

Parks and Recreation – Workshop Reference Sheet

Relevant goals, objectives and actions from the Community Vision

Place 1.1: Improve walkability and bikeability within the network by creating dedicated bike paths and walking trails that connect transit, neighborhood business hubs and public spaces, including Milwaukie Bay Park

Place 3.1: Ensure that our parks and green spaces are safe, green and clean, with amenities like restrooms, seating areas, play structures, walking paths, parking and covered recreational facilities

Place 3.2: Complete Phase 3 of the Milwaukie Bay Park to create spaces for community gathering and the arts and promote the park as a community destination with year-round programming

Place 3.4: Make improvements to Milwaukie Bay Park in a manner that celebrates the river and increases opportunities for waterfront events and access for boats and other water-related recreational activities

Prosperity 3.4: Develop a new public plaza in the south downtown area that can be used for year-round events and enhance the Milwaukie Farmer's Market

Discussion notes from previous CPAC meetings and Planning Commission

- Need for more and/or expansion of parks, especially in underserved areas.
 - Improve safe connectivity between parks and Milwaukie's underserved neighborhoods through adding walking/biking infrastructure and adding parks in existing neighborhoods
- Parks must be gathering spaces with amenities for all ages and abilities: more sitting areas, work-out stations, soccer field, skateparks, bocce ball, covered horseshoe area, other activities for all abilities, etc.
- Provide natural play spaces/areas
- Update the park classifications according to needs of the community
 - Are park classifications needed?
 - City response: Yes, for things like active vs passive, neighborhood vs regional.
- Divorce park facility master plans from the Comprehensive Plan
- Apply a new parks and open space zoning district and remove the requirement for Community Service Use review
- Planning on the existing levy rate would not do much
- City should plan for the park system it wants and then figure out how much it will cost. Then figure out levies and go to the voters and Council.
- Plan for parks east of current city limits to I-205
- Preserve and increase inventory of parkland and natural areas by 1) requiring open-space dedications for subdivisions of 1 acre or larger for community gardens, dog parks, playgrounds, etc.
 - Acquisition of lands within natural hazard areas
 - Limit development in natural areas to only low-impact uses like trails and wildlife viewing
- Statewide Goal 15 – Natural Area Preservation and Conservation
 - Serve as model for ESA-cooperative community and preserve natural areas (establishment of Greenway Trail corridors for wildlife movement, etc.)
 - Prioritize the protection and enhancement of habitat qualities of natural waterways and wetlands
 - Focus riverfront recreation intensification at existing developed facilities like Milwaukie Bay Park – recreation design should consider natural area conservation

Parks and Recreation – Workshop Reference Sheet

Community feedback	
Survey	Town Hall discussion
<p>Most frequently used recreation spaces:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At a city park (74%) • At an NCS D school after hours (38%) • Somewhere else (27%) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Neighborhood streets ○ Apartment complexes ○ Waterfront ○ Library ○ Downtown Milwaukie ○ Portland parks ○ Trails (e.g. Springwater Corridor, Trolley Trail) ○ Milwaukie Farmer’s Market ○ Aquatic parks • At an indoor rec center (16%) <p>Top 5 amenities respondents want to see increased:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walking trails • Natural areas • Off-leash dog areas • Covered, open air areas • Rec space for teenagers <p>Likelihood to use a community garden or edible landscape:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14% very likely to use • 32% somewhat likely to use • 27% not very likely to use • 25% not at all likely to use • 2% don’t know/unsure <p>Priorities for the next 20 years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving bicycle and pedestrian connections to parks and rec areas (60%) • Enhancing/restoring natural areas (45%) • Finishing unbuilt parks (36%) • Acquiring additional land for parks (24%) • Providing more programs (17%) <p>Support for a potential levy/tax for park development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50% strongly support • 29% somewhat support • 10% would not support • 12% unsure/don’t know 	<p>Recreation needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bike and pedestrian access • Amenity improvements, “complete parks” • Active, creative spaces • Areas for dogs • Places for quiet, reflective opportunities, natural area protection • Water activities • Recreation centers in central locations • Parks that are safe <p>Desired amenities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trails, pathways, nature trails, pedestrian paths under/over 99 E • Benches with backs, bike racks, awnings, park shelters, lighting, large tables, clean bathrooms, historical signage/markers • Skateparks, splash pads/water activities, community gardens, basketball court, volley ball court, playgrounds • Dog parks • Natural areas and nature trails • Non-motorized paddle vehicles (i.e. Kayaking, canoeing, etc.) • Space for community activities and events • Safety enhancements: Park rangers, well-lit parks <p>Priorities for the next 20 years</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving access to and connectivity between parks and natural areas. • Enhancing or adding new amenitie to serve a diversity of ages and abilities. • Finishing parks that are under development as a priority, including Kronberg Park and Milwaukie Bay Park. • Greater protection of native trees, wetlands and existing natural areas • Additional studies to better understand park utilization and recreation needs . • A few groups said new land should be acquired for parks, but only when its financially prudent and the funding is available. • A few groups said more indoor community centers are needed and discussed program improvements that could be made at the Milwaukie Center.

