



**Comprehensive Plan  
Citizen Advisory Committee  
Meeting # 26**

**July 25, 2012  
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:** Sally Moncrieff (Chair), Dorothy Atwood, Tom Brennan, Christopher Clee, Doug Cushing, Tom Fahey, Nancy Gronowski and Liz Hartman

**Members not in attendance:** Katie Abbott, Bill Gaar, Jim Johnson, Tim Mather, Bob Needham, Teri Oelrich and David White

**Staff in attendance:** Beth St. Amand, Kirstin Greene (Cogan Owens Cogan), Julia Metz, Intern; Erica Rooney, Assistant City Engineer; and Nancy Flye, Traffic Engineering Technician

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Dave Beckett, Chair of the Blue Heron Neighborhood Association, was concerned about the policy in Complete Neighborhoods and Housing regarding the half mile radius. He stated it was too long and would put many homes at risk of being rezoned. He questioned what percentage of the citizenry would use bikes to get around the hilly city. He advised if the City was trying to get people close to employment areas on bikes that would require more safety. Staff clarified the radius was not intended to increase density. They would clarify that policy.

**CAC COMMENTS**

The density-related concern Mr. Beckett had expressed had also been voiced at a neighborhood meeting. Allied Waste representatives had asked to be allowed to provide input regarding the transportation system because they knew every single street in the City. Staff planned to do that. Planning Commissioners had wanted to know where they would look to get a sense of all the activities that would be allowed in an employment center. That information could be offered in introductory text, a matrix, or some other part of the document. Staff was asked to bring a copy of the table of contents to the next meeting for the CAC to refer to.

**REGULAR BUSINESS**

- **Agenda Review & Announcements**

Ms. Greene reviewed the agenda items. Committee members were asked to read the draft minutes of the May 23 and June 27 meetings and email comments to Ms. Weigel. The CAC meeting day was to be changed to Thursdays starting in August. Ms. Weigel introduced the new intern, Julia Metz. The Connected Community Bike Ride would be on August 11.

- **August 25 Community Fair: Community Health & Public Safety and Healthy Ecosystems**

Ms. Weigel related that the NRAB, Police and Fire would help out and other organizations had agreed to participate. The announcement would be inserted into *Hello L.O.* She asked for volunteers to help staff the booth.

- **Community Health & Safety Action Area, Part 2: Policy Questions**

- Administrative and Government Services, and Communications
- Police and Fire Protection

- Stormwater Management
- Water Treatment and Delivery
- Wastewater Collection and Treatment

Part 2 dealt with Public Facilities and Services. The Public Facility Plan addressed infrastructure and transportation. It was required by the state. The background information was available on the website. Attachment 3.b. summarized it and proposed policy questions to be asked at the upcoming Community Fair.

**Police and Fire Protection** (Goal 11, Section 1). The local building code was required to reflect the state building code. The CAC discussed the concept of local policy that went beyond what was currently required by the state. For example, some CC&Rs required shake roofs. People were saying that it had high cost and a composite roof might be a little safer. One of the questions was whether the City should support the movement to ask the state to incorporate a related requirement for non-combustible roofing materials in the next revision of the state building code. Staff clarified the new requirements would be applied to new development, not existing development. Others related that Sunriver regulated roofing; the Palisades Neighborhood allowed architectural grade composition roofs; and shakes could be treated.

Councilor Moncrieff confirmed the City was about to circulate an RFP for contracted services currently provided by AMR. The Police Department had outgrown its current space in City Hall and the 911/Communications Center was required to upgrade its hardware and software. Police was currently a full-service department. Police wanted to know if the community supported the entire suite of services it currently provided. Staff was working with the department to frame the questions. Should they respond to all calls or prioritize types of calls? Should they continue to staff police presence at community events?

During the discussion staff noted the call center provided service under contract to West Linn and Milwaukie and served a total of about 83,000 persons. They noted the Center had received 100,000 calls in 2010-11. Only 23,000 of them were calls for emergency service. 29,000 of them were incident calls where the police followed up. They wanted to know how the Center dealt with cell and internet phone calls. Staff did not know. They wanted to know what the department's strategic plan was. Staff planned to provide a link to that. Ms. Rooney offered a recent example of non-emergency calls. Someone who had been sprayed by an ODOT truck and believed it was tar had made two calls. The investigation had required two officers for about three or four hours and it also involved Engineering staff. Councilor Moncrieff related that in the past the Council had always found that renewing contracts with the other cities was in the best interest of Lake Oswego. Police and Fire had always urged the Council to keep 911 at the Police Department because it was invaluable having dispatch collocated in town. Staff related the 2010 survey showed high level of community support for Police and Fire, but it also indicated people did not know much about the call center or that it even existed in Lake Oswego. This would be a chance to educate people about the service they had.

The CAC suggested letting people know there were different types of calls and asking them if they wanted a police officer to respond to all types or to prioritize response. They suggested the Center might have to serve a high number of people after it was upgraded in order to justify the expense. They suggested staff take another look at the background summary, where the information that the center had outgrown its space and was serving other cities might lead people to question why it was serving other cities. The overriding issue might be the seismic issue. The Committee raised the question of the purpose of the questions. Was it to find out what each individual member of the community wanted a police department to do; validate the service that was currently being provided; or prioritize services? Staff saw the questions as a way to gauge things by educating and sampling the citizenry. It was not a statistically valid survey. A CAC member agreed it was an opportunity to educate and remind people what they were getting. It was a qualitative sample to help at the policy making level and not something to drive the service delivery level. The Committee considered what to ask regarding police staffing of community events. Events were part of Lake Oswego culture, but someone had to pay for police time. Ms. Flye related that there were events many weekends of the year so a lot of overtime had to be scheduled and police were 'burning out' because of that. Staff invited CAC members to email additional comments. They planned to circulate the draft survey to them the following week.

