



CITY OF LAKE OSWEGO

380 A Avenue
PO Box 369
Lake Oswego, OR 97034

503-635-0270
www.ci.oswego.or.us

MEMORANDUM

TO: Comprehensive Plan Citizen Advisory Committee

FROM: Sidaro Sin, Senior Planner

DATE: May 17, 2011

SUBJECT: Scenario Evaluation for June 2 Open House (PP 10-0007)

ACTION

Staff is requesting the Citizen Advisory Committee's (CAC) input on the scenario assessment materials and the format of the June 2 open house.

Your comments and direction will be incorporated into a revised scenario assessment handout that will be available for a final review via email May 25. In order to incorporate last minutes changes next week before the open house, we request that you provide final comments back by Friday morning May 27. We will make every effort to incorporate them.

BACKGROUND

At the April 27 CAC meeting, the committee reviewed three land use scenarios, two housing growth rates and four economic development growth rates. The CAC was asked to choose which options should be pursued for further assessment. The CAC directed staff to assess the following:

- All three land use scenarios because they provided a range of options.
- Low housing growth rate because it was consistent with the 2010 Census (10-year AAGR).
- Medium housing growth rate because it seems like a reasonable step above the low growth rate.
- Low economic development growth rate because it is consistent with the housing growth rate.
- Medium-high economic development growth rate because it provides an opportunity to review the implications of a higher employment growth rate and the city is placing more emphasis on economic development.

DISCUSSION

Scenario Assessment

The scenario assessment is intended to provide a comparison between the scenarios to help the community and the CAC determine which scenario best meets the community's vision for the future. A working draft scenario assessment (Reference Material B) has been prepared based on staff and consultants' best professional judgment. It is merely a starting point for discussions. Ultimately, the CAC with input from the public will need to determine which scenario best represents the community vision.

Assessing the three scenarios against the vision using the sustainability framework strategic questions (which includes the vision) posed several challenges, including:

- Minimizing the subjectivity in the assessment.
- Keeping the level of detail and information at a higher conceptual level, even though there may be an urge to get into more detail. The level of assessment should be equal to the level of planning that we are at - - broad conceptual community vision and scenarios planning.
- Balancing between providing too much detailed information to inform the assessment and not enough.
- Graphically representing the results of the assessment so it is easy to understand.

In order to address some of these challenges, the assessment is based on the following assumptions:

- The level of this assessment is at the same level as the scenarios and vision statement (i.e. the scenarios and vision statement are broad and general in nature, the assessment also aims to be broad and general).
- Subjectivity is minimized by looking at more objective factors when at all possible.
- A rating system of “very well”, “well”, and “moderately well” with symbols are used to graphically show the relative strength of the scenarios’ ability to implement the community vision. The rating system also assumes that all of the scenarios provide strengths, opportunities and challenges that could implement the vision, but at varying degrees and therefore, the rating system does not include a “none of the above” rating.

The working draft scenario assessment is a work in progress. The draft presented is based on the analysis done to date. Given time and budget constraints, we would like the CAC’s feedback on:

- Is the assessment moving in the right direction?
- Is this an appropriate rating system to simply and graphically represent a comparison between the three scenarios?
- Is there enough information in the Vision Action Area assessment to rate the action area? If not, what additional information should be included?
- How can the assessment be more objective?
- What action areas should be used to assess the strategic questions 2, 3 & 4 (as some action areas may not be applicable)?
- What “rating” would the CAC give to the scenarios based on the vision statement and the sustainability strategic questions?

Sustainability Advisory Board Review

On Monday, May 16, the Sustainability advisory Board had the opportunity to review the assessment materials and was asked to focus on applying the sustainability filter (four strategic questions) and provide the following feedback:

- What action areas should be used to assess the strategic questions 2, 3 & 4 (as some action areas may not be applicable) or is there another way to answer the strategic questions?
- What “rating” would the SAB give to the scenarios?

The SAB felt that instead of assessing the scenarios based on the specific language of the Sustainability Principles, more concrete questions could be used for the evaluation to more clearly communicate the concepts with the public. The following questions were suggested to evaluate the scenarios based on the concepts embodied in the Sustainability Principles:

- Which scenario requires least amount of new infrastructure (e.g. infrastructure materials have a carbon / resource footprint (Strategic Question 1); infrastructure potentially impacts natural systems (Strategic Question 3)?
- Which would best promote development / redevelopment in areas already served by infrastructure?

- Which would allow for use of decentralized infrastructure (e.g. site, neighborhood, district water, WW treatment, energy, waste / composting/neighborhood recycling)?
- Which would reduce SOV trips / less GHG emissions? (Strategic Questions 1, 2 & 4) (e.g. more options for bike/ped/transit; more connections in existing neighborhoods to commercial/school, etc.)
- Which would allow for smallest development footprint / eco-footprint or development that better lends itself to energy and water efficiency (Strategic Questions 1, 2, 3) (e.g. higher density, multi-family inherently more energy efficient due to shared walls, smaller building footprint=less impervious surface)
- Which best promotes diverse, local economic opportunities for residents? (Strategic Questions 1 & 4)
- Which best promotes diversity in housing types in terms of size, affordability, age (e.g. aging in place-one-level; affordable housing (rental and owner) for families with school age kids near schools)? (Strategic Questions 1 & 4)
- Which best provides for a diverse economic opportunities and diversity of residents? (Strategic Question 4)
- Which has the least impact on natural systems? (Strategic Questions 2 & 3)? (new development at fringes vs. infill that does a good job of not adding to impervious surfaces/surface run-off issues)

The SAB felt that there was not enough time to fully review the scenarios and assessment and requested additional time to provide input. Staff has tentatively schedule additional time on Monday, May 23 from 3:00 – 5:00 pm for further discussion. CAC members are invited to attend and provide additional input.

Open House Format:

The open house is scheduled for Thursday, June 2 at the West End Building. It was originally scheduled for May 25, however, it was delayed because on May 3, the City Council held meeting to discuss the Comprehensive Plan budget. The consultant work on the scenario assessment was delayed until after the Council meeting because it was uncertain if funding was going to be available for the scenario assessment.

The purpose of the June 2 meeting is to solicit public input on a preferred scenario that best reflects the community vision. Feedback from this open house will be presented to the CAC at the June 22 meeting where the CAC will discuss and forward a recommendation to the City Council on the vision statement and preferred scenario. The Council is scheduled to receive the recommendation in mid July.

The format of the open is proposed to be similar to the March 29 open house, but with one change:

- Open house from 4:00 pm – 8:00 pm
- 15-20 minute overview presentations at 4:30 and 6:30 pm to present how we got to where we are now, assessment results, and remind participants to fill out a comment card on their preferred scenario. This is new for this open house.
- Layout – explanatory boards around the center of the room with the three scenarios on the east wall
- We are requesting CAC members volunteer to staff one of the scenarios to help answer questions. This is also a great opportunity for CAC members to talk with fellow citizens.

Does the CAC have any comments or suggestions on the open house approach?