



CITY OF  
**West Linn**

## Memorandum

Date: May 15, 2018

To: West Linn Planning Commission

From: Jennifer Arnold, Associate Planner

Subject: Public Testimony submitted for the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan update  
(PLN-18-01)

---

On May 14, 2018 Staff received written testimony from Rebecca Adams expressing concern about draft Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan presented.

On May 15, 2018 Staff received written testimony from Alan Smith requesting the plan be presented to each Neighborhood Association prior to making a decision or approval.

This is the only written testimony received by Staff prior to the Planning Commission public hearing for this application. Any further testimony received will be presented to the Planning Commission on May 16, 2018.

## Boyd, John

---

**From:** Mollusky, Kathy  
**Sent:** Monday, May 14, 2018 7:37 PM  
**To:** Boyd, John; Shroyer, Shauna  
**Subject:** FW: PLEASE ADD AS WRITTEN TESTIMONY FOR FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING ON THE PARKS MASTER PLAN: MAY 16TH , 2018

**From:** Alan Smith [mailto:[aalansmith57@gmail.com](mailto:aalansmith57@gmail.com)]  
**Sent:** Monday, May 14, 2018 7:36 PM  
**To:** Mollusky, Kathy <[kmollusky@westlinnoregon.gov](mailto:kmollusky@westlinnoregon.gov)>; Flynn, Courtney <[cflynn@westlinnoregon.gov](mailto:cflynn@westlinnoregon.gov)>; Digby, Dylan <[ddigby@westlinnoregon.gov](mailto:ddigby@westlinnoregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** Fwd: PLEASE ADD AS WRITTEN TESTIMONY FOR FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING ON THE PARKS MASTER PLAN: MAY 16TH , 2018

Hi,  
Will you please include this in the testimony for the Planning Commission on Wednesday May 16?  
Thank you.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Alan Smith** <[aalansmith57@gmail.com](mailto:aalansmith57@gmail.com)>  
Date: Mon, May 14, 2018 at 7:19 PM  
Subject: PLEASE ADD AS WRITTEN TESTIMONY FOR FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING ON THE PARKS MASTER PLAN: MAY 16TH , 2018  
To: [planningcommission@westlinnoregon.gov](mailto:planningcommission@westlinnoregon.gov)

Dear Planning Commission,

When I was a youth heavily involved in my home city sports programs back east, we played all our basketball games in the high schools in the city. I do not see anywhere in this plan utilizing the good will between the WLWSD and the City to open up the gyms for use. The only thing this Plan offers is a \$13 million dollar recreation center. Many problems with that:

- 1) No such gym is in any of the City's Master Plans.
- 2) We have a beautiful and a complete gym at the high school that can be used. If people want to swim go support the Clackamas swim center. The voters just in 2014 voted down a swim center in West Linn. Why is Ken pushing that idea again? Very suspicious to me.
- 3) Whatever parks programs they now offer can be done with one tenth the cost of a new center, with the old fire stations. There are a lot of people who appreciate the historic value AND structurally fit stations.
- 4) The Council gave the Parks Department money to study the old fire stations, but they have not done that. Until that happens then and only then can we have an honest discussion about a \$13 million dollar gym.
- 5) The Bolton Neighborhood Master Plan calls for a local recreation center.

Please push Ken's Master Plan back to the Parks Department with the caveat that it will not be voted on until they have gone to all Neighborhood Associations with it. All other City Departments have visited NAs. This Plan is about our future and without serious vetting, our children will get swindled into a \$13 million dollar tax bill.

