

**CITY OF MILWAUKIE
CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION
JANUARY 3, 2000**

Mayor Tomei opened the work session at 5:45 p.m. in the City Hall Conference Room.

Present were Councilors Kappa and Lancaster.

Staff Present: City Manager Bartlett; Assistant City Managers Bennett and Richards; Public Works Director Stepan; Civil Engineer Roeger; Neighborhood Services Manager Gregory; Interim Public Works Staff Swanson; and Thom Kaffun, North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District (NCPRD).

Park and Recreation Board members: Sharon Van Horn, Darlene Walsh, Don McCarty, Mart Hughes, and Edie Kerbaugh.

Information Sharing

1. **Councilor Kappa** discussed the importance of training Council and City employees to improve overall effectiveness and enhance leadership skills. **Councilor Lancaster** commented that it was important to balance training among the members, particularly those newly elected, and to identify the various resource opportunities.
2. **Bartlett** announced that Senator Ron Wyden was scheduled for several meetings in Milwaukie on January 20.

Park and Recreation Board Draft Resolution for FY 2000 - 2001 Parks District Funding

Richards described the Park and Recreation Board's public outreach efforts to determine park and trail needs in under-served Milwaukie neighborhoods.

The proposed resolution prioritizes the City of Milwaukie's funding requests for the North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District's (NCPRD) fiscal year 2000 - 2001 budget. The format of the resolution was changed from previous years in that it identified Capital Program Priorities and Operation Priorities.

The first Capital Program priorities were property acquisition in Lake and Ardenwald neighborhoods; facilities for outdoor playing fields, basketball courts, and skateboarding and rollerblading; and, in order of importance, trails, wetlands, and open spaces. The second priority was recreation and leisure activities for summer preschool and school-aged children at three Milwaukie locations and increased after school programs. Educational and volunteer activities were

expanded to include neighborhood activities with the goal of increasing community pride and participation in such projects as the recently complete Water Tower Park.

The subsequent Capital Program was upgrading existing Milwaukie facilities to meet increasing needs. These included Furnberg, Century, Wichita, Spring, and Dogwood Parks; Elk Rock Island; and Lewelling and Hector Campbell neighborhood parks.

Councilor Kappa asked what kind of improvements the neighborhood wanted in Century Park.

Richards replied that the neighbors wanted to upgrade the existing types of activities and enlarge the basketball court.

Kaffun discussed possible improvements to Century Park if grant funds were awarded.

Richards added that Dogwood Park master planning would be done in conjunction with the downtown/riverfront project. The City would also like to move forward on annexing Elk Rock Island and implementing the adopted management plan. There are still discussions that need to be held with City of Portland regarding Elk Rock Island including public safety issues.

Richards discussed the most recently purchased neighborhood parks in Lewelling and Hector Campbell. Staff is working on a stabilization plan for the Stanley and Willow site that currently involves clearing the brush and blackberries and seeding the area. It is an open space for community use with no active recreation. The Hector Campbell property will remain a natural wooded area with indigenous plants and cleared of the blackberries.

Richards continued with Capital Program item #3: construct and/or acquire facilities for youth activities. The goal would be to create partnerships with other governmental agencies, private and non-profit entities, and volunteers.

The operation priorities were to develop recreation and leisure programs through partnerships and continue to expand on educational and volunteer activities related to community and civic pride and wetland, open spaces and neighborhood activities.

The Board understood the District has financial problems with funding such programs, but it wanted the District Board to know that these needs do exist.

Walsh added that current programs can be expensive, and a significant number of families are eliminated from participating. Many programs are too specialized to serve a diverse population. She understood the funding issue and believed

that partnering with the School District might provide the best solution and offer the most public benefit. Walsh also felt structured summer events for all ages were important, and she recommended bringing the summer concert program back to its previous level.

Councilor Kappa understood the School District got some state funds for after school programs.

Richards said she did not know the School District's funding sources.

Kaffun said the Parks District was looking at the "instant park" concept that involves the neighborhoods in development.

Richards added that those involved with the skateboard park had information on fundraising and soliciting both raw materials and labor.

McCarty noted the success of the Clackamas High School Key Club in developing Water Tower Park. He saw Milwaukie High School as an untapped resource for community activity.

Councilor Kappa supported trail connections between parks, and **Richards** said that was the third priority in Capital Program.

Hughes asked if there was any idea of the number of miles of trails it would take to connect the parks, and **Kaffun** responded that would be a future PARB task.

