

MILWAUKIE CITY COUNCIL  
WORK SESSION  
APRIL 2, 2001

The work session came to order at 5:30 p.m. in the City Hall Conference Room.

City Council present: Council President King and Councilors Lancaster, Marshall, and Newman.

Staff present: City Manager Pro Tem Swanson, Assistant City Manager Bennett, Neighborhood Services Manager Gregory, and Program Specialist Wachs.

Information Sharing

1. Councilor Lancaster provided information on the upcoming Natural Step Conference on Sustainability.
2. Council agreed to schedule its retreat for May 19.

Government Education Series and Youth Involvement

**Wachs** reported on several locally available community leadership courses including those offered by the League of Oregon Cities and Chamber of Commerce. He found these to be rather broad and recommended staff develop an in-house education series designed for interested residents who want to learn about their city. The Neighborhood Association Leadership group is supportive of the concept and feels it might increase trust between citizens and local government. City departments reported they could gather necessary material in about one month. He sought Council direction on beginning the series of weekday classes in the fall and asked the level of elected official participation.

**Councilor Marshall** recommended offering the series more than once a year. The group discussed scheduling evening or weekend classes, and Wachs suggested taping the sessions for replay on the government channel as well.

**Councilor Marshall** suggested a scaled-down version of the earlier Land Use Committee training to temper some of the frustrations people feel when dealing with land use issues. He further recommended each department explain how it interfaces with the community.

**Councilor Lancaster** felt each department should relate how its activities accomplish the Community Goals.

**Council President King** thought training should include guidelines on how to access city departments directly, the city code and charter, and how the democratic process

works. She hoped once trained, people would act as point persons in their neighborhoods.

**Councilor Newman** felt new councilor orientation would be helpful and suggested highlighting the benefits of being an active Neighborhood District Association (NDA) participant.

**Councilor Marshall** recommended explaining "confusing jargon" in understandable terms.

**Council President King** thought any local business giving its employees time off to attend these classes should be publicly honored.

The group agreed a three-day education series should be held three times a year. The City Council directed staff to schedule the first session in early September.

**Wachs** has also been working with North Clackamas School to Careers staff to involve youth with neighborhood leaders. This type of preliminary work will help determine if a youth advisory council is needed.

**Councilor Newman** discussed the feasibility of a youth summit to determine if an actual board is needed.

**Council President King** volunteered to participate with the Milwaukie High School staff in program development.

The group discussed the Langford Team's success and agreed it is important to recognize the members for any ideas that are implemented.

### South Corridor Study Update

**Bennett** gave an overview of the South Corridor Study process. Metro is the lead agency and is partnering with the Cities of Milwaukie, Oregon City, and Portland, Clackamas County, Tri-Met, and Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT). Originally, 7 non-light rail alternatives were considered for high capacity transit options in the area. In December, the policy group narrowed the options to 3: busway, bus rapid transit (BRT), and high occupancy vehicle lanes (HOV). Light rail was added as a fourth option. She discussed potential advantages and disadvantages of each option.

The option of a new, less expensive light rail alignment between Portland and Milwaukie uses the Hawthorn Bridge and runs along Main Street. Finding a suitable stop that would support rather than negatively impact downtown Milwaukie businesses is a challenge. This option is estimated to cost about \$360 million and, with additional funding, either BRT or busway to Oregon City and the Clackamas Town Center could be added easily. Light rail is the most expensive of all options but has strong support for Portland neighborhoods.

**Gregory** gave a report on March 28 quarterly Neighborhood District Association (NDA) Leadership meeting at which attendees discussed the South Corridor Study. She noted David Aschenbrenner, Hector Campbell NDA chair and Corridor Study participant, provided a lot of input on the process. Peter Koonce, Ardenwald Chair, offered relevant technical information.

At the request of the NDA leadership, Gregory prepared a statement for the City Council. The first part of the discussion was venting at the way the Study unfolded. Next, the NDA group gave its opinions on the 4 options. These were: (1) HOV does nothing for Milwaukie; (2) busway is expensive and requires elevated structures; (3) BRT seems to be a short term fix; and (4) light rail will not be acceptable until its advocates are willing to do something for Milwaukie. The terms for accepting the light rail alternative include no light rail in the neighborhoods; no station community planning or social engineering; consider future connectivity; no Harmony/Linwood park-and-ride; and no station or bus transfer at Safeway.

