



CITY OF West Linn

Memorandum

Date: September 3, 2019

To: West Linn City Council

From: Jennifer Arnold, Associate Planner

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

The following is a summary of all testimony Planning Staff received during the length of this project. All testimony described below has been presented to the West Linn City Council in previous meetings.

On May 14, 2018 Staff received written testimony from Rebecca Adams expressing concern about draft Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan presented. This was presented to the Planning Commission prior to the initial public hearing.

On May 14, 2018 Staff received written testimony from Alan Smith requesting the plan be presented to each Neighborhood Association prior to making a decision or approval.

On May 15, 2018 Staff received written testimony from Roberta Schwarz expressing concern about the draft Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan as presented. Mrs. Schwarz also requests that the plan be presented to each neighborhood association and requests support for smaller community centers to be added to this plan. This was presented to the Planning Commission prior to the initial public hearing.

On May 15, 2018 Staff received written testimony from Ed Schwarz expressing concern about the draft Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan as presented. Mr. Schwarz also expressed concern over the expense related to a community center/aquatic center. This was presented to the Planning Commission prior to the initial public hearing.

On June 5, 2018 Staff received written testimony from Rebecca Adams expressing concern about draft Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan presented and if the Planning Commission's recommendation was received by City Council.

On June 15, 2018 Staff received written testimony from Rebecca Adams expressing concern about the draft Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan as presented to City Council. Adams



CITY OF West Linn

also mentions concerns about the Meeting Notes details and video from the Planning Commission's May 16, 2018 public hearing. On June 16, 2018 Staff received further testimony from Rebecca Adams clarifying her June 15, 2018 testimony.

On June 15, 2018 Staff received written testimony from Roberta Schwarz expressing concern about the draft Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan as presented, the lack of public outreach to the Neighborhood Associations, and expressed opposition to the community center/aquatic center.

On June 16, 2018 Staff received written testimony from Alan Smith expressing concern about the draft Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan as presented to City Council. Smith asked for a clearer comparison from the plan presented to the City Council and the plan with corrections recommended by the Planning Commission. Smith also requests serious consideration to the financial challenges facing the City.

On June 18, 2018 Staff received testimony presented at the City Council public hearing from Stacy Epsteen. Ms. Epsteen wanted to express support for the plan.

On June 18, 2018 Staff received written testimony from David Kleinke expressing support for the plan.

July 22, 2019 Staff received written testimony from Ed and Roberta Schwarz expressing concern regarding the pool/aquatic center in the Parks Master Plan. Mr. and Mrs. Schwarz request that the Parks Master Plan no move forward with the existing references to the pool/aquatic center.

On July 31, 2019 Staff received written testimony from Karie Oakes expressing concern regarding the legislative process the Parks Master Plan has taken. Ms. Oakes also raised many questions in her letter.

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>
Date: Mon, May 14, 2018 at 3:47 PM
Subject: WRITTEN TESTIMONY FOR Parks Master Plan...a few concerning things
To: planningcommission@westlinnoregon.gov
Cc: City Council <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

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]
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 7:36 PM
To: Mollusky, Kathy <kmollusky@westlinnoregon.gov>; Flynn, Courtney <cflynn@westlinnoregon.gov>; Digby, Dylan <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>
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

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: Boyd, John
Sent: Tuesday, May 15, 2018 7:16 PM
To: Arnold, Jennifer; Shroyer, Shauna
Subject: FW: Regarding Public Hearing: Parks Master Plan Update, PLN-18-01

From: Ed Schwarz [mailto:ed.schwarz@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 15, 2018 5:51 PM
To: Boyd, John <jboyd@westlinnoregon.gov>
Cc: Zak, Teresa <tzak@westlinnoregon.gov>
Subject: FW: Regarding Public Hearing: Parks Master Plan Update, PLN-18-01

Resending.

Please add the below email to the Planning Commission packet for tomorrow evening's meeting.

Thank you.

Ed

From: Ed Schwarz <ed.schwarz@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 15, 2018 5:42 PM
To: Planning Commission (planningcommission@westlinnoregon.gov) <planningcommission@westlinnoregon.gov>
Cc: West Linn City Council (citycouncil@westlinnoregon.gov) <citycouncil@westlinnoregon.gov>
Subject: Regarding Public Hearing: Parks Master Plan Update, PLN-18-01

Please add this email to the public record for the subject Planning Commission agenda item.

