

**Comprehensive Plan
Citizen Advisory Committee
Council Chambers, City Hall
4:00 pm – 6:00 pm
Meeting #12 - Summary**

June 22, 2011

Members in attendance: Sally Moncrieff (Chair) , Dorothy Atwood , Christopher Clee, Doug Cushing, Tom Fahey, Bill Gaar, Nancy Gronowski, Liz Hartman, Bob Needham , Teri Oelrich, David White

Members not in attendance: Katie Abbott, Tom Brennan, Jim Johnson, Tim Mather

Staff in attendance: Sid Sin, Sarah Selden, Emily Brennan, City of Lake Oswego; Kirstin Greene, Cogan Owens Cogan (facilitator), Todd Chase, FCS Group

- 1. Public Comment.** There were no comments given at the beginning of the meeting.
- 2. General Updates**
 - **Meeting notes** – Kirstin asked if anyone had changes to the draft meeting notes and there were no changes raised.
- 3. Regular Business**
 - Community Vision**
 - Staff forwarded comments received by the Planning Commission and City Council.
 - To expedite the review process, staff recommended the following changes to the vision statement:
 - Community Health and Public Safety: “We have excellent public safety” as opposed to “We are known for excellent public safety”
 - Inspiring Spaces and Places: Planning Commission addition of, “to preserve”.
 - Doug Cushing: Motion to accept.
 - Christopher Clee: 2nd the motion to accept.
 - Bill Gaar asked for clarification on the motion; Kirstin responded.
 - Motion approved unanimously by CAC members.

CAC Preferred Scenario Recommendation

- Kirstin Greene: Goal is to either move forward with one of the scenarios or create a hybrid of the scenarios, to recommend to City Council for endorsement.
- Sid: This has been a year long process for public involvement: Reached out to 1,600 citizens of Lake Oswego, 6 public open houses, 12 CAC meetings, 9 TAC meetings, 4 Goal 9 and 10 workgroup meetings, 11 City Council Meetings, 11 Planning Commission meetings and meetings with dozens of community groups. Results of the work to date include: worked out technical data for Goal 9 & 10 elements of the comprehensive plan, demographic report, evaluated population, housing, and job forecast ranges, discussed a sustainability framework, and developed a community vision and conceptual scenario.
- Two very important outcomes of this process are the community vision and preferred scenario. The CAC’s preferred scenario is scheduled to go to City Council on July 19, 2011 at

6:00 pm in Council Chambers. Staff invited CAC members to attend the meeting because this is not a City or staff recommendation, but a CAC recommendation and it would be beneficial to have members there.

- Councilor Moncrieff reiterated this request; emphasizing that it means a lot to Councilors to hear from the citizens that have worked closely with the issues.
- Sid continued with a recap of the March 29th open house purpose: are these the right scenarios to pursue?
- For the June 2nd Open House, he restated that the purpose was to determine which scenario best implements the community vision? The rating system was from 1-3 (1 meaning fit the Community Vision statement well). Results were very similar to the March 29th meeting. The Village Center scenario stood out in all the action areas, with the exception of “economic vitality,” where LOconomy was the strongest. Under Connected Community, there was no strong front runner from June 2nd Open House. From the March 29th Open House citizens favored the walkability, bikability, and transportation assets of Village Centers and LOconomy.
- Sid noted a concern raised about the potential streetcar. He clarified that all of these scenarios allow for streetcar development, including the existing Comprehensive Plan.
- In its discussion, the CAC should also consider the Sustainability Filter: Is it consistent with the community vision? Consistent with sustainability principles? Is it a good fiscal investment? Is this scenario a good flexible platform to move toward sustainability?

Update on Fiscal Investment:

- Todd Chase with FCS group explained that the first draft was completed in April through working with the Lake Oswego’s finance department. Since the first draft, we’ve decided to focus analysis only on the General Fund Impact, as opposed to Enterprise Funds. In summary, there would be a net positive fiscal benefit for the General Fund, assuming we reach the forecast levels over the next 30-40 years. Keeping the services the same per capita would result in revenues that would exceed the expenditures on the General Fund.
- With more employment added, then revenues would increase, without a drain on public services. Medium range employment forecast would result in an extra million per year revenues for the city. High was an extra 2 million. May vary year to year.
- Sources of revenue: Property taxes, state shared tax revenues, library shared tax revenues.
- Low density housing had the least net fiscal benefit. Medium and high density housing had a slightly higher fiscal benefit. Most positive impact was office space, and then retail and industrial. Senior housing is a profitable housing type if it was a “for-profit” facility, as non-profits do not pay property taxes.
- All three forecasts would be positive from a “bottom-line” perspective and are not specific to location of development

CAC Preferred Scenario Recommendation CAC Comments/Discussion:

- CAC members discussed the attributes of the scenarios based on the information to date. Their direction follows.
- Use Village Centers as a base (map), but designate Marylhurst as an employment center as opposed to neighborhood center.
- LOconomy: Clarify Tualatin’s jurisdiction in mapped Southwest Industrial District.
- Marylhurst is a separate entity. Moving in direction of more businesses-offices rather than a neighborhood. Marylhurst already has a master plan in place; reference that.
- More public/mass transportation element in LOconomy. Incorporate the transportation piece in the hybrid scenario.
- Need for effective and safe connectivity between the 20 minute neighborhoods.

