

**CITY OF MILWAUKIE
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
Milwaukie City Hall
10722 SE Main Street
TUESDAY, July 27, 2010
6:30 PM**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Jeff Klein, Chair
Nick Harris, Vice Chair
Scott Churchill
Lisa Batey
Mark Gamba

STAFF PRESENT

Katie Mangle, Planning Director
Bill Monahan, City Attorney
Li Alligood, Assistant Planner
JoAnn Herrigel, Community
Services Director

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

Chris Wilson
Teresa Bresaw

1.0 Call to Order – Procedural Matters

Chair Klein called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and read the conduct of meeting format into the record.

2.0 Planning Commission Minutes

2.1 May 25, 2010

Commissioner Batey stated she did not finish reviewing them; therefore she would either need to abstain or ask that they be postponed for the next meeting.

Bill Monahan, City Attorney, explained that public meeting minutes had to be made available to the public in a reasonable period of time. If this set was not available as an adopted version, and since it had been 2 months already, the Commission should at least be making the draft available. He advised it would be best if the minutes were finalized.

Chair Klein stated considering that only 3 of the 5 Commissioners were present, it would be more appropriate to wait 2 weeks.

Commissioner Batey said she appreciated the extension, because she did have some comments for the half she actually got through, and she anticipated having more.

3.0 Information Items - None

4.0 Audience Participation – This is an opportunity for the public to comment on any item not on the agenda. There was none.

5.0 Public Hearings

5.1 Summary: North Clackamas Park North Side Master Plan
Applicant/Owner: North Clackamas Parks & Recreation District/City of Milwaukie
Address: 5440 SE Kellogg Creek Dr
File: CPA-10-01
Staff Person: Li Alligood

Chair Klein called the hearing to order and read the conduct of legislative hearing format into the record.

No Commissioners wished to abstain.

Commissioner Batey stated she did not think it was a bias, but believed it was appropriate to declare that some members of the audience were a part of the group called The Friends of North Clackamas Parks who may comment tonight. She stated for the record that she had participated in some of their meetings or volunteer events in the past year on approximately 3 occasions.

Li Alligood, Assistant Planner, reviewed the staff report with these additional comments:

- She explained that tonight's goal was to determine if the proposed Master Plan provides the right balance for the site. As discussed, it is a highly regulated property, and those regulations will apply at the time of development.
- She advised the Master Plan had been revised and differed from the one sent out and included in the packet; copies of the revisions were made available at the meeting.
 - The revision involved relocating the driveway to the proposed parking area which was done in response to some concerns from the Friends of Milwaukie Center and the Milwaukie Center Community Advisory Board. She noted that as a conceptual plan it was still a conceptual move.
 - She explained 5.1 Pages 4 and 5 of the packet and Pages 2 and 3 of the draft Master Plan outlined the proposal in more specific terms.
- She concluded by stating staff found that the application meets the relevant criteria and suggested the Commission recommend approval. She quickly reviewed the list of exhibits distributed to the Commission as follows:
 - Exhibit 1: Alternative Parking Lot Plan
 - Exhibit 2: Public meeting records
 - Exhibit 3: Email from Pat Russell sent to staff at about 5:00 p.m. today.
 - Exhibit 4: Public Involvement Notebook; a couple copies were made available to the Commission for review.
- She stated that the Applicants had brought additional background materials to the meeting, and one new comment had been submitted.

Commissioner Batey asked if just the Findings are included when a Master Plan is put into the Comprehensive Plan. How much of the documentation would actually be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan?

- **Ms. Alligood** clarified that the final version of the written document submitted by the Applicants, and referred to as Attachment 2, would be included in the Comprehensive Plan. This was still a draft.

The Commission took a brief recess to review the submitted materials and reconvened at approximately 7:05 p.m.

Chair Klein called for comments from the Applicants.

Michelle Healey, North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District, thanked the Commission for considering all the material, City staff for their support with the planning process, the Planning staff, specifically for their assistance with the review and regulatory guidance, and all

the other participants. She presented the North Clackamas Park North Side Master Plan (Master Plan) with the following comments.

- As Ms. Alligood explained, this was a conceptual picture of improvements that might take place at North Clackamas Park in the future. This Master Plan document would help guide future changes. It did not layout exact configurations, sizes or materials, though some suggestions had been received. There was no guarantee that everything would be built. Ultimately, that would be dependent on funding and future regulatory processes. Because it is a highly regulated site, she was confident that as things were proposed, the Parks District would return before the Commission.
- Until such time, the park would generally remain the same with some tweaks here and there during maintenance, as well as work coordinated by Tonia Burns, the natural resources coordinator with the Parks District.
- One thing the Master Plan does is help to identify what would not be in the park. For example, no ball fields, basketball or tennis courts, or other such things were proposed for the area. There was a recent question about putting an archery range on the north side of the park. Her staff responded by showing the Master Plan they were working toward getting City approval for. That was the idea of how her team was going to use this.
 - Since the south side development process had been very contentious and emotional, people really wanted to understand with certainty how the north side of the park was going to be developed in the future, which is why this Master Plan focused on the north side. She noted that some of the current Commissioners had been on the Commission at that time of the south side planning. .
- Fortunately, the north side planning process was not as emotional or contentious. There were many varying opinions but a lot more people were at the table during this process.
- The Master Plan being proposed is a result of an extensive public process, which began in 2006 after the ball fields were built, and has continued until today. North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District (Parks District) was always communicating with people about the Master Plan and the Stewardship Committee (Committee) for the park is updated on the Plan almost monthly.
- The public involvement notebook was submitted for the record and contained most of the public input received, and included a list of all the meetings held. The Applicants tried to include meeting minutes as well to show what had been discussed. She apologized that only 3 notebooks were available. More copies would be forwarded to the Commissioners if needed.
 - As outlined on the list, many groups and individuals were involved in the Master Plan. The Parks District Advisory Board had monthly public meetings where the public could hear about what was happening with the planning process. The City of Milwaukie Park and Recreation Board also reviewed and discussed the Master Plan, as well as the Milwaukie Center Community Advisory Board, Friends of the Milwaukie Center, and the Friends of North Clackamas Park, who were very involved with the south side planning and also very involved during the North Side Master Plan from the beginning. Also involved were the Lake Road Neighborhood District Association (NDA); the Oak Lodge Community Council, which is the unincorporated neighborhood association; the Committee; the general public, neighbors and park users in general.
 - As part of this public process and these meetings, a Project Advisory Committee was used and the Committee fulfilled that role.
- The initiative to form the Committee came after the south side development to mend some feelings and try to reunite people, as well as to get different stakeholders together to discuss park issues and consider the park as a whole.

- The Committee includes representatives from the Friends of North Clackamas Park, the Kellogg Creek/Mt Scott Creek Watershed groups, dog park and horse arena visitors, and athletic field users as well as some neighbors. The Committee also included neighbors from Turning Point Church and Cascade Heights Public Charter School door, as well as representatives from the Milwaukie Center and the City of Milwaukie.
- The Committee generally meets monthly, and is still meeting. They describe themselves as ombudsmen to help with problems. The Committee was the Project Advisory Committee during this process, and actually helped prepare the scope of work to do the planning process, and helped define what would be studied. The Committee also helped to define the public process and reviewed the concepts and comments received throughout the process. Lastly, they helped get the word out and encouraged the public to participate.
- Feedback for the project was collected during the public meetings and also received through emails and phone conversations. A project website was also available.
 - For some concepts, a survey was mailed directly to the adjacent neighbors as well as distributed to the neighborhood groups and other groups. She emphasized it was not a scientific survey by any means, but was geared more to gauge peoples' preferences. A survey was also conducted onsite with park users in English and Spanish.
 - Invitations to the meetings were sent to approximately 500 people, including all directly adjacent neighbors and to people who had been identified as sincerely interested in the park.
- The goals of the Master Plan had been established with the community early on, and included enhancing the north side of the park while trying to avoid significantly intensifying the use. The Applicants believed they had achieved that.
- As far as priorities and intent, a preference was indicated for retaining and improving existing uses and not adding too many new things.
 - Generally, the Plan involved moving the dog park to the south and east away from the creek, adding some parking and a walking trail, and replacing the existing A-Frame picnic shelter with 2 smaller shelters to allow smaller groups to rent it. There had been some concerns that the big A-Frame attracts big groups, and perhaps smaller structures might be a better alternative due to the number of people.
 - Other items include renovating and moving the bathrooms to a more central location, rearranging where the maintenance building would be as well as the caretaker's building. There was also a small addition to the playground; potentially adding some bouldering elements for older children at the park.
- She provided further details about elements that might have raised questions, and some submitted items as follows:
 - Dog Park. A Dog Park Working Committee was established during the process as a subset of the Project Advisory and Stewardship Committee to help collect and provide information to guide the planning process regarding the dog park. Several different options were considered: one entailed eliminating the dog park altogether; another was moving it to the south side, making changes, and making it bigger. The Committee discussed the dog park at length, investigating which amenities would improve it to make it a better experience for people. Ultimately, they determined the dog park should remain in the park, be fixed and not any bigger, but perhaps split so smaller or more passive dogs could be separated from larger/aggressive dogs. This was included in the Master Plan.
 - The existing dog park is actually in the riparian buffer for Mt Scott Creek, so one goal is to move it further away. Creating a bigger buffer of about 70-ft of 75-ft deep was proposed, which is beyond that required for the regulatory processes.