**Thank you for your service and consideration.**

Alan Smith  
VP Bolton Neighborhood Association

## **Arnold, Jennifer**

---

**From:** R Adams <radams014@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, May 14, 2018 3:57 PM  
**To:** Arnold, Jennifer  
**Subject:** Fwd: WRITTEN TESTIMONY FOR Parks Master Plan...a few concerning things

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** R Adams <[radams014@gmail.com](mailto:radams014@gmail.com)>  
**Date:** Mon, May 14, 2018 at 3:47 PM  
**Subject:** WRITTEN TESTIMONY FOR Parks Master Plan...a few concerning things  
**To:** [planningcommission@westlinnoregon.gov](mailto:planningcommission@westlinnoregon.gov)  
**Cc:** City Council <[citycouncil@westlinnoregon.gov](mailto:citycouncil@westlinnoregon.gov)>

PLEASE ADD AS WRITTEN TESTIMONY FOR FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING ON THE PARKS MASTER PLAN: MAY 16TH , 2018

Dear Planning Commission,

There is much good in this Parks Master Plan, but also some odd things about it. I hope you can improve the draft. Please look at it with a critical eye to detail. Here are some things that are troubling. General page references provided for your convenience:

### **Concessions**

**page 69 Staff and concessions**

**page 77 concessionaires**

**page 79 riverfront regional cost generation...**

**page 51 potential commercialization of use in parks**

There is quite a lot of mention of the possibility of bringing concessions into the Parks, but no Mention of Chapter XI, Section 46 of the the West Linn Charter which states a prohibition in leasing of parks, except for some grandfathered instances. It may be that concessions of some sort really are going to be appropriate in a future Riverfront Park, but it seems this rental use would need to go to a vote of the people given the way our Charter reads. Since concession is mentioned so much in the Master Plan, what I suggest is just a simple mention that concessions may require a vote of the people per the Charter. Maybe also adding the idea that presence of Concessions significantly alters the feel of a public space, so should be approached in a space by space manner.

### **Encroachments and Importance of Rights of Way, especially near Parks**

**Page 7. State goal 5 and goal 6 and goal 7**

**page 8 goal 12....connectivity Transportation**

**page 52 Encroachment policy**

**page 55 goal seven connectivity insure ROW vacation considers use**

While getting serious about the Encroachment Policy is long over due since it would allow completion of Public Resources such as the Palomino loop and address the private building and excavation that is going on in the ROWs adjacent to Burnside Park and other parks. I think it would be useful to also create a vigorous policy that any vacation of Right of Way is reviewed with respect to its impact on Parks and on the Trails Master Plan. The recent vacation of the Willson Street Right of Way was recommended for approval by staff WITHOUT any written provision for the ongoing pedestrian access specifically planned for in the Master Trails Plan. Having watched a number of vacations now, not only is the city routinely giving away public land for free, but often the larger questions of whether a vacation contradicts some of our Planning Goals are not being fully explored by staff in the lead up to the Council Hearing which decides the matter. The donor of the Burnside Park, E.G. Caufield, had asked that adjacent ROWs be included in the park, though did not require it. It still has not happened, so those green buffers to the park are vulnerable to our lax vacation policy.

What I suggest is that the Parks Master Plan contain a line stating that ROWs adjacent to Parks should not be vacated, and that all ROW vacation requests be reviewed with respect to our Goal 5 aspirations and Master trails Plans, as well as our overall vision for connectivity of habitat and transportation. We can do better with state goal 5 and goal 6 and goal 7 by stopping the practice of flagrantly giving away ROWs.

### **Bias against Smaller Community Recreation Centers should be left out of document**

**page 34 On map Bolton is an indoor facility**

**page 35 indoor uses are scheduled to capacity**

**page 42 improved indoor space, very flexible concept**

**page 50 Goal 2 Social Hubs**

**page 53 problematic revisioning to exclude small community centers**

**page 54 goal six importance of community focus**

**page 78 biasing language about not funding neighborhood projects**

**page 79**

**annual prioritizing process will be pre-biased if criteria are not allowed to be applied to worthy satellite community centers**

This part of the proposal was not subject to much, if any, citizen engagement. It comes late in the game, and was surprisingly the subject of some recent misinformation in a Tidings article. That was very surprising article with political undertones given the Bond election now going on.

