

MINUTES**MILWAUKIE CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION****October 16, 2007**

Mayor Bernard called the work session to order at 5:30 p.m. in the City Hall Conference Room.

Council Present: Mayor Bernard and Councilors Barnes, Collette, and Stone

Staff Present: City Manager Mike Swanson, Community/Public Works Director Kenny Asher, Associate Planner Susan Shanks, Engineering Director Gary Parkin, and Resource and Economic Development Specialist Alex Campbell.

Transportation System Plan Pre-Adoption Briefing

Ms. Mangle said the draft plan was being mailed to neighborhood associations and the advisory committee. She explained the purpose of the briefing was to go over some of the process and some overviews of the recommendations and there would be time for questions to be answered. The TSP was a plan for the entire City that addressed all modes of transportation. There were set state requirements that require that the City to have a TSP plan and we have had one since 1997. From the beginning staff decided with the support of the City Council and Planning Commission to go beyond that and get deeper and tailor it to Milwaukie's issues and in some cases make it broader. There are some issues that are addressed that are not required. Public involvement was critical to make this the community's plan. A lot of the recommendations came from the working group and were vetted by the advisory committee. Staff learned from those who participated and most of them were new to the City so it wasn't really an option for them to sit down and write a plan. The volunteers who offered their time were impressive. There were many places where the chapters connect and people were talking about completed streets with sidewalks and areas for parking and bus stops and facilities that complemented the character of the neighborhoods. This was a plan she felt would serve in the long run.

She said they were able to pretty successfully draft a set of nine TSP goals, which set up the recommendations and fundamentals of the Plan. The goals were livability, safety, provide travel choices, quality design, reliability and mobility, sustainability, efficient and innovative funding, compatibility, and economic vitality. There are projects policies and process improvements that make up the three different types of projects. She said there is a map in each chapter, called the master plan and that was the big idea or the solutions that they were able to come up with that they could build to make the system more complete, safe and function better. They try to take the 20,000-foot view. Some of the key recommendations are that the main traffic problems we have in terms of looking into the future, as the county changes, will be on the highway corridors of Hwy 224 and 99E. Though it has been in the City's plan for a long time to do a corridor study what they learned with this plan is that it is not just a good idea, but it is really something that is in the City's best interest to take the initiative to study. Whatever happens it needs to help knit the City back together again, and not separate it farther from the two parts of the City. They developed some options for increasing truck and freight access in the Industrial area, but it definitely warrants further study. We shouldn't be waiting for the County or Metro

CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION – October 16, 2007

APPROVED MINUTES

Page 1 of 8

to initiate and take the lead. We need to expand the tools we use to improve the bicycle network and bike boulevard concept, and develop complete streets to ensure pedestrian connections, and allow more people to choose not to drive. That can also help with some of the drainage problems the City has had especially in the southeast part of the City where there is no curb and gutter system. Also, expanding transit service to cover currently underserved neighborhoods and enhance the facilities that we do have. There are several new policies related to transit; developing the transit center, and ensuring that as high capacity transit comes to City that we push for reserving the time that is gained by converting bus lines into light rail. That time should be kept in Milwaukie so we reinvest that transit service on some of the bus routes. There was some really good policy work that was done by the transit group. They are adopting the downtown parking management policies that have been worked on for a while in the TSP. Throughout there was discussion of ways to practice environmental stewardship, and how we manage to build and plan for the system. All of the master plans had discrete projects, and many of them were capital projects. What is important for everyone to understand when looking at the master plan is that there is not enough money to build all of that, but the good news is the City doesn't have to fund it all. There are Primarily three different ways that those projects will be implemented. Some of it will be through the CIP. They also have access to regional, state and federal funds if they want to apply for grants and get help, and a really important part is that the development that happens in the City will implement many of these projects. A lot of the State requirements for having a having TSP is to make that land use and transportation linked to make sure we understand what development should be required to do, and the impacts that development has on the transportation system. They also need to assess what a development project would need to do to mitigate any impacts they might have. An example was the signal at 43rd Avenue and King Road, which was paid for by the Safeway development.

Mr. Campbell discussed the assumptions and method going into the financing plan. This was all in present dollars and inflation was not factored in. In recent years the inflation and project cost had outstripped the inflation of our revenues. At some point they needed to limit the number of variables so it is not terribly conservative. On the other hand, it is conservative in that they did not consider any other revenues that did not exist today. It was a projection, which he discussed in round figures. All revenues were about \$60 million including SDC's, gas tax, franchise fees, and street surface maintenance, which was \$23 million dedicated to preservation. They looked historically at what was spent on maintenance, which was another \$30 million leaving about \$7 million over 22 years to contribute to capital projects. Most of revenues were available for operations or capital and about \$215,000 on bike projects. We do struggle to even match the grants that we are able to raise. That \$7 million could fairly rapidly find the grants, which absorbs the \$7 million for grants as a match. If the City wants to do more there are two options that City might look at are to make adjustments to SDC impact fees charged to new development by increasing levels. They will need to do research on how those increases would compare to the development costs in the City versus other cities. The City of Portland had done some good comparative work, and they are confident that we are currently at the low end of development costs. Another issue is or change that we could make is to tighten up credits against SDC's for any transportation infrastructure. A More typical practice would be to only provide those credits if that capital project that they are building is part of the CIP. The credit was really an expenditure of our expected SDC revenues, and the policy would be that the CIP

had been adopted by City Council, and if we forego SDC revenues it should be only for those projects that the money is intended to pay for.