- Moving the dog park to the east and closer to the parking lot was also proposed. Concerns were expressed about dog owners letting their dogs off leash, and having the park closer to the parking lot would provide a more direct route.
- Buffering the dog park with plants to improve it was also proposed, as adding trees might help limit dogs from barking at people.
- Parking. During the process, significant feedback was received about adding parking, with comments primarily focused on adding parking to serve the Milwaukie Center (Center).
 - The Master Plan includes replacing the existing gravel parking lot to the left of the Center, next to the A-Frame, with a new parking lot that would also include the area where the A-Frame is currently located. Again, the A-Frame would be removed as part of this Master Plan.
 - Based on square footage, the existing lot provides 20 to 25 spaces. The new lot would have about 40 spaces, with 4 spaces set aside for buses that provide senior transportation to the Center.
 - The Center wanted a secure place to park the buses, as they have had issues with people breaking into the buses when parking them behind the Center. The Master Plan provides a dedicated place for bus parking.
 - Within that new lot, there would also be the required ADA spaces.
 - The Community Advisory Board for the Milwaukie Center and the Friends of the Milwaukie Center had been involved throughout the planning process, and had concerns about having the parking lot off of the existing lot.
 - During the planning process, the Applicants offered one alternative that placed the new parking area directly off the existing lot, but the Center did not want to see that happen. The Applicants agreed with their concerns about the lot being a straight-shot and people driving fast in front of the Center. So the intent was to have it remain as proposed, so that cars still have to proceed around the loop when accessing the parking lot.
- The Applicants would like to consider traffic calming options, such as bump outs or installing a raised crosswalk in front of the Center, etc., to ensure traffic moves slowly. The Center was a heavy user of the park and a large constituent, so the Applicants wanted to try to work together to make it as safe as possible for that group.
- She explained that an alternative revised parking lot Plan was submitted because the Plan included in the packet did not show the new proposed parking lot where the existing lot is located. Although it was conceptual, visually that was where the lot was supposed to be.
- The Applicants researched who currently utilized the parking lot, and found that, primarily, Center patrons were using the parking lot during the day when the Center was open, and not enough parking was close to the Center. People using the Center were parking in the gravel lot or at the Sara Hite Rose Garden. The Applicants wanted to ensure the proposed parking lot worked for them because there was a need for it. They want to make it as safe as possible, and the Applicants believed that would come as the parking lot design was filtered out in the future.
- Natural Resources. Putting the natural resources element in the park was an extremely important part of this plan. The Applicants heard that loud and clear from individuals involved in the planning process, and so the Applicants had been doing a lot of that work.
- She introduced Tonia Burns to discuss the Master Plan, some of its improvements, as well as some of the work being carried out to enhance the resources.

Tonia Burns, Natural Resources Coordinator, North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District, said she started working for the Parks District in 2008, but was not involved when this process initiated. When she got the position, they went through the Master Plan and although they did not have a lot of funding to implement these elements, they were on her list of tasks to accomplish. She quickly reviewed several goals and issues to address that were included in the proposed Master Plan as follows:

- Crushed culverts in Camas Creek need removal for the creek to be open.
- Placement of large wooded debris in Mt Scott Creek.
- Issues with human access and moving trails away from sensitive zones.
- Protective fencing installation to protect natural resource areas, and installing viewing platforms to enable people to experience natural areas while minimizing their impact.
- Suggestions of invasive plant removal and riparian plantings.
- Assess whether back channel access could be accomplished for fish routes.
- Removal of concrete in Mt Scott Creek.
- Enhancing the Oak Ash woodland, proposing rotating picnic areas so that understory systems can reestablish.
- Meadow enhancement and increasing the buffer of the creeks.
- In 2008, the Parks District's Natural Resource Department consisted of her and a hired AmeriCorps intern, and they began working at these tasks. Since that time, they have planted over 2,000 trees, planted over 1,000 live softwood stakes, and spent thousands of hours controlling invasive, noxious, state-listed weeds.
- In 2008-2009, they had 26 volunteer work events with volunteers working about 350 hours to help natural resources, and then within the last fiscal year, 33 events were held with almost 1,500 volunteer hours helping with natural resource enhancements in the park.
- The Parks District was recently awarded a Nature in Neighborhoods Restoration Grant with the new North Clackamas Urban Watersheds Council. The Parks District will be enhancing the Camas Creek area predominantly and a portion of Mt Scott Creek. The Watershed Council will be working on the adjacent church property to the east.
- The Parks District was also working with the City and Water Environmental Services (WES) to prepare an application for a Nature in Neighborhoods Capital Grant, which proposes to do many of the items listed as goals and objectives within the North Side Master Plan including:
 - Removing the small crushed culvert near the confluence of Camas Creek and Mt Scott Creek.
 - Large woody debris placement in the Mt Scott Creek channel and increasing complexity within the in-stream channel.
 - Installing viewing platforms along Mt Scott Creek.
 - Removing the concrete within Mt Scott Creek and doing more invasive removal, and riparian planting and enhancement to not only provide more habitat for terrestrial systems but also to increase water temperature which addresses regulatory Department of Environment Quality (DEQ) Total maximum Daily Load (TMDL) requirements.
- She concluded that she had more specific information available about the species being planted and the invasives being removed.

Commissioner Gamba:

- Inquired if any biologists, such as fish biologists, were consulted at any point during the planning process.
 - **Ms. Burns** replied 'yes,' Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW). During the process the Parks District hired Pacific Habitat Services, Inc. (Pacific Habitat) to do a natural resources review and wetland delineations.

- If and when any of these elements within the Master Plan are implemented and need to go through the land use process, the Parks District would have to redo their wetland delineations because of the time lapse.
- When Pacific Habitat was doing their natural resources review, ODFW participated in making some of the recommendations put forward by Pacific Habitat. She noted the Commission had received their comments.

Commissioner Batey:

- Stated she participated in on one of the south side spring work parties and it seemed that Camas Creek was a good success story in terms of replanting and removing invasives. She inquired if any sort of research existed or if Ms. Burns had any experience showing that habitat actually has improved since the 2006 timeframe.
 - **Ms. Burns** replied she forgot to mention that Camas Creek's riparian buffer was fairly narrow and during this time period, they had moved the setbacks to 50 ft, widening the buffers all along the creek, so development-type activities like mowing no longer occurred within those areas. The areas within that setback had all been planted, though not to the level that the Parks District wanted, which was a process they were going through.
 - The Parks District did not have that much at this point in time, although some historic data existed of when certain areas along the creek had been planted. The Applicants could use spherical densitometers to measure the relative light levels at Camas Creek, to verify that they have decreased the solar input at the creek up to this level. She agreed it would be a good idea to do that.
- Asked if anything else was being done in terms of measuring the amount of water, how late in the year the water was there, etc. She understood Camas Creek did not have water in it year-round.
 - **Ms. Burns** replied they thought there were some springs, but that they were to the west, below the gravel parking area. She believed the area above there, near the Center, does dry out but it is considered a wetland. Wetlands only need to be wet for 14 days out of the year; therefore, based on elements like vegetation, hydrology, and soils, those areas had been declared wetlands and would be protected as such.

