



AGENDA

MILWAUKIE PLANNING COMMISSION
Tuesday, September 24, 2013, 6:30 PM

MILWAUKIE CITY HALL
10722 SE MAIN STREET

- 1.0 Call to Order - Procedural Matters**
- 2.0 Planning Commission Minutes** – Motion Needed
- 3.0 Information Items**
- 4.0 Audience Participation** – This is an opportunity for the public to comment on any item not on the agenda
- 5.0 Public Hearings** – Public hearings will follow the procedure listed on reverse
 - 5.1 Summary: Transportation System Plan (TSP) Update *continued from 9/10/13*
Applicant: City of Milwaukie
File: CPA-13-03
Staff: Brett Kelter
- 6.0 Worksession Items**
- 7.0 Planning Department Other Business/Updates**
- 8.0 Planning Commission Discussion Items** – This is an opportunity for comment or discussion for items not on the agenda.
- 9.0 Forecast for Future Meetings:**
 - October 8, 2013
 - 1. Public Hearing: AP-13-01 Pendleton Woolen Mills Parking Determination Appeal
 - 2. Worksession: Murals Code Project
 - October 22, 2013
 - 1. TBD

Milwaukie Planning Commission Statement

The Planning Commission serves as an advisory body to, and a resource for, the City Council in land use matters. In this capacity, the mission of the Planning Commission is to articulate the Community's values and commitment to socially and environmentally responsible uses of its resources as reflected in the Comprehensive Plan

1. **PROCEDURAL MATTERS.** If you wish to speak at this meeting, please fill out a yellow card and give to planning staff. Please turn off all personal communication devices during meeting. For background information on agenda items, call the Planning Department at 503-786-7600 or email planning@ci.milwaukie.or.us. Thank You.
2. **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES.** Approved PC Minutes can be found on the City website at www.cityofmilwaukie.org
3. **CITY COUNCIL MINUTES** City Council Minutes can be found on the City website at www.cityofmilwaukie.org
4. **FORECAST FOR FUTURE MEETING.** These items are tentatively scheduled, but may be rescheduled prior to the meeting date. Please contact staff with any questions you may have.
5. **TIME LIMIT POLICY.** The Commission intends to end each meeting by 10:00pm. The Planning Commission will pause discussion of agenda items at 9:45pm to discuss whether to continue the agenda item to a future date or finish the agenda item.

Public Hearing Procedure

Those who wish to testify should come to the front podium, state his or her name and address for the record, and remain at the podium until the Chairperson has asked if there are any questions from the Commissioners.

1. **STAFF REPORT.** Each hearing starts with a brief review of the staff report by staff. The report lists the criteria for the land use action being considered, as well as a recommended decision with reasons for that recommendation.
2. **CORRESPONDENCE.** Staff will report any verbal or written correspondence that has been received since the Commission was presented with its meeting packet.
3. **APPLICANT'S PRESENTATION.**
4. **PUBLIC TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT.** Testimony from those in favor of the application.
5. **NEUTRAL PUBLIC TESTIMONY.** Comments or questions from interested persons who are neither in favor of nor opposed to the application.
6. **PUBLIC TESTIMONY IN OPPOSITION.** Testimony from those in opposition to the application.
7. **QUESTIONS FROM COMMISSIONERS.** The commission will have the opportunity to ask for clarification from staff, the applicant, or those who have already testified.
8. **REBUTTAL TESTIMONY FROM APPLICANT.** After all public testimony, the commission will take rebuttal testimony from the applicant.
9. **CLOSING OF PUBLIC HEARING.** The Chairperson will close the public portion of the hearing. The Commission will then enter into deliberation. From this point in the hearing the Commission will not receive any additional testimony from the audience, but may ask questions of anyone who has testified.
10. **COMMISSION DISCUSSION AND ACTION.** It is the Commission's intention to make a decision this evening on each issue on the agenda. Planning Commission decisions may be appealed to the City Council. If you wish to appeal a decision, please contact the Planning Department for information on the procedures and fees involved.
11. **MEETING CONTINUANCE.** Prior to the close of the first public hearing, *any person* may request an opportunity to present additional information at another time. If there is such a request, the Planning Commission will either continue the public hearing to a date certain, or leave the record open for at least seven days for additional written evidence, argument, or testimony. The Planning Commission may ask the applicant to consider granting an extension of the 120-day time period for making a decision if a delay in making a decision could impact the ability of the City to take final action on the application, including resolution of all local appeals.