Ms. Mangle explained the difference between the action plan and master plan. The master plan is all the big ideas, and the action plan was what the City could afford with local funds being forecasted. That did not assume a lot of grants and what developers could pay for. They came up with the action plans by using the goals and they asked the question, "how well does this project help achieve these goals?" In addition to the priorities they got from the working groups, each working group set their priorities and then they ranked against each of the goals and then looked at role of the neighborhood association. That is how they came up with overall priority list for all of the projects and the advisory committee helped them refine that and made sure they weren't overlooking anything. Even though the priorities are shown in each chapter it was actually developed as one action plan list as shown in the appendix.

Mr. Campbell said in the appendix that the full list cost reflects the expected City share. They did not count grants as part of the revenue, so they looked at what the expected City contribution would be to that project.

Councilor Stone understood that with \$60 million over 22 years they could do all of the projects on the master plan.

Mr. Campbell replied no. \$60 million is what we have available in all transportation revenues to cover maintenance and operations, and \$7 million of that is what we have available to spend. That includes the new surface transportation fees and taxes. For projects that improved street surface they were thinking that it made sense to pay for the street surface part of that project using the street surface maintenance utility fee.

Ms. Mangle said at the end of the day they tried to make the conservative assumptions. They new a baseline of what we are able to do.

Councilor Barnes said after reviewing this the big issue was grant funding. How much staff time can we afford to spend on writing grants or are we in a position where the City can hire a grant writer for these kinds of projects?

Mr. Campbell responded as far as staff time currently spent on grants it is significantly less than half of his time, and it was cyclical. He also tracked the grants. The City could probably hire two people full-time and they wouldn't have that much success. The granting agencies want match from locality because it indicated support. There are exceptions like the Kellogg Lake restoration for example that may find some share of the local funds. Light rail was like that and the region would look for creative ways of funding. For a lot of the regular street projects he didn't know whom you would ask for that kind of money.

Councilor Collette said what she understood Councilor Barnes to say was when we have the local match would it be useful to hire someone on a contingency basis?

Mr. Campbell replied that we have the capacity to get as many grants as we can match already. We have a number of projects in the pipeline and they are currently struggling to figure out how to pay the local match such as Lake Road and Logus Road.

Mayor Bernard said it is more about the money that comes from JPACT and smaller pockets of money.

Councilor Collette said there are some other grants available for Main Street improvements and small grants for bike paths and beautification projects. Sometimes it takes more staff time to follow up with someone than being at the table when the major funds are divided.

Mr. Campbell said the more creative you get the smaller the grants are. There are a lot of foundations out there that give \$10,000 - \$15,000 grants, but just applying was no guarantee we would get them. They are looking for more needy applicants than the City.

Councilor Collette said the downtown development was a good example in that they prefer those projects to come from the grassroots rather than the city government.

Mayor Bernard said the Lake Road money came from the feds in a different way. Regarding McLoughlin Boulevard he hoped somewhere in this plan and in that case Milwaukie needed to put in a certain amount of money, which was well worth it. When they came through town there was probably a certain match the City had to provide.

Mr. Campbell said he thought it was just an ODOT preservation project. The City was not contributing to that.

Mayor Bernard asked generally if there is a project like that we are not chasing matching dollars.

Ms. Mangle said not necessarily. A good example was the sidewalk and overlay project on Hwy 224. That was an ODOT project and they paid for not only the overlay, their bike/pedestrian planner went and sought funding for the sidewalks. That project didn't involve a lot from the City.

Mayor Bernard said one of the things he thought that was odd was that we had to build a bike lane on McLoughlin Boulevard even though there was a bike path within a few feet. That did not make sense to him when we make a road wider we have to have a bike lane on both sides, which takes up space and actually increase the speed volume on a road.

