

**CITY OF MILWAUKIE  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
Milwaukie City Hall  
10722 SE Main Street  
TUESDAY, December 9, 2008  
6:30 PM**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT**

Jeff Klein, Chair  
Dick Newman, Vice-Chair  
Scott Churchill  
Teresa Bresaw  
Paulette Qutub

**STAFF PRESENT**

Katie Mangle, Planning Director  
Gary Parkin, Engineering Director  
Susan Shanks, Senior Planner

**COMMISSIONERS ABSENT**

Lisa Batey

**1.0 CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Klein called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. and read the conduct of meeting format into the record.

**2.0 PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

**3.0 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES—None**

Approved PC Minutes can be found on the City website at [www.cityofmilwaukie.org](http://www.cityofmilwaukie.org).

**4.0 INFORMATION ITEMS –City Council Minutes**

City Council Minutes can be found on the City website at [www.cityofmilwaukie.org](http://www.cityofmilwaukie.org).

**5.0 PUBLIC COMMENT—None**

**6.0 PUBLIC HEARINGS—None**

**7.0 WORKSESSION ITEMS**

7.1 Transportation Code Amendments (MMC Chapter 19.1400) project briefing  
Staff Person: Susan Shanks.

**Susan Shanks, Senior Planner** reviewed a proposed flow chart illustrating the process for determining Transportation Facility Improvements that would be included in the Code amendments. Several prior applications were recounted to demonstrate how the flow chart would work.

Staff responded to questions and concerns from the Commission as follows:

- The current process was difficult to follow for both staff and applicants. The new flow chart was part of a new streamlined system that also provided a good explanation of the process.
- Nonhabitable space that was modified to be habitable would presumably come in as a tenant improvement (TI) and could be captured by the intensification of use trigger under the new Code.
  - Nonhabitable accessory structures smaller than 200 sq ft would not trigger transportation improvements. Closets were considered habitable space.
- Once permit fees are collected, no additional fees existed for frontage improvements triggered by impacts, though fees were associated with Planning review.

- Currently a separate transportation review land use application, Transportation Plan Review (TPR), existed. Staff proposed calling the chapter Public Facility Improvements (PFI). TPR applications would still be processed as land use applications, but when a Transportation Impact Study (TIS) was proposed, a separate fee would be required with a separate land use application.
  - Staff still wanted to review TIS, but also receive a deposit from the applicant to pay the City's engineering consultant to review the study.
- Staff's proposal would not require a separate land use application, but would change the fee schedule for land use applications to cover engineering costs. Some fees would shift into minor land partitions and subdivisions, for instance, causing those fees to increase, but only for the applications that always required a review for a PFI.
- No changes to development permits were proposed. A State process existed that regulated what fees could be charged for System Development Charges (SDCs) and building permits.
- Currently, the building department used a standard formula that was based on use to determine costs; permit fees were then based on those costs. Code triggers for impacts were based on the building department fees; however, the cost-based triggers in the Code would disappear.
  - Under the old Code, finishing an existing habitable space was evaluated based on the cost of the improvements. Under the new Code, since no additional square footage was added, there would be no transportation impacts.
- The Planning department was not involved in triggering the assessor's office decision to increase taxes when an owner increased living area. It was standard practice for the tax assessor to pull building department square footage as a flag to reassess a property.
- Item B.2.a on page 11 of the packet should read, "For expansions of less than ~~400~~ **200** square feet, no improvements are required."
  - Under the new Code, the cost to beautify one's house, no matter the cost, triggered no transportation requirements. However, if 200 sq ft were added at a rough cost of \$20,000 to \$30,000, some transportation improvements would be required.
    - Wording about adding 'square footage' was used instead of adding 'a room' to avoid confusion about improvements such as converting a large closet into a nursery. The addition of a room was linked to transportation impacts.
  - Item B.2 was based on the incremental approach to adding onto a house and the need for considering some impacts related to each phase. The City wanted to encourage improvement, but wanted some improvements applied to beautifying the community and sought to do that in as rational a way as possible.
- Encouragement to install semipermeable pavers for driveways fell under public work standards.
  - Some Nature in Neighborhoods projects under Title 13 would be modeling semipermeable pavers in the spring as it applied in the Code.
  - Semipermeable pavers were more expensive to install, but might be cheaper overall if they counteracted having to do some detention.

