



## **PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA**

### **City Commission Chambers - City Hall**

320 Warner Milne, Oregon City, Oregon 97045

**April 27, 2009 at 7:00 P.M.**

The 2009 Planning Commission Agendas, including Staff Reports, memorandums, and minutes are available on the Oregon City Web Page ([www.orcity.org](http://www.orcity.org)) under Planning Commission.

#### **1. CALL TO ORDER**

#### **2. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT LISTED ON AGENDA**

#### **3. ADOPTION OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES: *None***

#### **4. PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING:**

- A. CP 09-01** The applicant has requested the approval of a Concept Master Plan for the Oregon City Public Works Center Plan. The subject site is located at 116 and 122 Center Street, 121, 204, 206 and 220 S. John Adams Street and 520 1<sup>st</sup> Street, Oregon City, Oregon 97045. The properties are identified as Clackamas County Map 2-2E-31, tax lots 400 and 500 and 2-2E-31CA, tax lots 2100, 2200 (no site address), 6201 (no site address), and 1700.

**Staff recommends that the hearing be continued to the May 11<sup>th</sup>, 2009 hearing.**

#### **5. WORK SESSION**

- A.** Discussion of 2009 Planning Commission Goals and Objectives.  
**B.** Introduction to the Urban and Rural reserves.

#### **6. ADJOURN**



### MEMORANDUM

To: Oregon City Planning Commission  
From: Tony Konkol, Senior Planner  
Re: Public Works Center Plan: Planning File CP 09-01  
Date: April 20, 2009

---

#### **Recommendation:**

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission open the public hearing, providing the opportunity for staff to present an overview of the application, the applicant to make an initial presentation of the project and interested citizens to provide public testimony. Staff requests that the Planning Commission provide staff with any questions prior to leaving the record open for additional written evidence, arguments or testimony and continuing the hearing to the Monday, May 11<sup>th</sup>, 2009 Planning Commission meeting.

#### **Reason for Recommendation:**

The McLoughlin Neighborhood Association (attachment 4) has requested a continuance of the April 27<sup>th</sup>, 2009 hearing concerning the Public Works Center Plan application. Per Oregon Revised Statute 197.763(6)a, prior to the conclusion of the initial evidentiary hearing, any participant may request an opportunity to present additional evidence, arguments or testimony regarding the application. The local hearings authority shall grant such request by continuing the public hearing pursuant to paragraph (b) of this subsection or leaving the record open for additional written evidence, arguments or testimony pursuant to paragraph (c) of this subsection.

#### **Project Overview:**

The Public Works Center Plan (attachments 1, 2 and 3) examines the current and future needs of the entire Public Works Department, incorporates all the Public Works groups into one location and how to accommodate and expand most of the needed facilities on the current site, which is located at 122 South Center Street.

The applicant has proposed a four phase concept master plan for the development of the site. The first phase includes the closure of South John Adams through the upper site, security fencing, demolition of the existing warehouses on the upper site, site grading, assorted storage and parking construction, paving and landscaping. Phase two includes the construction of a new, four-story office building of approximately 25,600 square feet on the lower site, street improvements and



# OREGON CITY

## Community Development – Planning

221 Molalla Ave. Suite 200 | Oregon City OR 97045

Ph (503) 722-3789 | Fax (503) 722-3880

landscaping. The third phase includes the construction of the fleet, storage and shop building, construction of the covered walkway and patio area, additional street improvements and landscaping. The fourth phase includes acquiring the Armory, demolition of the Cameron warehouse, existing parking lot improvements, stormwater detention area improvements, street improvements, construction of the pedestrian path through Waterboard Park and additional landscaping. A detailed phasing summary is provided on pages 7 and 8 of the Public Works Center Plan application.

### **Process:**

In response to the request for additional time to present evidence and comments, staff has recommended continuing the hearing to the May 11<sup>th</sup>, 2009 meeting. Any interested party may submit evidence into the record, either in writing or through public testimony up until the time that the commission closes the public hearing. For information to be mailed to the commissioner members for the May 11<sup>th</sup>, 2009 hearing, it will need to be submitted to the city no later than 5pm on Friday, May 1<sup>st</sup>, 2009. Information received after this date will be forwarded to the commission members at the hearing. Staff is planning to present the concept master plan staff report at the May 11<sup>th</sup>, 2009 hearing.

