



Planning for People, Places and Prosperity

**Comprehensive Plan
Citizen Advisory Committee
Meeting # 31**

**January 17, 2013
Main Fire Station, 300 B Avenue
4:00 pm – 6:00 pm**

PLEASE NOTE THIS SUMMARY IS NOT A WORD FOR WORD DOCUMENTATION OF ALL INFORMATION PRESENTED AT THE MEETING. TO SEE THE INFORMATION PRESENTED AND DISCUSSED PLEASE REFER TO THE MEETING MATERIALS ON THE CAC MEETING WEB PAGE:

<http://welovelakeoswego.com/citizen-committees/cac-meetings/>

Members in attendance: Bob Needham (Acting Chair); Dorothy Atwood, Tom Brennan, Doug Cushing, Tom Fahey, Bill Gaar; Nancy Gronowski, Liz Hartman, Patti Zebrowski (for Teri Oelrich); Lynda O'Neill, and David White.

Members not in attendance: Jim Johnson (Vice Chair), Christopher Clee, Teri Oelrich and David White

Staff in attendance: Laura Weigel, Beth St. Amand, and Kirstin Greene (Cogan Owens Cogan)

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

CAC COMMENTS

Ms. Zebrowski reported that a School District study projected another 3% decline in the number of students in the district in the next ten years. The best type of housing to bring more young children to the district was new, detached homes. The District had also commissioned a real estate study.

REGULAR BUSINESS

Agenda Review & Announcements

CAC members were asked to submit any comments on the November 19, 2012, meeting summary by the end of the week. The City was going to receive an award from the American Planning Association for the 'We Love Lake Oswego' video. Applications for the vacant young adult position on the CAC were due the following day. The Council had appointed Tom Coffee as Interim City Manager; it had not yet appointed a CAC liaison. The next CAC meeting was January 31 at the WEB.

Process Overview

Ms. St. Amand reported the process was in the home stretch and the final adoption hearings would be held during 2013. She encouraged the CAC to be keepers of the vision and attend the hearings. CAC work would likely be done in June. People could track the process online. The CAC was going to talk about the schedule and action planning at its January 31 meeting. The Planning Commission would work on the Land Use Planning action area.

Community Health and Public Safety

- **Urbanization Goals and Policies**

Staff discussed some final issues with the committee.

Policy C.2 The City may initiate island annexations as allowed by state law to:

- a. Create logical City boundaries;**
- b. Provide economic and efficient provision of City services to existing and proposed development within the subject area, and to adjacent land; and,**
- c. Equitably distribute costs for those city services enjoyed by residents of island areas.**

The CAC had talked about adding an item to annex for health and safety reasons related to septic failure. Staff did not recommend that for the following reasons: It was not related to land use actions; it was a state

health department decision; and once the city initiated an island annexation it had to take in the entire island area.

Policy B.3. If concept planning occurs for the Stafford Basin Urban Reserve:

- a. **Participate in a primary decision-making role.**
- b. **Advocate for the following plan features to be included:**
 - i. **Development of a walkable, transit-oriented, mixed-use town center near the I-205/ Stafford interchange.**
 - ii. **A design and development pattern that results in strong transportation and transit connections to the east and west along I-205.**
 - iii. **Concurrent provision of high-capacity transit service along I-205.**
 - iv. **In the Upper Stafford Basin, retention of the rural character and related land uses (Policy B-1) and a rural buffer between existing communities and future urbanized areas (Policy B-2).**
- c. **Support the area's inclusion in the UGB only if i-iv. are part of the final plan.**

The CAC had previously suggested determining and defining what 'Upper Stafford Basin' was. Ms. St. Amand reported that the Stafford Hamlet did not differentiate between an 'upper' and 'lower' basin. She provided a map suggesting an area (outlined in blue) that was based on natural breaks and barriers and asked if that was what the CAC had in mind. If it was, staff could insert the definition and the map.

