

### **Executive Board**

2006 – 2008

Paul Ostroff – Chair

Jay Woodworth- Vice-Chair

Cindy Lewis – Treasurer

Ann Pomazal – Secretary

### **Area Managers**

John Surrett – Area 1

Budd Levin – Area 2

Chris Wright – Area 3

Lee Wicklund – Area 4

Katherine Shallenberger – Area 5

Rosemary DiCandilo – Area 6

Katie Richards – Area 8

Jaliene Hollabaugh – Area 9

Art Sorenson – Area 10

Becky Salsburg – Area 11

Harold Rust – Area 12

# **Palisades Neighborhood Association**

Saturday, May 05, 2007  
10:00 a.m.

Home of Jay Woodworth  
2090 Ridgepoint Dr.

For information [www.palisadeslo.org](http://www.palisadeslo.org)

## **Executive Board Meeting Minutes**

- 1. Call to order and roll call.** Meeting was called to order by Chair Paul Ostroff at 10:09 a.m.  
In attendance: Paul Ostroff (PO), Bud Levin (BL), Lee Wicklund (LW), John Surrett (JS), Becky Salsburg (BHS), Cindy Lewis (CL), Ines Bojlesen (IB), Jay Woodworth (JW), Jaliene Hollabaugh (JH), Ann Pomazal (AP) & John Lewis (JL)
- 2. Presentation by Kim Gilmer, LO Parks and Recreation Department (KG)**
  - a. On track for design documents for Luscher Farm and will go out to bid on two weeks. If goes well construction starting in July. Hope to be done by November. Won't be playable field for fall. Most activity will kick off in February.

- b. One of the challenges to keep Dog Park open during construction but it is too constrained. Can either close and provide no dog park during construction or we can find a temporary site. Trouble at Stevens meadows with dogs. Posted it no dogs. Getting calls from neighbors that dogs are affecting the horses on the neighboring property. Tried to have Park Ranger there to control it. Dogs must be on leash except in signed areas, such as the Dog Park. Concerned that if we don't provide a temporary area, then Stevens Meadows will become the de facto dog park. Don't have round the clock coverage for the Park Rangers.
- c. BL – has Waluga West Park been considered? KG – Yes, that park has a wetland around it and there is controversy about using this area for a dog park. Most of the parks are situated in neighborhoods with homes next to them, except the properties near here.
- d. One of the things she is contemplating regarding Steven's Meadows is to amend the P&R rules to say no dogs allowed, and then people could be cited for violating this rule.<sup>1</sup>
- e. JW – Steven's Meadows has deed restrictions that say no dogs allowed. KG disagrees and would like to see the deed. JW - The park ranger should work in the morning since that is when people walk dogs. Has the Lusher Farm] design been approved by City Council? KG - Yes, DRC and City Council have approved the Luscher Farms design. JW - There are other dog parks in the area, such as Mary S. Young State Park.
- f. KG - To finish her request. Possibility of creating a temporary small site on the Rassekh<sup>2</sup> property. The temporary Dog Park would be open just during construction of the LF project and would be closed off after the new dog park is open. All other areas [in LF] are zone exclusive farm use, and would require CUP and it is not certain to get one. If we mowed down blackberries and then allow them to grow back that would prevent them from continuing to use area for dog park after construction of new one. Would avoid the wetlands. Map displayed to illustrate location. Room for about 12 cars, not a very large area with temp fencing that could be easily removed at the end of the time.
- g. BL - It sounds quite reasonable. But he is interested in what JW said about people being relocated to Mary S. Young.
- h. CL – there is a lot of impact on this area on this area already. The ongoing construction<sup>3</sup> plus this would be a huge impact to the area. The people who favor off-leash dog parks are determined and would not likely give it up when the time period is over. Block it off and do not offer a dog park during construction.
- i. JS – is the dog park listed as a regional dog park? No, it is listed as a community dog park but due to size it draws people from other areas. JS - Was a dog park considered as part of the master plan? KG - No, but is more desired now. Don't understand why some of the other parks that are under-utilized such as West Waluga isn't considered since it seems like it is never used? KG – we looked at 26 sites throughout the city and none of them were suitable.
- j. JW – The city could have chosen to annex more than the 10 acres and now is having to compact many uses. Have 110 acres and could use that area. If the city council gets behind it [the CUP] would go through quickly. Lee and Jay met with dog park people and sports people. Feels that going to the county is an option and not a huge problem
- k. LW - Three issues –
  - i. How important are NAs to the city? He sees NAs coming up with ideas and the city coming up with other plans

