

Public comments received via the We Love LO Website from October 6 thru October 20, 2011 (2:00pm).

Emails received:

Regarding Lake Access

1. Philip J. Biege – 10/6/11
2. Rob Goodwin – 10/6/11
3. Jim – 10/7/11
4. Stephen T. Boone – 10/8/11
5. Kristy Neubo – 10/10/11
6. Todd Prager – 10/16/11
7. Kent Lindell-Ross – 10/17/11
8. Diane Dressler– 10/18/11
9. Sarah DeMerritt–10/18/11
10. Tom Berridge–10/18/11
11. John McMunn – 10/19/11

Regarding other topics

12. Craig Stephens – 9/28/11
13. Frank Hall– 10/13/11
14. Byron Putman– 10/17/11
15. Frank Hall– 10/18/11
16. Byron Putman– 9/28/11
17. Cory Willson– 10/18/11

THURSDAY, OCT 6

1. From: Philip J. Biege

Subject: Lake access

Message Body:

If you want lake access buy a home pay the exorbitant taxes and dues and invite all of your friends to come over.

The town has more parks then any other community; in addition the City has purchased a majority of the commercial properties subsequently taking off the tax rolls.

If this continues I will move and you can buy my house!

2. From: Rob Goodwin

Subject: Public Access to Lake Oswego

Message Body:

It's a private lake.

It was built to be a private lake.

Property was sold and bought around the lake based upon it being private and recognized as so for over 75 years by the community, city, county and state.

Are we becoming a nation of laws and lawyers instead of citizens and community?

Give it a rest.

Updated on October 20, 2011 2:00 p.m.

FRIDAY, OCT 7

3. From: Jim

Subject: Oswego Lake

Message Body:

Todd Prager seems to think that everyone's back yard should be available for public use. I guess that everyone should be able to use the golf course at the Lake Oswego Country Club or their neighbor's pool also. For someone who has been here from California for only a couple of years, he seems pretty demanding.

SATURDAY, OCT. 8

4. From: Stephen T. Boone

Subject: Open access to the Lake

Message Body:

I am opposed to the idea of the lake being open to the general public. The Lake has always been a private lake run by the Lake Oswego Corporation, which is paid for by the property owners around the Lake. If the Lake is to be opened to the general public then does it not make sense that the rest of the city residents be taxed to support the operation and maintenance of the Lake? On top of that residents on the Lake have to pay ramp fees, and if they put their boat on any other body of water they must have their boat and trailer sanitized so as to prevent the spread of invasive species. On top of the fees people have to pass a written test before they can use a boat on the Lake and must demonstrate on water competence of the rules. I feel that people should have to prove that they have had their boats sanitized before each and every use of the Lake to maintain the water quality that the Corporation has worked so hard for over the past decade. Even non powered boats pose a threat to the water quality of the Lake. The operators of the non powered boats would need to be tested for knowledge of rules on the lake to maintain the safety and security of all.

To allow a bunch of city officials to make decisions about the Lake would be like allowing grade school kids to be in charge of our government. City Officials have no experience or even expertise in running or maintaining a lake.

The people who would be impacted the most would be those closest to the access point on the Lake. All those who wish to open the Lake up need to think about that in using the lake you would now be using the residents of this Lake's back yard or front yard. How is the general public now going to compensate the residents of this lake for all the years of higher taxes and Lake Property assessments, plus usage fees that the residents have had to shoulder? I equate it to joining an athletic club that has rules that must be followed and fees that have to be paid. Even state parks have rules, regulations, and fees that people have to pay and abide by if you are going to use them.

On a busy day it can be chaos on the Lake and I can just not see how it would work or be fare to those who live on the Lake to have people that have nothing invested or understanding of the rules that involve the safety for everybody

Monday, October 10, 2011

5. Kristy Neubo sent this conversation thread to the we love lo website on Monday, Oct 10, 2011. It is the exact conversation that she had with Mr. Prager on his website (lakeaccess.wordpress.com/). The conversation is highlighted in blue.

Original Message-----

From: Kristy Neubo [<mailto:LO500@comcast.net>]

To: WeLoveLO

Subject: The private Lake of Oswego, The focus of the Planning Department and Mr. Prager's misinforming the public

Message Body:

Kristy Neubo says:

October 7, 2011 at 9:57 am

Updated on October 20, 2011 2:00 p.m.