### **Attachments:**

1. Public Works Center Plan, dated February 23, 2009 (On File at the Community Development Department);
2. Public Works Center Plan Transportation Impact Analysis, dated February, 2009 (On File at the Community Development Department);
3. Memorandum from J. Lewis, dated April 15, 2009;
4. McLoughlin Neighborhood Association continuance request, dated April 17, 2009;
5. Comments submitted by Mr. Whelan, dated April 17, 2009;
6. Comments submitted by Mr. Whelan, dated April 17, 2009; and
7. Comments submitted by Mr. Wilson, dated April 17, 2009.

### **Contact Information:**

The Community Development Department is located at 221 Molalla Avenue, Suite 200, Oregon City, Oregon 97045. Tony Konkol, Senior Planner can be contacted at 503.496.1562 or by email at [tkonkol@ci.oregon-city.or.us](mailto:tkonkol@ci.oregon-city.or.us).



# OREGON CITY

## Public Works - Operations

122 South Center Street | Oregon City OR 97045  
Ph (503) 657-8241 | Fax (503) 650-9590

TO: William Gifford, McLoughlin Neighborhood Chair  
Jon McLoughlin, Historic Review Board Chair

FROM: John M. Lewis, P.E., Oregon City Public Works Operations Manager

COPY: David Hyman, AIA, Principal  
Nancy Kraushaar, P.E., City Engineer/Public Works Director  
Larry Patterson, City Manager  
Tony Konkol, Senior Planner  
Christina Robertson Gardiner, Planner

DATE: April 15, 2009

SUBJECT: Operations Master Plan Responses - DRAFT

---

The Oregon City Public Works Department has submitted a master plan application for phased development of the Public Works Operations Center located at S. 1<sup>st</sup> Street and Center Street, including the upper yard located on South John Adams Street. The application is currently under review. As part of our due diligence, we have met once with the Neighborhood Association and twice with the Historic Review Board.

OCPW would like to obtain letters from both groups in support of the master plan. In an effort to be a good neighbor and to address concerns where possible, we have prepared the following responses to comments we have received to date.

### **Historic Review Board (HRB) Comments (from meeting on Jan. 27, 2009) and OCPW Responses**

1. HRB Comment

Noted risk of landslides from Waterboard Park. Suggested further geotechnical research.

OCPW Response

*The critical new buildings (shops and offices) in the master plan are located away from the boundary to the Park on stable soil. In the next phase of planning, when the buildings are being designed, the City will engage a geotechnical engineer to analyze soil conditions and make recommendations.*

2. HRB Comment

Consider stepping 4-story office building to minimize scale on South Center Street.

OCPW Response

*The master plan process does not require the building to be designed; however we have indicated in the application that the building will be stepped back from Center Street in two locations. The first step will occur at the approximately 35', which is the current base zone height limit.*

3. HRB Comment

Consider designing 4-story building to take advantage of views of basalt cliff.

OCPW Response

*During the building design phase, we suggest including windows and perhaps decks overlooking the basalt cliff.*

4. HRB Comment

Consider using basalt rock from site in future building and landscaping.

OCPW Response

*Basalt would be a good material for site walls and decorative landscape elements. It would be quite expensive to use as a building material, unless it is used sparingly as an accent.*

5. HRB Comment

Consider shortening the building, extending elevator and including stairs to upper yard level.

OCPW Response

*One of the key features of the office building is supervision of the upper site. The current plan is to locate the office of the Operations Manager and Division Supervisors on the top floor overlooking the upper yard.*

6. HRB Comment

The board encouraged further documentation of the history of the buildings identified on the Master Plan to be demolished/recycled.

OCPW Response

*Historic consultant, David Pinyerd, has performed further studies and documentation of the buildings being considered for removal, since the meeting with the Historic Review Board on January 15<sup>th</sup>. He presented that information at our second meeting with the HRB on that information available to anyone who is interested.*

**Neighborhood Meeting (January 15, 2009)**

1. Neighborhood Comment

Encourage sustainable design. Perform solar analysis of the site for use of solar technologies. Consider green roofs. Provide public access to storm water management facilities.

