



CITY OF LAKE OSWEGO NATURAL RESOURCES ADVISORY BOARD MINUTES

MAY 17, 2006

APPROVED

I. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Co-Chair Craig Diamond called the Natural Resources Advisory Board meeting of Wednesday, May 17, 2006 to order at approximately 6:30 p.m. in the Human Resources Conference Room of City Hall, 380 "A" Avenue, Lake Oswego, Oregon.

Members present besides Co-Chair Craig Diamond were Co-Chair William Gaar, Ellen Adams, Sarah Asby, Morgan Holen, Nancy Gronowski, and Greg Wells (student representative). Russell Jones was not present. City Councilor Frank Groznik was also present. Staff present were Jonna Papaefthimiou, Assistant Planner; Annie Bergelin, AmeriCorps; David Odom, Assistant Planner; and *Dennis Egner, Long Range Planning Manager.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Stewardship Report

Annie Bergelin, AmeriCorps, reported that 41 volunteers had participated in an Earth Day event to remove ivy from trees in Iron Mountain Park. She said Starbucks had provided snacks and SOLV and Friends of Brookside had participated. She said the Uplands Elementary School students had conducted an ivy pull, and there were 20 volunteers signed up to work the following Saturday. She related that the Hallinan and Glenmorrie Neighborhood Associations were working together in several areas.

III. REGULAR BUSINESS

Lake Grove - Discussion

Co-Chair Gaar related the recent history of planning the Boones Ferry Road corridor through Lake Grove. He noted the initial plan had focused on traffic-oriented solutions and called for a wider road with limited turns, consolidated driveways, a fifth lane for turning, and medians. More recently, a working group was fashioning a more pedestrian-friendly "Town Center." However, several property owners had formed a separate group that planned to write a minority report calling for a full economic study before the City proceeded.

Sustainability Efforts Update

Co-Chair Diamond announced that he had applied to serve on the Community Center Steering Committee as an individual because he could not represent a group. He reported learning that the Natural Resources Advisory Board (NRAB) memorandum to the

Council recommending that the Platinum Standard be followed in developing the site had been forwarded to the architects.

Community Forestry Update/Discussion

Ms. Holen related that she was a forester. She explained she had researched the recent history of proposed changes to the Tree Code. She questioned why the City did not have a community forestry plan when other cities had such plans in place. She advised that the Tree Code focused on individual trees, but a Community Forestry Plan would allow broader consideration of the aesthetic and ecological aspects of the urban landscape. She asked the Board to discuss the idea. Members observed such a plan would help the City make better decisions related to individual trees. For example, it might facilitate removal of a tree someone had planted years ago and wanted to remove, or removal of a tree in order to replace it with a more appropriate tree. They anticipated it would reduce the opportunity for someone to use the Tree Code as a tool to delay a development. They anticipated it would require the City to identify its significant trees.

Mr. Odom related that he was a certified arborist, with a degree in Forestry. He explained the City currently required a developer to consider alternative site plans that would relocate the footprint in order to save a tree. He advised an urban forestry plan would not replace the Tree Code. Ms. Holen said the Task Force that had been asked to suggest revisions to the Tree Code had focused on protecting native over ornamental trees, and not just all trees over a certain diameter. Mr. Odom advised trees could currently be removed for either development or landscaping purposes. Ms. Holen suggested asking Chris Roth to speak about the efforts of the Task Force that had recommended changes to the Tree Code. She reasoned that if a community forestry plan were in place, everyone would be aware of what their responsibilities and constraints were before they asked for tree removal. The group indicated they were not certain whether the Board was charged with reviewing and commenting on the Tree Code, but the Co-Chairs said the NRAB was a resource for the City Council and they observed there was general agreement to proceed to discuss the matter and possibly forward a recommendation to the City Council. Ms. Holen agreed to write a summary of the current discussion for the membership to discuss at their next meeting.

NRAB Decision-Making Process

The Board considered what alternatives there might be to physically attending a special meeting to vote on a pressing issue. Co-Chair Gaar distributed copies of the rules related to public meetings. He observed that e-mailing information back and forth between members and staff prior to an electronic vote would violate the rules because it was considered deliberation. He offered to discuss with the City Attorney whether the NRAB could be allowed to collect information on a public web page before an electronic vote. The members generally agreed to table the matter until he reported back to them at the next meeting.

Recruiting More Candidates for NRAB

Co-Chair Diamond reported that there were at least two candidates for the two open board positions, but he understood the City Council required more than one candidate for each

seat before they conducted interviews. He asked how the Board could help facilitate the process. He anticipated that he would discuss the procedure with City Councilors and suggest that they schedule interviews if there was at least one well-qualified candidate. He asked members to think about what qualities a highly-qualified candidate should have so they could discuss recruiting at their next meeting.

Lake Grove Village Center Plan Update

*Dennis Egner, Long Range Development Manager, joined the meeting. He distributed copies of the draft Lake Grove Village Center Plan. He explained the Planning Commission had asked staff to present it to each of the City's advisory groups and solicit their comments before the September hearings. He said he would return to hear their comments and recommendations at the next NRAB meeting. He related the history of planning the corridor since the corridor concept plan had been fashioned in 2003. He explained the current Advisory Committee had worked hard to achieve consensus between business and neighborhood interests and they were to present both a Plan and Code implementation amendments to the Planning Commission. When asked, he suggested the NRAB might be most interested in parts of the plan that discussed natural resource areas; potential sites for the Village Commons that featured natural resources; how the "Gateway" would be designed with a "trees" theme; the "Green Street" concept; pedestrian/bikeway connections; and the project list. He noted, however, that the entire plan focused on fashioning a sustainable, "walkable," district with more housing. He offered to bring copies of the draft Code to the next meeting if the members wanted to examine it.

During the questioning period, he clarified that the draft plan did not include one segment of existing pathway easement between Bryant Road and Reese Road because the adjacent neighborhood wanted it to serve as a buffer and they did not want a pathway installed close to their homes, and the adjacent commercial property owners had already given up frontage for the street and did not want to have to give up more land for the pathway in the rear. He pointed out, however, that there would still be a similar usable through-connection using driveways instead of a separate pathway. He described the general makeup of the representation on the Advisory Committee as a "balance" of interests. He recalled they had reached a consensus regarding allowable building height by stepping it down toward the neighborhoods. He related that a group had formed that opposed the median. He clarified that even with a median there could be driveway access for almost every property along the corridor. He anticipated the City would find a segment of the corridor in which to build a "demonstration" project to test the concept of the median. He confirmed the City had enlisted the help of a transportation consultant who advised that the U-Turn program should work in the narrow right-of-way, except for larger trucks. He reported the Planning Commission Chair planned to discuss the issue with the adversaries. Mr. Egner related that he had initially believed staff could conduct some kind of economic analysis for the dissenting group, until they heard the group wanted a site-by-site analysis. The experts he had consulted were not sure how such a study could be done. He anticipated it would be the construction impacts that would be the hardest on any already marginal businesses. Board members thanked Mr. Egner for his presentation and he left the meeting. They subsequently agreed that each individual member was to read the draft plan and forward their written comments to Co-Chair Diamond, who would

compile them and send them back to the members so they could prepare to discuss them at the next meeting. They anticipated they would use the next two meetings to discuss and formulate their comments to the Planning Commission.

Meeting Time

The Board members unanimously agreed to change their regular meeting time to 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business Co-Chair Diamond adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:30 p. m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jonna Papaefthimiou
Assistant Planner