Parks and Recreation – Workshop Reference Sheet

Staff Questions and Recommendations

New Policy: Add a policy that calls for the creation of a parks/recreation/open space zoning district.

- Objective 1 – Park Classifications
 - Provide new park classifications that match NCPRD Master Plan: Neighborhood Parks, Community Parks, Natural Areas, Greenways, Special Use Areas and add Pocket Parks
 - NCPRD doesn't apply standards for park acres per population, but states the typical service area radius. Leave out or keep in?
- Objective 2 – Parks and Recreation Master Plan – **TAKE OUT**
- Objective 3 – Intergovernmental Coordination – Rename to Funding and Partnerships?
 - Move some funding related and partnership policies underneath this new title. Keep intergovernmental polices, especially relationship with NCPRD, that are needed.
 - **Potential New Policy under Funding:** “Pursue prioritizing proportional contributions from new development and redevelopment for the expansion of public recreation opportunities in underserved areas of Milwaukie”
 - **Potential New Policy:** “Work with NCPRD to complete and adopt an overall parks master plan.”
- Objectives 4, 5, 6, & 7 – Combine under one umbrella goal called “Opportunities”
 - **Potential New Opportunities Goal language:** “In cooperation with NCPRD, plan, develop, and enhance recreation opportunities to meet the needs of community members of all ages, abilities, cultures, and incomes.”
 - **Potential New Policy:** “Encourage interim recreational opportunities on vacant and underutilized sites on private or public land to be community member initiated and managed.”
 - Objective 4 Policy 1 - Mentions requiring park or open space where park deficiencies have been identified, which was never done. Versus requiring space, maybe use System Development Charges (SDCs) that are applied with all new development.
Potential New Policy: Have a flexible system with NCPRD so that the City can accept land when appropriate in lieu of SDCs.
 - **Potential New Policy:** Add a policy that expansion of parks, redevelopment of parks, and new recreational opportunities shall be tailored towards the needs and abilities of diverse communities.
 - **Potential New Policy:** Improve access and connectivity between parks and natural areas.
 - Objective 5, Policy 2: Add language that reflects more the needs brought up by CPAC and community members tailored towards neighborhood parks (i.e. covered, open air areas, nature play areas, community gardens, etc.)
- **New Potential Goal: Transportation and Connectivity**
 - **Potential New Policy:** Language around providing an active transportation network to increase connectivity between recreation opportunities.
 - **Potential New Policy:** Add language about bike trails, sidewalks, and walking trails providing convenient access for pedestrians and bicyclists to all parks and recreational areas.
 - **Potential New Policy:** Encourage transit access to community parks.
 - Replace Objective 7, Policy 6 with a broader policy around pursuing the expansion of greenways, trails, and waterway recreation as both recreation opportunities and transportation alternatives?

Willamette Greenway – Workshop Reference Sheet

Relevant goals, objectives and actions from the Community Vision

Planet 2: Milwaukie has free flowing, accessible, pristine waterways that are protected by a robust stormwater treatment system. The Willamette waterfront is easily accessed by the public and offers a wide variety of activities and events that can be enjoyed by all.

