

MILWAUKIE CITY COUNCIL
WORK SESSION
APRIL 16, 2001

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

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

Staff present: City Manager Pro Tem Swanson, Assistant City Manager Bennett, Planning Director Rouyer, Neighborhood Services Manager Gregory, Associate Planner Gessner, Program Specialist Herrigel, and Associate Engineer Barnett.

Information Sharing

1. **Mayor Bernard** discussed Council meeting procedure, and members agreed to address each other by title and last name at regular and work sessions. He intends to begin each regular session with a quotation. **Councilor Marshall** suggested inviting civic groups to lead the Pledge of Allegiance. The group discussed Robert's Rules of Order training.
2. **Councilor King** announced Feed the Hungry dates are July 1 and November 4.
3. **Councilor Newman** and **Herrigel** announced the Springwater Corridor Cleanup Project on April 21.
4. **Herrigel** announced Milwaukie Down-to-Earth day on May 19 and other upcoming neighborhood cleanup efforts. Council directed she move forward on the "Tree Hugger Photo Contest". The deadline for entries is May 31, and Council will award the prizes at its next meeting.

Open Public Forum

Ed Zumwalt said the Historic Milwaukie Neighborhood supports a proactive approach to the South Corridor Study as well as the "14 points" developed at the recent Neighborhood District Association (NDA) leadership meeting. He was concerned about keeping station community planning and "new urbanism" under control in the future. People feel it is time to do something and take a firm stand. Most people are do not feel light rail can be stopped, so it is important the community gets what it wants.

Swanson recommended putting everything in writing, and, if there is an agreement, make sure all parties sign off on it. Someone must have the will to enforce. He further recommended one master file of record copies of significant documents.

Councilor Marshall made it clear no entity has been tougher on Metro than Milwaukie.

Dick Jones, 3205 SE Vineyard, Oak Grove. He does not believe there is a significant problem with travel time into downtown Portland, but it has increased dramatically on I-205. Population increases have a direct impact on the number of service and delivery vehicles on our roads. High occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes will serve all transportation modes. He does not support light rail.

Scott Cook, Masonic Lodge, Milwaukie. He supports neighborhood recommendations and moving the transit center from the Safeway property. The Lodge is interested in acquiring some of the property for parking and other constructive uses.

Eugene Schoenheit, Oak Grove resident. Oak Grove does not support light rail.

Lewelling School Trip Safety Program Report

Barnett provided a copy of the draft Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) which includes Logus Road Safety Improvement recommendations. The task force assigned to complete the study recommends emphasis on safety education. The area is well served by a walking network that needs to be maintained and free of obstructions.

Logus Road is 18 - 20 feet wide with no sidewalks, so students who do walk to school have a limited walking area and tend to straggle in the street. Tri-Met buses on Logus take up more than half the street. The task force also recommends exploring the feasibility of no-parking on the south side of Logus Road during school hours, installing signs, clearing obstructions from the right-of-way, and constructing a path or sidewalk on the south side of the street between 43rd and Stanley Avenues.

Art Ball, Lewelling Neighborhood District Association (NDA) chair and task force member, said, in addition to Logus Road being very narrow and little improved, the neighbors have encroached on the right-of-way with mailboxes and hedges. The right-of-way is generally 30 feet, but only 18 - 20 feet are paved. Logus Road is not pedestrian friendly and is unsafe. He does not agree with the Traffic Safety Board's recommendation for a gravel path over constructing a paved sidewalk. In addition to 19 Tri-Met buses, there are over 1,000 cars per day and numerous school buses using Logus Road. He did not believe emphasizing the path network would meet the needs.

Barnett said the Traffic Safety Board recognizes the rural flavor of Logus Road and is concerned a sidewalk so close to the street creates a false sense of security. The existing path network functions well, and the education element can be reinforced.

Councilor Newman said people naturally want to reach their destinations as quickly as possible, so the city should plan for them to do this as safely as possible.

Bennett explained Logus Road is an old county road and does not have a base, so reconstruction costs would be high. She anticipated opposition from Logus Road residents accustomed to a certain lifestyle.

Councilor Marshall felt there could be one sidewalk on the south side of the street. He considered the Board's recommendation erroneous and narrow minded. There are a lot of walkers in the area other than students.

Barnett said a sidewalk on one side of the street would cost about \$250,000, and full construction is estimated at approximately \$1.6 million.

Ball added the NDA, Lewelling PTO, and appointed advisory board recommend a sidewalk. He suggested trying to find grant money.

Councilor Newman discussed a current bill before the legislature to move some ODOT money into school travel route improvements from hazardous roads funds.

Ball was not opposed to doing a sidewalk project in segments starting with the area between 49th Avenue and Stanley Avenue. The NDA has not discussed the option of forming a local improvement district. Some residents are opposed to doing anything because of their landscaping but did not attend any meetings.

Barnett, responding to a question from Councilor Lancaster, said he was not aware of any pedestrian/vehicular accidents on Logus Road . He noted there was little response to outreach efforts.

The Council generally agreed to support the 8 recommendations proposed by the Lewelling School Trip Safety Task Force.

Councilor Lancaster suggested looking to the School District as a partner.

Transportation System Plan Implementation Project

Gessner updated the group on the implementation project and issues relating to traffic impact analysis requirements. One of the issues is determining what role performance measures play in land use application decisions. Staff recommends using performance measures over denial or approval criteria. Performance measures, such as level of service and volume to capacity, are more objective and probably stand up to legal review.

Level of service, in traffic engineering terms, is the measure of delay at an intersection. The peak hour standards for regional roads is "F" and "E" for local streets. Gessner described the model land use application and traffic impact analysis regulations. If an analysis is required and impacts are identified, the Planning Commission or City Council will have to determine what mitigation will need to take place. From this, there will have to be a policy decision on whether the performance measure should be an approval criterion or an indicator of existing conditions.

The next issue is what triggers a traffic impact study requirement. Staff recommends a scoping process that does not overburden the applicant yet is sensitive to residential areas, site specific conditions, and trips generated. The process must consider SDCs, the School Trip Safety Program, and the Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan.

The final issue, is whether the planning director should continue to decide commercial applications in a commercial district "by right." The Planning Commission supports this existing authority but recommends increasing the notification area from 150 feet to 300 feet in order to expand the opportunities for public comment.

Gessner said the Planning Commission reviewed and approved the proposals to date, and the NDA leadership made comments at its March meeting.

Councilor Newman wants assurances the triggers initiating a study are objective and that studies will be done. He was also concerned there be an appeal process.

Rouyer discussed the notice area recommendation, and said staff would provide some examples.

Councilor Lancaster thought trips per day impact should be ranked highly.

Councilor Marshall did not feel the community should accept a service level "F". There should be nothing more congested than "D" if the city wants to maintain its quality of life standards.

Councilor King was concerned "raising the bar" like that would force the city into building more streets.

Bennett cautioned the Council against creating a moratorium because the legal ramifications can be severe.

Gessner will offer mitigation options at a future work session.