Dear Planning Commission,

I am concerned about two items in the staff report for the Parks Master Plan Update:

1. Support of a large community center/aquatic center and
2. Lack of support for smaller, community centers.

I would like to remind the commission that the aquatic center idea has already been "floated" and it sank like a rock. Measure 3-432 was voted on by West Linn citizens in 2013 and it failed miserably with 76 percent voting against. This measure asked if West Linn should "sell bonds to refinance land and construct, equip and furnish a new indoor aquatic and community center." The most recent community survey conducted in preparation for this master plan update also saw scant support (22% of those polled) for a community center. And, I would like to point out that the survey did not include the initial construction and ongoing maintenance costs of such a facility. I believe that if costs had been included in the survey, the "support" would have been even lower. I know that there are some vocal citizens who would like to see an aquatic/community center, but the overall West Linn community has shown, time and again, that it is opposed to this idea. Please remove consideration of the aquatic/community center from the master plan update.

What I do support and hope you will consider in the master plan update, are smaller, local community centers using already existing buildings. Constructing new facilities from scratch is prohibitively expensive so why not better use what we already have in our community? Currently, we have three building which could be converted to fully ADA-compliant

community centers for much less than new construction – I am speaking of Robinwood, Bolton, and Sunset. These buildings are former fire stations and are well-dispersed across West Linn making them easily accessible to all our residents, whether or not they live in Robinwood, Bolton, or Sunset Neighborhood Associations. There is significant neighborhood support to finish what the citizens have already started – converting these three building into community centers.

I ask that you please change the focus of the master plan update from one, large, expensive aquatic/community center to smaller, more financially-friendly facilities.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ed Schwarz
West Linn

Arnold, Jennifer

From: Boyd, John
Sent: Tuesday, May 15, 2018 7:16 PM
To: Arnold, Jennifer; Shroyer, Shauna
Subject: FW: Planning Commission May 16th Meeting testimony for the public record regarding Parks Master Plan Update PLN-18-01

From: Roberta Schwarz [mailto:roberta.schwarz@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, May 15, 2018 6:42 PM
To: #Board - Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@westlinnoregon.gov>; City Council <citycouncil@westlinnoregon.gov>; Boyd, John <jboyd@westlinnoregon.gov>; Zak, Teresa <tzak@westlinnoregon.gov>
Subject: Planning Commission May 16th Meeting testimony for the public record regarding Parks Master Plan Update PLN-18-01

Please enter this email into the Public Record for the Planning Commission agenda item listed as Parks Master Plan Update PLN-18-01

Dear Planning Commission,

I just reviewed the information available online for the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan. There has been very little citizen input on this plan because there has not been much outreach. This should have been discussed at all eleven Neighborhood Associations and at the most recent meeting of the NAP since it will impact all of the people who live in West Linn.

I am very much opposed to the large community center/aquatic center which is once again being proposed in West Linn. Check page 156 for this proposed 16,500 square feet of pool space. How many times does a unified "No" need to be heard? In November of 2013 the people of our city spoke very forcefully when they voted "No" on this idea on Measure 3-432. In an article the Tidings headlined "Pool Measure Sinks by Large Margin" the 76 percent vote against spoke volumes. A recent Poll done by the City in December of 2017 and January of 2018 once again showed support of only 22 percent. That makes it twice in the past 5 years that the people have said that they oppose this idea and by almost exactly the same numbers.

In the past nine years more than 2,000 pools have closed throughout the US. This is according to Mike Nelson, facilities development director for USA Swimming. The substantial expenses that accompany public pools include lifeguard wages, training, and insurance. Construction, maintenance and PERS contributions are also major costs.

Instead, I am in support of smaller community centers which are already existing facilities that just need to be updated and made ADA compliant. The three that fit the bill are Robinwood, Bolton Fire House, and Sunset Fire Hall.

Neighborhood support for all three of these facilities is solid.

I respectfully ask that you who will vote on this Parks Master Plan reflect the vote of the people and say "No" to the large community center and pool. Please say "Yes" to reusing what we already have in the three community centers.

