

# LAKE OSWEGO RECREATION AND AQUATICS CENTER COMMUNITY MEETING

## NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING 1 SUMMARY

**Date:** 3/24/2021

**Time:** 6:00pm – 7:30pm

**Place:** Zoom Meeting

**Purpose:** Provide project update and details on the Lake Oswego Recreation and Aquatics Center, including recreation pool and dryland recreation plans.

**Outcomes:** Build understanding on where the project is currently, solicit feedback on neighborhood priorities, concerns and interests.

## Outreach and Attendance

### Outreach

The neighborhood meeting was publicized in the following ways:

- Invitations mailed and emailed to the chair(s) of the Palisades, McVey-South Shore and Westridge and Blue Heron neighborhood associations
- Invitation emailed to the chair of the Stafford Hamlet Board
- Invitations mailed out to neighbors within a 300' minimum from the site.
- Sign posted near the entrance of the site with details on how to register

### Staff Attendees:

Jenny Anderson, City of Lake Oswego	Tony Vandenberg, City of Lake Oswego	Sid Scott, Scott Edwards Architecture
Ivan Anderholm, City of Lake Oswego	Ken Rehms, PBS Portland	Allison Brown, JLA Public Involvement
Bruce Powers, City of Lake Oswego	Erica Baggen, Scott Edwards Architecture	Ariella Frishberg, JLA Public Involvement
Jan Wirtz, City of Lake Oswego	Jennifer Marsicek, Scott Edwards Architecture	

**Public Attendees:** The meeting was attended by 23 members of the public, including residents of the following neighborhoods: Sunny Hill, McVey-South Shore, Palisades, Lowenberg Terrace, Stafford, Blue Heron, and Westridge.

## Welcome and Introductions

Allison Brown, JLA Public Involvement, began the meeting. First, she reviewed the webinar tools and reminded attendees the meeting would be recorded. Questions could be asked using the Zoom Q&A function and

comments could be left on the Jamboard. Project team members introduced themselves and shared their role on the project.

## Project Overview

Ivan Anderholm, City of Lake Oswego, provided a broad overview of the project. Jennifer Marsicek, Scott Edwards Architecture, shared a presentation giving a broad overview of the conceptual site plans for the project. Ken Rehms, PBS Portland, provided an overview of the traffic study and the upcoming parking study. The slides from this presentation can be viewed here: [LORAC Community Meeting Presentation](#)

## Q&A

Members of the public were invited to use the Zoom Q&A function to ask questions. These questions are listed below (in order of how they were answered), along with answers provided by staff during the webinar or filled in afterward with additional information.

- *Will future meetings be in person?*
  - The project team hopes so! We will follow public health directives and will meet in person when it is safe to do so.
- *Why does the city need five months to permit when it is the permitting authority?*
  - Even the permitting authority (the City of Lake Oswego) must go through the proper bureaucratic process.

## Site Questions

- *Is there an intention to count residential parking as additional parking for the recreation center?*
  - No, the project is required by code to provide adequate on-site parking. Street parking in residential areas does not meet the City's requirements and is not included in the project.
- *Will the pools have any outdoor access during summer when people may want to get sun? An example is big garage doors that can open to an outdoor patio with sun lounge chairs facing the golf course area?*
  - Yes, outdoor access is something the project team is considering for the south side and golf course side of the project.
- *Can you speak to the wetlands planned on the north side of the site and potential impact to the neighborhood?*
  - After recent delineation and survey work was completed, the project team should have a full report on the wetlands. Our direction to the golf course designers was "no impact on the wetlands" with the new proposed design.
- *Will light pollution be a design consideration?*
  - The team hasn't gotten into the details of lighting yet, but will try to avoid "light trespass," meaning light spilling onto other people's property or into the sky. The project team will make a conscious effort to use cut off fixtures to block light pollution.
- *Can you show where the future development is on this slide?*
  - Jennifer shows where the proposed development will happen on the Site Analysis slide.
- *Since we have both Tony and Ivan, can we get an update on the IGA (Inter-Governmental Agreement)?*

- The IGA is in review with the City and will be coming to the school district for review. Ideally, it will conclude in May or the summer.
- *Currently a lot of stormwater drainage comes downhill on the driving range and residents have had to install their own stormwater management systems on their properties. And I'm hoping that stormwater is addressed in the design because it's been a big issue in the past.*
  - We will be required to manage our stormwater on site. If there is an issue, it would need to be fixed before the project gets permission to move forward. From a regulatory standpoint, we will have to manage our stormwater and if we are creating problems on your property, we will have to fix them. The intention in design is to extend the driving range to the north and there is existing grading. We should be able to capture more stormwater by grading and extending.
- *Are other options being looked at besides Overlook Dr for a second vehicle access? I live in the historical house directly across from that proposed access and am concerned about the traffic impact as well as still preserving the historical integrity of our house.*
  - Jennifer shows the location for a second vehicle access on Overlook Drive on the slide. The project team hasn't looked at other access points because the intersection is so busy. The second vehicle access is viewed more as a vehicle exit point more than a main entry, but it is needed to create circular traffic flow and for emergency vehicle access.

