

**Comprehensive Plan
Citizen Advisory Committee
Meeting # 21**

**February 22, 2012
City Hall
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), Katie Abbott, Dorothy Atwood, Tom Brennan, Christopher Clee (late), Doug Cushing, Tom Fahey (late), Nancy Gronowski, Liz Hartman, and Bob Needham

Members not in attendance: Bill Gaar, Jim Johnson, Teri Oelrich, and David White

Staff in attendance: Laura Weigel, Sarah Selden, Kirstin Greene (Cogan Owens Cogan)

Public Comment

Sherry Finnegan asked staff to create a one-page document of the policy draft document going to the Planning Commission that showed what was old and what was new side by side. **Sarah Selden** explained that staff had a knockout version and a cleaned up version of the plan policies for the Planning Commission. She indicated that they could make a clean copy version available at the hearing.

CAC Comments

There were no CAC comments.

1. Agenda Review and Announcements

Chair Moncrieff reported that the Council's discussion on February 21, 2012 regarding lake access included respecting the current process in light of the ongoing Comprehensive Planning process. She mentioned **Mayor Hoffman's** comment that discussing lake access was appropriate during the comprehensive planning process because the lake was a full chapter in the current Comprehensive Plan. She stated that the Council supported allowing the Comprehensive Plan process and the conversation with the citizens to continue its natural progression.

Sarah Selden reported that, at its January 13 work session, the Planning Commission considered the CAC's recommended language regarding lake access and decided to continue exploring the issue. She read the alternate proposal put forward by Commissioner Prager for inclusion in the Commission discussion at its upcoming Monday meeting February 27, 2012 (see PC meeting materials for details). She mentioned staff's expectation of a high turnout and media attention for this next Planning Commission meeting and the possibility of the Commission continuing the hearing and deliberations to March 12.

She confirmed to **Bob Needham** that the Planning Commission deliberations would include discussing the CAC's latest recommendations regarding the goals and policies for the five areas. She mentioned that the Commission has already thoroughly discussed the Community Culture goals and policies. **Chair Moncrieff** confirmed to **Nancy Gronowski** that they would take testimony from non-Lake Oswego residents.

Sarah Selden asked for volunteers to help present the CAC recommendation to the Planning Commission.

Kirstin Greene reviewed the agenda.

Laura Weigel distributed an updated project schedule. She advised CAC members to always check the date of the schedule shown in the upper left-hand corner because the schedule was a work in progress that changed on a daily basis. She confirmed community wide events for Economic Vitality and Connected Community in April and Community Health and Public Safety and Healthy Ecosystems topics in August. She announced the kickoff of the Transportation System Plan process in March with the first joint meeting between the Transportation Advisory Board and the Technical Advisory Committee. She described to Doug Cushing staff's thinking on holding a business community workshop on Economic Vitality and an open house on Connected Community (transportation) and Economic Vitality.

2. Greenhouse Gas Inventory Report

Susan Millhauser, Sustainability Coordinator, reviewed the background of the inventory (please see meeting materials) and noted the second memo and the technical report included in the meeting packet. **Joshua Skov, Good Company**, gave a PowerPoint presentation of the information contained in the *Community Greenhouse Gas Inventory for Lake Oswego* and the second memo, *Understanding the Connections*. He spoke of three key points: new State rules for greenhouse gas emission reductions, the need to adapt old processes (i.e., Comprehensive Plan and Transportation System Plan) to the new State rules, and proactive compliance with the new rules allowing greater flexibility.

Mr. Skov indicated to **Chair Moncrieff** that passenger transport included cars, buses, light rail, etc., while the regulatory scope included the transportation system and how it interacted with land use patterns. He clarified that a local government inventory looked at emissions associated with the city government operations while a community inventory looked at the broader range of business and citizen activities, including the government. He reviewed the reasons to conduct an inventory and uses for the inventory. He presented a summary of the inventory results (p.3).

Mr. Skov indicated to **Chair Moncrieff** that the 2006 data was as recent as it needed to be for this scale of exercise. 2006 was also the reference point for the EPA's detailed carbon footprinting exercise for the U.S. as a whole conducted a few years ago. He explained that these numbers did not change much in the short term. He spoke of a decades' long planning time frame. He indicated to **Bob Needham** that they used the Metro traffic models for apportioning the impact of I-5 between Lake Oswego and Tigard.