Thank you for considering this request,

Roberta Schwarz
West Linn

Arnold, Jennifer

From: R Adams <radams014@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 05, 2018 3:04 PM
To: Walvatne, Gary; Arnold, Jennifer
Cc: City Council
Subject: The PC Recommendation about the Parks Master Plan appear to be absent

Hi Chair Walvatne,

I thought the PC members should be aware that last night was the night that the Planning Consultant and Parks Director presented the Parks Master Plan to the City Council for the first time. I hope each of the PC members were able to watch, but understand that you all already invest a lot of time and can't watch everything. Anyway, I thought it was surprising to see that what was presented appeared to be the exact plan presented to you. What I mean was I was not able to see or hear any reference or note referring to the actual PC recommendations, nor was I able to see that the plan had been altered, though I did not check every alteration you required such as in the budget lines which I cannot actually read due to the small print. I did have to miss 3 minutes of Planner Arnold's introduction. I was playing close attention to the language excluding smaller community centers from the Master Plan, a topic I wrote to you all about a few weeks ago. Interestingly the consultant, who is a very skilled communicator, also explicitly supported this idea of exclusion from both planning and budget without any reference to the PC's objections.

So, I do not quite know what to make of this absence of your recommendations since I think that is actually part of the required process. I definitely got the impression there were some councilpersons who likely had not watched how thoroughly your Commission had considered the plan over those 2.5 hours of your hearing. Luckily Council has not voted on it yet, and they did express some concerns similar to yours, especially about the massive expense of the "Rec Center" which the Director has in the last year renamed as a "Community Center" as more and more support has grown from the smaller Community Centers.

In any case from a legislative stand point, I just do not know what to make of this when your recommendation is nowhere to be seen in the packet or in the testimony given to Council, and yet the Plan is forwarded as if the PC hearing recommendations did not occur. Of course there's lots of good in the Plan, but the consultant actually pushed the very part that you all objected to, and the Director emphasized a few times this is the Parks Board's vision and the PC as if all parks board members endorse it all, and of course no mention of the PC ideas. I understand the Council does not have to follow your recommendation, but for them to not even see/hear your recommendations while the Director and Consultant argue their exclusionary angle seemed a bit like gaming the process.

The Planning Commission not "closing the door" on the smaller centers really meant a lot to the growing number of citizens who value what the smaller centers offer. Our city has recently lost one important non-profit (The Friends of the Library) due to a space/facility issue, and we really may also lose the Community Pre-school and the Food Pantry if nothing is done. To me the non-profits not only help people in need, but provide the opportunity to meaningfully help others. These types of venues for volunteerism are very important to the fabric of our community. So keeping the "door open" as you all discussed with the visionary document really made sense to me.

Possibly, if staff is just not up to the task of forwarding your recommendations, your group could just forward something itself. Or perhaps since the recommendations were apparently skipped, the PC hearing should just be reopened so that your role in the process can be fully completed with recommendations specifically noted in a

transparent record. Possibly this should be discussed at CCI also since it does really have implications for legitimate engagement and due process in Planning if the PC recommendations can be left out like this. Going through the proper steps (due process) is a "technical adequacy" issue that has actual implications for citizen engagement.

Thank you for such time and care devoted to citizens' issues.

I'm really sorry to have to alert you to this puzzling occurrence, but we will be living with this plan for a very long time,

Rebecca Adams
Address on Record

From: R Adams <radams014@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 16, 2018 3:07 PM
To: City Council
Subject: Re: Missing Video from recent Planning Commission Hearing about Parks Master Plan

UPDATE AND CLARIFICATION REGARDING PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING VIDEO LINK:

Dear City Council,

City Manger Stein informed me that one must click on *only* the word "video" to bring up the video record. This actually did work today.

For the record, both Karie Oakes and I previously tried to view the Planning Commission Hearing video and failed, myself trying about four or five times. It seemed to me to be functioning as one link, but it is certainly possible I was not zeroed in quite correctly on the exact spot to get the proper effect. I'm afraid the subtlety of this split link would be lost on the typical citizen if both Ms. Oakes and I were completely stumped by it given that we are both regular users of the city records system. Why this matters is there appears to be a lot of politically motivated misinformation swirling around this entire topic of community centers including a particularly vicious maligning of the Bolton proposal as a private "clubhouse" by a disgruntled former staffer, a characterization quite unfair with respect to the actual proposal which renders benefits to citizens citywide if you believe in things like emergency food services for families and school kids, early childhood education, as well as meeting and classroom space. The electioneering energy around this topic is really getting quite intense and the thoughtful approach of the Planning Commission was something that transcended the political rhetoric in a way respectful of our Comprehensive Plan/s and the general values of the population. It appears the Parks Board is unaware of that a Community Center in Bolton has been part of the Neighborhood Comprehensive plan sine 2006 or 2008, or the citywide value of the current proposal.