- Are all of the neighborhood gathering/activity nodes correct? Need to better differentiate between the mixed-use developments and neighborhood nodes, which are for occasional or temporary use (i.e. weekly Farmer's Markets). The Mayor is holding his next meeting with the Neighborhood Association chairs on July 9th, 2011. Could review the map there for discussion.
- Incorporate existing Comprehensive Plan elements into Hybrid. Clarify that all scenarios build on the existing Comprehensive Plan, with some changes like less infill in low-density neighborhoods and moving that emphasis instead to centers.
- Under Healthy Ecosystems: Why is Village Centers better? Less infill impacts in under-developed areas. Better transportation options, less emissions, less disturbance to the environment.
- Should we identify more specific issues/impacts (i.e. tree coverage impacts)? Staff can look into that.
- LOconomy could support more robust and permanent cultural opportunities (more formal: theater, library, etc.) at the ends of town. This would require and support better transit to those locations.
- Hybrid: Village Center concept with LOconomy overlay.
- "Eco-District" Concept in the Foothills. Mix of housing, office, and retail. Light industry. The Wastewater plant as an asset.
- First floor retail to activate streetscapes.
- What should Rosewood Center look like? SW employment district elevate to higher employment concentration. Jean/Pilkington should be neighborhood mixed-use center.
- How to meet sustainability goals:
 - Maintain flexibility-resilient community.
 - Gathering spots/neighborhood hubs and contribution to social sustainability.
- Neighborhoods: Building on these as part of community/social structure-Village Centers Scenario.
- Transportation alternative choice: Attractive enough biking, walking, or mass transit options to have people choose one of these options instead of driving.. Key is making it a safe choice.
- Senior mobility and choice is a growing issue as the demographics change.
- Outdoor gathering spaces-not limited to, but including parks.-Integrate open, breathing space within higher density developments, as an attractive amenity-could storm water treatment.
- Amenities should follow transit opportunities.
- Scenario based on existing city and development, not existing comprehensive plan.
- Need density to support major cultural centers. Focusing development will bring new resources.
- Add an electric bus to connect East and West ends of town. Solve internal transit issues, and then focus on external transit. Many CAC Members agreed.
- Kirsten Greene: Further refinements to the scenario recommendation are possible via email.

Action Area Review Process and Schedule

- Sid: The conversation we just had sets the stage for July 27th CAC meeting. Sid directed CAC members to look at the working draft of the action areas update handout. In this next phase, we will be moving from preferred scenarios, to a more focused look on goals and policies.
- Objectives include:
 - Keeping the community engaged in this process (boards, commissions, civic groups, assisted living facilities (ALFs), school districts, etc.)

- Keeping the Planning Commission and other boards/commission informed and engaged in the process
- Allowing the City Council to review and “provisionally support” through a resolution the action areas in a staggered schedule over the next year and a half, as opposed to having the Council review all of the Comprehensive Plan updates all at once at the end.
- The next phase will begin fall 2011 and end spring 2013, which is the Periodic Review deadline.
- Each of these action areas will go through 8 steps that will take about 8 months. Overlapping will occur. The last step concludes in a City Council hearing, where the Council will be asked to adopt a resolution that shows high level of intent that they would then formally adopt all of the action area updates as part of one Comp Plan update package in spring 2013.
- Reviewing the action areas in pieces would allow the community to focus on their interest areas and be less of a burden on the Council when it came to adopting the full updated Comprehensive Plan.
- Councilor Moncrieff noted that the Council is in general support of this approach.
- The CAC (and staff) will be in charge of keeping track of the nuanced interactions between each of the action areas to ensure that conflicts are minimized between action areas.
- Christopher Clee: What is the background information on this plan? Sid: the information will come from past plans, OutLOOK 2025 and other neighborhood, district plans and associated documents that we have to-date.
- Dorothy Atwood: What will the end product be? Sid: A Comp. Plan with updated Goals and policies. The implementation piece that is currently in the existing Comp Plan will be pulled out as a separate item and become an implementation plan that will include action items and indicators to monitor annually the progress of how well the community is moving towards the vision and goals.
- Sarah Selden: We are open to feedback about the order, but there is a rationale in how staff ordered the Action Areas. Community Culture is our kick-off action area, because citizens can always see that as a positive and get excited about amenities, etc. Complete Neighborhoods and Housing, and Economic Vitality are scheduled for after we have more certainty on the city’s Metro-coordinated housing and job forecasts; and Healthy Ecosystems positioned to give a new natural resources planner time to get up to speed and contribute.

5. CAC Comments:

- No comments were made.
- Next CAC meeting July 27th.

6. Public Comment

- Tom Coffee: July 19th, 2011 City Council meeting – what is the expected outcome? Will it be a public hearing?
Sid: We are requesting an endorsement, similar to the vision statement. No hearing at this point.

7. Adjourn 6:00