The Council discussed the recommended options. **Councilor Lancaster** thought, in an effort to streamline government, the Planning Director should handle applications up to a established level. **Councilor King** did not want to short cut the public process. **Councilor Marshall** understood there would be established thresholds triggering certain actions.

The City Council generally supported the recommended options in the Transportation System Plan Implementation.

Washington Street House Update

Rouyer reported Richard Peterson applied for a moving application to meet the School District's May 1 deadline. The house will be temporarily stored at 21st Avenue and Lake

Road while Peterson considers his options. The building official is working on security questions.

South Corridor Update

Bennett and Gregory provided updates on the South Corridor Study and Milwaukie transit center issues. Material included an updated matrix outlining Council's position on each of the four remaining transit options under study, a draft action plan, and draft letter from Mayor Bernard to Metro Presiding Officer Bragdon and Executive Director Burton. **Bennett** reviewed Council direction on the four transit options under consideration: light rail, bus rapid transit (BRT), busway, and high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes.

Councilor Marshall referred to the light rail alternative and recommended deleting the condition of support relating to the downtown station and bus transfers on the Jr. High site. He felt the north Milwaukie industrial area needed to be on the table.

Councilor Lancaster felt it should be expressed this is the only acceptable location for light rail in downtown Milwaukie.

Councilor Newman felt the Jr. High site should be emphasized as the central location.

Gregory suggested language to the effect that the location for local service provision, whether it is light rail or another mode, should focus on the Jr. High site.

Bennett reviewed the matrix on the other 3 alternatives, and Council members agreed it captured their comments.

Gregory discussed the draft action plan. Part 1 of the plan is a series of small meetings with Metro, Tri-Met, North Clackamas School District, and City of Portland. Milwaukie will send a small delegation of 2 Council members and 2 interested neighborhood volunteers. Staff will schedule a joint session of the City Council and Clackamas County Board of Commissioners. These should take place before the South Corridor Study Policy Group meets on May 7.

Swanson added it is important to present a consistent and focussed community message. The goal is to accomplish this by May 7 to make sure Milwaukie puts forth a unified, powerful position in the Study.

Staff recommends a design workshop on options for a light rail alignment with a Jr. High station and a regionally-focused transit center either north or south of the downtown area. The proposal includes all South Corridor agency representatives in the workshop with Milwaukie taking the lead.

The Council agreed to this phase of the action plan with staff identifying the citizen participants.

Part 2 of the action plan is outreach to key groups to keep lines of communication open. Stakeholders would include appointed advisory board members, neighborhood associations, local organizations, and regional agencies. The 3rd part of the plan is an internal review to determine who can provide what expertise and how service delivery might be affected by the Council's plan of action.

The Council reviewed the draft letter from Mayor Bernard to Metro, and, with a few minor changes, directed staff to final it for the Mayor's signature.

Councilor Marshall requested staff research any potential limitations on use of the Jr. High property.

May Town Hall Planning

The group discussed possible topics for a Town Hall in May. Mayor Bernard thought this would offer an opportunity for the Council to observe city manager candidates' interacting with the community. Council agreed to consider dates in early June.

Council Retreat Planning

Council agreed to hold a retreat on the weekend of May 19th.

Urban Forestry Committee

Councilor Marshall moved to reconsider appointments to the current Urban Forestry Committee and Councilor King seconded.

The group discussed the appointment process, and there were concerns Councilors had not been advised of the Council President's decision.

Councilor Newman was reluctant to slow down the process since the Committee is on a short timeline.

Councilor King regretted her failure to poll the Council before making the appointments and understood the outcome would have been different.

Councilor Marshall did not think the same people would have been appointed if the process had been followed.

The group discussed adding more members and if the likelihood of doing so would correct the problem.

The motion to reconsider appointments to the Urban Forestry Committee passed 3 – 2 with the following vote: Councilor Marshall; Councilor Lancaster, and Mayor Bernard aye; Councilor King and Councilor Newman nay.

4046

Mayor Bernard and Councilor Marshall will prepare a proposal for the April 30 work session.

Adjournment

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

The work session ended at 8:30 p.m.

Pat DuVal

Pat DuVal, Recorder

**CITY OF MILWAUKIE
CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION AGENDA
APRIL 16, 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.	Open Public Forum	
3.	6:30 p.m.	Lewelling School Trip Safety Program Report	Lewelling NDA Brion Barnett
4.	6:45 p.m.	Transportation System Plan Implementation Project	John Gessner
5.	7:15 p.m.	Washington Street House Update	Alice Rouyer
6.	7:30 p.m.	South Corridor Update	Martha Bennett Michelle Gregory
7.	8:00 p.m.	May Town Hall Planning	Group
8.	8:30 p.m.	Council Retreat Planning	Group
9.	9:00 p.m.	Adjourn	Mayor Bernard

***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
Martha Bennett, Assistant City Manager, CD *MB*

From: Brion Barnett, P.E., Associate Engineer

Subject: Final Report of the Lewelling School Trip Safety Task Force

Date: April 6, 2001, for April 16, 2001, City Council Work Session

Action Requested

Accept the report of the Lewelling School Trip Safety Task Force, with comments from the Milwaukie Traffic Safety Board (MTSB).

Background

In 1995, City Council adopted a resolution tasking the MTSB with development of a Citywide School Trip Safety Program for elementary schools. At that time, due to a lack of participation, Lewelling Elementary School did not complete a study. However, a task force was formed in October 2000 to complete the study. Members of the task force have met several times to identify safety concerns, collect data/conduct research, and prioritize recommendations for improvements. Final recommendations were presented to the MTSB for comment and approval at their March 29, 2001, meeting session (a copy of the study presented to the MTSB is attached).

Executive Summary

The following recommendations are considered to be the most important for Lewelling Elementary School and are presented in order of preference:

- 1. Traffic safety education programs. Distribute route maps and conduct traffic safety presentations on an annual basis.** To be coordinated with school district, parent teacher organization, and police department.

2. **Clearing/cleaning obstructions in the right-of-way.** Notices to be sent to property owners referencing applicable city code.
3. **Possibility of no-parking on the south side of Logus Road during school hours.** Needs further research and feedback from local residents.
4. **Install signage in advance of existing crosswalk on 49th Avenue near Winworth Court.** Estimated cost \$700.
5. **Relocate school crossing on Logus Road west to actual crossing location.** Estimated cost \$500.
6. **Clean-up of walking paths on north side of school grounds.** To be completed by neighborhood association.
7. **Further evaluation of street lighting and consolidation/ganging of mailboxes.**
8. **Construct either a paved path or curb and sidewalk on the south side of Logus Road from 43rd Avenue to Stanley Avenue.** Estimated cost ranges from \$150,000 for a paved path to \$250,000 for curb and sidewalk.

It is important to note that the MTSB endorses all recommendations except for the paved path/curb and sidewalk option. The MTSB felt that designating the south side of Logus Road as a walking route (possibly gravel) coupled with a no parking during school hours posting would be more cost effective and maintain the existing rural character of the street.