The City of Lake Oswego owns property and parks that adjoin Lake Corporation owned Lake frontage, but no direct Lake frontage, therefore, without condemnation, the City can not provide public access to Oswego Lake. I suggest that if Mr. Prager wants Lake access, he should buy a lake front property or Lake easement property and pay his annual dues to enjoy the lake, like all of us lake shareholders do and have done for as many as 80 years. It is an expensive proposition to maintain and enjoy this watershed; millions and millions of dollars annually, something the city would have to pay for if public access was granted.

Oswego Lake is a man-made body of water which was owned by the Oswego Iron Company. Some 80 years ago, it was donated to the Lake Oswego Corporation and all Lake front property owners and easement holders who pay their dues, have the exclusive right to use the lake. Lake front property owners, as a rule do not own their water frontage, the Lake Corporation does, and the Lake Front property owner is issued shares of stock in the Lake Corporation when they purchase a lake front home. The Property owners and deeded easement shareholders, pay annual dues (this last year dues were over \$2700 per property), for the Lake Corporation to maintain, clean, control algae and patrol the lake, amongst other duties. The Lake is extremely tightly controlled and there are a lot of rules and regulations that the Lake Corporation carries out, regarding lake usage and the Lake Corporation tightly controls all construction on and in the Lake. All Lake Construction must meet the City of Lake Oswego planning and building department rules, and as is applicable, building permits must be obtained from the City of Lake Oswego Building Department, for all construction and remodeling projects. The Lake is more tightly regulated and Controlled by the Lake Corporation, than any Government entity would provide. Mr. Prager is misinformed, which is interesting, since he sits on the Lake Oswego Planning Commission. Mr. Prager stated a great deal of falsehoods in his Citizen's View and is grossly misleading the public with his views. All power boat operators must have a separate Lake Corporation Driver's License, and be instructed and tested by the Lake Corporation prior to issuance. Lake shareholders must carry at least \$500,000 in Insurance liability coverage. If you don't meet the requirements and tight controls of the lake corporation, you are not allowed to have your watercraft on the water. Even canoes and paddleboards must be licensed by the Lake Corporation to be allowed access to the lake. All watercraft must be properly steam cleaned prior to entry on the lake to avoid invasive species. There is little crime from lake access to lake front property and there is very little disrespect by Lake Users, currently. We live here, and we all respect our neighbors, both human and animal that we share this lake with. Most of us leave our watercraft out on our docks and our boat houses unlocked, as only our neighbors have access to our lake property, and neighbors don't steal from each other. Oswego Lake is a fragile eco-system with abundant wildlife and aquatic life. It is a small watershed of 405 acres. I have observed illegal fishing on Oswego Lake from bridges and City property. If public access were granted, we lake front property owners would be subjected to an increase in crime, a loss of water quality, invasive species, an uncontrolled public, lack of control of watercraft and more traffic on our small lake; which would be detrimental to current power boat water sports. The public would not be educated on the tightly controlled rules of the Lake Corporation, amongst other issues. Speed limits are strictly controlled by the Lake Corporation. Many areas are 5 mph speed limit. Bridges are low and narrow and navigation is difficult if you are not familiar with the lake. Some areas are shallow and rocks protrude. Some alleyways are a mere 6-8 feet wide and very difficult to navigate. Half Moon Bay is particularly treacherous and has one home that juts way out into the water, making it difficult to have two boats pass. The canals are only 20 feet wide, and some are even narrower than that. Most bridges can only have one boat at a time pass through. Public access is not practical on this lake. It is too small and too dangerous.

If Public access to the lake were granted, the city would have to take the lake in a condemnation proceeding. The City would then force the Lake Corporation out of business, as there would be no purpose in its existing, and the shareholders that pay \$2700 (based on this last year) plus a year In dues per property, would no longer pay dues to the Lake Corporation. If the Lake Corporation was abolished, the City would have to take over all of the duties of the Lake Corporation, and become stewards of the Lake, the same as the Lake Corporation does now. This would cost the City millions and millions of dollars per year. Does the City have millions of extra dollars lying around?

For 80 years, the lake has been private and all of a sudden, instead of paying his fair share like we shareholders all do for Lake access, Mr. Prager wants to change things so he can use the lake for free, instead of paying for its use, as we have all done for as many as 80 years.

I see this as someone wanting something for free. Mr. Prager wants his hand-out but doesn't want to pay for it, and he is stirring the public pot without educating the public with the full facts of this matter.