The great irony is the plan submitted by the Bolton Taskforce was crafted with much input from the Director of Parks, following his advice and respecting what I think is an informal and arbitrary framework where the community center would not be part of parks at all. I say informal and arbitrary since Sunset and the Adult Community Center are part of Parks, and Bolton Fire Hall for quite a few years now has been used extensively for the storage needs of the Parks Director and some non-profits of his choice, not that those aren't very nice non-profits, but the place in the last two years really looks like a firetrap with combustibles strewn everywhere inside and out. I think we as a city can do better to provide for these favored non-profits and can save the Community Pre-school and Food Pantry as well. With a little wise investment in taking care of what we have we can foster all these non-profits that strengthen the fabric of our community. Or we can turn our backs on some of them and watch them disappear as has recently happened to "The Friends of the Library" which was founded in 1978 and was recently terminally displaced leaving a void in our community.

Whether through Parks or through the Bond I hope we can somehow take care of what we have and extend that care to the various non-profits that add value to our community. It is small minded to pit one non-profit against another, just as it is small minded to pit one neighborhood against another. This only serves those who would profit from contrived political wedge issues. The Planning Commission was right, explicit exclusion of the community centers does not belong in our Parks Master Plan. Also, beware the plan's curiously inflated Budget is not at all "just numbers", so please be careful about the phrasing of the three stage Aquatic Rec Center

Gymnasium idea, as the proposed phrasing is far too leading, too defining of what is likely a fiscally disastrous path.

Again, please require a readable final draft before you sign anything. A page and a half single spaced does not give you the chance to really see the changes in context and the typographic errors to be corrected were not even presented to you, meaning if you agree to this, we have no idea what the final may contain. We are paying a consultant to handle this, surely drafts showing revisions would be part of any professional service worth it's paycheck, so please do not accept anything less than an actual final draft for approval.

Thank you again for your time,

Rebecca Adams
address on file

On Fri, Jun 15, 2018 at 12:24 AM, R Adams <radams014@gmail.com> wrote:

PLEASE ADD AS TESTIMONY FOR CITY COUNCIL HEARING ON THE PARKS MASTER PLAN

Dear Council,

Once again there is something odd to report about our public record. I think this is a Council and CCI matter since without adequate information it is hard for citizens to engage in the Parks Master Planning. As you prepare for the hearing on the Parks Master Plan, I bet some of you will want to review the Planning Commission's hearing. After all we have a well-versed Planning Commission that spent two and a half hours discussing the plan and making specific recommendations. I was just today going to review the tape for the section on community centers. I know Commissioner Farrell said something quite eloquent about them being part of our heritage and he added some reference to this being a mill town historically, a reference I wanted to hear again. Each commissioner said something supportive and interesting, and Commissioner Melten came up with the defining phrase of the evening by suggesting we "keep the door open," a beautiful metaphor when you consider it.

Well, the Planning Commission video is no longer posted at all! Instead are some of those thoroughly aggravating "Meeting notes" that the one staffer does which are so unfairly selective in what is included, in this case the entire substance of citizen testimony is excluded. The four verbal citizen comments are noted in totality this way:

"Kevin Bryck, Alan Smith, Vicki Handy and Don Kingsborough spoke."

Zero substance was related, and Commissioner Farrell's statements about our heritage and the mill town idea which I was trying to review were completely absent. What else could be missing? Commissioner Metlen's complaint that the financial figures did not actually add up is soft-pedaled. I thought he might have actually said he could not in good conscience vote for something which would pass forward such numerical errors. The universal concern about the financial tables being microscopically small so as to be unreadable, that's missing too. This begs the question of whether we as a community were supposed to read the numbers at all.

So these "meeting notes" is the official record that the public or a councilperson will see on the eve of what might be the final hearing or when reviewing the matter into the future. I hope you will ask yourselves why the shorting of the public record is allowed to regularly occur in our town, and how these "meeting notes" have an odd way of spinning things to staff's advantage by marginalizing citizens' ideas and obscuring staff's mistakes or indiscretions, at least those of you keeping up with CCI know about the disappearance of mention of various

staff mistakes that gummed up the land-use process and how the concept of insuring "technical adequacy" arose from the problematic examples which were then missing.

And speaking of staff indiscretions I am only going to say this about the staff's "Proposed Revisions for the Parks Master Plan," the revisions have managed to partially honor your instructions and partly dishonor them by a bit of slippery phraseology which reads like it is probably intended to commit the city to making this Mega Rec Center happen. Look carefully at the proposed language changes and how much it commits to. What I heard you saying in the work session is if the city *were* to consider the various phases of such a large Rec Center, it would need to evaluate very carefully the financial matters because PERS will soon strain our budgets and the voters have not at all wanted to pay for the two or three aquatic Centers proposed before and the staff to run such things.