<sup>1</sup> See meeting minutes of City of Lake Oswego Parks and Recreation Advisory Board dated 01/22/07 for motion to change this rule. [www.ci.oswego.or.us/parksrec/PDFS/MIN01\\_22\\_07.pdf](http://www.ci.oswego.or.us/parksrec/PDFS/MIN01_22_07.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> The Rassekh property is located on the NW corner of Stafford Rd. and Atherton Dr. inside PNA boundaries

<sup>3</sup> Construction consists of current building of convalescent facility across from Lakeridge, planned development of Collier property and development of Luscher Farms turf fields.

- ii. When you look at the 26 sties, Safeco wasn't on the list. It is a centrally located, there could be a temporary dog park there.
- iii. If the decision the decision is already made, then put the gravel where the fire department is going to have their parking lot.
- a. To respond, the reason she is here is because the neighborhood input is important. She is sensing that we are not receptive [to the idea of a temporary dog park]. We would like to discuss further as a group. If we decide not to use the Ressekh property, if we see problems then she may come back and talk to us.
- b. IB – Stevens Meadows does not have any parking facilities. Easier to enforce non-use with no parking available. Sounds like we are rewarding the wrongdoers by being afraid of what they'll do. That is what law and law enforcement is for. We don't have to act according to what the ones who are doing wrong are doing. When we did the survey the majority want that space to be an open space area. There have been several attempts to take that away from PNA, which is the only area left in our are for a park. Have to be very careful and to respect what PNA residents what and what the mayor promised us. If you are going to spend money for something temporary, let us use that money to develop a park.
- c. JS - how much standing do we have as a NA since the Rassekh prop is part of PNA. PO – doesn't matter since if it affects us we can still take a stand. (LOC chapter 50.777.025)
- d. KG would like to master plan for Rassekh property and involve surrounding neighborhoods. Now there isn't any money in the next two years to develop the park, but if we have a master plan we can develop a budget.
- e. IB – LF was not part of PNA and was determined to be outside of PNA. Rassekh is part of PNA.
- f. BL – Appreciates that Kim came and discussed with us and thinks that she has demonstrated an honest attempt to be creative and responsive, even if she can't satisfy everyone. LW would add that it is like an iceberg (most of it is under water) P&R does a marvelous job and we aren't talking about that.
- g. Kim Gilmer left at 10:43 a.m.

#### 1. Dr. Bill Korach (BK) Superintendent of Schools here to present

- a. Appreciates the opportunity to come and speak. Thank you and appreciates us working with them and want to continue to work well with us. PNA did come through for them. Tried hard to address issues that hadn't been address for a long time and have tried to be responsive. Speaks volumes for the integrity of our organization
- b. How are we [school district] doing? We are not facing any divisive issues and wanted to hear what we want to say. The school district is challenged by declining enrollment and will be for several years. Have dropped 500 students over the last five years. Dr. Wicklund is part of a reconfiguration committee. No decisions made, but could share what is likely to happen.
- c. JH – Construction [of turf fields] is going well. Time restrictions adhered to. BK – the project manger lives on the street and that has helped.
- d. BHS – In a meeting with mayor and city manager. A little concerned about the possibility of closure of Lakeridge and Palisades. How we would as an organization address those issues as part of our neighborhood plan. Concerned that mayor is creating a self-fulfilling prophecy.. BK – Palisades history – was principle at LOHS 81 – 84 he was on a committee for studying school closures. The recommendation of the committee was Bryant be closed. Superintendent felt that that with the new schools on either side of Palisades would be easier adjustment.
- e. JS – was affected by the earlier closure of Palisades. Lakewood and Palisades were closed due to too many schools in the district. What is the trend on declining enrollment? BK - Lakewood was sold and was old and didn't have much land. Our elementary population is declining. Don't have the same situation as in the early 80's. A lot of people had to relocate during that time to find jobs. Now we have a different problem. It is very

difficult for young families to buy a home in LO. We want to be competitive with people who are looking at OES and other private schools. Want to attract those families. Move ins tend to be at secondary level, not at elementary level.

