

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

Members Present

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

Members Not Able to Attend

Albert Chen, Jessica Neu, Joe Gillock, Matthew Bibeau, Neil Hankerson, Stacy Johnson

City of Milwaukie

Mark Gamba, Mayor; Councilor Lisa Batey

Joseph Edge; Planning Commission

David Levitan, Denny Egner, and Mary Heberling, Jen Davidson; Planning Department

Envirolssues

Emma Sagor

Other

Greg Hemer

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

WELCOME

Emma Sagor started the meeting and welcomed everyone. She indicated that she was taking over for Kirstin, since she had moved on to another job with the State. Mayor Mark Gamba continued to open the meeting and welcomed members of the Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee (CPAC). He stated that tonight we will be workshopping the final policies for this block. The next meeting will be the beginning of Block 2. He mentioned that the survey had a good turnout with over 120 responses and thanked everyone who attended the Neighborhood hubs meetings and the Climate Action Summit.

Emma asked if there was any feedback or changes to the Meeting 4 Summary Draft.

- **Lisa Batey** – On Page 2, on the discussion about the sewer treatment plant, change “Clean Water Project” to “Clearwater Project.” There is also a typo that says “wasterwater.”

PROJECT UPDATES

Mary Heberling provided an update on the Neighborhood Hubs project. She stated that there were four neighborhood brainstorming sessions in May. Each was attended by 15-20 people and had a good, robust discussion. Staff will be meeting with NDAs in August and September to get feedback on concepts for the neighborhood hubs. Instead of going to NDA meetings, this will take place at concerts in the park and neighborhood picnics in order to connect with people who may not typically attend NDA

meetings. For NDAs that don't have these types of events already scheduled. Staff will work with them to find other options.

QUESTIONS

- **Sara Busickio** – Will these meetings include proposals of neighborhood hub areas?
 - **Mary** – *They will include basic, overview concepts at a high level, such as areas that could work. We will also be working with Economic Development Dept to determine what is feasible with regards to density, etc.*
 - **David Levitan** - *People at NDA meetings tend to narrow in on a few specific sites, but whether or not they should be feasible for commercial spaces or mixed-use depends on the individual sites factors.*
 - **Mary** – *We are looking for both short and long-term ideas rather than just waiting for developers to come in and make this happen.*

GOAL/POLICY FEEDBACK

Emma – Staff has combined feedback from CPAC, PC, Council, Survey and will talk about that feedback then discuss.

Emma reviewed the overall survey findings:

- Strong indication of goals moving in the "right direction"
- Demographics show largely white, older residents participating. We will want to make sure we try and get other demographics as we move forward with outreach for future surveys.
- Areas of improvement/concern:
 - Some confusing language
 - Importance of inclusion and equity
 - Some concern about maintaining Milwaukie's identity
 - Some concern about City expenditures
- We also wanted to get policy feedback as an opt-in. About 1/3 of respondents did that. Those that did, we wanted them to choose their top priorities. We are using this as feedback to find policies that may need language refinement.

Questions:

- **Daniel Eisenbeis** – From the data it looks like about 1 out of every 7 respondents live out of Milwaukie. Did you analyze data just of Milwaukie residents?
 - **Emma** – *No, we did not do that, but we can look into that data and email it out.*

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Questions/Feedback – What additional refinements are needed?

- **Lisa** – If workforce development ranks higher? Should we move it up more in numbers? (referring to Policy 10.3)
 - **Celestina DiMauro** – *Is that how the plan works – where higher listed policies are higher priorities?*
 - **Denny Egner** – *Typically they aren't prioritized like that in a plan.*
 - **David** – *Lisa, are you asking that at the goal level or policy level?*
 - **Lisa** - *I was thinking at the goal level. Just putting the thought out there.*

