



**Meeting Summary**  
**North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District**  
**District Advisory Committee**

**Wednesday, April 13, 2022**  
**5:30 – 7:30 p.m.**  
**Location: Virtually (via Zoom)**

---

**DAC Members Present:** Anatta Blackmarr, Ben Johnson, David Gilman, Debrah Bokowski, Desi Nicodemus, Grover Bornefeld, Joel Bergman, Maureen Thom, Ryan Stee

**DAC Members Absent:** None

**Staff and Officials Present:** Paul Savas (Clackamas County Commissioner), Michael Bork (NCPRD Director), Heather Koch, Elizabeth Gomez, Jessica May (NCPRD)

A video of this meeting is available on the NCPRD website at  
<https://ncprd.com/public-meetings/meeting-minutes>

---

**Call to Order**

DAC meeting was called to order by Chair Bornefeld at 5:30 p.m. A quorum was present.

**Action Items**

- Approval of DAC Meeting Summary
  - The summary from the DAC meeting held on March 9, 2022 was approved with one minor edit presented by Joel Bergman.

**Discussion Agenda**

- Sub-Area Outreach Process to Recruit & Nominate Local Representative
  - Chair Bornefeld provided an overview of the DAC member recruitment process.
- FY 22-23 Budget Update
  - Director Bork provided an update on the NCPRD budget.
- Milwaukie Bay Park Update\*
  - Heather Koch provided an update on the Milwaukie Bay Park project which included the design refinement and next-term steps.
- Concord Update\*
  - A Concord Project Update meeting, ran by Gary Schmidt (Clackamas County Administrator), is scheduled for Wednesday, April 20, 2022 via Zoom from 5:30pm-6:30pm.
- SDC Methodology Update\*
  - Heather provided a brief update on the SDC Methodology.
- NCPRD Funding Update\*

- The funding update was provided under the agenda item “FY 22-23 Budget Update”.

### **Public Comment**

- Jeanette DeCastro
  - Jeanette asked what the proportion is of full-time employees versus part-time (or temporary) employees that have changed from last year’s budget to this year’s budget.

### **DAC Member Reports**

- Anatta Blackmarr (Subarea 2 representative)
  - My wish is that we would receive an update from every subarea during these meetings. I would like to get to know other subareas.
  - On July 16, the subarea 2 community is putting on the annual Trolley Trail fest where the Trolley Trail crosses Oak Grove Blvd. NCPRD will have a booth at this event.
- Joel Bergman (Community Center representative)
  - The Community Center Advisory Board’s (CCAB) bylaw revisions were approved by the NCPRD Board of Directors.
  - The CCAB currently has one vacancy.
    - The advisory board meets the second Friday of every month at 9:30 a.m. at the Milwaukie Community Center.
  - Tomorrow (April 14), the Housing and Senior Services fair is happening at the Milwaukie Community Center from 10a.m. to noon.
  - On April 30, the annual Italian Dinner will be happening at the Milwaukie Community Center
    - Tickets can be bought online:  
<https://aftontickets.com/italiandinner>
- Grover Bornefeld (Subarea 1 representative)
  - A group has been formed called the Friends of the Park at Jennings Lodge (school).
  - Looking forward to an update from the Tribes for input for us to consider.

### **District Monthly Reports**

Michael Bork provided the division reports.

- The District Monthly reports were included in the agenda packet.

### **Future Dates**

- April Agenda Submission Deadline: Wednesday April 20, 2022 by 5:00 p.m.
- Next Agenda Setting Meeting: Tuesday April 26, 2022
- Next DAC Meeting: Wednesday May 11, 2022
  - Planned agenda topics:
    - Tribes Naming Update Boardman Wetlands

### **Adjournment**

The DAC meeting was adjourned by Chair Bornefeld at 7:29 p.m.

### **Next DAC Meeting:**

May 11, 2022

5:30 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.

## **NCPRD DAC Meeting – Zoom Chat Log**

Virtual on Zoom, April 13, 2022

---

**17:41 Ryan Stee:** Would you show the map again please?

**17:48 Joel Bergman:** In the interest of time, perhaps Grover can submit his questions via email. He can CC DAC if he'd like.

