

Riverfront Board meeting - May 17, 2004

Board members present: Wall, Klein, Stacey, Green, Darling, St.Clair

Absent: Martin

Minutes: Darling motioned to approve minutes with corrections proposed by Green. Stacey seconded and motion passed 6-0.

St. Clair asked where the sign (with the map on it) south of Vic's tavern at the Riverfront came from? He suggested that if we want public input that is the place we should put our concepts to get people's attention.

Green suggested that once we have an updated plan we could put that plan there as well as at City Hall. He suggested we also have a presence at the Farmer's Market and asked if members would consider staffing a booth. Most agreed that they would.

Oregon Solutions Declaration of Cooperation:

Green noted that as part of the Oregon Solutions process all participants are being asked to sign a Declaration of Cooperation. This document will state what each participant is willing and able to do toward the goal of development of Milwaukie's Riverfront Park. As a participant, he said, the Riverfront Board has been asked to write up what they would add to this declaration. Following were the suggestions board members made:

The Milwaukie Riverfront Board will

- Advance the design of the Riverfront Park
- Act as a conduit for public input on the Park design
- Encourage funding from grants and donors
- Act as cheerleaders for the Riverfront Park project
- Act as shepherds for the design and development of the Riverfront Park

Wall suggested that Herrigel review the Board's mission to see if we were missing anything.

Darling made a motion that Herrigel and Green draft the text of the Riverfront Board's Declaration of Cooperation submission and circulate it to Board members for review. Wall seconded. Motion passed 6-0.

St. Clair said he would be willing to offer River Cruises to attract interest in the Riverfront.

Concept Plan:

Green began the discussion about the concept plan by recalling that at the last meeting the Board had reached consensus on Scheme 1 (boat ramp with less parking) with the condition that Gill Williams make some modifications to the drawing. He noted that Mike Stacey had sent an email the day after that Riverfront Board meeting telling Board members that he had changed his mind and could not support Scheme 1 even with the proposed changes.

Green said that he and Herrigel and Gill Williams had met with Oregon Marine Board staff to discuss the concepts the Board is developing and to attempt to apply some Marine Board engineering standards to the boat ramp and associated parking.

Williams showed the group a revised version of Scheme 1 (called Scheme 3) which:

- Added parking at the “log dump area”
- Made the ramp one-lane
- Widened the queuing area for boaters
- Used the existing gravel area to the north of the ramp for parking
- Applied the Oregon Marine Board standards to the parking area – thereby fitting more parking in certain areas

Comments from board:

- Stacey and St Clair asked how boaters could get cars and trailers in the log dump spaces. They suggested that, logistically, it doesn't work.
- Green noted that if more space was needed at the log dump maybe the City could ask for an easement on the south edge of the log dump lot near the Treatment Plant entrance. He suggested we find out where the property line is on the south side of the log dump.
- Darling noted that 1/3 of the park is now parking as it is shown on the scheme 3 – she had concerns with that.
- Green said the parking lot should be multi-use, accommodating Trolley Trail users and others (bikers, cars and boaters).
- Stacey noted that regarding the Chopsticks parking lot (on the east of McLoughlin) – there is an alley shown that doesn't exist any more
- Stacey said that Scheme 3 does not adequately deal with the issues of the 4,000 boaters in Milwaukie (each of whom have a partner – so 8,000 total)
- St.Clair – why can't we do the festival lawn on the north side rather than the south (Gill noted that there is more space on the south side and the site topography accommodates the festival lawn on the south side)

The group discussed the issue of Oregon Marine Board funding for this project and the 20 year obligation typically required in OMB agreements. Comments included:

- Stacey and St. Clair suggested that signing a 20 year agreement would be beneficial – since at least we'd know the boat ramp would be there for 20 years and we wouldn't have to think about all this again in the near future.
- Green noted that we had been focusing on the portion of the riverfront between the creeks. He said the comprehensive plan has no boat ramp and we've been trying to come up with a compromise – which is to integrate the boat ramp and parking into what was a green space. He said we can't really know what will happen in the future – but we do have some flexibility now that the grant agreements with the OMB have lapsed. Since we will always have unknowns, he suggested taking advantage of the Oregon Solutions process to develop a compromise.
- Wall and Green noted that the less we commit now (to OMB) the less we pay back later (if ramp and parking moves)

- Darling asked how many parking spaces were required for OMB funding. Green responded that only two ADA parking spaces are 'required' right at the boat ramp. The OMB told him that there was no hard and fast rule but that 20-24 was the typical guideline for a one lane ramp.
- St Clair asked why not plan this park so it works for now and go for the 20-year option. He asked if the group thought the ramp could really move to the Treatment Plant site in the future and speculated that he doubted that would happen. He said he'd almost bet that the Treatment Plant would still be on the Riverfront in 20 years. *(I'm pretty sure that he wagered his boat..... should we capture that in the meeting minutes?)*
- Someone asked how negotiable the 20 year term for OMB funds was....Green responded that the OMB had not been very flexible on that point. (Herrigel noted that OMB staff had said at their meeting that they have never signed an agreement that didn't have the 20 year clause in it.)

