



City of Lake Oswego Sustainability Advisory Board Minutes

October 20, 2008

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chair Jean Baumann called the Sustainability Advisory Board meeting of October 20, 2008 to order at approximately 6:30 p.m. at the West End Building, 4101 Kruse Way, Lake Oswego, Oregon.

Members present: Chair Jean Baumann, Vice Chair Dorothy Atwood, Matt Briggs, Bruce Brown (alternate); Jeff DeWitt (via telephone); Craig Diamond, Ron Gronowski, Lisa Murphy, Patrick Rowe, Jacob Shimkus, Amin Wahab, and Grant Watkinson. Staff present: Stephan Lashbrook, Community Development Director; Sidaro Sin, Senior Planner; and Susan Millhauser, Sustainability Planner.

MINUTES

The Minutes of August 27 and September 15, 2008 were edited and **approved** by unanimous vote.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Baumann announced that the Natural Resources Advisory Board (NRAB) wanted to host a “potluck” dinner so members of both boards could get to know each other. SAB members were interested and asked the staff to coordinate the schedule and alert the members.

SAB members had received an invitation to a water conservation presentation on October 30th at Tualatin Valley Water District facilities. Chair Baumann planned to attend and report back to SAB members who could not attend.

Members who had attended the Sustainable Industries breakfast meeting the previous week reported they found the presentation by Karl-Henrik Robert of The Natural Step to be motivating and educational. They said they had met more people from the Natural Step Network and learned some things about what the private sector and other countries were doing from the various speakers. They recalled speakers had stressed the need to promote collaboration and an interdisciplinary approach. Chair Baumann thanked the City for paying for some SAB members to attend.

PUBLIC COMMENT (None)

REGULAR BUSINESS

Review Agenda

Chair Baumann highlighted the agenda items.

Comprehensive Plan Update Process

Sidaro Sin, Senior Planner, described the Comprehensive Plan update process and timeline. He said it included a State mandated periodic review to ensure that five components of the Comprehensive Plan (housing, economic development, transportation, public facilities and services, and urbanization) complied with Oregon law and State guidelines. Mr. Sin noted that the Comprehensive Plan had not been reviewed and updated in a comprehensive way since 1994. He explained that this first phase was the development of a work program and review of the five components required by periodic review, as shown on the handout. He noted that the next part would be a broader community “visioning” process to identify how Comprehensive Plan goals and policies should be changed to more accurately reflect what the community wanted. He encouraged everyone to attend one of two open houses on October 23rd and November 6th. He said the staff was fashioning a work program to present to the City Council, which would then be forwarded to the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) for approval. He anticipated the changes would begin to be implemented by 2012.

During the questioning period, Board members wanted to know when and how the SAB could provide input. The staff confirmed they could submit comments for the staff to include in their report to the Planning Commission and they could comment at the open houses and/or at Planning Commission and City Council meetings as individuals or as a board. The Planning Commission was to consider the work program in late November or early December.

SAB members suggested the Board look at each Comprehensive Plan goal and consider how sustainability could be incorporated into it. They stressed it was important to ensure citizens understood what sustainability meant and understood The Natural Step framework during the visioning process. Mr. Sin suggested the Board submit their comments and recommendations regarding the work program before the City Council met to determine the scope of the update process.

Chair Baumann recalled the SAB was considering adding an item to their own work plan to appoint SAB liaisons to work with other boards and commissions to promote major initiatives. She hoped the City Council would give them authority to do that. She noted each of the five periodic review categories had major sustainability implications. Mr. Sin explained the work program would specify what studies and analysis were to be done, and the results would inform the community visioning process. Chair Baumann anticipated the SAB would fashion their input about the work program at the next two board meetings so they could submit it to the City Council in time to influence their decision. When asked if Comprehensive Plan goals and policies were binding, Mr. Sin clarified that they were implemented and became regulatory policy via revisions to the Community Development Code, and that the current process was intended to ensure all goals and policies were consistent, and did not conflict with each other. Thus, when a sustainability policy was implemented in the code it became a regulation.