Kristy Neubo

Todd Prager says:

October 8, 2011 at 3:01 am

Thanks for the comments.

First, it appears some of the City property lot lines, particularly those at the Millennium fountains, extend over the water. Definitely something to dig into further though if the City actually decides to pursue a policy of lake access in the Comprehensive Plan. The Lake Corp. should be commended for all it does to protect the lake.

However, all Lake Oswego property owners, not just the Lake Corp, contribute to protecting the lake. This occurs through taxes and fees that support the Stormwater and Surface Water Program to meet Clean Water Act requirements for Oswego Lake.

In addition to direct community investment, part of the program to protect Oswego Lake involves placing significant development restrictions on property owners that live along streams and uplands of the drainage area surrounding the lake. One of the main purposes is to preserve vegetation that cleanses water before it drains into the lake. Also, the lake is partially fed by waters from a canal dug from the Tualatin River. There is a tremendous investment upstream in the Tualatin River watershed that protects and improves the water that makes it way into the lake.

Yes, the City does require building permits on the lake for structures such as boat houses. The purpose of building permits are to protect the "fire, life, and safety" aspects of a structure. However, when there is are no zoning restrictions, the City can not regulate the type or intensity of development. For example, without zoning, a restaurant or hotel on pilings could be built on the lake. The lack of zoning on the lake is unlike anywhere else in the City. While the Lake Corp. does have its own set of development regulations, should this negate the need for any City development regulations? Many other entities in the City such as homeowners associations have rules that regulate development, but they are not free from City development regulations.

Water safety and other rules are very important, and anyone breaking the rules should be held accountable. Most people I have heard from that support increased lake access, think it should be limited to things like kayaking and canoeing, not additional powerboats. This would have minimal safety, water quality, and other impacts on the current lake users.

I agree that factual information is very important as the community continues this discussion.

Kristy Neubo says:

October 8, 2011 at 8:46 am

Mr. Prager,

You state in response to my letter, "I agree that factual information is very important as the community continues this discussion". I am not seeing that the community is discussing this matter. I am seeing this as your agenda alone. I am not even seeing that the Lake Oswego Planning Commission is considering or supporting your views. I am seeing this as your personal campaign only. I see that only myself has commented on this matter or taken your survey.

You state that all citizens participate in water quality of the lake, as one of your justifications of public use. You also state that the Tualatin River feeds the lake. The Tualatin River water is sparingly used, as it is full of nutrients detrimental to the water quality of the lake. The watersheds that flow into the lake which ultimately flows into the Willamete River via the dam that creates electricity; this water benefits the public in two ways, it provides publicly used electricity and it provides some of the water for the Willamete River, which is owned by the public. This Lake watershed must be protected as it provides a lot of habitat for wildlife and the residents of The City of Lake Oswego further benefit by the water quality through the use of the two swim parks. I am not aware of any water quality programs on the Tualatin river that protect the water quality of the Lake. Have you ever been on a complete tour of Oswego Lake to see the topography and layout and j

Updated on October 20, 2011 2:00 p.m.

ust how dangerous this lake is in places? This Lake is not practical for public use. Some homes are within inches of the waterline, and the public would have open access to peoples homes, docks, boathouses and yards. Public theft would be just one small issue. Privacy is another huge issue, and navigation of the lake bed itself is a major safety issue and then who would pay for all of the things that the Lake Corporation provides? The Lake property owners willingly pay their assessments every year, as we fund the Corporation that works for us. We would not pay if the public had the same benefits that we pay for.

I think you are mistaken in your statement that the City owns water frontage land. It is my understanding that the Lake Corporation owns all land between the waterline and the Cities properties, thus disallowing any public access, let alone that the Legislature would have to change the designation of the Lake itself, to allow any public access. Personal small watercraft is a hazard for powerboats on the lake as it is, think of how this would be if there were more personal small watercraft on the lake. There are designated areas that small personal watercraft can navigate inside of, and how do you propose regulating the public to stay in this safety zone?