The group also discussed what actions regional partners could take to make things better for Milwaukie such as McLoughlin Boulevard improvements and Southgate park-and-ride. Another idea was to have the light rail station at Southgate with an extension to the Jr. High site while continuing to explore circumferential rail to Lake Oswego and eventually Beaverton. Some participants want the City to purchase the Safeway property for development as the downtown catalyst project. Others want to maintain focus on the I-205 corridor and not unnecessarily move all of the traffic west. Gregory added the NDA leadership felt strongly about having a broader community discussion.

**Bennett** recommended dropping HOV and asked for direction on what to pursue with the 3 remaining options.

**Teresa Bresaw and Rob Kappa**, Lake Road NDA, supported the Neighborhood Leadership statement. They were in favor of revisiting the Southgate/Hanna site for parking, bus transit, and light rail station. The impact to the downtown would be too great because the Safeway site is too small. There is no support light rail in residential areas.

**Dave Aschenbrenner**, Hector Campbell NDA, urged all the parties to stop bickering and work together on the issues. He was in favor of moving the regional transit center to Southgate because of the connectivity to Hwy 224, McLoughlin Boulevard, and downtown. A limited bus station at the Jr. High site is feasible. In response to earlier comments, Metro staff was clear in trying to direct the working groups away from light rail during the study. He was a member of the Milwaukie - Clackamas Town Center group, and its final comments only had to do with cost comparisons between bus and light rail. Busways with dedicated lanes could be used in a limited fashion.

**Councilor Newman** asked, for clarification, how Clackamas County's plan of elevated busways was generally accepted.

**Aschenbrenner** said people questioned elevating the busway except in the most congested areas.

**Bennett** explained station siting does not take place until the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS).

**Aschenbrenner** believed the regional hub should be on a sufficiently large site to support a parking structure as well as allow for growth. He discussed circumferential rail and connectivity to Lake Oswego via the old railroad bridge. The Jr. High site would offer connectivity.

**Councilor Newman** summarized: people would prefer transfers north of Safeway with light rail continuing to the Jr. High site for the southern terminus.

**Bennett** said staff recommends identifying and telling the regional partners what the potential community impacts are.

**Councilor Newman** was interested in the idea of the regional partners buying the Jr. High property for a light rail station and donating the remainder to the City.

**Zumwalt** said \$15 million has been spent on getting light rail into Milwaukie. Regional partners need Milwaukie as the hub, so they should pay for it.

**Aschenbrenner** was willing to spend time on this project to bring collaboration and trust back into the community. Safeway is too small, and he recommended a focused regional center that could be expanded.

**Donald Hammang**, Hector Campbell NDA and Planning Commissioner, said revitalizing Milwaukie's north industrial area has been a concern for many years, and he felt Tri-Met and Metro could help. Milwaukie never asks for enough, and he urged getting something with a definable benefit to the City. He is concerned about including the Jr. High site in transit planning. Safeway, in reality, is too small.

**Tracy Cook**, Linwood NDA and Planning Commission Chair, added people have spoken eloquently about impacts to the Masonic Lodge and Ledding Library. She supported focusing transit efforts on the north end of Milwaukie.

**Kappa** expressed concerns with creeks, the riverfront, and water quality. He encouraged the City Council and NDA leadership to have conversations with SE Uplift. All the residents he contacted unanimously supported the NDA leadership's recommendations.

**Councilor Marshall** commented it sounds as if people want Tri-Met and Metro to buy off Milwaukie. How will the alternative proposals help redevelop downtown Milwaukie? At one time, the community did accept light rail until it was shoved into the

neighborhoods. Light rail will have to be sold to the community with assurances plans will not change.

**Councilor Lancaster** said regional partners need to compensate Milwaukie for its sacrifices. Other agencies will have to talk to the City not work around it.

**Bennett** said staff needs direction on all of the alternatives. Milwaukie should have a strong position on all of the modes as they advance through the process.