The CAC examined the map. During the discussion Ms. Gronowski related she had assumed Luscher Farm would be a boundary. Mr. Cushing related he had been told there would likely be an initiative to form a City of Stafford. Staff clarified that none of Stafford basin was currently within the Lake Oswego's Urban Service Boundary (USB). If the Metro urban reserve designation was upheld in court it would be composed of four subareas: 4-a, 4-b, 4-c, and 4-d. Subarea 4-d extended quite a long way to the southwest. The group talked about how far the City's interest extended. They decided to specify that the City would have a primary decision-making role related to subareas 4-a, 4-b and 4-c because those areas were likely within the City's sphere of influence. However they wanted the City to have some flexibility to be involved in discussions about the area beyond that in case what happened there impacted Lake Oswego. They speculated it might be related to transportation planning. Policy B.3 would allow that because it referred to the 'Stafford Basin Urban Reserves', which meant the entire area. The consensus was to make the following three changes:

Policy B.3. If concept planning occurs in the Stafford Basin Urban Reserve*:

- a. **Participate in a ~~primary decision-making role~~ primarily for a., b., and c.**
- b. **Advocate for the following plan features to be included:**
 - i. **Development of a walkable, transit-oriented, mixed-use town center near the I-205/ Stafford interchange.**
 - ii. **A design and development pattern that results in strong transportation and transit connections to the east and west along I-205.**
 - iii. **Concurrent provision of high-capacity transit service along I-205.**
 - iv. **In the Upper Stafford Basin, retention of the rural character and related land uses (Policy B-1) and a rural buffer between existing communities and future urbanized areas (Policy B-2).**
- c. **Support the area's inclusion in the UGB only if i-iv. are part of the final plan.**

(*) Insert definition

Ms. Atwood **moved** to recommend the entire suite of Urbanization Goals and Policies to the Planning Commission. Mr. Brennan **seconded** the motion and it **passed** by unanimous agreement.

- **City Services/Police & Fire first review / Administrative and Government Services
Community Health and Public Safety, Goal 11, Public Facilities and Services, Section 5**

Ms. Weigel recommended removing this section from the revised Comprehensive Plan. It was unnecessary because these policies were covered in other areas of the Plan.

Ms. Atwood **moved to remove Section 5 from the revised plan.** Mr. Cushing **seconded** the motion and it **passed** by unanimous vote.

Public Facilities and Services, Section 1, Public Safety Police and Fire Protection

Ms. Weigel related that she had worked on these policies with Police and Fire officials. Some of the proposed changes were for cleaner wording and more accurate references. Two policies were proposed to be removed because Police and Fire never looked at building security and did not plan to (Policy 2.c); and all development was required by law to meet fire code requirements (Policy 12) so it was not necessary to keep it this policy. Two references to 'automatic' mutual aid agreements were removed because the term "mutual aid" could refer to both and the general public doesn't know what "automatic" means.

New Policies:

- A. Ensure that police and fire protection service providers are involved with land use decisions that have implications for the provision of emergency services.**
- B. Ensure the nature and level of fire and police services provided to the City are subject to annual monitoring, evaluation, and long range planning.**
- C. Keep up with the latest communications technology so as to provide effective and coordinated service.**

New Policies A and B were proposed to acknowledge things police and fire already did. Ms. Weigel agreed to clarify that A was directed at both those who made land use decisions and Police and Fire, and B was directed at Police and Fire. Ms. O'Neill state that Police and Fire did a lot in regard to community education. The policies should acknowledge that too. Policy C reflected the Police and Fire Departments' desire to have a budget that allowed them to keep up with the latest technology. Mr. Gaar suggested changing the emphasis from driving budgeting to: **Policy C. Provide effective and coordinated communications.**

Policy 2. Require adequate police and fire protection to be considered for all development.

Mr. Needham questioned using 'considered.' He recalled that features like adequate turnarounds for fire trucks were required in development review. Ms. Weigel planned to talk to Police and Fire officials about rewording this to indicate that all developments were to be designed for adequate police and fire protection.

Policies 8 and 9 called for police and fire to strive to respond within a specified number of minutes. The committee questioned whether the number of minutes should be specified or if each policy should just refer to some standard. Ms. Weigel advised the departments were meeting those goals now. She planned to talk to them about making the changes.

Policy 11. Maintain a Lake Oswego Emergency Operations Plan and provide sufficient resources to respond to emergencies including mass casualty incidents* wildfires, earthquakes, severe weather, major structural fires and hazardous materials accidents.

Mr. Brennan suggested 'floods' should be listed. Ms. Weigel planned to compare this policy with Hazards section goals and policies to ensure it was consistent.