The City of Milwaukie will make reasonable accommodation for people with disabilities. Please notify us no less than five (5) business days prior to the meeting.

Milwaukie Planning Commission:

Lisa Batey, Chair
Clare Fuchs, Vice Chair
Scott Barbur
Sine Bone
Shaun Lowcock
Wilda Parks
Gabe Storm

Planning Department Staff:

Steve Butler, Interim Planning Director
Ryan Marquardt, Senior Planner
Li Alligood, Associate Planner
Brett Kelter, Associate Planner
Alicia Martin, Administrative Specialist II



To: Planning Commission

Through: Stephen Butler, Community Development Director/Interim Planning Director

From: Brett Kolver, Associate Planner

Date: September 17, 2013, for September 24, 2013, Public Hearing

Subject: File #: CPA-13-03, 2013 Transportation System Plan (TSP) Update
Applicant: City of Milwaukie

ACTION REQUESTED

Recommend to City Council approval and adoption of the proposed amendments to the Milwaukie Transportation System Plan (TSP), Land Use File #CPA-13-03.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The City's Transportation System Plan (TSP) is an ancillary document to the Milwaukie Comprehensive Plan. The TSP implements the State Transportation Planning Rule's requirement for local governments to complete long-range multi-modal transportation plans. The City's TSP was first adopted in 1997 and extensively updated in 2007.

State law requires the City's TSP to be consistent with Metro's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The current RTP, most recently updated in 2010, includes several new concepts and standards and has a forecasting horizon of 2035 (the current TSP has a forecasting horizon of 2030). The City has until December 31, 2013, to demonstrate that the TSP is consistent with Metro's 2035 RTP.

A. History of Prior Related Actions and Discussions

On September 10, 2013, the Planning Commission opened a public hearing to consider the proposed amendments to the TSP. After a staff presentation, the Commission heard public testimony from 11 people, identified several topics that need further discussion, and continued the hearing to September 24. The Commission closed the hearing to further public comment, both written and oral.

B. Topics Needing Further Discussion

At the close of the September 10 meeting, the Commission asked staff to provide additional information on a number of topics raised during the public hearing, in preparation for Commission discussion on September 24.

1. East-west connections

Issue: Several people presenting testimony on September 10 made reference to the importance of improving multi-modal east-west routes across the city. Does the TSP provide enough discussion of this issue to emphasize its importance?

The TSP does address the importance of improving east-west connections. On page 1-5 of the current draft, the Recommendations section notes the need to “improve safety and accessibility of crossings over major corridors.” On that same page, proposed new language notes the community’s emphasis on improving east-west connections and mitigating the divisive effect of Highway 224. On page 2-3, new language is proposed for Goal 5 to emphasize the need for better east-west connectivity.

In Chapter 5 (Pedestrian Element), there are several references to the general lack of connectivity and citation of a need for more convenient crossings of Highways 99E and 224 (page 5-2). In Chapter 6 (Bicycle Element), there is a reference to the need to improve both east-west and north-south connections (page 6-1). Page 6-2 includes proposed new text specifying that north-south travel is particularly difficult—that language was influenced by the northwest-to-southeast angle of Hwy 224 and the Union Pacific mainline and should be revised to clarify that east-west travel is difficult.

In Chapter 12 (Downtown Parking), there is a note in the Park-and-Ride row of Table 12-1 that improved east-west bus connections to downtown Milwaukie are needed. In Chapter 13 (Funding and Implementation), the Consolidated Action Plan Project List (Table 13-3 on pages 13-10 and 13-11) includes several High priority projects that would improve east-west connectivity: Railroad Ave Capacity Improvements, Monroe St Neighborhood Greenway, Kellogg Creek Dam Removal and Hwy 99E Underpass, Intersection Improvements at Hwy 224 Crossings, and Neighborhood Loop Bus.

Staff Conclusion: Make one correction to the language on page 6-2 as noted above. Otherwise, the current draft amendments provide adequate emphasis on the need to improve east-west connections.

2. Crossings of Highway 224

Issue: There are 5 specific intersection improvements with Hwy 224 that are proposed to be elevated from Low to High priority (at Freeman Way, 37th Ave, Oak St, Monroe St, and Harrison St). Are each of these intersections equally important or should there be some further prioritization among them?