2008-09 Goals & Work Plan

Work Teams v. Sub-committees

Chair Baumann pointed out an October 17th memorandum from the City Attorney that advised that the SAB had to get approval from the City Council to create any subgroup that would take action for or make recommendations to the full Board, or that required staffing. However, he clarified that City Council approval would not be necessary if they formed a work group that would not make any recommendations, but just gathered information and brought it back to the full Board for their decision, or that carried out actions previously agreed to by the full Board. She suggested the Board postpone talking about *how* they would implement their work plan until after they had decided *what* the work plan they planned to present to the City Council in November would be.

Work Plan – Draft 2

Chair Baumann observed a consensus to rename the work plan the “2009 Goals & Work Plan” because it was so late in 2008. The members examined Draft 2 of the Work Plan and continued their discussion of work plan details, starting with Goal 3, “Identify and support initiatives noted in the 2008 City Council Goals.” They debated whether to remove this item because it referred to initiatives the Council had already adopted, or was about to adopt.

Vice Chair Atwood **moved** to remove Section 3. Mr. Diamond **seconded** the motion and discussion followed. Mr. Lashbrook advised the SAB might want to continue their support of initiatives such as the water conservation plan, which was just the start of a conservation effort, and the outdoor lighting ordinance, which would only apply to public property and needed to be expanded to apply to private property. Members discussed how to reconcile Goal 3 work plan details with Goal 4, “Make recommendations for 2009 Council goals.” They reasoned those two sections should remain separate: Section 3 was to address 2008 initiative efforts that should continue in 2009; and Section 4 clarified that the SAB would recommend goals for the Council to adopt for 2009.

Vice Chair Atwood stressed the need for continuity, then **amended her motion** to revise Goal 3 to say, “Support sustainability related initiatives in the 2008 City Council goals.” Grant Watkinson **seconded** the motion and it **passed**, but two members had abstained. They explained they still did not understand language that indicated the SAB would assign individual members to represent the SAB in the selected initiatives. Chair Baumann explained that she had drafted the document to convey the intention that the board would assign one or two representatives to work on each specific initiative planning effort, but the full SAB would decide what initiatives started in 2008 they wanted to continue to support and what 2009 goals they would recommend to the City Council. The dissenters then indicated they felt more comfortable supporting the motion. Chair Baumann suggested the board could examine the 2008 goals to see if others might be sustainability related besides the four goals listed in Section 3(ii). She asked if the members wanted to remove the list of four “key initiatives to support.” Board members advised that a work plan needed details; the list of four initiatives would offer the Council a sense of what SAB members were thinking; they acknowledged the Council could decide to remove them; and they noted the “e.g.” showed the initiatives listed in the draft were not necessarily the only ones the Board would support.

Mr. Diamond **moved** to accept Goal 3 work plan details (i) through (iii). Mr. Briggs **seconded** the motion and it **passed** by unanimous agreement.

The group generally agreed the Work Plan should clearly indicate that the SAB would generate their own suggestions and recommendations for appropriate 2009 goals and not just regurgitate others'. Chair Baumann observed a consensus to modify Goal 4 to specify the SAB was to make recommendations prior to the City Council 2009 goal setting session and support the adopted goals. The staff anticipated the Council goal-setting session would be held in January 2009.

Mr. Diamond **moved** to accept Section 4 as modified. Vice Chair Atwood **seconded** the motion. Discussion followed and the group considered removing redundant items from sections 3 and 4. Mr. Diamond **amended his motion** by moving to adopt Section 4, but eliminate Item iii. The motion **passed** by unanimous agreement.