**17:54 virginia foster:** I was expecting to see a bar graph with numbers. We haven't actually seen the budget.

**18:17 Jeanette DeCastro:** What % of staffing is FTE vs part-time or temporary workers? Has that changed since last cycle? (okay to answer @ end)

**18:29 Jan Carothers:** I have a question about the 15 million in reserves. How does the district invest that money for growth? Is it invested by County finance managers or is it managed by the District finance manager?

**18:52 virginia foster:** How does this park serve the greater community when the majority of the parking is for boat trailers?

**19:04 Ben Johnson:** Hi Virginia. Parking is and always will be an issue at MBP - it's a function of it's location. A lot of the boaters live outside Milwaukie so that should be noted. We assume people will park downtown and walk 2 blocks to the park like they do for seasonal events like the Solstice.

**19:04 Heather Koch:** the next opportunities to ask questions are (1) to review the materials at your leisure online and email questions to [info@ncprd.com](mailto:info@ncprd.com) in advance of Apr 18 meeting and (2) to attend the Apr 18 meeting @ 6:30 (virtual). See [www.milwaukiebaypark.org](http://www.milwaukiebaypark.org)

**19:06 virginia foster:** parking is an issue for Sunday Farmer's Market.

**19:14 Ben Johnson:** I'm signing off -- I have to pick up my son from soccer practice.

**19:14 Joel Bergman:** <https://aftontickets.com/italiandinner>

**19:17 Jan Carothers:** Regarding the public parking list on the website, thank you Very exciting!

**19:20 Kandi Ho:** Sept. 10 at North Clackamas Park

**19:29 Jeanette DeCastro:** If it is a short answer to the question: what sub areas have reps present tonight?

**From:** [Richard Recker](#)  
**To:** [NCPRD - District Advisory Committee](#); [BCCMail](#); [Schmidt, Gary](#)  
**Cc:** [Mark Gamba](#); [Val Hubbard](#); [Debbie NDA Liptan](#); [Michele Bertaux-Zabaglio](#)  
**Subject:** Historic Milwaukie Neighborhood Comment to Clackamas County re: IGA for Milwaukie Bay Park  
**Date:** Monday, March 28, 2022 7:57:01 PM  
**Attachments:** [HMNDA Comment to CCBC Re Milwaukie Bay Park IGA-3.pdf](#)

---

## **Warning: External email. Be cautious opening attachments and links.**

---

Friends and Neighbors:

Below and attached are comments to support the timely, appropriate and sufficient resources and attention be advanced to commence the Milwaukie Bay Park expansion and improvements. These comments were originally shared in January of this year and have been updated to reflect the District Advisory Committee's expressed support for moving forward with the park project and the funding commitments.

Respectfully.

Rich Recker, Chair

Clackamas County Board of Commissioners:

In the trenches of a democratic republic are volunteer neighborhood organizations. The Historic Milwaukie Neighborhood District Association is one such group - hard-working, principled and committed to doing our part alongside hundreds of other neighborhoods in Clackamas County to be vibrant, inclusive, and sustainable places. We make this voluntary commitment happily and willingly, knowing that - collectively - we're building a better place for each new generation to enjoy and steward forward.

Our neighborhood hosts the current Milwaukie Bay Park. It sits below the confluence of the Willamette and Clackamas rivers - at the foot of the gathering place of Clackamas First People and later the growing seeds of settlement and development. This area is steeped in history, natural beauty and is a recreational launch pad. Even in its underdeveloped state, the park welcomes thousands of visitors from within the County and beyond.

Like any community at the threshold of a popular destination, that proximity comes with responsibility. As neighbors, we clean the park in preparation for daily and seasonal visitors, and start over again the next day. We wave in welcome, even in deepening traffic

or while sharing limited parking - as the park continues to grow in popularity even BEFORE the next stage improvements are installed. And in this season of the world, we gently and humanely manage a temporary population of people without homes - a sober reality of the paradoxes of modern American life.

This lengthy preface is a lead up to a request for Clackamas County to affirm commitments to develop the park to the vision and specification outlined; to refine and expand this place to fulfill its' full potential to be a playground for the entire County and all who may choose to visit. This is not the time to lose resolve to complete this project or any other in the cue throughout the County. This is the time to demonstrate to each one of us - the individual, in-the-trenches citizens that your word is a 'bond' and you stand next to us committed to the work you may have yet to do.