Richards explained that these recommendations would go to the City Council in the form of a resolution adoption and then be forwarded to the Parks District for consideration in its budget process. The PARB will be informed of all decisions.

There was correspondence from Councilor Marshall regretting that he was unable to meet his commitments to the NCPRD Board and tendered his resignation. He recommended appointing Councilor Lancaster in his place.

Reimbursement District

Swanson presented the staff report on the proposed reimbursement district. He explained the district was an area in which a person or company makes public improvements that ultimately benefits other properties. It is not a taxing district. The City would benefit by having more complete, rather than piecemeal, development of public improvements such as streets and sidewalks. The Finance Department has concurred with the proposal and will track the districts. Creation of the district is at the sole discretion of the City Council. He discussed non-payment of reimbursement fees.

Councilor Lancaster asked if there were any other methods for getting whole projects other than this type of process.

Swanson said local improvement districts are an option, but that is a cumbersome process.

Roeger noted a situation on Firwood where there was 24-feet of paving on only the west side of the street while there is development potential on the east side also.

Bennett said the purpose of the reimbursement district is to get better improvements that are more proportional to their impact.

Swanson added the right for reimbursement ends after five years from the district formation. However, application can be made for up to two five-year extensions for a total of fifteen years in which the developer can recapture expenses.

Councilor Kappa asked if, hypothetically, the City might be the applicant.

Swanson said that would be conceivable. For example, if the City wanted to construct a senior center at the end of a block that did not have sewer service, it could use this tool where there are intervening properties that do not have service.

Councilor Kappa asked if the reimbursement district could be used for roads.

Bartlett said a developer could construct full street improvements and use this as a vehicle for reimbursement by future development.

Swanson added that public improvements in this ordinance includes public streets.

Councilor Lancaster was concerned that developers pay their fair share and not be subsidized. He felt the fifteen-year recovery period was a long time.

Swanson said the reimbursement period could be amended when the City Council adopts the ordinance.

Bennett added this would be additional leverage on the developer by providing incentive to build at full potential with reduced risk. This district would help eliminate half street improvements and installation of undersized sewers.

Mayor Tomei noted that establishing the district and authorizing extensions was at the City Council's discretion.

Councilor Lancaster asked why the ordinance was being proposed at this time.

Roeger responded that the Firwood Meadows developer made this type of request, but no action was taken. He noted that the proposal was backdated to include the Firwood development.

Bartlett explained this would be a good tool when the City annexes area A.

Councilor Kappa suggested referring to "informational public hearing" in both 13.30.050 and 13.30.060 for clarification and consistency.

Bennett commented it was a Council policy decision and differed from the LID process.

The group discussed the procedural nature of the City Engineer's report referred to in 13.30.070 and how modifications might be made.

Councilor Lancaster asked if there would be reasonable standards applied and expressed concerns with the possibility of inflated bids.

Roeger explained that unit pricing from previous improvement projects is normally applied.

Councilor Lancaster noted a provision for collecting administrative costs, and **Bartlett** said those charges would be identified on a per unit basis in the cost of services study.

Councilor Lancaster referred to staff report page WS.3.7 and asked for clarification of a "unit" when applying the reimbursement fee. He wanted to be sure objective principles were used.

Bartlett said generally accepted improvements would be used.

Roeger added that the method is determined when the district established is established, so they could vary.

Councilor Kappa commented that each district could have its own unique set of circumstances.

Swanson explained these issues would be outlined in the Engineer's Report, and City Council could make modifications to that Report.

Councilor Lancaster referred to staff report page WS.3.7 and the engineering reimbursement fees not exceeding 13.5% of the eligible construction costs. He asked the source of that percentage.

Bennett said that percentage could be changed prior to adoption.

Councilor Lancaster referred to staff report page WS.3.8 and the section that allowed reimbursement for legal fees. He asked the rationale for that reimbursement.

Bennett said that would be a policy choice.

Bartlett added that was a tool the City could use, but it is not a high priority. It could be a benefit, however, in the annexation areas where the issues will be more complex.

Councilor Lancaster felt the City needed to look for opportunities to make processes as straight forward as possible. He asked what the interest rate would be for the district.

Bartlett said the interest rate would likely be based on what the City gets for the money it has in the local investment pool.

Councilor Lancaster referred to staff report page WS.3.10 and asked how the 60-day limit for contesting the district or the reimbursement amount was determined.

Swanon suspected that was statutory and would research the question.

Bennett said staff would work to answer the Council's questions by the next night's regular session.

Community Development Boards

Bennett reviewed the status of the Community Development appointed advisory boards: Historic Resources Commission (HRC), Citizens Utility Advisory Board (CUAB), and Traffic Safety and Transportation Board (TSTB).