Place 1.1: Improve walkability and bikeability within the network by creating dedicated bike paths and walking trails that connect transit, neighborhood business hubs and public spaces, including Milwaukie Bay Park

Place 3.4: Make improvements to Milwaukie Bay Park in a manner that celebrates the river and increases opportunities for waterfront events and access for boats and other water-related recreational activities

Discussion notes from previous CPAC meetings and Planning Commission

- Have higher level of Greenway review for properties closer to the water. Staff responded that this could take form of Greenway compatibility boundary.
- Make sure to include new policy about Elk Rock Island (not previously in City).
- We should not be changing the Greenway boundary as part of this process.
- In general, public viewpoints make sense. Have a plan for saving viewpoints from City designated resources.
- Should include a policy about removing Kellogg Dam and better connections to riverfront.
 - Prioritize protection of Kellogg Creek and call for fully-functional reconnection of Kellogg Creek to the Willamette River
- No consensus on whether City should have role in protecting viewpoints from private property; it was noted that Portland does not.
- Focus should be on public views on public property.
 - Current policy only lists Willamette River and Kellogg Lake viewshed. Elk Rock Island and other public views need to be added
- Existing Comp Plan talks about taking out the wastewater treatment plant; since plant likely isn't going in there, should focus on covering it, or encouraging it to pursue net-zero.
- Take out the Greenway Design Plan (GDP) in current Comp Plan.
 - Planning Commissioner Edge feels a GDP should be developed that is sensitive to habitat/natural qualities and free movement of wildlife, aesthetics of WRG that won't increase "take" of ESA-protected species and prioritizes the NMFS-identified Riparian Protection Zone of the WR Floodplain
- Consider affordability impacts of greenway review (Alma).
- Statewide Planning Goal Considerations
 - Use the Goal 5 process to review and manage natural resources within the WRG if natural resources review standards and evaluation criteria are not added to the review process
 - Revise WRG review process and criteria to heavily weight wildlife habitat and support functional qualities of the WRG
 - Prioritization of activities/qualities/mitigation measures should be based upon a ranked prioritization schedule identified by State Goal 15

Willamette Greenway – Workshop Reference Sheet

Community feedback	
Survey	Town Hall discussion
<p>Top 5 attributes valued most about the Willamette Greenway</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection of habitat and natural areas • Trails along the river • Access to non-powered water recreation (e.g. kayaking or canoeing, paddle boarding, swimming, fishing) • Access to recreation spaces on the shore (e.g. Milwaukie Bay Park) • Views of the river <p>Support to protect specific viewpoints of Milwaukie’s waterfront:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 38% Yes, namely from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Elk Rock Island ○ Kellogg Creek ○ Downtown ○ Klein Point ○ Spring Park ○ Land near the water treatment plant • 49% Unsure/don’t know • 13% No, I do not believe there are specific views that should be protected <p>Top planning considerations for the next 20 years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect natural areas along the waterfront should be a priority. • Connectivity between the city and the waterfront, particularly bike and pedestrian access. • Extend and connect to existing pedestrian and bike infrastructure, such as the Springwater Corridor • More recreation opportunities in the Greenway, including swimming areas, kayak and canoe access, parks, and trails. • Enhance safety along the waterfront, including protecting pedestrians/cyclists from vehicular traffic. • Enhance the waterfront to attract people to Milwaukie. A few suggested the Greenway should be developed into a multi-use area, including natural spaces, trails, walking and vehicle access, sports access, picnic areas and more. • Consider the economic potential of the waterfront – introduce small businesses in some areas. • Remove the Kellogg Creek dam. <p>Support to remove the Kellogg Creek Dam and developing trails along the creek:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 67% strongly support • 16% somewhat support • 6% don’t really support • 3% don’t support at all • 8% unsure/don’t know 	<p>Greenway Views to Protect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Klein Point • Elk Rock Island • Kellogg Creek Park • Views from Downtown • Views from the hills to waterfront <p>Top planning considerations for the next 20 years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many groups said they would like better access and connectivity to and along the Willamette Greenway. • Many groups suggest increased opportunities for non-motorized recreation activities are needed on the greenway. • Many groups strongly support development be kept away from the floodplain and the greenway. • Many groups feel strongly about removing the dam below Kellogg Lake. If it can’t be removed, some suggest the lake be dredged and natural habitats be preserved. • Several groups support enhancing the Greenway as an active destination that draws people to the community. Some prefer strict permitting and regulations on uses.