**Aschenbrenner** added a Southgate regional hub works with each of the alternatives.

**Councilor Newman** noted Milwaukie has a reputation for knowing what it does not want but not what it does want. This project should be done on Milwaukie's terms. He was confident the community could solve the problems, and each point should clearly reflect what Milwaukie wants to see happen. The City should be concerned about both the unoccupied industrial land as well as the downtown. At the end of the day, he wants to ensure an excellent connection to downtown.

**Bennett** urged resisting the temptation to look only at Southgate because there are other sites.

**Aschenbrenner** said the main regional hub needs to be north.

**Council President King** pointed out that Gresham did not want light rail in its downtown and suffered for that decision.

The group commented on all the options:

1. HOV -- No.
2. Busway -- concerned with blight of elevated structures and ramps going into neighborhoods; concerns with noise and exhaust; if region is willing to spend that much money, support light rail.
3. Park-and-ride -- explore K-Mart location; adamantly against Harmony/Linwood site.
4. BRT -- additional bus impacts would have to be mitigated; no bypass lanes in Milwaukie that would widen streets; concerned that pedestrians would not be able to cross Hwy 224 at Oak; least expensive option, but question if this option really accomplishes anything long-term; want dedicated route so buses do not get stuck in traffic; might give leverage to underground pedestrian crossing to riverfront. BRT is not the total answer but supports other solutions.

**Zumwalt** thought Metro should just forget the public outreach and get down to business.

**Bennett** suggested getting transfers out of downtown Milwaukie and pushing them to Tacoma. Make sure there is adequate parking so it does not spill over into the neighborhoods. Make all possible connections, but make it clear the high capacity route is not between the Clackamas Town Center and Milwaukie.

The group discussed people coming from Damascus and Happy Valley to work downtown. There are other options than bringing these commuters into Milwaukie. Councilors were unanimous that light rail should not go through neighborhoods, and they will demand mitigation for any impacts. Council President King had concerns about Johnson Creek Boulevard.

The group discussed parking structures, pass through traffic, and Milwaukie's willingness to absorb a second parking structure when Tacoma, if that site is selected, is full.

**Bennett** asked if Council wanted to look at the Jr. High site as a transit center option. Is light rail contingent upon a Jr. High stop.

**Councilor Newman** did not believe bus transit was compatible with the Jr. High and felt light rail was the only option for a stop at that site.

**Swanson** suggested there were linkages between light rail and the Jr. High site that could be explored. The group discussed a terminus at that location and link to commuter rail. They believed the transit station should be moved north.

**Councilor Lancaster** said it is important to make it clear there have been no reasonable proposals.

**Council President King** wants to express a willingness to be at the table to discussion the options.

**Councilor Marshall** wants the City Council to meet with the NDA leadership at its next quarterly if not before.

### Adjournment

**It was moved by Councilor Marshall and seconded by Councilor Newman to adjourn the meeting. Motion passed unanimously.**

The work session ended at 7:45 p.m.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Pat DuVal, Recorder



To: Council President and City Council

From: Pat DuVal, City Recorder *Pat*

Subject: April 3, 2001 Council Agenda Item VI.B -- Sprinkler Ordinance

Date: March 27, 2001

Please replace packet page VI.B.3 with the attached. City Attorney Firestone advised staff this is not a code amendment that requires a public hearing as stated in the body of the ordinance originally provided. No other sections of the proposed ordinance have been revised.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

ORDINANCE NO. \_\_\_\_\_

**AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF MILWAUKIE APPROVING A LOCAL AMENDMENT TO THE STATE UNIFORM BUILDING CODE TO REQUIRE AUTOMATIC SPRINKLER SYSTEMS IN ALL MULTI-FAMILY OCCUPANCIES OVER ONE STORY IN HEIGHT.**

**WHEREAS**, the City of Milwaukie is within the territorial boundaries of Clackamas County Fire District 1, A Fire Protection District, (herein "District"); and

**WHEREAS**, the District has requested that the City approve the local amendment to the State of Oregon State Structural Specialty Code ("Uniform Building Code") that requires automatic sprinkler systems in all multi-family occupancies over one story in height, which amendment is set forth in the Uniform Building Code, Appendix Chapter 9, Division III; and

**WHEREAS**, the District has presented substantial evidence in support of the local amendment, including testimony regarding multiple-death fires in multi-family occupancies over one story in height; and

**WHEREAS**, the District desires the local amendment to the Uniform Building Code pursuant to the local amendment process permitted under ORS 455.040; and

**WHEREAS**, based upon the testimony, the Council finds that public safety will be best served by approving the local amendment of the Uniform Building Code as requested; now, therefore,

**THE CITY OF MILWAUKIE ORDAINS AS FOLLOWS:**

Section 1: The City hereby approves Appendix Chapter 9, Division III of the Uniform Building Code, as a local amendment to the Uniform Building Code, a copy of which is attached as "Exhibit A".