**LEWELLING SCHOOL TRIP SAFETY PROGRAM FINAL REPORT
TO
TRAFFIC SAFETY BOARD**

INTRODUCTION

The Lewelling School Trip Safety Task Force is a working sub-group of the Traffic Safety Board. Its purpose is to advise the Milwaukie City Council on ways to improve pedestrian safety in the zone around Lewelling Elementary School.

Task Force Members:

Arthur Ball, Lewelling Neighborhood Association Chair
Jean Michel, Lewelling Neighborhood Association Vice-Chair
Gene Covey, Milwaukie Traffic Safety Board Member
Bruce Bains, Lewelling resident
Tricia Haugen, Lewelling resident
LeRoy Hummel, Lewelling resident

City Staff for the committee:

Officer John Hipes, Milwaukie Police Department
Brion Barnett, Associate Engineer
Jason Wachs, Program Specialist

SUMMARY OF THE PROCESS

The task force began meeting in October 2000. The primary focus was on identifying walking routes and physical improvements that would achieve the goal of improved pedestrian safety in the Lewelling/Logus Road area of Milwaukie. Resources the task force used during the study included the Institute of Transportation Engineers "School Trip Safety Program Guidelines," and reports from the Ardenwald Elementary School pilot study.

One of the first efforts was to define the best walking routes and identify problems with them. The following summarizes our findings related to pedestrian safety:

- To get to school, children and pedestrians use Logus Road and three pathways on the north side of the school (NW path to 51st Avenue and Winworth Court, N path towards Willow Street and Windsor Drive, and NE path to Drefshill Street).
- Logus Road is an area of concern because there are no sidewalks, the pavement is narrow (18-20 feet wide), limited right-of-way (generally 30 feet), limited shoulder and bush/tree obstructions cause many children to walk in the roadway (many with their backs to the traffic), and Tri-met bus traffic is present.

Therefore, objectives of the walking routes are:

- Maximize use of existing paths on the North side of the school.
- Increase safety of Logus Road for pedestrians.
- Minimize time spent on Logus Road.

The task force sketched the walking routes on a map that can be used to educate children, parents, and teachers on how to walk to school using the “safest” route. The walking system is currently being mapped by the City’s GIS Department. When completed, the map can be used as part of a traffic safety education program given annually to children at the beginning of each school year. To work most effectively, teachers should ask the students to take the map home to their parents with an accompanying letter. The letter should ask the parents to walk the route at least once with their child, pointing out hazards along the way. The letter should tell the parent to be sure and direct the child to use the route illustrated on the route map. A tear off signature slip should be provided at the bottom of the letter for the parents to sign and return to the school indicating that they received the map and discussed it with their child.

To obtain additional information, task force members performed pedestrian counts on existing school routes, contracted out a speed classification study on Logus Road, and sent out a survey to neighborhood residents and children and their parents via the school. The results were as follows:

- NW Path – 16 students in the morning/14 in the afternoon
- NE Path – 5 students in the morning/15 in the afternoon
- West of Logus Road – 14 students in the morning/25 in the afternoon with 19 of them walking on the north side of Logus and 6 walking on the south side of Logus
- East of Logus Road – 3 students in the morning/5 in the afternoon with 2 of them walking on the north side of Logus and 3 Walking on the south side of Logus.
- Approximately 1,126 vehicles per day on Logus Road in vicinity of the school (509 in the eastbound direction and 617 in the westbound direction). The average of the 85th percentile speeds for both directions was 31 mph.
- Unfortunately, only a handful of people responded to the surveys, a few showing support for improvements and few against improvements.

RECOMMENDATIONS

After several weeks of meetings, the task force has narrowed down its recommendations to the following, presented in order of preference:

1. **Traffic safety education programs. Distribute route maps and conduct traffic safety presentations on an annual basis.** To be coordinated with school district, parent teacher organization, and police department.

2. **Clearing/cleaning obstructions in the right-of-way.** Notices to be sent to property owners referencing applicable city code.
3. **Possibility of no-parking on the south side of Logus Road during school hours.** Needs further research and feedback from local residents.
4. **Install signage in advance of existing crosswalk on 49th Avenue near Winworth Court.** Estimated cost \$700.
5. **Relocate school crossing on Logus Road west to actual crossing location.** Estimated cost \$500.
6. **Clean-up of walking paths on north side of school grounds.** To be completed by neighborhood association.
7. **Further evaluation of street lighting and consolidation/ganging of mailboxes.**
8. **Construct either a paved path or curb and sidewalk on the south side of Logus Road from 43rd Avenue to Stanley Avenue.** Estimated cost ranges from \$150,000 for a paved path to \$250,000 for curb and sidewalk.



To: Mayor and City Council

Through: Mike Swanson, City Manager Pro Tem
Martha Bennett, Assistant City Manager, CD
Alice Rouyer, Planning Director

From: John Gessner, Associate Planner

Subject: Transportation System Plan (TSP) Implementation

Date: April 16, 2001

Action Requested

Provide direction on the City's TSP implementation project.

Background

1. History

On March 19, 2001, staff presented background information on this project to the Council in preparation for addressing policy issues on April 16, 2001. The Planning Commission reviewed the project at its February 19, 2001 and March 27, 2001 work sessions. The Commission identified the following issues on March 27, 2001:

- A. Community Service Overlay and certain conditional use developments located in residential zones should have lower threshold requirements for traffic studies due to neighborhood sensitivity to traffic impacts.
- B. Commercial projects located in commercial districts should be treated the same as they are now. Commercial projects that are not now reviewed by the Commission should not be subject to Commission review just for traffic issues. (*The existing option for appeal to the Planning Commission review following an administrative decision will remain.*)
- C. The notice-area for projects approved by the Planning Director should be increased from 150 feet (from the project site) to 300 feet. This would enhance neighborhood opportunity to comment on development proposals and related traffic issues.

- D. The Commission questioned the circumstances under which a project could be denied for traffic or transportation impacts. The staff response follows:
1. Applicants will be required to identify traffic impacts of a proposed development and identify needed improvements. Failure to demonstrate impacts and provide needed improvements will be grounds for denial.
 2. A project may be denied when the developer does not mitigate identified impacts.
 3. There are significant challenges to managing traffic impacts of new development due to regional traffic and existing transportation deficiencies. Denial of new development based only on these conditions may not be legally defensible.

The project was discussed at the March 28, 2001, Neighborhood District Association quarterly leadership meeting. Minutes of that meeting are attached in Exhibit 1.

2. Policy Issues

The following issues are presented for Council direction:

- A. What role should performance measures play in deciding land use applications?

Staff suggests that measures of performance (including "level of service" [LOS] and "volume-to-capacity ratio") should be used as indicators of needed mitigation rather than as approval or denial criteria because of the following:

1. Project denials may constitute a moratorium, which would require the City to develop a plan to correct the transportation deficiencies that constituted grounds for the denial in the first place. This situation may require significant expenditures by the City to correct existing transportation deficiencies.
2. Traffic associated with small- to moderate-scale development proposals can be a minor proportion of existing traffic especially when located on collectors and arterial roadways.