OCPW Response

*OCPW intends to make the upper and lower sites a demonstration project for sustainable storm water management and landscaping. Storm water runoff from buildings will be retained on site. The upper site will include a detention pond. We will consider public access to it. The lower site will include a cistern for collecting rainwater for irrigation and possibly other Public Works uses. It is also the intention to design the buildings to be sustainable and to meet a minimum of LEED Silver certification. Features may include green roofs, photo-voltaic panels, use of local and non-toxic materials, use of materials with recycled content, natural day-lighting and ventilation and high efficiency mechanical systems.*

2. Neighborhood Comment

Suggest having the police and fire department review the plans.

OCPW Response

*Police and fire departments along with several other review authorities were provided copies of the master plan package on March 24, 2009. Additional project review opportunities will be made available during the building permit process.*

3. Neighborhood Comment

Maintain access to Waterboard Park

OCPW Response

*Since the upper site will be fenced and restrict public use, OCPW will build a pedestrian trail in the Park to maintain a connection to the park from the southwest corner.*

4. Neighborhood Comment

Provide a turn-around area for vehicles at gated entrances

OCPW Response

*Current plan includes space for automobile turn-around.*

5. Neighborhood Comment  
Consider amending site plan to respond to topographic irregularities of the site.

OCPW Response

*Although currently irregular, the site will be re-graded to be much flatter to optimize usability. The new buildings have been arranged accordingly.*

6. Neighborhood Comment  
Existing rock outcroppings are a wildlife habitat. Maintain where possible.

OCPW Response

*We intend to preserve as much of the outcroppings and natural habitat on the perimeter of the site as possible. However, because of the limited space available, we intend to remove the rock outcropping on the northern portion of the site.*

7. Neighborhood Comment  
Locate fueling station further from the entrance to the site and provide screening.

OCPW Response

*In the current plans, we have moved the fueling station further away from the entrance to the site and screened it with landscape.*

8. Neighborhood Comment  
Consider preserving the existing office building on the lower site

OCPW Response

*The existing building does not meet with needs of the current Operations Division and will not meet the future space needs of the consolidated Operations and Public Works Departments. The building would require considerable expense to upgrade it to meet current seismic and ADA codes. Since it is not architecturally significant, OCPW considers it an unwise investment to preserve and renovate it. The design team has proposed architectural screening for the parking lot, beyond the code requirement, on the lower level which could recall the column spacing as a gesture to its former use.*

9. Neighborhood Comment  
Consider locating more public and staff parking on the upper level and reducing it on the lower level.

OCPW Response

*The intent of the current design is to separate the office uses from the shop uses for safety and security reasons. OCPW would like to restrict pedestrian and vehicular traffic, serving the office building, primarily to the lower site to avoid conflicts with service vehicles and heavy equipment. Employee parking is planned for the lower site at full plan build out. However, the upper site will be used to accommodate some employee parking between Phase II and Phase III of the implementation plans.*

10. Neighborhood Comment  
Office building design should be "significant", include high quality materials, and step back from Center Street to reduce scale and massing.

OCPW Response

*We agree and will address these issues in the next phase of design.*

11. Neighborhood Comment  
Consider exposing the stair case between upper and lower sites more prominently and allow public use.

OCPW Response

*We will consider this in the next phase of building design if it does not compromise safety and security.*

12. Neighborhood Comment

Concern was expressed about noise reflectance off the rock bluff into the neighborhood, once the existing buildings are removed.

OCPW Response

*We will look into provisions including screening and landscape inside the area encompassed by the rock bluff partly in an effort to address neighborhood concerns that the City includes provisions for noise mitigation.*

13. Neighborhood Comment

Concern was expressed about speeding traffic on South Center Street.

OCPW Response

*Speeding on Center Street is beyond the scope of the master plan. However, OCPW and the City's Transportation Advisory Committee are equipped to consider neighborhood speeding complaints. As related to this planning and public improvement process, street improvements along Center Street would be considered for traffic calming measures.*

14. Neighborhood Comment

Consider aligning South John Adams Street with 2<sup>nd</sup> Street at the South Center Street intersection.

