

1. From: scott schultze

Sent: Wednesday, November 09, 2011 9:03 PM

To: WeLoveLO

Subject: The Plan

From: scott schultze <schultzes01@gmail.com>

Subject: The Plan

Message Body:

We are on a trip. What is this all about and why do we have such a short time to respond! Any time a request is demanded in a very short period of time it raises concerns as to it's purpose. Please respond ASAP! Thank you

2. From: Richard and Katharine Cavalli

Sent: Wednesday, November 09, 2011 12:42 PM

To: WeLoveLO

Subject: Recreation

From: Richard and Katharine Cavalli <r.cavalli@comcast.net>

Subject: Recreation

Message Body:

We fully support continuing to develop recreational opportunities through the City so that they are convenient and could be walked to in all neighborhoods. While we do not fully understand what private recreation facilities would be, other than perhaps gyms and golf clubs. We do think that there should be some public recreation facilities, regardless of the existence of private ones since not everyone can afford or is willing to join a private club and that these should not be concentrated in one place. We understand there is some pressure to open Oswego Lake to the public, and we are adamantly opposed to allowing any more public access to the Lake, with the possible exception of additional swim parks or a "beach" area. It is a small lake and already has reached its limit in terms of the number of watercraft. One needs only to look at California small lakes such as Lake Sonoma to see what unrestricted access can do in terms of boat collisions and fatalities and general rowdiness. If the lake were to be opened to more boating, there would be significant costs in policing and 24 hour patrols would be necessary to protect lakeside property. Virtually all of our "backyards" are open and our homes would be at risk for thieves from outside our community. We have already had episodes of vandalism by Lake Residents, and we shudder to think what this will be like if anyone could put a boat on the lake at any time. We have paid a premium for our homes, and a premium to keep the lake in operation, and we do not want that to have been done in vain. There is plenty of opportunity for community use of the river, so there is no pressing need to open the lake, except in the minds of a few who desire something for nothing.

Richard and Katharine Cavalli

3. From: D. Hageman

Sent: Wednesday, November 09, 2011 10:08 AM

To: WeLoveLO

Subject: Comprehensive Plan-Recreation

Message Body:

I have seen articles regarding interest in opening lake access to the public. The subject was lightly addressed in last Thursday's public forum.

While on the face, this would appear to be beneficial to the city's attractiveness, serious consideration must be given to the following concerns if that were to happen.

1. How will the city make up the lost revenue in the obvious reduction of property values as well as additional costs that will be incurred by the city in controlling lake access?
2. How will the city support the cost of having to patrol the lake? That cost is currently paid by private lake shareholders who live on the lake.
3. How will the city control the clear exposure of theft of items from boat houses and property owners who live on the lake? Opening this to the public would bring in an enormous potential for theft and crime to the homeowners. How will the city know who is bringing on their own personal water craft and not leaving with lake homeowners' property in the form of kayaks, paddle boats, canoes, or small power boats?
4. How will the city maintain the water quality that has been successfully maintained by the Lake Corporation the past several years? The cost of that through alum applications and general cleanup maintenance has been born by the private shareholders and has been handled by the LOC private staff. Vancouver lake is a prime example of failure to closely monitor and control lake water quality when it had to be closed for some period due to E-coli and green algae infestation.
5. How will the city control the type and size of watercraft brought onto the lake? The lake is only 3 by 1/2 miles in size and enormous problems are caused by wakes from boats that are too large. Additionally, jet skis and wave riders cause extreme speed hazards and noise problems.

These are just a few of the numerous problems the city will confront if the lake is opened to public access. The lake is, by law, private property and that would have to change through a condemnation action by the city. Are the Council members ready to take on the obvious political ramifications if that were to happen?

Thank you

4. From: don burdick

Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 2:29 PM

To: WeLoveLO

Subject: oswego lake access

Message Body:

Very bad idea for Lake Oswego. Unintended consequences would be a disaster for lake, easement, and adjacent properties. City and school district could take a real hit from declining tax collections while City's increased costs would be significant. The Planning Commissioner promoting the idea has a significant conflict of interest saying he represents only himself.