Milwaukie organizations, the municipality, and hundreds of individual volunteers have already lived into and re-affirmed our commitments to polish up this amazing place for all to enjoy. We look forward to hearing your ringing endorsement for the project and the many creative ideas you will bring forward to achieve all that has been imagined and promised.

We stand ready to do our part - every day, and every step along the way. A united people have spoken. This now includes the District Advisory Committee's expressed, overwhelmingly positive support for moving forward with the park - and the funding to get it done. Now, we respectfully ask that you represent us well and reaffirm Clackamas County's financial, policy, and political commitments to the existing Inter-governmental Agreement.

Let's do this!

Respectfully submitted,

Historic Milwaukie Neighborhood District Association

Rich Recker, Chair

Val Hubbard, Vice Chair

Debbie Liptan, Secretary

Michele Bertaux-Zabaglio, Treasurer

Contact Info: % Rich Recker, 503-807-1653 [recker.richard@gmail.com](mailto:recker.richard@gmail.com)

Clackamas County Board of Commissioners:

In the trenches of a democratic republic are volunteer neighborhood organizations. The Historic Milwaukie Neighborhood District Association is one such group - hard-working, principled and committed to doing our part alongside hundreds of other neighborhoods in Clackamas County to be vibrant, inclusive, and sustainable places. We make this voluntary commitment happily and willingly, knowing that - collectively - we're building a better place for each new generation to enjoy and steward forward.

Our neighborhood hosts the current Milwaukie Bay Park. It sits below the confluence of the Willamette and Clackamas rivers - at the foot of the gathering place of Clackamas First People and later the growing seeds of settlement and development. This area is steeped in history, natural beauty and is a recreational launch pad. Even in its underdeveloped state, the park welcomes thousands of visitors from within the County and beyond.

Like any community at the threshold of a popular destination, that proximity comes with responsibility. As neighbors, we clean the park in preparation for daily and seasonal visitors, and start over again the next day. We wave in welcome, even in deepening traffic or while sharing limited parking - as the park continues to grow in popularity even BEFORE the next stage improvements are installed. And in this season of the world, we gently and humanely manage a temporary population of people without homes - a sober reality of the paradoxes of modern American life.

This lengthy preface is a lead up to a request for Clackamas County to affirm commitments to develop the park to the vision and specification outlined; to refine and expand this place to fulfill its' full potential to be a playground for the entire County and all who may choose to visit. This is not the time to lose resolve to complete this project or any other in the cue throughout the County. This is the time to demonstrate to each one of us - the individual, in-the-trenches citizens that your word is a 'bond' and you stand next to us committed to the work you may have yet to do.

Milwaukie organizations, the municipality, and hundreds of individual volunteers have already lived into and re-affirmed our commitments to polish up this amazing place for all to enjoy. We look forward to hearing your ringing endorsement for the project and the many creative ideas you will bring forward to achieve all that has been imagined and promised.

We stand ready to do our part - every day, and every step along the way. A united people have spoken. This now includes the District Advisory Committee's expressed, overwhelmingly positive support for moving forward with the park - and the funding to get it done. Now, we respectfully ask that you represent us well and reaffirm Clackamas County's financial, policy, and political commitments to the existing Inter-governmental Agreement.

Let's do this!

Respectfully submitted,

Historic Milwaukie Neighborhood District Association

Rich Recker, Chair

Val Hubbard, Vice Chair

Debbie Liptan, Secretary

Michele Bertaux-Zabaglio, Treasurer

Contact Info: % Rich Recker, 503-807-1653 [recker.richard@gmail.com](mailto:recker.richard@gmail.com)

**From:** [Grover Jeffrey Bornefeld](#)  
**To:** [BCCMail](#); [NCPRD - District Advisory Committee](#)  
**Cc:** [Jennings Lodge CPO](#)  
**Subject:** Jennings Lodge motion -Concord  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 29, 2022 9:45:09 AM  
**Attachments:** [Concord Library letter.pdf](#)

---

**Warning: External email. Be cautious opening attachments and links.**

---

Please see attached from the Jennings Lodge CPO meeting 3/22/2022

**For our community -**

**Grover Jeffrey Bornefeld**

Pronouns: he/him/his

[Why pronouns matter](#)

"Heroes are not giant statues framed against a red sky.

