

**MILWAUKIE CITY COUNCIL  
WORK SESSION  
OCTOBER 18, 1999**

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

Council present: Mayor Tomei and Councilors Kappa, King, Lancaster, and Marshall.

Riverfront Board Members: James Bernard, Chair, Kathi Cardinalli, Dave Green, Michael Martin, Paul Verbout, and Mitch Wall.

Consultants: George Crandall & Don Arambula; Gill Williams, Atlas.

Staff present: City Manager Bartlett; Assistant City Managers Bennett and Richards; Information Specialist Wheeler; Planning Director Rouyer; Neighborhood Services Manager Gregory.

**Information Sharing**

1. **Councilor King** was concerned with the number of youth congregating at the Town Deli.
2. **Councilor Kappa** felt there were issues relating to cigarette sales to minor that needed to be addressed.
3. **Councilor Marshall** attended the Clackamas County Growth Conference held on October 15, and it was clear that the County as a whole needed a cohesive vision to deal with future growth. The group discussed infrastructure and funding. **Mayor Tomei** attended the County's Complete Communities meeting relating to improved communications and developing a sense of vision. **Councilor Kappa** suggested discussing these issues with the Planning Commission.
4. **Councilor Lancaster** reviewed correspondence he had received from the Citizen Involvement Institute and census information. **Bartlett** indicated the census issue was not something to which the City Council needed to respond.
5. **Councilor King** announced the Johnson Creek Watershed Summit on October 30, 1999.

6. **Councilor King** discussed Monroe Street traffic and Milwaukie Lumber trucks. **Bartlett** said the business has been cooperative by using Hwy 224 and Harrison Street as frequently as possible. Monroe is a public street, and all truck traffic cannot be diverted. The group discussed Milwaukie in relation to regional traffic issues.
7. The group discussed name badges and a group photo for *The Pilot*.

### Community Forum

**Annaliese Hummel**, 2802 SE Monroe Street. She had gathered signatures from neighborhood residents and found they had concerns similar to hers regarding traffic. These were: increased traffic, speeding, trucks, and the need for traffic calming devices. She also noted that Monroe Street was very near the 30-point threshold required for consideration under the Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP). She asked why the elected officials did not protect the citizens. More and more traffic calming devices are being installed in Portland and surrounding areas.

If the riverfront/downtown plans are successful, traffic will only become worse in the adjacent, established residential neighborhoods. She wanted to make sure negative impacts would be prevented before they happen. Traffic and noise from Hwy 224 is already horrendous because of increased volume and is getting worse. She made the following suggestions: move the "City Center" sign past Harrison Street so drivers have enough time to plan for the turn; lower the speed limit between the Hwy 224 overpass and Harrison Street to 35 mph; and time the traffic lights for a longer green between Oak and Harrison Streets.

**Hummel** addressed downtown redevelopment. She was not in favor of a McMenemy's at the Jr. High Site. She wanted a downtown that would be attractive to citizens and visitors and recommended demolishing Key Bank and building something smaller. The current City Hall is a beautiful asset to downtown. She supported art including murals in public areas that people could enjoy. A computer store in Perry's does not attract people, and she suggested a downtown design similar to Aspen, Colorado. She recommended moving the transit center further north so it could serve the Sellwood neighborhood.

**Hummel** discussed a neighborhood issue regarding property at 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Monroe Street. Code enforcement directed the resident to prune vegetation because of a clear vision problem. The real problem is the layout of the street; making people cut down their trees is only an easy solution. She recommended a traffic circle and slow down banner at the top of the hill. These are the things elected officials need to take care of for citizens. She added that McMenemy's does not provide adequate employee benefits.

**Councilor Marshall** asked Hummel what she intended to do with the petition. He wanted to make sure the document represented an agreed upon problem and potential solutions.

**Hummel** said it shows that the entire neighborhood wants less traffic, no trucks, and traffic calming devices. She indicated she would ask the signers' permission before turning the petition over to the City.

**Jack Elder**, Milwaukie Downtown Development Association (MDDA) Director, 10953 SE 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue. He sought City input on a proposal to steam clean the downtown sidewalks.

**Bartlett** suggested Elder work with Martha Bennett and Mike Clark on a right-of-way permit and consider the costs and ramifications. If the project were done, the organizers would have to find a way to ensure that pollutants would not go into the storm drain. The group discussed pressure washing sidewalks and driveways generally and recommended a public information piece for residents. **Councilor Marshall** recommended a product called Simple Green and added that there is a sock that goes over a catchbasin designed to collect debris. The City street sweeper uses a vacuum brush to clean the streets.

**Councilor Kappa** urged looking at the citywide and regional issues relating to streets, traffic, and transportation.

#### Downtown/Riverfront Plans

The presentation consisted of a review of the last meeting, introduction of new material, and discussion and direction for the upcoming Town Hall meeting on October 27<sup>th</sup>.

**Crandall** provided a handout and noted six points at the end of Bartlett's memo needing preliminary Council direction:

1. City Hall -- move the building, locate City services in the Jr. High building, change the use of the current block, or get additional public input;
2. Jr. High Site -- City services, other uses, purchase Schedule 0025-6-a; retention life of structure and funding plan, or additional public process;
3. Kellogg Creek -- remove dam, location for athletic fields, other uses;
4. Plan review by Parks Board, Library, Board, North Clackamas Parks and Recreation, and Neighborhood District Associations;
5. Phasing for various projects;
6. Other issues/concerns.

## Review items:

- The menu of objectives for a successful plan included certain defined elements: pedestrian friendly, residential development, employment opportunities, transit access, and connecting the downtown and riverfront.
- A study of Milwaukie's historical background shows that it is and was a river city, but the disconnect started when McLoughlin Boulevard was constructed.
- Most of the waterfront is publicly owned property.
- There is little buildable land above the flood level on the west side of McLoughlin Boulevard. Most of it will flood at one time or another over a period of years.
- The big issue is connecting the downtown to the waterfront.
- The development program came partially from the Hovee economic study and clarified what chips could be played in the downtown area. Fundamentals of a good downtown are a grocery store, storefront retail, and restaurant. A healthy downtown also includes housing, transit, office space, and community services. Milwaukie has a bonus in that it has the potential for a hotel when the Kellogg Treatment Plant moves. The Dark Horse film animation and production operation could stimulate cultural and artistic outlets as well as college satellite campuses. The seeds for these already exist downtown and need to be cultivated to enhance Milwaukie's uniqueness.
- Ideas for connecting to the riverfront that have been explored have been the boulevard, cap, waterway, and parkway concepts. The Kellogg Marina has been a common theme to all the schemes.
- Thinking big and keeping a small town ambience are not mutually exclusive.
- The public survey of 552 responses indicated that the parkway got a better response than the other alternatives.
- Comparative cost estimates after pulling the marina out of all concepts to be considered as a separate item: Jackson Passage, \$3.2 million; McLoughlin Boulevard Cap, \$13.4 million; Waterway, \$21.5 million; Parkway, \$14.4 million; and Kellogg Marina as a standalone, \$18.2 million.
- People seemed to prefer the Parkway concept. It is, comparatively, a medium cost.
- Question: Who pays? Communities need to invest in the future to get a return. No investment -- no return. The investment is in improving the amenity package in the downtown to attract investors. New downtown development should pay for those proposed public improvements.
- How much development is needed to pay for those improvements? For every public dollar spent, seven dollars needs to come from private investment. The Parkway Concept would need to stimulate \$100 million over an extended period of time.
- What possibilities would the Parkway have to develop this kind of investment? **Crandall** reviewed the framework plan with different land uses including commercial, higher density housing, existing housing, institutional uses, and parkways. The public amenity package would consist of the waterfront development; the parkway itself; improvements to Main, Harrison, and