**Administrative and Government Services, Energy, Communications and Schools** (Goal 11, Section 5). Staff posed the question of how could the City incorporate more “green” practices. A committee member recalled whether the City should be a ‘leader’ had already been established. Another advised that the ‘should’ questions required an overly easy ‘yes’ or ‘no.’

**Stormwater Management and Water Quality.** The City was in the process of updating the stormwater code and creating a manual. Residential communities like Lake Oswego were the biggest generators of stormwater. One question was how to encourage residential best management practices. A CAC member suggested water credits, which staff advised could be addressed under water delivery. Staff related that Portland offered people credit for having trees on their property because that reduced the amount of runoff. Committee members advised that citizens should know that one-third of Lake Oswego was impervious surface. The City of Salem required any asphalt parking for public facilities to be pervious asphalt. Ms. Rooney advised against mandating pervious asphalt because it was not the best alternative in some situations. There should be a menu of solutions to choose from. Staff did not know what Portland’s percentage of impervious surface was. They advised that those working on the code update and manual were looking at ways to reduce the City’s runoff. Lots of balancing was necessary, but it could be done. This action area would involve an education and outreach component that would require funding.

**Water Treatment and Delivery** (Section 3). The water treatment plant was the City’s biggest consumer of energy. A CAC member related that water rates were a contentious issue and a frequent topic of discussion in the neighborhood. Staff advised water revenues had to support the existing system and also pay for increased future capacity of the system. Ms. Rooney advised the plant was at the end of useful life and had to be replaced whether or not Tigard participated. There was no federal money available for that. The CAC suggested breaking the amounts out to show each line item; explaining it was important to partner with Tigard in order to have redundancy after a natural disaster as well as for financial reasons; and explaining that one of the benefits citizens would be getting was better quality water due to improved water treatment. They observed that using treated drinking quality water to flush toilets and water lawns was wasteful. It would be smart to differentiate between water for consumption and water for other uses. The City could look at its policy regarding use of rainwater and consider other alternatives.

**Wastewater Collection and Treatment** (Section 4). Currently, any property proposed for annexation had to connect to sewer. There were still some septic systems inside the City. Staff asked CAC members to email suggestions for incentives that could be used to get people off septic.

- **Review of Draft Connected Community Goals & Policies (Continued from July 11 Meeting)**

The CAC had met with TAB to go over goals and policies under Connected Community that were also integral to the TSP update.

**Goal 4, Accessibility.** On July 11 the group had gotten through the first three goals and part of Goal 4, which they had agreed should call for a ‘multimodal transportation system.’ Ms. Weigel had refined the goals and policies based on that discussion. Staff planned to define what ‘multimodal’ was in the preamble. The TSPAC TriMet representative had written to recommend eliminating Accessibility Policy 4 to ‘Coordinate with TriMet for accessible transit service’. He explained that TriMet had a broad range of ways to help people access transit and the City did not need to call it out. The CAC agreed to do that. They also agreed to Ms. Weigel’s suggestion to reword Policy 3 to call for providing ‘transit-supportive amenities’ that met the access needs of residents and employees. Staff would add ‘such as...’ language with examples of amenities. Staff asked the group to email any other suggestions to Ms. Weigel who would then circulate a refined draft.

**Goal 5. Connectivity.** The CAC suggested the City could do better than just 'preserve' existing rights-of-ways. They changed Policy 5 to say 'Develop' instead of 'Preserve'.

**Goal 6. Livability.** The CAC asked why Policy 2 set maximum numbers of lanes for different street classifications instead of ranges. Staff observed there was not much room to add lanes to existing roadways and there was little likelihood of building new roads or reducing the number of lanes on existing roads, so they just capped the number. It was suggested Policy 2 start with 'Do not exceed' rather than 'Avoid plans for'. Staff agreed to tweak and clarify Policies 4 and 6 so they made more sense. A CAC member suggested removing 'while also meeting federal, state, and local design and engineering requirements' from Policy 1 because that should be obvious. Staff planned to move that language into the preamble of the action area. Staff agreed to work on clarifying that Policies 8 and 9 referred to neighborhood demand for traffic calming and diversion measures and that it needed to be warranted by an analysis.

**Goal 7. Sustainability.** The CAC agreed to add a policy regarding social equity. They selected one of two potential social equity policies Ms. Weigel circulated. They observed Policies 5 and 6 were very similar; 7 should be divided into two sentences; and 3 should begin, 'Decrease reliance on fossil fuels...' Staff planned to work on those.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Skip Ormsby cautioned that using the Willamette Shoreline right-of-way for bike travel meant going through a tunnel that would likely collapse in a large earthquake. For that reason it would likely not be routed through there, but would be routed through Birdshill. He described what he believed was a better route for a bike path that would go up to Lewis & Clark and eventually over a bridge at 1<sup>st</sup> Street/Terwilliger.

**CAC COMMENTS** (None)

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Councilor Moncrieff adjourned the meeting at 6:00 p.m.