Commissioner Gamba:

- Noted the discussion about removing the crushed culverts did not really talk about whether that meant day-lighting or putting a bridge over the stream.
 - **Ms. Burns** replied that the proposal in the Master Plan was to daylight as the Parks District worked with WES.
- Asked about under the driveway.
 - **Ms. Burns** explained that making that into a bridge would cost \$800,000. While not completely out of the question, it was too expensive to consider within the grant they were currently applying for.

JoAnn Herrigel, Community Services Director, and City staff liaison to the City of Milwaukie Park and Recreation Board (PARB) made the following comments:

- The City was a co-applicant in this Master Plan. The City owned the North Clackamas Park site and the Center. The PARB and staff believed this Master Plan before the Commission was a useful tool for guiding the future development of the north side of this park. As noted, the Applicants believed the Master Plan would guide both what they do and do not want in the north side.

- The PARB and staff have participated in the development and review of the Master Plan from the very beginning. Even before the Commission got the land use applications from the Parks District for the South Side Master Plan for the ball fields, the PARB had urged the Parks District to move forward with the public process for the north side of the park. She read into record an excerpt from a letter sent to the Parks District Advisory Board in February 2005, and provided to the Commission, in which the PARB stated:
"We fear that the construction of the Ball Field Project and the resulting use of this site may have a negative impact on the wetlands, plants, and habitat area to the north of the ball field area. It is with this in mind that we suggest that the District complete a Master Plan for the portion of North Clackamas Park, located north of the entrance drive and bioswales you have proposed on the sports field proposal."
- The PARB had requested that this effort begin very soon and be completed by the summer of 2005. She wanted to note that the Master Plan was actually something that the PARB and staff had urged the Parks District to do because of the South Side Master Plan and not despite it.
- The Committee was formed just after the Ball Field Project was done. She was asked to be the City's representative and has served on that group since it was formed, conveying information to the PARB regularly about the Master Plan for the north side, as well as having Ms. Burns and Ms. Healey attend and update them on a regular basis.
 - Comments in general have been very positive, and specific comments included suggestions about day-lighting instead of replacing the culvert; fence placement; modifying the buffer, etc. Copies of the meeting minutes where the PARB heard updates from the Parks District could be provided upon request.
 - The representatives on the Committee had already been named, but she emphasized that environmentalists and dog park advocates had played a major role in the development of this Master Plan throughout the process.
- The process was intended to be as inclusive as possible to meet the needs of all the stakeholders but, as most public processes go, for any one opinion there is usually an opposite opinion. For instance, one person or group might want all the trails paved so people with alternative abilities can use them, while another group did not want paved trails because it added impervious surface to a flood plain area and were too close to creeks; likewise some would say the dog park should be expanded while others believe the dog park should go away completely.
 - She believed the Parks District and Alta Consulting Services, Inc., the consulting firm that worked with both groups, did the best they could to balance the input gathered from neighbors, advocates for specific park elements, and also from park users. As noted, onsite surveys were conducted. The PARB also reviewed the Master Plan, and their comments were generally favorable.
- She expressed her appreciation of the Commission's time, and was happy to answer any questions.

Commissioner Gamba:

- Asked if the Applicants had considered in-stream maceration, braiding possibilities, or anything that would bring it more back to what it probably was before people started channelizing that flood plain to help mitigate the flooding, and restore it to a salmon habitat or anything of that nature.
 - **Ms. Healey** replied that was an important question, but the concept plan did not get into that level of detail. Pacific Habitat looked at some of those elements. It was about trying to balance and allow people to use the site while also improving the resources. The Parks District hired Ms. Burns to use her expertise to assist them while they flushed

those things out. For example, when designing the parking lot, they were considering Mt Scott Creek and what was the best thing to do. While working with WES to fit this site into the whole Mt Scott/Kellogg Creek watershed, the Parks District was fortunate to have Ms. Burns in this position to help achieve that goal.

- The ideas [for restoration] were there, although not included in the detail she believed they needed in working on some of the projects Ms. Burns had discussed doing this year.
- Stated that in establishing a plan, there would be a path a number of feet away from the stream, but in reality, that riparian area might need to be a bigger area to allow braiding to take place. That was why he wondered how much consideration had been given.
 - **Ms. Healey** replied that the Applicants looked at the existing regulatory environment, and actually made the buffer beyond that. If some of those things changed, the Applicants were still amenable to moving the trail or making some changes at that point. She reiterated that layout and element placement was not set in stone, but the Master Plan did give some guidance. There were still a lot of resource questions that needed to be investigated.
 - **Ms. Burns** understood 2 predominately forested areas on the north side of the creek were being considered by WES as potential off-channel habitat.
 - At this point, she did not believe WES would use the terms “flood abatement” or “flood control” because they were having difficulties using that type of terminology at this point. Therefore, the primary focus would be back channel habitat for fish. The riparian enhancements would be mainly to work more at the DEQ Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL) issues of lowering water temperature and other such issues.
- Clarified that his comment was actually more in that direction. The natural state of that area probably was not a channelized little stream, and therefore it would have done 2 things: it would have mitigated floods to a certain degree naturally and it would have provided better habitat for fish and thrush.
 - **Ms. Burns** noted that at this time, the water flows onto the site and by no means were the elements meant to detour water flow; a trail would not block any of this from happening. It would do what it needs to do and if, due to possible future conditions, things change, then the Parks District would also have to adapt to those changes in order to be good park managers.

Chair Klein:

- Asked why the Master Plan was only being done on the north section. This was a whole park, but they were only really looking at one portion.
 - **Ms. Healey** explained that a different direction was given when the south side was completed about how the park was to be handled. The Committee really wanted a plan developed for the north side, and the Applicants then proceeded given that direction. She believed they had built up goodwill with people, but now it was truly time to focus on the piece that was not considered during the south side planning, and noted that people did not want to see more ball fields put on the north side.
- Asked if everything on the south side was functioning properly, because what the Commission was last presented with was not even close to what was inevitably built.
 - **Ms. Healey** replied that would probably depend on who was asked. Functionally, no stormwater problems existed on the site, and they were able to manage the few parking problems that had arisen.
 - People still talked at length about noise with the Committee. The Parks District had been successful in not exceeding the decibel levels in activities put forward in the application

- at that time. They did not have a lot of complaints about noise, although some neighbors in attendance could give their own thoughts.
- Some adjustments were made to the lights after working with specific neighbors who had raised issues.
 - The Parks District had received tremendous amounts of positive feedback from park users who love the south side park facilities. Thousands of people used the park each year, so from a recreational standpoint, it was very successful.
 - She recognized that with every park and project, there would be differences of opinion, but generally it had been a positive improvement to the park and community.
 - Agreed. However, as he saw it, if they planned [the whole area], they could look at the whole park to determine whether or not it was functioning, and be able to take steps to make changes to address any issues with the south side development. Now would be the time to address those issues.
 - Was sure there were impacts now, because the water detention area was now a bioswale. It would be nice to know how those things were functioning because he was sure it had impacts on Camas Creek as it was sitting at this point. The [proposed Master Plan] only considered the impacts that would be made to Camas Creek from the north side. However, the north side has minimal development with the exception of the parking lot which would increase impact. No significant changes were being done on the north side, so he was lost on why the Master Plan would not be all-encompassing.
 - **Ms. Healey** noted Ms. Burns was not with the Parks District at that time to compare Camas Creek now to what it used to be like. From her own anecdotal information, she believed there was quite a lot more habitat, and noted the South Side Master Plan created a new 50-ft buffer on the creek; originally it was mowed up to the edge. Again, many people were happy about the south side, though some remained unhappy.
 - She explained the Parks District was responding to continual questions about what was going to happen to the north side of the park, which was why they did not get into the south side, which could be taken as an existing condition and added to the Master Plan. She understood comments made about wanting the big picture, but the intent was to provide the Commission with the best information available in response to the direction received after the 2006 project.
 - Believed the Master Plan was a very good concept. Before the ball fields were built, he was certain the dog park was the most popular amenity used besides the Center, and it was nice that those patrons would get some redevelopment.
 - Wanted some clarification about what had happened during the 3 months of testimony the Commission had heard, and then what application was inevitably approved for the south side. He has had questions about that history for a very long time.
 - The Commission approved an application at the end and then it seemed that the Parks District and the Friends of North Clackamas Park appealed the Commission's decision, which was quite a unique thing. He asked for further explanation as to what was going on, maybe outside of the Commission.
 - **Ms. Healey** clarified that the Commission did approve the south side project, which had been emotional and contentious. The Commission's decision was appealed, which then took it to the City Council. The Parks District did not want to get into another 3-month fight before City Council, and therefore tried to get the groups together to find resolution.
 - The groups represented included specific individuals that ultimately formed the Friends of North Clackamas Park group, some staff, and those with baseball and horse arena interests, but she did not believe any dog park people were involved because it was really about the south side.