Read the first time on \_\_\_\_\_ and moved to second reading by \_\_\_\_\_ vote of the City Council.

Read for the second time and adopted by the City Council on \_\_\_\_\_.  
Signed by the Council President on \_\_\_\_\_.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mary King, Council President

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:  
Ramis, Crew, Corrigan & Bachrach, LLP

\_\_\_\_\_  
Pat DuVal, City Recorder

\_\_\_\_\_  
City Attorney

**CITY OF MILWAUKIE  
CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION AGENDA  
APRIL 2, 2001**

**MILWAUKIE CITY HALL**

Second Floor Conference Room  
10722 SE Main Street

***WORK SESSION – 5:30 p.m.***

Discussion Items:

	<u>Time</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Presenter</u>
1.	5:30 p.m.	Dinner and Information Sharing	Group
2.	6:00 p.m.	Government Education Series and Youth Involvement	Jason Wachs
3.	6:30 p.m.	South Corridor Study Update	Martha Bennett Michelle Gregory
4.	7:30 p.m.	Adjourn	

***The Council may vote in work session on non-legislative issues.***

***The time listed for each discussion item is an estimate only. The actual time at which an item is considered depends upon the actual time devoted to each item.***

*At the end of the work session, the Council may hold an Executive Session under the authority of Oregon Revised Statutes 192.660 as needed.*

*For assistance/service per the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)  
dial TDD 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 Pro Tem *MS*  
Michelle Gregory, Neighborhood Services Manager

From: Jason Wachs, Program Specialist *JW*

Subject: City Government Education Series

Date: March 23, 2001

### **Action Requested**

Council direction on a City Government Education Series proposed at the February 5, 2001 City Council Work Session, which is discussed and refined below.

### **Background**

**Update on Council request that we look into Available Leadership Courses:** Leadership Courses that are available to Milwaukie citizens, staff, and elected officials include classes taught by the North Clackamas Chamber of Commerce, League of Oregon Cities, and the Ken Blanchard Company.

The **North Clackamas Chamber of Commerce** offers an 8-month leadership course from October through May, which participants attend once per month. Field trips are taken all around the region and a few of the monthly topics for this year included Human Resources, Social Services, Government (took field trip to State Capital), Economic Development, and "Future Day." Tuition is \$495 and a committee coordinates the curriculum and schedules speakers from around the region. This leadership course could be valuable in learning about Clackamas County and State Government, but may not be specific enough for Milwaukie residents who want to learn about local government.

The **League of Oregon Cities** recently implemented a Local Governance Institute Series. Beginning in March 2001, the League will begin its first annual training series on Governing Body Leadership. *Adventures in Governing* will be the theme. Topics will include what can and can not be done in the eyes of the

law, how to manage citizen involvement, etc. The workshops are either one or two days and the closest one to Milwaukie will take place on April 27, 28 2001 at the Beaverton City Library.

The **Ken Blanchard Company** offers Situational Leadership Courses that help employees set goals, negotiate for the support they need from their bosses to achieve those goals, and manage relationships more effectively. A four-day public or in-house training for trainers program is available. Southeast Uplift in Portland has utilized these classes for its employees in the past and feels that they are well done and very informative. While these classes could be helpful to City of Milwaukie employees, it would probably not be very applicable to residents in learning about local government.

The Leadership courses already available in the region could be very effective in providing a baseline of knowledge about leadership, but would not provide in depth knowledge about the cross departmental cooperation and the structure of governance that exists in Milwaukie.

#### **Structuring an Internal City Government Education Series:**

The structure of a City Government Education Series in Milwaukie could result in the following classes. Each class would be taught on location by each department who would also provide material for a combined notebook that would be provided to each participant. Neighborhood Services could assemble the notebook initially and then this duty could be handled yearly by an Education Series Committee made up of city staff from various departments.