From public testimony I assume most of you are aware that there is a lot of what looks like political electioneering centering around the denigration of the smaller Community Centers and the posturing over the big Rec idea. This began with the last election and is sure to continue into the next. I just do not see the voters agreeing to the \$65 million dollar money loser, or even a \$13 gymnasium when our district has plenty of gyms. I think it would be cheaper to persuade the School District to rent at a favorable rate those school gyms which we are already paying for via taxes. As skeptical as I am about any money guzzling albatros, I am humbled by Metlen's idea of keeping the door open. I only hope you will discard staff's leading language and use subjunctive phrasing on the matter as in *"If the we someday look into a gymnasium complex, we must really be sure the financials pencil out."*

One last thing, please do not approve this until an actual final finished draft is put in front of you so that you are assured you know what you are approving. The proposed revisions are just not very readable, and are missing the normal features to help you see changes in context. The list of typographical errors is not even included. How are you to know they actually know where the typos are? And what if the numbers still don't add up in the final?

Thank you for consideration of these ideas, and I sincerely hope each of you had the chance to view the Planning Commission Hearing since there was much substance to it.

Rebecca Adams
Address on file

From: Roberta Schwarz <roberta.schwarz@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, June 15, 2018 9:17 AM
To: Axelrod, Russell; Cummings, Teri; Sakelik, Richard; Martin, Bob; Perry, Brenda; City Council
Subject: Community Comments on the proposed Parks Master Plan
Attachments: Community Comments on the proposed Parks Master Plan.docx

Please enter the attached comments as part of the public record for the West Linn City Council hearing on the proposed Parks Master Plan update, PLN-18-01.

Thank you,
Roberta Schwarz

Please enter this email into the Public Record for the City Council Hearing on the agenda item on the Parks Master Plan Update PLN-18-01

Dear Mayor Axelrod and West Linn City Council,

I just reviewed the information available online for the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan. There has been very little citizen input on this plan because there has not been much outreach. This should have been discussed at all eleven Neighborhood Associations and at the most recent meeting of the NAP since it will impact all the people who live in West Linn.

I am very much opposed to the large community center/aquatic center which is once again being proposed in West Linn. Check page 156 for this proposed 16,500 square feet of pool space. How many times does a unified "No" need to be heard? In November of 2013 the people of our city spoke very forcefully when they voted "No" on this idea on Measure 3-432. In an article the Tidings headlined "Pool Measure Sinks by Large Margin" the 76 percent vote against spoke volumes. A recent Poll done by the City in December of 2017 and January of 2018 once again showed support of only 22 percent. That makes it twice in the past 5 years that the people have said that they oppose this idea and by almost the same numbers.

In the past nine years more than 2,000 pools have closed throughout the US. This is according to Mike Nelson, facilities development director for USA Swimming. The substantial expenses that accompany public pools include lifeguard wages, training, and insurance. Construction, maintenance and PERS contributions are also major costs.

Instead, I am in support of smaller community centers which have already been built. They just need to be updated and made ADA compliant. The three that fit the bill are Robinwood, Bolton Fire House, and Sunset Fire Hall.

Neighborhood support for all three of these facilities is solid. Most citizens want you use the three community centers that have already been built in this town and have withstood the test of time. Please do not waste money on new construction when all you need to do is upgrade what we already have in West Linn. I noticed in one of the recent articles on this in the Tidings that there are volunteers ready and willing to help with the needed upgrades.

I respectfully ask that you who will vote on this Parks Master Plan reflect the actual vote of the people and say "No" to the large community center and pool. Please say "Yes" to reusing what we already have in the three community centers.

Thank you for considering this request,

Roberta Schwarz
West Linn

From: Alan Smith <aalansmith57@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 16, 2018 8:26 PM
To: City Council
Subject: Concern when reading the proposed changes written by the Parks staff

Dear Honorable City of West Linn Council,

I read the summation of changes written by the Parks staff as recommended by the Planning Commission, and passed out at the Parks Board meeting. Astonishingly they passed a resolution 4-1 to approve the Master Plan AS WRITTEN!

As far as I know, the majority never even asked for a draft that incorporated the PC recommendations! Unbelievable that the Parks Staff chose to do a half truth on the Parks Board. Presenting only a summation of the PC recommendations to the Parks Board was at best disingenuous.