Washington Streets such as sidewalks, lighting, intersections, design guidelines, and landscaping; and connections to Spring Creek. Milwaukie's fundamental problem is that it has very little land.

- The framework provided some good private investment sites. **Crandall** recommended some housing at the Jr. High Site because of the amenities and open space. In broad terms, the entire downtown cannot be a greenspace because public improvements will be needed to attract investment. This could be a very compact and rich development if done correctly. The greenspace could be carried up into the current lumberyard and the creeks opened. The second block of the parkway could be partially developed for retail and/or a restaurant between Main Street and 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue.
- **Crandall** discussed the Parkway Concept that would consist of an underpass that was 120 feet wide and at least 15 feet high featuring a fountain, viewing area, and terraced access. He showed how the businesses, offices, and housing might be distributed around the amenities to attract developers. The waterfront could have a staging area connecting to the road with an esplanade for walking and viewing, a rowing facility, and perhaps a floating restaurant. Housing was shown north of 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue.
- The next problem was making retail work on Main Street. It would work best to have an anchor, such as a grocery store, acting as a trip generator that leads shoppers to adjacent retail. The best and most effective design would be four continuous blocks, edge-to-edge, of retail on both sides of the street. The block upon which City Hall sits is a key block for retail. The value of City Hall in that location versus its being used for retail has to be weighed. Attendees at the last Riverfront Town Hall made it clear they did not wish City Hall to relocate to the Jr. High Building. The City may want to consider moving the building to a less critical retail site.
- The Jr. High Site is quite large at 55,000 square feet and could conceivably house City Hall in addition to a performing arts center. The last Riverfront Town Hall meeting attendees were clear on not wishing City Hall to be relocated. The grounds could be designed to include a Milwaukie Gardens with an exposed Spring Creek and possibly an amphitheater.
- **Crandall** included the latest version of the Tri-Met transit center to the north. A housing precinct could be in that area over the long term.
- To the south, near the end of Main Street could be the Dark Horse performing arts/cultural/entertainment facility. This could work very well. A facility such as this needs to be located near the edge of a development to compliment rather than disrupt a commercial district. This design took the liberty of terminating Main Street at the complex. If Kellogg Lake was returned to its natural state. The complex could potentially overlook a very attractive amenity. The environmental agencies are in favor of this type of action and will actually push for it. The resulting Kellogg Park could be the new location for the current Jr. High playing fields. The hotel site was also indicated with marinas.

- He reviewed the responses from the previous Town Hall meeting in September. Most people voted yes when asked if the Parkway Concept should be moved forward for refinement. People suggested mostly passive uses for the Riverfront Park. They generally reacted negatively to the use of the Jr. High Site as City Hall preferring a McMenamin's and/or cultural facility. They also liked the suggestion of the Kellogg Lake area being used as a park or public athletic facility.

**Crandall** showed the group a design of a similar development site in Racine, Wisconsin. The Racine City Council adopted the plan, and a marina was built for \$25 million dollars. The problem with this plan was that weekend visitors from Chicago parked their cars and went out on their boats but did not go into the downtown because it had nothing to offer. An amenity package was proposed and \$55 million was spent over a period of time. Similarly, the much publicized Beaverton Round project is isolated and difficult to reach.

**Crandall** advised the group to be skeptical of what it sees and point out any seeming inconsistencies or potential pitfalls when looking at the fundamentals.

**Crandall** discussed the connection between the downtown and the riverfront and the Dark Horse proposal to cap McLoughlin Boulevard. He reviewed elevations and pointed out that the cap, rather than being level with the downtown streets, would be five to six feet higher. The cap would likely block the view to the water and be about 40 feet over the water level. The issue would be access to the water. He also recommended that the Dark Horse campus be a more effective attractor at the end of a main street rather than the middle of the business district. The campus uses would be mostly introverted and not provide the everyday types of retail that would cause people to come downtown. The Parkway is the key piece. To be successful, it must be a great hike that compels people to want to use the Parkway to get to the riverfront.

**Arambula** reviewed the study model and overall plan. The public and the Riverfront Board indicated an interest in part of the Jr. High School property being developed as an amphitheater. The other question would be moving City Hall which would be more a question of cost. It could be relocated next to the Masonic Lodge creating a small district composed of City Hall, Masonic, and Ledding Library. The Jr. High building could be a regional arts and cultural center. The marina uses were moved toward the hotel to make it more of a feature with a restaurant and perhaps a permanently-docked sternwheeler.

The key to making the waterfront work is to gracefully transition under McLoughlin Boulevard. The first challenge would be access. A series of ramps at a 5% slope would address handicap access. Features would include informal, natural streamways with waterfalls. To reduce the perceived width of the area under McLoughlin Boulevard, **Arambula** suggested the median strip be designed in such a way as to provide a skylight to the passage below. This would break

the area into two, 45-foot sections with natural lighting at both ends and above. The bridge would have two travel lanes, bike lanes, solid barrier to address noise concerns, and a cantilevered pedestrian walkway. The City would also want to look at an architecturally pleasing gateway element.

**Williams** suggested that plants could grow easily in the passage with that much ambient light.

**Crandall** discussed circulation for waterfront events and the possible access options. There are any number of configurations available with either a hard edge with seats looking back at the garden creating a promontory effect or a soft edge that slopes to the water.

**Arambula** suggested creating a slight swail to create a better view of the water. A green mall might be developed to connect the neighborhood, park, and housing area. It would be a more informal effect.

**Crandall** explained these ideas were presented only as possibilities to get a sense of whether or not they work. He asked the group to be very critical. The group discussed giving the bridge a slight arch. **Crandall** said the minimum passage height would be fifteen feet and more was desirable.

**Verbout** discussed the natural topography and fill needs.

**Crandall** explained the north end of the bridge was at grade and is above four feet on the other end. Elevations vary through the area.