The improvement projects listed in the TSP for the various Hwy 224 crossings are estimated to cost \$20,000 each, which is enough money to install audible crossing signals but not much else. It is possible that ODOT itself will make some intersection improvements before the City finds funding to do it, so this question may become moot. However, there is a larger, overall need to analyze these crossings collectively and determine what would truly improve the crossing situation over the long term.

A ped-bike bridge over Hwy 224 at Monroe St (and perhaps another at Freeman or 37th Ave) would be an ultimate solution, with ped-bike traffic directed to that above-grade crossing from other nearby crossings. That would reduce the need to make improvements at each

individual intersection but is itself a very expensive solution. It is also likely that future concept planning for the Monroe St Neighborhood Greenway will generate ideas for other intermediate improvements for the Hwy 224 crossing at Monroe St, such as refuge islands and/or elimination of left-turn movements onto Monroe St from Hwy 224.

Staff Conclusion: Three of the five Hwy 224 intersections are fairly close together (Harrison, Monroe, and Oak). One suggestion is for the Commission to identify one of those three as a High priority and reduce the other two to Medium or Low priority. The Monroe St Neighborhood Greenway concept may make the Monroe St crossing a logical top candidate for improvements. As for the intersections at 37th and Freeman, it might be worthwhile to keep one of the two at a High priority level and drop the other to Medium or Low priority. In addition, the Commission might propose adding a new project to study all five crossings and identify a range of improvement solutions—staff estimates a \$50,000 cost for such a study and recommends it have either a High or Medium priority.

3. Breaking big projects into smaller components

Issue: Several people presenting testimony on September 10 raised the concern that listing improvement projects that cover a long linear distance as a single project, instead of as several smaller projects, has the effect of making the project too expensive and practically unfundable. The project to build sidewalks on Stanley Ave is one example—Stanley stretches from Johnson Creek Blvd south to Railroad Ave, but has distinct breaks at King and Monroe. Should some big projects be broken into smaller components?

Listing a project like Stanley Ave sidewalks as a single project does not mean it has to be either funded entirely or not at all. The project can be funded in sections according to when/how the City is able find funding opportunities that might fit with the needs of one portion of the whole facility. Where there is a choice between two equally fundable parts of a project, staff can consult with neighborhood stakeholders and City Council to determine the appropriate priority level.

In the case of sidewalks on Stanley Ave, building sidewalks along the entire length of the street is a High priority, and staff does not recommend reducing any part of it to Medium or Low priority. However, it would not be a problem to break the Stanley Ave sidewalk project (which is already being listed in the context of a larger Neighborhood Greenway) into two parts based on Neighborhood District Association (NDA) boundaries, with the break point being at King Rd. The City would not be limited in its ability to build sidewalks on only short portions of either the northern or southern sections of Stanley as funding becomes available. The same could be said of sidewalks on Linwood Ave, which also stretches from Johnson Creek Blvd south to Railroad Ave.

Staff Conclusion: Staff cautions against breaking too many projects into smaller components, because it adds unnecessary complexity to the project lists. However, there are a few large projects which could be listed in sections to better focus the search for funding. The sidewalk projects on Stanley Ave and Linwood Ave, as well as the bicycle components of the neighborhood greenway project for Monroe St, could be listed in sections. Staff recommends retaining the same priority for the new sections and allowing for further micro-level prioritization or ranking based on community/staff discussions outside the TSP document.

4. Residential parking permit program

Issue: Several questions were raised at the September 10 meeting about the sections of Chapter 12 that address the issue of residential parking permits (on page 12-13): Should

establishment of a permit program be noted as a priority for any particular neighborhood(s)? What exactly is meant by the reference to the 51% figure and polling affecting residents? Should there be less detail in the TSP about the workings of a permit program, instead of more detail?

In 1993, the City adopted a traffic regulation that established the official process for setting up a residential parking permit program (Traffic Regulation #237, adopted May 6, 1993). Chapter 12 reiterates that structure and process on page 12-13. Staff does not believe there is a need for the TSP to establish any special priority for a particular neighborhood or area, since the existing regulatory structure is available for use whenever needed. On page 12-9, there is a point related to the Operating Principle that the City will facilitate the establishment of Residential Permit Zone programs upon request of an affected neighborhood.

In response to public comments that have indicated a desire to adjust the established process for implementing a Residential Permit Zone program, it seems reasonable to ensure that the TSP addresses basic principles without inhibiting needed changes to the existing regulation.

