

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

Members Present

Ben Rousseau, Bryce Magorian, Daniel Eisenbeis, Everett Wild, Liz Start, Matthew Bibeau, Rebecca Hayes

Members Not Able to Attend

Albert Chen, Celestina DiMauro, Howie Oakes, Jessica Neu, Kim Travis, Neil Hankerson, Sara Busickio, Stacy Johnson, Stephan Lashbrook

City of Milwaukie

Mark Gamba, Mayor; Councilor Lisa Batey
David Levitan, Denny Egner, and Mary Heberling, Planning Department
Natalie Rogers, Climate Action and Sustainability Coordinator

Angelo Planning

Matt Hastie

Envirolssues

Bridger Wineman

Conversation and questions/answers are summarized by agenda item below. Raw flipchart notes are attached as an appendix to this summary (Appendix A, respectively).

WELCOME

- Bridger Wineman welcomed the CPAC. Went over the overview of the meeting for the night.

PROJECT UPDATES

- **David Levitan:** said that the housing policies were pinned down on July 16th with little edits from the City Council.

SUMMARY OF OPEN HOUSE/SURVEY RESULTS

- Bridger provided an overview of the open house. Lot's of support for the public facilities policy questions. Some concerns about regulating trees on private property, expanding capacity or capping Kellogg Treatment Plant, and reduced parking requirement.
- David: also noted that with the expanding capacity question for the treatment plant that people tended to think that mean expanding the facility too, which may not be the case. Could have made that clearer.
 - **Mayor Gamba** – it would be nice to know which way they were voting because either they didn't want a larger facility or because they thought expanding facility mean more population and density.

- Online Survey
 - **Bridger** - support for public facilities policy questions, support for housing in commercial areas, support for removal of Kellogg Dam, about 50% support form-based code, 25% are unsupportive, concerns about reducing parking requirements and increasing plaza and public amenity requirements
 - **Daniel Eisenbeis** – Noticed that the annual household income showed respondents as higher income and will need to think how that influenced the responses. Also would want to know the age of the respondents and how they answered each question.
 - **Bridger** – We will be able to do that in our more thorough report, which will be completed more in early August.
 - **Daniel** – Noticed there was less consensus on the parking question and treatment plant. Would like to know if there were differences in answers from those who live near the plant versus not. Also would like to know the discrepancies between the age and income for the parking question.
 - **Denny** – Would like to know more about the respondents for those who
 - **Liz Start** – Would be interesting to get more feedback from low-income folks. Know that the respondents seemed to be higher income.
 - **Daniel** – Would like to know more about those who stated they live/work outside of Milwaukie.
 - **Lisa Batey** – Do know that the Watershed Council pushed hard to have their members respond. Could be a reason why.
 - **Bridger** – We can also take those responses out (outside of Milwaukie) and see if the average income is lower or higher or unchanged.

DRAFT GOAL/POLICY REVIEW AND DISCUSSION

- **Natural Resources and Environmental Quality**
 - **Goal 1:**
 - **Liz** – How many brownfields does the City have?
 - **David** – We do have some, the murphy and mcfarland sites for sure. Some others, but I don't know the exact number right now. We do have it somewhere.
 - **Liz** – #4 can we make this more actionable/strong and what we can do as a City.
 - **Lisa Batey** – There may be some County funds to help with this sort of thing.
 - **Matt Hastie** – There are also state and federal grants to help with clean-up.
 - **Everett Wild** – I thought “support” was strong language so that is good to know that it can be interpreted differently
 - **Bryce Magorian** – #1 and #2 seem more like goal statements versus policies
 - **David** – Policy #1 could even be an over-arching chapter goal
 - **Goal #2**

- **Denny** – Add language so say it’s requires “development application/applicant”
 - **Bryce** – Is there a way to make #4 stronger towards “avoid”
 - **Lisa** – Why do we have both #9 and #10? They seem repetitive.
 - **Mayor Gamba** – I think #9 is about quantity and #10 is about quality. #9 may need to be more specific.
 - **Daniel** – Should we include policies around groundwater quality research/monitoring? We can make #10 more about groundwater quality.
- **Goal #3**
 - **Lisa Batey** – I do appreciate that this section talks about habitat connectivity, but we do have a city that is split by two highways.
 - **Everett** - #6, does the wording “and incentivize” mean that the City is committed to spending more money on this?
- **Goal #4**
 - **Everett** – Language in #1 “a diverse and multi-aged tree canopy and inventory” should be moved to #6.
 - **Liz** - #3, can you explain what this means?
 - **David** – Came from the focus group, I think it was to mean that we should include street trees as part of the larger City tree population.
 - **Everett** – I think that is what #5 is saying. We can delete #3.
 - **Natalie Rogers** – I can re-word #3 to better meet the intent. Will send to David.
 - **Daniel** - #4, the wording “environmentally-sensitive areas” is this referring to natural resources and more?
 - **Mayor Gamba** – our natural resources inventory doesn’t include everything that is “naturally sensitive”
 - **Denny** – State Goal 5 refers to, Metro refers to.....
 - **Matthew Bibeau** – In #4, “reduce impact” should be worded better and defined more clearly.
 - **Matthew** – Does the City have a definition for ecological services and what measurements do we have for them?
 - **Natalie** – The Urban Forestry Plan may have some language around this.
 - **Everett** – Should we move #4 up with #1? And make it clear that specific data driven things we want is in the Urban Forestry program.
- **Goal #5**
 - **Ben** - #1, is this a place where we can support renewable power generation?
 - **Liz** – Would like to see more about reusable materials. On #3, will also need to consider how this may affect affordable housing.

