

**Riverfront Board Meeting Minutes
July 11, 2004**

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

Members absent: Klein

Observers: Dennis McCarthy, Oregonian, Kevin Mohr

Minutes: Wall made a motion to approve the minutes of the June meeting. Martin seconded and the motion carried 4-0-2 – with Stacey and St. Clair abstaining since they were not at the June meeting.

Presentation on Treatment Plant site use:

Kevin Mohr, a recent graduate of the University of Oregon Architecture program showed the group a design for a mixed-use development for the site currently occupied by the Kellogg Sewage Treatment Plant. His design hosted 8-9 single-family homes at the south end and several buildings containing rental apartments (63 units/building) with retail space on the lower stories.

Oregon Solutions Update:

Herrigel shared a summary of the Oregon Solutions process with the group. She noted that although no firm funding for a final design was committed during this process, many grants and potential donors were identified that staff will pursue once the concept plan is finished. Green said that he hoped the Oregon Solutions group would continue to meet regularly to keep the momentum of the process going.

Darling asked that the final version of the Riverfront Board's Declaration of Cooperation be distributed to the Board.

Green reported that Howard Dietrich of the Mill End Store had suggested that underground parking might be good for the Riverfront Park. Dietrich had also volunteered to pay \$1,000/month to hire a fundraiser for the Riverfront. Dietrich had suggested Dick Townsend, the Oregon Solutions staff person, as the fund raiser. Board members cautioned that whoever was employed to fundraise for this project have experience. Members also raised concerns about what organization (City, CMI or other) would receive donated funds. It was recommended that staff research further whether the City's status as a non-profit would allow donations to be tax-deductible.

Riverfront Concepts:

Dave Green handed out two Riverfront concepts completed by Gill Williams that integrated the comments from the Board's June meeting. Scheme 1 showed a "Green" park with a dock, but no ramp and no parking between the creeks. Scheme 2 showed a

boat ramp and two docks and 4 car and 4 trailer parking spaces between the creeks. Both schemes showed additional parking south of Kellogg Creek (at the log dump area).

St. Clair asked what the next step was for these concepts. Green responded that at the last meeting the group had recommended that staff take the concepts and a proposed public input process to the City Council so that we could kick off a public review of the concepts.

St Clair said he was disappointed that the group hadn't kept the 8 to 12 spaces for parking that had been in a previous concept plan. He noted that despite his disappointment he thought we needed to get the concepts out to the public for review and input.

Martin said he liked the amphitheater better on the south side – rather than the north where it is shown in Concept # 1. Green said he would ask Gill Williams to move the amphitheater.

Green noted that the Riverfront Board had spent months trying to get to a compromise but that it seemed that they couldn't reach one. Stacey responded that this (Scheme 2) was not a compromise.

Green said it was time to get something out to the public to see what they thought.

St. Clair agreed, saying that we should see what the public thinks. He added that the sign currently near the entrance to the boat ramp should be removed since the rendering shown there is misleading. Green noted that that sign was intended to show the potential for the Riverfront. St Clair responded that we need to make sure we show the public, very clearly, the difference between what we have now and what we are proposing. St Clair went on to say that all the users of the current facilities are important.

Green said he felt that the Milwaukie citizens were the most important ones to get input from. He recollected that when the Board was discussing the Oregon Solutions effort that they had strongly stated that the decision regarding what developed on our Riverfront was the City's and not Tri Met's, Metro's or other state or regional agencies'.

Darling stated that she liked the public input process that staff had developed and was very happy with it.

St. Clair asked if the 12 parking spaces could be added back.

Stacey said he felt that both concepts were unusable as they were right now and that he had nothing to "sell" (to the boating constituency.)

St. Clair said that the Oregon Marine Board said that if you have 20 parking spaces, a project may get funding but we only have 14. He said if we had 4-5 more spaces he'd feel more comfortable. Green noted that the Marine Board was not able to commit to any funding at this time and that Scheme 2 had been developed to reflect what the Board

majority thought the park should look like, not necessarily what the Marine Board could commit to fund.

Green said that we may end up with more spaces ultimately but that this (Concept 2) does push the green space back toward the south, keeping the parking facilities out of the north end of the park.

St Clair said he is fine with putting this out to the public – he just wishes that we had more parking.

Green asked how many days per year there were 12 or more trailers parked at the boat ramp. St. Clair responded that he thought this occurred 90% of the time, especially during April and May. He added that this was with a ramp that is in bad repair. He thought that with an enhanced ramp that people would come from all around. (Stacey asked how many days a year there were 12 or more park users down at the Riverfront.)

Darling asked why it was that so many people used our ramp since it was in such bad shape. St. Clair responded that he thought it was because it is the only one on this side of the River that is accessible.

The group discussed who should be surveyed for input on the concepts: Only Milwaukie residents or all users of the Riverfront. St Clair asked if it would be possible to get zip codes from survey takers so information could be grouped that way. Others noted that this may be a decision Council needs to make. Green said that it was important to establish how information would be used before we started the review process.

St.Clair made a motion that the survey input be obtained from in and around the City but that the data be sorted by source using zip codes or another mechanism. The motion was seconded by Stacey. The motion carried 4-2 with Martin and Darling voting no. The nos felt that input should come from Milwaukie residents only.

St Clair motioned to adjourn and Stacey seconded. Motion passed unanimously and the meeting adjourned.