Staff Conclusion: The Operating Principle point on page 12-9 should be modified to include spillover not just from downtown zones but from the new light rail stations at Tacoma St and Park Ave as well. In addition, the language on page 12-13 about the Residential Parking Permit program structure should be revised to be less specific so that it provides more overall guidance and leaves room for future details to be defined outside the TSP. Staff will propose revisions to the language in the revised Addendum materials that will be sent in a supplemental packet prior to the September 24 meeting.

5. Alternatives to full street improvements

Issue: The Commission raised the concern that the City does not have enough flexibility to allow deviation from traditional curb and sidewalk standards in situations where alternative methods might be just as functional and more cost effective. Additionally, it appears that the current language on page 10-11 is outdated and needs revision, particularly where flexible street design standards are concerned.

Chapter 10 (Street Design) emphasizes flexibility in the City's approach to street design. The existing language on pages 10-2 and 10-3 was new in 2007 and described the need at that time. But the City's zoning code has been amended since 2007 to specifically allow greater flexibility in street design (Milwaukie Municipal Code Section 19.708, Transportation Facility Requirements). The City's Public Works Standards provide more detail about specific standards for dimensions and materials but also allow some flexibility for addressing site-specific conditions.

However, standards such as those for the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) will always overrule City standards. For example, there is room for considering different types of innovative construction materials to create a multi-use pathway surface—but if an alternate material cannot be demonstrated to meet ADA standards, then it cannot be used. Another consideration with any project is whether an alternative material will prove to be effective over the long term. Some lower-cost construction materials require more regular maintenance and therefore have a higher long-term cost.

Staff Conclusion: Some of the language in Chapter 10 does need to be updated to reflect the greater flexibility inserted into the zoning code since 2007—specific amendments will be reflected in the revised version of the Addendum document, to be provided in a supplemental packet prior to the September 24 meeting. As for alternative methods and

materials, City staff is open to considering new options but is obligated to: (1) approve only those that can meet ADA and other related standards and (2) evaluate the short-term and long-term costs.

6. Truck traffic and neighborhood impacts

Issue: People continue to report problems with tractor-trailer trucks using neighborhood streets to get to or through downtown—this has been reported on Monroe St in particular. Does the TSP provide enough address of the problem?

The diversion of truck traffic onto neighborhood streets is primarily the result of a lack of east-west connections and several accessibility issues along Highways 224 and 99E. Within Chapter 3 (Existing Conditions), page 3-44 summarizes key findings related to the freight mode but does not reference the impact of truck traffic on neighborhoods. A new finding could be added to this section to identify that truck traffic is diverted onto neighborhood streets and impacts the livability of the city.

In Chapter 9 (Freight Element), pages 9-3 and 9-4 reference the impacts of truck traffic on neighborhoods and identify the need to reduce the impact of truck traffic on neighborhood livability. The City actively encourages all heavy vehicles to use identified local freight routes. However, no specific strategies for reducing freight traffic on neighborhood streets are proposed in Chapter 9.

Chapter 11 (Neighborhood Traffic Management) appears to be a more appropriate place for discussion of strategies to reduce truck traffic on neighborhood streets. Page 11-8 already lists “Truck Restrictions” as one tool for limiting impacts, and many of the other traffic-calming measures listed in Chapter 11 would also discourage heavy truck traffic. Heavy truck traffic could be added to the list on page 11-2 of concerns that can be addressed with neighborhood traffic management tools. A sentence could be added in Chapter 9 to direct readers to Chapter 11 for examples of traffic calming measures that can be used to reduce truck traffic.

In the public testimony presented on September 10, Monroe Street was specifically identified as a street that experiences high levels of truck traffic. If implemented, the Monroe St Neighborhood Greenway project (currently listed as a High priority project) would result in the installation of traffic calming measures that would reduce or eliminate cut-through truck traffic.

Staff Conclusion: Add language in Chapters 3, 9, and 11, as noted above, to emphasize the issue of truck traffic impacts to neighborhoods and to better connect these three related chapters. Staff will propose specific language in the revised Addendum materials that will be sent in a supplemental packet prior to the September 24 meeting.

7. Accuracy of Figure 12-1 (Park & Ride facilities)

Issue: Given the different sizes of the Southgate and Milwaukie Presbyterian Church Park & Ride facilities, should this figure show the number of spaces at each location? And should there be an indication that the Southgate Park & Ride might be closed in the future?

