



# Golf Tennis Feasibility Study Meeting #3

**Wednesday, September 30, 2009**  
5:00 p.m.

**West End Building**  
4101 Kruse Way

---

I. **Review Process & Guiding Principles**  
The meeting began at 5:07 p.m.

In attendance were Ron Bailey, Richard Singer and Jack Kamrath from PBK Consulting, Kim Gilmer, Director of Parks, Gary Evans, Assistant Director of Parks, Tom Mueller, Golf Course Manager; PRAB members: John McComish, Sandy Intraversato, Steve Dodds, Susan Senf Smith and Michael Fontenot.

Sub-Committee members attending were Robert Eidson, Mary Hammond, Marianne Conroy, Walter Ledsema, Katherine Frewing Shallenberger, Kevin Daly, Mark Ohlson, Doug Oliphant, Jennifer Pierce Zahniser, Gary McKenzie, Charles Oldham.

Guests: Members of the community who signed in were:

Les Modell, 9830 SW Durham, Tigard  
Mike & Jo Hatfield, 1981 SW Park Forest, Lake Oswego  
Jan & Bob Campbell, 14 Walking Woods Dr., Lake Oswego  
Tom Holder, 481 Iron Mountain Blvd., Lake Oswego  
Pam Andresen, 17966 St. Clair Dr., Lake Oswego  
Lynne Pavetchan, 17339 Blue Heron Rd., Lake Oswego

Kim Gilmer opened the meeting and reviewed what the team hoped to accomplish during the meeting, which included to come up with a preferred recommendation for golf and one for tennis. She also told the group that the consultants would be presenting their findings from the work they've been conducting since the July 29 meeting. The evening's meeting would consist of the consultant's overview followed by a breakout session with golf and tennis.

Ron Bailey reviewed the three guiding principles of the project:

1. To develop a plan for golf and tennis facilities that addressed the recreational needs and expectations of the Lake Oswego community, while also responding to market demand identified in the market analysis conducted by the PBK consulting team;
2. To develop tennis and golf facilities that are aesthetically appropriate for Lake Oswego as well as accessible; and
3. The resulting plan should be fiscally responsible, so it can be implemented by the City of Lake Oswego.

## II. Review Development Alternatives

### A. Review On-Line Survey Results

Kim Gilmer reviewed the on-line survey results. She explained that the survey was open to anyone in the community to respond, and was not conducted using statically valid methodology. Yet the information gleaned from the survey is helpful during planning processes, such as the golf-tennis study.

120 responses were received. Half of these responses were from residents who reside within the Palisades Neighborhood Association; 16 responses did not indicate where they lived, or lived outside of Lake Oswego. Four options were presented, with no one option an overwhelming Yes or NO response.

Some highlights of the responses and comments included:

- The existing driving range is inadequate.
- Liked the idea of improving the Golf Course entrance and visibility.
- Want a warm up location at the golf course site.
- Likes the idea of a short game practice area.
- Some concern about the aesthetics of a new driving range at Luscher
- Consensus that a new tennis facility is needed.
- Concurrence that tennis should be located separately from golf

### B. Discuss the Proposals Identified at the July 29 Meeting

Ron Bailey reviewed the four options defined at the last meeting and subsequently presented to the public for comment via an internet survey prior to this meeting. He explained the associated costs and identified the challenges with each of the four options. The Options are attached to these minutes.

The challenges uncovered led the consulting team to look at golf and tennis separately which resulted in some additional options for the members to consider. The Options are attached to these minutes.

Charles Oldham asked for clarification about a tennis issue. What happens to the existing tennis center? Jack Kamrath said the best approach is to sell the property, lease it back during construction to continue tennis programs while building a new tennis facility.

Richard Singer said based on feedback and site analysis, putting tennis and golf together is not the optimum solution.

The consulting team analyzed three additional options (hybrids of the existing four options identified on July 29, and with the understanding that golf and tennis are separated. The three new options do not include an underground access tunnel between the golf course and a future driving range located across Stafford Rd. due to the high costs.

### C. Additional Proposal and D. Funding Options

Richard Singer presented the new option 5, 6, and 7.

Option 5 for golf includes a modified minimal upgrade to the golf course.