Ms. Mangle responded that there is not just one type of cyclist. There are families out with their kids riding bikes and the bike commuters who want to get to work as fast as they can and then there are the people in between. That would be one reason to have a path and bike line. She was not familiar with the details of that project, but now there is the commuter route where cyclists can go as fast as they want and there are the cyclists that can go at a slower speed away from traffic in the park. Duplication was not such a bad thing and allowed people to make choices. She addressed the other questions that Mayor Bernard had emailed her, "Was street lighting addressed in the TSP?" She said that it was addressed in two places in the TSP in the transit chapter related to improving bus stops and it was also in the downtown-parking plan. They do have a GIS based inventory of the streetlights that PGE has provided to the City, and Mr. Parkin has been thinking about it in terms of proposed and pedestrian safety in terms of small investments. He also learned that PGE had different kinds of lights, which were more sustainable and would be expensive to make that switch about \$700 per light. The only place where there is a defined program is in the downtown where there is a plan to improve the street lighting, but it may be incremental.

Mayor Bernard said he was concerned about the traffic circle on 34th Avenue. He has heard that trucks go up on the sidewalks and curbs to get around the

circle. If a traffic circle is put in the curbs need to be accommodated so there is room to go around so a truck would not have to go up on the sidewalk.

Councillor Collette asked if that was a freight route? Those circles are used to reduce cut through traffic by freight trucks in neighborhoods.

Ms. Mangle said they need to be well designed not just the circle, but also the entire intersection. The Neighborhood Traffic Calming chapter was a product of two working groups. The traffic group and the street design group talked about a lot of the tools to a great degree. They were asked if they wanted to prioritize the tools and take anything off the table, and they said no they want all of the tools on the table and that the decisions should be site specific. She said they tried to tackle that chapter in two ways. First, it was to remind everyone there were a lot of tools including; education, physical improvement, information and enforcement. Second, was to outline what a process would look like and they would continue to work as it was not fully defined but it was a step in the right direction. They would continue to work with the neighborhoods.

Ms. Mangle addressed the questions about JCB. She said over the course of the last year and half they received a lot of comments, which came from the internet survey, working groups and advisory committees so there were people from all over the city that made comments. What she was including in the hearing packages as they come up are the comments that were received on the drafts because a lot of the comments they received prior to the draft had been accommodated. Since they finished this hearing version of the TSP the only comments she had were about JCB, so hopefully that meant they have successfully addressed the other issues. JCB was challenging because it was in three jurisdictions with only a small section in Milwaukie so they decided to include JCB and 32nd Avenue as a study section although it was not in the City. She said it was important for them to learn about that intersection because it is an important part of our system whether it is in the City or not. They did that and learned that it was failing or close to failing at how a traffic engineer looked at it. Traffic engineers looked at that to make it meet standards. They recommended turn lanes and widening the road and the bridge to make it meet the standards. Staff didn't agree with the engineers about widening the street. They didn't feel it was necessary for the function that the road served in the City, and they realized that the function of that road is more of a collector than an arterial as had been previously designated. In the city of Portland it is designated as a neighborhood collector, and they don't have plans in their TSP or their CIP to do any of that widening. They revised the recommendation not to widen the street or add turn lanes, but because it is already at failure and will probably get worse that anticipating signals at 32, 36 and 42 is a prudent thing to do because we also have the responsibility to make sure that the corridor is managed effectively.

Mr. Parkin said at that intersection the current level of service (LOS) was F, which factors the average waiting time and then the capacity, which is the number of vehicles that could be served even though they had to wait. We would be over capacity, and cause more pollution with cars idling. Taking a minimalist approach even with lights the LOS would still be at F, but the capacity would improve because it would cut the wait time in half.

Councillor Stone said it came out loud and clear at the last Neighborhood meeting that people did not want signals in their neighborhood. Her experience in being in that gridlock was that a turn lane onto 32nd would help to divert some of those cars. At the light at the bottom of JCB when the pedestrian slow point was put in they eliminated what was a wider street that allowed cars to turn right

onto JCB eastbound. We need to have that turn lane back and she said she thought if that turn lane was brought back traffic would flow a lot better.

Mr. Parkin said that was county jurisdiction in that area and to get turn lane they would have to widen the bridge. There was some level of detail, but they aren't projecting when the street would likely fail. Once we have the data it seems prudent to do something to say we should address this. How it actually happens there would have to be further studies. He thought they are better off by at least recognizing and listing this as an issue in the TSP and not just ignoring it.

Councilor Stone said it was failing just at peak hours.

Councilor Collette was very concerned about premise of increasing the flow of traffic would reduce pollution. More people would use JCB if it was easier to get through. She said we should be working to keep cars on highways and keep cars off streets like JCB. She is concerned when signals are put in as being proposed speeds would go up and safety would go down. The Neighborhood was very concerned. She was concerned even if it shows up in the plan then Wal-Mart would have a clean ride from a traffic perspective and she did not want that on the plan.

Ms. Mangle said it is easier for us to require something of a developer if it is in our plan.

Councilor Collette said that if it is in the plan all the City would have to do is require them to put in the signals in.

Ms. Mangle said any development whether it is TriMet park and ride or Wal-Mart or any other development that might be happening along that area they would have to do a traffic study and that traffic study would look at it in much more detail than this plan is, and they would have to address how they would mitigate traffic impact.