Requiring mitigation by new development can help address neighborhood concerns about existing traffic. Denial of projects based on a level-of-service criterion may eliminate opportunities for addressing existing problems.

3. Improvements required as condition of approval are limited by legal standards. Conditions may be imposed when they are limited to correcting only the proportionate impacts created by the project.

B. What level of development should require a traffic impact analysis?

Traffic impacts from development are related to the following:

1. type of development and number of trips generated by the proposal, and
2. location of the project; and
3. condition and adequacy of existing roadway and transportation facilities.

A large development located on a street with adequate facilities may not have significant traffic impacts. Alternatively, a relatively minor project located on a street with inadequate facilities may result in noticeable impacts. A single "trigger" for determining when a project requires a traffic study, such as trip generation, may not adequately address site specific concerns.

Staff suggests that a "scoping" process be developed to help determine when a traffic study is required based upon type of development, trip generation, location, and other factors.

C. Should the Planning Director continue to decide "by-right" commercial land use applications when located in commercial districts?

New regulations requiring traffic impact analysis for commercial projects may result in required mitigation including roadway improvements. Under present zoning laws, the Planning Director is authorized to approve many types of commercial development. The present regulations do not however authorize analysis of traffic impacts and requirements for off-site traffic improvements.

The Planning Commission has recommended that the City retain the Planning Director's authority to review "by-right" commercial development. This process includes an option for a public hearing, which may be requested by interested parties. New regulations would expand the application process to include submission of traffic studies for larger-scale projects, Planning Director review of traffic impacts, and requirements for mitigation where warranted.

The Commission further recommends that the notice-area for Planning Director decisions be expanded from 150 feet to 300 feet from the site to enhance neighborhood opportunity for review and comment.

Alternatives

A summary of the preceding policy issues and description of options follow on the next three pages.

1. What role should performance measures play.

Recommended Option	Advantages	Disadvantages
<p><i>Adopt LOS standards "F" for regional roadways, and "E" for city streets.</i></p> <p><i>Use performance measure as indicator and study "trigger" instead of approval criterion.</i></p>	<p>Will help ensure problem intersections located near development sites are considered.</p> <p>Avoids potential legal challenges based on claims of moratorium.</p> <p>Consistent with Regional Transportation Plan.</p>	<p>None identified.</p>
Alternate Option	Advantages	Disadvantages
<p>Adopt LOS standards "F" for regional roadways, and "E" for city streets.</p> <p>Use performance measure as study "trigger" instead of approval criterion.</p>	<p>Provides a basis for requiring transportation facilities to be adequate to accommodate development.</p>	<p>May not meet legal standards that limit conditions of approval to correction of proportionate impacts.</p> <p>May increase pressure for city to undertake roadway projects due to claims of moratorium.</p> <p>May result in denial of desired development.</p>

2. What should trigger the requirement for a traffic impact study?

Recommended Option	Advantages	Disadvantages
<p><i>Develop a scoping process that is sensitive to residential areas, considers site specific conditions, and is based on trip generation and other factors.</i></p>	<p>Addresses the Planning Commission concern that businesses not be overburdened by application procedures when there are no significant traffic concerns.</p> <p>Addresses Planning Commission recommendation to be sensitive to neighborhood traffic issues.</p> <p>Allows a more detailed evaluation of site specific variables that can contribute to traffic impacts.</p>	<p>More complex than a simple "trip generation" trigger". May require more applicant effort and staff effort.</p>
Alternate Option	Advantages	Disadvantages
<p>Use a 200-trip per day threshold to require a traffic impact study.</p>	<p>Ease of administration.</p> <p>Highly predictable for the City and developers.</p> <p>Consistent with practices in other communities.</p>	<p>May not adequately address neighborhood traffic issues.</p>

WS. 4 5

3. **Should the Planning Director continue to decide "by-right" commercial land-use applications when located in commercial districts?**

Recommended Option	Advantages	Disadvantages
<p><i>Retain the Director's existing authority and application process. Increase notice-area to 300 feet.</i></p>	<p>Addresses the Planning Commission concern that businesses not be overburden by application procedures when there are no significant traffic concerns.</p> <p>Increase opportunities for neighbor comment.</p> <p>Existing practice seems to be working well for the City and business owners.</p>	<p>None identified.</p>
Alternate Option	Advantages	Disadvantages
<p>Require Planning Commission review of "by-right" commercial development that may have potential traffic impacts.</p>	<p>Facilitates community review of development proposals that may have traffic impacts.</p>	<p>Increased costs to property owners and business operators.</p> <p>Increased staff work loads and costs to City.</p> <p>Outcomes may not be any different than if the Planning Director reviewed the proposal.</p>

NDA Leaders present:

Ed Zumwalt, Historic Milwaukie Neighborhood Chair
 Dave Aschenbrenner, Hector Campbell Neighborhood Chair
 Amy Hough, Lewelling Neighborhood Secretary
 Jean Michel, Lewelling Neighborhood Vice Chair
 Sarah Smith, Hector Campbell Neighborhood Vice Chair
 Ray Bryan, Historic Milwaukie Neighborhood Treasurer
 Dolly Macken-Hambright, Linwood Neighborhood Chair

Kathy Buss, Island Station Neighborhood Secretary
 Peter Koonce, Ardenwald Johnson Creek Chair

Sharon Phillips, Festival Daze Representative
 Ed and Roz Giese, Lake Road Neighborhood
 Bonnie Petty, Festival Daze Representative
 Sharon VanHorn, Festival Daze Representative

Staff Present:

Michelle Gregory, Neighborhood Services Manager
 John Gessner, Associate Planner

Steve Campbell, Code Compliance Officer
 Jason Wachs, Program Specialist

Transportation System Plan Implementation - John Gessner, Milwaukie Associate Planner

After the introductions were completed, Michelle introduced John Gessner, Milwaukie Associate Planner, to explain the implementation of the Transportation System Plan (TSP).