They are people who say, This is my community

and it's my responsibility to make it better." - Tom McCall

*The price of Liberty is Eternal Vigilance*





---

**jenningslodgcepo@gmail.com**

---

23 May, 2022

Honorable Chair and Members

Board of County Commissioners

2051 Kaen Rd.

Oregon City, OR 97045

Re: Proposed Clackamas County Library Building

Dear Chair Smith and Commissioners

At its regular meeting held last night, the Jennings Lodge Community Planning Organization passed the following motion by a vote of 16 to 0 and two abstentions:

“The Jennings Lodge CPO recommends that the Oak Lodge Library be freestanding and located on the Concord School property.

It should be developed without delay, based on further input from the community about style, location, sustainability and energy efficiency levels.

There should also be concurrent adoption of the park design which complements the library.”

Please feel free to contact me if you need further information.

Sincerely,

Ed Gronke, Acting Chair

Jennings Lodge Community Planning Organization

**From:** [Ron Campbell](#)  
**To:**  
**Cc:**

**Subject:** Re: Oak Lodge and Gladstone Community Project - Project Crossroads  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 22, 2022 11:13:42 AM

---

**Warning: External email. Be cautious opening attachments and links.**

---

---

Mark,

I think we all feel like we are spinning our wheels to some extent, and I respect your concern and your opinion on how we should proceed from here. But I would have some serious concerns about backtracking in the planning process to more public involvement at this time, before the Task Force has again reached agreement on an option. You probably recall a couple of related questions that were raised in recent meetings and addressed in writing by the management team. One question alluded to a possible need for more public involvement, and another asked what review criteria would be used to evaluate new design options, considering the review criteria that were used previously based on public involvement coupled with sound design principles. I agree with the management team's responses to these questions, that the public input and review criteria used previously are still valid and applicable in deciding what option is best under the current circumstances and from the Task Force perspective.

A significant part of the roughly \$2 million already spent on the planning process was used in developing a data-base of public opinions to help guide us to a sound decision on a chosen option. It was developed through multiple means of public outreach. This was the team's best shot at involving a broad cross section of the interested public. Asking for additional input now, via a comparatively shallow public involvement effort, would likely not yield results nearly as reliable and would risk biasing the data-base we already have. This is not to suggest that the public shouldn't be updated or have more input; rather, that it would be better for the Task Force to reach their decision based on what we already know, and then update the public on the "what and why" aspects and invite comments. This remains consistent with our charge, provided that we are still taking our best information on public needs and values to heart as we decide which option we believe is best. Based on the last couple of Task Force meetings, we seem to be closer to agreeing

on the best option. And in the end, it will still be the BCC making the final decision after hearing more public comments.

All of us are frustrated, but that doesn't discount the importance of what we are doing. I continue to believe the Task Force will reach a reasonable agreement soon, hopefully in our next meeting. As for the lack of participation among some members, perhaps it would help if these members were contacted directly by staff to stress the importance of their participation.

Respectfully,  
Ron

**From:** [Ron Campbell](#)  
**To:**  
**Cc:**

**Subject:** Re: Oak Lodge and Gladstone Community Project - Project Crossroads  
**Date:** Saturday, March 26, 2022 12:21:18 PM

---

**Warning: External email. Be cautious opening attachments and links.**

---

---

Denis,

I'm very glad you reached out. I'm also in favor of moving forward with Option 3 as soon as possible.

I have thought a great deal about this since the last Task Force meeting; in particular, about the TF vote on design work for a two-story library. As I stated in the meeting, my interest is in the design of the Option 3 library, wondering about the feasibility of designing that building at that location in a way that would enable adding an upper level if more space is needed in the future. I've had no interest in locating the library farther from the existing building, and remain fully in favor of Option 3 mainly because of its operational efficiencies and the synergy between the buildings.

Regretfully, the motion regarding our vote on whether or not to recommend design work for a two-story option did not take into account the distinctions between studying an entire new location versus what I was talking about; one main distinction being the comparative time and cost of providing enough information on feasibility. What I was talking about would not require anywhere near the same time or expense as compared to studying a different location, since we already have the Option 3 design, at least in concept but subject to refinement. I'm regretting not raising this concern myself before the voting commenced. My vote pertained to Option 3, and not to the idea of a new location, which skewed the result.