OCPW Response

*The topography is too steep to accommodate the needed grade change and a connection would also require dedication of a significant amount of public right-of-way. An improvement of this nature would significantly (negatively) impact both the neighboring resident and the natural habitat.*

## Tony Konkol

---

**From:** McGriff, Denyse [McGriffD@pdc.us]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2009 5:39 PM  
**To:** Tony Konkol  
**Cc:** Tim Powell (E-mail 2) (E-mail); William Gifford  
**Subject:** Oregon City Public Works Master Plan

Just to let you know that the MNA is still working o master plan issues with the staff. We will be meeting again on April 23. We are not in a position to make commetns on the application at this time. John has been great to work with and I am confidence that we can resolve the many questions we have. Therefore we request that the hearing be continued to all more time for review by the MNA and Public Works staff

Thank you, Denyse

*Denyse McGriff*



*Frank S. Whelan, Architect*

2009 APR 17 PM 4: 36

April 17, 2009

RECEIVED  
CITY OF OREGON CITY

Tony Konkol, Senior Planner  
Oregon City Planning Department  
221 Molalla Avenue, Suite 200  
Oregon City, Oregon 97045

Reference: CP: 0901  
Public Works Concept Master Plan

Dear Mr. Konkol:

I have addressed another letter to the Planning Commission, regarding the proposed site for Public Works new facility. In the event that they do not reconsider the site selection as I suggest, I would like to propose certain conditions be included in their approval of the Master Plan. They are:

1. Limit Site Access to Center Street.

Truck access to the site should be limited to Center Street. Trucks should travel along major double yellow arterial streets (Center Avenue and Fifth Avenue) not on minor residential streets through an historically designated neighborhood to serve areas to the east and north of the City. No access should be permitted from John Adams Street on the north side of the property. For the first two blocks this street is only one lane wide, making two-way traffic unfeasible. Without sidewalks, truck traffic would be hazardous for pedestrians. Steep slopes along each side of this street make road widening prohibitively expensive.

2. Parking at Trailhead

The public who use the park are presently parking in the area in front of the Armory. Because of the constricted width of John Adams Street, there is not space for on-street parking. 10 perpendicular or parallel parking spaces should be provided on the south side of the street near the trailhead. The space should be taken from the north side of Public Works property. Not providing parking would force public parking onto the adjacent road and alleyways, blocking fire department access.

3. Opaque Landscape Buffer

Provide a "softscape" totally opaque landscape buffer along the east and north property line from the trailhead to the bluff. The buffer should extend from grade to a minimum of 8'-0" above the crown of the adjacent roadbed and be located outside any security fence. It should block views of the site from neighboring residential property. A laurel hedge would conform with this requirement. Metal fences, chain link fences (with or without wood slats), block or stone walls would not conform. Trees or planting that do not completely obstruct views do not conform.

Attachment 5

4. Future Growth

Require that Public Works agree in writing that they will not make any future request to use the park land to the south and east for expansion.

5. Retain Existing Bird Habitat and Oak Grove.

Retain an arborist and an ornithologist to evaluate existing oak grove and bird habitat and make recommendations regarding retention of existing environment. Planning Department shall evaluate and determine what trees are to be saved and maintained.

Sincerely

Frank S. Whelan, Architect

Attachment: Letter to Planning Commission

Via: email

Frank S. Whelan, Architect

2009 APR 17 PM 4: 36

April 17, 2009

RECEIVED  
CITY OF OREGON CITY

Oregon City Planning Commission  
221 Molalla Avenue, Suite 200  
Oregon City, Oregon 97045

Reference: CP: 0901  
Public Works Concept Master Plan

Dear Council Members:

My wife Valerie, son Gordon Wilson and I are property owners and residents of the property at 107 Jefferson Street. The following comments are offered for your consideration in reviewing the Master Plan for the proposed new Public Works Maintenance Yard facility.

#### Site Selection

In 2004 Public Works went through a site evaluation process and selected the proposed site on the bluff above Oregon City. The advantages are obvious: It is contiguous with the existing facility on Center Street. The property may be repurchased from the National Guard for \$1.00. It is presently being used by Public Works. The continued use of buildings on Center Street will allow construction to be phased over time, reducing initial investment. The site is zoned Institutional and maintenance yards are a permitted use.

