

## DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

### **Members Present**

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

### **Members Not Able to Attend**

Jessica Neu, Joe Gillock, Matthew Bibeau, Liz Start, Neil Hankerson, Stacy Johnson

### **City of Milwaukie**

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

### **EnviroIssues**

Emma Sagor  
Bridger Wineman

*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**

- Lisa Batey – This is a big milestone tonight since it's the end of Block 2. The feedback from the last meeting was very helpful for the staff in creating the policies we'll look over tonight. On December 11 the City Council will be looking at updated policies based on your input tonight.

### **PROJECT UPDATES**

- Emma Sagor: Will be going through a career change and leaving EnviroIssues on Dec. 14<sup>th</sup>. This is her last CPAC meeting.
- David Levitan: We will be going to talk more about housing at the end of this meeting, the joint meeting with PC and CC has been moved to 7pm rather than 8:10pm. He will send an email out about that change.

### **DRAFT GOAL AND POLICY LANGUAGE DISCUSSION**

#### **Parks and Recreation:**

- Does the language in the overarching chapter goal incentivize the creation of private parks?
- Consider removing text regarding private recreation facilities in Overarching Chapter Goal.
  - Other CPAC members disagreed; we should get as many recreational facilities as possible.

- Reference indoor/private recreation in overarching chapter goal
- Call out need for more trees in city parks to help meet city tree canopy goals
- Goal 4.1 – does the use of “public” preclude non-public spaces such as the Wetland Conservancy’s?
- Goal 4.1 - Better define “open space” or is it different than natural area? Rename to “green space.” Want to restrict more incentives to develop with concrete. Hierarchy of definitions: open space, natural area, parks.
- Policy 4.1.4 – get rid of “publicly owned”.
- Agree with proposal to remove Goal 4.1 entirely and move the underlying policies to another section.
- Show spaces for public use separately from schools (which aren’t always accessible).
- Policy 4.2.1 – there was discussion about whether NCPRD should be called out by name, or if we should refer to “parks district” or “parks provider”. There was no consensus among CPAC members.
- Policy 4.3.2 – agree that we should call out other types of renewable energy besides solar.
- Agree with proposal to rename Goal 4.5 to something other than “Implementation”.
- What is the meaning of dedication? Need a set of definitions.
- Add language clarifying public acquisition of dedicated park land. Consider size/scale of space.
- Exclude HOA parks that don’t allow public access (from inventory of available parkland).
- How much overlap should there be between this section and Recreation Goal (15.5) of Willamette Greenway?

#### Willamette Greenway:

- Need a definitions section
- Need to better define what the greenway is and why it is important, preferably in the overarching chapter goal.
- 15.7.2 – Interest in educating the public about this?
  - *A: Tricky territory. Policy is from the current comp plan.*
- 15.7.1 – Seems at odds with 15.7.2. Maybe we should pick one?
- Take out 15.7 as a whole.
- Are there any situations about questions regarding who owns land?
- If we get rid of 15.7 as a whole, will that cause issues when the Kellogg Dam is taken out?
- Consider definition of Willamette Greenway in the Overarching Goal section.
- 15.6 – References to Kellogg Lake need to be looked at. Should these apply to Kellogg Creek instead? Or should they be removed entirely?
- 15.2.2 – Consider this as a place to discuss climate change.
- 15.5.4 – Why is that in there?
  - *A: Town hall we received a lot of feedback about wanting connectivity within the Willamette Greenway.*

## Climate Change & Energy:

- 13.2.4 – End sentence after projects.
- 13.3.8 – Agree with Commissioner Edge’s comment, but make sure to say renewable energy generation.
- In overarching goal, take out word “potential” next to climate change.
- 13.1.9 – Agree with Commissioner Travis, expand this to every single staff report to decision makers.
  - Agree with this, as it’s in the CAP.
- 13.2.4, 13.2.5 – reference to “alternative” change to “renewable.” KEEP LANGUAGE CONSISTENT.
- 13.1.6 – Advocate that it’s good the way it’s written. Don’t think we need to have specific developments, like cluster development.
  - 13.1.6 - What does “energy efficient land use” mean?
    - *I look at it as land closer to the MAX is more efficient, but land farther away from transit is less efficient.*
    - *I think Milwaukie has more opportunity to capture growth in the City boundaries versus UGB expansion and don’t want to miss that opportunity.*
- Should the overarching goal mention the CAP? Maybe make policy language about doing something through the CAP.
- 13.1.2 – What is “significant efforts”? Should that be defined better?
  - *A: That could be tied to CAP goals.*
- 13.1.5 – Create a new policy around the second part of the sentence.
- 13.1.9 – Move up to the top of the section and broadened, but still include land use applications.
- 13.1.10 – Is that more of an implementation strategy?
- 13.3.9 – Also elevate this one in the section.
- 13.3.11 – What are those “materials”
  - *A: Materials could be encompassing more than the built environment, like grass between pavers.*
- 13.1.6 – Worried that it’s too limiting. Looks like it’s only defining efficient land use as infill development. Want to capture that there may be lots of different ways.
  - *Don’t think it would be bad to list out other ideas.*
    - *Should reference Hubs in this list.*
- 13.3.9 – Someone will make the argument that none of this is affordable. Need policy(s) around making sure it’s affordable.
- Local food policy and local food co-ops. Didn’t see anything about that.
  - *Expand on 13.3.1 to include this idea?*
  - *City should be incentivizing this type of development.*
- 13.3.8 – *Add a similar policy around this language: “Explore opportunities for local food production, etc.”*

