



## CITY OF LAKE OSWEGO

### Sustainability Advisory Board / Natural Resources Advisory Board Joint Meeting Minutes

August 10, 2011

#### CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

SAB Co-chair Bruce Brown called the August 10, 2011 joint meeting of the Sustainability Advisory Board (SAB) and Natural Resources Advisory Board to order at 6:30 p.m. in the Santiam Room of the West End Building, 4104 Kruse Way, Lake Oswego, Oregon.

SAB members present: Co-chair Bruce Brown, Gregory Monahan, Lisa Adatto, Andre DeBar, Daniel Gottlieb, Vidya Kale and Suzanne Spencer

NRAB members present: Co-Chairs Denise Dailey and Doug Rich; Stephanie Wagner and Craig Stephens

SAB members excused/absent: Sarah Asby and E. Jay Murphy

NRAB members excused/absent: Kara Warner and Benjamin Clark

Guests: Laurie Hughes; Sandy Intraversato, PRAB Co-chair; Nancy Gronowski; Laura Masterson; Jim Johnson, Lake Oswego Planning Commission and Oregon Department of Agriculture; Maryanne Conway; Tania Lola Rain; Steve Papp; Mark Olen; Mary Olson, City Council

Council Liaison: Sally Moncrieff (SAB) was present; Bill Tierney (NRAB) was not present

Staff present: Susan Millhauser, Sustainability Coordinator; David Donaldson, Assistant City Manager; Jordan Wheeler, NRAB Liaison; Ryan Stee, Park Project Manager

#### ANNOUNCEMENTS

Matt Briggs was going to offer free tours of his near net zero home the following Saturday. The SAB was hosting the Electric Vehicle Expo on August 21.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

Sandy Intraversato read aloud and then submitted a letter she had sent to City Council regarding Luscher area planning. She asked all three boards to work together.

## REGULAR BUSINESS

### **Luscher Area Master Plan (Discuss and develop input)**

Gregory Monahan had drafted a memorandum to spur the discussion. As he wrote them on the whiteboard the group added to his list of topics and then discussed whether to formulate a recommendation, ask for more information or just make a statement related to each topic. During the discussion they indicated they wanted more information about the current Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) designation. They wanted to know if the plan was consistent with the City's sustainability plan and framework. Millhauser advised that plan was limited to City operations. Brown suggested using the 20 Minute Neighborhood framework. That raised the issue of transportation. One "stepping stone to the future" would be to plan for bus stops now so they would be there for future mass transit and meanwhile serve special event shuttle buses. The group recalled the existing needs analysis for playing fields was ten years old. Demographics had changed since then and popularity of some sports had changed. They saw a need to have a current analysis. They saw a need to establish a sequence of development in the Luscher area so there would be new farmland established before the existing farmland was shut down. They wondered whether farm planning was premature. It was suggested that there be a timeline that integrated farm area planning with the Comprehensive Plan update and the Parks 2025 System Plan. All plans should consistently meet the City's sustainability and natural resource protection goals. The group wanted to clarify the historic area boundary. They wondered if the City's planning criteria considered the best use of land. Would it allow a ball field to be developed on excellent farming soil?

The group asked Jim Johnson to comment on land use. He clarified that he was speaking for himself, not as a Planning Commissioner. He believed the farm area was large enough in size and important enough to the entire community to be treated as a district, rather than as a neighborhood park or facilities plan. He personally hoped it could be processed through the land use process and come before the Planning Commission. One reason for that was it had impacts to land uses on its edges. Another was that what the City did in the Luscher area would give people an indication of the City's position on long term urbanization of Stafford. If it brought in the park people would expect it would support others who wanted to urbanize their land. The Mayor and the Planning and Parks department heads were talking about the process. They had decided to slow it down. Councilor Moncrieff confirmed the area was outside the City, but she advised that the City did plan areas in the Urban Services Boundary (USB). Mr. Johnson advised the part that was outside the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) would have to go through the county land use process, but envisioning what the area would be a City function. The City needed to decide what its long term position on urbanizing Stafford was going to be. The group added that topic to its list: The City needed to decide what its vision was for the Stafford area.

