

MINUTES**MILWAUKIE CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION
APRIL 19, 2005**

Mayor Bernard called the work session to order at 7:25 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers.

Council Present: Councilors Collette, Loomis, and Stone.

Staff Present: City Manager Mike Swanson, Planning Director John Gessner, and Engineering Director Paul Shirey.

Annexation Evaluation – Presenter Andy Parks, GEL Oregon

Mr. Swanson felt he should make several important observations as the City Council considered the annexation issue. Often annexation by one city of an unincorporated area was proposed because the city desiring to annex needed the increased value to solve current financial problems. Milwaukie operated on the margin and struggled annually to put together a budget. He did not believe the purpose of annexation was to fix financial problems. Likewise, it should not cost the current residents anything. The real purpose of annexation was to provide services. That was the City's business. Cities did not manufacture anything or sell a product as such; they provided services. During the presentation, money would be discussed because that was one of the languages used to look at the annexation issue. He asked that the Council members keep uppermost in their minds that in the end this was about the mission of providing services. The report would address money, but in the end the question was not how much the City reaped or how much it would cost. As long as the cost was neutral, he thought it was something the City Council should consider. In the end, the real question was can Milwaukie provide a level of service consistent with the needs of those looking to annexation.

Andy Parks, GEL Oregon, discussed his background that included 13 years with the City of Bend. This was the fourth annexation evaluation he had done including Bend, Madras, and Redmond.

The evaluation looked at all of the revenues that could be generated for the various services and was focused on non-enterprise activities. Annexation was not an easy thing to do – it was a word that created a lot of emotion and angst. He discussed the Complete Communities survey done by Cogan Owens and Cogan for Clackamas County, the results of which were not inconsistent with what he found in Bend and Redmond. Two-thirds of the people in the unincorporated area, basically south of Hwy 224, were happy with the status quo. The other 1/3 was split between wanting to annex to an existing city, creating a new city, or some combination of the two. The one issue that was not factored into the equation was that the question was not framed from the standpoint of assuming the status quo was not an option. To a degree that inevitability was not discussed relative to annexation.

CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION – APRIL 19, 2005

APPROVED MINUTES

Page 1 of 12

Why would someone consider annexation? Historically, cities have been able to provide planned, efficient expansion and delivery of urban services as necessary and desired relative to community services, police, planning, library, and to a lesser extent fire. In less metropolitan areas, there were some equity issues, and there were likely some here as well. In some cases, residential was in the unincorporated areas with commercial and jobs inside the City. The demands were inside the city, but the residents were not being taxed for the demands they placed on the system. Mr. Parks discussed state shared revenues such as gas, liquor, and cigarette taxes that were ultimately distributed back to cities based on population. That money was lost to the incorporated areas.

All areas within the urban growth boundary (UGB) were planned to be annexed at some point as urban development occurred. The Metro Region 2040 Plan, which was a broad visioning document, identified Milwaukie as a Town Center and the Clackamas Town Center as a Regional Center. If the area was not going to be brought into Milwaukie, then where would it go? He referred to the UGB map and identified the cities and unincorporated areas. He pointed out the Regional Centers including Portland, Beaverton, Oregon City, and the Clackamas Town Center. These would carry a lot of planning and transportation-related improvements. If those were not within a city, then the ability to influence would likely be limited. Beaverton was selected to be a pilot for Metro's Centers program to work through the issues related to Regional Centers.

In the early 1980's the voters defeated the City of McLoughlin concept by a large margin. In 1990, Milwaukie entered into the Urban Growth Management Area (UGMA) agreement with Clackamas County. It identified City and County interests and adopted a public facilities plan, but it did not seem to result in a lot of action. Milwaukie was building its organizational capacity to be able to deliver services beyond its boundaries and was also realizing some successes to generate people's interest in becoming a part of the community. McLoughlin Boulevard and the North Main Village were two excellent examples of the type of visioning and development that Milwaukie would want to see.