Key points discussed by the Planning Commission and staff included the following:

- Concern about homeowners getting hit, and the City benefitting twice from a house remodel because of the upfront fees charged for the remodel and the increased tax revenue due to the value of the house increasing over time.
  - Increasing a 1,500 sq ft house with four residents to 3,000 sq ft would not directly impact to the transportation system, but the remodel would potentially allow more

- people to live in the house. It was difficult to require transportation improvements knowing that the impact would not happen immediately, but the potential was there in the future. The Institute for Transportation Engineers (ITE) had a metric about larger houses having greater transportation impacts than small houses.
- Continuing to add fees for remodeling houses was a concern. Ultimately, the City wanted remodeling to occur and to capture the tax revenue at the end. The City should not place too much of a burden on an owner wanting to remodel their home.
    - Paying \$10,000 or more in fees could price a Milwaukie homeowner out of a neighborhood and out of making an improvement. They could take the extra money and go buy the size of house they needed elsewhere.
    - Homeowners might also balk at paying for improvements they felt should have been done by the City.
  - Building a new house would require whatever the street needed for full frontage improvements, whereas remodeling an existing home would be proportionately based on the new square footage.
    - Remodeling an existing home would add some trip capacity, but not as much as a new house. Generally, a larger house generates more trips, and though it might not immediately, the criteria were applied in a broad manner. The homeowner was charged for the potential, though it might never be used.
  - The proposed 200 sq ft parameter was not arbitrary, but based on the 32 residential additions completed in the past two years.
  - Improvements would be done according to the order listed in Chapter 19.1402 (B)(3)(a-e), which followed the steps for constructing a street. Applicants would generally only be required to do one item. If the entire list was completed, then no requirements would be imposed.
  - A suggestion was made to require something for public facility improvements.
    - Fees for improvements were split into roughly \$3,000 to \$5,000 amounts, although potential variables existed. While the right of way (ROW) dedication might seem like the homeowner did not pay anything, a cost was actually associated with donating that property.
  - Access improvements that bring access into conformance with City standards might include moving a corner lot's access from a higher to a lower classification street, though that might not always be possible. Shifting a driveway away from the property line or narrowing a wide driveway were other examples of access improvements.
    - Any one of the required improvements could vary greatly, depending on the application and subject location.
  - Staff wanted to ensure the Code made mention of existing improvements being brought up to current standards. Though not explicitly stated, the City currently required sidewalks to be brought up to current standards.
    - Improvements to stormwater drainage systems and pipes would fall under public facilities, not transportation, and would not be triggered in this case.
    - Public facilities was added to Chapter 1400 because it was not in a good place in the Code.
      - Storm drainage facilities, like stormwater catch basins integrated at the curb, were included in 7.1, page 12, Chapter 19.1400 (B)(d).
  - Once all standards were met, applicants are charged a fee in lieu of construction (FILOC), which is returned to the property owner after a ten-year period. By law the money could not be held indefinitely to meet requirements when more money was available later.

- A FILOC was tricky because the City stated that improvements were required because of impacts, but money was accepted without the improvements being completed. The City preferred that the applicant offer a FILOC contribution.
- Apprehension existed about FILOCs because money was accepted, but projects were not completed. Milwaukie had sections of streets without sidewalks or curbs because FILOC funds were not attributed to projects that needed to be done.
  - A FILOC served its purpose if the potential to build a project existed, in which case the project should be completed instead of FILOCs being accepted.
- The new guidelines on page 14, Chapter 19.1406 Fee in Lieu of Construction, clearly stated that transportation improvements were required at the time of development. Though the Engineering Director may or may not approve their construction based on the guidelines, the City's practice and policy was to build the project.
- Cumulatively, FILOCs worked. Money had been collecting for about five years, so each neighborhood district had a small amount of money available. According to the City's Economic Development Specialist, the City would never have a problem spending FILOC money in 10 years. It is often used to match grant money.
- FILOCs were tracked and credited unless returned to the homeowner after 10 years.
- Language in Item 3 about scheduling construction within 3 years provided a guideline for when funds would actually be accepted in lieu of a funded project that was an identified Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) project versus a project that might happen.
- FILOC funds had to be spent within the neighborhood boundaries so the money benefited the person providing the money. Funds were often spent on higher classification streets that often delineated neighborhood boundaries. Money might be pooled from two different neighborhoods to complete improvements.
  - Funds were not necessarily used to build a specific sidewalk in front of a specific house.
- FILOCs would not be accepted for just any reason; the improvements would be required.
  - With the street cross sections now designed in the new Code, staff would know the required improvements would fit and were logical for the whole block or blocks. When another project triggered an improvement, the next step toward that design would be required.
  - Design flexibility enabled the City to require that the improvements be built, while design uncertainty and rigidity had led to accepting FILOC.
- Resources were not available to design a master street plan, so streets would be built over time based on TSP work.
- The best way to ensure all the improvements were made in a neighborhood with unimproved infrastructure was through a local improvement district. Additional funds might also be available through grants, for instance, to contribute toward the local improvement district.
- Concern was expressed about having a consistent measurement to determine transportation impacts. The Commission should refer to the ITE manual to avoid backing down from the potential use. For instance, a restaurant, whether good or bad, was attributed a certain number of trips in the ITE manual.
  - Impacts would change over time but only a snapshot in time existed to determine the potential for more impacts and require transportation improvements.
  - As far as being consistent regarding how intensification of use results in impacts, Chapter 19.1402 (A)(5)(b) and (c) on page 11 provided the opportunity to

