

PSAC Meeting  
April 24, 2025  
Public Safety Building

Attendance:

Chair: Shimron Tubman (Linwood)

Vice Chair: Stephan Lashbrook (Lewelling/TSP)

NDA Representatives: Elvis Clark (Ardenwald), Christine Giatti (Lake Road/TSP), Julie King (Island Station), Andy Fisher (Historic Milwaukie)

At-Large members: Jack Hudson, Camden Mckone

City Engineering Liaisons: Jeff Tolentino, Adi Salinas, Jen Garbely

Police: Tony Cereghino

Anonymous online

A quorum was established.

The meeting was called to order at 6:00pm by Chair Tubman

I. Approve Minutes from 3/27/25

(Jack/Julie) motion to approve minutes

8 approve/ 0 opposed/ 0 abstain

Motion passes

II. Public Comments (Limited to 3 min per person)

No public comments

III. REPORTS

A. Milwaukie Police Report

- Milwaukie Officer of the Year award – went to Detective Meier. Detective Meier and Flora both received wrestling belts as a fun award.
- Sat 26<sup>th</sup> 1am – 2pm – Shred event and drug take back
- May 17/18 – LoveOne is doing a fundraiser with Pit Stop Coffee – for 2 days in a row PitStop will donate 10% of proceeds to LoveOne
- 2 new officer 4/14 – Sworn in May 19, almost full staff, a lot in training
- Detective Meir and Flora having huge success - found a tiny usb stuck to the bottom of a nightstand – had 1000's of images of child abuse and images of local kids, this person will be going away for a number of years. They have also been helping FBI agents with child abuse cases
- Officers have been working with Lululemon on retail theft – seized over 15k in stolen merchandise that came mainly from CA.
- 1<sup>st</sup> week of April, officers went out to check on a person that was having a mental health crisis and made comments about self-harm – person had a gun in their bathrobe belt,

told the officers if they came in they would shoot him. The officers slowly backed up, Luke Straight called in and negotiated and was able to get the person to come out and surrender successfully in about 30 minutes, all firearms collected.

## **B. NDA Concerns**

ARDENWALD: none

LINWOOD: none

HECTOR CAMPBELL: rep absent

HISTORIC MILWAUKIE: the new sidewalks installed downtown are uneven – Jen Garbely responded that the ODOT ADA inspector will have to sign off on it and if it doesn't pass, it will be taken up and repoured.

ISLAND STATION: none

LAKE ROAD: none

LEWELLING: none

## **IV. DISCUSSION**

### **A. SPOT Program (7:05PM – 7:30PM)**

A separate meeting was held on 4/17/2025 with Emma Sagor, Joseph Briglio, Jen Garbely, Jeff Tolentino, Shimron Tubman, Andy Fisher, Jack Husdon, and Elvis Clark. The goal was to align on how to resolve & document city Department objections to PSAC approved projects. They came out of the meeting feeling like we're making progress as we continue to develop this program. There is currently a letter from Emma Sagor, in draft form outlining the proposed process that will be sent to City Council, which they will review, provide feedback or approve.

The newly proposed final steps of the Spot Program process are:

1. PSAC approves the second (more detailed) proposal form
2. Engineering forwards it to all City Department Heads. They have two weeks to register any objections they may have - no approvals are required. If no objections are raised after two weeks, the project will be scheduled for implementation.
3. The only valid categories of objections are:
  1. Legal complications
  2. Safety concerns
  3. Maintenance concerns
4. The Department Head who registers the objection provides an explanation of their concern; and this is forwarded to PSAC.

Jen came to this meeting to talk about city processes. Her role is to build capital projects all over the city. Her hope is to bring to this group the request to have an open mind when thinking about solutions for the problems being presented. And we need to consider the efficiency, feasibility and effectiveness of the proposed solution. For example, when we're looking at solar flashing LED lights – think about tree coverage and how effective the flashing light is, if it will be visible.

Defining the road in question should be part of the process for what is being proposed to install. Slower speeds can have a different type of light. Arterials need to have RFB (Rapid Flashing Beacons). Arterials are major routes that are truck routes (Linwood, King, Harrison, etc.).

Question about the flasher by the Wichita center – maintained by the school district – the visibility is fine but it gets hits all the time and the solar can't keep up because of the amount of use it experiences. This one will get updated with the King Road project and will be hardwired.

From PSAC: It would be helpful to know how many calls the school district gets to fix that RFB so we can take it into consideration as we consider maintenance costs for future proposals.

We received a proposal about putting a RFB at Logus – the challenge is that it will cost \$80-\$100k because of the amount of design that has to be involved. Also, installing a RFB without other traffic calming measures gives a false sense of security because the traffic study shows that folks are going 38 in a 25 on that road and we need to slow traffic down before installing flashers.

Julie – revisiting what we discussed last meeting about not having the tools to assess non vehicle needs – she looked into a camera that does collect data on everything – autos, bike, pedestrians, anything that can go by. It is \$16k to buy a camera and then \$4k every time we want to move it and collect more data.

She also said that her NDA would be willing to provide volunteers with clickers to count folks with guidance from the city on what sorts of data are valuable.

Jen - We need to figure out the answer to what kind of data that we need – bringing it into the conversation about what the city has already approved vs are still looking at (N Stanley vs Harrison). If we want to move forward with something that may already be caught up in a city project, we need to figure out what data would be needed for that.

Jeff – we need to collect enough data to be able to defend our proposal. If we want to move forward with a proposal with limited data, it puts PSAC up to potentially be scrutinized more.

Harlow and Stanley – proposal was for a flasher but are there other measures we should consider and are we going to allow the committee to change proposals.