- **Mayor Mark Gamba** – *Workforce development is a concept that people can more easily see themselves in and understand the direct impact versus the other two goals. Makes sense that would poll higher.*
- **Everett Wild** – Regarding Policy 10.3.4, is the language “stomachable” for the City?
 - **Lisa** – *Take off the first three words of 10.3.4?*
- **Stephan Lashbrook** – I think Milwaukie should focus on a different economic land use approach than the Hillsboros and Wilsonvilles that have large acres of employment land. I also think we need to talk about “economic gardening” – Littleton, Colorado as an example.
- **Bryce Magorian** – Goal 10.1, phrase that keeps coming up is “how”? I think the language should at least indicate the type of action we many want to take. For example: 10.1.6 says “provide additional flexibility” I don’t know what that means. 10.1.7 says “incentivize” and I know what that means and money will be spent towards that.
- **Howie Oakes** – 10.1.9 says "Create", should we say create with zone changes?
 - **Denny** - *That could be one way to create a hub, but we're working on using different ways to get there. Rezone could be one. Or it could be to identify "pop-up" places. Ways to start creating energy in these areas.*
- **Daniel** – 10.1.9 – from "create" to "foster" - I think it's also missing accessibility to transit. These hubs could increase road capacity and transportation.
 - **Howie** - *That has been the balance that is being discussed in the neighborhood meetings.*
 - **David** - *We have received feedback on managing expectations for the hubs and making it clearer. “Foster” does sound better than “create” to cause less confusion.*
In response to Bryce - In Economic Dev it is finding that sweet spot between the 20 year policies and the short-term actions that may be included in a 5-year economic plan.
- **Celestina** - I had opposite ideas of 10.1.6 and 10.1.7 from Bryce's comment. I think 10.1.6 is more specific than 10.1.7.
- **Ben Rouseau** - Some of the things I shared from the Portland Plan are pieces I thought were missing in our draft policies. Specific language related to food needs to be tied in more to our Economic Development policies. Access to healthy food should be more direct. Low carbon and renewable energy economy is missing in our policies. Import substitution - to a resilient economy.
- **Mayor Gamba** – Regarding the conversation on hubs – I’m worried about going slow. The downtown has been zoned for years for 6 stories, but that hasn't happened. We need to create the opening to get these hubs started. May even include buying up land.
 - **Denny** – *Example, that little corner shop on Monroe and Home - what if that redeveloped to a little coffee shop? That change is simple enough that won't break the bank for the owner. Then the next step is how do we expand that site out? On the map we would draw where the adjoining properties could re-develop. If we went in and put in all of these huge expansive hubs right away, that may cause some panic in the neighborhoods.*
 - **Howie** – *We don't want to displace local businesses, but there are areas where there isn't much and we can create more incentives to get larger development.*
 - **Denny** – *That may work in some places better than others. We just need to be cautious and notice that some areas can accommodate larger redevelopment.*
- **Mayor Gamba** – To Daniel’s transportation question - we are looking at creating micro-transit in Milwaukie.
- **Lisa** – *10.1.5 seems like a statement of the status quo. Is that okay? Do we just want to memorialize it?*

- **Denny** – *Some of it we do want to say we support this pattern. But it does also add light manufacturing uses.*
- **Howie** – *Do we want to add anything about environmental friendly manufacturers?*
- **Mayor Gamba** – *Do we want to do that? The Vision did bring it up.*
- **Sara Busickio** – I’m wondering about the speed of neighborhood hub roll-out - There are a handful of people that are frustrated and want to see this redevelopment happen sooner rather than later. Also, what happens when this is done? What is the goal of the Comp Plan, and how do we keep this relevant beyond adoption?
 - **Mayor Gamba** – *The policies in the Comp Plan are what the Milwaukie community need to encourage to help staff and Council to prioritize.*
 - **Lisa** - *And there will be more legislative decisions that happen right after.*
- **Joseph Edge** – Policy 10.1.9 - also have concerns about "create." Change to "define and facilitate." Food sources would also be important there. Policy 10.3.4 - develop strategies and "implement programs" to create more of an action to it.
About environmentally friendly businesses - in the Climate Action Plan - we may think about asking a conditional use review to businesses that increase the carbon footprint.
 - **Denny** – *We do have to make sure the wording doesn’t go out of date once adopted.*
- **Daniel** – Policy 10.2.1 - don't think "redevelopable" is very specific, think "underutilized" is a better fit.
- **Joseph** – Given the constraints of land - should there be a policy to encourage businesses that are rail adjacent (freight rail)?
 - **Lisa** – *Are we discouraging business from doing that?*
 - **Joseph** – *We are not encouraging it. I feel like there are missed opportunities there. May not need to be its own policy, but address it.*
 - **Celestina** – *I like the idea, think it’s a good implementation strategy.*
 - **Daniel** – *Some places have water dependent business areas. Is this more about using rail versus trucks?*
 - **Joseph** – *Yes.*
 - **Daniel** – *Then maybe it’s better in the energy section of the Comp Plan.*

URBAN GROWTH MANAGEMENT

Questions/Feedback – What additional refinements are needed?

