



---

## City of Lake Oswego/City of Tigard Water Supply Partnership Finished Water Pipeline: McVey Bridge Crossing Land Use Neighborhood Meeting September 3, 2014

Project Director, Joel Komarek welcomed project neighbors and called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. on September 3, 2014, at the Lake Oswego United Methodist Church, 1822 S Shore Blvd., Lake Oswego, Oregon 97034.

**Present:**

**LOTWP Staff:** Joel Komarek, Jane Heisler, Katie Wilson

**David Evans & Associates:** Ethan Rosenthal

**E2 Land Use Services:** Eric Eisemann

**Kennedy Jenks:** Brad Moore

**Guests:** Carlyne Jones (Glenmorrie Neighborhood), Loren Masters (Lakewood Neighborhood), Christian Manz, Jackie Manz (Hallinan Neighborhood)

---

### 1. Welcome & Project Introduction

**Mr. Komarek** welcomed neighbors and gave an overview of the program. **Mr. Komarek** highlighted each of the major components of the project including the river intake in Gladstone, raw water pipeline in Gladstone and West Linn, water treatment plant in West Linn, finished water pipeline in West Linn, Lake Oswego and Tigard, Waluga reservoir 2 in Lake Oswego, and Bonita pump station in Tigard.

### 2. Project Design

**Mr. Moore** explained the original “under-the-lake” alignment and the reasons for an “around-the-lake” alignment for this segment of the finished water pipeline. He noted the cost associated with the previous alignment and the methodology of redesigning this portion of the pipeline to bring the best value and best serve the community.

Additionally, **Mr. Komarek** explained the meeting was required as part of the land use process for the new alignment to cross Oswego Creek.

### 3. Land Use Approval Process and Requirements

**Mr. Eisemann** reviewed the land use approval process and permitting requirements. He explained that the proposed pipe bridge and pipeline must satisfy the base zoning requirements for three

---

different zones: R-0, R-7.5 and PNA (Parks and Natural Areas), as well as those for a conditional use and design review, since it is considered a major public facility. The requirements also include a potential hardship variance, and Resource Protection-Resource Conservation District delineation. **Mr. Eismann** further explained community input was an important factor in the discussion regarding the hardship variance and Resource Protection-Resource Conservation District delineation and mitigation planning. Of particular note, is the front yard setback variance in the R-7.5 and R-0 zones, which requires that the setback be 13.3 feet further back than the 40 foot McVey Street special setback. This creates a special hardship because it moves the pipeline so far from the bridge that it will be more visible and pushes the pipe and supporting structure further into the sensitive lands area. **Mr. Eismann** also noted that the side yard setback requirements for the underlying zones were more appropriate to a building rather than a horizontal utility and that these setbacks also create a hardship. **Mr. Eismann** noted there would be public notice of a public hearing on the matter sometime during the next few months and that oral and written testimony would be taken.

#### 4. Environmental Issues and Response

**Mr. Rosenthal** explained that part of the review process is to review the environmental impacts of the work and develop a mitigation plan in response to those impacts. He reviewed a preliminary plan to perform required mitigation at a different site than the creek crossing due to the shallow soil conditions of the site and a pre-existing planned project (separate from this one) to remove invasive black locust trees from the area. The preliminary planned site for mitigation is Glenmorrie Park. This park has a well-established canopy of native trees but is plagued with invasive English Ivy. The mitigation plan would include removing the English Ivy and replanting with native plants. The proposed mitigation area is slightly over the 1.6 acres required for mitigation. **Mr. Rosenthal** also mentioned that there were several black locust trees on site and that they would be removed under a separate review and permit because they are invasive species.

#### 5. Public Questions

**A. Ms. Manz** asked why Glenmorrie Park was selected for mitigation since the impacts to natural resources due to the pipeline work will occur in the Hallinan neighborhood. She suggested Hallinan Woods be considered as an option that is closer to the impacted area. She noted the Hallinan Woods is adjacent to Hallinan Elementary School and has been neglected for some time.

**Mr. Rosenthal** explained the mitigation plan is only a preliminary plan and that other sites for mitigation could be explored. **Mr. Komarek** agreed that the Hallinan Woods area could be explored as an option for mitigation and thanked **Ms. Manz** for her suggestion.