I'm hoping we can maintain interest among TF members given everything that's happened. So, thanks again for helping to keep us engaged.

Regards,  
Ron

On Fri, Mar 25, 2022 at 2:36 PM Denis Hickey wrote:

Hello Task Force Members,

I wanted to express my appreciation for members staying engaged in the TF's work. A shout out to Mark, Ron, and Mike for sharing their thinking this past week, and for others staying involved as well. We ended our last meeting with a majority of present members voting to request additional design funding to consider a two-story stand-alone option.

Given that the CCC board chair has declined to provide additional funding for consideration of more alternatives, the TF, as I see it, has two options: 1.) to challenge the funding decision or 2.) accept the decision and move on with involvement around final style, sustainability, and efficiency elements for option 3.

Challenging the chair's decision has potential to result in some unintended issues (slow or stall the project altogether, incur additional unplanned costs, etc.), and is highly unlikely to result in a change to the chair's decision(s). It is clear to me that the county commissioners are extremely concerned with budget matters across the entire district and our project is just one of many areas needing funding.

I have embraced the consensus model for the TF's decision making however, I also feel that TF consensus may be unattainable at this time. We can however, individually, in small groups, or as a task force provide our interest (and concerns) regarding next steps to the commissioners, and they will, as planned, decide major next steps.

As I have shared a few times, I have been a strong supporter of option 3 (separate but near the community center) since its introduction. I believe that this design best achieves the most (naturally, not all) TF goals. Demonstrating strong support for option 3 as a task force will result in this process moving forward.

Thank you,  
Denis Hickey

On Wed, Mar 23, 2022 at 2:28 PM Michael Schmeer wrote:

Mark (et al):

I absolutely share your frustrations with the status of the progress being made by the Concord Task Force. Our last meeting was, in my opinion, AGONIZING, and I feel like we are going in circles to some extent. I am also frustrated, to the point that I've added a codicil to my will nominating a successor to my position on the Task Force, anticipating that I might not live long enough to realize a final outcome (JUST KIDDING - sure hope not).

It feels to me like we're hashing out questions and issues that we've already addressed when we ultimately arrived at a UNANIMOUS choice when we decided on one alternative for the project last year. We've already spent two years debating all those things, we all agreed to one alternative design then, and I have no desire to backtrack now. None of us is happy about the cards we've been dealt, but I believe we need to accept it and move on. To revisit the process that we've already been through, including more "rigorous, time-consuming, public engagement", runs the risk of prolonging an expensive process all over again, and could ultimately torpedo the entire project. Though I respect the majority vote of the Task Force to entertain a design for a library on Olive Ave., I did not vote for it and do not approve of it. I feel that we already have a couple viable alternatives before us, that more-or-less meet the goals of the originally approved design, but are more within the financial limitations that have been presented to us. I feel that if this project is to move forward in any reasonable time frame, the Task Force needs to settle on one of them. I feel that they are good alternatives to the originally chosen design - maybe not perfect, but good - , and that the community would be thrilled to see any of them come to fruition.

With respect to our continued participation with the Task Force: When this Task Force was originally assembled it consisted of "15 voting members" (according to my notes) from several interests in the community. At last count I think we're down to about 12 or 13 (10 at the last meeting). Back then we had a facilitator to help us stay focused and stay on track. That's all disappeared now, but if the Task Force is to remain relevant, and represent a cross section of the community, we cannot afford to lose our focus or lose more people. Also, replacements at this juncture would not have the benefit of the understanding gained from two years of studying and analyzing the intricacies of the Concord Project - - possibly prolonging the process even longer. It all costs money, and costs continue to go up. I am as frustrated (exasperated might be a better word) as everyone else on the Task Force, but I am determined to see it through as long as it takes, in hopes that we'll be able to break ground on a new library, and a community center, before my codicil goes into effect.

Mike Schmeer

On Mon, Mar 21, 2022 at 3:55 PM Mark Elliott wrote:

Good afternoon everyone,

It has been a week since our last Task Force meeting and I feel the project is at important crossroads with an uncertain way to move forward. I'd like to offer some observations about where we are and how we might move forward.

The project team consisting of NCPRD as leader, Opsis as Architect of Record and the Task Force as the user group representing the Community, needs to make some important

decisions about the future of the Library, Park and Community Center. Each has our part to play.

