

CITY OF MILWAUKIE
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING SUMMARY
TUESDAY, JUNE 14, 2007

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Jeff Klein, Chair
Teresa Bresaw
Dick Newman
Scott Churchill
Paulette Qutub
Charmaine Coleman
Lisa Batey

STAFF PRESENT

Katie Mangle, Planning Director
Rob Yamachika, City Attorney

A certified verbatim transcript of this meeting was included in the July 3, 2007 City Council packet and is available on the City of Milwaukie website (agenda item 6.B, Attachment 9): <http://www.ci.milwaukie.or.us/council/councilpackets/2007/CCRS070307p.pdf>. The following is a summary of the meeting for Planning Commission records.

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

The PC meeting was called to order at 6:05 p.m.

2.0 PROCEDURAL QUESTIONS -- None.

3.0 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES -- None.

4.0 PUBLIC FORUM

Chair Klein explained the purpose of the forum was to take public comment about adding the McLoughlin and/or Main Street alignment to the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). Mr. Klein explained the ground rules for the forum and allowed the City Attorney to speak about standards for commissioners' participation.

Commissioner Churchill, who had recused himself from this forum on June 12th, did not participate in the forum or deliberation.

Chair Klein asked the City Attorney to address the role of the Planning Commission in this forum.

Planning Director Katie Mangle then reminded the commission that they were not deciding the merit of individual alignments, but whether any of the alternatives seem supportable enough to warrant their inclusion in the SDEIS study.

Chair Klein re-opened the public comment portion of the meeting.

Twenty-six people testified; comments included both those in favor of and those opposed to adding the new alignment study into the SDEIS.

Chair Klein closed the public comment period after all whom had signed in to speak had done so.

Chair Klein opened commission deliberations by reminding the commissioners of the two questions Mayor Bernard had asked.

After listening to a cumulative three and-a-half hours of public comment, the Commission deliberated on the Mayor's two questions and voted on how to answer them. The following summarizes the statements and votes made by each commissioner.

Question 1. Does a large cross-section of the community support the inclusion of a McLoughlin and/or Main Street alignment in the South Corridor Phase 2 SDEIS study?

- **Commissioner Paulette Qutub:** Yes.
There is a majority of support for including another alignment in the study.
- **Commissioner Theresa Bresaw:** No.
For the larger community, the answer is no. For the people who testified, the answer is yes. If it can be done without delay to the project, go for it.
- **Commissioner Dick Newman:** Yes.
Tuesday's forum wasn't a representative cross-section, but Thursday was better. What does it mean to have a "cross-section?" The petition submitted adds weight. It's significant.
- **Commissioner Lisa Batey:** Don't know.
She thought the downtown alignment had been studied, and asked for information on the history and reasons why a downtown alignment wasn't studied, but didn't have the answers. She was concerned that adding a fourth alignment will delay things, and doesn't want to see delay. She fears that the anti-light rail crowd is taking advantage of the Waldorf community's concerns, and hopes that those who say now that they support light rail (just not on the Tillamook branch), will support the alignment that is ultimately chosen. The letter submitted from Stephan and Lisa Lashbrook may better reflect the pulse of the community. The previous processes, and all of the people who participated then, has to be considered.
- **Commissioner Charmaine Coleman:** Don't know.
There is a difference between "I don't like this" and "I want another thing to happen." When considering the cross-section, she looked for citizens who don't live on the alignment. In her tally, of the people who didn't live next to the alignment, 7 people said the City should study the Main Street alignment, 3 said don't; 7 people adamantly opposed a McLoughlin alignment, 6 people expressed support; 6 people said they supported the Tillamook alignment, 1 was against. Most people who testified seemed to just want the light rail to go away from their home or school. People who live elsewhere are split. In general, people are excited about light rail, and momentum is important. Was there a large portion? No. Was there a significant portion? Yes. Not enough information to answer "yes" to the question.
- **Chair Jeff Klein:** No.

Emotions about a project or a place bring people out. He is concerned that a similar pattern is emerging with the Logus Road project in the Lewelling neighborhood – people don't participate, then after years of struggling to get funding for a project now people come out of the woodwork to protest. Doesn't believe there is a cross-section. No.

Question 2. Does a McLoughlin and/or Main Street alignment have merit with regard to downtown's future economic development, urban design and revitalization?

- **Commissioner Theresa Bresaw:** No.
In 30 years anything is possible, but in the near future, no.
- **Commissioner Dick Newman:** Yes.
Mark Gamba's ideas were good. Why would a Main Street option damage development? Light rail on Main Street would help address lack of parking. His travels show that light rail is important for urban revitalization. The process has gone on for a long time. If options are studied the professionals can determine which is best.
- **Commissioner Lisa Batey:** No to a McLoughlin alignment. Yes to a Downtown (Main St. or 21st) alignment.
Catherine Brinkman made good points. Light rail could be beneficial for downtown, and the downtown streets option warrants more study. The ODOT issues for a McLoughlin alignment would be insurmountable.
- **Commissioner Charmaine Coleman:** No to a McLoughlin alignment. Yes to a Downtown (Main St. or 21st) alignment.
Feels strongly that the city shouldn't choose something just because people will hate it less. Only two people actually wanted it on McLoughlin, stating that it would either consolidate transportation facilities or that there would be a good view for the riders. She doesn't want to cut off downtown from the river. A Main Street alignment presents its own problems, but it could be possible to enrich downtown. There are positives to the Tillamook line, such as more ridership. A McLoughlin alignment would be harm-avoidant, and it fouls up the park plans. Some people say why not study more? But there is enough preliminary information to show that some options, such as McLoughlin, are bad. But Main Street, at the conceptual level, could be good for downtown.
- **Commissioner Paulette Qutub:** No to a McLoughlin alignment. Yes to a Downtown (Main St. or 21st) alignment.
A downtown alignment could have merit.
- **Chair Jeff Klein:** Yes.
He heard a lot of comments about TriMet's intent, but the current process shows how much TriMet is allowing the city to determine its own course. His fear is that inaction will lead to a future lack of influence. Brendan Eisworth's comments were well-put – is the Tillamook branch the best option? Maybe, maybe not. We don't know. He is voting yes, but is concerned that this will undo past work. Believes it could be good on Main Street, but strongly believes it would not be good to go on McLoughlin. The City has options to the north of Hwy 224, it should have options south of Hwy 224 as well. Thanks for the

opportunity to have this discussion. Someone will have to make a tough decision in 14 months. With further study the best option will rise to the top.

Chair Klein concluded by announcing that staff would report on the public forum to the mayor and council on July 3. Since this was not a land use decision, there was no appeal process, but he encouraged attendees to speak with staff about the upcoming SDEIS process.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.



Jeff Klein, Chair