



**Comprehensive Plan
Citizen Advisory Committee
Meeting # 16**

**October 26, 2011
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, Tom Brennan, Christopher Clee, Tom Fahey, Bill Gaar, Nancy Gronowski, Liz Hartman, Jim Johnson, Tim Mather, Teri Oelrich, David White

Members not in attendance: Dorothy Atwood, Doug Cushing, Bob Needham

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

1. Public Comment

There were a number of comments submitted through the We Love LO website which can be found [online](#) with the meeting materials. Questions or comments regarding these e-mails will be addressed during the CAC comments section of the next CAC meeting.

Don Burdick addressed Todd Prager's campaign to change access to Oswego Lake and to impose zoning on the Lake. He stated that he thought the issue was divisive and outside the scope of the comprehensive plan. Addressing Commissioner Johnson directly, he called for Commissioner Prager to step down from his position in the Planning Commission, citing his personal campaign on the issue of lake access as a conflict of interests.

2. CAC Comments

Liz Hartman attended the Old Town neighborhood annual meeting and stated that she would be attending the Lake Forest meeting the following evening. She stated that an announcement was made at the LOSD Coordinating Council meeting regarding the Community Culture Summit and that many council members plan to attend.

Laura Weigel shared some KATU news coverage of the We Love LO poetry contest.

3. Agenda Review & Announcements

Kirstin Greene urged members of the public to remember to sign in at every CAC meeting so that an accurate roll is kept.

Sarah Selden announced the award of a \$30,000 grant from the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD). This figure is \$10,000 less than what was requested so staff will revise the project scope to address this change. The project will focus on development barriers to redevelopment in mixed use areas and improvements to the clear and objective code standards for the housing needs component of statewide land-use planning goal 10. Once the scope is refined, City Council is tentatively scheduled to accept the grant award on November 15th. The full amount of the award will go to outside consultants in addition to an in-kind contribution from the City of 25% of the grant award.

Sid Sin presented draft graphic displays for the Community Culture Summit: Community Vision, Vision Map, and 2035 Vision Typologies. Some wording was changed from the last iteration, and new photographs were included.

4. CAC New Issues Protocol

This discussion references the “New Issues Protocol Memo” which can be found [online](#) with the meeting materials. Councilor Moncrieff posed several discussion questions from the memo:

Do we want to have a protocol or procedure through which we can deal with issues that come through e-mail, public comment or the action area summits?

CAC members agreed but stressed that the process be all inclusive while staying concise and focused.

Councilor Moncrieff pointed to the potential protocol put forth in page two of the memo. It was suggested that while there should be a rigid format for comment submission, some flexibility is desirable as not all submissions will conform. It was stressed that comments which fall within the periodic review framework need to be addressed. Concern was voiced over how “level of support” will be measured in submission criteria #4.

It was stated that this draft protocol describes a process but lacks measures to gauge performance. All CAC members agreed that the requisite majority vote should not occur first because more information might be required.

Councilor Moncrieff summarized the CAC’s input on the draft protocol:

If the need to evaluate a proposal or citizen request arises, the CAC may consider the following:

- Define the proposal. What specifically is the proposal, and what response is requested of the CAC?
- How is the proposal addressed or not addressed in the existing Comprehensive Plan?
- Is the proposal consistent with the 2035 Vision statement?
- Why is the CAC the appropriate body or should more information be required from an outside board or commission?
- What level of interest has the proposal received through the public engagement process?
- The CAC may also raise other considerations as appropriate.

This will be followed by a majority vote that will decide whether the CAC will evaluate the proposal as part of the CAC charge, or whether it is not within their scope.

It was suggested that there be a firm deadline for project proposals. It was also proposed that proposals after the closing date still have the potential for inclusion, perhaps in the form of plan amendments.

It was also suggested that a method be established for responding to the request, such as a memo from staff explaining how the issue was considered.

5. Updated Summit Schedule

Sid Sin gave a brief overview of the new 4-summit schedule. Councilors stated that they worried about the Planning Commission's ability to fully digest information from community summits on this shortened timeline. Councilors voiced their approval of the grouping of summit action areas.

