



## City of Lake Oswego Natural Resources Advisory Board Minutes

December 20, 2006

**APPROVED**

### I. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Co-Chair Craig Diamond called the Natural Resources Advisory Board meeting of December 20, 2006 to order at approximately 6:30 p.m. in the City Council Work Room of City Hall, 380 "A" Avenue, Lake Oswego, Oregon.

Members present besides Co-Chair Craig Diamond were Co-Chair William Gaar, Sarah Asby, Morgan Holen, Nancy Gronowski and Stephanie Wagner. Douglas Rich was excused. Staff Liaison was Jonna Papaefthimiou, Natural Resources Planner. Other staff present were Joel Komarek, City Engineer; and Deb Weschelblatt, AmeriCorps worker.

Guests were Carolyn Jones, Carolyn Krebs, Lisa Fopel and Jim Bolland.

### II. PUBLIC COMMENT

**Carolyn Jones** asked the Natural Resources Advisory Board (NRAB) to ensure the City took the same level of care of the environment as it required of private property owners. She cited examples of City tree-cutting in parks and the City not doing anything about oily highway runoff flowing into a nearby stream. She related it had been costly to get permission to build in the stream corridor on her property and she pointed out that phosphorous would fall from the atmosphere and run into streams even if there were not roofs for it to run off of.

### III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**The Minutes of July 19, September 20 and October 18, 2006 were adopted** as corrected to identify speakers, clarify two statements, and correct the spelling of the name, Mattison, **by unanimous vote of those members present and eligible to vote.**

### IV. REGULAR BUSINESS

#### *Sewer Interceptor Update*

**Joel Komarek, City Engineer**, reported that the interceptor replacement project would replace a deficient existing system that had been built in the 1960s which lacked capacity, was deteriorating and was seismically vulnerable. He reported the City had not yet decided whether to build an in-lake or out-of-lake system. He described the studies and testing that had been done and explained the remaining alternatives, which

included a trussed in-lake system, or a buoyant in-lake system. He described the most likely piping, joint and truss materials to be used. He explained temperature changes could make the interceptor pipe expand and contract by as much as 17 feet. He anticipated the project would require two “draw-downs” of the lake. He clarified that the City owned the strip of lakebed the pipe laid on, but the Lake Corporation owned the lake. He anticipated the old pipe would be capped and left in place.

Mr. Komarek recalled that local concerns about algae control had been addressed at a recent City Council meeting. He reported the City’s sewer system had been inspected and some areas of clogs were being cleaned out. He said the estimated cost of replacing the current interceptor had risen from an original estimate of \$21 million to \$50 to \$70 million. He explained a stakeholder committee had originally established the criteria for selecting a system and he showed the list of permits required for the project. He advised the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) issued a discharge citation if the discharge after a heavy rainfall exceeded that of a 5-year event. He said the City was most recently cited for discharge after a 2.5-year rainfall event. He said the out-of-lake alternative would require the City to build a number of pump stations and power stations and some would likely be in lake easements. He anticipated that construction could take place between 2009 and 2011. Co-Chair Diamond requested that the NRAB be allowed to evaluate the environmental impacts of each alternative. The Board members planned to discuss the lake interceptor project again at a later meeting.

### ***Council Report Recap***

Co-Chairs Diamond and Gaar reported that they had presented NRAB goals to the City Council and heard several Councilors were receptive to the idea of establishing a separate Sustainability Board and wanted the NRAB to draft a related recommendation. They said the Councilors also seemed receptive to the idea of an urban forestry plan. They said they had explained to the Councilors that the Tree Ordinance would just be a part of the broader plan and the Board wanted to educate the public on the value of an urban forestry plan that would include the Tree Ordinance. They explained taking an “ecosystem approach” would also give the Tree Ordinance more flexibility. Ms. Papaefthimiou explained the process was that the Councilors would consider NRAB suggested goals at their goal setting work session and thereafter convey to the Board what they expected from the Board. She agreed to summarize and distribute to the members her notes of Councilors’ comments during the NRAB presentation.

### ***Introduce Urban and Community Forestry Coordinator and Heritage Tree Update***

**Deb Weschelblatt, AmeriCorps volunteer**, anticipated that the City would soon purchase new software to use to begin the tree inventory that would eventually provide data for an urban forestry management plan. She said she planned to ask neighborhood associations to identify a tree subcommittee or “point person” to help recruit volunteers to assist in the project. She planned to start in the First Addition Neighborhood and Old Town inventorying trees in the public right-of-way. She said a representative from the Oregon Department of Forestry would help train volunteers and she anticipated they would start work in the spring and the inventory project would take two to three years to complete. She explained that the City planned to survey trees on private property from

the air. She said she would also help Ms. Papaefthimiou fashion the management plan and she would work on educational outreach efforts to let people know Lake Oswego had an urban and community forestry program. One of the guests, who chaired the Lake Oswego Neighborhood Action Coalition, suggested that Ms. Weschelblatt meet with LONAC, too.

During the ensuing discussion a participant worried that even though the record of three years of Tree Removal Permits showed a “staggering” number of trees had been cut, trees removed for a Planned Development were not counted and the City Arborist was not involved in PD plans for tree removal. Another person was concerned that natural resources were not even documented in her neighborhood before a PD was built over them.

Ms. Weschelblatt reported she was working on making Heritage Tree application forms more informative and drafting a new Heritage Tree arborist’s evaluation form and a Heritage Tree inspection form (to be kept current by City employees). She said she planned a Heritage Tree program and map display at the library. She clarified that Heritage Tree status was voluntary and the property owner signed a covenant that transferred with the deed. She said a Heritage Tree could be removed with a Type 2 Tree Removal Permit if it became a hazard. She explained the public would be invited to nominate Heritage Trees, the NRAB would review the nominations and select Heritage Trees, and the new group of Heritage Trees would be announced during Arbor Week. Co-chair Diamond asked the City Arborist to come to the selection meeting to discuss the nominations. The members suggested that schools might be interested in nominating candidates for Heritage Trees.

## **V. ADJOURNMENT**

NRAB members presented Ms. Papaefthimiou with a card and gift to thank her for her assistance. There being no further business Co-Chair Diamond adjourned the meeting at 8:43 p. m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jonna Papaefthimiou  
Natural Resources Planner