



**Comprehensive Plan
Citizen Advisory Committee
Meeting #34**

**March 21, 2013
Main Fire Station, 300 B Avenue
4:00 pm – 6:00 pm**

PLEASE NOTE THIS SUMMARY IS NOT A WORD FOR WORD DOCUMENTATION OF ALL 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: Jeff Gudman (Chair), Tom Brennan, Christopher Clee, Doug Cushing, Tom Fahey, Bill Gaar, Nancy Gronowski, Liz Hartman, Bob Needham, Teri Oelrich, and David White

Members not in attendance: Jim Johnson (Vice Chair), Dorothy Atwood, and Lynda O'Neill

Staff in attendance: Laura Weigel, Sarah Selden, Beth St. Amand

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

CAC COMMENTS

None.

REGULAR BUSINESS

Agenda Review & Announcements

Councilor Gudman reported the Council had appointed Shelly Alexander to serve on the CAC. The Chamber had presented Debbie Craig with the Citizen of the Year award. The Council had voted to propose an alternative to Sensitive Lands to Metro. Councilor Gudman said he would share the proposal going to Metro with the CAC as soon as the documents were available. Tom Coffee and Ron Bunch were going to discuss the direction of the Comprehensive Plan update process with the Council on April 2. Councilor Gudman invited Bill Gaar and Jim Johnson to participate in the work session and invited all CAC members to attend. He told the CAC that the agenda and staff report for the session would be forwarded to the CAC upon availability. Regarding a question posed at the previous CAC meeting, engineering staff had determined that the Street of Dreams would not create any major traffic concerns for Lake Oswego.

Ms. St. Amand described the current approach to the Comp Plan hearing process. There would be three sets of Planning Commission hearings on the following topics:

- 1) Community Culture; Economic Vitality; Complete Neighborhoods and Housing; Inspiring Spaces and Places; and Connected Community. This hearing was scheduled for April 22. These goals and policies had been shared with neighborhood association chairs.
- 2) Community Health and Public Safety; and Land Use Planning.
- 3) Healthy Ecosystems

Community Health and Public Safety:

Surface Water Management Goals and Policies, 2nd Review (Attachment 4)

Ms. Weigel reported the Planning Commission had made some changes; the City Attorney had recommended some wording changes; staff had cleaned up some of the language, removed redundant Policy K, and added a definition for Low Impact Development (LID). The changes were highlighted in the document. Ms. Weigel discussed each of them.

Goals

1. **Improve water quality by reducing the amount of pollution* conveyed by storm water runoff.**
2. **Ensure that future land use activities protect and enhance area water quality.**
3. **Protect and enhance natural ground and surface water drainage systems*.**

The CAC agreed to these three goals. Later, they converted Policy C to a goal (see below).

Policies

- A. Utilize natural systems and non-structural methods* to treat, convey and dispose of stormwater runoff at the source to the extent allowed by site characteristics.**

The CAC would change “utilize” to “use” if it made no legal difference.

- O. Ensure that construction and maintenance projects are planned and implemented to reduce and improve short and long term harm to the environment.**

The CAC modified the wording to focus on reducing harm: Ensure that construction and maintenance projects are planned and implemented to reduce short and long term harm to the environment.

Ms. Weigel advised that erosion was now addressed under the Landslides, Erosion and Unstable Soils. The policies were not in priority order. A developer would look at the CDC rather than the Comprehensive Plan to find out what he had to do to when it came to measures to minimize runoff.

- C. Promote public safety and minimize damage to public and private property from surface water runoff.**

The CAC changed this policy to a goal. During the related discussion Ms. Gronowski reported that her neighbors were concerned about downstream impact on property and suggested making this a goal. Mr. Gaar recalled hearing during Clean Streams planning that this was one of the biggest issues. He inquired whether changing this policy to a goal would mean it would have less effect on the code to be drafted. Ms. St. Amand pointed out there were other policies that would support code, including Policy I, which required development to implement measures to minimize runoff. Ms. Gronowski observed the City absolutely had to accomplish a policy, but from a practical perspective, when it came to water runoff, it could only try to accomplish it. Ms. St. Amand observed the words ‘promote’ and ‘minimize’ were more reflective of a goal than a policy.

Councilor Gudman related that next year he planned to suggest a system that did not tie SDCs to specific categories like parks or water. The Council would be able to allocate the total SDC amount. For example, if water projects were funded the Council could allocate some SDCs to unfunded surface water projects. Staff observed consensus to recommend this set of policies.