Councilor Stone asked how feasible is it to look at those two locations and make another turn lane and how it would help at peak hours.

Ms. Mangle said that 32 and JCB was looked at and the engineers said they would have to widen the bridge to get a turn lane. She said they have to meet engineering standards for safety.

Ms. Mangle said at the Springwater intersection they found 95 bikes per hour so there were safety implications of adding turn lanes, which must be considered. It is in County's TSP. JCB was a neighborhood collector in the City of Portland.

Councilor Stone had questions about changing the classification of JCB. She asked for clarification. Was it a neighborhood collector?

Ms. Mangle said it is considered a neighborhood collector in the City of Portland. We do not have that designation, and it did not come up in the TSP.

Councilor Stone said 10 years ago when they did the initial TSP it was changed from a neighborhood collector and became a neighborhood street, collector. People felt strongly that that street should be a neighborhood collector. Was the reason for changing the classification that we own a small portion of the street?

Ms. Mangle said we don't have that classification. She said that didn't come up during the course of the TSP about re-evaluating the classifications.

Mr. Parkin said our classification of a collector is broad enough that it encompassed a neighborhood type of designation.

Ms. Mangle said that Portland had a much different classification system than any other city in the region. It was tailored to Portland's transportation planning, which was more nuanced than Milwaukie's. The City would be well served by having a simple and straightforward system. Chapter 8 defined what the different systems mean and they weren't just about volumes of traffic but they were also about the different land uses that are served and how they connected across the City. Collector was a broad definition and acknowledged that it did go through neighborhoods.

Councilor Stone said in the original TSP arterials were exempt. She asked why speed bumps are called speed humps, she suggested changing it to bump. The signs call them bumps.

Mr. Parkin said that there is distinction between speed bumps that are in parking lots and the speed hump, which is a more gentle term. The signage uses the word bump as it is more global and it is not to define the speed hump.

Councilor Stone said she was so pleased that this was such a comprehensive plan. She was amazed at the amount of detail in all of the chapters. She asked if there would be any minimization of the use of yellow paint. Overuse of yellow paint detracted from aesthetics. In different jurisdictions they minimized the use of yellow paint.

Mr. Parkin responded that was a maintenance matter and was not addressed in the TSP.

Councilor Barnes asked they could we talk about the SDC situation.


Ms. Mangle said it would be after the plan. They City had a commitment to ODOT to adopt the TSP by the end of the year. Public hearings start next Tuesday with a two-part public hearing at Planning Commission and a two-part hearing at City Council. The Planning Commission hearing would be on 10/23 and finish on 11/13. The City Council hearing would be on 12/4 and finish on 12/18. The goal for 12/18 is a thank-you party for all of the volunteers. The three parts that will be brought forward are the TSP itself which is ancillary document to Comprehensive Plan, and an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan and two minor zoning code changes that were required to stay in compliance with state requirements. The next step is they would continue next year with amendments to the Transportation Development Code (Section 1400) that had been on their work plan, and they would use that to streamline the process and begin incorporating street design ideas into the code to allow those to happen along with the Public Works Standards. There was Policy direction in the TSP to allow more flexible street design and right now there was a rigid street design policy so they will look at the Public Works Standards and the code to make sure they allow the kind of flexibility and livability to breathe through into the projects as they are done. There are some parking recommendations they can start acting on, financing and SDC recommendations that will be part of the work in the next year. They will invite the people involved in street design to be involved in the further work that needs to be done next year.

Councilor Collette said that she has worked on TSP's as a consultant and had a lot of work on public involvement and this process was phenomenal and the involvement was remarkable. It was an award-winning document.

Mayor Bernard said he was very impressed that with all of the questions thrown at you that you spent a lot of time and came up with those answers. He thanked them.

Ms. Mangle said that this was not only a community effort but also a team effort and everyone had worked very hard and the feedback meant a lot to her.

Mayor Bernard adjourned the work session at 6:40 p.m.



Pat DuVal, City Recorder

AGENDA

WORK SESSION MILWAUKIE CITY COUNCIL

OCTOBER 16, 2007

MILWAUKIE CITY HALL

Second Floor Conference Room
10722 SE Main Street

A light dinner will be served.

WORK SESSION – 5:30 p.m.

Discussion Items:

	<u>Time</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Presenter</u>
1.	5:30 p.m.	Transportation System Plan Pre-Adoption Briefing	Katie Mangle
2.	6:30 p.m.	Adjourn	

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Executive Session: The Milwaukie City Council may go into Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(2). All discussions are confidential and those present may disclose nothing from the Session. Representatives of the news media are allowed to attend Executive Sessions as provided by ORS 192.660(3) but must not disclose any information discussed. No Executive Session may be held for the purpose of taking any final action or making any final decision. Executive Sessions are closed to the public.