- She reiterated it was about finding resolutions to avoid extending the issue for 3 more months. Ultimately there was some give and take, and they determined the fighting had gone on long enough. As a result, the Stewardship Committee was formed.
- Recalled there being a very short time period from when that Plan left the Commission to when it was approved through City Council. If he understood correctly, given the time frame in which it happened, it appeared a lot of that negotiation was going on while the Commission was having its meeting.
 - **Ms. Healey** clarified it was after the Commission made its decision and then it was appealed. To her knowledge, no negotiation took place during the Commission meetings; everyone was sitting at odds with one another during the Commission meetings. She was unaware of any side conversations, and explained she was not that involved after the appeal, but attended one meeting to take notes.
- Expressed his concern about where the Parks District was and how they could mitigate a good plan down. They had a good plan initially. What assurances did the Commission have that this Master Plan would not be mitigated down? Substantial things were different between the north and south sides.
 - A lot of people were interested that came and voiced a number of things. As a result, the Parks District moved into a huge open process, but then the negotiations involved a very small number of people and took a lot of people out of the equation.
 - He added that the County appealed its own approval.
 - **Ms. Healey** believed it was appealed first by The Friends then the Parks District joined them to find a solution together. She emphasized it was strictly an attempt to avoid getting back in front of City Council and have another 3-month fight. It was really an attempt to meet in the middle and move things along.
 - **Ms. Herrigel** commented on the difference between that previous application and the one being considered tonight specifically. That prior application was almost a final design for the south side ball field project that the Commission actually approved to be built. This application was a master plan for elements the Parks District would like to bring before the Commission during final design.
 - One assurance that this would not get mitigated down was that the Commission would get to see it again in tiny chunks. If and when WES decides to do riparian enhancement projects, they must return to the Commission or at least go through Ms. Mangle and Planning staff to have the approvals according to the HCA, Title 13, the Water Quality Resource area, etc. for each of the elements. To put in the parking lot, the Parks District would have to design it and bring it either through Ms. Mangle or to the Commission. She did not know at this stage if each element had to come back to the Commission, but they might.
 - The difference was that the Commission would probably see each of these elements in specific form over the next 5 to 10 years. If it was modified or appealed after the Commission's decision, then she believed that was how the process was set up, and she did not know that she or Ms. Healey could change that process.
 - **Ms. Healey** stated that normally their goal was not to appeal approvals of their projects. She believed the south side plan was a unique and unfortunate process. Although the project turned out well, the process was not good.

Chair Klein called for public testimony in favor of the application.

Steve Burliner, 10824 SE Oak St, #311, Milwaukie, OR, Chair, Stewardship Committee for North Clackamas Park for the current term, stated Ms. Healey and Ms. Herrigel gave a very

good description of the Committee. He added that they met every fourth Wednesday of the month at the Center and represented approximately 10 formalized stakeholder groups to serve as ombudsmen to all those various stakeholders, including the baseball and active sports people.

- One amazing thing about the Committee, which came out of an extremely contentious period and application, was that they reached consensus almost 100% of the time and normally operated on a consensus methodology, rather than a majority vote.
- At the June Committee meeting, they had 100% consensus to support the North Side Master Plan. Therefore, as Chair he felt it incumbent to personally inform the Commission of that on behalf of the Committee. Not only did they work very hard with Alta Consulting and the Parks District for more than 4 years on helping develop this plan, but that today, they fully supported it.
- He believed there would naturally be a lot less tendency to mitigate this concept because a large percentage of Committee members that helped developed this Master Plan were former opponents to the active recreation of the South Side Master Plan. He could not imagine who would want to see the current Master Plan drastically changed in concept. If so, they had not appeared yet.
- He noted Camas Creek was developing into a magnificent micro habitat example, and as such, it was an important tributary to Mt Scott and the Kellogg Creek systems. In the past, Camas Creek was often referred to as 'the ditch that runs through the park.' He discovered that some concerned citizens for the environment decided it should have a real name and went to a great amount of trouble to gather support and have it added to the Geographic Places, State and National Records as a real creek and tributary. And now it was getting tremendous support. The people responsible for that work, Dick and Sally Shook, were present.

Commissioner Batey asked what his perception was with regard to the need for more parking.

- **Mr. Burliner** believed the Committee saw some need to make the area in front of the Center safer and to add parking, if there was room and without much impact on the natural area. There had been a lot of passive recreation space lost to the south side development. Alta Consulting presented different drafts for the Committee's comments and input.
- He noted he has rarely had problems finding parking, although the frequency of his visits has declined. He uses the park to help restore or for a project with the parks. Overall, he treasured the natural areas more than a place for his own active recreation, but he did use that because it was conveniently nearby and not off limits to formal sports only. He used to visit a little more to fly a kite or bring a dog on leash and things of that nature.

Anthony Clarke, 13630 SE 120th Way, Clackamas, OR 97015, stated he was also on the Committee and has been representing the dog park. He noted a lot of people had worked very hard to design this Master Plan; it really was a good plan that they all supported. He had spoken to many people in the dog park and they were excited about the proposed changes; for instance, the inclusion of a small dog area and improvements that would make it a much better park.

Chair Klein:

- Was happy that someone representing the dog park was at the hearing. He asked what outreach was created during this process to get the dog people involved.
 - **Mr. Clarke** replied that interested people had been included in all the meetings. He had personally communicated with people in the dog park. Although there had not been a formal dog group, they recently got a bulletin board to get more information out to the

people. Dog park visitors had been generally informed and invited to participate throughout the process.

Commissioner Churchill:

- Confirmed that Mr. Clarke had visited other dog parks in the Portland metropolitan area, adding he had visited a few and had always been a bit saddened by what he saw at North Clackamas Park. The proposals for the small dog area and being closer to parking seemed like good improvements. He asked if any topographic or elevation changes seen at other parks in the area were considered.
 - **Mr. Clarke** replied that he had proposed changes that allow dogs to have high ground/low ground areas, but they were not in that stage of planning yet. He had suggested breaking up sight lines, having some kind of heavy duty equipment or tunnels that the dogs could play on or around. He had looked at most of the big parks in Vancouver, Hillsboro, Beaverton, Lake Oswego, and West Linn. North Clackamas Park had a lot of good things to offer, but there was definitely room for improvement.
- Explained he just wanted to understand the depth of representation and applauded Mr. Clarke for investigating other sites.
 - **Mr. Clarke** added that people were very happy to have the dog park, and most were satisfied with the size. There was always something they would like to see improved, which was being addressed in the Master Plan.
- Asked if any other elements were considered that might not be identified in the Master Plan. Gabriel Park has a winter park, which is a great feature that allows the summer park to recover from heavy use and helped control erosion long term. Had anyone considered that as part of the dog park interest or application?
 - **Mr. Clarke** replied he was not sure where that type of feature would go in North Clackamas because of the limited space. Gabriel Park had the space to have the winter area with sandy ground. He believed the best thing to do in the dog park was to select the best possible surface that would hold up year around. However, having more dog parks in the area would be the ultimate solution to break up the demand at North Clackamas Park.