- evaluate on a case-by-case basis because intensification of use related to gross living area or vehicle trips per day was difficult to determine.
- An engineering evaluation of impacts was an important part of the flow chart. However, capturing some intensifications, such as the improved high school field, were difficult to know how to capture or quantify.
  - Ultimately the tools were imperfect, but best practices, good judgment, and knowledge about what the Milwaukie community wanted were considered for consistency in evaluating transportation impacts.
  - Aspects of the single-family home improvements were unsettling. It seemed property tax increases should be used for improvements, but that was not working. The community wanted to look better and for people to make improvements, so roadblocks that kept people from improving their property should be eliminated. Urban renewal seemed like the only option.
    - Most property taxes went to other services. Gas tax monies typically used for street improvements was a totally separate fund that barely kept up with the street maintenance program. Improving a property did provide some benefits over time. Property taxes were a slow way to get the overall system improved. Urban renewal would likely achieve improvement goals more rapidly.
    - Because the downtown area requirements were so great, City Council agreed that staff could pursue studying urban renewal as an option so downtown developers would not have to pay for all the public area requirements. Council preferred urban renewal to reducing the downtown standards.
  - The proposed amendments were much clearer and should not be shocking for most people planning a remodeling project. It was especially important to clearly state the requirements for single-family improvements so the expectations were very clear from the beginning. The 200 sq ft parameter set a clear standard. Someone wanting to expand could add 199 sq ft, which would be fine.

The Commission responded to staff's request for feedback regarding applicability, flexibility, and consistency as outlined on page 4 of the packet as follows:

- The Commission consented that 200 sq ft was a reasonable threshold.
- Support was expressed for deferring unusual situations about whether impacts would result from projected increases in square footage to the Engineering Director. New studies could be utilized to aid in making future determinations and court cases could also be considered.
  - Specific to proportionality determination analysis and street design cross section determinations, a variance could be applied for per Chapter 19.700, or an appeal of the Engineering Director's determination could be made to the Planning Commission for those who disagreed with the Engineering Director.
  - The clearer the standards the better. If the Commission felt that staff allowed too much discretion, they could request an annual report from the Engineering Director showing how the standards were applied. One or two examples could be reviewed and discussed, and the Commission could offer guidance. This would also prevent anyone from taking advantage of their authority.
- Determining threshold numbers for transportation impacts were based on case histories for different situations in other areas as well as what made sense for Milwaukie. Specifics were factored into the analysis, but it was hard to state that one trip resulted in something exact, so flexibility was included in the numbers.
  - Triggers in the applicability section were impact-based. Most applications were straightforward and would not be heard by the Commission, such as dividing property, adding a new dwelling unit, building a multifamily apartment building or new single-family house, etc. For more complicated applications, some tools were

available along with Engineering's judgments and public discussion because no one right answer existed.

- Checks and balances were in place in the department to assure decisions were not made in a vacuum. Staff was aware of the potential for biased decisions and was trying to build guidelines into the new Code. Other things could be added to an annual report to ensure it was kept in check, but still allowed for common sense decisions.
- The Commission consented to equal treatment of downtown and nondowntown development with regard to Chapter 19.1400.