All Lake Front properties fall under the jurisdiction of all City of Lake Oswego Zoning, building and planning Department rules. You sit on the Planning Commission and you should know this. Hotels and office buildings can not be built over the water. These kinds of statements are inflammitory and are a part of your personal agenda to mislead the public. On your web-site you quote David J. "Jeff" Kroft, Ph.D. Senior Policy Specialist Land Management Division as stating; "Oregon Department of State Lands First, the reservoir is closely controlled by the Corporation at standards which exceed every applicable federal guideline, from boating safety to pollution control to dock construction. Second, operation of the reservoir and all attendant facilities, and purchase of water from the Bureau of Reclamation's Tualatin Project, is a very costly proposition, and the homeowners assess themselves an annual charge to cover it. Any federal action to dilute the homeowners' control carries with it the threat of their losing the value of their continuing to take over the operation of these facilities. Finally, a Congressional declaration that Lake Oswego is not a navigable waterway for the purposes of the federal government.

I should point out, as you indicate, that any rights of the public to use Lake Oswego or any other waterway are contingent on the ability of the public to gain legal access to the waterbody. A person may not cross privately-owned property without the owner's permission to get to the waterway. Doing so constitutes a trespass. The factor that complicates what the public can/cannot do on Lake Oswego relates to the dam: the line of ordinary high water as it existed prior to the construction of the dam is below the current water surface. This results in the state-owned submerged and submersible land being below the current water surface. Consequently, although the public has the right to recreate on the surface of the water, it does not have the right to use what is now the post-dam submersible land around the land – which is above the pre-dam line of ordinary high water – as it would if the lake had not been dammed unless such land is publicly-owned.

In any event, to use the surface of the lake, the public has to gain legal entry through either publicly-owned land or with the permission of an adjacent landowner. And once on the surface of the land, the public cannot use the submerged or submersible land that exists above the pre-dam level of the lake.

Because that part of Lake Oswego which was formed as a result of the dam is an "artificial" feature and was not in existence in 1859 at the time of Oregon's statehood (as would be a man-made canal or basin along a waterway) a navigability study would not apply."

This State expert is basically telling you that the public has no ability to use the Lake as a whole regardless of any other factor. There may be portions of the Lake that the public could legally use if they could gain legal access (which they can't), however this is impracticle as there is no access point, and could you imagine roping off this section, but not that section for public use? Your ideas are not supported by the City, or so far by any residents and are a waste of your time. If you want to properly serve the community, focus your efforts on projects that bring in revenue and jobs and attain quality of life for the residents that you serve. Don't mislead your people by stating facts that are not supported. It is not fair to lead the people of Lake Oswego into thinking that they could somehow obtain public access to the Lake, because they can't. This issue could potentially be devisive with the Lake Sheholders and non-shareholders. If your heart is in the right place and you want to serve the people of Lake Oswego, you need to focus your efforts elsewhere, as your misleading campaign is not doing your job properly. You have gone to the huge effort to create a website, not supported by the City, but which looks official, to further your personal agenda. This is an abuse of a public servants power and should be looked at by the City for disciplinary action.

Todd E Prager says:
October 8, 2011 at 7:36 pm

Thanks again for your comments.

In my experience the lake is an important issue the community (not just me) is interested in discussing. This has been validated based on the responses I have received to my opinions (both for and against). I think it is healthy to have a robust community discussion on these types of issues so collective decisions can be made.

I think there are a number of options for public access to Oswego Lake, but it is important to decide first whether lake access fits within the community's vision.

I am not trying to mislead the public by expressing my understanding of lake zoning issues. The implications of the lack of zoning on the lake have come up many times in the past by people other than myself. I am certainly not the first to raise the issue.

There is no prohibition on me expressing my personal opinions on this or any other matter. Both elected and appointed officials publicly express their personal opinions all the time. Consider the ongoing streetcar debate. I think it is a good thing for public officials and private citizens to come out with their views on issues to help inform discussions.

This website is simply another outlet for expressing a personal viewpoint. It really wasn't hard to make. It is simply an additional way of getting ideas out there such as conversation, opinion pieces, emails, etc. This website is certainly not connected to the City of Lake Oswego. I will add this to the sidebar to help ensure people understand that.