- John explained that the TSP was passed four years ago and represents a very specific plan outlining a wide variety of transportation concerns like road improvements and sidewalk improvements.
- But John pointed out the plan needs additional documents to support the TSP's implementation. These documents will change how traffic and transportation issues are addressed at the time of development review and update and unify elements of the City's transportation regulations.
 - These new traffic impact regulations will help ensure new development is held accountable for the traffic it introduces.
 - A new city transportation design manual will be developed that sets unified design standards and policies.
 - The city's codes and policies will be updated to meet State and Regional regulations, which is important in that Metro – our Regional government – disburses federal dollars, and Milwaukie needs to meet the Regional guidelines in order to receive federal funding.
- John then explained how this implementation project would affect Neighborhoods.
 - There will be traffic analysis requirements that establish baselines to measure future traffic impacts. These studies will identify existing traffic conditions, help with the estimation of vehicle trips the proposed development will generate, assess how the new traffic will affect the existing system, and suggest recommendations for mitigating the adverse effect the development it would create.
- John emphasized the plan will not solve all of the city's current transportation concerns, and that there are legal constraints as to what the city can require of the developer.
- Michelle asked if the design manual will be for the developers or for staff, and John answered that both parties would use the manual. The developer would use it as a reference manual, and staff would use it to make sure the developer followed the manual's prescribed procedures.
- Dave asked how these regulations would effect a type of development like the King Road shopping center.
- John said there would first be a trip generation estimation, and then a study would be required to examine how the trips would affect the surrounding system. This same study would set traffic mitigating conditions that would have to be met before the development gained approval.
- Peter talked about how this implementation process would have been helpful in the Ardenwald/Johnson Creek Neighborhood when Milwaukie Providence proposed its expansion.
- Michelle asked for clarification concerning the traffic impact analysis. John explained that each land-use zoning district needs to be treated differently, and that each zone needs to have baselines set so that when a development proposal is forecasted to create a number of trips that is more than the zone's trip threshold, a traffic impact analysis will be required.
- Kathy Buss asked if the TSP considers where bike paths are routed. John said the TSP has established a bike network, but the city's trail system is not incorporated as of yet. Kathy suggested the two should complement one another, and should be considered together.
- Michelle asked if and how the Transportation System Plan gets updated or amended?

- John said that amendments can be suggested and would be subject to review by the Planning Commission and City Council.
- Peter said updating the TSP would be a good idea, and that it would be natural for the document to be revised after four years of existence.
- John added that the TSP would need to be revised in order to comply with Legislative changes that may be made to the State's Transportation System Plan and the Metro's Regional Transportation Plan.
- Ray asked who determines whether or not a development proposal creates a traffic problem.
- Peter said 400 trips a day is typically created by about 40 homes, and that usually 20 houses creating 200 trips a day would trigger a study. Peter said there are national standards that prescribe fixes, like additional stoplights.
- Dolly asked who pays for these studies, and John said the developers would pay, and that typically they would be permitted to choose their consultant to conduct the study.
- John added that in some cases 200 trips may be the threshold, but that in other places, depending on the surrounding conditions such as the condition of the roads, the trip threshold could be lower.
- Michelle asked about how the process would work if a number of developments were going up in the same area at the same time. How would the cumulative affect be known? Would the the developers combine for one study or would they each do their own? .
- Peter said it depends on the order in which the development was going up. The first one would only have to consider it's own traffic effects, while the second would have to consider its own and the first, and the third development would have to consider all three.
- Dave wanted to know how trips would be calculated if a development is being created at the end of a long street where houses already exist. John explained the developer would be responsible for determining how many trips they were introducing.
- Peter brought up the point that widening streets to accommodate the introduction of more traffic is not always the best solution, as broader by-ways can negatively impact a neighborhood's livability.
- John explained there are safeguards in place that restrict converting lower capacity streets like collector streets into higher capacity streets such as arterials.
- John closed his presentation by saying he'd be more than happy to visit Neighborhood Association meetings to discuss the TSP Implementation. John's number is (503) 786-7652.

Festival Daze – Sharon Van Horn, Sharon Phillips, Ed Giese and Roz Giese, Bonnie Petty

Sharon V. outlined a variety of the attractions that will be featured at Milwaukie Festival Daze, which will be held on June 15, 16 and 17.

- There will be a carnival, a Show and Shine Car Show, climbing rock, music bands, Clackamas Review is sponsoring a talent show, on Saturday an Elvis impersonator will be the headliner, and the faux Elvis daughter will do a Britney Spears impersonation, and son will do a Buddy Holly impersonation. There will be a beer garden, a pack of performing pigs, a dunk tank, and a jump house.
- Sharon V. thanked Historic Milwaukie Neighborhood for contributing \$10,000 to the Festival.
- Sharon S. reported that she has collected \$16,000 in donations for the Festival.
- It was asked how much it cost to run last year's event, and the team was around \$19,000. Sharon V. estimates this year's will run around \$20,000, as the Festival Committee is covering a lot of costs in order to keep prices down.
- Bonnie talked about the events that will be going on in the Children's Tent.
 - The High School's art department will be doing live paintings, there will be balloon artists both days and free meals from Chevy's will be handed out.
- Bonnie added that she's soliciting money from Neighborhood Associations to fund a banner and prizes for the Children's Tent.
- Sharon said she's trying to organize some sort of petting zoo, and Ray suggested looking into the Humane Society to see if they might bring pets to the Festival.
- Ed suggested contacting OMSL to see if they might want to do some outreach at the event.
- Ray asked if the MDDA was helping fund the Festival, and Sharon said it was not.
- Roz is heading the effort to bring craft and food vendors to the Festival, and she was looking for suggestions to help round up participants.
- She also discussed the Milwaukie Center's 50th Anniversary Celebration that will be running concurrently with the Festival. Many of their activities will be at the Center, but buses will be available shuttling participants back and forth.
- Sharon V. said Festival Daze posters and programs would be produced and posted by the 1st or 2nd week in May.
- The group shared several ideas for finding more craft vendors: contacting the Sunday Market organizer, Brendan Eisworth, contacting MDDA President Dave Strauss, and contacting area Senior Centers.
- Ed suggested they contact Jack Elder to get the list of artists who participated in the workshop on creating an arts center in Milwaukie.



WS. 5 1

To: Mayor and City Council

Through: Mike Swanson, City Manager Pro Tem
Martha Bennett, Assistant City Manager *MB*

From: Alice Rouyer, Planning Director *AR*

Subject: 2336 SE Washington Street home

Date: April 6, 2001 for the April 16, 2001 work session

Action Requested

None. Information only.

Background

At the March 20 meeting, Council directed Planning staff to work with realtor Richard Peterson regarding the feasibility of moving the house at 2336 SE Washington to a site at the northwest corner of Lake & 21st Avenue. According to North Clackamas School District, the house needs to either be moved from site by May 1, 2001 or will be demolished to make way for an expansion of the Milwaukie High School parking lot. North Clackamas School District granted Mr. Peterson preliminary approval to move the house to another site.

Staff met with Mr. Peterson on March 22. During the meeting, staff gave Mr. Peterson the option to move the house and store it at the site before the May 1 deadline until staff, Planning Commission and/or City Council makes final decisions about developing the site. Final development approval will not occur on the Lake Road/21st site before the May 1, 2001 deadline because Mr. Peterson has not yet submitted land use applications or building permits. The Zoning Ordinance prescribes certain scheduling requirements to accommodate public notice. Provided that Mr. Peterson submits materials for permits to move and temporarily store the house by mid-April, he could move the house prior to the May 1, 2001 deadline established by the School District.

Mr. Peterson met again with staff in a pre-application meeting on March 29. It appears that Mr. Peterson will need to obtain a variance from the off-street parking requirements in order to develop the site with the house at Lake & 21st. This would require Planning Commission approval. If Mr. Peterson submits a complete application to staff by April 6, 2001, the Planning Commission could

WS. 5

2

consider the application in a public hearing as soon as May 22, 2001. However, Mr. Peterson has also indicated that he may not submit an application for a variance, but may instead approach the Union Pacific Railroad about acquiring adjacent property to accommodate the extra land area needed for off-street parking.