**Verbout** suggested locating retail on the ground floor with office and/or living space on the upper floors. This would create some elevation through the downtown area in order to take advantage of the river views.

**Crandall** agreed the more views of the water the better because that is the natural and most striking amenity of the project. The already-adopted mixed-use zoning would accommodate this type of blend.

**Cardinalli** liked the design because it was wide open and green with a soft waterway.

**Williams** reviewed the Park Block design looking east from the river toward a central focus such as a fountain. The design would create a connection back into the town with friendly, usable passive space. The terminus would set up a sequence of visual connections to the south and create a large open space. He suggested leaving the waterfront natural with ample area for a variety of events. Trucks could access the site from the north. By being lower than McLoughlin Boulevard, the park would be buffered from some of the road noise.

**Crandall** said the goal would be to offer maximum flexibility for the community and not limit the types of events that could take place. The truck access would appear to be a wide pedestrian walkway about 15 feet wide.

**Williams** discussed the green connection, expanding the Kellogg Bridge, and making the Lake as natural as possible. Naturally shaded pools would help revive the habitat. This would all eventually connect with the proposed sport facility.

**Verbout** suggested a loop around the downtown to tie the entire community into the Plan.

**Arambula** outlined the possible walkway connecting Crystal Creek and the Springwater Corridor that would eventually be joined by a footbridge at the Pendleton site.

**Crandall** encouraged the group to think in terms of looping around the downtown and constantly look for pedestrian and bike connection opportunities.

**Cardinalli** suggested a hotel on the Pendleton property, and **Crandall** agreed that was certainly an option to consider.

**Williams** showed the normal flooding area and added that the access road would have to be constructed to possibly be under water every year. It could be elevated somewhat.

**Green** was concerned with noise problems at the riverfront park; however, terracing the site as it drops toward the river would help.

**Crandall** said noise needs to be captured at the road level by some sort of solid-edged structure.

**Councilor Marshall** asked what would be done once Kellogg became a free-flowing stream and was no longer a lake.

**Arambula** said a concept would go to other agencies such as Fish and Wildlife, and potential trade-offs could affect the uses. The land that would be uncovered by removing the dam would predominantly be publicly owned. There are about 24 property owners on the north side of the lake plus the Kellogg Lake Apartments.

**Councilor Marshall** understood that the land City Hall sits on was deeded as a park.

**Bartlett** said there was a deed restriction, but the owners have a large parcel they want to sell the City.

**Verbout** believed it would be important to factor in the cost of reclaiming land for a limited use such as ballfields. There has never been an economic study as to what the overall impact would be.

**Arambula** explained that area would probably be a cut and fill balance.

**Verbout** said there would be a lot of resources going to a public facility that the City would essentially turn its back on.

**Crandall** said the property could be very useful as a public amenity. It is not a developable site because of its location in the floodplain.

**Bartlett** felt there might be other public funds identified after the City meets with ODOT and the County.

A member of the audience suggested acquiring the Pendleton property for a hotel because it has better access and parking. Some site on the south end could be used for a restaurant and marina.

**Crandall** reminded the group that development needs to pay for the amenity package over time.

**Verbout** did not feel the north side was tied into the project as well as it could be. Maybe the north end could house the government complex.

**Crandall** said the north end is not amenity-rich, so few would want to live there.

**Arambula** added that it was his sense that housing on the north end would not be high density. It could support a garden or courtyard complex and perhaps some affordable housing. This concept was an adaptation of something developed during the creation of the transit center.

**Councilor Marshall** proposed moving forward from the details and discussing how the City Council would get a read on the public acceptance and willingness to support the project. The details will change substantially over the years of the project.

**Crandall** agreed it was always a concern that a majority of the population was not up to speed on the program. He felt adopting a streetscape plan and creating a viable Main Street would send a convincing message to the community that the project was real. He recommended reconvening the group after the upcoming Town Hall meeting to decide on what kind of outreach should take place. People need to know about the costs and see a somewhat more refined design. It is time to get to a point where people can agree.

**Councilor King** appreciated Councilor Marshall's input. When people talk to her about the waterfront, she wants to have a good idea of what is going to happen and some idea of how much it will cost.

**Councilor Kappa** agreed with Marshall that the project will not look the same. First, decisions need to be made on how to cross McLoughlin Boulevard. People will vote their pocketbooks, so it is important to consider other funding pressures. The Jr. High Site needs to be involved in the plan. He urged involving the Park and Recreation Board and Library Board in the planning process.

**Cardinalli** felt the group should adhere to the original goals of having an early, visible success.

**Green** suggested restoration efforts along Johnson Creek.

**Crandall** said he would present the group with some phasing suggestions at its next meeting.

**Bartlett** said the key was to have the plan evolve enough to move forward. A downtown plan, streetscape plan with established criteria for enforceable regulations, and logical phasing were key deliverables. Crandall needs some direction related to moving City Hall and how to deal with deed restrictions.

The group discussed the pros and cons of relocating City Hall. Several members felt the public would object to relocating the building. Mayor Tomei and Councilor Marshall felt the option needed to be left open. It was also agreed to study the feasibility of moving City Hall operations to the Jr. High School site.

**Bartlett** summarized the direction:

1. The Plan has evolved to a point where staff could begin regulatory documents; and
2. Move into a riverfront/downtown design that considers amenities such as benches and street lights.

**Mayor Tomei** felt a grocery on the north side of Harrison Street was imperative.

**Councilor Marshall** felt the concept should be taken out to the community for feedback. He liked the basic plan, but, realistically, the details will change over time.

**Wall** asked about the possible relocation of the boat ramp.

**Crandall** responded that the boat ramp is located in the middle of the project on a very valuable piece of property. It is currently used by a small segment of the population when it should be a 365-day-a-year public amenity.

**Wall** felt it would be important to tell the public that another regional boat ramp facility was being sought. It serves an important function that needs to be accommodated.

**Councilor Kappa** agreed that the boat ramp was important, but is it the best use of the land. He felt an early success that could be advertised was the extent of publicly-owned riverfront property.

**Green** asked when the funding discussion takes place.

**Crandall** said these kinds of improvements are often tied to tax increment financing. The community spends money on capital improvements over a period of time as part of the phasing. Quick return on the first phases is desirable when public money is spent to stimulate the private sector.

**Green** asked if a private developer ever began a process.

**Crandall** responded that a developer will usually want the public body to do something to show its commitment. Developers will want to be near amenities.

**Martin** believed there needed to be public outreach in addition to the Town Hall meetings. He generally liked the Plan and the suggestion for the hotel on the Pendleton site. He discussed the importance of Johnson Creek and Elk Rock Island.