Chair Klein confirmed that Mr. Clarke was satisfied with the dog park voice that had been put into the master planning process at this point.

Commissioner Batey:

- Asked about Mr. Clarke's perception of the need for more parking and if he believed more parking was necessary.
 - **Mr. Clarke** replied yes, there was a need for more parking at times. If there was a big event, or several big events, parking could be difficult. Those willing to walk further could certainly find parking; he had never had a problem parking there.
 - He clarified he has used the dog park since 2005, prior to when the ball fields were built, and did not recall ever having a parking problem before then.

Dick Shook, 4815 SE Casa del Rey Dr, Clackamas County, 97222, stated he was a neighbor to the park; his house was right above the dog park overlooking the park's north side. He noted he was a Board member on the Friends of Kellogg Creek and Mt Scott Creek Watersheds as well as the North Clackamas Urban Watersheds Council. He is also a Park Districts Advisory Board member, but was not representing them tonight.

- He advised Commissioner Batey that Camas Creek flows year round for two-thirds of its length, and has a part-time but vigorous flow, even during the dry summer months.

- He had attended many of these planning meetings and generally he agreed with the Master Plan as a concept. The devil will be in the details and it would take some initial hashing out to determine what the features would be and how they would finally look.
- He emphasized that one of the most important features of the Master Plan was the removal of the maintenance road at the confluence of Camas Creek and Mt Scott Creek, noted as the “crushed culvert.” He indicated the location on a displayed map and advised that those culverts were not completely sealed; one of them still flows.
 - The removal of the maintenance road would open up a high-water refuge if done correctly. He believed part of the concept of the Master Plan was to work with the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) to provide fish refuge, so juvenile fish could get out of the mainstream during high water flows, as the creek was very spiky and came up and down very fast and vigorously.
- He noted this area would also provide a great opportunity for some restoration work and an educational opportunity. One thing the Committee was promised by the County was that there would be some money available for educational signs, not only about fish and wildlife, but about watersheds as a whole. The viewing platform shown on the Concept Map would be a wonderful opportunity to provide these storyboard signs and educational opportunities.
- The dog park was a very popular feature in the park. However, he felt that it was really the wrong place for an off leash dog area and too close to the neighbors. He did believe that it would be much improved with some of the ideas set forth in this concept, as Mr. Clarke said, without sight lines, with more trees, and separating the dogs. He hoped that once people saw what a nice amenity it could be, they would work even harder to locate additional areas for additional dog parks. He did not own a dog, but [dog parks] are an important recreational facility that park goers would like to have.
- As far as parking, Camas Creek often has standing water in it near the picnic A-Frame, and so people have to park in the creek itself. Therefore, the parking has to be moved or some type of barrier constructed because the buffers are not being maintained in the area across the access road. He added that he has lived at his property since 1976 and has seen the flooding issues often.
- He clarified parking issues occurred usually when there was an event. He believed it could also be more from dog park visitors and those using the picnic areas rather than visitors to the Center.

Commissioner Batey remembered that during the ball fields’ review, Mr. Shook had very compelling photos of the flooding in 2004.

Commissioner Gamba asked Mr. Shook to indicate on the map where flooding occurs.

- **Mr. Shook** explained that when Mt Scott Creek rises, it backs up Camas Creek to the second footbridge, resulting in flooding.
- He indicated an area where another footbridge went up into the Casa del Rey neighborhood, noting that the water comes through there as a very heavy flow, enough to make it tough to wade across. There was a downed tree where the water backed up and this last winter, the water came through the area and across into the playground area. Those were the worst areas of flooding that occurred most often.
- He also indicated where the water backs up and stands. It eventually recedes but the standing water usually lasts a couple days.

Chair Klein called for testimony from those neither supporting nor opposed, but with questions about the application.

Eleanor Johnson, 4343 SE Robin Rd, Milwaukie, OR 97267, Chairperson, Milwaukie Center Advisory Board, said she recently resigned from the North Clackamas Parks and Recreation Board of Directors after serving for 8 years. She was also on the original Stewardship Committee for 2 years, and was familiar with the changes to the Park, and was very proud of it. The process involved with the ball parks project was interesting and resulted in a good concept.

- She has real concerns about the proposed plan since first hearing about it, namely regarding traffic in front of the Center. Although many elderly are dropped off in front of the Center, the parking lot is a loop. The loop can create a safety hazard for those visitors who park and have to cross in front of traffic. People are not always careful of the elderly, or consider that they do not move quickly or hear well.
- Often, there is not enough parking in front of the Center because of the many classes and activities during the day, and programs are also being offered in the evening. She felt that with the proposed plan and more people coming into the park, there will be even more traffic.
- Ms. Healey and her colleagues have worked hard with the Center to work out the traffic issue. She believed it could be worked out, but finding a solution agreeable to everyone would not be an easy process.

Commissioner Batey:

- Confirmed that Center staff park behind the building, where she counted 30 spaces.
 - **Ms. Johnson** explained the rear parking area was used for Loaves and Fishes. If other cars were parked there all day, the volunteers would not be able to get their cars loaded for deliveries. A "Staff Only" sign was posted. She was a volunteer, but was not at the Center all day.
 - She had visited the park on a Sunday in the summer to see about the parking, and there was a wedding at the Rose Garden, ball games on all 4 ball parks, a company picnic at the A-frame, as well as general public visiting. Wedding attendees often parked at the church and then are transported or walk up.
 - She had thought about the situation a lot. She hated to see too much cement, but perhaps a parking lot could be built at the back of the park so people would not have to walk so far.
- Asked if the parking situation had worsened since the ball fields were added.
 - **Ms. Johnson** replied no; only if a lot of activities were going on. The person coordinating the park's programs works with the ball park people to coordinate activities..
- Said she had never been there when parking was a problem. The gravel lot usually had busses, and 3 or 4 cars parked from dog park visitors.
 - **Ms. Johnson** commented that was fortunate, because it can get filled up, and noted the park is not coordinated for parking; people just park wherever they can.

Commissioner Gamba asked how much the equestrian area was used.

- **Ms. Johnson** replied that she has never seen anyone using the facility. She has inquired with Lisa Gibson of the Committee about any usage, but she was only contacted once. She was sorry it wasn't used more; the facility had been laid out very nicely. Understanding why it was not used more might be a consideration.

Chair Klein called for testimony opposed to the application.

Jeannie O'Leary, 5440 SE Campanario Rd, Milwaukie, OR noted her home's location in relation to the Park, noting she was concerned about moving the dog park. She was unsure how far it would be moved and if it would result in more noise for her, as there was indeed much

noise heard from the park. She suggested moving the dog park to the southwest corner in the horse arena area because nothing was there.

- She asked whether the dog park would remain the same size and simply be moved over a whole section or just partially.

Ms. Healey indicated on a displayed aerial photo that the dog park was currently located in the buffer of Mt. Scott Creek. She stated the proposed Master Plan would move the dog park between 25 ft and 50 ft east, and potentially south another 25 ft to 30 ft, to outside the creek buffer. She clarified where the east end of the dog park would be located.

Ms. O'Leary responded that was right behind her house. She already had to close her windows in the morning because of people yelling; now she would hear dogs, too.

- She noted that currently many people at the park let their dogs off their leashes, and felt that comments about this just lead to arguments. It seemed that most people think the whole park is the dog park. She saw one dog off its leash go at a little girl.
- She restated her suggestion about keeping the dog park where it is located or moving it near the horse arena.

Nancy Dollar, 5246 SE Campanario, Milwaukie, OR said she lived right along the creek, north of the park. She was also concerned about the dog park because that whole area is often wet, as is the area to the east where they proposed moving the dog park. The walking bridge across Mt. Scott Creek is often very wet and it was difficult to walk through the current dog park. She did not understand the reasons for moving the dog park.