Staff has been in regular contact with Patty and Julie Wisner about this matter and will keep the Council informed as new information becomes available. If Council members have questions, please contact me at (503) 786-7654 or rouyera@ci.milwaukie.or.us.



To: Mayor and City Council

Through: Mike Swanson, City Pro Tem

From: Martha Bennett, Assistant City Manager *MB*
Michelle Gregory, Neighborhood Services Manager

Subject: South Corridor/ Milwaukie Transit Center Follow Up

Date: April 7, 2001 for April 16, 2001 City Council Work Session

Action Requested

Review and provide staff with direction for further action.

Background

At your April 2, 2001 Work Session, Council gave staff direction on the four options still under consideration as part of the South Corridor Transportation Alternatives Study. Additionally, Council directed staff to pursue a plan of action developed by the neighborhood district associations leadership for the further investigation of light rail. In addition, on April 3, 2001, Council directed staff to prepare a letter to Metro outlining the Council's position on the South Corridor Options.

Attached to this memo are three items that follow up on your April 2, 2001 and April 3, 2001 discussions:

- An update of the matrix that outlines the advantages and disadvantages of each option, which outlines the direction staff received from Council on April 2, 2001. This represents the issues staff will present as part of the technical work on the South Corridor Study.
- A draft action plan for outreach and involvement on the Council's proposal for further study of light rail and the two transit center changes (one transit center at the Junior High and another in the north industrial area). Staff needs feedback on this plan and direction to schedule meetings and workshops if the Council concurs with the plan.
- A draft letter from Mayor Bernard to Executive Officer Burton and Presiding Officer Bragdon outlining the City's position.

Alternative	Corridor Riders Projected	Cost Estimate	Advantages	Disadvantages	Impact Issues	Council Direction
Light Rail	92,400	<p>\$360 million in FY 2006</p> <p>Cost rises to \$413 million with BRT to Oregon City and Clackamas Regional Center.</p> <p>Cost rises to \$505 million with Busway to Clackamas Regional Center and BRT to Oregon City.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rapid travel times between Milwaukie and Portland. This is the fastest of all of the alternatives. 2. Cost is competitive with busway. 3. Least impact on air quality. 4. Greatest potential to stimulate private investment in the Milwaukie Town Center. 5. Fewer buses through downtown Milwaukie than either busway or BRT. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. High volume of transfers (Currently 5,000 per day. With LRT, would be approximately 15,000 per day). 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. 3. History of political opposition on Milwaukie and Clackamas County. 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. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 2. Opportunity to discuss location of Milwaukie Transit Center. 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. 4. Opportunity to secure public improvements in the downtown (sidewalks, intersections etc). 5. Would we request that LRT never be extended from Milwaukie to CTC? Perhaps only if new ramps built along 224? 6. Potential traffic for historic Milwaukie, Lake Road, and Island Station neighborhoods should be prevented and mitigated. 7. No requirements for changes in land use intensity (e.g., station communities.) 8. Possibly request elimination of consideration of Linwood/Harmony park and ride. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Council supports the study of light rail on the condition that the downtown Milwaukie station and related bus transfers are on Milwaukie Junior High School property along the Tillamook Branch. This achieves two major objectives. First, it provides commuter rail connections and the opportunity to extend light rail south. Second, it is part of the community's goal of preserving the Junior High 2. The Council is opposed to having "regional" bus transfers happen in downtown Milwaukie and supports moving a large percentage of the bus transfers to another location, possibly in Milwaukie's north industrial area. 3. Council stated light rail must not harm Milwaukie neighborhoods. 4. Council stated that there should not be any station community planning required. 5. Council stated that there needs to be sufficient park and ride provided so as not to cause a park and ride problem in downtown or in any Milwaukie neighborhood. 6. Council supports elimination of consideration of the Linwood/Harmony park and ride. 7. Council supports consideration of a light rail extension down I-205 to serve Clackamas Regional Center. 8. Council believes that the community should be able to consider options for a light rail alignment, not just one solution.

Alternative	Corridor Riders Projected	Cost Estimate	Advantages	Disadvantages	Impact Issues	Council Direction
Bus Rapid Transit	91,600	\$77.5 million in 2006	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Least expensive 2. Lowest capital impact 3. Would not prevent a different alternative from being developed in the future 4. Most flexible - bus mounted technology, signal prioritization and routes can be reassigned to accommodate changes in traffic patterns. 5. Very efficient – carries a lot of riders at a low cost per new rider. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not as rapid or reliable as other options because it's confined to mixed traffic. 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. 3. Not as 'long term' a solution as some of the more capital-intensive options. 4. Will generate additional bus traffic into Milwaukie Transit Center. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Need to mitigate the impacts of additional bus traffic into the Milwaukie Transit Center (air pollution and noise mostly). 2. Need to secure significant street and intersection improvements in downtown Milwaukie. 3. Queue by-pass lanes along McLoughlin (boulevard section) would not work with our "boulevard" design. 4. It may also increase the need for pedestrian underpass construction to the Riverfront. 5. Pedestrian crossing concerns on Highway 224 at Harrison, Oak, and 37th would also have to be addressed. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Council supports further consideration. BRT is acceptable as an interim option, but is not the long-term solution. 2. The growth in buses is a significant concern, and Council was concerned about the impact of buses on the downtown and downtown neighborhoods. Can we keep buses off Harrison Street? 3. No queue by-pass lanes on the portion of McLoughlin between Highway 224 and River Road. 4. Resolve problems of widening highway 224 in the "Town Center" area – intersections with Harrison, Monroe, Oak, and 37th. Need not to worsen pedestrian safety.

Alternative	Corridor Riders Projected	Cost Estimate	Advantages	Disadvantages	Impact Issues	Council Direction
Busway	93,500	<p>\$351 million in 2006 of busway only, and \$368 adding BRT to Oregon City</p> <p>Cost is \$259 million in 2006 w/o the new bus only bridge. Total is \$276 with BRT to Oregon City</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Could be seamless between CTC and Portland. 2. Very rapid travel times, second only to Light Rail. 3. Separated right of way means that it is highly reliable. 4. Buses retain flexibility that is not there with rail - constrained alternative. 5. Innovative approach. 6. Strong support from Clackamas County. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Requires new ramps in north part of downtown onto Highway 224. 2. The "full" busway as envisioned by Clackamas County requires elevated structure between Harrison Street and 37th. Large increase in the number of buses through the Milwaukie Transit Center (although 1/2 of eastbound buses would skip Milwaukie). 3. Opposed by Portland neighborhoods. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No elevated structure through Milwaukie. This will require that there be a mixed busway BRT project along Highway 224. 2. Must construct north ramps onto Highway 224 to avoid the impact of bus trips on Harrison Street. 3. Must mitigate additional air pollution and noise pollution from increased volume of buses on downtown, Ledding Library, Scott Park, & Masonic Temple. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Council was concerned about busway moving forward into the DEIS because of the high cost for a bus option. They did not express formal opposition, but there was not strong support. 2. Council was opposed to elevated structure in Milwaukie, and felt the buses should be in mixed traffic or on the shoulder of the 224. 3. Council was concerned about the proposed ramps from Main Street to Highway 224, but felt they should be studied to prevent increased traffic on Harrison. 4. Council generally opposed using Harmony Road to access Clackamas Regional Center. They suggested that the Busway should connect to Clackamas Regional Center by using the Highway 224/ 82nd Avenue interchange. 5. Council also suggested a park and ride at K-Mart (Highway 224 and Johnson Road) instead of Linwood/Harmony.