Clearly, Public Works have done their homework and are in conformance with the applicable codes. They are certainly entitled to build on the site. However, what they are entitled to do and what they should do is open to question. Unlike private entities, Public Works and Planning Commission's first consideration is the public welfare. Considerations such as cost, adjacency to existing facilities, and zoning may be important. However, they pale in comparison to larger public interests.

#### 1. Zoning

The site at one time was being considered as a location for Clackamas Community College. That certainly met the intent of the Institutional zoning. Later, in a patriotic gesture, the City sold it to the National Guard for \$1.00. While a maintenance facility is defined as an institutional use, it does strain one's credulity to group it together with museums and educational facilities as "*Institutional*". Common sense suggests that it is more appropriately defined as industrial. Such use, abutting residential and park land, is mixing oil and water. A basic tenet of good planning is to develop property to its highest and best use. This project on this site doesn't pass muster.

## 2. Site

The site is on a bluff facing south with a commanding view of the Willamette River and Falls. Artifacts of Native American communities have been found in the immediate area. Oregon City's first pioneers settled on the bluff over 150 years ago. The historically significant McLoughlin Neighborhood is on the northern boundary of the proposed site. A grove of old-growth oak trees provides bird habitat. This is one of the few undeveloped sites that remain in the public domain along the bluff. It should be retained as such for future public use. Each of us can envision some pearl our grandchildren might want add to the City's crown. Don't take their option away with a maintenance yard.

The proposed site for the Maintenance Facility is in the southwest quadrant of Oregon City – away from the center of the area served. As the City expands to the northeast, the facility will become even more distant. This will increase travel distances and operational costs.

## 3. Trojan Horse

A previous study of Tualatin and West Linn's maintenance facilities indicated that the required usable land area for a similar facility serving smaller constituencies is 8 to 10 acres or more than twice the size of the site Public Works has selected. If indeed that is true, the only available adjacent land for growth is the City park to the south. Because both city parks and maintenance facilities are zoned as "Institutional" use and are City property, this would mean that Public Works could expand into this area without going through rezoning or possibly public hearings. After having previously made a \$20,000,000 investment in a new maintenance facility, how likely would it be for the City to deny the Public Works the ability to expand into park land in the future? It would wrong to assume that Public Works can readily purchase the adjacent residential property. Is the City amenable to using Eminent Domain to force sale of private property? In for a penny, in for a pound.

## 4. Traffic

There are only two points of access to the property; one from Center Street, the other from John Adams. Both are constricted and only one lane wide. There are no sidewalks on either street. Rock outcroppings and precipitous slopes at both points preclude widening of the access roads. Only one vehicle at a time can drive along the street. A number of homes with children front John Adams along the last two blocks north of the site. Maintenance trucks using this street would be hazardous for children and other pedestrians. They would also be driving on a minor residential street for seven blocks through an historical neighborhood.

## 5. Long Term Oregon City Planning Goals and Objectives

I pose a question for both the Planning Commission and Public Works. Is the visionary, long-term development of Oregon City as a vibrant forward-looking community compromised by selecting this site for expansion of Public Works. Or should another more appropriate site, that better serves both the public and Public Works needs, be found. If there is question of concern in your mind, further study is justified.

This is not a case of "we have already addressed this issue before"; it's a case of what now best serves the community. It is not too late to reconsider. Some of the issues raised above may not have been considered during previous reviews of the Project. Yogi Berra would say "Its not over until its over". The importance of this site demands reconsideration. If land costs of other property are driving the decision, Public Works should wait until money is available.

Sincerely,

Frank S. Whelan, Architect

**Gordon Keith Wilson**  
107 Jefferson Street  
Oregon City, OR 97045  
503-722-1233

2009 APR 17 PM 4:36  
RECEIVED  
CITY OF OREGON CITY

April 17, 2009

City of Oregon City- Planning Commission  
221 Molalla Avenue, Suite 200  
Oregon City, Oregon 97045