Public Notice

- The Council may vote in work session on non-legislative issues.
- The time listed for each discussion item is approximate. The actual time at which each item is considered may change due to the length of time devoted to the one previous to it.
- For assistance/service per the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) please dial TDD (503) 786-7555.
- The Council requests that all pagers and cell phones be either set on silent mode or turned off during the meeting.



To: Mayor and City Council

Through: Mike Swanson, City Manager
Kenny Asher, Community Development and Public Works Director

From: Katie Mangle, Planning Director

Subject: Draft Transportation System Plan Briefing

Date: October 2, 2007 for October 16 2007 Work Session

Action Requested

This is a briefing on the City's current Transportation System Plan (TSP) Update project, and is for information only. No action is requested at this time. Staff would appreciate Council feedback on the proposed plan as we prepare for a two-part public hearing on the TSP on December 4 and 18.

Background

TSP Update Project

The Transportation System Plan (TSP) is the City's long-term master plan for the transportation system, which provides policy direction for transportation matters, and includes a list of projects that could be implemented through the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), development review, or grant funding. This TSP planning process has been a great opportunity for the community to define its transportation goals, and discuss how the whole transportation system can be improved to support the livability and economy of Milwaukie.

The current TSP was adopted in 1997 and is outdated in many ways. It was one of the first TSPs prepared in the state, and therefore does not reflect current approaches to planning, traffic modeling, or project development. The project lists are outdated and therefore not helpful during the annual development of the CIP. Most importantly, it does not reflect either the complexities of Milwaukie's built and natural environment nor the policy preferences of today's citizens.

Though project staff were able to draw upon the 1997 document for policy guidance and used the 1997 project lists as a starting point, the "updated" TSP can be viewed as an

“overhauled” TSP. Significant staff and volunteer time went into understanding both the existing transportation system and the community’s needs and aspirations, and crafting a plan that will support a healthy Milwaukie.

The TSP project has achieved many of the goals identified by the City when we embarked on this project.

- The community has engaged in this process to a degree that appears to be unprecedented in Oregon, and the resulting document displays the result of such astute and extensive public participation.
- By including non-traditional issues such as Street Design, Downtown Parking, and Neighborhood Traffic Management, we have been able to address community concerns in a more thorough way. Though not all community concerns are resolved, the TSP will establish a policy framework for continuing to address these issues.
- The fundamental purpose of the TSP—planning for multi-modal transportation improvements to support planned development—has been met in a manner that exceeds state requirements.
- The plan emphasizes the connection between the community’s goals for the transportation system and the transportation investments the city should make or require of others.

Public Process

The TSP public involvement process that began in November 2006 may very well have been the most extensive to date for a TSP in Oregon. In total, the City hosted almost 30 meetings in which over 100 people participated. Many individuals chose to participate in more than one way, and this greatly strengthened the process and the resulting recommendations.

What We Learned

Throughout the project, staff repeatedly encouraged participants to discuss and consider transportation issues and solutions that weren’t being addressed by other groups, projects, or jurisdictions. Though coordination with other projects, such as Portland – Milwaukie Light Rail and Harmony Road was important, we reminded participants that the TSP process was the only place in which Milwaukie’s needs and decisions could be focused on exclusively. As a result, participants created a set of recommendations that implement state and regional policies but are tailored to Milwaukie’s current and future needs, and with a finer grain of detail than is typically found in a TSP for a city the size of Milwaukie.

From all of the input that citizens and businesses offered during the TSP process, some clear messages shone through. The highest priorities for improving transportation in Milwaukie are:

- Improved pedestrian and bicycle facilities throughout the city.
- Enhanced public transit service.
- Well-maintained transportation facilities.

- Managed traffic in neighborhoods (address “cut-through” traffic) as regional traffic volumes increase.
- Improved safety and accessibility of crossings over major corridors.

Though it is common for people to be focused on their own street, neighborhood or bus line, a broad number of people identified the following areas as a priority:

- Downtown
- Milwaukie Marketplace area
- SE Railroad Avenue
- Railroad crossings throughout the city.

Findings and Recommendations

Project staff drafted TSP chapters by drawing on the 1997 TSP, best practices, and, most importantly, on the work of the Advisory Committee and Working Groups. Though generally each chapter is the result of a different mode-focused working group, in the end staff did not find that the recommendations were inconsistent or incompatible. All of the draft chapters, as outlined in Table 1 below, are available on the TSP section of the City of Milwaukie website.¹

Table 1 - Milwaukie 2007 TSP Table of Contents

Chapter 1	Executive Summary
Chapter 2	Goals and Policies
Chapter 3	Existing Conditions
Chapter 4	Future Forecasting Process
Chapter 5	Pedestrian Element
Chapter 6	Bicycle Element
Chapter 7	Public Transit Element
Chapter 8	Auto Street Network Element
Chapter 9	Freight Element
Chapter 10	Street Design Element
Chapter 11	Neighborhood Traffic Management Element
Chapter 12	Downtown Parking Element
Chapter 13	Funding and Implementation Plan
Chapter 14	Transportation Planning Rule Implementation
Appendix A	Public Involvement Summary
Appendix B	Prioritized Master Plan Project List
Appendix C	Study Intersection Conceptual Design Diagrams
Appendix D	Technical Appendix