Willamette Greenway – Workshop Reference Sheet

Staff Questions and Recommendations

- **Recommended Policy Revisions:** Revise Objective 1, Policy 1 to Include language about a Greenway Compatibility Review Boundary (the areas within 150 feet of the OHWM of the river), with the highest level of compatibility review occurring in this area. Revise Objective 3, Policy 2 to note the two levels of review for determining compatibility within the Willamette Greenway Zone. Revise Objective 3, Policy 1 to specifically mention the WG Overlay Zone, as opposed to just referencing Map 8. Revise Objective 5, Policy 3 to note that impacts on views are analyzed within the Compatibility boundary.
- **Recommended Goal/Policy Revision:** Revise Objective 2 and the underlying policies, which call for creation of a detailed Greenway Design Plan and includes very prescriptive requirements. Replace with a goal that “allows” or “encourages” the preparation of a Greenway Design Plan, “where needed”, and with policies that call for individual Park Master Plans to provide guidance on recreational opportunities, access, and views. The Greenway views to protect should focus on those identified by the public during the Town Hall and Online Open House, such as Klein Point, Elk Rock Island, Kellogg Creek Park, and views from downtown and the hills. Note that if a Greenway Design Plan is adopted, it would be as an ancillary plan to the Comprehensive Plan.
- **General Goal/Policy Suggestion:** Planning Commissioner Joseph Edge has suggested that the City should prioritize protection of lands and the natural qualities along the Willamette River. Goal and policy language should address environmental protection and conservation within the Greenway.
- **Recommended New Goal and Policies:** Include a new goal that calls for protecting and preserving the natural resources within the Willamette Greenway, while recognizing recreational needs. Include new underlying policies that call for the protection of Habitat Conservation Areas and Water Quality Resource Areas (the City’s two natural resource overlay zones), and for increasing tree canopy.
- **Recommended New Policy:** Include a policy that encourages trees and other improvements to be intentionally placed to frame and enhance views of the river.
- **Recommended New Policy:** Include a policy calling for the removal of the Kellogg Dam, noting its benefit in restoring Kellogg Creek.
- **Recommended New Policy:** Include a policy that Elk Rock Island will be managed as a natural area.
- **Recommended New Policy:** Include a policy that encourages riverfront trail and pathway connections to future greenway trails to the north and south of Milwaukie.
- **Recommended New Policy:** Include policies that call for improved pedestrian and bicycle connections to the riverfront including from downtown Milwaukie to Milwaukie Bay park.
- **Recommended New Policy:** Include a policy that calls for either redevelopment of the wastewater treatment plant or capping the plant with park facilities over the plant.
- **Recommended Policy Revision:** Revise Objective 4, Policy 2 to specifically call out the recreational needs within the Greenway, as opposed to relying on what’s in the Parks and Recreation Chapter.

Natural Hazards – Workshop Reference Sheet

Relevant goals, objectives and actions from the Community Vision

Planet 3.2: Develop a Climate Action and Energy Plan that aims to reduce the impacts of the Milwaukie community on climate change and by 2040 make Milwaukie a Net-Zero energy community that produces more electricity than it consumes

Planet 3.5: Ensure that the City’s infrastructure and facilities can reasonably withstand natural or man-made disasters and that the City can continue to provide services during an emergency event.

Planet 3.7: Promote household and neighborhood-level emergency preparedness by expanding the role and capacity of Community Emergency Response Teams (CERTs).