Jen – safety is about designing for the most vulnerable person we will be impacting. Jen would like to say we don't need all the data in the world to get that – she would accept volunteers to go out and collect the data. The bigger issue is the safety and liability issue. Not against RFB at Stanley, concerned about the amount of sunlight and maintenance.

Camden – in considering the desire to be quick and cheap and the desire to do our due diligence. One idea – can we put in tiers of projects. I.e. signs, paint on ground are Tier 1; Tier 2

is moderate impact (volunteer-based data collection), Tier 3 is higher impact things, ie a hard wired RFB. A lot of things could be covered in the Tier 1 project, especially if we update the form and ask folks to identify their Tier.

Jeff – to follow up on the discussion about data and address the Tiered approach – we just need enough data to defend the decision. Also, if we decide to do clickers, also have a phone video of the session you're clicking to show that you are clicking for each person. Others responded to the video suggestion saying they that felt like that is too much and we're making this too hard.

Andy – Safe Route to school is doing a study on Harlow next year.

Jen – Safe Route to schools is a great study. Or, we get a certain number of people in the impacted area to sign off on a petition for the improvement. Depending on the proposed improvements, the number of folks needed for the petition would change. A RFB vs a speed cushion.

One thing to think about is if we are proposing any new crosswalks, we need to confirm the sidewalk ramps are ADA compliant.

**i. Island Station Signs (Initial proposal)** - looking for “share the road” signage on signs that already exist. City engineers accept this proposal. Need to confirm that the signs put up are the ones we use in the city.

Camden will be the PSAC rep to move it to the next phase.

(Jack/Stephan) Motion to move to next phase of SPOT proposal  
8 in favor/0 opposed/0 abstain

Do we have solar speed signs? This may also be a good spot to add them. Andy is reaching out to PD to see if we have the signs in yet.

**ii. Speed Bumps on Wichita (update)** – safety issue if only have 2, city has proposed 4 (change from 5 at last month's mtg). City would not approve it if only 2 are going in b/c the gap between 2 is too long. SPOT would need to pay for all 4, the city has no additional funds. It will be pulled into the summer grind project. It's about \$4-\$5k/bump. NDA is ok to have more speedbumps. We do also get final right of refusal after we get a proposal back to see what actual costs are. We go out to bid in 2 weeks, they have 3 weeks to submit bids, we would receive an email with bids that we could vote on at June meeting.

(Jack/Camden) Motion to approve 4 speeds bumps, not to exceed \$25k  
7 in favor/1 opposed/0 abstain  
Motion passes

**iii. RRFB at Stanley Ave & Harlow St (update)** – an RFB is not going to be the most effective traffic control measure in this location. Jen proposes doing an elevated crosswalk (also called speed table) – bring it up to sidewalk level. It acts as a huge speed bump, raises the people higher up to make them more visible. Can also make it no parking within 50 feet of the crosswalk to make the pedestrians more visible. Biggest concern about an RFB is that there isn't enough sun on one side and that the other side may need concrete work which increases costs.

Jack is worried that the speed table will make people stop/slow every time and cause more distraction and not do the job of letting drivers know when people want to cross.

Andy – for the solar, we can run the RFB solar panel up higher on the existing pole. That makes it more amenable to city engineers. We also need to ask PGE for permission to mount it on their pole.

We need to make sure we have ADA compliance around the sign on the other side of the street. Need to get measurements to see if we have an issue. We are asking the city engineers to do that assessment before the next meeting.

City engineers will check with PGE and ADA assessment.

**iv. RRFB at Harrison (Update)** – we had approved moving forward with trying to do a traffic calming measure of an RFB. Have learned it is illegal to install a flasher on a 4-way stop. You could switch out the stop sign with one that constantly flashes. You can choose which stop sign(s) to flash. Could also put in the rumble strips as people approach the stop sign. Could also put flashers around the “stop sign ahead” sign as well.

If we put anything at the 24<sup>th</sup> and Harrison, need to do a new railroad order because it's so close to the railroad tracks. They can say no and it's not fast.

Jen would propose putting the flashing stop light and stop sign ahead light to the Public Works team because we don't need to go to a contractor which will make the project take longer.

Andy says the NDA will be ok with the flasher around the “stop ahead” sign but is going to take the rumble strips and the flashing stop sign back to the NDA.

(Camden/Jack) Motion to approve the “stop ahead” flasher.  
8 approve/0 opposed/ 0 abstain

**v. Gravel Hollywood (Update)** – not going to happen – vetoed by maintenance

**B. TSP Advisory Committee Update** – link to the project maps and list of projects:  
[https://www.milwaukieoregon.gov/sites/default/files/fileattachments/planning/page/123972/meeting\\_materials\\_tspac\\_april\\_17\\_2025\\_revised.pdf](https://www.milwaukieoregon.gov/sites/default/files/fileattachments/planning/page/123972/meeting_materials_tspac_april_17_2025_revised.pdf)

Will share the maps at the May PSAC meeting and everyone is invited to the June 18 public feedback meeting.

## **V. ACTION ITEMS**

### **A. Spot Program (7:30PM – 7:50PM)**

Can SPOT fund a trail cam and then volunteers would review the footage to do counts. Jen thinks its more important to talk to the neighbors and the community and make sure everyone is onboard with the changes being proposed but that we should spend money on equipment for counts.

Camden – brought up idea of different Tiers and having a Tier that is automatically approved based on the low cost. Next step to send to Jeff his ideas. Also we want to see through the current process at least 1 or 2 times before making changes.

## **VI. FUTURE MEETING DATE/AGENDA ITEMS All**

Next regular meeting May 22nd, 2025

## **VII. ADJOURN at 7:56pm**