¹ <http://www.cityofmilwaukie.org/milwaukie/projects/tspupdate/tspupdate.html>

Staff is providing council with the full draft TSP as Attachment A to this report, and urges Council to review the entire document. The heart of the plan is in chapters five through twelve, which describe the needs, strategies and recommendations for improving the various transportation modes in Milwaukie. Each section has been written to address Milwaukie’s specific needs, and to reflect the recommendations that emerged from the community discussions.

The draft TSP includes not only recommendations for capital improvements, but also updated policy direction. A sampling of the key findings and recommendations are outlined in Table 2.

Table 2 – Select TSP Recommendations

Recommendation	Problems this Addresses
Initiate a Hwy 224 / Hwy 99 Refinement Plan to explore improvements to the interchange, North Industrial access, and reducing the barrier effect of Hwy 224.	<p>As development in the County increases, traffic that flows through Milwaukie will increase significantly, and may put pressure on Highway 224. It is in the City’s best interest to understand and guide how this corridor changes.</p> <p>A new overpass at Ochoco over 99E could solve access challenges in the North Industrial Area.</p>
Use a variety of tools to improve the bicycle network. Specifically, create “bicycle boulevards” to enhance existing bike routes on lower traffic streets.	<p>While bike lanes are needed on many arterials, filling the gaps in the bike lane system will require costly road and bridge widening.</p> <p>Small improvements, such as directional signage, can guide cyclists to the few existing routes that connect Milwaukie neighborhoods.</p>
<p>Develop “complete streets” to ensure pedestrian connections and allow more people to choose not to drive (see Attachment 2 for more detail).</p> <p>Develop more flexible street design standards for pedestrian improvements and stormwater management.</p>	<p>Though the community wants to improve conditions for walking, a traditional gutter and sidewalk design could dramatically alter the character of many streets.</p> <p>Allowing for “context-sensitive” pedestrian improvements can help achieve the goals of both enhancing neighborhood character and improving walking conditions.</p>
Expand transit service to cover currently underserved neighborhoods, and enhance quality and safety of bus stops.	Several areas in Milwaukie do not have transit service at all, and many areas have very limited service during off-peak hours.
The City needs to invest in projects that support the redevelopment of downtown by improving facilities and connections for parking, cycling, walking, and riding transit.	The effort to reinvigorate downtown relies on the creation of a multimodal environment in which residents and employees are able to bike, walk, take transit, or drive. Existing infrastructure is deficient for all of these modes.
Use City funds to implement projects that best meet the TSP Goals.	Approximately \$7 million in local funds will be available to implement the Master Plans in the TSP.

In addition to outlining recommended capital and operational investments, the TSP also includes policy direction. Most of the City's previous policies are re-confirmed in this document. However, some sections of the plan also include important new policy direction that acknowledge the City's current challenges and will guide staff and decision makers as Milwaukie evolves. Key new policy recommendations include:

- Parking management policies and principles that were originally developed during the 2003 Downtown Parking and Traffic Management Plan.
- Promotion of "context sensitive" street design to acknowledge the need to balance mobility with livability.
- Re-classification of two streets – Johnson Creek Boulevard (from Arterial to Collector) and International Way (from Local to Collector).
- Use the nine goals (Livability; Safety; Travel Choices; Quality Design; Reliability and Mobility; Sustainability; Efficient and Innovative Funding; Compatibility; and Economic Vitality) to define the relative merits of transportation investments.
- Practice environmental stewardship in all aspects of planning, developing and managing the transportation system.
- Several new transit policies, including the dissolution of the Transit Center, increasing transit service to the under-served neighborhoods in the east part of the city and local reinvestment of transit "savings" as high capacity service is introduced into Milwaukie.
- Increasing the City's System Development Charge rate to increase funding for transportation projects.

Citywide Priorities and Action Plan

Collectively, the Master Plans in each chapter describe all of the proposed capital and operational improvements to the transportation system between 2009 and 2030.

From these Master Plans, the Advisory Committee (AC) created the citywide Action Plan, which focused on the highest priority projects that are most likely to be funded over the next 15 years with limited City funds. The citywide Action Plan is built upon the premise that, given the limited funds available, the City should prioritize funding of transportation projects that 1) effectively address identified problems, and 2) best meet the City's transportation goals.

The financially constrained Action Plans at the end of chapters five through twelve identify projects that the City should prioritize for funding with limited City funds. While these Action Plans will set the priorities for the use of local funds, they do not assume funding sources such as state or regional grants, or contributions from local development. Therefore, the "financially constrained" list is very constrained indeed.