Natural Hazards and Disaster Goal and Policies, 2nd Review (Attachment 5)

Ms. St. Amand reported the Planning Commission had looked at these in December. Then staff had made minor changes, cleaned up the language, and improved a graphic. She agreed to find out if the policies that

applied to the main channels of rivers and streams also applied to the lake. As they went through this set of policies the CAC suggested using consistent formatting and flipping the order of the components of some statements in order to make them clearer.

General Hazard Policies

3. Allow innovative site design, building design and density transfer to minimize development in hazard areas.

Ms. St. Amand explained this policy would allow people to develop their property and give them options that would allow the development to stay out of a hazard area. The current code allowed that.

Flood Policies

Policies 6 and 7 were similar to some specific surface water management policies in other sections of the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Gronowski was concerned that if one was changed the corresponding policy in the other section would not be changed. Staff advised these policies needed to be here, but they would make them more general than the policies they corresponded to and insert cross references.

5. Improve flood control through protecting and restoring and maintain the natural systems of floodplains including riparian vegetation, wooded areas and wetlands and fish and wildlife habitat.

The CAC observed the proposed wording seemed awkward; and one of the ways to control flooding was to protect the natural systems. They changed this to read: Improve flood control by protecting, restoring and maintaining the natural systems of flood plains, including riparian vegetation, wooded areas and wetlands.

Staff agreed to revise the language of **Policies 3 and 4** so they reflected that the City had already adopted the FEMA model code.

Landslides, Erosion and Unstable Soil

Staff agreed to clean up the language of **Policies 2 and 3**.

Definitions - Critical Facilities and Infrastructure.

Ms. St. Amand was to check to ensure that all of the City's critical facilities were listed. She heard consensus to recommend this set of goals and policies to the Planning Commission.

Access to Local Food Goal and Policies, 2nd Review (Attachment 6)

Alternative language for the final sentence of the Vision Statement: To promote the health and social interaction of our residents there are opportunities to live an active lifestyle and to obtain locally grown food.

Ms. Weigel reported the Planning Commission supported the alternate language.

Goal: Provide the opportunity for residents to access a variety of healthy, fresh and local food options.

Staff reported the Commission had removed 'healthy and fresh' so that did not have to be defined. The CAC observed those words also had to be removed from **Policy 3**.

Policies

2. Support the preservation, use and development of agricultural land owned by the City.

Ms. Weigel recalled this policy had been crafted by the SAB with Luscher Farm in mind. There had been a lot of discussion regarding whether a Plan policy should refer to one specific area and regarding whether 'development' implied something other than agriculture. She recalled Mr. Johnson had argued having this policy in the Plan would ensure agricultural uses at the Farm would be supported in case the Luscher Area Master Plan was proposed to be changed. She recalled the Stafford area had been specifically called out in other policies.

Mr. Gaar suggested being very clear that this was about calling out Luscher Farm. Councilor Gudman observed the Luscher Area Master Plan was a wonderful compromise between competing groups. Calling it out acknowledged that everyone could live with it, even if not everyone liked it. Ms. Gronowski observed it was a balanced master plan that accommodated a lot of uses in a fair way. Ms. Weigel suggested saying: Support the preservation and use of agricultural lands as designated in the Luscher Area Master Plan. Mr. Brennan confirmed that the agricultural use area designated in the Master Plan was the same as where it was today at the Farm. Ms. Selden confirmed that the Comprehensive Plan was the controlling document and the Master Plan would always have to be consistent with it. The consensus was to accept Ms. Weigel's suggested wording.

1. Support farmers' markets, farm/produce stands* and community gardens that are compatible with the surrounding uses.

4. ~~Encourage~~ Ensure that residents have the opportunity to grow and raise healthy, fresh local foods.

The CAC discussed Policy 4. Did 'ensure' mean the City would have to accept whatever location people chose to grow food? What if, for example, that was in the median in front of their property? They decided to go back to saying, 'Encourage' instead of 'Ensure'. Encouragement could be things like programs to help people raise food. Staff related that people often called to ask if what they could raise in their yards. They asked about things such as animals and bees. Ms. Selden recalled the group wanted food to mean more than just produce. Ms. Weigel suggested the language the group agreed to recommend: Encourage residents to grow and raise food. Staff observed consensus to recommend this set of goals and policies to the Planning Commission.

Energy & Environment goals and Policies, 2nd Review (Attachment 7)

Ms. St. Amand noted this section had been reviewed by the Planning Commission, the CAC and the Sustainability Advisory Board. She differentiated between emissions coming from motor vehicles that degraded air quality and greenhouse gas emissions, which were addressed in a different section. She highlighted the changes.

