



## DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

### Members Present

Albert Chen, Ben Rouseau, Bryce Magorian, Celestina DiMauro, Daniel Eisenbeis, Everett Wild, Howie Oakes, Liz Start, Rebecca Hayes, Sara Busickio, Stephan Lashbrook

### Members Not Able to Attend

Jessica Neu, Matthew Bibeau, Neil Hankerson, Stacy Johnson

### City of Milwaukie

Mark Gamba, Mayor; Councilor Lisa Batey  
David Levitan, Denny Egner, and Mary Heberling; Planning Department  
Peter Passarelli, Public Works Director  
Natalie Rogers, Climate Action and Sustainability Coordinator  
Kim Travis, Planning Commission

### EnviroIssues

Bridger Wineman

### Angelo Planning

Kate Rogers

*Conversation and questions/answers are summarized by agenda item below. Raw flipchart notes are attached as an appendix to this summary (Appendix A, respectively).*

---

### WELCOME

- Bridger welcomed the CPAC. Went over the overview of the meeting for the night.

### PROJECT UPDATES

- David Levitan:
  - Project updates on the first Housing Committee meeting. Discussed approach/framework for the Housing block.
  - Would like CPAC to provide comments on the equitable housing report by March 13<sup>th</sup>
  - Hillside community design workshop on Feb. 21<sup>st</sup>, County will present three design alternatives in late March.
  - Upcoming housing events:
    - CPAC Housing Committee Meeting 2 – March 18<sup>th</sup>
    - “Middle Housing Options in Milwaukie” Open House – April 3<sup>rd</sup>
    - Comp Plan: Housing Town Hall – April 18<sup>th</sup>

## TOPIC BACKGROUND PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION

### Public Facilities:

- **Lisa Batey** – The Public Facility plans for the campus and City buildings have never happened? This section also talks about City facilities, right?
  - **David** – Yes, we'll need to see how we can meet Goal 11.
  - **Denny Egner** – We'll need to put policies in our plan around anticipating growth and how to expand those facilities, but haven't seen Comp Plans that address it aggressively.
  - **Peter Passarelli** – The City did do a facilities use study back in 2011.
  - **Denny** – Typically Goal 11 is meant for cities that are expanding their boundaries and need to provide facilities/utilities (fire stations, etc) way out in the new areas.
- **Stephan Lashbrook** – Change map to wastewater treatment plant, also shouldn't be referred to "Milwaukie's wastewater treatment plant", owned by the County.
- **Stephan** – 3 inches of rainfall in 24 hours capacity for the stormwater system seems out of date.
  - **Denny** – We've adopted Portland's stormwater system plan, but will need to see what it says about this.
- **Stephan** – Community solar should be added as community option in this section.
- **Mayor Gamba** – What can we put in the Comp Plan to help PGE create a smart grid in the City, beyond the pilot project we are working on now.
  - **David** – One of the things we have control over is: facilitating an easier process for them to do. Infer possible financial support for it.
  - **Denny** – Not sure if there is. There are not many permitting situations where they are coming to us in need of a permit. It seems like it would come about more in a partnership type situation.
  - **Peter Passarelli** – I was also thinking of streamlining the process to make it easier for PGE to do this first rather than another option.
    - **Denny** – That makes sense. We probably would require it as a Conditional Use currently, which is a longer/more expensive process to the Planning Commission.
- **Mayor Gamba** – Who wants Milwaukie to be our own fiber internet service? As a public service versus a private service? Potentially with Clackamas County as a partner.
  - **Daniel Eisenbeis** – I think we could make policy around saying we'd like fiber internet services that are lower cost, equitable, and robust versus calling out specifically public fiber services.
- **Denny** – re: Housing capacity for growth
  - Growth is currently limited by sewage treatment capacity. Regarding public facilities, there may be locational limitations based on sizes of facilities.
  - When it comes to planning for growth, do we match zoning to the system capacity?
- **Albert Chen** – Had plumbers tell them that the water in Milwaukie is hard. And may damage people's water heaters and other fixtures in houses. Would it be something to address in the Comp Plan?
  - **Peter** – It is very expensive process to soften water and treat it that way. Probably will be more economical to do it yourself in your own home. There are multiple options to do that.
  - **Lisa** – Is it different all over the City?
    - **Peter** – No, it's roughly the same throughout. Depends on the well.
  - **Denny** – Peter, you mentioned we have lots of water rights, but it's more about storage and the above ground facilities that is the issue.
    - **Peter** – That is correct.