- She agreed the dog park should move to the park's southeast corner where it was higher and dryer. She supported dog parks because it was great for dog owners to have such areas, but this was not the best place.
- The proposed walking trail was a great idea, which she supported since she uses the park for walking.

Chair Klein called for any additional comments from staff.

Ms. Mangle stated staff's comments were limited to clarify points or in response to questions: She noted that according to the MCC Parking Standards, the Center lacked adequate parking, given all the activities taking place solely within the Center. Staff was working with the Center about this issue, but it did not necessarily involve the Master Plan.

- She clarified that only the existing paved parking area was included in the parking calculations for the Center, not the gravel area or Rose Garden. The Rose Garden was permitted as its own development and underwent a Conditional Use process. The Center was also permitted as its own development. These areas have always been fragmented, which was how the calculations were done. In isolation, the Center did not have enough parking, as heard from Center staff and occupants. Parking was challenging because of the many uses occurring at the Center.
- She assured that the extensive list of implementation projects underway described by Ms. Burns did not require land use review. Ms. Burns and Ms. Herrigel discussed implementation with staff after the process for developing this Master Plan was completed and reviewed what would, and would not, require permits.

Commissioner Batey:

- Asked if any recent assessment of the parking existed in the meeting packet or in work done by Alta Consulting or other consultants.

- **Ms. Alligood** replied the last parking analysis was done for the ball field application. City staff had not done a parking analysis for this particular application. She explained that staff stated the Center is under-parked because many spaces had been combined into ADA spaces, resulting in a net loss over the years. The Center had not been approved with less than the required amount of parking; the parking had just slowly been reduced.
- **Ms. Healey** stated the consultants did not do anything specific during the planning process, but the Parks District staff did some work to address whether parking was really needed. She reported that 356 spaces existed in the park. This assumed 26 spaces in the gravel lot, which included the 4 spaces facing the Center. The Center has 42 spaces in front, 30 irregular spaces, and 12 ADA spaces with 30 spaces behind the Center, one of which is taken by the dumpster. The ball fields and Rose Garden have 257 spaces, 6 of which are ADA spaces.
 - Staff watched the parking situation for 2 days. Depending on time of the day, parking in the gravel lot, in front of the Center, and part of the Rose Garden was generally filled by Center patrons. No one was parking in the ball field lots. The Center's parking lot is not full in the evenings. No official traffic study was conducted but the staff did try to go out and collect information.
 - It was heard through the process that walking long distances was harder for those frequenting the Center, which might have prompted the many comments about needing more parking for the Center.
 - Overall, parking is not a major problem in the park. The parking issue arises during peak use of the Center, the proximity of parking, and the possible need for additional ADA spaces closer to the Center as well.

The Commission took a brief recess and reconvened at approximately 8:55 p.m.

Chair Klein called for the Applicant's rebuttal.

Ms. Healey stated the Applicant wanted to work with the Center to solve some of the parking issues and were willing to develop further designs about what the parking might be like as the Master Plan moved forward.

- The Applicants also appreciated comments made about the creek. They were amenable to moving things around to accommodate the creek as they moved ahead with the grant applications to get some of the improvements done.
- She thanked the Commission and offered to answer further questions.

Commissioner Batey:

- Understood the Center's concerns and believed the drive access could be reconfigured. She knew a specific parking plan was not being proposed yet, and that a traffic study and whatever else is needed would be presented at a later time.
- Was especially concerned about adding a drawing with such a big slab of concrete in the Comprehensive Plan. The coverage of the shelters, maintenance facility, etc., was probably less than half of the parking lot pavement coverage.
- Noted 5.1 Page 31 of the packet, Page 2 of the Application, shows a chart indicating existing and proposed new parking areas. The language discussing parking area as existing would be accurate if only the gravel lot would be paved. However, calling the proposed parking to be placed where the A-frame structure is located in not actually creating new parking, so the chart is not accurate.
 - **Ms. Healey** responded that although 40 spaces were shown, if a smaller lot would make the Commission feel more comfortable, they were amenable to making that adjustment.

Parking was proposed close to the Center and the gravel lot would provide about 25 spaces, which was used by the Center and needed to be included in parking calculations. She emphasized the Applicant was not tied to the big parking area, and was willing to make adjustments.

Commissioner Gamba asked if the parking area could be a permeable surface.

- **Ms. Healey** replied the Applicant would certainly be willing to consider such options. A really shallow water table was present there, so a geotechnical evaluation would need to be done to determine what could be used.

Chair Klein closed public testimony for CPA-10-01.

Planning Commission Discussion

Commissioner Gamba stated that he liked the application in general, but agreed with Commissioner Batey that plunking a picture of a big parking lot in the Comprehensive Plan tends to lead to expectations. He would be much more comfortable if the lot was smaller and the intention to consider permeable surfaces was included.

- He wanted to see more consideration of the flooding as he would like to see flood mitigation to have a strong representation in the plan. Also to consider is what could be done with the riparian areas, such as additional channels, braiding, etc. to increase and improve the habitat areas. Otherwise, the application was acceptable.
 - He explained that braiding regards the several stands of a creek which are generally dry throughout the year, but are running during the heavy rainfall times of the year. This braiding technique tends to mitigate flooding, and can be manmade. There is a sizable part of the creek in the park, and a lot of effort and national money is being invested in much smaller projects than this to try to restore salmon habitat.
- The concept of various parking lots not being big enough for the each separate use seemed bothersome. He agreed with Chair Klein that this is one big park that should have one big plan, and parking should be a part of that. The parking for the rose garden and the Center should be counted in the whole, rather than building more parking that is not necessarily going to be needed. For example, they should not be building the Kmart parking lot for the Christmas rush as it were.

Vice Chair Harris liked the conceptual plan presented to the Commission, but shared the other Commissioners' concerns about a Master Plan that only covers half a facility.

- His other concern was that according to the chronological record of public meetings, the last truly public meeting was held 2½ years ago. That is a long time. Neighbors were present that stated they did not see the plan more recently than that.

Commissioner Batey said she had attended some of the meeting held on the Master Plan over the years and believed the Parks District had done a really good job of outreach to relevant parties; so she was less concerned that there were neighbors who did not tune into it until now.

- She was still concerned about the expectation that the drawing being considered for the Comprehensive Plan creates a lot of parking, although the Commission did not have the evidence as to whether the parking would be needed or not. That was her main concern.
- She would be supportive if specific language addressed wetland restoration. She liked Commissioner Gamba's idea of including language that would encourage the parking surface to be permeable if possible.

- She agreed parking should not be built for the worst day of the year, when ball fields are in use; a giant company picnic is going on; a wedding is being held, etc. Parking should be built for the average summer use.

Vice Chair Harris agreed that the Parks District has done a lot of outreach via the Committee and the other committees and groups they work with. However, the Parks District's list identified that the last public meeting and open house was in 2007. It did not refer to a Committee meeting or a meeting with the Milwaukie Center Board, but publicly announced meetings, and to him a difference exists between them.

Commissioner Churchill echoed comments made by the other Commissioners. He could not support this project as part of the Comprehensive Plan without seeing an overall comprehensive look of the entire park. It was short-sighted to isolate a portion and expect a response. Although this was a Master Plan for the north side of the park, with Camas Creek dividing it, he needed to see [the Master Plan] in context of the whole park.

- He believed underutilized areas at the southwest corner of the park need to be considered, and how that impacts the density of use on the park's north side.
- He had some concerns about the amount of parking spaces, but believed that would get resolved. He had used the dog park when the A-Frame picnic structure was being used, which created a parking problem for certain peak periods, irrespective of what was happening at the Center. However, people could park at the ball fields and walk over.
- His biggest objection was that the Commission was seeing a portion, albeit a small portion of the park, and being asked to approve it as a separate master plan.
 - He understood that what the Commission reviewed and approved 4 years ago did not result in what was built. So he believed this application requires a look at the overall master plan of the entire park. This [Master Plan], as a subset of that overall master plan, might be approved once the Commission understood how it fit together.
- For the record, he would like to look at the dog park use specifically, because it is so close to wetland areas. The dog park is currently used to the point where soil compaction occurs, which leads to erosion, and essentially abuse of the land. He would like the Applicants to consider using the park's southwest corner as a winter dog park. This would have both an ecological and acoustical impact, relieving the pressure on the ecosystem on the north side of the park, and helping transition some of the noise generation to other areas of the park, possibly providing some relief to residents adjacent to the [current] dog park area for a certain time of the year.