The Southgate Park & Ride provides 329 spaces; the park & ride at Milwaukie Presbyterian Church provides 30 spaces. This information can easily be added to Figure 12-1.

Currently, Chapter 12 does not include language about the future of the Southgate Park & Ride facility. A footnote could be added to Table 12-1 to indicate (1) that it is unclear what will happen to the Southgate site once light rail opens and (2) that the City would like to see the site transition to operate as a parking lot for local employees.

Staff Conclusion: Add language to Figure 12-1 and Table 12-1 to list the number of spaces at the two local park & ride facilities and address the future of the Southgate Park & Ride in particular as noted above. Staff will provide proposed specific language in the revised Addendum materials that will be sent in a supplemental packet prior to the September 24 meeting.

8. Light rail displacement of downtown parking spaces

Issue: Page 12-3 indicates that 50 on-street parking spaces have been or will be displaced by the new light rail line downtown. Is that figure accurate and does it include spaces displaced by the Adams St connector project?

Approximately 56 on-street parking spaces will be displaced from 21st Ave, Washington St, and Adams St downtown due to the new light rail line. The closure of Adams St between 21st Ave and Main St (the “Adams Street Connector” project) will be responsible for the removal of 21 of those spaces. Associated adjustments on Main St will add 6 to 8 parking spaces, for a net loss of 48 to 51 on-street spaces, with 27 to 30 of those spaces not related to the Adams Street Connector.

Staff Conclusion: It is true that a net of approximately 50 on-street spaces will be permanently lost due to the new light rail construction. Of those 50 spaces, 21 spaces are directly related to the Adams Street Connector project.

9. Horizontal/vertical separation in street design features

Issue: With respect to street design, page 10-8 discusses horizontal and vertical separation of the pedestrian zone from the street zone and indicates that achieving both horizontal and vertical separation is the preferred option. Given how difficult it can be to accomplish both in one place and given how many pedestrian needs there are, should the TSP language in that section be revised to indicate that getting either/or is acceptable?

The paragraph immediately under Table 10-1 on page 10-8 discusses horizontal and vertical separation and describes community preferences for different types of streets. The paragraph concludes by stating simply that the City should clearly identify the reasons why one design alternative would be chosen over another for a particular facility. The same paragraph on page 10-8 also notes that, while two-sided pedestrian facilities are generally preferred, one-sided pedestrian facilities “are acceptable and even desirable under certain circumstances.”

Staff Conclusion: The current language in this part of Chapter 10 is adequate for addressing the concern that the City should have flexibility in determining which particular design is most appropriate for a given facility. No further changes are deemed necessary at this point.

10. Bike-share programs

Issue: Does the TSP discuss bike-share programs as another tool for increasing the percentage of non-single-occupant-vehicle trips? Should the TSP address bike-share programs and/or add a project to establish a bike-share program in Milwaukie?

A bike share program is one way to distribute bikes across the community, making them accessible for one-way or round-trip travel. There are a number of different ways that other communities have experimented with the establishment of bike-share programs, including whether they are publically managed or done by private entrepreneurs. The TSP does not discuss bike-share programs, but one place to insert such a reference would be on page 6-8, which provides a bullet-list of strategies for improving the bicycle system.

Staff Conclusion: On page 6-8, insert a new bullet point in the “strategies” list to identify bike-share programs as another tool, whether implemented directly by the City or encouraged by the City. There might be some adjustments needed to the zoning code or right-of-way standards to allow for the bike-share use in particular locations. Staff will propose specific language to that effect in the revised Addendum materials that will be sent in a supplemental packet prior to the September 24 meeting.

11. Transportation Demand Management

Issue: It seems like Transportation Demand Management (TDM) options, such as carpooling, designating priority parking spaces, improving services for alternative modes of travel, parking and congestion pricing, and other market-based measures, might be cost-effective ways to reduce the need for expensive capital projects. Does the TSP adequately address TDM options?

TDM options are discussed in Chapter 8 on page 8-24. The TSP does not currently include a project to study or implement TDM options, but the Metro RTP does include TDM improvements. These RTP projects are listed in Table 8-8, which is misreferenced on page 8-24.

Staff Conclusion: TDM options are adequately addressed in the TSP, and it appears that the City could choose to follow up with the various agencies listed in Table 8-8 to lobby for implementation of the projects listed.