Three things I ask you to please seriously implement:

- 1) The production of the full plan in a side by side format, with the PC recommendations, be made available to you BEFORE you discuss the fate of the Master Plan.
- 2) The production of the full plan in a side by side format, with the PC recommendations be made available on the front page of the city's web site.
- 3) That PERS is a huge challenge and the city needs to work out the full financial burden to the tax payer before any proposed aquatic/gymnasium be included in this Parks Master Plan.

Given the thousands of tax dollars spent on this plan the professional arrangers of the document should be held to the highest standard. When working with important documents, a production of a side by side draft is common practice. I don't know if there is already one, and the Parks Staff chose to withhold it from the Parks Board.

It is my hope that City Council can find their way to agree to implement the Planning Commission recommendations *in toto*.

Thank you for your service,

Sincerely,
Alan Smith
West Linn Resident
address on file



CITY OF
West Linn

1

PLEASE PRINT

ANY INFORMATION PROVIDED MAY BE CONSIDERED PUBLIC RECORD AND SUBJECT TO DISCLOSURE

I wish to speak during **Public Comments** on a non-agenda related item (limited to five minutes):

Please specify topic (required):

I wish to speak during the **Business Meeting** on the agenda item listed below (limited to five minutes):

Please specify agenda report number(s) or topic(s) (required):

PARKS/REC

I wish to speak on the **Public Hearing** on the item listed below (limited to five minutes):

Please specify 22864 and 22870 Weatherhill Road and/or the Parks Master Plan.

I do not wish to speak however; I would like to have standing on this item.

Issue:

Failure to raise an issue during the City's hearing on this matter precludes an appeal to the Land Use Board of Appeals based on that issue. Any party with standing may appeal the decision of the City Council to the State Land Use Board of Appeals according to the rules adopted by that Board.

In Support Neither for nor against In Opposition

Please print:

Name: STACY EPSTEIN

Address: 3258 FOREST CT

City: WEST LINN State OR Zip 97068

Email (optional): SEPSTEIN@COMCAST.NET Phone (optional): _____

My name is Stacy Epstein and I live in Robinwood.

While I am a member of the Parks and Rec Advisory Council I do not represent them tonight.

I have 3 generations of family members living in West Linn and the parks and open spaces are an important component of our quality of life. We have had birthday parties in the shelters, and watch baseball games at the fields. We hike the trails, use the spray pads and the playground equipment. I believe that our parks and open spaces are the true jewels of West Linn.

The Master plan represents hours of work certainly. But additionally it represents hours of soliciting citizen input and vision. Most importantly it represents a work product that has been transparent, and has integrity AND the positive intentions of all who were involved. While I appreciate that it is impossible to please 100% of our citizens I believe that the vision of his plan represents a majority of our citizens.

I feel strongly that it is critically important to maintain and improve the parks and open spaces as we move into the future. Having a 10 year plan provides several things: firstly it lays a framework for prioritizing the work at hand today and tomorrow. Secondly it is flexible enough to allow for any future financial opportunities. And finally, it is impossible to move forward if you don't know where you are going.

I encourage you to trust the expertise and commitment of the parks staff and volunteers. To that end, I strongly urge the City Council to adopt this plan as we look toward the future.

Thank you

Arnold, Jennifer

From: Stein, Eileen
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2018 3:41 PM
To: Zak, Teresa; Digby, Dylan; Arnold, Jennifer
Subject: FW: Parks Master Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

FYI. Here is one more letter re the Parks Master Plan that went to the Council today. Eileen

From: dakleinke@comcast.net [mailto:dakleinke@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2018 2:06 PM
To: City Council
Cc: Worcester, Ken ; Kingsborough, Don ; Stacy Epstein ; 'Dave Kleinke'
Subject: Parks Master Plan

Dear Mayor Axelrod and members of the City Council,

Thank you for taking on the important role of governing our community and giving up so much of your valuable time. I don't envy your position which requires taking sincere input on so many topics which set the direction for our community for years to come. I am a member of the Parks Advisory Board but I'm writing this letter as a citizen and not as a representative of the board.

I've been a member of the parks advisory board for only a short period. I came in towards the end of the parks master planning process but had a chance to see the high quality and solid professionalism in both the city parks staff and members of the board. I was and still am very impressed with the caring and thoughtful way the staff and board worked through the process with the consultants. It was clear to me that the consultants and board worked hard to collect community-wide input in crafting the best possible parks plan for our city. There are many ways we could go but in a resource constrained environment with competing agendas I believe we have come up with the best option for our city. I strongly support the Parks Master Plan as submitted.