**Verbout** observed that outreach was identified as a key element at the beginning of the project, and he felt some money should be spent surveying the community for additional input and developing a larger support base. Clearly, the general public does not want to support the downtown out of its own pocket, and there is no indication of how much support is really out there.

**Crandall** said good information needs to be given out before one can expect meaningful feedback. This includes financing. He felt his basic questions had been answered during this discussion: stay with this framework; move forward on a detailed streetscape; look at phasing and cost estimates; consider hotel site; and consider options for City Hall.

**Bernard** recommended having someone speak at the upcoming MDDA annual meeting to discuss the plan and answer questions.

**Bartlett** said staff would put together a proposal for a tabloid as part of the public involvement process.

The meeting ended at 8:25 p.m.

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

**CITY OF MILWAUKIE  
CITY COUNCIL AND RIVERFRONT BOARD  
JOINT WORK SESSION AGENDA  
OCTOBER 18, 1999**

**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 Community Forum	Group
3.	6:30 p.m.	Downtown/Riverfront Plans	Riverfront Board & George Crandall

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

*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.***

# SUMMARY RESPONSE SHEET 4

## MILWAUKIE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

September 22, 1999  
31 Respondents

### Milwaukie Workshop Questions:

1) Parkway - Select for refinement? (Yes/No/Other): Yes: 24 Yes & No: 2 No: 3 No Response: 2

- 1) Yes
- 2) Yes
- 3) No Response. Not necessary to have several paths to the river - crossing highway - two should be enough. Will walkways have ramps or other way for elderly and handicapped? What about parking?
- 4) No Response - Canal too straight. Lose the City Hall? It is so Main Street - unique. Focus (farmers' market there?) Fountain idea good. Still no river front connection across McLoughlin Blvd.
- 5) Yes. Prefer meandering stream. Recognize maritime history - small boat livery.
- 6) Yes - overpass. Marina - pleasure.
- 7) Yes! Further refinement, elevating smaller cap. Policing, flooding, crime, access to river not underground or same level - usage. User friendly. No water Spring Creek - takes too much room.
- 8) Yes. OK for refinement - but what about existing businesses (the ones to be moved)? Condemn? Law of eminent domain?
- 9) Yes. 'Like the courtyard.
- 10) & 11) Yes. Refine parkway - but here's what's wrong with the current plan: 1) If Main Street/ 21st Street & McLoughlin go over the parkway, then those overpass sections should be beautifully designed bridges, not ugly cement over passes - Europeans could build beautiful, small masonry bridges hundreds of years ago - Why can't we achieve the same good looks in the 21st Century? We don't want UGLY development in Milwaukie! The straight water course is unattractive and unimaginative. The water course should be natural, with curves like a real stream - Use some imagination and creativity and show us something better than what you have.
- 12) Yes
- 13) Yes
- 14) Yes. More restaurants with water view. Raise McLoughlin - and/or remove traffic lights. Open access.
- 15) Yes. Raise McLoughlin above town. Remove traffic lights. Increase speed limit to 55 mph.
- Small restaurants.
- 16) Yes. I like the parkway, greenway open access to the river plan.
- 17) No. Underpass dark and dank. Prefer ped, parkway or cap as natural access. Water extension into city strong with existing geography, drainage and amenity. Structured parking graded into ground to mitigate impact, noise to the park side.
- 18) Yes.
- 19) Yes. Plan looks good! Slow down traffic on McLoughlin.
- 20) Yes. A covered walkway in this climate is great - i.e. pedestrian way under McGloughlin. Include some seating and other amenities for use during inclement weather.
- 21) Yes. Overall plan looks feasible. Need boat launch site with parking identified on plan. Need more details about the transit center and relationship to library including traffic flow. Space consideration for expansion of library. Make waterway flow more naturally.
- 22) Yes. If can afford. Otherwise the Boulevard with Jackson passage is the next best bet (more affordable). With above ground open meandering creeks. So sad to lose City Hall - can they leave the front of the building there?
- 23) No! Prefer cap on McLoughlin. Parkway eliminates 1-1/2 to 2 blocks of downtown. Cap of McLoughlin increases amount of developable land.
- 24) Yes. Very enthusiastic about all the fine work. I didn't have a strong opinion before, but the option presented seems best. This seems like the kind of place I would want to visit/work in/live in, not just drive through.
- 25) Yes, but noise is an issue. Need a buffer from McLoughlin. Maybe a narrow strip of retail to shield the park. Concerns with underpass - safety, ease of river access.
- 26) No. We need a modified over pass maybe a block long - grassy loam. No underground passage!!! Afraid of crime. Not appealing to go underground - it's depressing!!
- 27) Yes - to future waterway (not straight).
- 28) Parkway - Neutral between Parkway and Waterway. No development that restricts public access to river.
- 29) Yes - Definitely!
- 30) Yes & No. The entire block should not be total park - capped and developed? I don't feel a big park is the answer to bring people into town which in turn would bring businesses. I don't see such a large park area attracting business.
- 31) Yes. Natural setting for waterway.