Chair Klein agreed with Commissioner Churchill, and believed it was a mistake to not master plan the whole site, which would allow the correction of some of the errors and mistakes that occurred in the past.

- He really liked the Master Plan for this particular area as presented. The problem was it was not just that area, but a big piece of land with lots of uses occurring and he did not believe it was being considered.
- He was bothered by the manner in which the last application for the ball fields was approved. He took great pride in the process which allowed people to come and give their input to the Commission, who then made a decision that moved forward. That process was taken away, and a voice was given to a specific group by the County administrator and by a particular County Commissioner at that point in time. He believed that was a grave mistake.
- He agreed with Commissioner Churchill and believed the whole site should be considered. He would not support the application, though he did like everything in the document. He wanted to look at the whole picture.

Commissioner Batey said she was not opposed to the application, but it needed some tweaking for her to vote yes.

Commissioner Gamba agreed with the logic. Mitigations could occur to take pressure off the dog park area that would involve the south end of the park. It did not make sense, particularly when discussing parking, to separate parking areas and building another parking lot because more parking was needed. It was completely illogical to not look at the whole park as one big picture. Though he liked 90% of the Master Plan, he would vote no.

Chair Klein said his point was that this was a master plan, rather than an application before the Commission right now. There was no dire need, and it was not as if nothing could be built without a master plan, because they built North Clackamas Park.

Ms. Mangle asked the Commission to consider whether they would want to permit certain improvements with a development permit without having this type of a master plan in place. For example, if the Parks District or City was successful in securing a grant to remove the crushed culvert.

Commissioner Gamba answered yes, in his personal opinion.

Chair Klein emphasized there were holes in this Master Plan one could drive a car through. Issues were not being addressed on a greater scale. If the culvert could be fixed with a grant, then bring it before the Commission, which would occur anyway because the whole project could not be funded at this point. The whole project needed to be considered.

Commissioner Batey stated, playing the devil's advocate, if the Parks District gets the money for the culvert removal and comes before the Commission, some will say that a Master Plan is needed before such improvements could be made, as Mart Hughes had stated regarding the ball fields.

Commissioner Churchill replied he would agree, a master plan was needed, and would need to be brought back before the Commission.

Chair Klein noted that although Mr. Hughes stated that the north field needed to be master planned, he interpreted that Mr. Hughes wanted these things done in conjunction. This was why he wanted them done at the same time so review of the whole park would be done at once, rather than piecemealed together. He assumed that he would have said that they wanted to have the Master Plan done and in place by the summer of 2005, which happened to coincide with the development of the parks. If Mr. Hughes was directing the Commission, where was the Commission on this master plan?

Commissioner Gamba remarked that it was 5 years late.

Commissioner Batey explained that the Applicants were in a hard spot. She knew about trying to get funding for the park, and one never knows where a grant will come in. If the Applicants get funding for some piece and do not have a master plan, would people be upset that it was not approved.

Chair Klein asked if rebuilding the culvert would result in an intensification of use.

Commissioner Batey noted that if anything, it would be a de-intensification of use.

Bill Monahan, City Attorney, agreed with Commissioner Batey that the improvement of the culvert will de-intensify the problems that exist at this time.

Ms. Mangle asked if it would be worth discussing what could be done to change the given Master Plan and return to the Commission to discuss adoption. She noted that Commissioner Batey mentioned doing a parking assessment, and that other achievable things were discussed. Starting over with a whole new master plan was a different ball park. It would be nice to know where the Commission would be interested in seeing work done.

Commissioner Churchill clarified he did not want the entire park master planned, he wanted to see how the subject North Side Master Plan fit with the master plan for the entire park, which must exist. If one did not, then the City was doing things in isolation and they might as well be doing a culvert. The Commission was being asked to approve a master plan on a small portion of the park, but some thought had to be put into it. This was how things get fragmented, like the rose garden fragmented with its own parking, and the Center, ball park, and dog park all with their own parking issues. It was difficult to see how the whole thing would come together. He believed the Applicants needed to take a broad look to show the Commission that they understand the entire site and what the long range goals are for the different areas. It did not have to take a year. Working in isolation was not benefitting the park as a whole, or the community.

Chair Klein stated this was how Milwaukie was built, and was one of the frustrations for the Commission; streets without sidewalks, no pedestrian access on streets that need it; no bike lanes. A lot of things were not considered and this was a continuation of that.

Vice Chair Harris agreed. Without a plan for the entire park, one cannot clearly see how the north half would even fit together with the south half.

Chair Klein asked about available options. He did not propose throwing the Master Plan out, but having it go back for some more work.

Ms. Mangle requested that the Commission be as specific as possible about the work that needed to be done.

Chair Klein said he wanted to look at how the southern portion of the park was performing, which seemed to be well, to have as a comparison. He also wanted to consider some alternative uses throughout the park, and see where some adjustments could be made regarding the ideas discussed at this time. Looking at this small area for those ideas did not do it justice.

- He believed all the proposed elements should stay in place. The dog park would not be removed. His ultimate goal would be to actually help the dog park, since it was the most heavily used element at the park, outside of the Center.
- He clarified that some ideas discussed utilized the southeast corner. Alternative sites within the entire park could be used for the elements mentioned.
- If there were uses the City had not heard about or people who had not provided input, the City needed to get those people involved.

Commissioner Churchill agreed. The Commission just needed some context.

Chair Klein stated he was very discouraged coming into the meeting, because it seemed not a lot of discussion had occurred with dog owners, but he felt much better after Mr. Clarke's comments. It would be nice to consider a bigger picture.

The Commission took a brief recess, and reconvened at approximately 9:20 p.m.

Ms. Mangle stated that following discussion, staff and the Applicant requested that the Commission consider continuing the hearing to a date certain, directing staff to work on the following five items to see if the Commission's concerns could be addressed:

- Provide material about what changed regarding the Commission's decision on the south side ball fields, since there had been questions about that issue. Staff had the record and could be very clear about what actually changed between Planning Commission and City Council.
- Discuss what alternatives have been considered with regard to the uses, especially with the southwest corner of the site. The Parks District did look at some things, and could explain why those alternatives were rejected, such as the dog park.
- Put this Master Plan in the context of the larger park; however, this would not mean doing this level of planning for the whole park, but putting it in that context to explain or show on one graphic how those relationships could work together.
- Do some work on the shared parking issue. Parking was analyzed during the ball park's application and the Center was considered. Staff could explain what was learned then and update it.
- Explain the timing of the process with regard to planning and grants, and the 2-year gap. There were actually some good reasons for that gap.
- She clarified that doing this work would not involve hiring consultants, redoing a lot of the work, or redoing a master plan for the entire site. The Parks District and Planning staff were happy to review that material for the Commission's information and consideration.
- However, if this level of detail was wanted for the entire park, it would probably be better to withdraw the application. The subject Master Plan was a sub-area type of plan, and providing more context could address the Commission's specific concerns. She wanted to ensure the right concerns had been noted.

Chair Klein asked what process would follow if the application was withdrawn. Would a master plan be done for the entire site?

Ms. Mangle responded probably not, but that would be best addressed by the Applicants.

Mr. Monahan noted the public hearing should be reopened to allow the opportunity for the Applicants' comments about proceeding given the option discussed. He confirmed that if no clarification was needed from the Applicant, the Commission could discuss what they thought of the idea posed by Ms. Mangle.

Commissioner Gamba stated he did not believe the provided option addressed the big picture. While questions would be answered, there would still be a whole park without a master plan; and a half a park with a master plan. He was curious to know who directed the creation of a master plan for half a park, which seemed bizarre.