C. Project Priority Adjustments

The Planning Commission identified the following TSP projects as ones that need additional discussion to determine whether their priority should be adjusted.

Project	TSP Chapter	2007 Priority	2013 Priority (proposed)	Issue / Response
Franklin Street Sidewalks	Pedestrian	Med	Low	<p><u>Issue:</u> Even though Campbell Elementary has closed, there is still some use of the site by the community. Should the 2007 priority for this sidewalk project be maintained or reduced?</p> <p><u>Staff Response:</u> The proposal is not to remove this project from the list, only to reduce it in priority since it is no longer a direct route to an active school and because there are other sidewalk projects with higher priority.</p> <p><u>PC Options:</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Keep proposed priority (Low) <input type="checkbox"/> Keep 2007 priority (Medium)</p>
Lake Road Capacity Improvements	Street	Low	Low	<p><u>Issue:</u> Several public comments indicated opposition to the project to widen Lake Rd (from Oatfield Rd to downtown) to a three-lane cross section. Should this project be removed from the list?</p> <p><u>Staff Response:</u> Lake Rd is classified as an arterial street and is an important facility serving downtown. The projections of future traffic and travel demand continue to show that the Oatfield Rd to downtown section of Lake Rd will need additional capacity with a center turn lane or turn pockets. With that said, there are a variety of public</p>

Project	TSP Chapter	2007 Priority	2013 Priority (proposed)	Issue / Response
				<p><i>opinions about the recently completed improvements on Lake Rd between Oatfield Rd and Hwy 224, as well as varying perceptions of safety and vehicle speed there.</i></p> <p><i>Staff believes there should be further study of the actual function of the newly rebuilt section of Lake Rd, as well as discussion with stakeholders along Lake Rd, before removing this project from the TSP. Deciding to accept a lower Level of Service for Lake Rd in the future is a policy decision that is beyond the scope of the 2013 TSP Update and would be better addressed as part of a future TSP update project.</i></p> <p><u>PC Options:</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Keep proposed priority (Low) <input type="checkbox"/> Remove project from TSP</p>
Johnson Creek Boulevard and 42 nd Ave Signalization	Street	Low	Low	<p><u>Issue:</u> Residents of the Ardenwald neighborhood continue to oppose the project to install a traffic signal at Johnson Creek Blvd and 42nd Ave. Will installation of a signal at Johnson Creek Blvd and 32nd Ave result in the removal of stop signs at 36th Ave and 42nd Ave?</p> <p><u>Staff Response:</u> <i>It is possible that, once a traffic signal is installed at 32nd Ave and Johnson Creek Blvd, traffic queuing may back up into the 3-way stop intersections of Johnson Creek Blvd with 36th Ave and 42nd Ave, which could result in a need to remove one or both stop signs. A second signal at Johnson Creek Blvd and 42nd Ave has been identified as warranted, though the Ardenwald neighborhood has objected to its installation. To date, it is not the City's policy to use intersection or facility failure as an official means of traffic calming. Staff continues to believe it is important to maintain this project in the TSP but as a Low priority.</i></p> <p><u>PC Options:</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Keep proposed priority (Low) <input type="checkbox"/> Remove project from TSP</p>
Logus Road Sidewalks	Pedestrian	High	Med	<p><u>Issue:</u> The Commission received one public comment requesting that the project to build sidewalks on Logus Rd between 43rd Ave and 49th Ave remain a High priority project. Should its priority be kept at High or reduced to Medium?</p> <p><u>Staff Response:</u> <i>On one hand, Logus Rd benefitted from a major sidewalk project only a couple years ago (2010-11) and there are other important streets that have no pedestrian facilities. On another hand, it is important to fill in sidewalk gaps near active schools (Lewelling Elementary, in this case). Perhaps a compromise would be to retain the High priority designation for this project but not place it on the Action Plan for pedestrian facilities.</i></p> <p><u>PC Options:</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Keep proposed priority (Medium) <input type="checkbox"/> Keep 2007 priority (High)</p>