## MILWAUKIE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

September 22, 1999  
31 Respondents  
Page 2

### Milwaukie Workshop Questions:

#### 2) Riverfront Park - Preferred uses?

- 1) Marina, children's park, dog park, cruise boats, walking paths, bike paths.
- 2) Remove Boat Ramp, marina, stern wheeler (cruise boats).
- 3) No response.
- 4) Stern wheeler docking - "Columbia Gorge" and "Portland Rose". Johnson Creek Natural Area. Pier? Marina? Fishing Dock? Where are they? River taxi, bathroom, I hate to use any of the property for parking.
- 5) Open area - no commercial development. No parking lot for boats (marina).
- 6) Walkway, park, marina, for launching pleasure boats, dock for ferry! See below. Ferry to Oregon City, Lake Oswego.
- 7) Open space, public access, dock, no parking, amphitheater, hotel? - can't get it back, cruise ship.
- 8) Hotel great at south end. Leave as natural as possible - lots of greenway. Maybe statue of stern wheeler in the future. (Model of Lot Whitcomb - side-wheeler.) Dock for cruise ships and water taxis.
- 9) Open park area. Marina, floating restaurant, rest rooms, boat dock, fishing pier. Gas station for boats? Walking path, dock for dinner cruise boats, stern wheeler.
- 10) & 11) Needs marina! Space for watercraft - motorboats, sail boats, canoes/kayaks, excursion boats. Keep park for picnics, walk paths, fishing pier. Needs boat ramp? How about a beautiful fountain on the waterfront or on the plaza. Don't like underground access to river front or parkway. Figure out something better than that.
- 12) Recreation, boating - ?? access to boat ramp.
- 13) Keep adequate boat ramp.
- 14) Multi-use or mixed-use - condo, esplanade/shops, microbrew/restaurant, condos, amphitheater for concerts and gatherings, marina with pier for cruise tour boats, parklike, also similar Riverplace.
- 15) Multi-use, boating, walking, marina facilities, boat ramp & parking.
- 16) Pedestrian access - moorage, pier, parklike, river access, like Riverplace, boat ramp needs to be nearby, esplanade.
- 17) Park uses, picnic, frisbee, barbecue, walk, jogging, parties, kite flying. Connect to downtown Portland east side ped path.
- 18) Need to include boat ramp on river front.
- 19) Park - walking and bike paths, picnic area, floating restaurant a good idea.
- 20) Some commercial on river front with related parking.
- 21) Need boat launch - Springwater trail connection.
- 22) Need a boat launch ramp someplace else - not too far away further south or ?
- 23) Marina, docks, seasonal restaurants, kiosks (snack), hotel - upscale - no Best Western. Amphitheater.
- 24) Park. I like the idea of a boathouse, preferable rowing and other "quick" boating experiences. A 5-mph limit and possibly a "no jet-ski area" would be good. The flooding potential is to be seriously considered - nothing taxes people's ? more than new construction that doesn't plan for the inevitable.
- 25) Natural area, amphitheater, boat mooring needed, quiet boating activities at low speeds.
- 26) Keep it open space. Maybe amphitheater (natural - a grass amphitheater), NO Restaurants - NO Riverplace. Floating restaurant is OK with dock out in water.
- 27) Marina. Like floating restaurant idea. Preserve boat access ramps - permanent. Hotel. Ferry to Lake Oswego.
- 28) Must have a boat ramp! Put boat ramp behind River Road House Tavern.
- 29) Walking paths, trails. Hotel with boat dock and day facilities.
- 30) Park, paths, maybe marina, small store, water pump.
- 31) Restaurant - limited parking. Boat Ramp access - Important in area. Marina - good idea.

**MILWAUKIE DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

**September 22, 1999**  
**31 Respondents**  
**Page 3**

**Milwaukie Workshop Questions:****3) Junior High Building - Cultural Facility/Future City Hall or other?**

- 1) McMenamin's, Can we move the City Hall building to a more appropriate locations?
- 2) McMenamin's.
- 3) Cultural facility, apartments in top floor. Have farmers market on Junior High grounds on Saturday or Sunday.
- 4) No apartments on all that property - park or pool or recreation area or play field - soccer pitch. Like the public garden idea - new Oregon State gardens just opening.
- 5) No response.
- 6) Cultural facility, plays for young people - arts performance i.e. - Lake Oswego Performance or the Eastside Perf. - Community enjoyment like Children's museum and arts for older ones as well.
- 7) Keep city hall where it is; McMenamin's - Edgefield; Acquire property - further study; Maximum use of land - public planning, gardens, green space, mixed use, site specific planning. Proceed with caution involved in planning.
- 8) All OK, Cultural, City Hall (if must build), but not so sure about gardens. Leave as much of the park a playground as possible.
- 9) McMenamins, park - keep open space. Keep pool.
- 10) & 11) The Junior High site preserved as an open space. 'Could be Milwaukie's "Central Park". Absolutely NO City Hall at Jr. High building! The Jr. High should be part retail, part private office, Arts Center, Theater, Restaurant. Keep the field intact - NO housing. The grounds should have an amphitheater, public gardens. , preserve the open space, Keep our historic City Hall (or locate City Hall toward the public safety buildings).
- 12) Good idea.
- 13) Cultural facility.
- 14) Cultural Facility - yes; Future City Hall - No. Retail - like John's Landing/Multnomah Arts Center.
- 15) Cultural - park.
- 16) Cultural Facility - yes; Future City Hall - No. And retail - something like John's Landing.
- 17) City building monitored for use by public, or McMenamin's, Boys & Girls club gymnasium, pinball, etc.. Meals on wheels facility, public meeting hall, brew pub.
- 18) Yes - cultural facility/future City Hall.
- 19) Maybe art gallery & cultural facility along with City Hall if possible. Milwaukie High School has a large auditorium possibly (McMenamins would be great or combination of the above.
- 20) 'Like gardens and Spring Creek Extension. Performing Arts - Coordinate with Milwaukie High School Auditorium. Perhaps best called cultural center. OK in moving City Hall.
- 21) What costs would be involved to bring building to current codes and to handle current and future technology? How would they be paid for? Suggest joint use of Milwaukie High Performing Arts Center at the entertainment event of the plan.
- 22) Could be good idea but not sure if there's good parking for public work trucks - should ask them - the workers first. As long as it's well planned - OK yes could do a wonderful hotel, old fashioned with lots of charm, but where would the parking be? Love the Milwaukie gardens idea with a hedge sheared to a scallop along the top or wrought iron fencing for security and style. I think the Jr. High site is the most important site with the most potential.
- 23) Yes - all public (city Milwaukie management), Council, etc.
- 24) Cultural facility and/or City Hall sound good. Pleasant buildings - good open space. Keeping the farmers market seems important - good small-town feel.
- 25) McMenamin's-style cultural center.
- 26) Mixed Use - art facility, restaurant, hotel (McMenamins), similar to Edgefield with gardens. Mix use OK but only two stories high - on south end of Jr. High.
- 27) Cultural Facility. Future city hall? Yes to gardens area and arts center. Alternate idea: use as a McMenamin's hotel and pub.
- 28) Sell to McMenamins pub a la Kennedy School in Portland.
- 29) City Hall offices, cultural, civic center great idea - Yes, yes, yes.
- 30) Cultural facility, CCC, PSU, Housing.
- 31) OK - but not sure cultural center is needed. Better for McMenamins (private ownership).