**Ms. Shanks** concluded that staff was still working to finalize the Code language. She would present the proposed amendments to downtown business owners and key stakeholders, and attend the Neighborhood District Association's (NDA) Leadership meeting in January to receive input about outreach to individual neighborhoods.

- The Code amendments were expected to be before the Commission in January. Any further comments were welcomed from the Commission after the entire draft was received.

## 8.0 DISCUSSION ITEMS

**Ms. Mangle** reminded about the Commission's desire for a debriefing about the Immovable Foundation Church hearings. Staff wanted to share some of their concerns on a wide range of issues, and also desired feedback about how staff might better help the Commission prepare for hearings.

**Ms. Shanks** reviewed staff's concerns about the hearing as follows:

- The public benefits impact of a Community Service Use (CSU) is quite subjective and broad. With regard to consistency, had Commissioners considered other church CSUs when reviewing this CSU, applying the criteria the same as for any other church in any other location? Consistency was a concerning issue across many planning decisions.
  - Could more structure be used to apply the more subjective criteria? Did the Commission want to discuss whether CSU impacts were evaluated as narrowly or broadly as possible.
    - For example, the park deficiency of the Lake Road neighborhood was raised.
    - The community's concerns with the first Education Service District (ESD) application about not losing valuable open space were carried over to the IFC application. Would the Commission have applied the same analysis regarding a general park deficiency, whether or not a deficiency existed for other sites in other locations? Was this item appropriate to consider in reviewing a CSU?
- Another concern was the cut-through traffic aspect of the use, which was never on the table. If the modification was approved and went to City Council, staff was uncertain that they could defend the Commission's position. She did not know whether staff could have been clearer that cut-through traffic was never on the table before, so to put it on the table after the fact made staff uncomfortable.

Key discussion items among the Commission and staff included:

- The idea of preserving the park was obvious, but the difficulty was trying to understand what people were doing. The definition of how the community used the property and what the school had allowed got lost. There really was no rule, which was the difficult part.

- While staff was not clear in the beginning about how the community used the property, residents who testified that they did not want it to become a housing development were clearly negligent in not stating what their use of the property was at that time.
- The applicant did not know what they had agreed to when accepting the school's park rules.
- Though North Clackamas Park was not part of the Lake Road NDA, a pathway connected the park to the neighborhood. Neighbors also used the Christmas tree farm in the neighborhood as open space. When including North Clackamas Park, the area probably had the most open space of any other neighborhood.
- While churches and schools allowed the public on their property, they also had the right to say no.
- Unfortunately, it was never clear from the beginning that the neighborhood used and wanted to continue to use the site. Residents only discussed the park and the views.
  - It was never the applicant's understanding, but it was good of them to allow people to use the property as a pedestrian cut-through.
  - Some things were thrown wide open in a land use application, which was why staff tried to note the key issues to focus the discussion for the Commission. While staff might question whether they got the key issues right, hopefully the Commission would recognize when certain topics were not appropriate.
- Holding a CSU refresher course was suggested. Church front lawns were used to play football and their parking lots for park and ride locations. A sort of an 'unwritten' perception of allowing community use of church grounds existed.
- CSUs had to be considered differently for churches that were already established in a neighborhood versus those seeking a new location.
  - **Chair Klein** observed that the IFC drew people from other areas, not Milwaukie. Milwaukie needed a lot of infrastructure to make the church viable to the community, but the church was not doing anything for Milwaukie.
  - On the other hand, residents testified they did not want a housing development in place of the park and told the developer to find someone else who would use the structure in a manner that fit the area. It was frustrating.
- **Commissioner Qutub** said that the Commission viewed the CSU differently than the applicant. Strong cultural differences existed which created conflict. Having a briefing about how to address culture and religious differences would have been helpful.
- **Ms. Mangle** observed that the Willamette National Cemetery does not allow dogs or recreational public use. While culture might play a part, it was not a stretch to say that the owners considered the property somewhat sacred as a religious institutional property. Correctional facilities were also CSUs and often had rules that precluded overlying public access.
  - Staff tried to focus on the narrow issue of whether the CSU property owner should be able to define the use of their property in a way that for them was religiously motivated. Though different than what the community expected, staff recommended that it was reasonable, given the type of use.
  - Staff was uncomfortable that the scope of the issue kept getting broader, and then regarded views from the property, cut-through traffic, ADA issues, etc.
- **Commissioner Qutub** did not believe staff had erred in explaining what was expected to the Commission. Everyone took it so personally that they deviated from what was to be reviewed. Staff did a good job keeping the Commission on target, but the Commissioners kept expanding the scope.
  - **Mr. Monahan** added that the applicant made a specific application request regarding what terms of the CSU they wanted to modify. Anything other than that