Financing and Implementation

A required element of a TSP is a realistic financing plan. The intent is to inform both decision makers and the public about the resources available and how many projects the jurisdiction can reasonably expect to fund.

The first step is to project future revenues for the plan period, which in this case is 22 years. Project staff assumed that recent history is the best basis for forecasting and made no assumptions about future rate increases, for example, in the State gas tax. Projections were made for all transportation-dedicated revenues:

- local share of the Oregon Highway Trust Fund (state motor vehicle fuel taxes and license fees);
- franchise fee payments to the Street Fund from city-operated utilities;
- System Development Charges and funds collected as Fee in Lieu of Construction (FILOC); and
- Street Surface Maintenance Program (SSMP) revenues (local gas tax, street surface maintenance fee, and PGE privilege tax).²

The City's total projected revenue stream for transportation is about \$60 million over 22 years. The vast majority of this is either specifically dedicated to preservation and maintenance, or has traditionally been spent on maintenance. Staff assumed that historical maintenance spending will continue (for operations), with all new SSMP revenues also dedicated to the capital costs of the maintenance program.

After subtracting expected maintenance expenditures from total revenues, the balance available is approximately \$7 million. About half of that \$7 million will be generated by SDCs or FILOC revenue, and is therefore dedicated to new capital projects. The other half is flexible funds that could also be spent on capital or new operations activities.

The Action Plans in the TSP reflect only projects that fit within this \$7 million expected to be available. The Advisory Committee and staff believe that the City's past practice of seeking to leverage local funds with grant opportunities should continue. Therefore, the Action Plan cost for many projects reflects an assumption that the projects will be pursued if and when grants are secured to pay for the balance of the project. Council should note that this approach recommends continuing the past practice of utilizing funds collected through the state gas tax as match against grants for capital projects.

The Master Plan project lists in Chapters 5-12 include a large number of unfunded, but nonetheless high-priority, projects and programs. The City may wish to consider new revenue sources to ensure that funding is available for proposed capital projects and other transportation programs. Many cities use some combination of general fund revenues, tax increment financing, and expanding SDC rates to supplement their capital and/or maintenance budgets.

Given the transportation needs identified in Milwaukie, and the relative size of the City's existing transportation SDC, staff believes a higher transportation SDC rate is warranted. A regional examination of combined SDC and development fee costs conducted by the City of Portland found that the City of Milwaukie charges less than the

² As directed by Council when it established this program, all revenues from these sources are dedicated by ordinance to street surface maintenance and repair and may not be used to construct capital projects.

majority of other jurisdictions (17th out of 21 overall), and has particularly low rates for residential uses. The projects identified in this TSP will help the City increase quality of life and property values for residents and businesses as the City experiences continued growth. It is appropriate to ensure that growth pays a fair and commensurate share of the costs of these new facilities.

Plan Adoption

The TSP adoption package will include:

1. A Comprehensive Plan Amendment to adopt the updated TSP as the new Transportation Element of the City's Comprehensive Plan.
2. Two Zoning Code amendments needed to comply with the state Transportation Planning Rule.

The Oregon Department of Transportation funded this TSP Update through a \$142,500 grant to the City. The City's Intergovernmental Agreement with ODOT commits the City to adopting the TSP before December 31, 2007. Staff is currently preparing a Draft TSP for public hearings before the Planning Commission on October 23 and November 13, 2007. City Council is scheduled to hold public hearings on the TSP on December 4 and 18, 2007.

Concurrence

There is no action with which to concur.

Fiscal Impact

None. Staffing for the TSP project is being managed within the adopted FY07-08 budget.

Work Load Impacts

Multiple departments are contributing to the TSP project. Significant staff time will continue to be required to deliver a high quality document for Council adoption.

Alternatives

None at this time.

Attachments

1. Draft Transportation System Plan
2. Draft Comprehensive Plan amendment to Chapter 5, Transportation Element
3. Draft code amendments

ATTACHMENT 2

PROPOSED

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT

The Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan needs to reflect the City's long-term transportation goals and policies. Since the Transportation System Plan (TSP) contains the City's long-term transportation goals and policies and is the City's guiding transportation document, the Transportation Element needs to be updated to reflect the adoption of the 2007 TSP.

The Transportation Element currently contains the goals, objectives, policies, and master plans from the 1997 TSP, thereby duplicating some of the information contained in the 1997 TSP. Staff proposes to reduce the amount of duplication contained in the Comprehensive Plan by summarizing key points from the 2007 TSP, highlighting the public involvement process, and directing readers to the document for more detailed information.

Repeal the Transportation Element of Chapter 5 of the Comprehensive Plan and replace with the following text:

The Transportation System Plan (TSP) is an ancillary Comprehensive Plan document that contains the City's long-term transportation goals and policies for pedestrians, cyclists, drivers, transit users, and freight carriers. It provides for the coordination of transportation improvements at the local level and the integration of the local transportation system with the regional transportation system. It also identifies the issues, policies, and projects that are important to the community.