In 2002, Milwaukie and Clackamas County engaged the Executive Leadership Institute (ELI) at Portland State University (PSU) to address alternatives to the current urban service delivery system within the UGMA. The study addressed the financial issues but did not deal with quality of services and potential benefits or costs of annexation to the residents. ELI found there might be some short-term challenges but determined there could be positive financial implications for both the City and County. Milwaukie did some lot-by-lot annexations, but it was very low relative to other communities. Milwaukie engaged GEL Oregon to update the ELI report, consider alternative strategies for annexing the Clackamas Town Center, and review the intergovernmental agreements (IGA).

Based on Phase 1 work, it did not look financially feasible to pursue annexation of the Town Center at this time. Mr. Parks updated the rest of the ELI report to address the remaining smaller study areas. He pointed out residential (2), urban renewal (5), 82nd Avenue commercial (4), industrial/commercial/government (6),

and industrial and open space (7). The information Mr. Parks presented was at a very high level and behind that was a lot of spreadsheet data.

The Clackamas Town Center would generate about \$600,000 in revenue. Police did a lot of research on calls for service and what it would take for law enforcement to serve that area. The department discussed service levels with Paul DeMarco, General Manager of the Town Center. It was determined it would cost considerably more to provide the level of service desired relative to the revenues. It was primarily a direct result of the Town Center's being within an urban renewal district and the money going to debt service. The district was scheduled to close in 2013 under the current arrangement. At that time, a considerable amount of income would be spun off including the overlapping jurisdictions such as the Fire and School Districts.

If the City did move forward with the annexation, then it would generate about \$1.2 million in additional property taxes that would be directed to the urban renewal district. With the contemplated improvements, there would be an additional \$600,000 going to the existing debt service. The urban renewal district could put some properties back on the tax rolls to benefit the various taxing entities, to pay back the debt earlier, or a combination of the two. If the urban renewal district did not exist, there would be \$1.36 million in costs vs. \$1.32 million in revenues. He thought it was reasonable that the money generated would cover the police costs including facility improvements. About \$300,000 in capital would be spread across other areas. Annexing this area alone at this time would have significant cost implications for the City if the Town Center desired the level of service currently provided by the police. In the long-term it would generate adequate revenue to pay for those services.

Phase 2 considered subareas with similar characteristics, concerns, and issues. These were broken down into smaller residential, commercial, and industrial properties. Area 3 was primarily industrial. Area 4 was primarily the commercial strip along 82nd Avenue. Area 6 was commercial/industrial, and area 7 was primarily industrial. All of the 2's were pockets of residential. 2A was unsewered, and 2B and the others had some sewer. Area 1 was a large area with open space and public, non-taxable uses such as LaSalle High School and Christ the King. He had generated revenue forecasts for each major area outside of enterprise activities and went into quite a bit of detail on population estimates for each area. He reviewed each of the major services that were outside the enterprise activities.

Mr. Parks estimated about \$4.6 million of revenue being generated currently versus about \$6 million in costs. If annexation did occur, there would be service reductions or an impact to current City residents. Subareas 3, 4, 6 and 7, appeared to have positive situations where revenues would be greater than expenses. Industrial areas typically generate more revenue than they cost to serve. Area 4 was fully on the tax roles in terms of commercial development. The residential areas ended up costing more than the revenue generated. Area 5 would generate less than what it cost because of the urban renewal district. If the urban renewal district expired and was no longer taking those revenues, it

appeared that the City would be able to provide the current level of services with the revenues generated. The primary areas of change were 5,6, and to some degree 7 because each of those areas were impacted by urban renewal.

Mr. Parks reviewed the City taxable assessed value (TAV) per capita, which was a little over \$60,000 to generate the money to pay for the services being provided. In the study area outside the City, the amount was about \$69,000. The negative \$23,000 was the per capita negative impact of the urban renewal district. That would make the TAV about \$44,000 relative to the current \$62,000. The City would have fiscal challenges with annexation.