Project	TSP Chapter	2007 Priority	2013 Priority (proposed)	Issue / Response
Downtown Parking Signage	Parking	Med	Low	<p><u>Issue:</u> The project to install parking information signage downtown seems to be a low-cost way to increase usage of existing parking. Should it be elevated to High priority status before committing resources to a much more expensive project?</p> <p><u>Staff Response:</u> The suggestion is a good one, as a way for the City to promote more efficient use of existing parking spaces downtown.</p> <p><u>PC Options:</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Elevate to High priority</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Keep 2007 priority (Medium)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Keep proposed priority (Low)</p>
Downtown Parking Structure	Parking	Med	Med	<p><u>Issue:</u> Are there low-cost projects that would help make better use of existing facilities, before building a new facility at great expense?</p> <p><u>Staff Response:</u> Constructing a large parking structure downtown would be a major commitment of funding and land area. The larger issue of downtown parking needs further study and analysis, particularly given the imminent opening of the light rail line. There is merit to the suggestion of making better use of existing facilities before building a new, very expensive one.</p> <p><u>PC Options:</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Reduce to Low priority</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Keep proposed priority (Medium)</p>
Cyclist Education	Bicycle	Med	Med	<p><u>Issue:</u> Similar to the downtown parking signage issue, the project for cyclist education seems like a low-cost way to improve use of existing infrastructure—should it be elevated in priority?</p> <p><u>Staff Response:</u> The activity of the Bike Milwaukie group over the past 1.5 to 2 years has been an effective promoter of cycling in the community. However, there is an inherent dilemma in the question of which should come first: new bike infrastructure or education to get more riders out on the existing infrastructure. Staff is inclined to err on the side of making more improvements to the infrastructure before shifting to focus on cyclist education.</p> <p><u>PC Options:</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Keep proposed priority (Medium)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Elevate to High priority</p>
Linwood Ave Sidewalks <i>(This topic was not on the Commission's list from the September 10 meeting, but it was the focus of several comments during the public hearing and warrants a response.)</i>	Pedestrian	Low	Low	<p><u>Issue:</u> Should the Linwood Ave Sidewalks project be a higher priority, at least in the vicinity of Linwood Elementary School?</p> <p><u>Staff Response:</u> Similar to the Stanley Ave Sidewalks project, Linwood Ave has a need for complete sidewalks between Johnson Creek Blvd and Railroad Ave. Due to the presence of Linwood Elementary School in the southern section of Linwood Ave, it may make sense to split this project into northern and southern sections (breaking at King Rd) and to prioritize the southern section more highly</p>

Project	TSP Chapter	2007 Priority	2013 Priority (proposed)	Issue / Response
				<p><i>to improve pedestrian conditions near the school.</i></p> <p><u>PC Options (might be more than one):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Break project into two sections (north and south) <input type="checkbox"/> Keep as single project <input type="checkbox"/> Elevate southern section to Medium or High priority <input type="checkbox"/> Keep southern section at Low priority <input type="checkbox"/> Elevate northern section to Medium or High priority <input type="checkbox"/> Keep northern section at Low priority <input type="checkbox"/> Keep single project at Low priority <input type="checkbox"/> Elevate single project to Medium or High priority

D. “Parking Lot” Items

The Commission listed several concerns that may not factor directly into the 2013 TSP update and that would be better addressed separately.

- **Maintenance of plantings in bioswales for clear vision**
Plantings for bioswale facilities should be chosen and maintained with clear vision principles in mind so they do not present safety problems. This is more of an operational concern for City staff and crews and not one that needs special address in the TSP.
- **Traffic calming on Lake Road**
This is an ongoing, operational type of concern that can be addressed by citizens and City staff using the flowchart process outlined in Figure 11-1 to generate traffic calming solutions. No additional address is needed in the TSP.
- **Dangerous right-hand turn from Oatfield Road onto Lake Road eastbound**
This is also an operational type of concern that can be addressed using the process outlined in Figure 11-1. No additional address is needed in the TSP.
- **Kellogg Creek Trail and status as regional greenway**
The existing Kellogg Creek Trail, which runs behind the sewage treatment plant between 19th Ave and Riverfront Park, is shown as a local pathway on the regional map in Metro’s Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The Kellogg Creek Trail is not as extensive as either the Springwater Trail or the Trolley Trail, nor is it as much of a connecting facility, but it is accurate to say that it is shown on the regional greenways map in the RTP.

The Kellogg Creek Trail represents a small portion of the larger North Clackamas Greenway, which is a conceptual multi-use path that would extend from downtown Milwaukie eastward alongside Kellogg Creek to beyond the eastern city limits. A project to study the feasibility of establishing the North Clackamas Greenway corridor is listed on the Regional Projects section of the Master Plan Project List in Table 13-4.