He confirmed to **Tom Brennan** that their work used the EPA's work as a starting point. He concurred that this involved non-point source thinking because greenhouse gas emissions resulted, not so much from specific sources, but rather from how people live their lives. He urged caution in drawing conclusions from the comparison chart of the U.S., the Metro region, and Lake Oswego (p.9), given that these numbers correlated to activities related to individual household income. He spoke of public education opportunities to raise people's awareness that material flows from consumption constituted half the emissions shown.

He pointed out that there were key parameters in reducing emissions that were outside of Lake Oswego's control, determined by the federal government and the global economy. He described the specifics of community design as arrows in a quiver available to the local community. He drew attention to the *Understanding the Connections* memo as a summary of the different planning mandates and processes related to greenhouse gas emissions. He noted the chart on p.12 in particular, which Kelly Hoell and Bob Wise created, to

show how Lake Oswego's local initiatives related to the four areas of greenhouse gas emissions noted in the inventory. He commented that the backdrop for action was reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 80% to 85% by 2050.

Kirstin Greene asked the consultants to address why the community should care about reducing greenhouse gas emissions. **Josh Skov** mentioned the regulatory requirements coming down the road, a societal or moral imperative to participate in broader solutions at a community level, and the economic, health, and societal benefits in dealing with reducing emissions.

Laura Weigel indicated to **Kirstin Greene** that the next step of reviewing and incorporating the inventory results into the Transportation System Plan and the Comprehensive Plan would happen first at the Transportation System Plan Advisory Committee level and then come to the CAC. **Ms. Greene** spoke of being more holistic in their thinking, given the analysis' finding of more sources for greenhouse gas emissions than simply transportation.

Tom Brennan asked if other communities have enacted legislation to help deal with the materials piece. **Josh Skov** indicated that the many decentralized programs related to that concern, such as recycling, buying local, reducing waste, and public information and education.

Christopher Clee asked what the impact would be on the Comprehensive Plan. **Josh Skov** referenced the *Understanding Connections* memo, which took a new approach in showing the relationships between greenhouse gas strategies and other planning processes. He indicated that the place to start when thinking about the Comprehensive Plan was to ask how did an action area influence community greenhouse gas emissions and how did a greenhouse gas reduction strategy impact land use and the community vision. Susan Millhauser mentioned engaging in good community planning and the sustainability framework principle of reducing reliance on fossil fuels. **Bob Wise** directed attention to p.12 in the memo and its discussion of the direct and indirect relationships.

3. Follow-Up Discussion of Recreation Policy on Swimming Prior to Planning Commission Hearing

Sarah Selden reviewed the three options laid out in the staff memo (p.2) for discussion tonight. **The CAC** raised concerns about not calling out swimming specifically in relation to the swim parks only, not precluding other swimming opportunities or facilities, and not taking the provision out of the Comp Plan completely. The members eventually agreed to combine Options 1 and 2. **Nancy Gronowski** stated her minority position that calling out swimming was too specific for goals and policies; it should be covered in the action area.

Bob Needham moved to recommend the language combining Options 1 and 2, "provide for public swimming access and appropriate recreation amenities, and continue to preserve swimming access on Oswego Lake through the City Swim Park and through coordination with the Lake Oswego School District to preserve the Lake Grove Swim Park." **Tom Brennan** seconded the motion. The motion passed by majority vote with Nancy Gronowski voting 'no.' **Kirstin Greene** noted that they would also submit a minority report.

4. February Summit Debrief

Laura Weigel reported that the staff compilation of the comments received at the summit and through the virtual open house would be available to the CAC next week. She asked the CAC for feedback on how the summit worked. She thanked the CAC members for their participation as facilitators and notetakers.

