

**CITY OF MILWAUKIE  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
Milwaukie City Hall  
10722 SE Main Street  
TUESDAY, MAY 13, 2014  
6:30 PM**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT**

Sine Bone, Chair  
Wilda Parks, Vice Chair  
Shannah Anderson  
Shaun Lowcock

**STAFF PRESENT**

Denny Egner, Planning Director  
Li Alligood, Associate Planner  
Brett Kelter, Associate Planner  
Vera Koliass, Associate Planner  
Peter Watts, City Attorney

**COMMISSIONERS ABSENT**

Scott Barbur  
Gabe Storm

**1.0 Call to Order – Procedural Matters\***

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

*Note: The information presented constitutes summarized minutes only. The meeting video is available by clicking the Video link at <http://www.ci.milwaukie.or.us/meetings>.*

**2.0 Planning Commission Minutes**

2.1 March 11, 2014

**Chair Bone** noted that the spelling of a few names had been corrected.

**It was moved by Vice Chair Parks and seconded by Commissioner Lowcock to approve the March 11, 2014 Planning Commission minutes as corrected. The motion passed unanimously.**

**3.0 Information Items**

There were no information items.

**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**

**6.0 Worksession Items**

6.1 Summary: Original Art Mural Area Measurement Discussion  
Staff: Denny Egner

**Denny Egner, Planning Director**, reminded the Commission of the approval of the Public Art Mural program with the changes noted regarding the size and layout of the murals. He noted the draft procedure for measuring the mural percentage in the staff report. The changes would be outside of the hearing process since it would involve the new Title 20, but he wanted to confirm that the proposed Title 20 was what the Commission had in mind.

**Vice Chair Parks** appreciated the proposed Title 20. She felt that once applications started being submitted, what changes were needed would become clear.

6.2 Summary: Metro Climate Smart Communities  
Staff: Denny Egner

**Mr. Egner** noted that Vice Chair Parks and Councilor Dave Hedges have both been involved in the Climate Smart Communities project. At this point, the project was at an important step that involved making a recommendation to Metro Council regarding what direction to go next. He gave a brief overview of the project and where it was in the process.

The project's objective was to develop, through a scenario-planning process, regional strategies that would help the region reduce greenhouse gas emissions in response to a state law passed in 2009. Each jurisdiction was given a reduction target: the estimated emissions in 2005 were 4 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub> per capita and the target was 1.2 million tons per capita by 2035. The vast majority of the reduction was expected to come about through broader transportation-related changes, such as advances in fleet technology, and would be independent of local decisions.

The local focus was on the smaller target of a 20% reduction, and scenario strategies dealt with land use design, pricing, marketing and incentives, road improvements, and technology. Also, a primary focus had been on alternative transportation modes, improved public transit, technological changes, education, etc. However, the methods came with a hefty price tag; how much was the region willing to spend to get to the target goals.

Metro developed three scenarios, which were included in the staff report, and involved A-recent trends, B-current plans, and C-enhanced plans. At a joint meeting of the Metropolitan Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) and the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), committee members expressed preference for a "B=" scenario. The next meeting was scheduled for May 30 which would focus on the costs. A standing question was if the State was going to contribute funding toward the project; much of the scenarios came down to how transportation was paid for/funded and would require lobbying at the state level. The "B+" scenario was about three times the recent trends in terms of expenditures. The proposal that was hoped to come out of the May 30 meeting would then go on to public comment and further review by the Fall 2014. The adopted plan could result in changes to the Urban Growth Management Plan (UGMA) and the Regional Transportation Functional Plan, which would then filter down to local jurisdictions.

**Mr. Egner** felt that Metro's goals were shifting from requirements to more incentive-driven programs. With light rail coming and current bike-improvement projects underway, Milwaukie was in good shape locally. This project would help build out plans in place as the region continues to grow in town and regional centers and corridors with transit-oriented development. That was the underlying assumption in the analysis that has been done.

**Vice Chair Parks** noted the focus on technology; ways to use technology more effectively and efficiently which would require partnerships between local jurisdictions and organizations (i.e. City and Oregon Department of Transportation, etc.)

**Commissioner Lowcock** asked about public-private partnerships to help achieve some of the transportation goals. He noted, as an example, Tesla's intent to build high-speed charging infrastructure for their cars along the coast. That type of partnership would encourage the purchase and use of electric vehicles.

**Vice Chair Parks** noted the different programs that try to promote reducing vehicles on the road. Through her experience with Clackamas County, it was difficult to work with businesses in terms of getting information to their employees about transit options; and was extremely difficult to get travel option information out to households and consumers. Hopefully an outcome of this project would be a more concentrated effort in educating the public on transportation options and alternatives.

**Mr. Egner** concurred that a strategy was the outreach component.

**Commissioner Lowcock** noted that some cities like Paris have instituted 'no-drive' days, although the reality of that in the Portland area was unlikely. Public transportation also needed to be affordable.