He did not believe the intergovernmental agreements were sufficient to meet ORS 195 urban service provider standards. There was no reason for them to be there right now; however, several things could trigger that. One would be that if the City wanted to move forward with an ORS 195 annexation, then those agreements would have to be in place. Metro had some regulations that required those agreements to be in place when the Comprehensive Plan was updated. He provided a list of those agreements that should be in place that included sewer, stormwater, water, parks, police, fire, planning, and mass transit.

In conclusion, Mr. Parks believed the industrial areas and those areas needing sewer services might provide the best opportunity for near-term annexations. The current service delivery standards appeared to be financially feasible after the urban renewal district returned fully to the tax roles. Urban service agreements needed to be updated. There was time to engage the citizenry because the financial situation would not change until 2013 when the urban renewal district closed.

Benefits of annexation were enhanced police services and stability. Milwaukie's response times, for example were superior to the enhanced patrols. He addressed coordinated urban service delivery and reliability. Citizens would have the ability to participate in civic affairs.

The cost to the property owners within the UGMA would be about \$3.86 per thousand plus some franchise fees that the City collected but that the County did not. The annual amount would be about \$446 for a \$100,000 home. He provided a comparison of Milwaukie's monthly costs with those of Oak Lodge, North Clackamas, Gladstone, Happy Valley, and Johnson City. The difference between Milwaukie at the highest and Johnson City at the lowest was about \$36 per month. The question was, is it worth the cost? The response would be that it was worth it because Milwaukie offered quality of life services and potentially increased the value of people's property. Homes were typically the largest single asset a family had, and Mr. Parks believed it was worth the investment to protect them. He has had opportunity to talk about annexation with others in Tigard, Bull Mountain, and Beaverton, and the common thread was to engage the citizenry early on in the process. He referred back to the first slide that indicated 42% of the people surveyed did not know about the issue at all. He felt those who were more informed about annexation and what it could do for both the City and the resident felt less threatened.

Mr. Parks suggested that the annexation process would go through many elected bodies in terms of years and efforts. This group could set the stage for future Councils and provide the true underlying support of citizens by saying it wished to ultimately annex. He said it was important to establish and communicate a marker of where Milwaukie intended to annex and when. Milwaukie should continue to improve so others will want to be a part of it. Finally, he suggested there be adequate time to secure the support of City residents, service providers, and residents within the UGMA.

Mayor Bernard said the urban renewal district did not pay for fire services, and that was a great concern for him. That would continue to 2013, and he understood there was an effort to remove some of the property. He felt the City should have been involved with development on Hwy 224. The Town Center might be concerned about SDCs and permit and planning fees. He knew Milwaukie's were significantly less than the County's, so it would be an advantage for a developer to annex in order to save millions in fees and charges.

Mr. Parks did not look at SDCs outside of transportation because they related to enterprise funds and were one-time charges. The key thing in this study was the ability of the revenues generated on a continuous basis to be sufficient to pay for services. Building and planning fees were established to pay for the cost of those services.

Mayor Bernard sent the County a letter saying Milwaukie would be happy to serve the area limited by what it could do for \$600,000. He thought that would be a great agreement both for the City and the County, and the SDCs would go to the City to provide sewer, water, and transportation in that area. If the County dissolved the urban renewal district, then the City could provide those services.

Mr. Parks said it would be helpful to have further dialogue with the County and the urban service providers. It may make sense to annex the Town Center sooner than later and perhaps the County might agree to pay part of the costs. In Bend and Redmond the cities and counties agreed the roads were not built to city standards, and there was an agreement to pay a substantial sum of money over a 5-year period to bring those roads up to standards.

Mayor Bernard said \$5.7 million in gas, alcohol, and cigarette taxes would come to that area. He discussed the benefits of Milwaukie's annexing the Town Center and the County's agreeing to serve it. Right now, neither the City nor the County was getting that \$5.7 million, and it was distributed to every one else.