Opsis, as Architect of Record is obligated to NCPRD as their client to produce an acceptable design in a timely manner. As AOR they should also be devoted to administering a design process rather than promoting a specific outcome, something I feel has gotten off track recently. Showing preference to a specific outcome will lead the Task Force to lose confidence in the process and corrupt the final outcome. I feel Opsis and NCPRD need to renew their commitment to the process and go beyond what is required for a quick solution to what's necessary to reach consensus on the design. To that end additional work is necessary to illustrate design options the Task Force has asked be developed.

The original design solution unanimously approved by the Task Force was achieved through a rigorous, time-consuming and expensive public engagement process with a solution achieved through consensus. We are now asked to achieve a similar outcome with a minority representation of the original Task Force membership through a majority vote with no direct public involvement. Since last year there has been no public engagement on project status, updates on progress or presentation of design options available to meet the financial constraints now facing the project. That must change.

I ask the project Team to consider adopting the following steps moving forward.

1. Renew our commitment to the design process similar to that which delivered an unanimously approved design solution that everyone could rally around.
2. Engage in a new in-person and virtual public engagement opportunity with the goal of a) updating the community on the status of the project, b) presenting all current design options including the original design solution for their consideration and c) asking the Community for their input on a preferred design solution.
3. Incorporate the desires and aspirations of our community into a final design solution and project delivery strategy that may include requests for additional funds necessary to make it happen.

As a Task Force member, I feel steps like these are necessary to regain confidence in the process, maintain community credibility and for me personally, to justify my continued participation in the Task Force.

I welcome others thoughts and input on how we move forward.

Mark Elliott, Concord School Task Force Member

**From:** [Ron Campbell](#)  
**To:**

**Subject:** TCP Support for Appropriate Allocation of Concord Property Space  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 15, 2022 10:27:45 AM  
**Attachments:** [Concord comments 3-3-22.pdf](#)

---

**Warning: External email. Be cautious opening attachments and links.**

---

All,

We are writing again as The Concord Partnership (TCP) Board of Directors to reaffirm our support for responsible planning and development of the Concord School property in keeping with the Concord project's purposes, principles, and community values regarding three equally-important planned uses of the property: a library, community center and community park. Our comments expand on our recent letter submitted on March 3, which is attached for reference. As with our previous letter, we are calling attention to an important consideration concerning the amount of space needed for the community park. Design studies produced previously by the consultant team have illustrated how the limited space available for the park is directly affected by the library location, size and design.

From the time NCPRD acquired the Concord property in 2017, the intent has been to repurpose the property with development of a community park on the former school grounds and a community center in the former school building; and potentially, to also include a new library on the property. The need for all three of these uses in Oak Lodge has been well-recognized for decades. The fundamental purpose of the master planning process has been to plan for all three uses arranged in a synergistic community complex design, with no prioritization among these uses, but with the caveat that the feasibility of locating the library on this property would be determined in the course of developing concept designs. It was not until design options had been reviewed and a preferred option chosen that the Task Force voted to acknowledge the feasibility of siting the library on this property.

The professional design work, which culminated in seven original design options, revealed key findings regarding the opportunities and limitations of the property that affect the viability of options. First, it soon became clear that, while the existing building is suitable for a community center and NCPRD offices, this



building is not of suitable size or design to also house a library without an addition.

Second, as illustrated by two of the seven design options, the size of the property was found to be too limited to accommodate a separate library building with a footprint size of 19,000+ sq. ft., together with a community-size park, considering not just the library building itself but the related infrastructure as well. Both of these concept designs attempted by the consultants would unreasonably diminish the space left for a park to less than one acre. This limitation was foremost among several reasons that neither of these options was chosen.

And third, one of the remaining design options, involving a 19,000+ sq. ft. single-level library contained mostly in an addition to the existing building, was clearly the best option in relation to the review criteria used to evaluate the options. With the library joined to the existing building, this option would include the minimum space needed for a reasonably-sized (two-acre) park that would include basic community park features: an accessible playground, a multi-use gathering and event space with a small pavilion, naturalistic area planted with native trees and shrubs, an accessible loop trail and, potentially, a water play feature, which are all features supported by early public outreach in the planning process. This option was unanimously approved by the Task Force, strongly supported by the public, and approved in concept by the BCC. Sadly, this plan was later determined to be unaffordable under current financial conditions, which triggered a re-review of design options.

