



**Comprehensive Plan
Citizen Advisory Committee
Meeting #8 – Summary**

**February 22, 2011
Fire Station
4:00 pm – 6:00 pm**

PLEASE NOTE: THIS SUMMARY IS NOT A WORD FOR WORD DOCUMENTATION OF ALL OF THE 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: Sally Moncrieff (Chair), Dorothy Atwood, Tom Brennan, Christopher Clee, Tom Fahey, Bill Garr, Nancy Gronowski, Liz Hartman, Jim Johnson, Tim Mather, David White.

Members not in attendance: Doug Cushing, Bob Needham, Teri Oelrich

Staff in attendance: Sid Sin, Laura Weigel, Sarah Selden, City of Lake Oswego; Kirstin Greene, Cogan Owens Cogan, facilitator; Todd Chase, FCS Group

1. Public Comment

Sheri Finnegan introduced herself as an observer for the League of Women Voters. The League has a position on comprehensive planning and will share it with the CAC in the future.

Councilor Mary Olson stated that she didn't think that Tom Brennan's memo regarding the City Council's position on the Vision Statement was quite accurate. The City Council does have some suggested changes to the statement. She encouraged everyone to watch the City Council Session online at <http://www.tvctv.org/government-programming/government-meetings/lake-oswego>.

An email from Craig Stephens, Old Town, was distributed by Liz Hartman who received the email. Please see at the end of the notes.

2. CAC Feedback

Chairman Sally Moncrieff said that now that the CAC has been meeting since August it is a good time to give a status on where the group is in the process and how they got here. Moncrieff outlined the comprehensive plan work process that the Council adopted in resolution 0908 <http://www.ci.oswego.or.us/calendar/councilmtgs/documents/051909packet.pdf> which is the comprehensive work plan which includes visioning and outreach.

Councilor Moncrieff also revisited the CAC charge statement, which in brief states that the CAC's charge is to provide thoughtful and creative recommendations to Planning Commission and City Council regarding the broad community vision, update the comprehensive plan goals and incorporate sustainability into the plan. The CAC needs to understand that the City has limited budget and a three year mandated deadline therefore decisions will need to be made with limited information in order to remain on schedule and within the budget.

Councilor Moncrieff also referenced the 2011 Council goals adopted on February 1, which include the following statement: "Plan for the Community's present needs while envisioning a future that sustains the high quality of life for future generations for Lake Oswego through the three-year update to the City's Comprehensive Plan."

3. Draft Vision Statement

Councilor Moncrieff responded to Councilor Olsen that four out of the seven council members agreed that the Vision Statement was headed in the right direction and that there will be an opportunity to discuss the Council comments in the near future.

Sid noted that the February 15 City Council was not yet posted on the Tualatin Valley TV web site and suggested delaying discussions until the next meeting when everyone had an opportunity to view the meeting.

4. Population Forecast

Greene reviewed the population forecast motion from last meeting and suggested that instead of endorsing one population forecast at this time that the CAC should continue to look at the forecast ranges until after listening to the Goal 9 & 10 presentation as well as waiting for feedback from the public on the growth scenarios at the March 29, 2011 open house.

5. Goal 9: Economic Development and Goal 10: Housing (see meeting materials)

This information was presented to the technical advisory committee and the Goal 9 & 10 Work Group prior to this meeting and should be considered a work in progress. The City received a grant from DLCD for 9 and 10 for the analysis.

Metro develops a population forecast every five years and are in the process of creating a forecast for 2045 for the region which will be complete by the end of 2011. Local jurisdictions will be working with Metro through the end of the year to develop the numbers. It's anticipated through the coordination that the forecast will reflect the vision of the community. Additionally census data will be out in about a month which may impact the forecast.

The FCS low growth forecast from 2010 to 2035. This forecast is not consistent with Metro.

- Population - 43,094 to 48,266
- Dwellings - 17,956 to 20,111
- Employment - 14,646 to 16,404
- Annual growth rate of .45%

The FCS medium growth forecast assumes job growth equates to population growth rate.

- Population - 43,094 to 51,981
- Dwellings - 17,956 to 20,111
- Employment - 14,646 to 17,668
- Annual growth rate of .75%

High growth forecast only applies to employment (Goal 9) and is consistent with the forecast Metro 2009 growth rate, which was extrapolated to 2035.

- Population and dwelling - same as medium forecast
- Employment increases to 24,429

Comment: The job number seemed high to the TAC.

Atwood asked if this type of employment growth is real in other cities. Chase said that it is probably truer in outer ring cities. Some communities see that large number as a great opportunity.

Jobs in ratio to population are lower per capita in Lake Oswego than other AAA rated cities. Jobs are important for this ranking.

There is a big question about industrial jobs. Would the City really gain them?