Mr. Parks said question would be if the various properties in the Town Center wanted to annex, then that would lead to those conversations with the County. It would be a greater challenge if there were no interest.

Councilor Collette asked clarifying questions regarding the financial impacts in terms of what Mr. Parks considered the revenues and expenditures.

Mr. Parks said the revenues were those property taxes generated in the area. Some of the property was removed from the urban renewal district, but a majority of it was still within the district. There would be some state shared revenues that

were calculated on a per capita basis. The area on the map designated as 5a was the Town Center. No revenue was generated from the state because no one lived there. In the expanded area, there were about 3,800 people, so that area did generate state shared revenues. There were also some miscellaneous revenues that were captured. The initial analysis looked at police only in those areas designated 5. Police, planning and other non-enterprise departments were considered in areas 1 – 7.

Councilor Collette asked if the full study was available.

Mr. Swanson could provide whatever level of detail the Council wished. He had not up until last summer pursued a lot in the area of annexation. It was not because he did not believe it was important for the City and the areas it might propose to annex. He had never worked with a better and more professional law enforcement agency than the Milwaukie Police Department. It was motivated by a values-driven organization, and he thought that should be exported. He also felt there were more important issues to deal with inside the City. One question on the minds of those living in the unincorporated area was why would we want to become part of the City of Milwaukie? Part of the answer was developing -- North Main, the McLoughlin Project, the riverfront, the potential for light rail extension, the potential transit center, and Lake Road improvements. Those were not plans on the shelf. The first thing was the completion of Johnson Creek Boulevard after 20 years of planning. This was the beginning of the answer to the question, why the City of Milwaukie? Why was annexation an issue now? The Happy Valley Mayor put it on the front burner by laying claim to the Town Center. Without that, Mr. Swanson would not have been looking for ways Milwaukie might be able to annex the Town Center. He thought it was important for the City to get its own act together first so it could go to the Town Center and say Milwaukie makes things happen. He would be proud to be the City in which the Town Center was located. He did not have the resources to do it, and Town Center did not generate the revenues. The Town Center generated a lot of tax resources, but general revenues to a City government would not happen until 2013 unless properties were released from the district. The dilemma was that the folks in Happy Valley could at any time they wished march forward and attempt to annex the urban renewal area. They could probably do that without a thought to services because they did not provide any -- or minimal. If Milwaukie generated \$600,000, then Happy Valley would generate \$60,000. He would love to wait and prove that Milwaukie was what he thought it was, which was closing on the North Main Village Project, closing on McLoughlin Boulevard, and closing on other projects. The City had to be able to offer something because of the net increase to people's tax rates by \$3.86 per \$1,000. The City had to have something to sell.

Milwaukie sent a letter to the County saying it would agree to annex today if the County agreed to provide the services. The County would not lose anything. Milwaukie would be willing to do that today because he saw it as the only way to ensure this City could be the service provider for the urban renewal district area. He would like to wait while business was taken care of in the City, but he could

not afford to wait because he had no assurance the competition would wait. He also could not, in good conscience, propose that the Council do anything today unless and until he could make sure it would not result in increased costs to current residents. He would propose a higher level of police services than there was currently. He would not be proposing annexation if it were not for what happened last summer. He would say let's bring to conclusion those things Milwaukie had been working on so hard over the past year. He did not feel he was safe in doing that because he had no legal assurance or by agreement with the City of Happy Valley that it would not try to march in and annex those areas where he thought Milwaukie could provide an excellent level of service.

