

Hi Laura

I would like to express both an appreciation for the changes and direction provided in the "Inspiring Spaces and Places" and "Urbanization" draft and a concern relative to the lack of regard for clear consideration of natural and historic resources as per Oregon Goal 5 and Oregon Goal 10. Both the intent and the letter of the law seem to have been washed out with statements such as "uses land resources in an efficient manner" and limiting protections to those that provide places to "...live, work and play...". Goal 5 and Goal 10 both state:

"4. Plans providing for housing needs should consider as a major determinant the carrying capacity of the air, land and water resources of the planning area. The land conservation and development actions provided for by such plans should not exceed the carrying capacity of such resources."

What is needed is a clear *designation* (and please don't quibble with the meaning of this word as was done by certain staff members relative to the Parks Master Plan when I suggested this before, I think we all know what "designation" means!) of *natural open spaces* (same proviso, I think we all know what this term means!) and a mandate to inventory natural resources and to fully understand stream capacity and "necessary" natural open spaces so that generations to come can find a place to visit to combat "nature deficit disorder". Certain areas should not be put to "efficient use" and not used for anything but enjoying and observing nature within the urban setting.

As you know we somehow made a couple of decisions last year that have brought this distinction, which seems minor but isn't when the "rubber meets the road," into focus. The first decision (integral to the Parks Master Plan) to call all natural open space "parks" and then to decide what "uses" to apply to these parks. Another decision (inherent in the Sensitive Lands Code omission and Parks Policies), and apparently directly contrary to the Oregon Goals, was to take a hands-off attitude toward restricting biocide use anywhere in the city including Sensitive Lands or Open Natural Areas. In other words the concept of preserving open natural areas has been completely obliterated by well-meaning approaches with severe unintended consequences.

So my suggestion relative to amending the Draft "Inspiring Spaces and Places" is for the CAC to review the Oregon Goals and to manifest those in the Comprehensive Plan as clearly as they are expressed in the universally applauded and non-controversial Oregon Goals, particularly Goal 5. If you find language that is "slip-sliding away" from actually protecting natural resources and understanding and respecting their capacity limits, please add specific language to do so. This is where the Vend Diagram of Sustainability, much of which many people do not espouse, and of Natural Resource Protection per State Law, which almost all citizens do espouse, intersect. Please don't throw out this language and replace it with only the concepts of "live, work and play" and "using" land resources "efficiently".

I would again draw the attention of all on the CAC to the excellent book "The Nature Principle - Human Restoration and the End of Nature Deficit Disorder" by Richard Louv or his previous book which focuses on how important natural refuges are to the minds and souls of young people.

That Lake Oswego has natural beauty is no accident. Previously the Comprehensive Plan specifically reproduced the language and intent of Oregon Goal 5 and Goal 10.

Please don't throw the "baby out with the bathwater". I am sure you feel that the language is adequate for these protections to continue. I would like to express my concern as a person that has reviewed a lot of documents and understands the language as well as anyone, that it in fact does not. You can test this by exploring whether an existing natural open space could take a path whereby it would be converted to a "park" and then when no good use was discovered and the cost to "maintain it" as a park use was excessive, it could be sold to a developer who would then implement mitigation to remove the natural elements and developed without any specific restrictions as to the "need" for the natural open space for the community nor the capacity effects on streams and quality of life.

Presently and with the Urbanization section of the Comp Plan Update as it is here presented in this Draft, there is a loophole you could drive several dumptrucks through. At least that is my concern and perception. And if I see it that way, so could anyone else that decided to explore and implement development via that loophole so that our quality of life and natural beauty was not respected.

I also feel that the historical resources are not sufficiently protected by this language although the intent is expressed. As we have seen, over-riding the Comprehensive Plan is easy enough, it should not be made easier by having loopholes to begin with.

