

**Email from Craig Stephens provided in the CAC packet at the meeting on September 28, 2011**

**From:** craig stephens [<mailto:craigattbi@yahoo.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, September 26, 2011 5:09 PM  
**To:** Weigel, Laura  
**Subject:** Re: A message from We Love Lake Oswego

Hi Laura

Thanks for the reminder, update and status information regarding the CAC for the Comp. Plan Update.

If I could do so without disrupting the process in any way, I would like to ask that the CAC and all who are participating please be aware of the limitations of compliance with Title 3 and Title 13 of the Metro Urban Growth Management Functional Plan relative to compliance with Oregon Goal 5 which has been addressed with the existing Comprehensive Plan in Lake Oswego. Metro has made these limitations clear. Title 3 is said to be adding requirements that would address Oregon Goal 5 (implying that they are not being addressed to any extent as yet) and Title 13 is said to address (only!) some of the requirements of Oregon Goal 5 (primarily wetland and riparian area limitations for development, not the aspects of Goal 5 that have to do with preserving and protecting Open Space and having a plan to do so). So Oregon Goal 5 should be addressed as clearly as with the present Comprehensive Plan.

Some of the mistaken impressions that have been voiced recently are the following:

- 1) "Open Space" requires a lot of "maintenance". The fact is that minimal maintenance of Open Space is required, there is no requirement to convert non-natives to native plantings or to apply herbicides or improve natural area development in Oregon Goal 5. In fact, other than erosion control, best accomplished by leaving natural areas as they are, and reasonable access paths of a rudimentary nature, the habitat is best left undisturbed. Open Space does not require a lot of maintenance, it is almost completely optional.
- 2) "No one really knew what Open Space meant when they voted to acquire it." This line of thought is to support changing Open Space to Natural areas or to Parks or both. At that point Open Space *does require* a lot of maintenance and the habitat is jeopardized and all of the protections in the Comp Plan, Oregon Goal 5 and promised the voters, who really do understand what Open Space means, are forsaken.
- 3) "Natural areas as part of Parks are pretty much the same thing as Open Spaces in terms of protection and really the use of development and chemicals is something that disturbs neither habitat nor human enjoyment of nature." I and others would point to the book "The Nature Principle" by Louv to refute this thinking, which is completely wrong. I wish I could afford to give a copy to every single person that is involved with the Comprehensive Plan Update and/or allow the author to speak to this subject.

The fact is that Oregon Goal 5 is sound policy, universally supported and should be a part of the Comprehensive Plan in addition to addressing code restrictions per the Titles

in the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan, we cannot go wrong by doing that. I am attaching a consultant's recommendations to the City of Albany just to give an idea of what this could and should look like from another perspective. And of course our existing Comp Plan is very clear with regard to protecting Open Spaces when the map is updated showing all of the dedicated and designated Open Spaces. Perhaps the word "dedicated" is incorrectly used but I am trying to convey that the community is dedicated to purchasing and maintaining the areas we have been calling, up until this last year, "Open Spaces".

I am also attaching the Oregon Goal 5 because it is also clear and to the point. If desired I can also send a summary of the Metro "Titles" that Metro provides to support the statements above that Metro has clearly stated that compliance with the Titles does not replace Oregon Goal 5 requirements which are across the entire community and which require a plan, not just code restrictions.

Thanks very much Laura and thanks to ALL who have been working so diligently on the Comp Plan Update!  
Craig

PS: The Disclaimer: This represents my point of view only and does not necessarily represent any organization or group nor should it reflect a position that might be taken or not taken by any organization or group. The charter/mission statement of NRAB does include protection of "necessary open spaces" and NRAB was formed for the purpose of compliance with Goal 5 according to the Comprehensive Plan formulated at that time but other than that there is no connection or authorization from NRAB for this POV which is mine alone.