Transportation goals form the basis for how the local transportation system will be developed and maintained over the long term. Given their importance, the City involved agency, business, and citizen stakeholders in developing goals that support a multi-modal approach to transportation planning that reflects how citizens think about and experience the transportation system. Since they are equally important in different ways, they are not listed in order of importance or priority.

- Goal 1:** **Livability.** Design and construct transportation facilities in a manner that enhances the livability of Milwaukie's community.
- Goal 2:** **Safety.** Develop and maintain a safe and secure transportation system.
- Goal 3:** **Travel Choices.** Plan, develop and maintain a transportation system that provides travel choices and allows people to reduce the number of trips made by single-occupant vehicles.
- Goal 4:** **Quality Design.** Establish and maintain a set of transportation design and development regulations that are sensitive to local conditions.
- Goal 5:** **Reliability and Mobility.** Develop and maintain a well-connected transportation system that reduces travel distance, improves reliability and manages congestion.
- Goal 6:** **Sustainability.** Provide a sustainable transportation system that meets the needs of present and future generations.
- Goal 7:** **Efficient and Innovative Funding.** Efficiently allocate available funding for recommended transportation improvements, and pursue additional transportation funding that includes innovative funding methods and sources.
- Goal 8:** **Compatibility.** Develop a transportation system that is consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan and that coordinates with county, state, and regional plans.
- Goal 9:** **Economic Vitality.** Promote the development of Milwaukie's, the region's, and the state's economies through the efficient movement of people, goods, and services, and the distribution of information.

The TSP Advisory Committee and Working Groups assisted City staff in refining and developing policies that further define the nine multi-modal goals listed above. They also translated transportation needs and improvements into mode-specific master plans that prioritize the improvements the City should undertake in the near and far term. Refer to the Transportation System Plan for additional detail, as it is the City's guiding transportation document.

ATTACHMENT 3

PROPOSED ZONING CODE AMENDMENT

Commentary

The Oregon Transportation Planning Rule ("TPR", or Oregon Administrative Rule Chapter 660, Division 12) requires new development to provide "preferential parking for carpools and vanpools." To remain TPR compliant, the proposed zoning code amendment is recommended as part of the 2007 TSP update.

The Milwaukie zoning code has a provision that quantifies the number of carpool/vanpool spaces that must be provided (10 percent), but it does not require that they have preferential status. Other jurisdictions typically satisfy this provision through a spatial directive. That is, carpool/vanpool spaces must be closer to the main entrance to the building than general-purpose spaces. The City proposes a similar solution.

CHAPTER 19.500 OFF-STREET PARKING AND LOADING

19.506 CARPOOL AND VANPOOL PARKING

- A. Applicability. New industrial, institutional, and commercial development with fifty (50) or more employees shall provide carpool/vanpool parking.
- B. Number of Spaces. Carpool/vanpool parking shall be provided for at least ten percent (10%) of the required parking.
- C. Location. Parking for carpools/vanpools shall be closer to the main entrances of the building than other employee or student parking, except parking spaces designated for use by the disabled.
- D. Standards. Carpool/vanpool spaces shall be regular-sized, per requirements in Section 19.503.10, and shall be clearly designated with signs or pavement markings for use only by carpools/vanpools.

The Oregon Transportation Planning Rule ("TPR", or Oregon Administrative Rule Chapter 660, Division 12) requires that local codes separate transportation projects into three categories for review purposes. The categories are: those that are exempt from design standards and procedures, those that are subject to limited review (e.g., Type I) under objective standards, and those that are subject to more extensive review (e.g., Type II) because they are significant or require discretionary decision-making. To remain TPR compliant, the proposed zoning code amendment is recommended as part of the 2007 TSP update.

The Milwaukie zoning code clearly identifies which projects are in the second and third categories in Milwaukie Municipal Code (MMC) sections 19.1405.1 and 19.405.2. However, no projects are explicitly categorized as exempt. The City has interpreted its current code as exempting certain activities from land use regulations such as maintenance of, repair to, or operational changes to an existing transportation facility by a public agency. Since this is not explicit in the code, some of these activities could qualify as "development" per MMC section 19.103, and would therefore be subject to all of the transportation planning, design standards, and procedures of MMC Chapter 19.1400, per the catch-all category "other," listed in MMC section 19.1403.A. The City would like to explicitly exempt these types of projects.

**CHAPTER 19.1400 TRANSPORTATION PLANNING, DESIGN STANDARDS,
AND PROCEDURES**

19.1403.1 Limitations.

D. The following activities and uses are exempt from the requirements of this section:

1. Operation, maintenance, and repair of existing transportation facilities.
2. Public capital improvement projects.