Staff will review the existing references to the Kellogg Creek Trail in the TSP and will add any proposed clarifications or text corrections to the revised Addendum materials that will be provided to the Commission prior to the September 24 meeting.

E. Responses to Other Comments

There were a number of other comments taken in as part of the public testimony. However, the Planning Commission appears to have identified (in Parts B and C, above) the most substantive comments that could result in some additional changes to the proposed TSP amendments. Staff will provide short responses to significant comments or questions from the public testimony portion of the September 10 meeting as part of a supplemental packet that will be sent to the Commissioners prior to the September 24 meeting.

CONCLUSIONS

Staff's recommendation to the Planning Commission is as follows:

- *Vote to recommend that City Council approve and adopt the proposed amendments to the Milwaukie Transportation System Plan, Land Use File #CPA-13-03.*

Staff will provide a revised list of Addendum items, as well as a draft of the recommended Findings in Support of Approval, in a supplemental packet that will be sent to the Commissioners prior to the September 24 meeting.

CODE AUTHORITY AND DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

The proposed amendments are subject to the following provisions of the Milwaukie Zoning Ordinance, which is Title 19 of the Milwaukie Municipal Code (MMC), and the Milwaukie Comprehensive Plan (MCP):

- MMC 19.902 Amendments to Maps and Ordinances
- MMC 19.1008 Type V (Legislative) Review
- MCP Chapter 2 Plan Review and Amendment Process, Objective #1 Amending the Plan
- MCP Chapter 5 Transportation, Public Facilities, and Energy Conservation

The proposed amendments are subject to legislative review, which requires both the Planning Commission and City Council to consider whether the proposal complies with the code sections shown above. For legislative actions, the Planning Commission assesses the application and makes a recommendation to City Council. City Council will hold another public hearing to consider the Commission's recommendation, evaluate any additional testimony and evidence, and make the final decision on the proposal.

The Planning Commission has the following decision-making options:

1. Forward a recommendation to City Council to approve and adopt the proposed amendments and ordinance as proposed.
2. Forward a recommendation to City Council to approve and adopt the proposed amendments and ordinance with modifications.
3. Continue the hearing to further evaluate the proposed amendments and ordinance.
4. Forward a recommendation to City Council to not approve and adopt the proposed amendments and ordinance. This would have the effect of leaving the TSP inconsistent with Metro's 2035 RTP.

Recommendation Deadline

Metro has given the City a deadline of December 31, 2013, to demonstrate that the TSP is consistent with Metro's 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). There is some flexibility in the project schedule at this point, though it is limited. An additional Planning Commission meeting is possible, with the result that the remaining timeline will become tighter. If the Planning Commission is not able to provide a recommendation at the September 24 meeting, the adoption process would continue with the following timeline:

- **October 1, 2013:** Pre-adoption briefing by staff to City Council (work session)
- **October 8, 2013:** Third meeting by Planning Commission (if necessary)
- **November 5 and 19, 2013 (tentative):** Adoption hearings by City Council
- **December 31, 2013:** Deadline for demonstrating compliance with Metro's 2035 RTP

If the Commission is able to provide a recommendation on September 24, the schedule will proceed with the October 1 Council worksession and October 15 public hearing by Council.

COMMENTS

Prior to continuing the public hearing until September 24, the Planning Commission closed the record to further public comment. Additional comments received after September 10 will be added to the official record for the associated land use application (file #CPA-13-03) and can be made available to the Commission upon request.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachments are provided as indicated by the checked boxes. All material is available for viewing upon request.

	PC Packet	Public Copies	E- Packet
1. Draft Ordinance*	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Exhibit A: Recommended Findings in Support of Approval*	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Exhibit B: Proposed Amendments to Transportation System Plan (Underline/Strikeout Version) – <i>already distributed to PC</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Addendum to Proposed TSP Amendments (revised)*	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Responses to Questions from Public Testimony on Sept 10*	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**To be provided in a supplemental packet.*

Key:

PC Packet = paper materials provided to Planning Commission 7 days prior to the meeting.

Public Copies = paper copies of the packet available for review at City facilities and at the Planning Commission meeting.

E-Packet = packet materials available online at <http://www.milwaukieoregon.gov/planning/planning-commission-88>.