- f. If we continue to decline, it is possible that we go to one high school. He would recommend LO. Because LO, LOJH & Uplands all within the same area as a large campus, Lakeridge would become the middle school. The scenario that we would close Lakeridge is off base. This is not the plan, however. Two small high schools is still very very viable for us.
- g. BL – school district will allow people from outside the district to come here (with tuition). Could we draw from the future homes being built on the Rosemont area?
- h. Yes, and he would love to see more homes. The development in Stafford is actually West Linn School District. It would be easy to accommodate more children Lakeridge could accommodate 1400 kids with the rooms currently available. West Linn is not interested in changing boundaries.
- i. JW – Is the school district line is different from the city line? Yes. Tuition – is there some way to subsidize tuition? Board has established \$6500 for each year all grades.
- j. JS – What is your position on the city’s taking property tax generating buildings off the roles and how it affects the financing of the schools. BK – The school districts’ business manager has raised that point and there has only been one meeting with the board on this issue.
- k. BL – If you are going to close schools, does that mean that our tax rates would go down? No. There are a couple of issues regarding Lakeridge – significant investment in past and coming up.. What are we doing for the teachers as opposed to the grounds and the kids? If it is on the table that the school is going to change its character or close then we should suspend all investment. BK – restate that it is not our plan to change Lakeridge from a high school. Believes that we can sustain two very viable high schools. One of the factors is whether we can attract 50 students from outside our district.
- l. LW – can we get back to BHS’s original question, about the mayor “spreading rumors” BK – all of our elementary schools are doing well, Palisades is a very strong school. Certainly Palisades wouldn’t be the first school on the list. If we were going to close a school, we would look at it for several years and look at the longer term of what it would be. There would be no more reason to close Palisades over any of the other schools.
- m. LW – teacher at Palisades and active Palisades parent are on the reconfiguration committee with Dr. Wicklund. He is not the only representative from Palisades.
- n. JH – how much money do you get from the state for each child that attends a school? Around \$5000. This is the first year of an increase in 8 years. The foundation has saved us. Is it better for people to move in or to get children from other districts? Could you offer subsidies to attract people to move in to the area? Have thought about subsidizing our teachers being able to move here with their children.
- o. JS – concerned that this upfront money has to come from the other tax payers, getting back to properties being pulled from the tax roles. Increased property taxes and fees will scare people away from the LO area.
- p. JW – building a turf field now. Why is this being built before Luscher Farms? BK - Their operation is separate from the school.
- q. BHS – is the field still being funded by private money is that still true? BK - We have not gotten a large donor, and will have to continue to try to fund it with small donors. Gotten some money with from the state. The money will not come out of the “education pot”. The construction monies will not come out of operating fund. Money that has been set aside from bond and other sources for construction. Should be done in June.
- r. JS – is the P&R use of school facilities use money generating? BK - We have a joint use agreement and have first priority. Neither pays for use of each other’s facilities.
- s. JS – concerns about removal of buildings from property tax generating revenues and tax

increment financing - how to address with school district? Should go through school board.

- t. BL – there is still a lot of construction going on and all these properties going up for \$800 - \$1000K.
- u. BK – thanks for allowing him to come to our meeting.
- v. The flyer [marketing material for school district] was inserted in the Oregonian last weekend.
- w. BK left at 11:30.

### 1. Update on Neighborhood Plan

IB - Neighborhood Plan is going very well. May 21<sup>st</sup> getting all drafts from City. Have a meeting on the 31<sup>st</sup> and then will ask for a meeting with the Executive Board. Then a general meeting. Paige and Sarah the new planners have really embraced our cause. LW would like to say that this is would not be possible without Ines' leadership.