## **Traffic Questions**

- *Traveling Stafford has already been horrible, i.e. stop and go, during events at the golf course, Lakeview High School, or Luscher Farm. What evidence is there that suggests that Stafford will be able to support the additional traffic associated with a rec center?*
  - The traffic study looked at current conditions today and conditions a few years after development is built and determined that Stafford Road can accommodate this traffic from the improvements made in this project. Roadway standards in the future are determined by local agencies in Transportation System Plans. Road grade projects look at growth in the area for the next 20 years, not just the specific project. Traffic study is still in review and will be release once it is approved.
- *When will the traffic study be available for public viewing? Where can we access a copy?*
  - It will be made available when it is reviewed and finalized.
- *Will there be any changes to traffic signals as part of the project?*
  - No. Traffic signals are not currently part of the project.
- *Please explain what will be protecting the pedestrian from cars. Cars drive fast along Stafford.*
  - We don't have details yet, but we will enhance the existing pathway with a five-foot landscape buffer between the path and the road. Also, the speed limit in the corridor was reduced to 35 mph in 2020.
- *Is there a plan to put a walking path on the west side of Stafford road between the C3 church and the corner of Overlook?*
  - That is not part of this project, but Bruce will be happy to research that outside of this meeting.
- *We can expect more traffic passing through local neighborhoods and subdivisions. What considerations has this been given for this and concerns about overflowing parking in neighborhoods.*

- The parking will be contained on site. It is less accessible and less likely that people will park in surrounding neighborhoods. Hazalia Park is much closer and more likely to serve as overflow parking. There are ways of managing the parking in neighborhoods such as “no parking” signs.
- *Concerns about accessing Koawood Drive and other considerations for neighbors who are adjacent to other access points around the project area.*
  - The golf course design is not complete yet, but if we end up with an access trail from Koawood Drive to the golf course along the school district property line, it would be gated to allow it to be locked at certain times. If it’s a safety issue, the idea is to provide pedestrian access from the neighborhoods along a public multi-use pathway. Potentially might put in a sidewalk.

**General Questions:**

- *Will the gym be built to "immediate occupancy" earthquake standards? Will there be storage for first aid and other emergency gear at the site? How many people would the gym accommodate in an emergency?*
  - The project has not been planned to be built as emergency center – that would require a more intensive level of construction and seismic planning to accommodate that. This would need to be discussed with City Management. The school district will be completing seismic upgrades to many of its properties in the district this summer. The newly completed Lakeridge Middle School is built to seismic level four with some provisions to be an emergency shelter. Other seismic upgrades include improvements to large common area spaces such as gymnasiums and cafeterias.
- *Can you just briefly summarize what elements of the project are possible to change or modify as a result of public input and which cannot be changed?*
  - The City wants feedback early and often. Our goal is to reach out to get as much information between now and the end of design when we want to put our construction documents out to bid. Public feedback for this project has been solicited by two surveys; feedback can be reviewed in the project website. The next online outreach will include an online open house and a future community meeting. The public can reach out to Bruce Powers at any time.
- *What is the capital budget for this project and how are operating and capital costs shared between LOSD and the City?*
  - The capital budget for the project is \$30 million. The budget for golf course is \$3.2 million. The capital costs will be shared equally between the City and the school district (\$15 million each) and the City is paying for the golf course. The operating costs have not been negotiated and that will be part of the IGA process. The City and the district will share the operating costs, but the shares have not been determined at this point.
- *Does the \$30 million include the upgrades to Stafford. If not, where are those funds coming from?*
  - Yes, they are included in the \$30 million in the category of off-site improvements.
- *Previously, there were concerns that operating revenue would not be sufficient to cover operating costs, triggering a bond which would increase taxes.*
  - Swimming pools do operate as a service therefore there are tax dollars that go into the operations cost. That is part of the negotiation with the IGA, but it is also a consideration that the

City Council and School Board are both looking into. There is another consultant on the project that looks specifically at operations for public recreation facilities.