In reviewing new design options presented by the staff and design team, it appears that the allocation of sufficient space for a community park remains as a primary consideration, as was intended. Each of the new options allocate an amount of park space similar to that of the originally chosen plan. Although a separate library building is again under consideration in two of the new options, the building footprint as represented by each of these options would be sized to allow enough space for the needed park.

While it seems clear that the staff and design team continue to support the need for a community-size, multi-use park, we are also aware of various comments from the public that continue to promote the idea of a separate library building with 19,000+ sq. ft. on a single level. Some of these comments have suggested that the library should be considered the most important among the property uses, and that the park is solely for the purpose of enhancing the library experience. Such comments seem to contradict the very purpose of the project.

TCP strongly encourages the Task Force, the Board of County Commissioners and the project management and design teams to uphold the purposes, principles and community values and expectations that were meant to guide the project through master plan completion and project construction. The intended uses should be

addressed fairly for the overall betterment of the community in light of their respective public service roles and values. There should be no questioning of the relative values of either the library or the community park, or of the community center. And these uses can all fit on the property with creative design and appropriate balance in the allocation of limited space.

Thank you all for your dedication and patience as we continue working toward completion of a valuable community project.

Respectfully,

TCP Board of Directors: Ron Campbell, Michael Schmeer and Geoffrey Janke



March 3, 2022

**TO:** Clackamas County Board of Commissioners  
Gary Schmidt, Clackamas County Administrator  
Concord Property and Library Planning Task Force  
NCPR District Advisory Committee  
Clackamas County Library Advisory Board  
Michael Bork, NCPRD Director  
Mitzi Olson, Clackamas County Library Director  
Jim Kalvelage, OPSIS Architecture

**FROM:** The Concord Partnership Board of Directors

**SUBJECT: Concord Property Plan Options: How well do they achieve needed balance in the allocation of limited space for a park?**

We are writing as The Concord Partnership (TCP) Board of Directors to comment on plan options under consideration for the Concord project. Our comments are based on our objective assessment of the options presented to date, guided by what we have learned from the NCPRD-facilitated planning process, and from our seven years of involvement in working to save the historic Concord School building, conserve the property's open space, and repurpose the property for community use as described in TCP's Mission.

Since NCPRD's acquisition of the property, the overarching purpose of the Concord project has been to provide a park and community center, and potentially to also locate a new library on the property. These uses are treated equally in the way the project was conceived and described, and eventually represented in a professionally-developed and well-supported master plan. All three uses are badly needed in the Oak Lodge community, and they were meant to be addressed accordingly in the planning process. Because of the property's limited size, and with a library added to the project, there is a need for balance in the allocation of space together with creative functional and aesthetic design.

Our comments focus largely on the issue of balance in the allocation of enough contiguous space for a community park as affected by the library location, size and design. We are also highlighting certain features related to the pros and cons of certain options that deserve consideration.

### **Option 1**

(Please note: This option was formerly labeled "Option 2" among the options originally considered in the planning process.)

This option was originally chosen among seven options, by unanimous vote of the Task Force, strong support from the public and conceptual approval by the BCC. For a number of good reasons, this option clearly stood out as the very best based on the review criteria used to evaluate all seven options. The cost of this option is what recently triggered a pause in the process and reconsideration of options.

The Option 1 design would attach a library addition to the historic building with certain spaces and operations shared and utilities joined between the community center and library, which would

facilitate long term operational cost savings for both the Library District and NCPRD. It would require library construction and renovation of the historic building for the community center to proceed simultaneously.

The allocation of property space is optimal with Option 1. With a single building containing the library and community center, the library would have the desired size of 19,500 sq. ft. while leaving two acres of contiguous park space, enough for the park to include an accessible playground, a multi-use gathering and event space complemented by a small pavilion, naturalistic area with native trees and shrubs and a loop trail.