Energy Services (Attachment 7.a.)

GOAL

A. Ensure energy systems* and communication systems are available to all development.

Policies

3. Support small-scale renewable energy projects while ensuring compatibility with surrounding uses.

Staff had revised this policy to call for compatibility after the Planning Commission had discussed the types of energy distribution it could possibly include in the future (for example, would this apply to a small nuclear reactor in a back yard). The CAC accepted the changes.

Goal

B. Reduce net community energy use and carbon emissions to increase Lake Oswego's long-term affordability and resiliency.

Ms. St. Amand clarified that 'net community energy use and carbon emission' was everyone's use and emissions. 'Affordability' had been used because City operations was the biggest user of energy and that affected rates and everyone's bottom line. She agreed to define 'resiliency' which was about avoiding price fluctuations that would come with climate change and ensuring the community was prepared for anything. Ms. Hartman anticipated the City would charge residents for energy use and cost containment would not be a factor. Ms. Gronowski observed that 'long term affordability' did not make much sense. She suggested this policy be worded: Reduce net community energy use and carbon emissions to increase Lake Oswego's long-term resiliency and decrease costs. There was consensus to accept that. Staff planned to define 'resiliency'.

Goal

C. Increase energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy improvements

Staff had crafted this goal and the related policies in order to get to the issue of green building. One of the related Action items was to update the development code to address this set of goals and policies. Mr. Cushing commented that he was glad to see wind turbines added because there were some small ones in Portland that demonstrated that turbines did not have to be big. Ms. Gronowski related a building she was aware of got about 1% of its energy from the turbines.

4. Promote energy efficiency and renewable energy use through site planning for all types of development.

Staff agreed to clarify this statement was about how a site was planned and not about a process point.

The consensus was to recommend this set of goals and policies.

Sound Quality

Ms. St. Amand reported the Planning Commission had only made a few minor legal tweaks to this set. CAC members observed that some people might consider 'happy noise' connected with a conditional use to be negative noise. The conditional use permitting process would evaluate noise impacts.

The consensus was to recommend this set of goal and policies.

Solid Waste Management and Resource Recovery (see Attachment 7.c.)

GOALS

A. Reduce the community's overall consumption, amount and toxicity of solid waste.

The CAC considered removing the word 'consumption' and revising the goal to call for reducing the community's overall generation and toxicity of solid waste. Staff clarified this goal related to what City government could do as an organization to reduce its own consumption. CAC members recalled the Zero

Waste effort. They talked about making this a sub-policy and placing it under either Policy 10 or 11. Staff planned to revise this set of policies and bring it back to the next meeting.

*Councilor Gudman complimented the CAC for getting through so much of a very full agenda and left the meeting.

Police & Fire, 2nd Review

This discussion was moved to the next meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Dianne Cassidy, 601 Wren St., indicated she did not support making access to local food a goal. It was not necessary; it was not a city function; it was not appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan because it was not a land use goal; if people wanted a community garden they could go through the Parks and Recreation Department; it was government 'mission creep'; just saying 'encourage' would obligate the City to provide things like boxes and instructors; boxes were not necessary for raised gardens and there were hundreds of master gardeners who would teach for free. There were many loose, ambiguous and undefined things in this goal. For example, how far out was 'local'?

Staff response: As stated in the Staff Memo for the meeting (Attachment 1):

During the Planning Commission discussion of the revised Community Health and Public Safety vision statement on February 11, 2013, they questioned whether there was a definition for "locally grown food." Currently there aren't definitions corresponding to the vision statements.

Staff researched definitions for local foods and turned out to be more complicated than anticipated. In fact, the USDA dedicates 13 (out of 87) pages of its "Local Food Systems Concepts, Impacts, and Issues" report to discussing the various approaches to defining local foods.

http://www.ers.usda.gov/media/122868/err97_1_.pdf

USA Today also tackled the subject:

http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/money/economy/2008-10-27-local-grown-farms-produce_N.htm

According to the USDA: "Unlike organic food, there is no legal or universally accepted definition of local food. In part, it is a geographical concept related to the distance between food producers and consumers. In addition to geographic proximity of producer and consumer, however, local food can also be defined in terms of social and supply chain characteristics."

For the sake of simplicity, staff recommends not defining it at this time. The CAC should review and make a recommendation to the Planning Commission.

CAC COMMENTS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 6:00 p.m.