- *Are there noise considerations for the project?*
  - Most of the recreation elements are internal, so noise should be contained. Acoustics inside the recreation center are being considered to ensure it's comfortable for users.
- *I know the golf course design is ongoing and down the road...but will the 9 hole course design be more in line with designs where it is more of an "executive course", similar to the 9 hole layouts at Charbonneau where it is more than just short par 3 holes?*
  - Currently the initial concept is an "executive" course with 3-4 of the holes being par 4.
- *Has there EVER been a project that was changed because it can't handle the increased in traffic? Level of services seems to be debatable!*
  - Great question! In my 29 years of transportation projects, I have not seen projects die from increased traffic. Level of service does use actual traffic data and have standards for these levels. I know that doesn't always give people a great comfort level, but these are common practices with traffic engineers nationwide.
- *What will be the policy for out of district swim/polo teams for have access to use of pool for practice/games?*
  - The pricing policy will be aligned with our existing policy, out of city residents pay more for access.
- *How much use, pool time is allotted for "other teams"?*
  - We have not developed the program detail at this time, but we will follow the same or similar policy for prioritized use for other facilities. 1) LOSD/City programs, 2) LO based youth programs, 3) LO based adult, 4) non-res youth, 5) non-res adult, 6) commercial.
- *Will the golf course still be expected to provide enough revenue to support itself and other facilities? If so, what happens if it doesn't?*
  - The golf course operation was moved into the general fund in 2019, and the cost of operation is balanced with revenue from the course and general fund dollars.

## Public Comments

In addition to the Q&A function, members of the public were invited to use Jamboard and the ZOOM Chat function to provide comments related to traffic, general concerns and hopes for the project. Additional questions and comments from the public were also emailed in advance of the meeting.

### Traffic Concerns:

- My biggest concern with the Cloverleaf path is people parking along Banyon/Cloverleaf and walking up. We have enough issues with the High School parking.
- Compounding this issue is the large number of promises that were made to the neighborhood when Lakeridge High School was built, almost all of which have been broken.
- One thing that would help McVey traffic a lot is to close the couple of parking spots at the base of McVey where the road widens to 2 lanes as feeding into 43. Spreading into 2 lanes sooner would reduce the bottleneck. Those condos have parking lots and the 4 or so on street parking spots are not

justified given the bottleneck it causes. And there are public spots directly across street at Geo Rogers park entrance. It would improve traffic flow a lot. I've written city transport and planning a couple times the past 2 years and never got reply. It's a simple fix that would help a lot.

### **General Concerns:**

- I am also concerned that the modified golf course will be inappropriate for most of the people who currently use the course and will be uninteresting for the types of golfers that the parks and rec department is hoping to attract.
- I am especially concerned about the access point at Koawood Dr since it opens into our yard. My daughter is autistic and this will be a big safety hazard for her.

### **Hopes for the Project:**

- My biggest hope is that there are a variety of activities offered of good quality that will appeal to a wide variety of ages and families - healthy activities from yoga to zumba to water aerobics to exercise equip and classes etc. It would be great if neighbors met neighbors, had fun, increased level of community affinity. A magnet for fun and improved well being. Jim Desmond

### **Additional questions and comments from the Zoom Q&A and Live Chat:**

- Swimming is a healthy all ages activity. Ops cost at a pool pale in comparison to community value. I find it both surprising and unacceptable that a city of LO's size and quality does not have a public pool. This is long overdue in my opinion.
- Outdoor access to pool is a great idea!

## **Wrap Up and Next Steps**

Project team members thanked the community for attending and asking questions. Additional questions can be sent to Jenny Anderson and Bruce Powers and project updates will be posted on the project website. There will be an online open house soon, dates to be announced in the future.

## Appendix 1: Additional questions received from the public via email

- How would the worsened traffic and increased parking from this project be mitigated?
- My only comment is my strong support for a pedestrian pathway directly linking the sunny hill neighborhood to the community center, via the most direct route possible. The children in this area walk to the high school, since the community center will be close to the high school, this is a unique opportunity to link them all together.
- I feel that adding a recreation/aquatic center to the current public Golf Course on Stafford will increase the traffic 10-fold. Stafford road is already at it's limit. There have already been multiple accidents pre-covid. My question is why do you think putting a rec/aquatic center in an already congested/high traffic street and neighborhood is a good idea? The city had an opportunity to have a community center off of Kruse Way, where there would have been ample parking and the roads leading there could safely handle the traffic. Unfortunately, that is not the case on Stafford Road.
- Will there be an opportunity for open questions and discussion or will the meeting be managed in a way that does not permit such open consultation with members of the neighborhoods adjacent to the area of the project.