Reference: CP 09-01 Public Works Concept Master Plan

Dear City of Oregon City –Planning Commission,

My name is Gordon Keith Wilson and I am part owner along with my mother (Valerie Whelan) and stepfather (Frank Whelan) and I live at 107 Jefferson Street, Oregon City, OR, 97045, and have lived here for the past four years. I am writing to you concerning the CP 09-01 Public Works Concept Master Plan. I would first like to say that the Oregon City Public Works does a great job and has been a good neighbor ever since I have lived here, and Nancy Kraushaar and John Lewis have been very helpful and open to my questions and concerns. Though in reading through the “Public Works Center Plan- Feb. 23, 2009” (as I understand it) I find many errors and omissions that have created serious concerns as a close neighbor to this project and member of the McLoughlin Historic Preservation Neighborhood. In the first part of this letter I will just go through the “Public Works Center Plan- Feb. 23, 2009” and point out the errors and omissions that I’m concerned about, along with Category 5 “Oregon City Comprehensive Plan” violations that this project may be committing if allowed to proceed. In closing I will consolidate my suggestions and feelings about “Public Works Center Plan- Feb. 23, 2009”, the future of Oregon City in general and end with some quotes from the “Oregon City Comprehensive Plan”.

## **Errors and Omissions in “Public Works Center Plan- Feb. 23, 2009”**

### **2.2 Project Goals**

#### **A.) “Guide Facility Development over the next ten years to meet demand and allow for future expansion.”**

**Problem:** With the current site in the “Public Works Center Plan- Feb. 23, 2009” there is no room for expansion unless you condemn and purchase 16 surrounding residential properties in the Historic McLoughlin Neighborhood. In the 2005 “Operations Facilities Plan- Dec. 14<sup>th</sup> 2005” they studied the current Milwaukie and Tualatin Public Works Operations sites, both cities smaller than Oregon City and concluded that the Oregon City Operations will most likely require eight to ten acres over the next 20 years. In 2005 Milwaukie occupied eight acres and needed more and Tualatin owned ten acres and occupied nine. The current Oregon City Center Street

## **2.2 Project Goals (cont.)**

Public Works site totals approximately 4.5 acres, yet the actual usable acres due to difficult natural terrain is only 2.2 acres per the “Operations Facilities Plan- Dec. 14<sup>th</sup> 2005”. So even with the addition of the Armory property, the current site would only be 6-7 acres, which is just not big enough if you consider future the growth; that was forecasted to require 8-10 acres. The only way to expand the current site would be to condemn and purchase more residential properties in the surrounding Historic McLoughlin preservation district; which is clearly a negative impact on the surrounding areas, violating Municipal Code 17.39.10 Institutional District “ensure compatibilities of these developments with the surrounding areas.”

### **B.) “Provide efficient circulation of vehicles and workflow.”**

**Problem:** From section 6.5 Site Circulation- “Most of the Operations vehicles enter the site from South Center Street, which requires navigating a hairpin turn with no shoulder and a steep, narrow access drive. The road does not meet current Oregon City Street Design Standards. It is particularly dangerous during icy weather conditions, when sanding trucks use the road to load sand from the upper site. Widening the road and improving the turning radius will require purchasing additional property at the intersection of South John Adams and South Center Streets. The alternate route to the upper site, via South John Adams Street, is safer, but is less direct and requires passing through a residential neighborhood. Unimpeded travel to the upper site is critical due to the programmatic requirement for access during inclement weather and other emergencies.”

Paula Blackwell, the owner of the property at the intersection of South John Adams and South Center Streets was at the neighborhood meeting discussing this issue and was told specifically that they were now not interested in acquiring her property. Yet John Adams Street, the only other access point to this upper site, is a one lane paved road with no sidewalks bordered by cliffs and residential houses with many children and was not even included in the Transportation Impact study. It therefore is not possible to develop this upper site for efficient and safe unimpeded travel and workflow, without condemning Paula’s house, which we were told was not going to occur.

### **C.) “Provide centralized location for vehicle, equipment and material storage.”**

**Problem:** Although the current Center Street location could currently be considered a somewhat central location in Oregon City; if you look at a map and consider the future growth and expansion of Oregon City it would not be considered central to Oregon City but really more on the perimeter. A more central location in regards to the City and it’s future growth and expansion would be somewhere near the Hilltop area. A central Oregon City location is important for many reasons, decreasing traffic and associated pollution while increasing efficiency of operations therefore saving money and servicing the whole of Oregon City much easier and faster.

## **2.4 Process**

**Cost Effectiveness** “By maintaining the facilities on the current site, the city will save the cost of purchasing additional land...”