All three growth scenarios don't meet Metro requirements, which could be an issue, but the CAC will address potential strategies throughout the process. This is just the initial step in the process.

More important than the population forecast is the requirement by the State to comply with the Metropolitan Housing Rule which states that Lake Oswego must provide the opportunity for 10 dwelling units per net buildable acre (du/nba). Currently the City has 3.5 dwelling units per acre. In 1994 when comprehensive plan was adopted, City was in compliance with 10 du/nba, so even though the City had the capacity to develop at that density the market did not build out that high.

Atwood observed that neither of the two growth scenarios don't meet state require 10du/nba and asked if that was a problem. Chase stated that it could be and that the City may need to be creative in how growth is accommodated. Atwood asked if we should create a scenario that meets the du/nba? What are the legal requirements? The state wants cities to think through all the policy options. It was suggested that Staff talk to DLCDC to see if we should include a high growth scenario.

Hartman wanted a clarification as to why the State requires the cities to have a specific number of dwelling units per acre. It was explained that the state land use system is attempting to provide the opportunity for different housing choices for different income levels across the state. Johnson stated that it is a problem of the system that every single City is treated the same.

Johnson stated that the Metro forecasts were developed during the economic boom time. Currently the State and Metro are looking at the population forecasts. They want to know where growth should occur and is everyone providing the opportunity to accommodate growth? These are state requirements that are followed by Metro. The State doesn't care about population forecast , they care about du/acre. The census data will provide updated information about whether growth is actually occurring and will influence the population forecast.

Atwood pointed out that this is very complex information and it will need to be simplified before presenting it to the public. The information should be synthesized and implications of choices should be identified.

Clee made a motion to have a further explanation as to how the forecast numbers were developed. He thinks that each of the forecasts was developed with a different set of assumptions, so it is hard to compare them. He stated that the high and medium growth forecast are top down and developed based on requirements and the low growth is bottom up based on population.

In response to Clee, Moncrieff stated that we need to consider the quality of life in the City. What are the consequences of not growing compared to growing too much?

The CAC agreed to use the range of forecast for the time being and narrowed it down after more review and public comment.

6. Scenario Development Briefing

Sin provided a brief update on the scenarios planning. At the March 10 meeting the CAC will discuss the different elements of each scenario (requirements, vision, sustainability) in preparation for the March 29 Community Open House. Currently staff and the consultant are working on simplifying the information as well as correlating the information to the Action Areas.

7. Public Comment

Tom Coffee – The 10du/nba -unit density and 50/50 rule is applied to future available land, as opposed to the city-wide. When the plan was acknowledged in 1994 the aggregate was 10.5. Now the movement is have the capacity on vacant land which makes sense, but the City's remaining land cannot accommodate the 10du/nba. The low growth scenario shows that it can be done, but we are challenged by directives on distribution and allocation from the higher authorities. So my suggestion for the group is after having had this primer on the rules to go forward focusing on community and

what citizens want it to be knowing that you may face future challenges but not let those challenges cloud or direct the way you complete this process. If it ends up low growth, you take on these issues. It may be that the state needs to reconsider the rule. It's 20+ year old rule that doesn't work anymore. It keeps taking smaller and smaller parts of communities and having them accommodate the next 20 years growth. The obvious alternative is to go beyond the urban services boundary and that's a whole other issue that would be challenged by the courts as well. You should proceed with the way you are going with listening to the public and following the vision and not let the rules influence outcome. If you get to the end and need to challenge the rules, challenge the rules.

Jim Johnson (CAC member) thinks that the CAC should have a parking lot for ideas of things to suggest to the Council that needs to be part of their legislative agenda not just what needs to be done for periodic review. Cities like Lake Oswego should push for legislative policy change. Lake Oswego may have more clout than they think. The City shouldn't fear showing up at the legislature to change the law where needs to be changed. My experience with the legislature is that the usual suspects are always there and the Lake Oswego's of the State aren't there. I remember when the issue of Stafford first came up and the City didn't have any real policy to direct them where to go and how to advocate for this. We need to have a legislative queue so we that we can start to take on some of these issues; otherwise we are going to be driven by what the existing law is.

Jim Bolland –When Metro came out in the late 80's and asked us to give them a number understood that number was 4,000± additional households. But Metro did understand that all of the different communities used independent formulas to calculate the number without consistency. Metro now gone away from numbers, they now have a no-net-loss policy on dwelling capacity. The latest population growth figure from Portland State University (that metro uses) for Lake Oswego, the growth was .4 for the last 10 years, which is boom and bust time. So when I hear the numbers that people throw around I think get real. It's obviously not going to happen. Imagine what kind of angst would be generated in this community if the City started up zoning and other types of land use policies to encourage that type of growth.