Discussion notes from previous CPAC meetings and Planning Commission

- Best to focus on incentives to retrofit and easiest/best fixes, such as bolting structures to foundation or the development of green/natural infrastructure to help prevent hazards such as floods and landslides
- Need hyperlocal access to preparation resources, and better community engagement.
- Create emergency/disaster management plan to account for primary modes of transportation, resource delivery and allocation, electricity generation, and water collection and filtration, among other considerations
- Need to expand focus of policies beyond floods to include earthquakes, power outages, etc.
- Do we have designated community gathering places, which might include stockpiles of resources/supplies?
 - Ensure that resilient active transportation infrastructure connects these essential services and facilities
- How do we reach out to and help vulnerable populations, including those living in isolation, low-income residents, those with medical dependencies, communities of color, and non-English speakers?
- Need to increase affordability/accessibility of housing opportunities outside of hazard areas with access to transit/active transportation infrastructure
- Develop plans for interagency cooperation and emergency preparedness
- Need to specifically address emergency preparedness and encourage more CERT certification.
 - This can also include providing accessibility to participate in insurance and/or structure modifications to reduce impacts on low-income households
- Need to examine (and improve as needed) our infrastructure, including utilities, fire flow, etc.
 - Additional policies and codes need to be added to account for hazard preparation, prevention, and response
 - Neighborhoods/areas in the city have substandard access or will disproportionately affected need to be identified and potentially prioritized
- City should not be developing in areas where risk is catastrophic.
 - Add language to what qualifies as a “risk” and what it means to be most vulnerable to those risks
- Need to address liquefaction risk and the fact that the 100 year-floodplain is becoming less and less meaningful (as events are consistently more and more frequently)
- Objective 1 language needs to be strengthened
 - Emphasize the use of language such as “best available science”
- Hazards Map(s) need to be updated
- Participate in the FEMA NFIP Community Rating System (CRS) and maximize every practicable means of safety and NFIP rate reduction available through the CRS

Natural Hazards – Workshop Reference Sheet

Community feedback	
Survey	Town Hall discussion
<p>Types of “green infrastructure” respondents would like to see more in Milwaukie:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 58%, bioswales • 55%, permeable pavement • 40%, rain gardens • 28%, cisterns and rain barrels • 27%, green roofs <p>Support for policies that call for protecting and increasing tree canopy on private property:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 61%, strongly agree • 27%, somewhat agree • 4%, somewhat disagree • 4%, strongly disagree • 4%, not sure/don’t know <p>Support to disallow development in areas of high hazard risk while incentivizing increased density in other risk-free areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59%, strongly agree • 25%, somewhat agree • 6%, somewhat disagree • 3%, strongly disagree • 7%, not sure/don’t know <p>Respondents that have a plan in the case of a natural disaster:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59%, yes • 31%, no • 10%, not sure <p>Top 5 types of support respondents would like from the city to help prepare for natural hazards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community and neighborhood events focused on emergency preparedness • Online and printed maps showing areas of greatest hazard risk (e.g. floods, landslides, earthquakes, etc.) • A tool kit to help create disaster plans for your family • Increased opportunities for in-person training related to emergency preparedness • Regular updates and tips about hazard planning in the Milwaukie Pilot and other City communication channels 	<p>Development in high-risk areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many groups strongly felt the City should regulate development in high risk areas with major inclination for development to be avoided, very restrictive, and/or prohibited whenever possible. • Some groups preferred more rigorous development requirements and regulations in risk areas. <p>Support for hazard preparedness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several groups would like support for property owners or future owners of high-risk/hazard areas. Support may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Periodic risk notifications ○ Raising awareness to the susceptibility of risk-areas ○ Developing informational maps and resources about risk and making them easily accessible • Suggestions to support resilient development include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Update building code to require more resilient materials be used and to ensure buildings can withstand natural disasters like earthquakes. ○ Provide incentives to developers for resilient construction. ○ Consider affordability incentives. ○ Require permeable pavement and drainage areas within and outside of flood areas. ○ Review/audit geotech reports. ○ Provide incentives for seismic upgrades when homes/businesses sold.