## MILWAUKIE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

September 22, 1999  
31 Respondents  
Page 4

### Milwaukie Workshop Questions:

#### 4) Kellogg Lake - Park/Athletic Facility or other?

- 1) Park, athletic facility, skate board park, dog park, children's park.
- 2) Skate board park, dog park, ball park.
- 3) Where is the trail (Springwater corridor)? It should go to Milwaukie.
- 4) Natural.
- 5) No response.
- 6) Sewage treatment center - how long to clean the air? Wildlife habitat - great idea.
- 7) OK.
- 8) Park/athletic OK. Must be natural area not surrounded by high rises.
- 9) Skate park, dog park? Or maybe keep wetlands - wetland park.
- 10) & 11) Restore the natural fish habitat - keep it a natural space for people to enjoy - We need to see more designs about what built facilities might look like there. I was hoping there would be a marina there but I guess OFW wants to restore fish habitat.
- 12) Park and athletic facility.
- 13) Natural as possible.
- 14) Park/Athletic facility. Keep natural as possible.
- 15) Park - athletic - natural area.
- 16) Good use.
- 17) Marina for fisherman as existing historic use. Continuity should be maintained. Marina.
- 18) Park yes. Plan shows too much land for athletic fields.
- 19) Park, athletic facility and pool - good idea if possible.
- 20) No response.
- 21) Needs coordination with parks district and water agencies to see if athletic fields are feasible in wetlands.
- 22) If Dark Horse moves down near by Kellogg Lake, than they need to be asked on their feelings and ideas for Kellogg Lake/Creek.
- 23) Concerns - will flood annually, fields will be damaged - where will parking be?
- 24) Athletic facilities are good to replace, especially if removed elsewhere. Natural "resource" values (endangered species runs, ...) seem most important. I would miss, however, the >100 year history of the lake.
- 25) Creek restoration is a good idea. Parklike setting needed. Keep as natural as possible.
- 26) Leave it natural - as on plan. Afraid of ball park flooding - keep it wetlands.
- 27) Park/Athletic Facility - yes. Also fields. Will draining be one of the first stages? Money available?
- 28) No Response.
- 29) Other - Athletic fields.
- 30) Yes.
- 31) Good idea.

**MILWAUKIE DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

**September 22, 1999**  
**31 Respondents**  
**Page 5**

**Milwaukie Workshop Questions:****5) Other?**

- 1) No Response.
- 2) No Response.
- 3) Marina with stern wheeler that goes to Portland & back - perhaps Oregon City too. Don't get rid of City Hall. It's just been remodeled and fixed up.
- 4) No walking access to Ardenwald - Springwater Corridor Trail - No way to gain access to this valuable neighbor. And railroad tracks to Ardenwald. Bend has an active downtown, but no housing or apartments in the downtown area. It has park concerts and Drake Park attracts. In front of City Hall (toward river) is a parking lot - why not a park there? Or with restaurant and park treatment. What about family that owns Texaco? They want to remain there.
- 5) Who is going to sell this to developers?
- 6) Spring Creek could produce a beautiful waterfall in town. Attractive pedestrian walk way over McLoughlin Blvd. to the Waterfront Park way. Possibility of a ferry to and from Oregon City and Lake Oswego!!! Reinstall trolley from Oregon City to Portland!
- 7) Farmers' Market. Maximize greenspace, access to water. Natural as possible. Small town - unique opportunity for park at Jr. High and river front greenspace. No hotel. Spring Creek should not be diverted. Maximize green space.
- 8) Concern about underpass - crime, water.
- 9) Where will the boat ramp go? Clackamette Park? Yes to hotel to help pay for development. Nature's health food store please!
- 10) & 11) Hotel development looks to big for treatment plant site. Should be smaller scale - I'd rather see it left open space. 'Like the floating restaurant! Small scale development - coffee house, cafe, near waterfront. We need Farmers' Market (indoor-outdoor) and skate park.
- 12) No response.
- 13) Moving waste treatment plant is a vital issue.
- 14) Move waste treatment plant. Walkway/bike path connecting Willamette/Kellogg/Spring Creek and Johnson Creek and Elk Rock Island for historical and environmental tour.
- 15) No response.
- 16) Bike/walking paths from athletic facility to parkway.
- 17) Grocery store relationship to outbound traffic. Ball field in Kellogg not appropriate remain @ Junior High as multi-use. Activity generator and revenue. Perhaps Westmorland-style casting pond and amenity, urban connection.
- 18) No response.
- 19) Boat ramp place south of hotel. Are there any economic development monies available from state, county?
- 20) Boat launch. Where does it go? Need to address this issue as part of plan. Hotel on sewage treatment site good use. Some may have missed new athletic fields & swimming pool at "Kellogg Park" site to replace those at existing Jr. High site.
- 21) Partnership with Oregon Nurseryman's Association for garden. Head (?) questioned on Harrison Street. Agree with additional housing - keep town alive.
- 22) Ask Dark Horse if they mind moving - I think it's a great idea and I'd like to see a topiary park with comic book characters. Don't take out entire block for greenspace - a strip of the block is enough. We have ball fields in other areas - do not put downtown. We have land that can be developed for playing fields in other areas.
- 23) I'm concerned that anything but a cap will continue the terrible noise and separation. Noise from above is still noise.
- 24) A good point was made at the table about the potential noise pollution of the park from McLoughlin Blvd. which would be less if capped. Perhaps (even) lower speeds would help. Masonry bridges for McLoughlin sound good. Bike path continuity. Public rest rooms - if at all possible.
- 25) Bike and pedestrian access. Connectivity to Springwater Corridor.
- 26) No response.
- 27) No response.
- 28) No response.
- 29) No response.
- 30) Do something ASAP
- 31) Johnson Creek natural area is an important part of the plan.

**RIVERFRONT BOARD MEETING  
OCTOBER 7, 1999**

The meeting came to order at 6:00 p.m. in the City Hall Conference Room.

Riverfront Board Members: James Bernard, Chair, Kathi Cardinalli, Dave Green, Steve Loaiza, Michael Martin, Paul Verbout, and Mitch Wall.

Staff: City Manager Bartlett, Assistant City Managers Bennett and Richards, Planning Director Rouyer, and Neighborhood Services Manager Gregory.

Guests: Carolyn Tomei, Gary Michael, and Donald Hammang.

Consultants: George Crandall & Don Arambula; Gill Williams, Atlas.

**Dark Horse Conceptual Plan**    ➤

**Bernard** reviewed the conceptual plan brought forward by Mike Richardson of Dark Horse Comics. Options in the design included: a town square with a community college campus; a one-block wide McLoughlin Boulevard cap; waterway, marina, and hotel. This could support the historical theme of Milwaukie's once being a riverboat landing site.

City Hall remained in the design along with a significant greenways and paths. There were kiosks on the riverfront that the City could rent to seasonal vendors. The design also included sufficient parking to support retail and campus needs. The Jr. High Site featured an amphitheater on the corner of Harrison Street and 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue. There was ample retail space with lofts on the upper floors. The Jr. High outdoor pool was maintained in the plan was accessible by walking paths. 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue was continued past the Ledding Library to the transit center with more retail to the north.

**Bernard** believed this plan offered some good alternatives that could actually be completed for Milwaukie's 2003 Centennial Celebration. The riverfront park would be a very good location for future Festival Daze. The plan would probably cost significantly less than the \$14 million Crandall estimated for the underpass because less property would have to be purchased.

Richardson feels that successful towns have a center with a place to meet and hold celebrations. He, along with Naito and Lanphere, are interested in investing in the project. **Bernard** believed it was very important to get Dark Horse involved in the project because business owners will bring others into the City.

**Wall** asked Bernard to identify the parking areas.

**Bernard** pointed out several areas near the railroad tracks in addition to parking near the mixed use zone. He added that retail on the bottom of a parking structure was also a possibility.