**Problem:** In the Section 2.4 Process at the end they contradict the above statement when it states: “ Since the preferred site plan requires purchasing additional property as it becomes available, some of the projected costs remain uncertain.”

**Sustainability** “ By preserving the existing infrastructure on the current site, the city will use fewer materials and natural resources, promoting responsible environmental policy.”

**Problem:** The master plan calls for demolishing everything but the Armory and bulldozing and paving a beautiful and scenic natural resource site, this is hardly promoting responsible environmental policy.

**Neighborhood Support** “By maintaining its presence in the neighborhood and planning for future growth, the Operations facility supports jobs and activities in the central city.”

**Problem:** None of my neighbors are in favor of this expansion; they worry about the safety of their children and the increased traffic, noise, water and air pollution this expansion will bring to the surrounding historic residential neighborhood. They also worry about losing the natural and scenic beauty of this area to a rock and large truck storage facility.

## **9.0 Implementation Strategy**

**Street Guidelines** “In summary the proposed Master Plan development will have no negative impacts on the surrounding roadways other than the closure of the John Adams Street shortcut through the site.”

**Problem:** The City of Oregon City Operations Facility Master Plan Transportation Impact Study” does not include John Adams Street even though the Public Works Master Plan includes an entrance/exit onto John Adams street. The Transportation Impact study also only considers the impact of 37 full-time employees, where the Public Works Master Plan is forecasting a total of 70 full-time employees, so I think they need to do a new Transportation Impact study before they can claim there will be no negative impacts on the surrounding roadways.



## Responses to Oregon City Municipal Code

### 17.65.05.A.1 Narrative Statement

#### G.) Site Description

##### 7.) Natural Resources that appear on the City's Adopted Goal 5 inventory:

"The proposed site does not contain any natural resources that appear on the City's adopted Goal 5 inventory."

**Problem:** The above statement is false and untrue. The upper site has numerous hundred year old native Oregon Oaks, wildlife habitat, wetlands, springs, scenic views of the McLoughlin Neighborhood, Mt. Hood, West Linn, The Willamette Falls, etc. that all fall under the City's Goal 5 Inventory.

Goal 5.1 Open Space

Goal 5.2 Scenic Views and Scenic Sites

Goal 5.3 Historic Resources

Policy 5.3.5 Preserve Natural Landscapes

Goal 5.4 Natural Resources

Policy 5.4.1 Conserve and restore ecological structure

Policy 5.4.2 Protect Wildlife Habitat

Policy 5.4.3 Restore Natural Resources

Policy 5.4.4 Consider Natural Resources as contribution to quality of life

Policy 5.4.7 City shall encourage preservation

Policy 5.4.8 Conserve Natural Resources

#### H.) Existing Transportation Analysis

**Problem:** The current Transportation Impact Study does not include John Adams Street when the Master Concept Plan has an entrance/exit on John Adams street. The Impact Study also is only forecasting for 37 full-time employs where the Master Concept Plan is forecasting 70 full-time employees. A new Traffic Impact study is therefore needed.

In conclusion I feel that this is not the best site available in Oregon City for the expansion of the Oregon City Public Works. It is too small a site to accommodate the future needs of the city. It is too difficult of terrain for safe and efficient operations. It is not central to Oregon City and it's future growth. And its expansion is not compatible with the surrounding historic residential conservation neighborhood. A larger Public Works Operations center would be much better situated in the center of Oregon City away from historic residential neighborhoods. Where they had enough room to function efficiently and safely and where natural habitat, scenic views and open spaces would not be disturbed. For the sake of Oregon City and it's current and future residents please consider a different site location for the expansion of the Oregon City Public Works.

**From "Oregon City's Comprehensive Plan- June 2004"**

"Oregon City's Goal 5 inventory requires that open spaces and natural, scenic, and historic resources be protected."

"Protecting the City's valuable natural resources is thus one of Oregon City's primary goals."

"We abuse the land because we regard it as a commodity belonging to us. When we see land as a community to which we belong, we may begin to use it with love and respect."  
-Aldo Leopold

Sincerely,

*Gordon Wilson 4-17-04*

Gordon K. Wilson  
107 Jefferson Street  
Oregon City, Oregon 97045  
503-722-1233