Natural Hazards – Workshop Reference Sheet

Staff Questions and Recommendations

- **Format Question:** Which format does the CPAC feel is more reader-friendly and better organized?
 - Goals and underlying policies organized by individual hazard type (floods, earthquakes, wildfires, etc.)?
 - Or more like what Hillsboro did, with policies that address multiple hazard types grouped under five goals related to Minimizing Risk, Preparedness, Coordination, Capacity, and Hazard Mitigation?
- **Format Question:** In general, the Comp Plan has been aspirational in nature as opposed to regulatory, with very few sentences that include “shall”.
 - Where existing building/engineering regulations already either limit or require certain standards, should the Comprehensive Plan language be stronger?
- **New Policy Recommendation:** Include a new policy that encourages the preservation of large trees, riparian vegetation, and wetlands, based on their ability to consume/retain/detain large amounts of surface and stormwater. The Floodplain section does not currently address the role of vegetation.
- **New Policy Recommendation:** Encourage and seek funding for programs that help the City or public land trusts acquire properties with high risks of flooding, landslide, and other natural hazards.
 - Objective 2, Policy 4 currently touches on this, but it is housed within a larger discussion of open space and recreation, and probably deserves its own policy.
- **New Policy Recommendation:** Include a new policy that specifically deals with helping low income and other at-risk groups in dealing with natural hazards.
- **New Policy Recommendation:** Pursue funding/assistance to remap the 100 and 500-year floodplain areas.
- **New Policy Recommendations:** Include policies that specifically note the City’s commitment to increasing resiliency and recovery in the event of natural disasters, including through:
 - building form
 - hardening of public utilities and infrastructure, including transportation
 - partnerships and communication with other agencies and providers
- **New Policy Recommendation:** The City will favor/prioritize the use of green infrastructure (will need to consult with Engineering Department on strength of this language).
- **New Policy Recommendation:** The City encourages the majority of development to occur outside of high risk areas, including through the use of density bonuses/transfers
- **New Policy Recommendation:** Maintain compliance with federal, state and local regulations, including the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP).
- **New Policy Recommendation:** Include a new policy about managing and mitigating development in landslide hazard areas.
- **New Policy Recommendation:** Allow for density transfers from floodplains and other high-risk areas to adjacent properties.
- **Policy Question:** Should we have a hazard overlay zone, similar to our historic or natural resource zones?
- **New Policy Recommendation:** Develop standards that address the potential impacts of liquefaction.

Climate Change and Energy – Workshop Reference Sheet

Relevant goals, objectives and actions from the Community Vision

Super Action 1: Make Milwaukie a model of resiliency, environmental stewardship and disaster-preparedness.

Planet 1.1: Implement city programs, incentives and development code amendments that promote sustainable development and help to better integrate the built environment and natural environment

Planet 3.1: Encourage energy and water efficiency and the use of renewable sources by offering rebates, incentives, and permit fee reduction or waivers

Planet 3.2: Develop a Climate Action and Energy Plan that aims to reduce the impacts of the Milwaukie community on climate change and by 2040 make Milwaukie a Net-Zero energy community that produces more electricity than it consumes

Planet 3.5: Ensure that the City's infrastructure and facilities can reasonably withstand natural or man-made disasters and that the City can continue to provide services during an emergency event

Planet 3.7: Promote household and neighborhood-level emergency preparedness by expanding the role and capacity of Community Emergency Response Teams (CERTs)

Discussion notes from previous CPAC meetings and Planning Commission

- Hillsboro mentioned as a city doing a good job in addressing climate change. Everett, WA as well.
- Cooling centers could double as clean air centers.
 - Should we use language to prioritize cooling/clean air center development near populations who are less mobile/more vulnerable to heat and pollution effects?
- Policies and development standards should be updated to support low carbon transportation, walkability, EV infrastructure, etc.
- Need a policy dedicated to climate change education, especially for youth and businesses.
 - Beyond outreach, this needs to include deep incentives, intentional marketing, and liaisons trusted/grounded within populations that will be targeted
 - Can we advocate for the County to spend more time on this in Milwaukie?
- Include climate action criteria in criteria for conditional use permits and other applications.
- We need a bigger focus on multi-family and commercial/industrial strategies.
- Need policies that encourage commercial/industrial entities to take on CAP strategies
- We need to discuss energy retrofits for existing buildings.
 - Outreach should communicate economic benefits to residents and businesses
 - City should explore programs to support this (welcome packets, bulk buys, etc)
- Ensure adaptation and prioritization of CAP goals while also encouraging economic growth
- Advocate and leverage partnerships with utilities and other local governments.
 - Require burying of new utilities, if not buried at least conduit to plan for wind storms?
 - Include a policy to advocate for regional high-speed transit?
- Need to explore financing/economic partnerships.
- What land use and transportation policies do we need to get to net zero?
 - Enabling siting of storage facilities, micro-grids, trees/natural areas, community solar, etc?
 - Efficient land use and density should be prioritized over solar access
- Bake into Comp Plan timeline for periodic reviews like the language used in the CAP.
- We need to intensify land use development outside of hazard and habitat areas to account for increased population growth – including climate migrants
- Do we want to be better than average, or exceptional?