- took away the applicant's investment in their opportunity. A modification requested to a condition of approval on other land use applications did not open up the opportunity to modify other items. The Commission should focus on CSUs in the same manner.
- **Commissioner Churchill** stated that the property owners took the existing large easement in a drastically different direction than where it was during the first application process.
  - **Chair Klein and Mr. Monahan** noted that ADA issues and ticketing people who walked their dogs on the property were not the Commission's responsibility and would pit the neighborhood against the church.
  - The CSU overlay was viewed as that originally approved for ESD. Making it a housing development made no difference, because neighbors walked dogs on the property anyway. The park was not actually a park, so that was not an issue.
  - **Commissioner Newman** felt that the decision was regrettable because the CSU that resulted did not seem even close to what was intended with ESD. The same thing could happen again where a CSU was written to allow something and then the property was sold, effectively and completely changing the original intent.
    - Once a CSU was allowed, it could not be reversed. Staff was smarter about the need to specify in the conditions of approval that a particular use with particular schedules and ancillary uses could not be changed without returning to Planning for review.
  - Discussion regarding Commissioner Qutub's participation included:
    - Though a quorum was needed for the second meeting, a lot is missed if meetings were not attended. It was difficult to get the details and the whole flavor of the meeting from the minutes.
      - Arguments addressed at the second meeting were pretty much the same as the first meeting. The applicant's needs did not change from the first to the second meeting.
    - Another element was that Mr. Monahan had not asked Commissioner Qutub to step down before she was involved in some of the conversations at the second meeting. At first her questions were obtaining good information for the audience, but then she seemed to indicate a direction in which she was going.
      - If Commissioner Qutub had not participated, but sat in the audience. She could have participated in the third meeting, although rebuilding would have required a lot of work in listening to the first meeting of the hearing.
      - When she participated at the third meeting, Mr. Monahan was concerned someone would think there was a bias. Someone could appeal to City Council and discredit the Commission.
      - Mr. Monahan might have covered his procedural irregularity by introducing a worksession prior to the meeting to review the agenda and confirm who would be participating to avoid embarrassing anyone.
        - No one had prepared Commissioner Qutub about whether she could participate or not. She would not have addressed anything if she had been told. She did understand the issue after reading the minutes and attending the second and third meetings, and felt prepared to make a decision. She asked if her participation caused problems for the decision.
    - The appeal deadline was December 11, 2008 and no appeal had yet been received. It was okay that Commissioner Qutub participated.
      - Mr. Monahan would have felt better if she had not participated at all in the second hearing, but he did not think anyone would challenge the decision. If someone did, City Council was the final decision maker. The concern was that it put a bad light on the Planning Commission.

- Not having Commissioner Qutub's vote could have changed the outcome of the application, sending it on to City Council for the decision.
- The Commission had to police themselves and the audience was asked about challenging any Commissioner's participation, not other Commissioners. Participation was a personal choice because everyone learned differently in rebuilding from the written or audio record.
  - Chair Klein did the right things at the third hearing by giving the audience the opportunity to challenge Commissioner Qutub's participation. Several people in the audience were at the prior meeting, so they did not have the concern.
- It was important that the public did not perceive that the Planning Commission talked to each other about issues. In this case, an audience member could have decided that someone was brought in because of the tied vote to ensure the vote went a particular way.
- **Ms. Mangle** stated that staff did not know if a quorum would be present for the second meeting, so it was important that Commissioners let staff know if they would attend. Legally, Commissioners were allowed to participate in situations where the need was evident.
  - If it served the public interest to participate for quorum reasons or otherwise, staff could provide the tapes, supporting materials, and minutes to help Commissioners prepare for continued hearings.
- Information was requested about what the tax implications would have been if the original CSU application had been developed into homes.
- Because churches were mobile, information about where the church's congregation came from was also requested. Was the church building community or just finding a central location?
  - Such information helped to determine community service use, though some Commissioners believed the request was biased.
  - Regarding traffic impacts, the analysis did not care if the cars came from Sherwood or Ardenwald; they were all cars.
    - It would make a difference if the attendees all came from Milwaukie because some would be pedestrians.
    - Having local congregational members helped centralize revenues within the city since local residents paid property taxes and did business in the area. The same issue came up with the Sweet Pea Daycare.
    - The impacts could go either way because local people would benefit from out of town people coming on Sundays and shopping locally without worrying about educating their school children.
- Holding a worksession 15 to 20 minutes prior to scheduled Commission meetings would help prepare for and save time in hearings. Worksessions would be public meetings and would provide a chance to clarify the staff report material, how the process would work, who would participate, any problems with exhibits, etc.
  - Participants might monitor the worksession to be sure no discussions were [inaudible].
  - Premeeting worksessions were pretty open, but also allowed the opportunity for executive session, which would be closed to the public. Regular land use applications would not generally qualify for an executive session. A premeeting could also clarify any expectations of Commissioners.
  - RLUIPA could have been discussed in an executive session, which would have been beneficial at meetings two and three.