- **Ben** – If we are considering an alternate language for "urban form" I don't think "development pattern" makes sense. Might be confusing too.
- **Everett** – A lot of 14.1, 14.2, 14.3 are the status quo and I don’t think that’s bad. Does reinforce what is already good.
- **Celestina** – I would lean towards a glossary and use some language that may be new for people. Helps to explain new ideas to people.
 - **Jen Davidson** - *The glossary could be at the beginning of each chapter or parenthetical. Maybe even links in the online version.*
- **Daniel** – Policy 14.4.3 - Is it popular because "respect Milwaukie identity" could mean a lot of things to different people. May need to be reconsidered.
 - **Bryce** – *I would get rid of the phrase in general. Might provoke people.*
- **Stephan** – Concerned about the wording “diminished level of service” in Policy 14.4.3. That may happen if we annex out to SE 82nd.
 - **Everett** – *Change wording to “Work closely with newly annexed areas” – that may get us on the same page.*

- **Ben** – *Maybe we need to break up Policy 14.4.3 to better reflect people's concerns about feeling alienated, downtown focus, etc.*
- **Daniel** - *Maybe there should be some sort of policy statement that supports downtown development as a focal point and support.*
- **Emma** – *Does Policy 10.1.10 get to that?*
- **Daniel** – *It sort of does, but maybe more like “Ensuring all neighborhoods are connected to downtown.” Connectivity improvements.*
- **Liz Start**- *For Policy 14.4.3 - the second part of it, make it sound more positive "ensure a level of service" instead of “diminished level of service.”*

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Questions/Feedback – What additional refinements are needed?

- **Stephan** – *I feel the Planning Commission should be the first contact for all Comp Plan related topics, not just land use and transportation. (1.3.1)*
 - **Denny** – *Council talked about using the annual committee reports to include the broader community engagement check-in and then the Planning Commission just take land-use and transportation, but that may be too specific. Change 1.3.2 - "Ad-hoc" Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee.*
 - **Lisa** – *If this is a state goal, how do other communities do it?*
 - **Stephan** – *Lots of different ways.*
 - **Everett** – *Is having a specific CIAC required by state law?*
 - **David** – *Yes, at some capacity. Beaverton has a separate committee, others use Planning Commission.*
 - **Everett** – *I do think we should enroll this to an existing body and think Planning Commission is the right body.*
 - **Stephan** – *There are all of these other contents in the Comp Plan that don't get touched on in committees. I think we need Planning Commission to do this.*
 - **Bryce** – *I agree, I think Planning Commission should be the CIAC. Somebody needs to be on the ground, taking the pulse of the community and if the government is being transparent.*
 - **Joseph** – *The Planning Commission mostly deals with land use planning and transportation issues. It may be more appropriate to have a separate committee entirely for community outreach with volunteers that provide insight and advice to City Council about how to engage the Milwaukie Community.*
 - **Liz** – *I suggest another committee. I like that inclusion and equity are in this whole plan, but I think to give it teeth we need a separate committee to put an equity lens on things.*
 - **Rebecca Hayes** – *I agree with Liz that a small advisory meets quarterly and reports back yearly.*
 - **David** – *I agree with Rebecca that I see this committee not meeting as frequently. Maybe bring in representatives from all of the City committees. As far as Liz's comments, I think that's a good idea and it will depend on how frequently it meets and how we can staff and support it.*
 - **Celestina** – *My reaction is concern about using volunteers with not having enough people to participate over time. I think we can't rely 100% on volunteer base. I like the CIAC should have representatives from other committees.*
 - **Everett** – *I still think Planning Commission is best place to go. I wonder if we can come back to Community Involvement and come up with measurements on how to measure*

community involvement - maybe come up with a form that people can provide once a year to Planning Commission once a year.

- **Ben** - *In favor of a committee for community involvement with strong focus on equity and inclusion. There would need to be a charter focused around equity and inclusion. Effectiveness of NDAs - I think there is an important connection between community involvement and helping NDAs.*
- **Mayor Gamba** – *The Climate Action Plan is also going to recommend a committee. We need to be careful about recommending too many new committees.*

HISTORY, ARTS & CULTURE

Questions/Feedback – What additional refinements are needed?