Reply

Kristy Neubo says:
October 9, 2011 at 8:46 am

Mr. Prager,

You state; "First, it appears some of the City property lot lines, particularly those at the Millenium fountains, extend over the water." This is yet another attempt by you to mislead the public. The state of Oregon's response to you was very clear that the dam changed the waterline and that all water was "waterlocked" so to speak and "landlocked" by property and submerged property owned by the Lake Corporation, thus making any access to the Lake unlawful by anyone not granted access by The Lake Corporation. Millenium Park and water fountain area is especially landlocked and waterlocked by the Lake Corporation owned private property. Millenium park and all adjacent land sits on Lakewood Bay, which if you had researched back in history, was an un-navigable marshy duck pond. At some time more than 80 years ago, Half Moon Bay was dredged and thus Lakewood Bay was created. The City property line is landlocked well behind the Lake Corporation private submerged property. Old photos readily available at the library and published in numerous books, show the old Lake water lines. Plat maps and even Google Earth show the entire Lake Corporation's property lines. If you are on the City Planning Council, you have a responsibility and obligation to the public to research your positions and form your opinions based upon a resonable reality, before you present them to the public. You are a public official and you have an absolute fiduciary obligation to present accurate information to the public and to not mislead the public. I would like gold to flow from my water faucet, but that is not going to happen, and neither is public access to lake Oswego. Like one gentleman stated to you, "he would like access to his neighbors swimming pool, is that legal?" The City of Lake Oswego has no legal authority to provide public access to the waters of Lake Oswego pursuant to law and pursuant to legislation. I am still very confused why you are campaigning the public with thoughts and ideas that cannot come to fruition. Your job as a public servant is to further the good of the public. Spend your time investing in agenda items that will create jobs and revenue for the City, and furthers the good of the public; instead of misleading the public with ideas that cannot happen under the law. I hope that you did not spend hours that you were on City time and that you did not use City computers, when you created this web-site and when you answer this blog, as it is not endorsed by the City. This is your own opinion web-site alone. This is your personal property and nothing to do with the City. Have you ever thought how much a condemnation action and legislation change action would cost the City, how many billions of dollars that the City would have to pay for the Lake front property and to the Shareholders, that it would need to purchase to abolish the Lake Corporation to make public access feasible, and how much the City would

Updated on October 20, 2011 2:00 p.m.

have to pay to take over the millions of dollars that we all currently pay to the Lake Corporation annually, and how many millions of dollars in additional insurance cost to the City to provide public access (if any actions by the City could possibly succeed) and how much lost property tax revenue it would cost the City by the depreciation in all of the multi-million dollar homes and properties around the lake, and how much in depreciation in property values it would actually cost the citizens who pay billions of dollars in property taxes that live in those Lake Front homes? While your at it, the private island in the lake would make a lovely park, why don't you propose the city buy this historic landmark property for the \$15 million dollar purchase price and propose that the city pay the \$99,000.00 annual tax bill on this property. You sound like you are really good at spending the city's money, so I say go for it. The City can handle millions and billions of dollars more in expense for no real good reason, right? You public servants think it is a great idea to keep spending and raising everyone's tax dollars. West End Building was such a great investment and really benefits the public by \$20 million dollars-right? I still say, you want Lake access, do what we all did and buy a Lake front property. Instead, you want it all for free instead of considering what is actually entailed in your "big" ideas. You are giving the public hope that somehow the City could legally provide Lake access and somehow it is simply not doing so. Present the whole picture and let the public know what would be entailed in doing something like this, if it could ever even happen, which is very, very doubtful. Kristy Neubo

Reply

Todd E Prager says:

October 9, 2011 at 4:17 pm

I think we have different interpretation of what the Department of State Lands told me.

Jeff Kroft with the Department of State Lands wrote, "...to use the surface of the lake, the public has to gain legal entry through either publicly-owned land or with the permission of an adjacent landowner. And once on the surface of the land, the public cannot use the submerged or submersible land that exists above the pre-dam level of the lake."

I asked Dr. Kroft about using the water above the submerged or submersible land that exists above the pre-dam level of the lake. He responded that, "...the Public Use Doctrine applies...water in a river or lake belongs to the State of Oregon. For this reason, the public can use the surface of a river or lake for any legal purpose once they have gained lawful entry. The limitations on what the public can/cannot do apply to the underlying submerged and submersible land."

The city owns property that provides direct access to property above "above the pre-dam level of the lake" at multiple locations in the City.

In my role as Planning Commissioner, I contribute to a whole range of issues including economic development, which I agree is a critical aspect of continuing to make Lake Oswego a great community.

I have spent my evenings and weekends working on this issue on my own time because I think it is important. If there is a legal way for the public to gain lake access, then I think it is important for the community to discuss whether they want this. If there is no legal way, then it would be good to know that and move on. I am trying to do my best to understand the issues and provide factual information. My intent is not to mislead people.

Thanks again for the discussion.