**Verbout** liked the retail on the south end near Kellogg Lake; however, it seemed disconnected from the rest of the retail to the north. How important is it that the design gives a sense of unity?

**Loaiza** had not been comfortable with the Plan to date and appreciated the Dark Horse conceptual plan as an option to be considered. He liked having another choice.

**Verbout** liked Crandall's plan with the quad of activity in the center, marina on the south, and park on the riverfront.

**Bernard** said the biggest difference was the town square which would be a cost to the taxpayer.

**Green** liked the idea of the amphitheater at the Jr. High Site which would eliminate his concerns with too much McLoughlin Boulevard noise for people to enjoy concerts. He also liked the idea of college involvement in the downtown and bringing students into the area.

**Verbout** noted that according to Crandall's figures, the parkway plus the Kellogg Lake Marina would be about \$32 million.

**Bartlett** added there would have to be a cost estimate on this design in the same manner as Crandall's.

**Bernard** pointed out the Dark Horse plan was a very rough draft. Crandall has scheduled a meeting with Richardson later this month.

**Bartlett** asked the Board if it wanted the Dark Horse design to go forward on the October 27<sup>th</sup> Town Hall meeting.

**Green** commented that people were still feeling somewhat uncomfortable with the pedestrian underpass.

**Loaiza** liked the cap idea more than the underpass.

**Verbout** felt the design expressed the values -- waterfront or highway? He believed going over the top to access the river was more natural.

The group discussed getting Richardson more involved.

**Bartlett** commented that there was a "Main Street" theory that says there needs to be a mix of business for the area to be healthy.

**Michael** saw similarities in the plans. Both of the options for crossing McLoughlin Boulevard were good and needed continued consideration. The Dark Horse Plan seemed weak in retail and did not show the continuous Main Street shopping scenario contained in Crandall's plan.

**Green** noted that a full cap between Jefferson and Monroe Streets added about \$800,000.

**Bernard** said Richardson's idea was to have PSU and PCC classes coordinated with Dark Horse's business projects. He agreed that the most significant difference between the plans was the manner in which McLoughlin Boulevard was crossed. He suggested using the Dark Horse concept as an idea to add to the mix.

**Green** suggested dropping the marina from the Dark Horse plan in order to make a more fair comparison.

**Verbout** cautioned against creating conflict between the two designers by advising Crandall that he might consider certain creative elements of the Dark Horse Plan.

**Martin** suggested that, although Dark Horse and related classes could be a good draw, the educational element did not have to be in the center of town.

**Cardinalli** was not sure the public should see this as a Dark Horse Plan and expressed concern about creating resentment between Richardson and Crandall.

**Martin** believed it was important to remember that Dark Horse has interested investors.

**Verbout** felt the plan was fragmented.

**Cardinalli** felt the Board should let Crandall know what it likes about the Dark Horse Plan.

**Bernard** believed the public wanted to know more about the cap concept.

**Green** recommended telling Crandall to put some more time into the cap and to use some of Dark Horse's ideas. He urged involving Richardson.

**Verbout** added that the group had discussed small, distributed, and affordable public efforts. The City should take advantage of what is good in the Dark Horse plan.

Board members identified components of the Dark Horse Plan that it wished to carry forward:

- Modified cap
- Town square idea
- Educational aspect
- Amphitheater

The group discussed the issue of no revenue being generated from publicly-owned lands. **Bernard** understood the intent was to build privately and then lease to the colleges.

**Verbout** commented that Dark Horse would have control of what happens in the downtown area.

**Cardinalli** asked about the natural water features, and **Verbout** commented that Crandall's scheme showed more.

The group agreed to leave the marina out of the discussion for the interim.

**Bartlett** said Crandall has seen the plan and prepared some comments for his next meeting with Richardson.

**Tomei** added that Board meetings are open, so it is not a matter of the public, including Dark Horse representatives, not being given an opportunity to attend.

**Green** thought people were uneasy about taking out two City blocks and recommended being more proactive about talking to the public.

**Verbout** said, at this point, the concept is in a fictional format and not literal. It was clearly explained that the designs at this point were guidelines for discussion.

**Bartlett** said the project has slipped by about 90 days and nothing is binding until the Plan begins going to the Planning Commission.

**Bartlett** said there will be presentations to the Milwaukie Downtown Development Association (MDDA), Park and Recreation Board, North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District, and regulatory bodies including the Planning Commission and City Council.

**Wall** felt skepticism on the part of the property and business owners was healthy.

**Cardinalli** suggested a personal letter to business and property owners to ease concerns and to encourage involvement with the MDDA.

**Verbout** suggested Crandall go to as many meetings as possible.

**Crandall** arrived for his portion of the agenda and indicated he would listen and record the Board's comments for the next Town Hall meeting. He had a map that showed the river, road, 100-year floodplain, and the 1996 flood line. He discussed the right-of-way and the possible future needs of south transit. He felt it was important to keep future needs in mind when considering the design.

He put a parkway scheme overlay on the initial map. If there was a flood, water would actually flow into the keyhole but would not likely reach Main Street. This was important design information about how that area might flood and what uses would be appropriate.

**Williams** discussed issues and regulatory limitations he was encountering with the North Macadam Project. The Milwaukie project has similar objectives including pulling the streets outward to create people areas, matching the natural and urban grid, establishing view corridors, and enhancing usable space. He discussed concerns put forward by the Corps of Engineers and Fish and Wildlife along with the main issues of habitat and the Endangered Species Act (ESA). The Milwaukie project will affect the Willamette River and Kellogg and Johnson Creeks and offer a huge potential for habitat reclamation along with providing some valuable bartering chips. He noted that he had been working on the Macadam project for two years.

**Green** understood that Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) was currently bartering over removal of the Kellogg Creek dam.

**Verbout** commented that regulatory influences will increase as the project becomes more aggressive.

**Williams** agreed that the City would have to choose its battles and select those areas of the project it wishes to emphasize.

**Crandall** said the environmental climate will change to support habitat including trees, shade, and buffered areas.

**Martin**, who works for the Corps of Engineers, indicated that agency does get involved in projects and shares costs. He suggested inviting Corps representatives to a future Board meeting to discuss its ecological program and how it might work with Milwaukie's redevelopment plans.

**Arambula** added the value of the creeks, which may prove to be bargaining tools, is to provide the refuge and shade important to the ESA rules.

**Williams** suggested there might be funds for a demonstration project. He discussed the Corps cut and fill trade-off which, for that agency, is an issue of

conveyance. The approach would be for the agencies to work as a group through Intergovernmental Agreements (IGA).

**Bartlett** added that it was up to ODOT as to what happens to the Kellogg Creek dam because it is in that agency's jurisdiction.