Alternative	Corridor Riders Projected	Cost Estimate	Advantages	Disadvantages	Impact Issues	Council Direction
HOV	92,000	\$231 million in 2006	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fairly rapid (third fastest) 2. Adds auto capacity 3. Significantly improves automobile travel time 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adds auto capacity. Creates more pass through auto traffic in Milwaukie. 2. Widens 224 and McLoughlin. 3. Requires construction of jug handles, which take up a great deal of land and result in a large number of displacements. 4. Poor access for Milwaukie transit riders, since there are no stops on Highway 224. 5. Serious impacts on several Milwaukie neighborhoods, particularly 29th Avenue and Penzance. 6. No political support from Portland. Minimal support in Milwaukie. 7. Increases impervious surface in Milwaukie, creating drainage and run-off problems. 	<p>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>	<p>The City Council recommends that HOV be dropped from further consideration and not be forwarded into the DEIS.</p>

Draft Plan of Action

Outreach and Coordination on South Corridor Light Rail and new Milwaukie Transit Center Option

At the City Council's April 2, 2001 Work Session, Council developed a plan for a new study of light rail transit to Milwaukie. This plan evolved from a series of recommendations made by the leadership of Milwaukie's neighborhood associations. This proposal includes creating a light rail station on the east side of the Milwaukie Junior High Building with major bus transfers happening outside of Milwaukie's downtown.

Staff recommends the following plan of action to ensure that City reach the many different citizen groups and public agencies needed to make this proposal a reality. The City's work on this plan is driven by the timeframe for decisions of the South Corridor Study and the North Clackamas School District's timeline for sale of the Milwaukie Junior High property.

The following plan of action is divided into three parts. The first part involves the Organization Steps the City needs to take to gather institutional support for the plan. The second part includes an overall discussion of the Outreach plan for ensuring that key stakeholders participate in the South Corridor study. The third part includes internal staff review to assess the impact on City services.

Part 1 -- Organization Steps

Step #1: -- Small Meetings

Staff recommends that small delegations, appointed by Council, (possibly two Councilors and two citizens) meet with the leaders of key participants in the South Corridor Study before the May 7 Policy Group meeting. The purpose of these meetings is to bring these agencies up to speed on the Council's position and the desire to have a junior high/light rail option explored seriously. These meetings should take place fairly quickly, and should seek the support of these agencies for studying the option:

- **North Clackamas School District.** Recommend that a small delegation of Councilors and citizens meet with representatives from the North Clackamas School District to discuss the status of the sale of Milwaukie Junior High and to request the school district's participation in the effort to site a station and small transfer center on the junior high property. Staff recommends that this delegation also include a representative from Tri-Met and one from Metro if those agencies are able to help.
- **Tri-Met.** Recommend meeting with Fred Hansen and other senior Tri-Met staff. In addition to ask for support to study the Junior High light rail alignment, staff recommends that this small delegation ask for Tri-Met to participate in a meeting with the North Clackamas School District.

- **Metro.** Recommend a meeting with Executive Director Mike Burton, Council Presiding Officer David Bragdon, and Councilor Rod Monroe (who is the chair of the South Corridor Policy Group.) In addition to asking for support to study the Junior High light rail alignment, staff recommends that this small delegation ask for Metro to participate in a meeting with the North Clackamas School District.
- **Portland.** Recommend a meeting with Commissioner Charlie Hales to convey the constraints and opportunities associated with the community's preferred option and discuss ways that Portland can support Milwaukie's efforts.

Step #2 -- Joint Council Session with Clackamas County Commission

Staff recommends a meeting of the full City Council with the full Clackamas County Commission. This meeting should be scheduled before May 7 to discuss the City's request and the County's desire for a busway, although it could possibly take place after May 7. Staff believes it is important to seek common ground with the County Commission.

Step #3 -- Design Workshop

Staff recommends that the Council host a joint work session with the NDA chairs. A representative from all of the South Corridor agencies should also be invited (Metro, Tri-Met, Oregon Department of Transportation, Portland, Clackamas County, and Oregon City) to discuss the design options for a light rail alignment that creates a junior high station with a local service focus and a transit center either north or south of Milwaukie's downtown with a regional service focus. This workshop should take place after the "Small Meetings" have taken place and should be timed carefully with the Joint Session with the Clackamas County Commission. Members of the City's advisory bodies (Planning Commission, Design and Landmarks, Library Board, etc.) can also be invited to attend. This can happen after the May 7 Policy Group decision.

Part 2 – Outreach

The second element of the action plan is maintaining active dialogue with key groups in Milwaukie and with other agencies. The City Council should evaluate the need to reach out to the following groups on a regular basis.

Advisory Boards

Staff recommends that after the design workshop, the City's advisory bodies, including the Planning Commission, Design and Landmarks Commission, Traffic Safety Board and Library Board, should discuss the possible alignment. These advisory groups should provide advice to the City Council and to City staff.

NDA Outreach

Staff recommends that NDAs reach out to their residents by publicizing and hosting meetings to discuss the position statement of the NDAs and the potential alignments

that would work for Milwaukie. They may wish to invite local or regional agency representatives to participate in those discussions.

Other Agency Outreach

The following organizations need to be part of the City's ongoing outreach efforts.

- North Clackamas School District
- Metro
- Tri-Met
- The City of Oregon City
- The Oregon Department of Transportation
- Washington County and the City of Lake Oswego (commuter rail)
- The City of Portland

Other Organizations

Staff recommends that the City reach out to local organizations within and around the City of Milwaukie. This outreach may take the form of community town halls, individual meetings, or publications.

- MDDA, North Clackamas Chamber of Commerce
- Kids First
- Masonic Lodge, Rotary, Elks, Odd Fellows, Legion etc.
- Faith-based organizations
- PTO's
- Milwaukie Historical Society
- Festival Daze Planning Committee
- South East Uplift
- Oak Grove Community Association

Part 3 - Internal Review

All of the South Corridor Options, including the proposal for light rail as outlined on April 2, 2001, affect several City services. Police, Parks, Public Works, Engineering, Planning, and Library may be affected by the Council's plan of action. Staff in these departments will be involved in reviewing plans and designs as they emerge, both to ensure that these departments can continue to provide high quality services and also to provide those department's expertise on the impacts of proposed designs for transit centers and transit options.