### **Option 2**

Option 2 was presented by the design team and staff as a means of substantially reducing construction costs. Like Option 1, this design would attach a library addition to the historic building, contained within, but smaller than the Option 1 footprint, with some spaces and operations shared with the community center similar to Option 1. A reduction in total library size from that of Option 1, to 17,000 sq. ft., would include reduction in the functional library space by 17% and a reduction in collection size by 15%. Certain construction features and materials that contribute to sustainability and aesthetics would be eliminated for added cost savings. Utilities serving the library would be separated from those serving the community center, which would enable the library to be constructed separately, and ahead of, renovation of the adjoining historic building spaces for community center use.

The allocation of property space with Option 2 is optimal because the library footprint is contained within that of Option 1, allowing space for the same park features as Option 1.

### **Option 3**

Option 3 was also presented by the design team and staff to substantially reduce construction costs. This is a free-standing library design, meant to address interests in completely separating the library and community center. The library would occupy the footprint of the building addition represented in Option 1, but would be somewhat larger than that footprint, with a total library size of 15,000 sq. ft. Although the total library size would be 23% smaller than with the Options 1 design, the reduction in functional library space would be proportionally less, about 13% less, and the reduction in collection size would be only 5 to 8 % less. This design would be more efficient operationally, and require only one service point as compared to two service points needed for the Options 1 and 2 libraries. There would be no shared spaces or operations between the library and community center, so no related operational cost savings for either; although the library would have access to community room space in the community center. With the library in a completely separate building, the community center would have additional space in the historic building.

With Option 3, the allocation of property space for a park would not differ significantly from Options 1 or 2, allowing space for the same park features.

### **Interest in a Larger, Single Level and Free-Standing Library**

The idea for a free-standing, single level, 19,500 sq. ft. library on the Concord property is once again being heavily promoted by interested parties. It's an idea that was publicly introduced and promoted for the first time in 2017 by library advocates, immediately following the public announcement that NCPRD was acquiring the property through a property trade with North Clackamas School District. The feasibility of this idea was tested for the first time as part of NCPRD's master planning process with two design options included among the seven options evaluated by the Task Force and the public. For

several reasons, neither of these options fared nearly as well in meeting the review criteria as compared to the chosen option, which is now represented as Option 1 discussed above.

A primary reason that neither of the free-standing library options were chosen was that, with both options, less than one acre of contiguous space would be left for a park.

### **Consideration of a Hybrid Option**

TCP has been considering possible compromises between design options that could help address differing interests while adhering to the purpose, needs and design principals that underlie the Concord project as well the basic design and benefits of the previously-chosen plan. There is one possibility that seems obvious, and that would not require additional concept design work other than possible minor adjustments. We suspect this idea has been considered by the staff and design team, but we have heard no discussion of such. It involves a hybrid design with key features of both Options 1 and 2.

Considering the key concerns at the forefront of discussions, this idea would not address the interest in a 19,500 sq.ft., single level and free-standing library. It would do the following, to the extent these features are affordable:

- 1) Retain the size and footprint of the Option 1 library with the addition to the historic building;
- 2) Retain the Option 1 library design features;
- 3) Retain Option 1 shared spaces and operations in a portion of the historic building;
- 4) Separate mechanical, electrical and plumbing facilities as in Option 2, enabling library construction to occur ahead of historic building renovation for the community center;
- 5) Retain the possibility of adding the large gym as in Option 2, but considering other NCPRD properties for this feature;
- 6) Retain the size and features of the Option 1 park.

In summary, we believe the decision on a “revised” plan for the Concord property should honor the fundamental purposes, principles and community values that guided the originally-chosen and conceptually-approved plan. Adherence to sound criteria used in choosing the original plan should not be taken lightly, nor should the high degree of consensus and support the plan received. Although some changes may be necessary for valid reasons, we see no valid reason for unnecessarily and substantially discounting the values of a community park so that an equally-important library can match a vision without needed compromise. The community deserves a beautiful and functional library, and also deserves a beautiful, community-sized, multi-use park as part of a well-designed and balanced community complex that Mark Elliot has so eloquently described as the “community’s home.”

TCP continues to support the original plan, but we also recognize the benefits and practicality of the hybrid option discussed above, as well as Option 3. We also support continued discussions regarding possible alternatives for future use of the historic building that we have all presumed would be a community center.

Thank you for your sincere consideration of our comments. We look forward to the completion of a long-awaited, quality community project that honors what the community has been led to believe.

Respectfully,

TCP Board of Directors: Ron Campbell, Michael Schmeer and Geoffrey Janke