- 13.3.1 – *What are we doing to educate the businesses and employees within Milwaukie. Not just the residents.*

Natural Hazards:

- 7.4.1 – Be more specific about who the “private” entities are. Maybe conservation organizations. And write out the purpose is to conserve land.
- 7.1.2 – Detailed technical reports should be conducted by a third party.
  - *Wilsonville is a good example for traffic studies done by a third party.*
- Combine 7.1.3 and 7.1.4.
  - *How do we realize this as an implementation? Density be transferred to specific locations like Neighborhood Hubs?*
  - *In 7.1.4 – put a period where the comma is. Don’t think the implementation of density transfers is baked out enough.*
- Looks like we list out flooding, landslides, etc, but don’t talk much about seismic disasters. Expand policy 7.4.3 to include seismic resilience.
- Climate-induced hazards language should be moved to the overarching goal rather than in 7.1.1.
  - *Think we should still keep some climate change language in that policy still though.*
- Think there is a lot of wasted time looking into Transfer of Development Rights program. Density transfer within a site would be easier. Then maybe move to adjoining properties to transfer density.
- We should have third parties look at floodplain areas, do it based on Wilsonville way.
- Need the concept around resilient neighborhood or area, that can be resilient based on a natural disaster. A portion of the town will be highly functional in the case of a major earthquake. Say something like 16 acres.
- 7.1.3 – Should there be more clear definition around “high hazard potential.” Should there be a hierarchy?
  - *Maybe we should just take out 7.1.3 and beef up 7.1.4?*
  - *I think we should call out more areas that are high hazards.*
  - *If we look at the mapping of hazards area, there are lots of areas listed as “high risk.” It’s not just a small part of Milwaukie.*
  - *Maybe quantify the “highest” risk. So that the top 10% that are listed as highest risk could be where we limit development.*

**CLOSING**

Remarks made by Mayor Gamba and Councilor Batey.

## APPENDIX A: SUMMARIZED FLIP CHART NOTES

### ***Q: How do we ensure alignment with our vision?***

#### Parks and Rec

- Vision speaks directly to MBP

#### Hazards and Climate Change

- Alignment between plans is important
- Vision Action Plan may be the vehicle for shorter term actions

### ***Q: Are the recommendations moving in the right direction?***

#### Parks and Rec

- Parks and Rec zone → Yes!
- Goal around transportation and connectivity → build on SAFE
  - Especially around access to waterfront
- SDCs → flexibility; rather than requiring park space, use SDC funds
- Consider barriers to getting to parks

#### Hazards

- Yes, generally right direction
- Organizing by broader goals (clean energy too) → yes
- Generally, use “shall” more
  - Where do we get specificity to make sure “shall” happens?
- Reducing development in high risk/incentivize development in low risk → YES

#### Greenway

- More restrictions closer to river; less further from the river
- Rec amenities specific to Greenway → Yes!
- Capping WWTP → could be cool, but \$\$
  - Integrate site with habitat protection

#### Energy and Climate Change

- Need to ensure these are adhered to
- Outreach, education, and awareness is key
- Apply Sustainability and Equity lens
- Green building and incentivizing upgrades → yes
  - Look at HAC policies

### ***Q: Remaining questions?***

#### Parks and Rec

- Green energy and parks
  - Echoed in CC/energy group
- Consider habitat connectivity and balance with human paths
  - Regional habitat connectivity WG
- Should we be requiring more open space/parks in new development?
- Bake in policy now around conversion of parking lots
  - Redevelopment of sites of a certain size?

## Greenway

- Educational programs along water → what kind of access we're providing
- E.g. education near Olympia WWTP

## Hazards

- Need more info on where to go with dev allowances in risk zones
  - Undecided on hazard overlay zone
  - Maps and data
    - Pull from other agencies
  - **Need at next meeting**
- What metrics should we be using/incorporating?
- CAP actions → Comp Plan

## Energy and Climate Change

- Should some policies have priority over others? (e.g. trees v. density; design v. affordability)
- Want more info on density transfer and financial implications → how it works

## **Implementation Action Parking Lot**

- Solar covered farmer's market space
- Uses allowed in parks once we develop the park zone