- **Everett** – Policy 1.4 – Change language from "encourage" to "appropriately memorialized"; change "Milwaukie history" to "Milwaukie area history." Want to make sure we find ways to partner across public, private, and non-profit sectors to make sure we're leveraging money and creating partnerships.
- **Daniel** – Combine Policies 1.10 and 1.11
Maybe find a way to talk about or require deconstruction for historic buildings.
 - **Mayor Gamba** – *Maybe we can talk about that more in the next block.*
 - **Emma** – *Maybe incorporate those comments about environmental benefits of preservation.*
 - **Celestina** – *Policy 1.12 talks about "community priorities" maybe that is where we can get at it.*
- **Liz** – Policies 1.1 and 1.3 could be combined.
- **Daniel** – I also like the new policy of land use flexibility to preserve historic structures. Like transfer of development rights.
- **Sara** – Do we currently have a historical process for buildings for follow? Like signage?
 - **Denny** - *Signage is being worked on. But we do have an inventory, that hasn't been updated in 30 years. There is a process that someone would have to go through to get on the historic properties list.*
 - **Sara** - *Is there going to be consistent signage that shows historic buildings within Milwaukie - like in Downtown.*
 - **Denny** – *We don't have any districts in Milwaukie, we do have local landmarks that we protect. The proposed policies will help put more buildings on this list.*

Large Comp Plan Questions:

- The group discussed how to keep the Comp Plan relevant and ensure progress is made.
- **Bryce** – The only way you don't have things be shelved is by creating time limits and strategies ahead of time. Maybe the best idea is to have a committee that keeps track of the Comp Plan and meets regularly to evaluate progress.
 - **Mayor Gamba** – *Technically we are supposed to do this every 7 years. That exists, but it is not regulated by the state for that reason anymore.*
 - **Bryce** – *Should we have some "shall" language about how Council will keep this timeline?*
 - **Denny** – *It may be a good idea for some parts of the Comp Plan.*

NEXT STEPS

- **David** – Lots of staff refinement of goals and policies that need to happen before resolution by City Council. We invite all CPAC members to join in that meeting on July 17th. Staff will keep you up to date with Neighborhood Hubs outreach happening in August and September.

Next CPAC meeting is early August. Possibly August 6th. [This is subject to change] Staff will look to identify a consistent time for monthly meetings rather than doodle poll each time.

David reviewed the topics in Block 2 and proposed groupings for discussion in CPAC meetings. The following comments were made about the structure of Block 2 discussions:

- **Mayor Gamba** – I have a preference that we do all together versus split into small groups.
- **Ben** – I appreciate the focus of a single group, but maybe also do some large group discussions.
- **Everett** – Maybe rotate the topics among small groups?
 - Denny – There is too much to get through to do that.
- **Sara** – Are we going to look at examples from other cities?
 - David – Yes, in the background reports we'll tackle that and also highlight some policies from other cities.
- **Rebecca** – Once we have a general discussion of all topics, then maybe break out in a short time for people that have a lot of knowledge and interest in one area.

Lisa Batey closed the meeting by thanking everyone for coming and the good discussion.

Adjourn

David adjourned the meeting at 9:00pm.

ATTACHMENT A
Raw Filpchart Notes

Economic Development

- Should 1.3 be 10.1?
 - Recognize implied importance, but not prioritized
 - 10.3 less “abstract” than 10.1, 10.2
- Strength of language
 - “Plan”, “develop strategies” too vague? Get to “do”.
- Clackamas Co. Economic Development plan prioritized workforce training
 - Milwaukie should focus on What we heard
- “Economic gardening”
 - Support existing local businesses
 - Colorado example
- Okay, how?
 - Indicate types of actions we could take
 - 10.1.6 - “provide flexibility”
 - 10.1.2 - “adapt”
 - 10.1.9 - “create” -> “through”
 - 10.2.1 -> very specific
- Hubs: “create” should be “foster”
 - Setting too high of expectations?
 - Doesn’t acknowledge market forces
 - Transit access - chicken or egg?
- “Sweet spot” long-range policies versus 5-year strategy
- 10.1.6 - “provide flexibility” is measurable
- Missing:
 - 10.1 - don’t see much speaking to resilience, equity, sustainability
 - Food access (separate from 10.1.9?)
 - Low carbon and renewable energy
 - Import substitution
 - These are also relevant to Block 2
- “Go slow” isn’t right message for hubs
 - Land banking?
 - Recognize multi-step process for hubs
 - Strategic intensification
 - After community engagement, consider displacement
- Micro-transit
- 10.1.5 - statement of status quo?
 - Tie to environmental impact?
 - “Memorializing”
 - Work language in regarding environmentally sensitive, clean, good neighbors
- Speed of hubs action - people want to see action; when plan is published, people will expect action

- What's the "goal" for the Comp Plan? End result and how we will use it
 - ACTIONABLE plan; stuff that people push for
- 10.1.9 - "define and incentivize development of"
- 10.3.4 - "implement programs"
- Climate friendly businesses
 - conditional use review
- Ensure policies don't go out of date once implemented
- 10.2 - Emphasize re-developable land - is school accurate?
 - 10.2.1 – "underutilized"?