Reply

Kristy Neubo says:

October 9, 2011 at 8:52 pm

Mr. Prager-

I am not aware of any property that the City owns that would allow access to any waters in the Lake. There is no land that is existing that is a pre-dam area- it is all submerged. Look at the old pictures and even those on your own web-site and you will see that the whole Lake surface was largely expanded when the Dam was installed, way prior to our lifetimes and in the lifetimes of our great-grandparents. The Lake Corporation owns all of that Frontage, thus making it private land. Address this issue, please. Why are you not addressing the costs (millions and billions of dollars)involved in your proposition? The Shareholders would no longer pay to maintain this private Lake at a cost of millions and millions of dollars a year. The City would have to take over the entire operation of the Lake Corportaion, the policing, the water quality, flood control, algae and water quality control, and all other duties that the Lake Shareholders now pay for. You also need to tour the entire Lake and see how impracticle and un-navigable this Lake is for public access. Have you ever been on every area of the Lake? Homes and people's doors are within inches of the water in some cases. The Lake is as narrow as 6-8 feet in some areas.

Every single property on the Lake without exception is controlled by the City Zoning, planning and building departments, and most are also controlled by FEMA. Why are you stating otherwise?

The Legislature and The State of Oregon has deemed that Oswego Lake is Non-navigable and is private property. Do you know how much money it would cost to attempt to change this? It would cost millions and millions if not billions of dollars. You are not serving the publics interest here, as you are not presenting all of the facts and you are misleading the public by not stating that the City has no Legal authority to provide public access to the Lake. The Lake Corporation lawyers will have to spend millions of dollars to fight any action that you may present to attempt to gain any public access to the Lake. Do you not find it interesting that the only people responding on your Blog and Web-page is you and me? Where are all of these people that you feel support your interest in somehow changing the way that Lake Oswego has operated since the beginning of time and is Legislated and is Lawfully run as a private Lake? You are abusing your powers, by not presenting all of the fac ts as they exist. The City has no Legal authority or ability to provide Public access to Lake Oswego. You are a public servant and I would like to see your time and energy better spent on improving jobs, lowering the Citizen's over all costs of living, job creation (I know kids in our district who's parents have lost jobs,their homes, and whose families are now on Food-subsidies-very sad), and most importantly- improving our schools. One of my tenant's children in the Palisades district were recently bused to Hallinan on a bus with 97 children on it! This is not acceptable! In addition, My Westridge and Hallinan's tenant's kids are now in classrooms with as many as 35 students, and it is about to get worse! Lake Oswego City is not known for providing Lake access to the public, but it is known for it's outstanding schools! Your priorities and your efforts are misguided, and will be extreemely expensive for the City, and you will not prevail in your efforts. My husband and I lived in Orange County California when an overzealous County Board bankrupted the County. One of the richest counties in the United States and the idiots running it, bankrupted it! You need to focus your Big position of "Planning Commissioner" on what is important to the quality of life of Lake Oswego's citizen's- education, Job creation, a stabilized tax base that is affordable, and quality of life that this City is known for. We have a huge River that George Rogers Park, and Millenium Park front on, with an existing big dock at Millenium Park. The Willamete River provides this City with ample water recreation area and opportunity. Why are you not placing your efforts on developing the docks at George Rogers Park? You could take a boat all over the world from the Willamete River. Docks at George Rogers Park might be a great additional Water Recreation area for this City. There is ample parking to park and launch small water-craft (No parking is available atthe New Sundeleaf Park), and there used to be a Public boat launching area at George Rogers Park. Developing George Rogers Willamete River water access is feasible, affordable and practical. It seems that you are on a public campaign because you have some kind of a personal resentment towards those of us that worked really hard and long all of our lives and purchased a home that has legal water access rights to the Privatley owned and operated Oswego Lake. Your efforts will better serve this City if you focus your efforts and the City's money on The Willamter River Public usage.

Kristy Neubo

Reply

Todd E Prager says:

October 10, 2011 at 2:33 am

I think at this point we have both articulated our positions well, and just have to agree to disagree. I appreciate your passion for protecting this community and doing what you think is in its best interest. I am trying to do the same, and I have no doubt that as a community we will decide on the best way to address this issue.