Climate Change and Energy – Workshop Reference Sheet

Community feedback	
Survey	Town Hall discussion
<p>Support respondents would like from the City reduce their carbon emissions, fossil fuel energy use and environmental impact (top 5):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounts and incentives on resources to reduce waste and increase energy efficiency • City-sponsored tool libraries and fix it fairs to reduce waste • In-person classes and trainings on climate action topics (such as weather proofing your house, increasing energy efficiency, reducing waste, etc.) • Community and neighborhood events focused on reducing emissions • Online trainings and tutorials on climate action topics <p>Considerations for supporting vulnerable populations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase awareness of hazard risks and climate change. • Tailor resources for vulnerable populations. • Provide financial resources to support these populations if they face hardship in the event of a natural hazard. • Authentically engage these populations and be intentionally inclusive to ensure their voices are heard. • Ensure shelters exist and are properly stocked in case of a disaster. • Expand bike and pedestrian infrastructure and increase connectivity of more vulnerable neighborhoods. • Build community and foster connections among neighbors. 	<p>Ways the City can help support residents reduce their carbon emissions, fossil fuel energy use and environmental impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many groups desire expanded multi-modal options and infrastructure improvements. • Many groups desire more education and outreach. • Many groups would like more city-led, collective efforts, e.g. tool libraries, community solar, local micro-transit, etc. • Many discussed land use patterns that make it easier to walk to key services and amenities, like neighborhood hubs, mixed use development, etc. • Many groups seek access to “green options” and resources, paired with incentives to use these resources, e.g. EV stations, energy storage options, alternative waste management solutions, re-use centers, access to native plant species, etc. <p>Supporting vulnerable populations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many groups believe vulnerable populations must be supported through access to cooling, heating, air quality, emergency, and health centers. • Many groups said resources—like tips on reducing energy use or weatherizing ones home—should be accessible and tailored (e.g. multiple languages, resources for renters and lower income community members, etc.) • Several community members suggest increasing CERT (community emergency response team) support and raising its profile.

Climate Change and Energy – Workshop Reference Sheet

Staff Questions/Recommendations

- **Format Question:** How do we incorporate climate change into the existing chapter that is focused almost exclusively on Energy Efficiency?
 - Hillsboro includes four goals/categories: Resource Efficiency, Renewable Energy, Transportation, and Innovation.
 - Livermore includes only one goal related to reducing GHG emissions, with dozens of policies underneath
 - Mill Valley, CA has GHG reduction, Adaptation, Zero Waste, and Technology
- **New Goal Recommendation:** Include a goal that is directly aligned with the Climate Action Plan's goal, which states that “By 2040, Milwaukie’s buildings will have no net emissions, and by 2050, we will be a fully carbon neutral city”. Given the long timeframe and the CAP’s commitment, there is less concern with this goal including “will” or “shall” language.
 - Underlying policies would focus on how topics related to land use and transportation planning could help achieve this goal, such as
 - Encourage redevelopment provide a more compact urban form (see below)
 - Incentivize net-zero buildings
- **New Policy Recommendations:** “Roll up” items from the CAP’s Land Use and Transportation Planning mitigation strategies into appropriate policy language.
 - Strategies include better bicycle/pedestrian access, transit service, a Transportation Management Agency, the neighborhood hubs concepts, and others.
- **New Policy Recommendation:** The City shall facilitate the development of clean air centers that can also serve as cooling centers.
- **New Policy Recommendation:** Encourage/incentivize programs that remove barriers to solar and that enable passive heating/cooling.
- **New Policy Recommendation:** Support/fund a multimodal transportation system and transportation management association.
- **New Policy Recommendation:** Prioritize a more compact and walkable urban form for redevelopment, including the neighborhood hubs concept.
- **New Policy Recommendation:** Educate the public about simple and cost-effective ways they can reduce energy use and GHG emissions.
- **New Policy Recommendation:** Support tree planting programs that call for a 40% canopy cover citywide.
- **New Policy Recommendation:** Streamline review for solar projects on rooftops, parking lots, and other areas we significant capacity.
- **New Policy Recommendation:** Support infrastructure improvements for pedestrians, bicycles, transit and electric vehicles.
- **New Policy Recommendation:** Be forward thinking in emerging trends and technologies related to building and transportation, and their impacts on the built environment.