Public Facilities and Services

• Wastewater Goals and Policies

The committee examined Wastewater Collection and Treatment goals and policies (Draft 1-11-13) in Attachment 5. Staff advised the Council had adopted the Wastewater Master Plan in November. The vision anticipated the city would grow within its current boundaries. The policies would ensure the proper infrastructure to serve the community now and in the future. Key points were that there were some areas within the Urban Services Boundary (USB) that were still on septic. The master plan recommended a program that focused mainly on repairing and improving the system and reducing infiltration. Expansion was a very small part of it. The Engineering Department was looking at where and when sewer needed to be extended.

During the discussion Ms. Atwood suggested looking at ways to decrease the load on the sewer system. She recalled waterless toilets and places where use of food disposals was not allowed. Ms. St. Amand did not

believe that load capacity was an issue, but she planned to talk with Engineering staff about that. Mr. Gaar suggested there could be policy language about sustainable use of the system. Ideas for reducing impacts on the system could be considered in the implementation planning phase. Ms. St. Amand advised the new wastewater master plan recommended a policy that called for the plan to be coordinated with the City's Sustainability Plan, but the related measures had not been developed.

GOAL Provide adequate and efficient wastewater collection and treatment systems to:
b. Improve the City's environmental quality.

Policy 4. Invest in maintaining the existing wastewater collection system to preserve its viability and minimize future capital costs.

Staff observed that the goal called for improving the City's environmental quality. That could be by lessening the loads and reducing the impacts. Minimizing impact and conserving energy would fit Policy 4 as well.

Policy 1. Require developers to:

- a. Provide adequate sanitary sewers to all new development; and,**
- b. Pay an equitable portion of costs associated with extending service.**

Policy 2. Require all new development within the City to connect to the City's wastewater collection system and pay a system development charge.

Ms. Atwood would call for development to provide wastewater treatment at the lowest impact. That would allow flexibility in how the service was provided. Mr. Gaar added that by reducing impacts on the system, you don't have to keep spending money to build and fix the system. Staff advised that Policy 2 was current city policy, but the concept of allowing for innovation might be explored when the committee talked about other policies. Mr. Cushing inquired whether in light of the annexation policies discussed earlier, are we really talking equitable? Ms. St. Amand replied that Policy 1 addressed the 'zone of benefit' concept, where a developer first invested in upgrading the sewer system, and then others in the area could connect to it. Mr. Cushing then asked if there should be a policy calling for the city to update the wastewater plan? Ms. St. Amand advised that the city was required to update plans as part of periodic review. It might not need to be a policy, but she would clarify.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

CAC COMMENTS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

Acting Chair Needham adjourned the meeting at approximately 6:00 p.m.

ATTACHMENT:

School District Study Overview

Housing and Enrollment

**Average Number of LOSD Students per Home, Fall 2012
By Housing Type and Grade Level**

	Grade Level			
	K-5	6-8	9-12	K-12
Single family homes built 2000-2010	0.29	0.13	0.19	0.62
<i>detached homes built 2000-2010</i>	0.32	0.14	0.21	0.68
<i>row homes built 2000-2010</i>	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.09
Single family homes built 1990-1999	0.23	0.16	0.23	0.62
Single family homes built before 1990	0.17	0.10	0.15	0.41
Condominiums	0.05	0.03	0.04	0.11
Apartments	0.07	0.04	0.04	0.15

Source: Data compiled by PSU-PRC, using LOSD student data and geographic shape files from Metro RUS. Excludes senior housing developments.

loss of 3 percent in the 10 year period, or a loss of 0.4 percent annually. By 2020, the fastest growing age groups are the elderly generation in its 70s and 80s. Growth in population age 60 and older in the District is forecast to more than offset the decline in population under age 60 within the District between 2010 and 2020.