Similar Government Education Series, including the CARES Program in Martin County Florida, discussed at the February 5<sup>th</sup> Work Session, conduct the classes during the regular working week (Monday – Friday) between the hours of 9 AM and 5 PM. Presenting the classes at this time has both advantages and disadvantages:

#### **Advantages:**

- ◆ Staff are available during these hours to present their information without coming to work during off-hours thereby avoiding overtime or comp time.
- ◆ Class participants get a real time experience because they are able to view the City “in action” as it functions during the working week. Many departments are closed on the weekend or at night, which would detract from this real time experience.
- ◆ Participants with children may be able to provide childcare easier during the week because they may already be providing it during these hours.

#### **Disadvantages:**

- ◆ Class participants may have more difficulty attending.

Providing the classes during regular business hours has not hindered participation in the CARES Program in Martin County. If this is true for Milwaukie the advantages outweigh the disadvantages greatly. It's also possible that some employers would honor this time off as a valuable community service. The proposed structure below recommends that the classes be held during regular business hours, though it could be adjusted to evening or weekends if Council preferred. Each department bulleted below would have a total of one half hour to give their presentations, which could include 15 minutes for the presentation and 15 minutes to answer questions. If longer sessions were necessary we'd need to extend the course to three dates.

**Session #1 (Location – City Hall)  
1<sup>st</sup> Thursday – 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM**

**Introduction and Overview (9:00 AM – 10:30 AM)**

- ◆ Welcome to all participants from the staff coordinating the series
- ◆ City History – (Could be given by Milwaukie Historical Society Representative)
- ◆ Team building exercise to acquaint the participants with one another.
  - ◆ Could include a discussion of each participant's history with respect to Milwaukie, their current role as a citizen, staff person, or elected official, why each decided to enroll in the course, and what each expected to get out of the course. Participants thereby know something about one another and begin to build trust in one another.

**Elected and Appointed Officials (10:30 AM – 11:30 AM)**

- ◆ Mayor and/or Council as guest lecturer
- ◆ Board and Commission Member as guest lecturer

**11:30 AM – 12:30 PM Lunch (Provided by City of Milwaukie on Location)**

**Management and Administration (12:30 PM – 4:00 PM)**

- ◆ City Manager's Office & City Attorney
- ◆ Records Information Management (RIM)
- ◆ Finance and Budget
- ◆ Municipal Court
- ◆ Human Resources & Public Employee Union

**Community Services (4:00 PM – 5:30 PM)**

- ◆ Library
- ◆ Program Services
- ◆ Neighborhood Services

**Session #2 (Location - Johnson Creek Boulevard)  
2<sup>nd</sup> Thursday – 9:00 AM to 6:30 PM**

**Community Development (9:00 AM – 11:00 AM)**

- ◆ Planning
- ◆ Building
- ◆ Fleet/Facilities
- ◆ Storm/Sewer

**11:00 AM – 12:00 PM Lunch (Provided by City of Milwaukie on Location)**

**Community Development (Continued) (12:00 PM – 2:00 PM)**

- ◆ Streets
- ◆ Right of way maintenance
- ◆ Water
- ◆ Engineering

**2:00 PM – 2:30 PM – Relocate to the Public Safety Building**

**(Location – Public Safety Building) 2:30 PM – 4:30 PM**

- ◆ Police Services
- ◆ 911 Dispatch Service
- ◆ Information Systems
- ◆ Fire – Clackamas Fire District No. 1

**Concluding Discussion (4:30 PM – 6:30 PM)**

- ◆ Feedback and Evaluation about the series
  - ◆ Could include a short written survey
- ◆ An open forum for participants to ask final questions and discuss what they have learned
  - ◆ Information would be disseminated concerning regionally offered leadership courses.