April 17, 2001

Mike Burton, Executive Officer
David Bragdon, Presiding Officer
Rod Monroe, South Corridor Policy Group Chair
Metro
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97232

DRAFT

Gentleman:

On behalf of the Milwaukie City Council, I am writing to outline the City of Milwaukie's position on the four alternatives that are currently part of the South Corridor Transportation Alternatives Study. We are writing for two reasons. First, we want to clearly outline our recommendations about the alternatives that are included in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Second, we are requesting your support in helping us explore a new and creative approach to further study of light rail transit to Milwaukie.

Light Rail Transit

The City Council held an extensive discussion about ways that light rail transit could meet community needs in Milwaukie. We were presented with an extensive proposal from the leaders of our Neighborhood District Associations (NDAs). This proposal was creative and positive. The Council supports the elements of that proposal, and we request that light rail transit be included in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, with the following issues addressed:

1. The Milwaukie City Council supports the study of light rail on the condition that the downtown Milwaukie station and related local bus transfers are on Milwaukie Junior High School property along the Tillamook Branch. This achieves two major objectives. First, it provides commuter rail connections and the opportunity to extend light rail south. Second, it is part of the community's goal of preserving the Junior High, which is a historic building and an important community resource. The City of Milwaukie requests that Metro and the other South Corridor agencies work with us to discuss the viability of this Milwaukie Junior High Station rapidly so we can discuss the possibility of purchasing this property with the North Clackamas School District.
2. Milwaukie would also like to see a station planned in our north industrial area. In other words, we would support an additional station between Tacoma and downtown Milwaukie. This will assist us at reexamining the role and future of the north industrial area.
3. The large volume of bus movements and bus transfers should not happen in downtown Milwaukie. The South Corridor study must study ways to relocate a large percentage of the bus transfers to another place, possibly in Milwaukie's north industrial area. Milwaukie would also support spreading transfers to several stations along the light rail alignment.
4. The design, alignment, and operation of light rail must not harm Milwaukie neighborhoods.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Planning • Public Works • Facilities

6101 SE Johnson Creek Blvd., Milwaukie, Oregon 97206

PHONE: (503) 786-7600 • FAX: (503) 774-8236

5. No station community planning required. If Milwaukie chooses to undertake planning around station areas, that must be a local decision, not a regionally mandated one.
6. There needs to be sufficient park and ride provided outside of downtown Milwaukie so as not to cause a park and ride problem in downtown or in any Milwaukie neighborhood.
7. Consideration of the Linwood/Harmony park and ride should be eliminated.
8. The Milwaukie City Council supports consideration of a light rail extension down I-205 to serve Clackamas Regional Center.
9. Milwaukie wants to consider several options for a light rail alignment, not just one solution.

Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)

The Milwaukie City council feels that BRT is a viable option that should receive further consideration. We view it primarily as an interim step that will improve transit service in this part of the region in the short-term. However, we do not believe it is a permanent, long-range or visionary solution to our community's desire for transit service. The Council identified the following issues that should be addressed in the draft environmental impact statement:

1. The growth in buses is a significant concern, because of the impact of buses on the downtown and downtown neighborhoods. Council suggests investigating a site for the Milwaukie Transit Center north of Highway 224 for this option.
2. Council also recommends further study of new ramps along Highway 224 to Main Street. However, we are concerned about the potential environmental impacts of these new ramps on Crystal Lake Creek along the south side of Highway 224.
3. Queue by-pass lanes on the portion of McLoughlin between Highway 224 and River Road are unacceptable because they are not consistent with our desire for a pedestrian-friendly boulevard in this area. Milwaukie also requests that Metro and the other South Corridor Agencies review our plans for a pedestrian underpass between downtown and the Riverfront. Increased bus volumes on McLoughlin may increase the need to build this underpass.
4. The study must resolve problems of widening highway 224 in the "Town Center" area – intersections with Harrison, Monroe, Oak, and 37th Avenue. This area is planned for mixed-use development that is pedestrian friendly. In addition, Highway 224 currently is a significant barrier to pedestrians walking between the Historic Milwaukie and Lake Road Neighborhood Areas and the Milwaukie Marketplace.

Busway

The Milwaukie City Council believes busway should be included in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, although we have significant concerns about the impact of this option on our community. In addition, we believe the cost of this option is high for a bus-related option, and we favor BRT if a bus option is selected. The following issues need to be addressed as part of the DEIS for busway:

1. The elevated structure shown to date for busway between Harrison and 37th Avenue needs to be eliminated. Buses should operate in mixed traffic on Highway 224 in this segment. Any BRT improvements made in this segment need to be sensitive to the fact that this area is part of our Town Center.
2. Council expressed the same concerns about the volume of buses as they did under the BRT option. Once again, Milwaukie requests investigation of a new transit center site north of Highway 224.
3. Milwaukie's concerns about the new ramps proposed from Highway 224 to Main Street are also the same as under BRT.

4. In addition to studying an alignment of busway along Harmony Road, the Milwaukie City Council also believes an alignment that uses the intersection of 82nd Avenue and Highway 224 as the way to access Clackamas Town Center. We recognize that this will add travel time to Clackamas Town Center, but we are concerned about the impact of increased bus traffic on the Linwood Neighborhood. In addition, with a 224 alignment, we recommend eliminating the Linwood/Harmony Park and Ride and replacing it with a Park and Ride at K-Mart at Highway 224 and Johnson Road.

High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes (HOV)

The City of Milwaukie opposes further consideration of HOV lanes. We have reviewed the impacts of the proposed jug handles on our neighborhoods, and the impact is simply too great. In addition, we believe this is not truly a transit solution, and will result in more automobile trips that simply pass through Milwaukie. In addition, in our outreach efforts, there was very little public support for this option.

Conclusion

The Milwaukie City Council believes that the work we have done on all four of the options to date represent a constructive approach to our mutual goal of improving transit service in the South Corridor. In addition, Milwaukie's neighborhoods have taken a significant positive step in framing a way for us to discuss a light rail alignment that meets both community and regional goals. The Milwaukie City Council urges Metro and the other South Corridor Agencies to meet this constructive attitude openly. We need your help in making a transit center at the Milwaukie Junior High possible, and we want to help you ensure that we are successful in finding a high quality transit solution for our part of the region.

Councilor Brian Newman will be expressing these concerns at the May Policy Group meeting. In the mean time, the Milwaukie City Council would be happy to talk with you or any other South Corridor Agency about our position and concerns. We look forward to working with you through the Draft Environmental Impact process.

Sincerely,

James Bernard
Mayor

DRAFT

- c. Milwaukie City Council
Bill Kennemer, Clackamas County Commission
Charlie Hales, Commissioner, City of Portland
John Williams, Mayor, City of Oregon City
Fred Hansen, General Manager, Tri-Met
Kay Van Sickel, Manager, ODOT Region 1
Mike Swanson, City Manager
Martha Bennett, Assistant City Manager
Michelle Gregory, Neighborhood Services Manager