- The Commission consented to discuss premeeting worksessions further when Commissioner Batey was present and the Commission's vacant position was filled.

**9.0 OLD BUSINESS** -- None.

**10.0 OTHER BUSINESS/UPDATES**

10.1 Code and Comprehensive Plan update pages

**Ms. Mangle** noted the Code updates were included in the meeting packet and then updated the Commission about the following:

- The Thomason sites were being developed, and included Willamette Jet Boat and the administration offices of a tile manufacturing company from Portland.
  - The sites would be industrial uses and met the minimum jobs requirement.
  - No potential impacts existed for light rail because the site was on the Tillamook branch not Main St.
  - The project was under the cost threshold for doing all the public improvements under the current Code, so some street trees would be planted, but not full public improvements.
- She thanked the Commission for agreeing that the JCB trailer met the minor modification standards, but the City decided that the project was close enough to the upper limit that it was wise to return to the Planning Commission in a public hearing for a major modification to a CSU. Staff wanted to ensure they were in no way doing anything different than would be asked of other applicants.

**Mr. Monahan** agreed that the initial analysis was good, but it was an opportunity to define the City's commitment to the process.

**Chair Klein** opened a discussion regarding the Commission's part in permitting and Code amendments related to the sewer treatment facility. The Commission had wanted to put some teeth in Kellogg Treatment Facility and when sent to Council, the discussion was repeatedly tabled. Mr. Knapp of the Clackamas County Service District (CSD) stated in a *Clackamas Review* article that it was worthless and the Commission had nothing to stand on.

- **Mr. Monahan** explained that the reason it was held off was because it created some strategic leverage. A special committee was created by the County when the Council put it on hold. He believed Mr. Knapp's comment saying it was nothing, meant it did mean something. Much was occurring behind the scenes and hopefully some resolution was close.
- Concern was expressed about the Code language presently before the Council, which needed refreshing after having been continued.

**Ms. Mangle** confirmed that no one had come to City Council with any complaints about the Planning Commission, though complaints about staff were heard from Ed Parecki.

**Chair Klein** noted that he had written an endorsement for the mayor in *The Clackamas Review* as a citizen, but the newspaper website had referred to him as Planning Commissioner. He wanted to assure the endorsement was intended as Jeff Klein, resident of Milwaukie; he was not speaking on behalf of the Planning Commission.

**Mr. Monahan** explained such references were common practice. He advised making it very clear when submitting letters and then following up with a call when the mistake is

made to provide documentation in case a complaint is lodged.

- 11.0 **NEXT MEETING:** January 13, 2009 (no meeting December 23, 2008)
- 11.1 CSU-08-04 Bridge City Community Church Sign Review
- 11.2 CSU-08-05 Pond House Application–Booktique bookstore/other Lending Library Uses
- 11.3 Officer Elections

**Ms. Mangle** noted that staff hoped to have a briefing on the South Downtown Concept Plan Project, which would include the consultants from the Center for Environmental Structure and possibly Christopher Alexander, himself. She would be in contact if the meeting was scheduled to begin earlier.

**Forecast for Future Meetings:**

January 27, 2009 –Parking Code Update briefing – *tentative*

Meeting adjourned at 9:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paula Pinyerd, ABC Transcription for  
Alicia Stoutenburg, Administrative Specialist II



Jeff Klein, Chair