Sunday, October 16

6. From: Todd Prager

Hi Sid,

Please pass these comments along to the CAC for their October 26, 2011 meeting:

Dear CAC,

Please consider addressing the issue of recreational lake access as part of the Comprehensive Plan update for the following reasons:

1. The community cares deeply about the issue of lake access.
2. The current Comprehensive Plan is silent on lake access (other than visual access). Clear policy on lake access is warranted due to the high level of community interest in this issue.
3. Clear policy on lake access will ultimately guide future development of public lakefront property (design and connectivity) and the use of the lake itself. These are fundamental land use issues.
4. Local Comprehensive Plans are required to address and conform with the 19 Statewide Planning Goals. Goal 8 (Recreational Needs) requires local jurisdictions to meet the recreational needs of its citizens. Further, Goal 8 includes guideline A.10 which says, "Comprehensive plans should be designed to give a high priority to enhancing recreation opportunities on the public waters and shorelands of the state...". The State of Oregon is on record as saying the entire lake surface is public waters of the state.
5. The current Comprehensive Plan is based on the premise that the lake is private. The State of Oregon is now on record as saying the original lake bed is property of the state, and the entire surface water of the lake is property of the state and can be used for recreational purposes. This information should be carefully considered when any background information, goals, and policies related to Oswego Lake are being updated for the new Comprehensive Plan.

I think this issue is too important to not address as part of the update to the Comprehensive Plan. Regardless of what the ultimate policy decision on lake access is, I think it is in the public interest to address this issue.

Thanks for your consideration,

Todd Prager (Planning Commissioner expressing an individual viewpoint)

October 17, 2001

7. From: Kent Lindell-Ross

Subject: recreational access to Oswego Lake

Message Body:

I've lived in Lake Oswego for 11 years with only swim park access. I'm an avid paddler, & paddle access to our lake would be the greatest!

Updated on October 20, 2011 2:00 p.m.

Tuesday, October 18, 2011 11:38 AM

8. From: Diane Dressler

To: WeLoveLO

Subject: Paddling on LO

Subject: Paddling on LO

Message Body:

Hello,

I live on Ash St, 2 blocks from the lake and would love to be able to access it with our canoe. How can I learn more about this?

Thank you,

Diane Dressler

9. From: Sarah DeMerritt

To: WeLoveLO

Subject: Access to the Lake by Kayakers

Message Body:

I live in LO and also work here. I love this town so much! I also have a kayak and find it so easy to take my little boat down to the Willamette and use the new boat dock. The views are spectacular and I meet many others doing the same thing right here in town. I hope that the plan to make the Lake open to kayakers and canoes becomes a reality. Not only will local folks gain access to a wonderful place to spend some time exploring this treasure of a lake, but perhaps the city of Lake Oswego can start being seen as more welcoming than exclusive. As it stands now only a small percentage of our citizens can put their boat in the water here and few take advantage of the opportunity.

I think that fears by homeowners of being overrun by hoards of crazy boaters invading their privacy and taking over the lake are quite groundless. I for one would be happy to pay a small user fee to have access to the lake in my own backyard. Please put me down as a YES for this.

10. From: Tom Berridge

To: WeLoveLO

Subject: Lake access

Message Body:

I would like for the new comprehensive plan to provide access to Oswego lake for any nonmotorized craft. I am a lake Oswego resident and would like to paddle my canoe on the lake.

October 19, 2011

11. John McMunn

Subject: Lake Access

Message Body:

My family believes strongly that the City should open access to the Lake to its residents by providing canoe and kayak rental and boat launch opportunities to citizens from City-owned property on the lake shore. That would immeasurably enhance the recreational and general ambience of Lake Oswego. Thank you for considering these comments.

Updated on October 20, 2011 2:00 p.m.

COMMENTS RECEIVED REGARDING OTHER TOPICS

September 28, 2011 5:22 PM

12. From: Craig Stephens

Subject: Re: A message from We Love Lake Oswego

Thanks Laura. Sorry I had to miss the meeting but I had family matters to take care of and another meeting to attend. I feel the written comment should serve to express my view which is basically that Oregon Goal 5 should be a primary purpose of the Comprehensive Plan and that other things are not a substitute. Furthermore Goal 5 represents what most people espouse in terms of natural resource protection because we want to preserve and protect some Open Spaces for our children to experience nature in an unaltered condition without herbicides or restoration or development. Plus not doing any of that has a matching cost that is zero.