He felt in a very odd situation. There was a lot more work to do because Milwaukie needed to look at the interests of those to be annexed in terms of service provision. The City also needed to consider the interests of current Milwaukie residents because they would not want to carry that load. He proposed that Milwaukie continue to push the County on the proposal. It was the only way the City's interests and the interests of those in the urban renewal district in terms of future service provision would be served. He also recommended pursuing those areas that were currently unsewered. That was an incremental annexation. He thought the City should also begin to plan and implement an informational campaign in the areas east of the City. There were 30 years of constant negative haranguing the City had to be overcome. One way to do that was with projects like North Mail Village, McLoughlin Boulevard Improvements, and Kellogg. The City also needed to begin introducing itself in a way different from what was heard in the past. He suggested a series of newsletters on City activities to begin changing people's minds. It was time to put together a strategy for what he thought would be a 20-year program. Many businesses along 82nd Avenue would be happy if Mayor Grant had not said anything in July. They were not looking to change. Now they were being talked about – sometimes without even inviting them to join the conversation. If left alone, they would be perfectly happy. Milwaukie needed to show people what it had and give them a reason to spend \$3.86 per thousand more than they were spending right now. It could be done, but it would outlive all of us. He thought this group should leave people with a plan and begin implementing it so the successors could pick it up and move forward.

Mayor Bernard hoped it would be a 10-year plan.

Councilor Collette suggested a special edition of *The Pilot* that introduced Milwaukie as a suitor and distributing it to a broader community. Most people did not have a very positive impression of Milwaukie, and what they read in *The Pilot* would leave positive notion of what was happening. She thought it would cost less to extend the distribution rather than starting a whole new marketing campaign.

Mr. Swanson had been thinking of a somewhat different version of *The Pilot* with some articles on annexation. The City would need to engage in a long period of introduction. Milwaukie did great things, and it was no longer a City that developed plans and put them on the shelf. People would not know that without

the City's saying it and slowly building up the reputation that had been torn down over the years.

Councilor Collette asked for a description of the difference between a Regional Center and a Town Center. Did the Town Center have resources as a Regional Center that Milwaukie did not have as a Town Center?

Mr. Gessner explained that in the Metro Framework, Regional Centers were identified for greater economic activity, more residential density, and higher transportation needs.

Councilor Loomis asked what was meant that the status quo was not an option. Was there a way to annex without the approval of the people being annexed?

Mr. Parks replied that right now Milwaukie would need the support of the people in the City and those in the annexation areas, as it was a matter of policy for Metro and city and county elected officials. He thought jurisdictions would continue to see legislation that facilitated annexation into incorporated areas where urban development had already occurred. In this case, development occurred outside the City that was to the density and in some cases higher than that which occurred within the incorporated area. At some point those people might not have a choice, and it would be inevitable that they were brought into an incorporated situation.

Councilor Loomis did not wish to imply he wanted to annex someone who was not interested in being part of Milwaukie. He was concerned with Happy Valley's doing that. He thought the issues had to do with the government's reputation in general, and not just Milwaukie's. He was concerned about someone's aggressively marching in if they had a way to annex without engaging the citizenry.

Mr. Parks said no matter if it were Happy Valley or Milwaukie, they would still need sign off. One way to look at it might be what did that investment of \$.67 per thousand get me from Happy Valley versus what my \$6 gets me from Milwaukie to protect my asset. Sixty-seven cents did not buy a lot of service. That did not even cover the Enhanced Sheriff's District. There were parks, libraries, and other urban services. That was the conversation that should take place. Do you want to have those things and be a part of it or not? It had to do with demonstrating that Milwaukie would be able to deliver that value.

Councilor Stone was struck by the information that 42% of the respondents were not aware of the annexation issues. As Councilor Loomis said, she did not think it was necessarily people thinking badly of Milwaukie. There were a lot of people who did not trust government and a lot of people who were not aware of things that were going on. She concurred with Councilor Collette's recommendation to get the word out and explain what annexation would mean to these people – perhaps via *The Pilot* or a special issue.

Mayor Bernard thought if Happy Valley decided to annex the Town Center, then it could do so because no one lived there.

Mr. Parks said the Town Center would have to ultimately sign off.

CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION – APRIL 19, 2005

APPROVED MINUTES

Page 8 of 12

Mr. Swanson noted that there were no electors.

Mayor Bernard asked if the property owner would have to agree if Happy Valley voted to annex. When Milwaukie talked about annexation some time ago, the discussion was to go along the railroad tracks and the aquatic center and maybe picking up LaSalle. Those people did not pay property taxes, and no one lived there. The citizens of Milwaukie could vote to annex those properties. Why could Happy Valley not just say it wanted to annex the Town Center? No one lived there to vote.

Mr. Swanson did not believe there were any electors there to participate in a vote. He had originally thought it would be great to avoid a vote by picking up LaSalle High School and Christ the King Church and then going to the Town Center. He was hoisted on his petard when he talked to Chief Kanzler. The Chief said it would not do any good because so many of the Town Center problems came directly from the north in the apartments. If the City was really talking about providing high quality public service, then it could not just annex the Town Center. In order to serve the Town Center, Milwaukie would also need to have responsibility for the apartments as well.

Mayor Bernard agreed that Chief Kanzler was absolutely right, but that did not mean someone who did not care about providing service across the street could not just do that.

Mr. Swanson said that was the dilemma. He thought it was about electors. To provide service to the Town Center, he had to be able to deal with the root of the problem. Even if it could be done without a vote, that did not follow through with what he said needed to be done. The City had to go after more property and risk losing a vote in order to follow the mission of service provision. It would be easy for someone else who was not as concerned to come in and grab the Town Center. That was his dilemma because he cannot provide the service because there was not enough value to provide the revenues for the services needed. There was a danger that Milwaukie could lose if someone wanted to annex that was not as concerned about the service provision aspect.

Mayor Bernard said Hwy 212 was a good example. There could be a cherry stem with very little population on Hwy 212. Happy Valley could vote to do that, and it did not have as large of a crime area. He did not know what could be provided for \$.67. That could happen, and no one could stop it. The Town Center could be the same way. He was meeting with Commissioner Martha Schrader next week, and he would like a copy of that letter to the County.

Mr. Parks did not believe there would be a situation in which a property could be annexed even without electors if the owner did not want to be annexed. He used the examples of Home Depot and Nike in Beaverton. He understood appropriate corporate officers would have to agree.

Councilor Stone asked for clarification that annexations to the east had to include the Town Center in order for it to be financially feasible for Milwaukie to provide services. If another jurisdiction annexed the Town Center but not the

area west of 82nd Avenue, then there would be a big pocket of mostly residential unincorporated area under County jurisdiction. Milwaukie would not be able to annex that area and provide services in terms of what the City would get back in revenue. Was it correct that it would cost too much to provide service without the Town Center?

Mr. Parks said that was not necessarily the case. He referred to the map with the negative cash flow areas in red and the positive cash flow areas in green. The green areas were the industrial areas that generated good property tax revenue, good franchise revenue through the use of utilities, and had low service needs. Areas 3, 6, and 7 generated a surplus. Area 4 was slightly positive, and area 5 was in the margin of error that revenues would be adequate without urban renewal. Area 4 was nothing but commercial. Area 5a had 3,800 residents as well as commercial, so a large amount of services were needed. One could look at 82nd Avenue to the west as another defining area that would probably balance to situation. He noted I-205 was a natural barrier, but 82nd Avenue was not.

Mr. Swanson thought the Town Center was important because it was the economic machine in that area. If one provided service to the Town Center, then that was seen as providing value and was part of the marketing campaign up and down 82nd Avenue.

Councilor Stone asked, as a follow up to Mayor Bernard's comments, if someone could pick and choose what they wanted to grab to produce revenue for their city and not take everything else. What if that happened and all that was left was the very poor unincorporated areas that still needed services. Could Milwaukie still annex that and be able to realistically provide services?

Mr. Swanson said Milwaukie could annex, but financially, it would not end up paying. The County Administrator said anyone that annexed had to look at eventually taking everything.