**Green** felt there were probably other options that affected agencies could consider.

**Crandall** said it would also be wise to consider future transit right-of-way needs. There is a limited amount of property on either side of McLoughlin Boulevard, so it is important to think about how best to use what is available.

**Williams** added it was very important to have knowledge of the regulatory issues before beginning to set up uses.

**Arambula** pointed out the area on the west side of McLoughlin Boulevard that was above the floodplain but subject to road noise impacts.

**Crandall** said this information was being provided so the designers and decision makers could stay in front of the process. It is also important to keep in mind that each year more regulations are added, so rapid forward movement is essential. He discussed potential areas for waterfront activities above the normal flooding area at elevation 25.

**Williams** added that the Milwaukie waterfront was a bay, so it is more protected.

**Verbout** asked if there was project money to fix previous ills like the log dump.

**Williams** suggested it could be bargained as prime habitat at the mouth of Kellogg Creek.

**Crandall** recommended serious consideration be given to an alternate location for the boat ramp such as the Kellogg Treatment Plant after its decommissioning. This could be the fatal flaw for which there would need to be a fall back position. The Riverfront Board could have a lot of influence on this issue with the Planning Commission and City Council. This is the community's front door, and a boat ramp is an under-utilization of the site compared to the number of people who might use it if it were pedestrian friendly.

**Michael** said the previous Riverfront Steering Committee considered moving the boat ramp south; however, that idea was dropped because of vehement neighborhood opposition. A survey indicated that at least two-thirds of the users were not Milwaukie residents and pointed to the need for a regional facility.

**Verbout** thought removing the boat ramp would be in conflict with potentially emphasizing the marine nature of the community. He agreed the boat ramp was probably an under-utilized asset but felt the character should be retained.

**Crandall** discussed the Dark Horse Concept Plan that capped McLoughlin Boulevard for one block. He had not heard the cap was the community's preference, and the depression would be very expensive.

**Arambula** added that the slopes and other technical issues prevent a shorter cap. Getting under the cap is the expense and is a different scheme altogether.

**Crandall** said the weakness of the cap would be that the trench would separate the two areas of town, and the cap itself would be much higher than the river. The cap would have to rise five to six feet, creating a hill and obscuring the view. The City would also have to consider an alternative route for McLoughlin Boulevard while the trench is being dug.

**Verbout** was concerned about the dark, tunnel effective of the proposed underpass. He was concerned with how ODOT might design that type of concept.

**Green** pointed out that the concept drawings showed the underpass as very wide, high, lighted, and open.

**Arambula** said the underpass design would resemble a wide ramp moving toward the water with light on both ends. He felt certain it could be made a good, welcoming environment.

**Crandall** said ODOT will spend \$1.8 million on the road. The design will have to be the City's because ODOT is not in the business of designing beautiful underpasses. He will provide samples of the underpass design at the next meeting. He indicated the depressed roadway with cap design should be put to bed because it would create a tremendous separation of the riverfront and downtown.

**Williams** said Powell Blvd. is an example of the long, canyon effect that a depressed road can create.

**Verbout** felt the underpass made a statement that the roadway was the first priority and the town second.

**Crandall** agreed this was a design issue. Noise will also be an issue that will need to be buffered.

**Loaiza** suggested going underground would offer some abatement, and he used the example of Portland's River Place development.

**Crandall** said it was critical to create a downtown framework that attracts development. The possibility of getting an investment core in the downtown with a trench and overpass would be minimal. He felt the framework could be created by pulling the park into the downtown and creating an amenity where there is none now. The park blocks are about gracefully connecting downtown to the waterfront. Not having that framework could be the fatal flaw. The cap was not the public's first choice, and ODOT did not like it.

**Verbout** recommended looking at the Dark Horse Concept for its better elements and perhaps incorporating some of them.

**Crandall** was concerned that he keep the faith with the Board and City and not present something the group could not support. The question is, what should be presented at the town hall meeting at the end of the month? There may be some new conclusions after his meeting with Richardson that he would want to discuss with the Board.

The group agreed to have a joint work session on October 18, 1999, with the City Council when it hears the downtown/riverfront project update. The presentation would include any new information from Crandall's meeting with Richardson.

**Cardinalli** asked why the Board was talking about the cap when it was not a viable option. There are other ideas the group likes. People need to see the process is moving along and that concerns, like openness of the underpass, are being addressed. It seemed to her as if the group needed to start eliminating some of the design proposals that would not work.

**Verbout** said, as an advisory body, the Board does not want to overlook a creative approach to the project.

**Bernard** thought stakeholders might not realize how high the cap would have to be and that its height may not make that design feasible.

**Tomei** said she, and probably others, would appreciate visuals of how the underpass would look and feel to the pedestrian.

Although he had concerns with the underpass, **Green** was not convinced the cap was the solution either.

**Williams** discussed the pros and cons of a hard edge or soft edge on the riverfront.

**Crandall** said the group needed to look at the riverfront after the Kellogg Treatment Plant transitions out. A built-up esplanade gives a formal feeling. A more casual path along the water could flood frequently. He discussed the

feasible of a floating restaurant that would be less impacted by traffic noise and possible locations for related parking facilities. A rowing facility could be located in that area. For entertainment purposes, there could be a staging area for trucks directly off McLoughlin Boulevard at Washington Street.

**Bartlett** added that ODOT was planning at-grade lights at Harrison, Monroe and Washington Streets.

**Arambula** commented the park would be very accessible at that point, and he felt the walkway was important to get people close to the water.

**Michael** commented he felt a scheme incorporating a marina with slips for both rental and transient use and trees along the water's edge to create a soft environment was appropriate. He did not support the hard edge waterline in addition to its likely not being popular with Fish and Wildlife. He suggested a cantilevered deck off the log dump facility that would shade the water. The last riverfront committee discovered that the channel was very deep in that area and would accommodate larger vessels.

**Loaiza** like the idea of being able to dock tour boats.

**Martin** liked the idea of the soft edge along with a hard path and observation area above.

**Crandall** summarized the comments he heard:

1. Continue idea of marina with boat slips -- look for alternate locations.
2. Rowing clubs
3. Restaurant
4. Trees
5. Steel wall with shading device at old log dump site
6. Tour boat dock
7. Consider river bottom grades and contours
8. Soft edge at water with pathway above
9. Be a gathering place for community activities
10. Place for kiosks for seasonal vendors.
11. Keep a flat staging area for public events and connect to the park blocks -- or more structured with an amphitheater

The group discussed the various elevations of McLoughlin Boulevard which was between 34 and 50 feet. The boat ramp itself is a series of terraces and could make a natural amphitheater. There could be a cut and fill trade-off. Several of the members were concerned about a design that would mitigate pavement noise.

**Next meeting: November 8, 1999, 6:00 p.m. at City Hall with representatives from the Corps of Engineers.**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

---

Pat DuVal, Recorder