6. Community Culture Summit – November 3

a. Format

Laura Weigel discussed the format of the upcoming Community Culture Summit. She cited capacity concerns as the reason for relocating the summit from the Lake Oswego High School library to the school cafeteria. CAC members will be asked to help facilitate breakout sessions. A virtual open house will also be available starting November 1st. Staff will provide facilitator training for CAC members. Further information about the format of the Community Culture Summit can be found [online](#).

b. Draft Policy Questions

Staff led a discussion on current draft policy questions (located [online](#)) for the Community Culture Summit. The CAC was asked to focus on two criteria:

1. Do the background/policy documents provide adequate information for members of the public to engage in discussion about policy questions?
2. Are the policy questions included the "right" questions and, of those included, which should have the highest priority?

Education

It was suggested that the background report mention that school closures have happened in the past – that it is cyclical. In addition, CAC members cautioned against delving too deeply into education policy questions, as they are largely outside the scope of a land use plan. Instead, policy questions should focus on the city's role in guiding the development of the Lake Oswego School District and Marylhurst University.

Policy question 5 stood out as a good "opening question" due to its broader scope and focus on the city's role.

Concern was voiced over the use of the term "neighborhood schools" in policy question 2 because it evokes school closures. CAC members approved of "transportation and housing options" being included in the question because of their nexus with land use. It was also suggested that the city include language about keeping closed school facilities viable in the event that they are needed in the future.

CAC members requested that the background report be amended to reflect the idea of "Lake Oswego – A Learning Community" and not focus solely on K-12 and higher education. They suggested that staff include information about continuing education classes such as those offered by the Library.

Arts

Arts is a new topic that was not included in the previous comprehensive plan and includes three draft policy questions.

Sarah Selden pointed out that Arts is a topic that spans multiple action areas (Community Culture, Economic Vitality, Inspiring Spaces and Places, etc.)

CAC members voiced concern over the lack of focus in policy question 3 in linking sustainability with the arts but elected to leave it in the policy document because of it may spur discussions related to sustainability at the summit.

Parks & Recreation

Nancy Gronowski suggested that language from the existing comprehensive plan, specifically section 6 as it relates to land for active recreation and ball fields, be added to the background/policy document. She also suggested that the bullet points under policy question one be rephrased and added to the list of draft policy questions.

A CAC member recommended that the title of the section be changed from “Parks & Recreation” to “Parks, Recreation, and Open Space” to reflect the open space discussion in the background/policy document but Nancy and Staff members were of the opinion that open space is only discussed in a recreational context in this section and thus it need not be mentioned in the section title.

Staff was cautioned against referencing natural areas and open spaces in the Parks & Recreation section as they may steer discussions away from relevant topics.

CAC members suggested that the objectives of workgroup session be more explicitly stated. For example “The City has been through an 18 month planning process, these are the goals that have been developed, do they steer us in the right direction?”

It was suggested that, in policy question 2, it be made clear that it may not be possible for residents to have access to “all three essential services” within a ½ mile reach. Rather, the city should guarantee access to at least one essential service.

Library Services

The Library Advisory Board had no comments regarding the draft policy questions.

Historic Preservation

Historic Resources Advisory Board has updated previous policy questions relating to historic preservation and had come up with draft policy questions. HRAB felt that policy question 1 should have the highest priority.

In policy question 1, it was suggested that deconstruction be described in more detail as well as some language about the reuse of design elements from older structures. Laura Weigel said she would give examples of incentives for deconstruction (tax credits, access to grants, etc.)

Civic Engagement

It was suggested that a question be included that asks workshop participants how they would like to be contacted or “reached out to” by the City. Also, how does the City adopt new technologies in communicating with its citizens?

7. Public Comment

Steve Milla addressed the declining enrollment in Lake Oswego Schools. A former resident of Lake Oswego, he attended district meetings and served on a school board committee trying to incorporate foreign language emersion. He and his family moved out of Lake Oswego to Southwest Portland in order to access a French emersion program in the Ainsworth School District. He stated that he seeks a Spanish language program, ideally emersion, in local elementary schools. He stated that many other families feel the same way and would move their children back to LOSD if such a program were to exist.

CAC pointed out that there are language programs in preschool and kindergarten, but budget issues restrict funding into higher grade levels.

Bill Graham of Westlake stated that there would be significant community support for a language emersion program and that those programs in other districts are currently over-subscribed.

8. CAC Comments

There were no additional CAC comments.