**B. Ms. Jones** asked if mitigation was to take place on public or private property.

**Mr. Rosenthal** explained the mitigation was to take place on public property (Glenmorrie is publicly owned). **Ms. Jones** then noted she agreed with **Ms. Manz's** suggestion.

**C. Ms. Jones** asked if the tax lots adjacent to the project were publicly or privately owned.

---

**Mr. Komarek** said there were both. He also noted that project representatives have been in contact with the property owners to gain their input in the planning process, as well as to acquire the necessary permanent and temporary construction easements.

- D. Ms. Jones** asked what kind of materials the supports for the pipe would be made of.

**Mr. Komarek** explained the supports would be made of concrete and steel. The exact steel material has not been decided as there are many factors to take into consideration

- E. Ms. Jones** asked if the design process included consideration of flood conditions.

**Mr. Komarek** explained that part of the design is to plan for the possibility of flood conditions.

- F. Ms. Jones** asked what the pipe would look like.

**Mr. Komarek** explained that the pipe would receive a coating that could be a variety of colors. It was assumed it would be best to choose a color that would camouflage the pipe as much as possible. An exact color has not been selected and is still open for discussion.

- G. Ms. Masters** asked about the height of the pipe crossing and if it would pose a safety hazard in terms of children trying to access it.

**Mr. Komarek** reviewed the specifications for the pipe and noted that it would be difficult for someone to climb on.

- H. Mr. Manz** asked why it was not made into a pedestrian pathway.

**Mr. Komarek** explained that was outside the scope of the project and would have complicated design (increased weight and safety issues and greater visibility) and increased cost.

- I. Ms. Manz** asked if there was any way to combine the pipeline work on McVey with sidewalk improvements as she does not feel there is adequate pedestrian walkways on McVey, especially when cars park there.

**Mr. Komarek** said it was possible to see if there were any improvements planned with the Public Works Department and to discuss the possibility of combining the work. He also noted that Land Use does not require that kind of mitigation for this project.

- J. Ms. Jones** commented that she believes the direct neighbors to the crossing should be consulted for their opinion on the project.

**Mr. Komarek** explained that project representatives have been in contact with the neighbors and that it appears that most of them would like the pipe to stay as close to the bridge as possible. He noted that input from the surrounding community is very important and will be taken into consideration. He encouraged anyone interested to write a letter to the Development Review Board.

- K. Ms. Jones** asked what kind of equipment would be necessary to construct the crossing and how would workers access the site.

---

**Mr. Moore** explained that due to the conditions of the site, most of the worksite would be accessed from Maple Street but a separate staging area would be off-site. He said exact means and methods would be determined by the contractor.

**L. Ms. Manz** asked if using Maple Street as the access point would cause traffic problems.

**Mr. Moore** explained minimal traffic impacts are expected because the temporary staging area would be on temporary and permanent easements.

**M. Ms. Manz** asked for more information about the cost savings for choosing this alignment rather than going under the lake.

**Mr. Moore** reviewed the planned costs of the new alignment. Construction estimates for going under the lake were approximately 50% greater than the design estimate. The new alignment has a substantial cost savings as it is estimated to cost around \$4-5 million less than the design estimate for the under the lake alignment.

## **6. Next Steps**

**Mr. Komarek** reviewed the next steps in the process. The meeting minutes from this meeting would be submitted to the Neighborhood Associations invited to the meeting and they would have 14 days to respond. The Land Use Application is expected to be submitted this fall (2014) and the construction Notice to Proceed for the Finished Water Pipeline Schedule 4 is planned for January 2015. **Mr. Moore** explained it is estimated the work for all of Schedule 4 (between Erickson, down Durham Street, State Street and connecting to State and B Avenue) will take most of calendar year 2015 to complete.

**Ms. Manz** asked if the meeting recording would be made available and if there would be minutes or a meeting summary. **Mr. Komarek** explained that Katie Wilson would create minutes from her notes and the meeting recording. He said he wasn't sure if minutes could be made available on the website but that staff would look into the best way to make them accessible.

## **7. ADJOURN**

**Mr. Komarek** adjourned the meeting at 7:54 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Katie Wilson, Administrative Support