The CAC discussed the pros and cons of this summit's process. Their observations and comments included:

- Good acoustics upstairs, bad acoustics downstairs
- Having separate facilitators and notetakers worked well
- Separating the small groups by neighborhoods worked well but it would be better to assign specific neighborhoods to tables instead of by geographic section (Southwest, Southeast, etc.)
- The need to find large meeting spaces with good acoustics
- Not allowing individuals in the small group to introduce themselves was a disservice to the group
- The importance of training the facilitators in their roles as neutral facilitators of the group discussion and not as persuaders of their personal opinions
- A sense of being rushed to get through the discussion points
- The people had no opportunity to give feedback on what was inspiring to them in Lake Oswego

Christopher Clee reported hearing from the Vice Chair of First Addition/Forest Hills that their table was dominated by one speaker, who was not a resident of Lake Oswego, using the summit to voice her opinion. He indicated that the problem was that the speaker did not declare her affiliation with Northwest Housing Alternatives up front. He mentioned a second problem reported- that the facilitator was taking too active a part in the discussion. He suggested throwing away the information collected at that table because of bias.

Kristin Greene summarized the main discussion points as making sure to identify up front the interests or affiliations of attendees, looking at Marylhurst or other possible locations with better acoustics, and continuing to work on training facilitators to facilitate and not to lead. She indicated to **Liz Hartman** that CAC members could share with Laura Weigel privately the names of any facilitators whom they thought should not be invited to facilitate again. She concurred with **Katie Abbott** that the timing was crunched due to the volume of policy questions. She recommended using a more focused strategy at future summits.

Christopher Clee indicated that he thought including extra instructions in the facilitator guidelines would be satisfactory in addressing the concerns reported by the First Addition/Forest Hills Vice Chair and that the notes taken at that table did not need to be disregarded.

5. Review Draft Economic Vitality Background and Policy Questions for April Summit

Sarah Selden indicated that staff might ask the CAC to review the second round of policy discussion questions for Economic Vitality via e-mail instead of discussing them at the March meeting, due to that meeting's ample agenda. She directed the CAC to her memo and background paper on Economic Vitality for background information on the key policy discussion items that emerged out of the Economic Opportunities Analysis.

She reviewed the discussion and comments from the Planning Commission on the Economic Vitality policy questions, as summarized in her memo. She asked for CAC feedback on the four policy questions (Background paper, pp.3 -4) and the Planning Commission comments. She indicated that staff usually summarized the background report into a two-page quick reference summary for the summits. **The CAC** suggested also providing a link online to the full Economic Opportunity Analysis report.

Chair Moncrieff recalled that the Planning Commission's main comments focused on economic vitality issues within Lake Oswego without considering the regional impacts on Lake Oswego's economic vitality. **Kirstin Greene** mentioned the Regional Economic Development strategy released recently by Greater Portland, Inc., which provided the regional perspective. **Bob Needham** mentioned the consideration of competition with neighboring cities, while **Chair Moncrieff** spoke of synergy. **Laura Weigel** remembered another Planning

Commission suggestion that the CAC take on doing research into what other communities were doing, which interested members could discuss with her later. **Bob Needham** suggested the possibility of tying into the defense industry manufacturing hub located in Clackamas County.

Kirstin Greene indicated that staff would provide online links to the Economic Opportunities Analysis, the census, and the regional strategy. She asked the CAC members to provide feedback regarding the policies via e-mail.

6. Public Comment

Jim Bolland, LONAC, expressed his disappointment that the CAC did not discuss what they heard at the summit. He mentioned hearing that another table had someone from the Clackamas County Housing Authority who was not a Lake Oswego resident. He informed the CAC of the comments he heard from the community regarding the summit:

- The clear indication that neither LCDC nor Metro required Lake Oswego to increase its density, as Lake Oswego was in full compliance with Metro's density requirements
- Concern about the policy questions related to increasing densities in the neighborhoods around the downtown and other commercial areas
- No interest in up zoning corner properties in light of no outside requirement to increase density
- No desire to change the current Comprehensive Plan policy on Stafford or the requirement for a public vote on annexations in that area
- No support for island annexations

7. CAC Comments

Chair Moncrieff noted that they were waiting on the distillation of the summit and online comments into an organized format. She mentioned that she was glad to hear that the community was discussing the summit.

Jim Bolland indicated to **Christopher Clee** that he would provide a written summary of the feedback he heard.