Thank you for sending out this notice Laura and best wishes to all on the CAC and my great appreciation and admiration for their diligence and progress goes to all and to the leaders  
Craig

**To: Laura Wiegel, City of Lake Oswego**

**From: Tom Cusack, Lake Oswego Resident**

**Subject: Requests for March 21, 2012 Citizen Advisory Commission Meeting**

On February 2<sup>nd</sup>, you will recall that I sent you written comments, including a link to my detailed comments on the housing needs analysis.

(A PDF of those comments are attached to the email transmitting this document, INCLUDING a link to my detailed Feb. 1<sup>st</sup> comments on the problems with the draft housing needs analysis. I have also pasted in the text of the emails on page 2).

On Feb 24th, I appreciated receiving an email reply from you apologizing for the 3 week delay in responding to my email and advising that

***We will forward you[r] comments to the CAC when they discuss the first draft of the Housing goals and policies at their March 21 meeting***

I was suprised therefore to see that the agenda for the CAC meeting on March 21<sup>st</sup> (posted on Friday evening March 16<sup>th</sup>)

1. Says that there were "No public comments addressed to the CAC." and
2. That none of the materials posted to date specifically reference my comments, including my detailed

Feb. 1<sup>st</sup> comments on the problems with the draft Housing Needs Analysis.

I think, given your February 24<sup>th</sup> response, that I had every reason to believe that my comments were being *addressed to the CAC* and therefore had not sent them separately to the CAC.

***I ask that:***

- 1. You forward my February 2<sup>nd</sup> comments to the CAC, including my detailed comments on the Housing Needs Analysis***
- 2. To insure that the record is complete that you include this letter, my Feb. 2<sup>nd</sup> written comments, and my Feb 1st comments on the problems with the housing needs analysis, in the posted meeting materials as "Public comments addressed to the Committee"***
- 3. I be given an opportunity to address those comments and answer any questions as an agenda item at the March 21<sup>st</sup>, 2012 CAC meeting.***

Thanks much,  
Tom Cusack  
Oregon Housing Blog  
[www.oregonhousing.blogspot.com](http://www.oregonhousing.blogspot.com)

### **My email to you on Feb 2<sup>nd</sup>**

*Since I retired I have authored the Oregon Housing Blog with now more than 2,500 housing related posts.*

*First and foremost thank you for holding a community wide forum on this important topic as a lead in to updating and revising the Comprehensive Plan. I hope to learn from others attending and, in the small group I participate in, will offer my insights about affordable housing needs and strategies to help increase housing choice in Lake Oswego.*

*I am attaching a written copy of my comments on the Housing and Complete Neighborhoods policy questions that attendees were asked to respond to during the community forum for this evening. (While I serve on several housing non profit boards and advisory groups, these views are my personal views and not the views of these organizations).*

*My Housing Policy comment # 3 in the attachment references the need to update and correct the Draft May 2011 Lake Oswego Housing Needs Analysis and includes a link to my detailed written comments about the HNA updates and corrections that I believe are necessary before adoption of any comprehensive plan changes.*

*Corrections and updates to the draft HNA may impact comp plan policies and housing needs but the draft HNA must be updated anyway to reflect the household growth allocations for Lake Oswego which are expected sometime from Metro this spring.*

*A direct link to my detailed comments on the draft May 2011 HNA is HERE:  
[http://www.housepdx.com/pdfs/housing/LO May 2011 Draft Housing Needs Analysis Corrections and Updates Needed.pdf](http://www.housepdx.com/pdfs/housing/LO%20May%202011%20Draft%20Housing%20Needs%20Analysis%20Corrections%20and%20Updates%20Needed.pdf)*

*Thanks again,  
Tom Cusack  
Oregon Housing Blog  
<http://www.oregonhousing.blogspot.com>*

---

**Feb 24 Response from you**

*Hello Tom,  
I am sorry it's taken me so long to respond to your email; it got buried in my inbox! We will forward you comments to the CAC when they discuss the first draft of the Housing goals and policies at their March 21 meeting. I have forwarded your feedback to my co-worker as well who is the primary staff person who worked on the HNA.  
Thank you for your careful consideration of this very important topic.  
Sincerely,  
Laura Weigel*

Please see attachments.