Historic Resources Commission

Staff suggested the HRC be used as the Design Review board as the Riverfront/Downtown Plan unfolds.

Councilor Kappa believed these two boards addressed different types of issues.

Bennett said staff was looking for direction on whether or not the City Council accepted the suggestion conceptually. The HRC has only met twice during the past year, so one idea was to make it part of the Planning Commission. This action, however, would add to the Commission's workload. Staff is concerned

that talented citizens are appointed to boards and commissions but have nothing to do.

Mayor Tomei felt it would be better to give a group a more meaningful charge rather than eliminating it.

Councilor Lancaster saw a connection between the historic resources and design review, but he was concerned that there were other people in the community interested in serving on a Design Review Board.

The group discussed the concept of ad hoc work groups that address projects as they come along rather than establishing ongoing boards that might have little to do.

Bennett said if the City Council chose that direction, it could initialize a working group and give it a charge with an established completion date.

The City Council agreed that staff should make this proposal to the HRC and get the members' feedback.

Citizens Utility Advisory Board

Swanson said the Citizens Utility Advisory Board (CUAB) has two defined functions: rate reviews and capital improvement programs. He believed the CUAB could meet only twice a year and fulfill its function.

Councilor Kappa noted that the issues have changed since the CUAB was established. He suggested an ad hoc group.

Mayor Tomei felt it was important to have experienced people considering rates and capital improvements. She was concerned that ad hoc committee volunteers would be restricted from serving on other advisory boards and commissions.

Bartlett suggested the City Council consider a code amendment that would allow ad hoc committee members to also be members on boards and commissions.

Councilor Lancaster recommended giving the ad hoc groups a specific charge and let them determine how often to meet. He supported the concept of transitioning to project groups.

Traffic Safety and Transportation Board

Swanson noted that the Traffic Safety and Transportation Board (TSTB) has maintained a narrow focus on traffic issues while its charge is really quite broad.

He suggested reducing the charge to monitoring Milwaukie traffic issues. When he discussed this change with the Board chair, she seemed receptive to the idea of limiting the scope and reducing the number of members. If the City Council decides to do so, ad hoc committees can be established and charged with specific, short term assignments relating to broader regional transportation issues.

Councilor Kappa felt strongly that Milwaukie needed a transportation board that would review regional issues and identify local impacts.

The group discussed the current members' appointment terms and changing the TSTB to a Traffic Safety Board that would meet on a monthly basis. The Board could consider Neighborhood Traffic Management Program requests, School Trip Safety Program projects, and traffic control devices.

The City Council directed staff to discuss these issues and options with the affected boards.

Draft City-wide Mission and Vision

Gregory asked if the Councilors present had any further changes or reactions to Councilor King's written comments.

The group discussed the following:

- Mission Statement -- agreed upon *Milwaukie: A great place to live.*
- Education -- Councilor Lancaster suggested replacing "all ages and genders" with "all citizens". Mayor Tomei and Councilor Kappa liked the specificity of "all ages and genders". They agreed to discuss it at the regular session.
- Education -- The group agreed to change the last sentence of that statement to "We support learning facilities, quality education, and extracurricular activities that are diverse, accessible, and affordable."
- Public Safety -- Councilor King wanted to add "for all citizens" to the first statement; some members felt that was implied throughout the entire document.
- Economic Development -- Councilor King wanted to add "socially and economically" responsible business partner. Other Councilors did not feel that was appropriate and agreed to discuss it at the regular session.
- Cultural Resources -- Councilor Lancaster wanted reference to "well-planned events".
- Vision Statement -- Change first sentence to read "...representing the values of its citizens while remaining a strong partner..."
- Infrastructure -- "Sustained basic services that provide quality, well-maintained capacity and supply at the lowest possible cost, ensuring that ..."

- Fiscal and Organizational Accountability -- "Our City shows value ..."
- Quality Built Environment -- "Careful review of all development and high property maintenance standards..."; delete the word "peaceful".

Staff was directed to prepare an adoption draft of the Mission and Vision Statements based on these comments for the regular session public hearing on the following evening.

Transit Center

Bartlett provided the City Council with an updated concept drawing developed by Tri-Met and George Crandall. The Ledding Library Board has also seen this latest iteration. He discussed the site and the surrounding area and business relocation in the transit-oriented development site. Tri-Met will be in the position of buying everything that is not in the right-of-way in July.

Meeting ended at 8:40 p.m.

Pat DuVal, Recorder