The SAB then examined Goal 5 work plan details. They agreed the document should reflect that there were other approaches besides The Natural Step and Triple Bottom Line to be looked at that were used in places such as Germany, Sweden, Berkeley, California and Cambridge, Massachusetts. Mr. Diamond suggested adding a statement under i.: "Identify and secure funding resources." They also discussed a suggestion to add an item to adopt a climate action plan by community vote under Goal 5 or 7. Mr. Briggs stressed it should be given its own section, so it would stand out as a goal, and not be one of the multiple initiatives listed under Goal 7. He held the number one thing the community could do was focus on energy consumption. Another member indicated she was not comfortable setting it apart from the other initiatives. Some suggested "Develop a climate action plan for the City of Lake Oswego as part of the Sustainability Plan" could be something the SAB recommended as a 2009 Council goal. Members clarified that input from the community should be solicited during the planning process prior to drafting the Community Sustainability Plan, as well as after the Plan was drafted.

Mr. Watkinson **moved** to accept the changes to the Goal 5 work plan details, the motion was seconded and **passed** by unanimous vote.

The Board examined Goal 6. Mr. Gronowski (?) **moved** to adopt Goal 6 work plan details as written. Vice Chair Atwood **seconded** the motion and it **passed** by unanimous agreement

Then the Board examined Goal 7 and the listed initiatives. When they discussed the first two projects on the list, Chair Baumann reported that a Lake Corporation member had suggested the initiative for a hydropower project. Mr. Lashbrook indicated his experience was the Lake Corporation did not put a high priority on power generation. A Board member explained he believed that PGE described some power sources as "renewable" when they actually weren't. SAB members suggested other projects to be added to the list of initiatives under Goal 7. They suggested projects to address local transportation and energy issues, bike boulevards, and a green building initiative. They acknowledged the list was long, but they thought it would offer the City Council a sense of what the Board was thinking. Chair Baumann recalled the SAB had previously agreed to accomplish "at least" three important initiatives, but they might be able to work on more. She noted the listed initiatives were offered as examples of projects they might choose to work on or that the City Council might ask them to work on. The board discussed whether to further discuss and refine the list of initiatives or to eliminate it for now and discuss at

a later date. The members also discussed not limiting the number of projects to three by adding the phrase “at least”.

Mr. Diamond **moved** to eliminate the “e.g.” in item 7(i) and listed projects 1 through 12. Mr. Briggs (?) **seconded** the motion and it **passed** by unanimous agreement. Mr. Shimkus (?) **moved** to revise Goal 7 to call for the SAB to identify and support “at least” three important initiatives. The motion was **seconded** and **passed** by unanimous agreement.

The Board then recalled the City Attorney’s advice regarding forming subgroups and considered how to use them. They anticipated that drafting a Community Sustainability Plan would be such a significant effort they would need to utilize a subgroup and they would likely want that group to fashion recommendations. The staff suggested an alternative in which members of a subgroup would each individually offer their own recommendations to the full board. They suggested the SAB alert the City Council at the work session that they would likely need to ask them to allow the SAB to form a subgroup(s) and that they anticipated the Community Sustainability Planning process would require additional staffing resources. Chair Baumann observed the SAB had just adopted “Work Plan - Draft 3.”

Prepare for Study Session with City Council

The SAB was scheduled to present their draft Work Plan to the City Council at a November 13th Council work session. The City Council was scheduled to vote on it at their December 2nd meeting. The members generally agreed that Chair Baumann, Mr. Watkinson, Vice Chair Atwood, Mr. Diamond and Mr. Rowe would prepare the presentation packet and PowerPoint presentation.

Next Steps

Chair Baumann anticipated the Board would use the final two meetings of the year to refine the Work Plan after the City Council reviewed it, and fashion their 2009 goals recommendation for the Council. She noted an SAB/City Council study session was scheduled for November 13th, a few days before the regular SAB November 17th meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting was scheduled for November 17, 2008. There being no further business Chair Baumann adjourned the meeting at 8:49 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Millhauser,
Sustainability Planner

L:\Boards & Commissions\SAB\Minutes\SAB2008 10-20 DRAFT.doc

