

**CITY OF MILWAUKIE
DESIGN AND LANDMARKS COMMITTEE
MINUTES
Milwaukie City Hall
10722 SE Main St
MONDAY, MARCH 3, 2014
6:30 PM**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Greg Hemer, Chair
Sherry Grau, Vice Chair
Val Ballestrem
James Fossen
Becky Ives

STAFF PRESENT

Denny Egner, Planning Director
Ryan Marquardt, Senior Planner
Stacy Bluhm, Light Rail Construction
Manager

MEMBERS ABSENT

None

1.0 Call to Order – Procedural Matters

Chair Hemer called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and read the conduct of meeting format into the record.

2.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Notes - None

3.0 Information Items

Denny Egner, Planning Director, noted that the next Moving Forward Milwaukie event was taking place on March 6.

4.0 Audience Participation –This is an opportunity for the public to comment on any item not on the agenda. There was none.

5.0 Public Meetings - None

6.0 Worksession Items

- 6.1 Summary: Kellogg Pedestrian Bridge Lighting Plan
Staff Person: Ryan Marquardt, Senior Planner, and Amy Fandrich, TriMet

Ryan Marquardt, Senior Planner, presented an overview of the proposal via PowerPoint.

- This was a consultation about a specific condition of approval from the Kellogg Bridge condition of approval from 2011, rather than the more typical design review meeting.
- The condition of approval from WG-11-01 related to the pedestrian bridge lighting were:
"Prior to approval of development permits for the pedestrian bridge, the applicant or other authorized entity shall propose pedestrian scale lighting for the pedestrian bridge. The Planning Director shall consult with the DLC about the proposed lighting prior to approving any development permits for the pedestrian bridge.
A. Propose energy-efficient and wildlife-friendly lighting, preferably LED lighting.
B. Shield lights from shining directly into windows on residential properties."
- The focus of the consultation was a light concept for the pedestrian bridge. A Type I Design Review application would be required prior to installation of the lighting.

Mr. Marquardt reviewed the proposed lighting concept for compliance with the conditions of approval.

- Propose energy-efficient and wildlife-friendly lighting, preferably LED lighting.
 - The proposed lighting fixtures were energy-efficient LED fixtures. This condition was met.
 - The City did not have specific standards for lighting adjacent to natural resource areas, but did have standards related to light trespass onto adjacent properties, which was limited to 0.5 foot candles at the edge of parking lots. The submitted photometric studies showed that the light level on the walkway was 4-5 foot candles, and below 0.5 foot candles within the natural resource area.
- Shield lights from shining directly into windows on residential properties.
 - The applicant had proposed shielding for the light fixtures, and the photometric studies showed that the light level at the adjacent property was 0 foot candles. This condition was met.
- Staff was requesting DLC direction regarding the consistency of the lighting plan with the downtown design guidelines for lighting.

Stacy Bluhm, Light Rail Construction Manager, provided an overview of the funding for and design of the pedestrian bridge.

- There was \$1.4 million designated for the pedestrian bridge, but the cost estimates were \$2.4 million. Because of the lack of funding, the pedestrian bridge would be installed in phases and the first phase would not include lighting. The idea was to plan for the lighting so it could be installed at a later date.
- The City would be paying for the lighting, but TriMet was willing to accommodate future lighting into the first phase of construction.

The Committee asked questions about the phasing of the pedestrian bridge, how the lighting would be integrated, how the bridge would be constructed, and how pedestrians would access the bridge.

Amy Fandrich, TriMet, introduced herself to the Committee and provided an overview of the lighting proposal.

- TriMet had considered a number of options for lighting on the pedestrian bridge, including a treatment similar to the jump span lighting. The pedestrian bridge didn't lend itself to the recessed lighting design for a number of reasons, including maintenance requirements and cost.
- TriMet's lighting engineers had proposed an alternative concept, which the Committee was reviewing tonight. The proposed lighting plan included fixtures that were attached to the bridge structure at regular intervals and were about 13 ft above the walking surface and addressed concerns about maintenance and vandalism.
- She reviewed the materials in the packet and described the various considerations reflected in the proposed lighting concept.

The Committee asked questions about the details of the light fixtures, including voltage, pole mounts, width of the poles, and the proposed shield.

Ms. Fandrich noted that the proposed concept was matte black in color, but other colors, such as dark bronze, were available. The proposed poles were square, and holes would be drilled in the bridge during construction to allow future installation of conduit and light fixtures.

Ms. Bluhm requested, at minimum, DLC input on the spacing of the light fixtures so the holes could be drilled during construction. This would not preclude future installation of light poles and fixtures.