**Consistency in the Presentations:**

The presentations by each department may be most effective if they each provide the same baseline of information, while allowing opportunity for each department to enhance on this fundamental information. A template could include:

- ◆ Departmental Mission including present and future goals
- ◆ Structure of the organization and relationships between departments
- ◆ Staff size, budget, major projects, ongoing responsibilities, and challenges
- ◆ How the department supports the rest of the organization and the public
- ◆ How the department may relate to regional entities such as Metro, Tri-Met, Clackamas County, or other service providers

- ◆ A Tour of the department's facilities
- ◆ In some cases, a tour of the community

The department heads could be the most appropriate persons to coordinate the presentations. The department heads are most appropriate because they delegate responsibility, coordinate with other departments and manage the budget, projects and workloads. Management and line staff would probably actually share the presentation responsibility. Line staff are directly involved in the day to day functions of each department, which is important to portray at the presentations. Management could insure that all portions of the department are represented and the bigger picture is conveyed.

**Graduation at a City Council Regular Meeting Session:**

The first available regular City Council Meeting after Session #2 could be used to present each graduate of the series with a diploma and official recognition from City Council of the accomplishment.

Alternatively, Council could meet more informally at a work session with recent graduates to hear their impressions.

**Promoting the Series:**

Implementation of the series could potentially begin in the Fall of 2001 after summer has ended and people are generally not taking as much vacation time. Recruiting could take many forms and include:

- ◆ Mailings and phone correspondence with employers in Milwaukie
- ◆ Mention of it in the City newsletter on an ongoing basis
- ◆ Neighborhood Association Meetings and events
- ◆ Correspondence with interested teachers at Milwaukie High School to involve students
- ◆ Informing all staff, elected officials, and appointed officials that it is available to them

Other avenues to promote the series would be sought on a continuous basis and key contact people could be recognized to answer questions should they arise.

**Concurrence**

There was discussion at the February 5, 2001 Work Session about finding avenues to combine Youth Development with a City Government Education Series. Once the series is up and running involving youth could be as simple as finding some to participate. The classes should be structured from the beginning to be very descriptive and informative, while leaving out confusing jargon. The presentations should be tailored to people who know nothing about local government and no assumptions should be made as to the level of knowledge of the participants. Structuring the series in this manner would enable High School

Students to participate in the series alongside other citizens, City Staff, and elected officials. High school students could gain much from such interaction, which would elevate the value of the series even further. A Political Science teacher at Milwaukie High School, has expressed interest in involving his students in local government and this would be an excellent opportunity for him to do so. Other partnerships with interested teachers who are willing to give credit to students for participating in the classes will be consistently sought.

### **Fiscal and Work Load Impacts**

#### **Regionally Offered Leadership Courses:**

The leadership courses previously mentioned could be valuable for city employees. Departments already attend training sessions and workshops when they come up around the region, which are paid for through funds allocated to Education and Training. These courses could be taken as part of this Education and Training. Elected and appointed officials could also benefit from such education, especially newly elected officials. An allocation from the city budget could be earmarked for such training if it were determined to be worthwhile.

#### **Structuring an Internal City Government Education Series:**

The fiscal impacts to implement an education series internally could be significant up front. Once all departments bought into the process and developed materials the cost would diminish rapidly. Each department would need to spend time preparing the information it would contribute to the notebook, preparing the presentation material for the classes, and presenting the information at the classes. Once this was established it could all be repeated from year to year with minor modifications in order to remain current and accurate. The classes could also be videotaped in order to capture the content and allow a record to be kept so that updates and changes could be made accordingly.

Another expense is the provision of lunch at the Sessions. Providing lunch is a relatively inexpensive way to entice people to participate and it provides a forum for the participants to meet and interact with one another. Having lunch hosted by local businesses could also be explored as a way to add another perspective to the course.


### **Alternatives**


The alternative to implementing a City Government Education Series in Milwaukie is to continue to provide such education on an as needed basis. This includes education and consultation from City Staff at Neighborhood District Association meetings, information contained within the Pilot, and the case by case open line of communication between City Staff and citizens on particular projects and issues.

Educating the citizenry about Milwaukie's governmental structure will continue in an ad hoc manner whether or not an Education Series is implemented. The Education Series would provide a more proactive means of educating the public, which could be its most valuable feature.



To: Mayor and City Council

Through: Mike Swanson, City Manager Pro Tem 

From: Martha Bennett, Assistant City Manager 

Subject: South Corridor Transportation Alternatives Study

Date: March 19, 2001 for April 2, 2001 City Council Work Session

#### Action Requested

Council discussion of the issues that need to be resolved for Milwaukie to be supportive of any of the current South Corridor Transportation Alternatives Study Options.