It has long been staff's policy not support local satellite Community Centers such as Robinwood Station, Sunset Fire hall and the proposed Community Resource Center at Bolton Fire Hall, *despite these things being part of our Neighborhood Plans which are part of the Comprehensive Plan*. The only way Robinwood was able to move forward was by creating a non-profit to run it, as Bolton has been also pressured to do. This is in contrast to many cities that would just run the community centers themselves, like our Sunset Fire Hall model, which is the model that makes the most sense to me. But in West Linn, staff has been able to create what I think is a tradition of artificial exclusion of smaller centers which in fact could supply more indoor capacity at very low cost.

There is much public support for these local facilities and I think it is a mistake to embed staff's bias against smaller centers in a long range planning document such as this. I disagree with staff's assessment that these facilities are unsuitable for recreation use, though they do all need upgrades to be optimally usable. It is noteworthy that while the city budgeted for the evaluation and planning of both Robinwood and Bolton Fire hall upgrades over a year ago, this money has gone unspent, despite these projects being in the City's Capital

Improvement Plan. It is possible that once upgraded (especially with the ADA upgrades) these facilities could be very valuable to extend the indoor capacity for activities, but I am not seeing that in this Plan at all.

It is unfortunate to see such as deliberate attempt in this document to denigrate the recreational and community hub potential of the satellite Centers. If one looked at the Parks survey about Bolton, for example, the question was framed as "do you support rehabilitation the Bolton Fire Hall?", but no description of the intended new use was given, or why one might support it. Imagine if the question had been to rehabilitate it to provide meeting and class space, as well as provide a permanent home for the Food Pantry, the Community Pre-school and a coordinated base of food and medical stores for emergency preparedness. Of course, the support would be greater. What I suggest is a more open ended, fair and measured treatment of the entire community center idea so as not to lock into this current staff bias.

**Bias toward a big gym style Rec Center should be toned down**

**page 70 Cost associated with big rec center**

**Page 70 Final words seem to be missing on page**

**page 74 numbers are very high**

Support for funding a big Gym style Rec center is an unknown. We know from the Aquatic Center that while people want a swimming facility, the capital costs and the operating cost (staff heavy) were prohibitive. A big Rec Center may have some of the same issue. At \$13 million estimate and the need to hire staff to run it, this is untested territory with the voters. It is only very recently that this idea is being called a Rec/Community Center, probably due to the overall support for community centers that is growing because of the efforts of the supporters of the smaller community centers. I think this whole topic should be treated in a more speculative manner in the document. If Gym space is the real need, then partnering with the School District to access some of the newly built facilities is probably much more reasonable and affordable, given that the population now carries about \$226 million in Bonded indebtedness for building those beautiful new school facilities. It is not unreasonable for voters to expect some partnering from WLWV School District to provide more Gym access. The very large cost for the proposed Rec Center and the ongoing staffing needs seem to be skewing the total Park needs financial figures very high and should not be approved for that one reason alone. In contrast the modest expense to the smaller city facilities could really deliver a lot of bang for the buck with no staff requirement if the non-profit model continues to be the way things are done in West Linn.

**Spelling of Maddax**

**page 3**

Maddax is spelled with and "ax" in it. It would be nice to honor the generous donors of the entire park, Dorothy and Virgil Maddax, by correcting their name on page 3.

**Lack of Specific Mention of State and Federal Historic Area Status which may someday provide funding opportunities**

**page 51 Goal 3**

The document should more clearly articulate our goals to integrate interpretive aspects of cultural history and natural history by stating an interest in coordinating with the Heritage Area efforts at state and federal levels. Such larger initiatives may provide important grant money for interpretive amendments to our Park, especially the potential Riverfront Regional Park.

Thank you for your careful consideration of this Master Plan as well as for considering my ideas,

Rebecca Adams  
Address on file

p.s. Planning Commission email is not functioning, by the way. Please forward to them and to Record for meeting.



Virus-free. [www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)