Will concerns about increased traffic and parking in our neighborhoods be seriously discussed or will be told again about results of a traffic study that was conducted two years ago that left many of us skeptical when we first heard claims based on that study.

Traffic and parking along Banyan, Koawood, Marjorie, and Cloverdale is a major concern. Children play on those streets, and many residents including senior citizens walk there every day.

- My family and I live in the Palisades neighborhood on Koawood Dr. A neighbor recently let me know that the current plans for modifying the golf course include a path to the recreation center that opens to our neighborhood at two places -- one at the junction of Cloverleaf and Banyan and the other at the junction of Banyan and Koawood. The second of these openings would be onto our property. I am concerned about this portion of the plan for a couple reasons.

I am worried that the opening at Banyan and Koawood will lead to a consistent flow of people into our yard. My daughter is autistic and the constant flow of people through our yard would be very upsetting for her and would be a safety hazard.

I am worried that one of the intentions of this plan is to use our neighborhood as additional parking for the recreation center. Aside from the increased foot traffic, I am worried that this will lead to much more automobile traffic in our neighborhood. This would again be a safety hazard, for pedestrians and residents and specifically for the large numbers of children and elderly in the neighborhood. It would also greatly damage the character of our neighborhood, making it less comfortable, less safe, and damaging property values.

Our neighborhood already contends with a sizable number of high school students parking on our streets on school days or during sporting events. This sometimes means groups of excited or angry students walking through the neighborhood late at night, screaming and vandalizing. Encouraging more traffic in our neighborhood will compound this problem.

Aside from this issue, it doesn't seem prudent to build a congregate facility, like the recreation center, during the pandemic. Although we are all hopeful about the possibility of the pandemic abating, the time when it will be safe to open this type of facility is still uncertain and the city could spend the roughly \$20 million needed to build the recreation center and not be able to open it for a long time. Once built, the

facility will need to be maintained, regardless of whether it is open or not, and opening it prematurely could lead to proliferation of the virus (or its variants) and expose the city to additional liability.

Furthermore, I remain concerned about the modifications planned for the golf course. The golf course was a large source of revenue for the city last year since it was one of the few places available for recreation in Lake Oswego during the pandemic. Shutting down the course for an extended period of time during the pandemic will eliminate this source of revenue. I also feel strongly that the new design won't meet the needs of the golfers that currently play the course. With the proposed changes, the course will be much less suitable for beginners, for summer classes, for older golfers, for the student teams, and for groups that regularly visit the course, like the Special Olympics. It will also be unlikely to draw the more skilled golfers that the plan is designed to attract. Why would a more skilled golfer visit a mediocre 9-hole course, like the one proposed, when there are several other full-featured 18-hole courses in the area? It seems like the City Council or the Parks and Recreation Department is trying to destroy the golf course, possibly in hopes of eventually being able to repurpose the land for another use in the future. This is distressing for many of us who play the course frequently, especially those of us who play the course as a family activity.

The impact of this project on our neighborhood has often made me think that our neighborhood needs legal representation. As the plan has continued to evolve, the concerns of our neighborhood are consistently ignored and the likely impacts on our neighborhood remain substantial, despite our efforts with the neighborhood association, the City Council, and the Parks and Recreation Department. In addition, the surveys conducted to support the project were biased and poorly constructed, making it seem like their purpose was to provide cover for a predetermined outcome. This has been frustrating and has led me to think that obtaining legal representation might be the only way to be heard and have our concerns addressed.

I very much hope that the webinar tomorrow night will address some of these concerns. Thanks.

- How would the worsened traffic and increased parking from this project be mitigated?
- When will the Traffic Study be completed? How will it impact design and scope of project?
- Neighbors across Stafford from the site are very concerned about traffic/congestion on Stafford. The neighborhoods off Bergis road (Stafford Oaks, Rolling Hills Farm) and especially the "Stafford Park" new development street adjacent to Hazelia field/dog park (which is essentially across the street) share this concern. These neighborhoods rely on crossing Stafford as pedestrians to access walking path to Hazelia and Lakeridge and downtown LO and it is dangerous as is, let alone with increased traffic pulling in/out of aquatic center. Cross walks across Stafford, or a walking path east side of Stafford from Bergis to Overlook's existing cross walk would solve that. Left hand vehicle turns out of these neighborhoods onto Stafford is also of concern. Need to make sure turn lanes don't block these neighborhood connections to Stafford road if there are cars queuing to enter aquatic center/golf course.

Location of pool itself on the property. Will houses hear pool noise? Can any outdoor spaces associated with pools face away from the road to limit noise toward neighborhoods and point toward high school/golf course?

Other than that, all my neighbors are excited to have a rec pool and dry athletic space so close!