#### Background

The South Corridor Study began in July 1999 as a way to look at non-rail high capacity transit options for this area of the metropolitan region as a result of the defeat of the funding measure for South/North light rail. Metro is the lead agency for this study, and six agencies are partners in the study, including the City of Milwaukie, City of Oregon City, City of Portland, Clackamas County, Tri-Met and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT).

This study initially examined seven non-light rail options:

- High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes (HOV)
- High Occupancy Toll Lanes (HOT)
- Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)
- Busway
- River Transit
- Radial Commuter Rail (from Oregon City to OMSI)
- Circumferential Commuter Rail (from Beaverton to Milwaukie)

In December, the Policy Group guiding this study recommended that the following options receive further study:

- Busway
- Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)
- High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes (HOV)
- Light Rail Transit from Portland to Milwaukie only.

Light rail was added to the study at the request of the City of Portland because of a large number of requests from Southeast Portland neighbors that the region look at a lower cost alternative as was done with Interstate Max. The City of Milwaukie supported Busway, BRT, and HOV north of Milwaukie for further refinement. Council also stated that if Light Rail were to be studied, then it could not go further than downtown, could not impact neighborhoods, could not result in social engineering or intensification of land uses.

#### *Burton Memo*

After the December 2000 Policy Group meeting, Metro Executive Officer Mike Burton sent a memo to Metro's Transportation Planning Staff indicating that Metro would not consider extending light rail to any jurisdiction that was opposed to it. He asked for an expression of Milwaukie's desire to study light rail to our downtown. This likely means that we need to indicate whether we support further consideration of light rail before the next "narrowing" step.

#### *Refinements*

Since the Policy Group meeting, Metro staff have been refining each of the four alternatives that are still under consideration. They have produced additional data about each of the options, and they have evaluated the technical feasibility of HOV lanes and different alignments for both light rail and the busway. The purpose of this refinement work is to allow the Policy Group to select the options that should proceed into the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Only alternatives that truly seem viable should be considered in the DEIS because this work is expensive and complicated.

#### Staff Recommendation

Attached to this email is a matrix describing the costs and benefits of each of the four alternatives. Staff recommends that the City of Milwaukie develop a negotiating position of each of the alternatives that are still a portion of the South Corridor Study. Staff requests that Council review and discuss the four options and give direction on:

1. Whether any alternatives be dropped. Staff recommends that High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes be dropped because of their impact on Milwaukie.
2. What issues need to be resolved for any of the alternatives Milwaukie wants to move forward.

#### Concurrence

Staff from Community Development, Neighborhood Services, Engineering, and Planning have been involved in reviewing the Evaluation Report from Metro.

#### Fiscal Impact

The next step in the study will be a draft environmental impact statement on the options that are included by the Policy Group. This will have fiscal impact due to staff and consulting time.

Alternative	Corridor Riders Projected	Cost Estimate	Advantages	Disadvantages	Impact Issues
Bus Rapid Transit	91,600	\$77.5 million in 2006	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Least expensive</li> <li>2. Lowest capital impact</li> <li>3. Would not prevent a different alternative from being developed in the future</li> <li>4. Most flexible - bus mounted technology, signal prioritization and routes can be reassigned to accommodate changes in traffic patterns.</li> <li>5. Very efficient – carries a lot of riders at a low cost per new rider.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Not as rapid or reliable as other options because it's confined to mixed traffic.</li> <li>2. Signal priority will require "cue by-pass lanes" which will widen some intersections. Design may conflict with our efforts to create a more pedestrian-friendly environment along McLoughlin and parts of highway 224.</li> <li>3. Not as 'long term' a solution as some of the more capital-intensive options.</li> <li>4. Will generate additional bus traffic into Milwaukie Transit Center.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Need to mitigate the impacts of additional bus traffic into the Milwaukie Transit Center (air pollution and noise mostly).</li> <li>2. Need to secure significant street and intersection improvements in downtown Milwaukie.</li> <li>3. Queue by-pass lanes along McLoughlin (boulevard section) would not work with our "boulevard" design.</li> <li>4. It may also increase the need for pedestrian underpass construction to the Riverfront.</li> <li>5. Pedestrian crossing concerns on Highway 224 at Harrison, Oak, and 37<sup>th</sup> would also have to be addressed.</li> </ol>
HOV	92,000	\$231 million in 2006	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fairly rapid (third fastest)</li> <li>2. Adds auto capacity</li> <li>3. Significantly improves automobile travel time</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Adds auto capacity. Creates more pass through auto traffic in Milwaukie.</li> <li>2. Widens 224 and McLoughlin.</li> <li>3. Requires construction of jug handles, which take up a great deal of land and result in a large number of displacements.</li> <li>4. Poor access for Milwaukie transit riders, since there are no stops on Highway 224.</li> <li>5. Serious impacts on several Milwaukie neighborhoods, particularly 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Penzance.</li> <li>6. No political support from Portland. Minimal support in Milwaukie.</li> <li>7. Increases impervious surface in Milwaukie, creating drainage and run-off problems.</li> </ol>	Staff recommends that Council oppose this alternative because the environmental and traffic impacts for Milwaukie exceed the benefits of added road capacity for the region. This option would exacerbate Milwaukie's role as a pass through community.