Option 6 is the best revenue enhancement option and the most expensive to undertake. This option includes locating a full size driving range across Stafford Road

at Luscher Farm, without an access tunnel under Stafford Rd.. Retain a warm-up area at the existing course site.

Option 7 considers a sale of a portion of the existing golf course to fund improvements. This options considers selling acreage at holes 1,2, and 3 which amounts to approximately 2.5 acres. If the land were to be rezoned to residential use the City could potentially raise about \$2M. These funds could be used to construct the underground tunnel under Stafford Road, rebuild the three vacated holes, and a new driving range at Luscher Farm.

Jack Kamrath spoke about Options 8, 9, 10 and 11 which specifically address tennis. PBK is recommending a 10 court facility. Of all the options considered, the Rassekh property is the best location for a tennis facility.

In 1974, the existing tennis center was built for \$335,000 financed by revenue bonds – not tax dollars. One option could be to sell the existing 2.2 acre tennis facility property for residential use. If rezoned for residential use, the property could be divided into about 6-8 lots at an average value of \$300K per 10,000 square foot lot. Jack used 5 lots sold at \$300K as a starting basis for the numbers in the sheet he handed out. Charles Oldham questioned the projected sale amount per lot of \$300,000. Ms. Gilmer mentioned that this number would be reviewed more closely before the final report was completed.

Other options considered for tennis included: Iron Mountain Park, West Waluga Park, and the National Guard Armory site The Armory location is about 5.7 acres of usable space on South Shore Blvd. This would be the second choice for a tennis location after the Rassekh property. Financing with revenue bonds is the recommended approach to funding the tennis facility.

### III. Determine Preferred Options for Golf and Determine Preferred Options for Tennis

After being presented all the options (attached), the larger committee broke into two smaller groups to specifically address golf and tennis. Each group spent 15-20 minutes discussing the pros and cons of each option presented and narrowed down their choices to a proposed recommendation to present to the larger committee for approval.

#### Preferred Options for Golf

Richard Singer presented the golf option. The overriding issue is that the Golf Course is a high priority for the community and so the first recommendation is to support the golf course financially as needed. The Golf Course enterprise funding should be modified and moved back to the City's general fund to facilitate this support. The second recommendation is to make minor improvements to the Golf Course entrance and frontage along Stafford Road to enhance "drive-by" marketing at an approximate cost of \$80K. The third recommendation is to, at some future date, add a new full length driving range at the Luscher Farm site and replace the existing driving range with a warm-up/learning center at a cost of \$150K. This improvement would enhance the golfing experience for the future.

### Preferred Options for Tennis

Gary McKenzie presented for tennis. The tennis group's recommendation is to identify a site for a new tennis facility at one of the following sites: the Rassekh property and Armory site are preferred locations with the West End Building as a distant third option. All sites have issues to overcome. Rassekh is outside the urban growth boundary; the Armory is being used by the National Guard, but may be vacated in the near future; and the disposition of the West End Building is still unknown. All sites can fit a 10 court facility and allow future growth. The group is proposing a 10 court facility, with lobby pro shop space, viewing area to watch all courts, a banquet or open room area with some level of kitchen facility, and restrooms with showers and changing areas. There was a suggestion to show the cost estimates for each of these sites as \$6 million. The group wants staff to go forward identifying a site in the upcoming year and begin design as soon as possible. In addition, the group recommended to fund the new facility by selling the current Indoor Tennis Center property and financing the balance with revenue bonds.

The groups was asked to vote on the preferred options as presented above.

Agree: 10 Disagree: 0

Susan Senf Smith made a motion to have another vote and separate the tennis vote from the golf vote. There was not second, so the joint vote stands.

#### IV. Discuss Next Steps in developing a Recommendation for City Council

Kim Gilmer explained that the consulting team will be preparing the draft final report and presenting it, along with the subcommittee recommendation, to the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board. Ms. Gilmer explained that the goal was to present the report and recommendation at the October 21 PRAB meeting, if time allowed. The public is welcome to attend this meeting to provide public comment.

*11/9/09 Update: The final report and recommendation is scheduled to be presented to PRAB at its November 18, 2009 meeting at, 6:00 p.m. at the West End Building.*

#### V. Conclusion/Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned 6:45 p.m.