- **Daniel** – I agree with Albert’s sentiments. I would be concerned about requiring the households to take care of the situation. Not sure most homes could have the ability to do that.
- **Peter** – Milwaukie currently has interchanges with Portland’s water system.
  - Surface water and groundwater has very different chemistries. City has all the water rights for growth, just not the surface facilities.
  - Surface versus groundwater – surface water is more subject to warming from climate change.
- **Mayor Gamba** – With 20-30 ft of sea level rise, will it cause problems to our wells?
  - **Peter** – I think we are still okay, even with that.
- **Lisa** – Undergrounding would only happen with new development, right? Not in current neighborhoods?
  - **Peter** – Yes.
  - Extreme weather may push the policies for undergrounding without development.
- **Lisa** – On the boundary of WES, there seems to be an implication that it will grow and expand. I think we need to make it clear that we do not allow expansion of the current footprint in the Comp Plan.
  - **David** – With the limit of the wastewater treatment plant in capacity, we estimated that it could currently serve about a 37-38% population increase, which is even more growth than Portland is planning.
- **Ben Rousseau** – Is there a way that we could encourage less centralized wastewater treatment and re-use water for toilets, lawns, etc? Is there a way we can encourage those types of systems in the Comp Plan?
- **Ben** – Is there something we can do here to align sustainability goals and an economic component to it where we can prioritize solid waste carriers?
  - **Denny** – Right now we don’t allow a transfer station in the City.
  - **Liz Start** – Metro is looking at that right now.
  - **David** – Not sure this fits perfectly in the Comp Plan.
- **Ben** – Is there something we can do to establish programs to help convert rainwater catchment.
- **Celestina DiMauro** – What infrastructure shifts should we be not just preparing for, but pushing for as transportation changes?
  - E.g., EV charging stations; neighborhood hubs shuttles
- **Liz** – I can imagine food composting program would be good, but also leave open other future technologies that help too, like anaerobic digestion.
- **Kim Travis** – What do other cities have in other comp plans around SDCs? Town Hall could also be an opportunity to educate the public about this topic and others.
  - **Stephan** – Ditto to Kim’s comment. Most people don’t have a clue how growth is paid for in cities.
  - **Kim** – we often hear SDCs are too high, making housing unaffordable.
- (?) Can we / should we be influencing behavior toward conservation by allowing systems to “fail”? (Similar to vehicle level of service concept?)

**Commented [DL1]:** Should we have a policy that says “increases in wastewater treatment capacity shall not result in an increase of the footprint of the Kellogg Treatment Plant, and shall instead focus on improvements in technology, local neighborhood (dispersed) options, or the Tri-City plant.

**Commented [DL2]:** Need policies about growth paying for growth- see current language about City taxpayers not being on hook for growth.

Natural Resources/Environmental Quality:

- **Lisa** – It was said that air quality is controlled by DEQ. I remember Portland was thinking of a regional air quality monitor. Is that happening?
  - **Daniel** – Portland is not currently pursuing it since the State is updating/updated air quality measures.