<p><b>Busway</b></p>	<p>93,500</p>	<p>\$351 million in 2006  Cost is \$259 million in 2006 without the new bus only bridge.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Could be seamless between CTC and Portland.</li> <li>2. Very rapid travel times, second only to Light Rail.</li> <li>3. Separated right of way means that it is highly reliable.</li> <li>4. Buses retain flexibility that is not there with rail - constrained alternative.</li> <li>5. Innovative approach.</li> <li>6. Strong support from Clackamas County.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Requires new ramps in north part of downtown onto Highway 224.</li> <li>2. The "full" busway as envisioned by Clackamas County requires elevated structure between Harrison Street and 37<sup>th</sup>. Large increase in the number of buses through the Milwaukie Transit Center (although 1/2 of east-bound buses would skip Milwaukie).</li> <li>3. Opposed by Portland neighborhoods.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No elevated structure through Milwaukie. This will require that there be a mixed busway BRT project along Highway 224.</li> <li>2. Must construct north ramps onto Highway 224 to avoid the impact of bus trips on Harrison Street.</li> <li>3. Must mitigate additional air pollution and noise pollution from increased volume of buses on downtown, Ledding Library, Scott Park, &amp; Masonic Temple.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Light Rail</b></p>	<p>92,400</p>	<p>\$360 million in FY 2006  Cost rises to \$413 million with BRT to Oregon City and Clackamas Regional Center.  Cost rises to \$505 million with Busway to Clackamas Regional Center and BRT to Oregon City.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rapid travel times between Milwaukie and Portland. This is the fastest of all of the alternatives.</li> <li>2. Cost is competitive with busway.</li> <li>3. Least impact on air quality.</li> <li>4. Greatest potential to stimulate private investment in the Milwaukie Town Center.</li> <li>5. Fewer buses through downtown Milwaukie than either busway or BRT.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. High volume of transfers (Currently 5,000 per day. With LRT, would be approximately 15,000 per day).</li> <li>2. Finding a suitable location for a stop that also serves as a transfer center in the downtown core is difficult. The old loop is unacceptable.</li> <li>3. History of political opposition on Milwaukie and Clackamas County.</li> <li>4. Actual alignment is as yet unclear. Proposed alignment along Main Street has problems because of the transfers into the Transit Center and because of the impact on businesses on Main Street.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Need to make sure a large percentage of transfers to bus take place at Tacoma station. Should not accept more than 9,000 transfers per day at Milwaukie Transit Center.</li> <li>2. Opportunity to discuss location of Milwaukie Transit Center.</li> <li>3. Don't need "renegade" park and ride problems. Need a park and ride structure. Opportunity for shared use parking garage would compliment downtown retail needs.</li> <li>4. Opportunity to secure public improvements in the downtown (sidewalks, intersections etc).</li> <li>5. Would we request that LRT never be extended from Milwaukie to CTC? Perhaps only if new ramps built along 224?</li> <li>6. Potential traffic for historic Milwaukie, Lake Road, and Island Station neighborhoods should be prevented and mitigated.</li> <li>7. No requirements for changes in land use intensity (e.g., station communities.)</li> <li>8. Possibly request elimination of consideration of Linwood/Harmony park and ride.</li> </ol>