2. **Rassekh property.** The new dog park is a done deal, the immediate question. Motion that the board votes no temporary dog park. Seconded, Passed unanimously via voice and had vote.

3. **Fire station relocation.** In meeting with City Manager and Mayor, the fire station chief would like to build a new fire station and one location is the Rassekh property. One reason is the future development in the area. LW has met with the fire chief at Rotary and he said that it was one of several locations. Needs to be on the agenda at the next general meeting. LW suggests that we have another board meeting prior to the next general meeting and have the fire chief meet with us. Move that we go on record to say no [to a fire station at Rassekh]. The matter is under study and the preliminary recommendation is to oppose it. Strongly support redesign and rebuilding on the current site. JW suggests that PO's letter to the city should .cc the city council and mayor.

4. JW would like the city council rep [Kristin Johnson] to come to the next board meeting

**Safeco voter initiative and infrastructure issues.** JS – petition to amend charter. Need 15% of registered voters by mid-July to be on November 2007 ballot. Requires city to ask voters before purchasing \$2 million dollars using city funds. Also would be retroactive and would then require the city to ask the voters about the Safeco property. Do other cities have measures like this? Yes, Beaverton & Sheridan for sure. Are there any other properties affected by the retroactive clause? No, in fact there are no other properties in 10 years that would have met this criteria.

Redevelopment agencies – LORA (created by state statue) we have no say. If the cities wish to purchase properties within a new redevelopment plan, it would have to go up for vote. LORA consists of City Council. Appreciate the support,, called Ask Lake Oswegans, motto is Ask Me First.

Infrastructure issues. We are faced with a \$120 million dollar sewer infrastructure expense. Also recently found that the water system needs repairs at \$75 million. Sees it as a competing need with community center. A petition to change the charter acts as a safeguard. It is going to raise our taxes to fix these sewer and water bills. The community center is not a necessity. \$16 million dollars in excess reserves and the rule said that the city couldn't spend more than 25% but they spent it all plus community development fund \$4 million. This was a short term and then replaced with line of credit. Paying \$83,000 month in interest charges. Used monies to move P&R to West End.

[Added per request Budd Levin - Risk and liability that the city must assume for the operating and maintenance costs for the community center when using the Safeco building.

Taking the LO Planning Group's own data, those costs are projected to be 8 to 10 times the original construction costs. Using the smaller numbers of \$80 million as the construction costs and 8 times, the total cost of operating expense and maintenance would be \$640 million.

Amortizing over a period of 20 years means that the operating/maintenance would be \$32 million/year.

The plan calls for fees to cover these costs but that seems impossibly optimistic. In the event that the fees do not cover all costs, then Lake Oswego (read citizens) must pay the difference each year. This means that the City will have assumed an enormous liability risk. While I will admit that the overall numbers seem huge, those are the numbers documented in their plan, in the section on budgeting.

Of course if you use the larger numbers (\$100M and 10 times) then annual costs increase to \$50M/year ... such spending would qualify our locally elected representatives for federal appointments. :=))

The costs and liability will increase if the city council adopts a phased approach to construction. JW – if you add up all the potential bond measures, \$300 million, with 10,000 homes, amounts to \$30,000 per home over a period of time. BL – went to Safeco planning meeting and got a copy of the draft plan. The original forecast for the sewer interceptor has grown. LW – as a taxpayer, he wants the ability to flush, have clean water, have fire and police and schools. These are the essential city services. The community center is “fluff”. This group should go back to focusing on the basic issues of a city. Question as to whether PNA can take a stand on the initiative or is this considered partisan. Can we, should we, or thirdly is there another way of doing it? Address the fiscal and infrastructure issues that are tied to this. Lee – the big issue now is the sewer.

- 1. Plan for next general meeting.** Meeting to be last week of May at Golf Course or School. AP will follow up. Would like to have better control of limiting speakers to PNA residents and limiting their time at the microphone. JW will act as Seargent-at-arms. Newsletter draft to be sent out soon. Need three weeks prior to meeting date for city to approve, print and prepare for mailing.

Meeting adjourned at 1:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Ann C. Pomazal  
Secretary,  
Palisades Neighborhood Association