Ms. Fandrich noted that the proposed lighting concept was fairly standard for walkways. Lighting on the hand rails would potentially glare into the natural areas. Footlights were good for stairs but did not provide enough light for safety.

Ms. Bluhm noted that the Police Chief agreed that these options did not provide sufficient visibility and safety.

Chair Hemer asked for clarification about what TriMet was proposing and requesting.

Ms. Fandrich and **Ms. Bluhm** clarified that the poles would be attached to the pedestrian bridge, but the cord would need to be pre-cut for the conduit. The size of the pole was not critical, but the spacing was critical. TriMet's proposal was to install the light poles on every 4th vertical rather than every 3rd vertical.

DLC Member Becky Ives noted that the Committee had spent a great deal of time to establish the weathering steel finish of the rail and pedestrian bridge and had some concerns about the color of the light poles and fixtures, and the potential for contrast with the weathering steel finish.

Ms. Bluhm noted that black was proposed because light poles throughout downtown were black, but the fixtures on the bridge could be a dark bronze or other finish.

Chair Hemer asked if the light fixtures would impede or affect the planned public art beneath the Kellogg Bridge. **Ms. Bluhm** stated that they would not.

Ms. Ives clarified that TriMet was looking for the DLC's direction regarding the placement of the lights and approval of the concept of overhead lighting.

Mr. Marquardt noted that the project team was looking for a head nod from the DLC regarding the placement of the lights on every 4th vertical and the use of overhead lighting. The design of the poles and light fixtures could be finalized later in the process.

Chair Hemer asked questions about the preference of the Department of Fish and Wildlife, the level of illumination being proposed, and how far the lighting concept could extend into Kronberg Park. He was concerned about the impact of the lighting on the future restored Kellogg Creek and the pedestrian experience.

Ms. Bluhm and **Ms. Fandrich** responded to his questions and discussed regional and national lighting standards for pedestrian pathways.

Chair Hemer asked why the light fixtures did not alternate on either side of the bridge, and whether it was a cost consideration. **Mr. Marquardt** and **Ms. Bluhm** noted that the shielding would cut off the lighting more easily from the adjacent residences, and that it was more costly to run conduit on both sides of the bridge.

DLC Member James Fossen suggested that some of the light fixtures would be on or off at different times of the day to adjust for light levels. **Ms. Fandrich** noted that the light levels were consistent along the bridge with the proposed spacing.

Chair Hemer asked details about how the light fixtures would operate. **Ms. Fandrich** noted that those details would need to be worked out during the next level of design.

Mr. Marquardt noted that the DLC appeared to be supporting Option B, mounting to every 4th vertical, with the proposed illumination of 3 foot candles and a height of 13 ft above the bridge walkway surface.

DLC Member Val Ballestrem clarified that he understood that the details of the lighting would be reviewed later in the process.

Chair Hemer asked the Committee members to state their recommendation on Option B.

Ms. Ives stated that she supported the concept, but it was important that the fixture fit with the weathering steel finish of the bridge.

Mr. Ballestrem stated that he supported Option B, and agreed that the color of the fixtures was important. He felt that the option was reasonable and a financial possibility.

DLC Member Sherry Grau supported the proposal.

DLC Member James Fossen supported the proposal but hoped that there wouldn't be regret about not installing brighter lights in the future.

Chair Hemer supported the proposal, but stated that his impression had been that the DLC would be reviewing the design of the lights rather than the location of the lights. He felt that the bridge was being permitted without lighting and he felt duped.

Ms. Bluhm noted that the DLC had reviewed the bridge in 2011 and the lighting design had been prepared later.

Chair Hemer expressed frustration that the lighting would likely not be installed with the pedestrian bridge and disappointment with the final result.

7.0 Other Business/Updates

7.1 Farewell to DLC Member Becky Ives

Chair Hemer noted that **Ms. Ives** had served on the DLC for 8 years, and was finishing her second term.

Ms. Ives remembered some of the key projects she had worked on, including the Milwaukie High School expansion, North Main Village project, and Riverfront Park. She noted that local knowledge, such as that provided by former DLC member Patty Wisner, was very important to the DLC, as was access to the Milwaukie Museum.

7.2 Update on Riverfront Park

Ms. Ives asked about landscaping for Riverfront Park. **Mr. Egner** and **Mr. Marquardt** noted that there was some community support for retaining the existing redwood tree on the site, which would necessitate redesign of the planned park plaza and large restroom building.

8.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Discussion Items

9.0 Forecast for Future Meetings:

April 7, 2014	1. Riverfront Park after-action review
May 5, 2014	1. TBD

Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Li Alligood, Senior Planner

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Val Ballestrem', written over a horizontal line.

Val Ballestrem, Vice Chair