Co-chair Brown observed that the plan was in part a response to a strong demand for ball fields. The group discussed whether the sustainable approach was more than just looking at the plan itself. If there was a need for more sports fields perhaps the City should look for the most sustainable locations within the City that people could walk or bike to. They might not be on good farmland. If that was not possible some “stepping stones” to the future in the form of bus stops for the people who used the area should be planned. The group added these topics to its list: A needs analysis; clarity regarding whether or not the City wants a farm; and the issue of whether the urban agriculture area (currently farmed as a community supported agriculture (CSA) farm) should be moved from the high value organic farmland it was currently on. The plan said that 79% of the area was natural area and 21% was neighborhood park. Rich saw a need to clearly define “natural area” and “open space.” Did that include the area where crops were planted? He did not consider an area with a paved path and a picnic table and benches in concrete to be a natural area.

Millhauser recalled that the Parks and Recreation director’s memorandum clarified that additional development could not happen outside of the UGB. So ball fields could not be installed outside the UGB. An event facility was subject to a conditional use permit. NRAB members advised that if additional area was going to be put in the UGB the NRAB wanted to protect the natural resources on that land. Others noted it seemed like a strange sequence to design the site before the other steps were taken. Stephens explained he would prefer to see Stephens Meadows designated as natural open space so it would not get developed as part of the plan.

Co-chair Brown outlined the SAB’s four mega goals: By 2050 the City should be a net zero carbon city; a nature neutral water city (using only the water that fell within the City’s footprint); a zero waste city and a zero toxins city. Others observed that what was in the plan should help the City meet those goals. A living building would be a net zero water facility that did not depend on pipe buried in the street. The group needed more information about the wetlands on the site of the future tennis center. It needed more information about how current building and development standards required developers to manage stormwater runoff and protect wetlands. Rich recalled the new park on the waterfront had impermeable surfaces. He wondered how that had happened. The NRAB had not been consulted at all. Brown related the SAB had recommended that Council adopt a goal to make capital improvement decisions based on the full lifecycle costs, not just a ten or fifteen year cost analysis.

The topics list included creating a timeline. Wheeler asked the Boards to provide a response or recommendation by mid-September. The group then sorted the topics and assigned members to draft the related language for each topic. They had an answer to the issue of moving productive organic farmland somewhere with different soil types and slopes. It had a unique value. The UGB and current zoning protected it as farmland. They would recommend it not be moved. They needed more information about transportation from the staff and other boards. They would recommend clear definitions. They needed a better understanding of the impact on natural resources. They wanted to gain an understanding of the historic area designation; the related regulations; and if those requirements were being met. They would consult the HRAB. They wanted the plan to provide for a future bus stop and shuttle turnarounds. The group wanted their boards to be involved in the development and they wanted the Planning

Commission to review it. They wanted the City to do a communitywide sports facilities needs assessment. The operation of a City facility in the farm area had to be consistent with the City's sustainability plan. The City should decide what its vision was for the Stafford area because the plan would affect it. The plan should show where the UGB was and if existing ball fields were inside or outside of it.

PRAB members who had come to the meeting explained the Luscher planning process was third in line behind the Comprehensive Plan and the Parks System Plan. But they needed a current plan that addressed the entire farm area in order to get grants for trails and pathways. Since the consultants had been hired and were being paid three-quarters of a million dollars they asked them to make the farm area part of their larger parks planning study. They explained the existing Luscher master plan only addressed half the acreage the City owned today. It did not address all today's uses. When they applied for the grants they had to be able to "check the box" to verify they had a current plan for the entire area that reflected all the uses there.

The group agreed to meet again on August 24 to continue their work. Donaldson related the City as updating the recreational field requirements as part of the Parks System master planning effort. He hoped it would be done by the end of the month. He related the Council had asked the staff to slow down the Luscher planning effort.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The next joint meeting was scheduled on August 24. There being no further business Co-chair Brown adjourned the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Millhauser  
Sustainability Coordinator

L:\Boards & Commissions\SAB\Minutes\2011\LO SAB-NRAB 2011 08-10 APPROVED.doc