(Economic development continued)

- Encourage businesses to locate rail adjacent
 - Addition to 10.2.1 - call out rail adjacent
 - Energy section?

Urban Growth Management

- "Urban form" - development pattern too vague
- Maintaining the status quo – okay?
- Support for glossary, helpful to have new terms
 - Intros, parenthetical
- 14.4.3 - "respect identity" - what does that mean?
 - Two ideas, separate policies?
 - Remove "respect identity"
- Diminished level of service?
 - Impacts where we annex?
- "Work closely with annexed areas to realize goals"
- Annexation plan
 - Gives flexibility in how we define program
- Connection to downtown for East side unincorporated areas - character impacts. "Remote neighborhoods"
 - 224 division, what brings people to downtown?
 - Events, MAX, meetings
 - Think of them as neighbors; invite them in. Will they feel part of Milwaukee?
- Downtown reaches OUT to neighborhoods
 - Outreach and transportation
- Break up 14.4.3?
- Policy statement about downtown as a center? Connections of all neighborhoods to downtown.
 - Thread across different topics?
- 14.4.3 - "ensure level of service"
- Impacts of sharing economy and tech developments needs to be part of plan
 - Where does this "live"?
 - We need to be flexible
 - What is in our control
 - Speed of change

- Emphasize sharing economy in hubs?
 - Add to Energy & Climate chapter?
- Add technology section?

Community Engagement

- Planning Commission - the place to talk about the Comp Plan
 - New language too limiting?
 - Council uses meetings with advisory committees?
- 1.3.2 - specify “ad hoc”
- Planning Commission has oversight of all confuses role of other advisory committees
- Is there a home for everything?
 - Once a year review
- Heavy mandate - requires new committee
- Planning Commission felt engagement is broader; requires separate committee with expertise in outreach and engagement
- Separate committee to focus on equity and inclusion?
 - Meets quarterly? Less frequently?
 - Representatives from other boards and commissions?
 - Separate from CIAC
- Concern about finding sufficient volunteers for committees
- In synthesis: return to community involvement; consider metrics
 - Easy reporting - form?
- Requires people who are passionate
- Effectiveness of NDA’s – CIAC can work on this

History, Arts & Culture

- 1.4 - remove “encourage”
- 1.3 - “Milwaukee area’s history”
- Find ways to forge partnerships
- Combine 1.10 and 1.11
- Consider integrating support for deconstruction in 1.6
 - Higher demolition permit fee
 - Job development option
 - Fits in Climate or Housing topic areas?
- 1.12 - could tie in environmental benefits
- 1.1 and 1.3 - combined?
- Land-use flexibility to support preservation
- Do we currently have a historic designation process?
 - Inventory but out of date
 - Plaque process soon to be implemented

Keeping the Comp Plan Alive

- Build in automatic review schedule?
 - Seven years is state requirement
 - Requires funding
 - “Council shall”

Milwaukie Comprehensive Plan Update

CPAC Meeting #5

June 27, 2018

Committee Evaluation Form Responses (11)

1. Overall meeting quality	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
			5	6	
2. Pacing	Too slow	A little slow	Just right	A little fast	Too fast
			9	1	
3. Presentations	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
		1	9	1	
4. Meeting materials	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
			7	4	
5. Discussion	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
			5	6	

6. Most useful?

- All of it. Best meeting so far.
- Meeting materials very organized.
- Group discussion (2)
- Notetaking
- The new meeting structure helped a lot in keeping us on track and on time.
- Facilitation was great and talk equal.

7. Least useful?

- N/A

8. Additional suggestions and comments about Block 2:

- I know time is of the essence on this committee, but I think there is potential to generate increased camaraderie amongst the committee members. Perhaps if we had a silly opening question that we all went around and answered to the group we might get to know each other a little better over time.
- I would encourage whole group introductions + preliminary discussions so that we get an idea of the general themes/concerns regarding each topic. Then, small groups look to carry the thoughts/concerns of the large group through to specific brainstorming and implementation in a small group.
- If not the above option, I would encourage large group discussion the whole time instead of small groups right off the bat.
- I'm interested in all three Block 2 groups. That said, I appreciate the need to answer a set of key questions for each, or an initial brainstorm list for each—maybe that could happen in a single meeting of initial small group discussions, or maybe a survey/questionnaire outside of a meeting?

- In Block 2:
 - General info for all
 - Break out in mini-sessions for specific knowledge dump.
 - Notes to all + regroup, then rotate in... or stay in larger group