As a council I ask that you sincerely consider the expert advice from our consultants, strong and broad-based feedback via a community-wide survey which formed the foundation for the boards work, and the many hours of review and discussion between our parks staff and citizens on our parks advisory board who represent many neighborhoods within the community. It's clear we cannot meet all individual and neighborhood specific interests but we can serve the broader interests of our community which the Master Parks Plan does accomplish.

Thank you for taking the time to hear my perspective.

Most respectfully,

David

David Kleinke
4130 Horton Road
West Linn, Oregon 97068
503 799-1777

Please include this in the Public Record.

**Testimony on July 22nd, 2019 on Latest Version of the Proposed West Linn Parks
Master Plan**

Tonight, you are discussing the newest version of the proposed Parks Master Plan. I have testified previously at the Planning Commission meetings about this topic.

I have new information to add to what I previously testified about in front of that body:

1. Lake Oswego is now planning to have a recreational center and pool built just **3.7 miles** from where we are sitting tonight. It will be at the Municipal Golf Course and the current 18-hole course will be reduced to 9 holes. People who would like to swim and who live in West Linn will have the choice to go to that facility or to the already existing pool, the North Clackamas Aquatic Park. which is just **9.2 miles** away in Milwaukie. There are also several non-government funded pools to choose from in the area. **There is no need to spend our money to have a pool in West Linn when there are several nearby.**
2. At a recent Portland City Council meeting it was voted to close Columbia Pool as of July of next year because of a budgetary shortfall. It is important to note that **in the past nine years more than 2,000 pools have been closed throughout the U.S.** according to Mike Nelson, Facilities Development Director for USA Swimming. The substantial expenses that accompany public pools include lifeguard wages, training, and insurance. PERS contributions, employee salaries and benefits, construction, maintenance, chemicals, and equipment are some of the additional costs.
3. The estimate for a West Linn aquatic facility has been lowered to **\$18 to \$20 million** in this new Park Master Plan on page 111 because the costs of the Recreation Center which would house it are not listed in this update. They were listed in the previous version. The previous estimate for both the pool and rec center was approximately \$60 million. This omission is worrisome. The people of West Linn deserve to know the total costs of a pool.

4. This brings me to the next information that is pertinent tonight. **The survey results that are quoted in the Executive Summary beginning on page 9 are not based on scientific methodology.** This was not a random sampling of West Linn citizens. In fact, people could vote as many times as they wanted if they used different computers to do so. This skews the results. The estimated costs of an aquatic center were not even included in the survey questions. Having that information would have greatly reduced the number of people who support building a pool in West Linn
5. In fact, the voters of West Linn already had a ballot measure for a pool placed before them. They overwhelmingly opposed it. **In November of 2013 Measure 3-432 was placed before the voting public and the result was 76% against. A scientific poll done for GO Bond funding showed only 22% support for a pool in December 2017-January 2018. That is twice the people have said "No".**
6. **Please do not allow this Parks Master Plan to go forward with the aquatic center included.** If you do allow it to stay in, please add that there shall be **an Advisory Vote of the people of West Linn** to decide if they are willing to pay for the costs of a pool before one can ever be built that uses any of our money.

There is one other item in the proposed Park Master Plan that I would like to address tonight. It concerns the White Oak Savanna.

Please have the White Oak Savanna listed as a **passive park** which is what it was referred to when grants were being sought and were eventually obtained for acquisition of that park. Please see map on page 30 which appears to list the White Oak Savanna as an Active Park. The color differentiation on the map is very hard to determine. Please also list it as such on the list on page 25. It is not listed there at all currently and it needs to be so it cannot be changed without notice to the people who worked so hard to raise the money to acquire it and to do the work to restore it.

Thank you,

 Roberta Schwarz

Arnold, Jennifer

From: Digby, Dylan
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2019 5:20 PM
To: Warner, Kenneth; Worcester, Ken; Arnold, Jennifer
Subject: Fwd: Parks Master Plan Amendment Procedures

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

FYI

From: Karie Oakes
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2019 5:16 PM
To: Axelrod, Russell
Cc: City Council
Subject: Parks Master Plan Amendment Procedures

Dear Mayor Axelrod,

I ask you to reschedule the hearing to amend the Parks Master Plan, Comprehensive Plan and Community Development Code on your August 5 agenda until a date when the procedures for adoption are in accordance with CDC 100.090 and CDC 98.00. At this point I can not determine if the plan has significantly changed to warrant another Planning Commission hearing.

