

City of West Linn Project No. PA-11-34.

We have reviewed the Lake Oswego Tigard Water Partnerships' (LOT) Land Use Pre-Application Packet. We are submitting the following questions and comments for your consideration and we look forward to responses from the applicant and City of West Linn (COWL).

- 1) We understand that the City of Lake Oswego has received permission from Cliff Houck, Property Manager, Oregon Park and Recreation Department, to submit the application for the Mary S. Young Property... can you confirm that permission was also granted for the two State owned lots adjacent to Mary S. Young, *prior* to the pre-application meeting being set.
- 2) The exhibits do NOT show the existing Lake Oswego water transmission line or the COWL sewer pipeline, including their associated easements. Specific to Mary S. Young Park, these two older systems are in the same general area where the exhibit shows the new 48-inch transmission line is planned. Without these significant utilities shown, how will the State and the COWL accurately assess the long and short term impacts and how can the permanent and temporary easements be established for this proposed pipe?
- 3) Please have the applicant confirm whether HDD staging site is the entrance or exit point for the pipe, since the equipment and materials vary differently. We would expect the applicant should be asked to share the pictures they have, of similar scale HDD operations, with the COWL and the State so that they can appreciate the magnitude of area and equipment needed to accomplish this project.
- 4) The exhibit only shows a schematic area for the HDD staging site, we strongly suggest that a much more detailed map be required that shows not only the dimensions of the staging site that they are requesting, but also all the equipment anticipated to be staged there and the expected durations. Also we request the exhibit also shows how this equipment is brought to the HDD staging site, the material haul routes, and truck turn-a-round areas, pipe storage and other equipment requirements for this large scale operation within the limits of the Park as well as the adjacent to State owned lots.
- 5) Please confirm the average depth that the pipe will be installed in the Park.
- 6) Please confirm how much of the Park will be closed for this project and the expected duration of the closure. Will the neighborhood access from Mapleton Drive be maintained during the construction?
- 7) We understand the City has obtained a legal opinion that no City wide vote is needed to allow this project, since Mary S Young Park is technically owned by the State. However, on the City website and in the glossy brochure "Discover West Linn Parks, Facilities, Trails and Pathways", Mary S Young Park is featured as a City of West Linn Park. Please clarify the roles and responsibilities of the State, COWL and the applicant in public outreach about the upcoming project, proposed impacts and closures, constructions notices, coordination with annual events, etc.
- 8) We understand not all the necessary permits were obtained for the early geotechnical drilling performed by the applicant. Please clarify the roles and responsibilities of the State and COWL in identifying restriction and mitigation requirements in the sensitive areas and monitoring construction activities in the Park.
- 9) We understand that Park improvements may be requested/required as part of the permit approval. How will these improvements or "fee-in lieu" dollars be identified.

- 10) Based on the geotechnical information, is water expected to be an issue in the trench excavation within Mary S. Young State Park? If so, how will the water and sediment from the dewatering operation be handled and will the settlement tank or pond locations be identified on the final application so all impacts can be assessed?
- 11) Based on the geotechnical information, is rock expected to be encountered in the trench excavation? If so, how will any blasting be allowed in the park or along the rest of the alignment? And if so, what pre-assessment of adjacent structures will be required?
- 12) Will the transmission lines in Mapleton Drive be cased? If not, what seismic event are the pipes designed for?
- 13) Per the language within the deed of the MSY property Parcel No. 21E24 00600; specifically, "Express Condition #2, states that the State will not cut or allow cutting of any trees for sale or commercial purposes. It appears that the open trench construction method for the installation of this 48-inch transmission line will require the cutting of trees. How will this be handled and does it put the park at risk of reversal to the previous owners?
- 14) Please have the applicant provide a series of "Typical Cross Sections" for the transmission line along Mapleton Drive. Specifically showing; relative depth to top of pavement, relationship with existing utilities, proximity to the right-of-way and typical trench width.
- 15) For the approximately 400 LF on Mapleton Drive, where the applicant proposes installing both the raw and clean water 4-ft transmission lines, please have the applicant provide additional detail on how that will be accomplished, specific conditions they will require of the contractor and a cross section showing all relevant information.
- 16) Will the COWL be requiring a tree survey along Mapleton Drive, as part of the application, so that the number of impacted trees within and adjacent to the ROW can be accurately assessed? Depending on the location and depth of the transmission line in Mapleton, it appears that this construction has the potential to impact many dozen trees. How will this be mitigated?
- 17) Specific to Trillium and Heron Creeks at Mapleton Drive, please have the applicant provide exhibits that show the pipe relative to the bottom of the channel and the expected limits of construction in these areas.
- 18) Please confirm the COWL will require, as part of the CUP, specific construction related requirements that require the applicant to maintain one lane of traffic at all times on Mapleton Drive and that daily access to residents will also be maintained.
- 19) Many of the residents on Mapleton do NOT support the installation of sidewalks, due to the overall impact a fully developed street section would have along the frontages of many homes. We ask that the City and applicant actively engage the residents in the resolution of the resulting street section prior to approval of the application.
- 20) We also request that the residents of Mapleton Drive be involved in the improvements chosen for any identified, "fee in lieu" funds resulting from a reduced street section or other waivers granted by COWL prior to approval of the application. (e.g. additional tree replacement, additional screening)
- 21) Within West Linn, the project has been split into two separately permitted projects. We request that COWL require that approval of each permit be conditional upon the applicant receiving approval for the other permit.