Councilor Stone would not want to see that happen. At some point, Milwaukie needed to have the Commissioners on its side in terms of looking at how it would benefit everyone in the region by making improvements and increasing property values.

Mayor Bernard understood the Commissioners could not stop it. He discussed levels of urban services. One of the biggest problems was that the County was providing urban levels of service, which removed the incentive for people to want to annex. The County cannot afford to do that. It needed to come to the realization and stop. The County was already talking about sewerage that area. What incentive would people have to annex? He thought the City should talk to the County about reducing levels of services in 195 to give people the incentive to become part of any city.

Councilor Stone agreed Milwaukie needed the Commissioners' buy in to do this successfully.

Paul DeMarco, Town Center, said with all due respect, Milwaukie did have an image problem that should not be underestimated. He had only lived in the area

for 7 years, and he was purposely steered away by the Town Center staff and his realtor from buying a house in Milwaukie. Whether the problem was real or imagined, Milwaukie needed a marketing effort.

Councilor Loomis agreed there might be a marketing problem, but a lot of the problems were not within the Milwaukie city limits.

Mr. DeMarco understood as the Town Center fights the same thing.

Mayor Bernard commented that a lot of people thought they lived in Milwaukie but did not.

Mr. Swanson said it important to remember there was an image problem and often times it was actively created because of the annexation issue. There were things that the City did that were not to its greatest benefit. It was different now, and that needed to be communicated outside. Mr. Kemper would probably say he would rather work with Milwaukie than the Portland Development Commission (PDC) because the City wanted to get things done. Bob's Red Mill would say the same thing. That was still in house; good things were happening. There was a great leadership structure on the Council and the Neighborhood Associations.

Mr. DeMarco asked if sales tax revenue factored in.

Mr. Parks said it did not; otherwise, it would be positive.

Mr. Swanson added that the County collected a hotel/motel tax that went to tourism development and the fair. A city may adopt its own ordinance to collect hotel/motel tax.

Councilor Loomis said at the last City Council meeting 2 new committees were brought up, and he hoped there would be further detailed discussion. He was concerned about staff time. Ms. Rouyer left because of her new family and the number of night meetings. A committee can take up to 25% of a staff person's time in preparing agendas and keeping everyone abreast of things.

Councilor Stone had not seen anything summarized about the goals, and she was still somewhat unclear about where those stood. She felt the City Council should discuss its goals more.

Mayor Bernard wanted further discussion on the communications agreement.

Councilor Collette understood many of the goals went to the Planning Commission.

Mayor Bernard thought these should be finished up over the next month. He had concerns similar to Councilor Loomis' and would not want to create a committee without an assignment. He discussed the feasibility of job shadowing.

Councilor Stone said the Traffic Safety Board had an ex officio student member from Milwaukie High School that provided reports from organizations like MADD and updated the Board on traffic safety issues related to the high school. The City Council might consider student members for its committees.

Councilor Loomis heard a comment about bringing youth into the appointed advisory board and perhaps on the neighborhood association level. That might be a way to involve youth so that additional staff time would not be required.

Councilor Collette was envisioning an all-volunteer type of project.

Councilor Loomis asked that a work session be scheduled to discuss these ideas.

Mayor Bernard adjourned the work session adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Pat DuVal

Pat DuVal, Recorder

AGENDA

MILWAUKIE CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION APRIL 19, 2005

MILWAUKIE CITY HALL

Second Floor Conference Room
10722 SE Main Street

WORK SESSION – 7:30 p.m. (time approximate)

A light dinner will be served.

Discussion Items:

	<u>Time</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Presenter</u>
1.	7:30 p.m.	Annexation Evaluation	Mike Swanson Andy Parks, Consultant
2.	8:30 p.m.	Adjourn	

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 preceding items.
- Executive Session: The Milwaukie City Council may go into Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660. 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.
- 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.