlin as they are now
- Maybe you could use the sewer plant site as a turn around or storage area
- Noted that they had gathered 290 signatures opposing the Tillamook alignment without even trying last Sunday

Mark Gamba, a Gallery owner at the McLoughlin Building(and Waldorf parent?)

- Why not have both stations on Main with Couplet option? (Batty said this could be done but they'd still need a terminus site for dead trains)
- Why not extend south, it makes sense to. (Weighart said all options would be evaluated with a southern "tail" and without one.)

Dan Hoight, a Waldorf parent and TriMet employee from 12 years

- What elements do you look at in the SDEIS? (Batty went over the matrix of issues looked at for each option presented and briefly described what the SDEIS would cover. Weighart then clarified that tonight's presentation was a "quick blush" concept plan and that there was a great deal more evaluation that would have to be done)

Ed Zumwalt

- Batty says no to one track but we were looking at one track before the Waldorf School was purchased (Weighart said that she has been unable to find any evidence of this in the records of the past light rail processes in Milwaukie)

Brandon Eiswerth, Farmers Market Manager

- Noted that there is still discussion of moving the Framers Market to the Riverfront
- Light rail would bring folks from all over to the Riverfront for the Market
- They'd come from Sellwood and south Portland
- People could come to concerts at the Riverfront by light rail too

Carol Damm, Waldorf School Board

- Handed out a position statement on Public Transportation Systems in Downtown Milwaukie
- Asked why not make Main and 21st both one-way
(Batty said they did look at one-way traffic pattern but would need to do broader review if this option moved to SDEIS. He said they present more problems than they solve at first look)
 - Asked why not single track on McLoughlin?
(Batty noted that single track running down center of McLoughlin would take less width but there would still be all the other issues for turning etc he'd

described. He noted that a single track is not really half of a double track due to the infrastructure required for tracks)

Ed Pareki, owner of a potentially impacted building

- Noted that at this point we don't know what impacts there are on the Tillamook line either
- All we are asking is that the pros and cons of other options be included

Scott Churchill, citizen of the City and member of Historic Milwaukie NDA

- Noted he was not speaking as a Planning Commissioner
- Asked that we not jump to tactical solutions
- Noted that the request to consider the Main/McLoughlin alternative was only made 15 working days ago
- We ask that you please include this alternative in the SDEIS
- Highway 26 to Beaverton(congestion was mitigated...???)
- There is inconsistency with how much space we need. Ranges from 30 feet to 100 feet
- Seems that you are building a foundation for tactical solutions

(Batty noted that 34 feet is for track and 80 feet includes curb sidewalk etc.)

Weighart noted that the discussion of the Tillamook alignment uses 100 feet of ROW as what's available – not what will be used. In no case, she said are we shoving 70-80 feet into the neighborhoods)

Green said he'd like the Board to spend time, now, discussing the question.

Wall asked what the timeline was for the SDEIS as it related to the Riverfront design.

Herrigel noted that she understood that the SDEIS would be completed in July of 2008. She said that the Riverfront design is underway now and would be complete in late summer or fall of 2008. She noted that if the Main/McLoughlin alignment went forward, the Riverfront design and permitting would have to be put on hold while the SDEIS went forward.

St Clair made a motion to add the McLoughlin/Main alignment to the SDEIS as long as it allowed the Riverfront design the Board had worked on to be achieved.

St Clair said he felt it would bring good things to the City and he would use it. He added that the light rail line should not be "in lieu of" our design for our park. He said he did not want to sacrifice what they'd worked on. He said if they could come up with an alternative that minimized the impact on the Park he thought we should consider it. If there was no way to do that, then he'd drop the idea.

Seagler stated that he thought our recommendation had to be about what we have seen tonight. (Batty said that there were certainly other options but that he couldn't speak to other design parameters)

St Clair said that the only way he could support any other option was if it didn't impact the park.

Green noted that St Clair is suggesting an option which we can't address tonight since the SDEIS is not done. Another option is to support only options that have no impact on the Park. He said he felt strongly that if we impact the Park at all that would be unacceptable. He said he was uncomfortable with additional lines separating Downtown from the Riverfront – that to him is as important an issue as how much space would be taken away from the park.

St Clair said he thinks it will bring people to the park rather than keeping them away.

Stacey said he felt that it would make McLoughlin even worse than it is now.

St Clair said that it could facilitate getting people to the River and wouldn't necessarily be a negative impact.

Seagler noted that there isn't really time to develop an alternative to what we've seen tonight. He said the best alternative shown would have taken more than 10 feet from the park.

Green asked if there was a second to St Clair's motion. Motion failed due to lack of second.

Wall said that based on the information from tonight's meeting he would **motion that the Riverfront Board recommend against including a McLoughlin/Main alignment in the South Corridor SDEIS based on the potential impact on the Riverfront park.**

Stacey seconded the motion. Motion passed 6-1 (St Clair voted no)

Carol Damm asked whether this meant any alternative or just those that impacted the Riverfront Park.

Green said that based on the alternatives they'd seen tonight the Board recommended against inclusion of the alignment in the SDEIS.

Scott Churchill said they should not jump to tactical solutions.

Herrigel asked Weighart when the report on these options would be done. Weighart said she would get it to Herrigel to get to the Board within a few days.

The Board reinforced that they hoped that Council would get the message that this alternative has major impacts on our process and our Riverfront Park project.

Oregon Solutions Update

Green and Herrigel summarized the June 1 Oregon Solutions meeting. Green noted that there had been about 20 agencies and groups represented. He noted that the permitting folks are interested in working with us on the treatments near the Creek mouths and along the water. Herrigel said she'd accomplished her goals of bringing the Partners up to speed on the progress made over the past two years and in letting them know we'd be coming to them with permits soon. She said she felt confident that they would know who we were and what our project was now.

Motion to adjourn passed 6-0.