5. From: Kathe Worsley (via Sally Moncrieff)

Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:45 PM

To: katheworsley@yahoo.com

Cc: Christie, Robyn; Council Distribution; Sin, Sidaro; Weigel, Laura; Selden, Sarah

Subject: RE: Comprehensive Plan re: Sensitive Lands

Robyn-

Would you please make sure that each City Councilor and the Mayor receives this email. I am out of the country and will not be able to attend the "Community Culture" event on November 3rd. Please email me back so I know you recieved this. Below is my take on it:

"I believe the "sensitive lands" issue must be addressed within the context of "Community Culture" as it is a program that greatly impacts the rights of citizens and livability of our community. It divides our community, encourages neighbor against neighbor enforcements, creates two tiers of private properties, limits recreational use and enjoyment of backyards, and devalues property.

In addition, I was appalled that in 2010, the following statement was removed from the Council's resolution regarding the "sensitive lands" program:

'Whereas, the City of Lake Oswego is also committed to the principles of fairness to individuals and respect for private property .'

This statement needs to be put back and all Sensitive Lands designations be removed from ALL PRIVATE PROPERTIES and only be applied to PUBLIC LANDS."

Respectfully,

Kathe Worsley

1877 Woodland Terrace

Lake Oswego, OR 97034

503-636-5057

6. From: Gery Schirado

Sent: Saturday, October 29, 2011 11:41 AM

To: WeLoveLO

Subject: Oswego Lake public access

Message Body:

Oswego Lake should be accessible to the public. There are any number of similarities to a lake inside a township and a park. They are there for the public to use and enjoy even for those who do not live within the town.

Durham City Park is open to the general public and is used by people and their pets many of whom do not live in Durham just as is Fanno Creek and access to the Tualatin River.

For Oregonians who enjoy our water ways Oswego Lake should be as accessible to me as well as you.

Thank you,

Gery Schirado

Mayor, City of Durham

7. From: Lori Benton

Sent: Friday, October 28, 2011 3:12 PM

To: WeLoveLO

Subject: lake access

Message Body:

I enjoy doing business and recreating in the city of Lake Oswego and I should be able to exercise my right to also access the lake itself for swimming and kayaking purposes.

8. From: Robdrt Bixel

Sent: Friday, October 28, 2011 9:01 AM

To: WeLoveLO

Subject: Lake access

Message Body:

I was born in Portland 50 years ago and have lived here for most of my life. I've always wanted to put my canoe on Lake Oswego but didn't know anyone who had a dock or access. I've always thought this to be very weird and exclusive. Why is there not a public access/launch? As far as I can tell according to the law there should be one. Please make it so.

Thank you, Robert Bixel

9. From: Colleen Wright

Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2011 4:06 PM

To: WeLoveLO

Subject: Lake Access

Message Body:

My husband and I would love to be able to take our non-motorized canoe down to the lake and paddle around. It would be a great way to take in the beauty of the lake, see it from a different angle and work the stress of the work day away or start the day centered in Nature. I do understand that we don't to get in a situation of overcrowding and I would definitely suggest non-motorized craft only except for those that have lakefront access or already have existing easements. I think there should be a user fee based on type of vehicle used (motor vs. paddle power). We are Lake Oswego residents and are a block from the lake. Residents behind house (further from the lake) have boat easements, the same for those 1& 1.2 blocks from us toward the lake. Essentially we are a small pocket of no boat access surrounded by those with access even further from the lake than us. We do understand the desire to keep things as they are and not overpopulate the lake. We can get creative and figure out different ways to allow access. Perhaps allowing only so many per a particular time frame and rotating that time frame.....

10. From: John Callen

Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2011 11:15 AM

To: WeLoveLO

Subject: Oswego Lake Public Access

Message Body:

I believe that the City of Lake Oswego should provide public access to Oswego Lake. Oswego Lake is a public resource, not a private asset. The community should be able to enjoy the various activities, boating, fishing, sailing, etc, that are possible on the lake.