Commissioner Batey stated that after the ball fields project, her perception was that the park had been segregated in 2 halves. This separate plan limited to the north side was exactly what she expected, right or wrong, better or worse.

Chair Klein stated it was not what he expected. He hoped there would be ties between the park areas and the Commission could see how it was functioning. Environmentally, it seemed like it was functioning very well, but more issues were involved. Certainly the uses were something that could be considered.

- He was fine with continuing the application to a date certain, provided that alternative uses were considered throughout the park as a whole, not just in the northern portion. There were things that caused problems, like the dog park functioning year-round where it was located. He wanted to see other portions of the park being utilized.
- When visiting the site today, there were almost as many dog walkers on the southwest corner of the park as there were in the dog park. People were utilizing that area now. If the equestrian area visitors were available, now was the time to involve them and address the area's use. He believed there were better uses for the amount of land in that area.
- As long as the application was moving in that kind of direction, he would be happy.

Ms. Mangle asked to clarify if it was the Applicant saying that they did look at it, explaining why the alternative was not selected, or did Chair Klein want to see a master plan showing the dog park in the southwest corner. She sought clarification because those expectations were pretty different.

Commissioner Gamba:

- Replied he did not necessarily expect to have the Applicant put a winter dog park in that corner, but he wanted them to look at the whole park and consider the best ways to utilize the entire area, parking, flood mitigation, environment, use, everything. Before saying he wanted to see [a master plan] level of planning for the whole park, he wanted to know the downside.
 - **Ms. Mangle** explained that the Parks District staff had said this has been a long, involved, and expensive process that involved hundreds of people to date. She believed the agency and people involved were much more interested in implementation, especially with regard to spending money on the creeks, rather than continuing to do planning for the whole site. So the whole focus has been on implementation. Limited funding was available, which was one reason why the Master Plan had been delayed in coming to the Commission.
- Clarified that acquiring a master plan for the whole area would steal funds from projects that could go forward immediately, such as removing the culvert.
 - **Ms. Mangle** said that projects were already not being done due to lack of funding. No funding was identified for doing a park master plan for the entire site.

Commissioner Churchill said he still believed there were a lot of elephants in the room that were not being discussed.

- If a culvert grant was trying to be obtained, then bring the project forward. If it needed a master plan to support that grant, then why isolate and do a master plan on one section? The City was continuing to do fragmented things in this park and it looked that way.
- He did not expect a fantastic tapestry for the balance of the park. He needed to see a context of how the subject Master Plan fit with the overall, high level plan for the park. Funding for a master planning effort might not be available, but internally within the Parks District, there must be some conceptual plan of long-term use of how they viewed the entire

park. He could not imagine that the City was doing isolated work now, and ignoring the balance of the park.

- This is a big, important part of Milwaukie, and he believed a bigger, broad-brush look was needed to pull it into context for the Commission. Otherwise, it was like looking at a small application, but ignoring the neighborhood around it.

Chair Klein recalled Ms. Healey's earlier comments about the prior ball field project and not wanting 3 months of fighting. He believed that fighting for something that is better and good is the right thing to do and should be done. He hated mitigating, and believed that settling was something that was always done in Milwaukie. He was aware that the audience may disagree with the Commission, but the fact is that this was a bigger [project]; it was not just the north side of the park, or the dog park.

- The dog park was extremely important. He believed utilization could occur throughout the park and that areas of improvement could make the whole place better, rather than pinpointing certain things, or making one portion the best place possible.

Commissioner Churchill added it was not as if the Applicant was being asked to open the southern half of the park to a giant public hearing process, the Commission just wanted some context, and show how it fits with the overall fabric of the park.

Commissioner Batey believed that it almost sounded like he agreed to what Ms. Mangle proposed.

Chair Klein stated that he was actually in favor of continuing the hearing; he did not want the application withdrawn. He wanted it to remain before the Commission and be worked on. Having money available to be spent on other projects, etc., put a bit of a priority on this Master Plan application.

Commissioner Churchill appreciated Commissioner Gamba's comments; it would be wonderful to have a detailed Master Plan of the entire park. He clarified that he was not personally asking for that, he was requesting for the context of how this fits within the whole.

Commissioner Batey believed the Commissioners agreed that having had a master plan in 2005 for the whole park would have been ideal, but what was realistic to expect at this juncture, cost wise, etc? She believed what Ms. Mangle was proposing was fine.

Chair Klein agreed, reiterating that he wanted the Master Plan to stay on the Commission's table.

Ms. Mangle explained that addressing the 6 items would be a fair amount of work for those involved. If the Commission did not believe that information would be enough and really wanted a more detailed master plan, she preferred to know now. She confirmed that the Commission wanted staff to do the work, which would influence the decision.

- She stated that it could take 2-6 months to prepare the requested information. Continuing the hearing to a date certain was probably not helpful because staff did not want to re-notice the hearing for that long period of time.

Commissioner Gamba asked if continuing the hearing to a date uncertain would stop projects that are imminent this summer.

Ms. Mangle replied not for this summer.

Chair Klein answered yes, this would have rippling impacts.

Commissioner Churchill countered that as mentioned, Milwaukie has been a series of jigsaw puzzle pieces, and this is an important park and he wants to get it right.

Ms. Mangle advised that the lack of funding was not a reason not to continue the hearing.

Ms. Burns added the Parks District would keep moving on its other projects with the assumption that the Master Plan would get worked out.

Commissioner Gamba added that with the assumption that by and large, the Commission likes the Master Plan, there was just a little more to the puzzle.

Chair Klein invited the Parks District to come back before the Commission should money become available for the culvert, which was probably the most minuscule thing. It helps. It was a good thing.

Commissioner Batey moved to continue the application for CPA-10-01 North Clackamas Park North Side Master Plan to a date uncertain. Commissioner Churchill seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

6.0 Worksession Items – None

7.0 Planning Department Other Business/Updates

Ms. Mangle noted an article in *The Clackamas Review* about a tree removal hearing in which she was quoted as saying, “We were making this up as we go along.” The statement was true in the sense that the City had not had a tree hearing in 7 or 8 years, and no guidance existed in the Code about how to conduct one. The hearing was related to the street improvements for the Bowman and Brae project for which the Commission approved a zone change. She reminded that the Minor Land Partition to create those lots was a Type II decision, which can be forwarded/upgraded to the Commission. She advised the Commissioners that it was best not to engage in any discussion about the issue, because it could come before the Commission.

- The City only regulates trees in Water Quality Resource areas or within the right-of-way. The tree removal permit process allows anyone concerned to request a tree hearing. People with concerns usually submit written comments.
- The tree hearing was held in the middle of the Bowman St right-of-way with about 20 neighbors. A decision had not been made yet. She noted the tree issue would have come up even if the project involved 2 houses instead of 3, because the street improvements would have been required regardless. The tree in question was right in the middle of the right-of-way.

8.0 Planning Commission Discussion Items

Vice Chair Harris announced the Concert in the Park Series was starting August 4th featuring “Stolen Sweets” at Llewellyn Park. Curtis Delgado and Jim Macy were also feature artists for the series.

9.0 Forecast for Future Meetings:

August 10, 2010

1. Worksession: Natural Resources Overlay project update
2. Worksession: Training discussion on holding effective public hearings

August 24, 2010

1. Worksession: Review Procedures Code Amendment project briefing #3
2. Worksession: Briefing on CET grant – long range planning *tentative*

Ms. Mangle reviewed the upcoming meetings with these additional comments:

- Staff was seeking some policy direction on a few key items of the Natural Resources Overlay project. The training worksession was also to help make the Commission as a whole more effective. Group discussion about how the Commission was doing would be an important part of the session.
- The Code Amendment project worksession would focus more on variances, nonconforming uses, and conditional uses.

Chair Klein announced he might be gone on August 24th.

Meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paula Pinyerd, ABC Transcription Services, Inc. for
Alicia Stoutenburg, Administrative Specialist II

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Jeff Klein', written over a horizontal line.

Jeff Klein, Chair