- **Howie Oakes** – In the Comp Plan could we come up with policies to address air quality emissions from local businesses where DEQ doesn't have the capacity to address highly local issues.
  - **Denny** – *Often times it's an enforcement issue. Most local governments aren't in the position to handle the proper monitoring (soil collection, air quality, etc.)*
  - **Mayor Gamba** – *Yes, we'd have to have specific numbers as ways to trigger nuisance problems.*
- **Stephan** – Potential conflict btw tree protection and solar. I think in this section it's worth saying that the City is committed to doing both even though there may be conflicts.
  - **Denny** – *There will also be issues with affordable housing and tree protection, lot coverage standards, etc.*
- **Ben** – Is there any kind of mechanism where the City can require a new business to disclose what their making and what kind of waste may be made. Would there be ways we could not require certain types of business that produce certain types of pollutants?
  - **Everett Wild** – *Could ask list of chemicals they provide based on needs for the fire department. Doesn't mean we can restrict them though.*
- **Everett** – Seems like we're missing light pollution in the Goal 6 discussion.
  - **Howard** – *Also color temperature pollution for animals and humans at night.*
  - **Peter** – *light pollution is mentioned in the policy questions of the Background Report.*
- **Daniel** – Would be good to address noise pollution, like the train going through the City and noise pollution from the highways.
  - **Peter** – just a note: the urban forest helps alleviate light pollution, noise, and air pollution.
  - **Natalie** – Hillside Development – EIS is looking at environmental justice issues. Sound wall creates a wildlife barrier. Trees versus wall for sound attenuation.
- **Celestina** – Conflict btw economic development and protecting natural resources. Wonder if we can combine those resources. Maybe NMIA may have more stringent solar requirements if industrial development cannot meet tree canopy requirements.
  - **Bridger** – *I know in Portland they are starting a fund so that properties that cannot meet the tree requirements pay into a fund where they will use the funds to plant trees in other parts of the City (fee-in-lieu).*
- **Sara B** – Want us to be careful about requiring less lighting and make sure we still make areas safe, like crosswalks and places with more pedestrian traffic.
- **Everett** – Should have policies around reducing idling construction equipment.
- **Mayor Gamba** – The Urban Forestry plan should be incorporated in every part possible in the Comp Plan. Trees should be prioritized for preservation; should have to justify any cutting. The City should be held to the same or higher standard in the right-of-ways around trees. Public streets should be where we could incorporate more trees to meet tree canopy requirements, especially neighborhood streets where there are no street trees currently.
- **Mayor Gamba** – Would like to see our opportunities to regulate point source air pollution so we have more control than just relying on the State (Goal 6 enables this).

Urban Design:

- **Stephan** – Solar access and urban design are related and should be emphasized in this section. See Village Homes in Davis, CA for an example.
- **Stephan** – Form based zoning and performance zoning may be combined to be a way to vary from Euclidean zoning. Could be used in this section.

- **Daniel** – Should housing be allowed in commercial zones: yes. Making it only allowed through mixed use probably depends on the geography.
- **Daniel** – Street oriented and pedestrian oriented design standards.
- **Daniel** – Default should be no parking minimums required for residential and mixed-use developments.
- **Daniel** – New policy: residential areas shall be within proximity of a neighborhood hub or mixed-use zone.
- **Kim** – Milwaukie has an interesting mix of building styles. Want to make sure our design standards don't make all new development uniform and the same.
- **Celestina** – Worried about access to resources, like food deserts. Would be worried about one of our resource hubs (Milwaukie Marketplace) would be lost. It should be more accessible, more walkable, more pedestrian friendly. May give it more attention for more businesses there.
- **Liz** – Make sure code is written to accommodate more recycling for more dense communities.
- **Rebecca** – Make sure we look for accessibility and universal designs for all abilities. Also need to recognize not everyone will be able to walk when we make areas more walkable. Need to address personal mobility as alternative to walkability.
- **Mayor Gamba** – Think Milwaukie Marketplace should be more walkable, dense, and mixed-use. We allowed them to opt out of the Moving Forward Milwaukie process, so they avoided rezoning.
- **Ben** – In the Vision there was a lot of discussion around community places and public spaces for community connections. Not sure what that looks like in policy language, but requirements around that for larger multi-family, mixed-use development.
- **Ben** – Think we should we have something in place around the high delivery rates (Amazon) that are using our transportation systems. Plan for changing retail and other emerging technologies.
- **Lisa** – Little pocket parks in development or other small community spaces should be a requirement when a big parcel is redeveloped. Maintenance will be a question.
- **Kim** – Public art or some other visual perspective could be important and help meet other objectives (e.g., traffic calming).

## CLOSING

Remarks made by Councilor Batey.