Darling said she was ok with Scheme 1 but scheme 3 had more (too much) parking.

St Clair said that in the same way that others didn't want to hobble themselves by committing to a 20-year obligation he didn't want to reject the 20 year obligation if it meant having to renegotiate this issue again in the near term.

Darling said she thought we'd decided to have a temporary plan so we could use it now and then move the ramp later (south of Kellogg). Stacey responded that the Board had originally decided to take two plans out to the public for review.

Wall said he remembered that we were looking at a temporary plan and that we'd all agreed on Scheme 1 last time – he asked why Stacey changed his mind. He suggested that Stacey just didn't want any change at all and Stacey confirmed that.

Klein said he didn't like tearing up concrete (south of the existing boat ramp) just to put it elsewhere (north of ramp). Williams addressed Klein's concern by stating that gravel or pavers could be used for the lot on the north side of the ramp.

Stacey noted that temporary means "temporary" and he doesn't want to lose "permanent".

St Clair asked Stacey if he would accept Scheme 3 if pavement was added to parking north of ramp and we fixed parking at the log dump...Stacey asked if OMB financing would be included.

Green suggested the Board should choose a plan they want and then see if the OMB provides funds.

It was noted that we will have to take at least two plans to the public: One which shows the design as it appears in the Comprehensive Plan and at least one other representing a compromise as proposed by the Riverfront Board.

It was suggested that we propose a plan that is "permanent until such time as another site is located." This was proposed as potential language for an agreement with the OMB agreement.

Further comments on Scheme 3:

- St Clair: enlarge the log dump area and add parking at the north end of parking lot (north of ramp?)
- Green – show boat house
- St Clair – I like the staging (queuing?) area
- Klein: Like Scheme 2 because parking is to the south of the ramp. We wouldn't need to change the lot and it would be less expensive since pavement exists there and wouldn't have to be replaced.
- Stacey: The log dump area, as shown, needs to be changed. Like either Scheme 2 or 3 but want to tie up for 20 years with and Oregon Marine Board agreement. All parking should be paved (asphalt.)
- Green – clarified that Stacey was asking for the Riverfront Board to promote a 20 year obligation
- Darling – like Scheme 3 but don't like parking at the log dump. Like parking on the east side of McLoughlin. Don't want to commit to OMB for 20 years.
- Wall: Like Scheme 3 with log dump area modified. Okay with permanent funding with OMB – but only with Scheme 3. Okay with paving parking areas.
- Green: Like Scheme 3. Would scale back the loop road around parking area to the north to add some green area. Might put an open lane next to the last boat space at the north of that lot.
- St Clair : Should strive for permanence. Okay with paving

The group asked Gill Williams to make the proposed changes to Scheme 3. Green said he would ask Water Environment Services about the land surrounding the log dump.

St. Clair made a motion that the Riverfront Board accept Scheme 3 with the condition that we are able to change the log dump parking to the satisfaction of the group and strive for permanence by pursuing Oregon Marine Board funding. Stacey seconded the motion.

Green clarified that, for Stacey, permanence meant Oregon Marine Board funding with a 20 year obligation. He said that he would be okay with pursuing Oregon Marine Board funding but that he would want to negotiate the terms of that agreement.

Stacey said that permanent to him meant a 20 year “tie up.”

Green said he would not support locking the City into another 20-year agreement with the Marine Board.

The motion was called and was defeated 2 yes(St Clair/Stacey) to 4 no(Darling, Green, Wall and Klein).

Atlas Invoice:

Herrigel reminded the group that Gill Williams had agreed to donate his own time to work with the Riverfront Board on these concept plans but that he had asked to be reimbursed for his staff's time and his materials. Herrigel asked if the Board would approve of the use of the \$3,000 in the City's Riverfront fund to pay Williams \$623 in expenses. St Clair motioned to pay Williams – Darling seconded and the motion passed 6-0.

Stacey said he would ask the OMB staff if they would ask their Board if they would ever agree to a contract for less than a 20 year term.

A motion to adjourn was made, seconded and approved 6-0.