I know this has been a long and arduous process, largely because the 2018 Council deviated from mandatory procedures (98.110) when it asked the Planning Commission and Parks and Recreation Advisory Board to work out differences in their recommendations to Council. Evidently this occurred because the director of Parks and Recreation and his assistant, in their roles as staff liaisons to the PRAB, lead the PRAB to believe it's recommendations should be elevated above the Planning Commission's recommendations, contrary to our land-use laws. Even the community development director thought it was a good idea and the city manager didn't act in her professional capacity to advise him and Council otherwise. The problem snowballed when the parks director refused Council's request for a red-lined copy of the Planning Commission recommendation. I lost track of what the PC did subsequently. It went south when the PRAB continued to make revisions and degraded people who did not agree with their recommendations.

The most concerning thing to me about this fiasco is how detrimental it was to public involvement. It is a matter for the Committee for Citizen Involvement to take up. The update process began in December 2016 and the PC hearing was 16 months ago. I don't recall when was the first Council hearing? It has been an impossible process for any member of the public to follow. So I remind you of this as I ask you to delay the hearing slightly longer in order to comply with the law for public involvement.

There are many particular parts of the above codes that are unmet and the project page information hasn't been updated since December. To begin with, notice was not given or at least that is the best I can surmise. This alone would be enough to reschedule. A copy of the notice and affidavits are not posted on the project page. I did not receive written notice as MNA President. I couldn't find notice in the Tidings. As far as I recall, Council continued a hearing it had sometime after the PC hearing, but did not continue it to a date certain.

I am not going to point out all of the other deficiencies of this application, but you can be sure I will at the hearing if any remain. I would suggest you try clearing your head of what you know about the project, set aside all the materials you've collected as Mayor and go to the agenda as a member of the public would do to prepare to participate. There are 6 links: AB, Plan, Testimony, Staff Presentation, ORDs. You'll find a link to the project page which hasn't be updated since December 2018 on the AB prepared by the city manager. Now you have all the information available to the public unless you were to make an appointment to wade through the planning file.

With this information available to you today, 5 days before the hearing, I ask you would you be able to understand the deliberations and decisions of the public bodies (PRAB, PC and CC) ? Would you as a member of the public seeing it for the first time? Would you as a member of the public who dropped out of participating, having been discouraged by the distorted proceedings and degradative culture perpetrated by the administration? Would you as a president of a neighborhood association, moreover, a newly elected one?

Many questions arise as one tries to make sense of the mass of information and upon reading it one realizes there is another mass of missing information. What are the standards and procedure for a decision? Where is the staff report for Council evidencing applicable criteria are met? Where is it evident in the ORDs that the criteria were met (see ORD 1649 "whereas" statements as example) ? What were the meetings of the PRAB; meeting(s) of the PC subsequent to it's hearing; and meetings of Council subsequent to it's first hearing? Was the public testimony given at these various meetings included in the record before me? One question leads to another. If only the information was complete and organized.

The purpose of Chapters 100 and 98 is to provide consistent legislative proceedings that give equal opportunity for all to participate and meet Oregon's policy for the public to know and understand the deliberations and decisions of government. The public must be able to rely upon it. Transparency depends on it. The proceedings are really quite simple: PRAB recommends to PC and PC recommends to Council. It is better understood and followed than this application where there are numerous back and forth meetings, special meetings, joint meetings and work sessions between hearings. Who wouldn't have a hard time keeping track? No wonder the record is a mess. This animal grew to huge proportions, wasting time and money.

Please excuse me if my frustration is apparent, but the proceedings of this application is second to that of "Cut the Red Tape" for being the worst legislative application I've seen. It placed second only because I believe Council's intention here was to involve the public. It causes me to think that this application was handled differently because it was an in-house application.

I hope you'll find my concerns helpful not only to this application, but for improving citizen engagement in land-use. Mr. Mayor, I trust with your experience as a former PC member, you might appreciate it. Is this application acceptable to you? Does Council understand all the criteria to make this decision considering the level of support from staff? I would suggest reading CDC chapters 100 and 98 to fully appreciate what I write.

Please submit this email to the record for PLN 18-01 Parks Master Plan Update. Please also let me know if you remove the plan from your agenda. I hope you will utilize all means of communication to inform the public if you revise the agenda. Thank you. Thanks to all who have taken the time to read and consider my concerns.

Sincerely,

Karie Oakes

Dylan Digby

Assistant to the City Manager

Administration

[#6011](#)



Please consider the impact on the environment before printing a paper copy of this email.

This e-mail is subject to the State Retention Schedule and may be made available to the public