**Mr. Egner** noted that redevelopment efforts were focused in town and regional centers and along corridors which were generally served by public transportation. He noted that Councilor Dave Hedges was a member of the C4 group which provided input to Clackamas County representatives on Metro's advisory committees.

**Dave Hedges, Milwaukie representative on the Clackamas County Coordinating Committee (C4)**, noted he found that at the County Commissioner meeting that morning and the last C4 meeting, the people who were assumed to be supportive of environmental change were actually not. The problem was sticker-shock - Scenario B would cost Clackamas County \$217 million and many of the members felt that was not attainable. However, he noted that the County could not afford not to do it. However, there was no drive at the County level to try to find a funding solution. Better maintained infrastructure would allow for more efficient transportation. He felt that the community needed to decide what would be best to fund.

**Chair Bone** asked about new revenue options for funding: would that be local, regional, or at the state level.

**Mr. Hedges** described the Street Surface Maintenance Program (SSMP) that had been successful in funding resurfacing roads in Milwaukie. However, more revenue was needed to continue maintenance and repair of the City's roads. He noted England and Europe's tax and public transit methods that were successful, although the population density, subsidization, and tax system were quite different. It was important for committee and community members to get past the sticker shock to be able to make progress.

**Mr. Egner** noted that Metro's 2040 Functional Plan helped achieve much of the Climate Smart Communities' project goals and this region was ahead of the game because of the framework that was in place.

**Commissioner Lowcock** mentioned the National Climate Assessment report published that month that outlined the true impact of climate change on the country.

**Mr. Hedges** concurred that it would cost much more if nothing was done.

**Vice Chair Parks** requested that the topic be revisited after the May 30 meeting. She noted the County Commission would hold a C4 meeting, scheduled for June 5, on transportation and what could be funded to move toward these goals.

6.3 Summary: Milwaukie Plans  
Staff: Denny Egner

**Mr. Egner** discussed the different planning documents that outlined the vision for Milwaukie. He referenced the matrix included in the staff report that outlined the different documents that guide different goals and policies. Although the plan documents weren't always 100% consistent, the basic vision was for downtown to be a mixed-use, pedestrian- and transit-oriented area.

The Comprehensive Plan was the overall guiding document for the community. With regard to the recent zone change application, there was concern about the conflicts between the Comprehensive Plan and the Town Center Master Plan (TCMP), and the relationship between the Comprehensive Plan and the ancillary documents that were designed to support it. He explained that there have been pieces of some of the ancillary documents incorporated directly into the Comprehensive Plan while others provided support through information, and some, like the TSP, were equal to the Comp Plan.

He added that the two documents that were most unclear as to their use and intent were the TCMP and the Downtown and Riverfront Framework Plan; only specific sections of the TCMP were adopted into the Comprehensive Plan, and the Downtown and Riverfront Framework Plan had elements that were clearly reflected in the Comprehensive Plan and in the Zoning Ordinance. He referenced the staff report and noted specific elements regarding downtown uses. However, hopefully through the Moving Forward Milwaukie (MFM) project's process and related amendments, the intent of and conflicts between the documents would be clarified.

Public Area Requirements (PARs) were a somewhat controversial element that was also being discussed as part of the MFM project. The street and improvement standards were high and expensive; discouraging development, so there was consideration to adjust those requirements.

**Steve Butler, Community Development Director**, clarified that the Land Use Framework Map would be remade through the MFM project to illustrate what the community wants with a reduced number of zones. Also, he reminded that the drawings within ancillary documents created a false sense of what would be. The MFM project focused on adaptive reuse and redevelopment over time as appropriate.

**Commissioner Anderson** appreciated the matrix of the plans in the staff report and found it very helpful.

**Chair Bone** agreed that it was important for the Commission to understand the intent and background of the plans, particularly going forward, as there has been a lot of work done previously by the City and the community.

**Mr. Egner** added that it was also important to note that some of the plans were created prior to light rail, which was a game changer. The PARs were good but discouraged development. Oftentimes in other jurisdictions, the improvements were done publicly to attract development;

however, the Council was not interested in a downtown Urban Renewal District although there was discussion of a block-by-block improvement process through a tax-increment process.

#### **7.0 Planning Department Other Business/Updates**

**Mr. Butler** noted that a groundbreaking ceremony for Riverfront Park was scheduled for June 6, 2014, and encouraged the Commission to attend.

#### **8.0 Planning Commission Discussion Items**


##### **9.0 Forecast for Future Meetings:**

- |               |   |
|---------------|---|
| May 27, 2014  | 1. Public Hearing: CSU-13-12 Wichita Park                   |
|               | 2. Worksession: Moving Forward Milwaukie project update     |
| June 10, 2014 | 1. Public Hearing: P-14-01 Moda Health Parking Modification |

Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Alicia Martin, Administrative Specialist II

  
Sine Bone, Chair