Table 12
Population by Age Group
Lake Oswego School District, 1990 to 2030

	2000 Census	2010 Census	2020 Forecast	2030 Forecast	2010 to 2020 Change		2020 to 2030 Change	
					Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Under Age 5	2,061	1,732	1,639	1,578	-93	-5%	-61	-4%
Age 5 to 9	2,816	2,470	2,290	2,204	-180	-7%	-86	-4%
Age 10 to 14	3,314	3,054	2,946	2,728	-108	-4%	-218	-7%
Age 15 to 17	1,999	1,983	2,011	1,855	28	1%	-156	-8%
Age 18 to 19	772	766	600	551	-166	-22%	-49	-8%
Age 20 to 24	1,666	1,609	1,563	1,507	-46	-3%	-56	-4%
Age 25 to 29	1,953	1,902	2,035	1,933	133	7%	-102	-5%
Age 30 to 34	2,100	1,650	1,593	1,546	-57	-3%	-47	-3%
Age 35 to 39	2,911	2,221	2,228	2,383	7	0%	155	7%
Age 40 to 44	3,879	2,808	2,488	2,445	-320	-11%	-43	-2%
Age 45 to 49	4,229	3,413	2,751	2,759	-662	-19%	8	0%
Age 50 to 54	3,768	3,926	2,944	2,670	-982	-25%	-274	-9%
Age 55 to 59	2,489	3,659	3,192	2,518	-467	-13%	-674	-21%
Age 60 to 64	1,540	3,181	3,422	2,565	241	8%	-857	-25%
Age 65 to 69	1,174	2,088	3,116	2,721	1,028	49%	-395	-13%
Age 70 to 74	1,062	1,326	2,694	2,902	1,368	103%	208	8%
Age 75 to 79	980	963	1,660	2,429	697	72%	769	46%
Age 80 to 84	620	877	1,052	1,906	175	20%	854	81%
Age 85 and over	540	1,127	1,376	1,741	249	22%	365	27%
Total Population	39,873	40,755	41,600	40,941	845	2%	-659	-2%
Total age 5 to 17	8,129	7,507	7,247	6,787	-260	-3%	-460	-6%
share age 5 to 17	20.4%	18.4%	17.4%	16.6%				

	2000-2010	2010-2020	2020-2030
Population Change	882	845	-659
<i>Percent</i>	<i>2%</i>	<i>2%</i>	<i>-2%</i>
<i>Average Annual</i>	<i>0.2%</i>	<i>0.2%</i>	<i>-0.2%</i>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 and 2010 Censuses; data aggregated to LOSD boundary by Portland State University Population Research Center. PSU-PRC Forecasts, 2020 and 2030.

Enrollment Forecasts for Individual Schools, 2013-14 to 2022-23

School	Actual	Forecast											Change	
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2022-23	2012-13-	2022-23
Forest Hills Elementary	435	450	446	446	430	437	444	441	437	432	430	430	-5	
Lake Grove Elementary	499	511	522	515	510	506	487	484	478	476	477	477	-22	
Oak Creek Elementary	530	506	493	488	468	471	463	462	457	454	451	451	-79	
Hallinan Elementary	437	435	437	407	399	401	393	388	385	383	384	384	-53	
River Grove Elementary	382	391	404	412	436	435	434	429	422	418	414	414	32	
Westridge Elementary	466	464	470	465	450	456	458	458	451	442	440	440	-26	
Elementary Totals	2,749	2,742	2,776	2,733	2,693	2,706	2,679	2,662	2,630	2,605	2,596	2,596	-153	
Lake Oswego Junior High School	871	882	873	867	883	882	869	832	849	838	836	836	-35	
Lakeridge Junior High School ¹	738	721	719	768	776	784	751	757	774	772	761	761	23	
Junior High School Totals	1,609	1,603	1,592	1,635	1,659	1,666	1,620	1,589	1,623	1,610	1,597	1,597	-12	
Lake Oswego High School	1,296	1,300	1,285	1,327	1,308	1,288	1,309	1,319	1,288	1,308	1,276	1,276	-20	
Lakeridge High School	1,122	1,124	1,077	1,074	1,030	1,011	1,068	1,077	1,077	1,099	1,067	1,067	-55	
High School Totals	2,418	2,424	2,362	2,401	2,338	2,299	2,377	2,396	2,365	2,407	2,343	2,343	-75	
District Totals	6,776	6,769	6,730	6,769	6,690	6,671	6,676	6,647	6,618	6,622	6,536	6,536	-240	

1. Waluga Junior High School has been renamed as Lakeridge Junior High School in 2012.
Population Research Center, Portland State University, December 2012

Lake Oswego School District, Enrollment History and Forecast between 2002-03 and 2022-23