I think it goes without saying that I and most people ALSO support organic gardening and flowers and want Lake Oswego to be a leader in such programs while not degrading watersheds. I want to see sensitive lands protection for wetlands and riparian areas and I want to see common sense protection of these that includes public property and not using herbicides, pesticides, biocides or any other harmful chemicals that pollute wetlands and riparian areas and degrade habitat protection. And I ALSO want Lake Oswego to continue to be a leader in amenities such as sports fields, a muni golf course, tennis and maybe even some day a skate board park and a swim center for the community. Of course these DO cost money and need to be prioritized. But these should not be mixed in with protecting and preserving Open Spaces because they are not the same!

Disclaimer: This is 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.

Thanks again

Craig

Thursday, October 13, 2011

13. From: Frank Hall

To: WeLoveLO

Subject: transportation and economic development vision for Boones Ferry Rd

Please consider a transportation idea that would support economic development for the Lake Grove area. The idea would bring foot traffic to Boones Ferry Road from denser populated areas of the city. Please consider in the visioning process a streetcar that connects Lake View Village to Bridgeport Village and runs along Boones Ferry Road, Country Club Road, and down A Street to State. The streetcar would connect the two major retail areas of the city to Bridgeport Village and provide significant pedestrian access to retail establishments throughout the city.

Thank you,
Frank Hall

Updated on October 20, 2011 2:00 p.m.

October 17, 2011

14. From: Pig Iron Petanque, a.k.a. Byron Putman

To: WeLoveLO

Subject: Flyer for November 3 Community Cultrue Summit

Predominately displayed on the Community Culture Summit for November 3rd full page poster is a group of six Pétanque players at Foothills Park. The issue is that all six players are men. Pétanque in general and Portland area Pétanque specifically, is mired in an astoundingly sexist environment; less than 5% of Portland area Pétanque players are women. That photo reinforces the antiquated concept that Pétanque is exclusively a male pursuit.

The Lake Oswego Pig Iron Pétanque Club is the only Pétanque group in the United States where the majority of regularly participating members are female. As the author of the only English language Pétanque book (and the organizer of Pig Iron Pétanque) I enthusiastically endorse Pétanque as an economical and effective community building activity. However I suggest that you are much more diligent in choosing images that reflect community demographics, not reinforce negative stereotypes.

-Cheers

Byron Putman, Organizer

Pig Iron Petanque on Lake Oswego's Willamette Riverfront

<http://www.meetup.com/PigIronPetanque/>

October 18, 2011

15. Follow up comment from Frank Hall

On other thought on a streetcar from Oswego Village to Bridgeport is that it would provide access for folks in Lake Grove to the Library.

October 18, 2011

16. Follow up from: Pig Iron Petanque, a.k.a. Byron Putman

Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2011 12:15 PM

To: Weigel, Laura

Subject: RE: Flyer for November 3 Community Cultrue Summit

Unfortunately you've not only bought into a sexist, but also an ageist stereotype. As one of the few advocates of egalitarian American Petanque, in addition to fighting sexist issues (the Portland Petanque Club has 100 members, but only one woman who throws regularly) I've have to grapple with the public perception that all bowls games (Bocce, Petanque and Lawn Bowling) are only suitable sports for the aged and the obese - as your choice of photos in your "Positive Aging in LO!" theme so aptly reinforces.

Why not show seniors involved in activities while interacting with people across a spectrum of ages? Your theme implies that in the process of positive aging one is relegated to only interacting with peers. Also notice that what you identify as the only female is isolated in the shadows and not a part of the main group. And to your contention that 1-out-6 (16.4%) means that all is not lost, tell that to the other 33.6% of women who aren't even allowed in the shadows.

-Cheers

Byron Putman, Organizer

Pig Iron Petanque on Lake Oswego's Willamette Riverfront

<http://www.meetup.com/PigIronPetanque/>

October 20, 2011

Updated on October 20, 2011 2:00 p.m.

17. From: Cory Willson

To: WeLoveLO

Subject: LO Community Culture Summit

To whom it may concern,

I am a parent of two children at Oak Creek Elementary. I am unable to come to the Community Culture Summit on November 3rd, but I feel inspired to write. Perhaps I can be a voice for those parents who cannot attend. First and foremost, I'd like to say thank you and show my appreciation for your support for education in your last planning year. What a difference you have made for our children! It is partly because of you that our children are continuing to receive excellent education here in Lake Oswego.

I would also like to express how truly important it is for you to continue to support education...our community, our future! Please know that there are many parents like me who appreciate you and want to be able to count on your support again as we face the financial crisis of the 2012-13 school year. We hope you will continue to do all you can for education here in Lake Oswego.

Thank you again for your time and devotion,
Cory Willson