



**Comprehensive Plan
Citizen Advisory Committee
Meeting # 18**

**December 14, 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, Doug Cushing, Bill Gaar, Nancy Gronowski, Liz Hartman, Jim Johnson, Tim Mather, Bob Needham, David White

Members not in attendance: Dorothy Atwood, Christopher Clee, Tom Fahey, Teri Oelrich,

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

1. Public Comment

Don Burdick voiced concern regarding an e-mail from Sue Marshall regarding Oswego Lake access (see attachment). Citing the Oswego Lake Forum (see attachment), a blog managed by Todd Prager, Mr. Burdick stated his belief that the aforementioned e-mail, sent by Sue Marshall, was not written by Sue Marshall, and noted that she lives outside the city limits and is the former executive director of Tualatin Riverkeepers. He requested that Todd Prager resign from the Planning Commission.

2. CAC Comments

Tom Brennan asked if staff screens letters to make sure they originate from within the city limits. Laura Weigel stated that staff does not screen public input at this time. Sarah Selden added that the Comprehensive Plan addresses the area within the City's urban services boundary, including those parts not yet within the city limits.

3. Agenda Review & Announcements

Kirsten Greene asked that CAC members meet twice in January, citing an increased workload: Wednesday, January 4 in addition to the scheduled meeting time on January 25.

4. Analyzing Community Input and Where We Go From Here

Alex Steinberger gave a brief overview of the process by which virtual open house comments were analyzed.

In order to analyze and condense the large volume of public input received from the Virtual Community Summit, common themes among respondents and their associated comment snippets were identified and extracted. The first step in this process was an initial survey of common words and phrases related to each policy question using WORDSTAT, a text and data mining program. These common words and phrases were used to define a range of 5-10 common themes. A series of data dictionaries were created based on the themes identified for each policy question. Relevant comments were grouped using these dictionaries by flagging them based on

keywords, phrases, and conditional statements. Once comment snippets were grouped by theme, they were manually reviewed and a series of one-page reports were generated detailing the content and prevalence of each theme.

Sarah Selden briefly discussed the Comprehensive Plan summit schedule, highlighting the upcoming Inspiring Spaces and Places/Complete Neighborhoods and Housing summit, scheduled for Thursday, February 2 at Lakeridge High School.

5. Draft Community Culture Goal & Policy Review

a. Arts

Concern was voiced over the use of “economic engine” in the Arts draft goal. It was decided that alternate wording such as “asset” could be used in place of engine.

Clarification was requested regarding access to artist spaces. Staff stated that artist space could include inexpensive work and exhibition space, but that this could be clarified during the implementation phase of the comprehensive plan.

Concern was expressed that arts goals and policies are too focused on visual arts alone. CAC members suggested that fine and performing arts as well as music as ways to describe arts goals and policies.

b. Civic Engagement

In policy question 2, it was suggested that the city “strive to” rather than “ensure” that technical information is readily available and simplified.

Concerns were voiced over the wording of policy question 3. It was suggested that Neighborhood Associations be listed in line with other types of organizations. Other CAC members suggested that no particular group types be referenced. It was also suggested that “general public” be used rather than referring to certain groups.

CAC members stated that the final two goals are redundant and should be removed. It was stated that these policies represent a deviation from the land-use focus of the Comprehensive Plan.

Staff stated that there is no language in community culture vision statement relating to civic engagement. The CAC might want to reconsider this in the future.

CAC members agreed that policies related to volunteerism should be removed as they do not fall under the umbrella of a land-use plan and do not relate to City decision-making as the other policies do.

c. Recreation

The CAC was asked whether a workgroup should be formed to review public comments regarding Lake access received by the City through December 14, 2011 and make a recommendation regarding a) whether the question of Lake access should be addressed through the Comprehensive Plan update process, and b) if

so, how and on what topic. Bill Gaar subsequently recused himself from the conversation. It was agreed that the CAC would form a workgroup with a clearly defined scope of work.

The initial work group proposal included: two Planning Commissioners, a Parks and Recreation Advisory Board member, and a Natural Resources Advisory Board member. It was suggested that a member of the Lake Corporation should somehow be incorporated. Some CAC members voiced concern over inviting interest groups, citing the need to stay focused on just analyzing public comments received to date regarding lake access and not open workgroups to outside political influence at this time. There was a proposal to modify the charge of the Lake workgroup to limit its membership to current members of the CAC the CAC agreed that the work group should only consist of CAC members at this time. If the work group concludes more work needs to be done on the issue, then a new work group with a new charge could be formed. The CAC also proposed to allow concerned citizens and groups to provide testimony. 7 CAC members were in favor of this proposal.

6. Public Comment

There were no additional public comments.

7. CAC Comments

Additional topic areas not discussed during this meeting will be discussed at the January 4th, 2012 CAC meeting. Staff asked the CAC to please e-mail them with additional thoughts on the draft goals and policies, so they could be included in the January 9 Planning Commission packet.