

From: **Jeff Williams**

Date: Tue, Jul 27, 2021 at 10:30 AM

Subject: Re: City Council Boat Ramp Work Session on July 27th at 7 PM

To: Rivergrove, Oregon Heather Kibbey

Comments for the Council since citizen involvement is not allowed in tonight's working session.

As the Council continues to endlessly debate the future of our boat ramp, I wanted to submit some comments specifically related to those items laid out in the email below.

1. Parking related changes.... The boat ramp is a popular amenity for the citizens of Rivergrove and others. Nothing we do, short of permanent closure, will stop people from using the ramp. So if parking is restricted around the ramp, those cars will simply spill out onto Childs (an even bigger safety concern), or areas on the other side of Childs. If the City is serious about parking concerns, it must recognize that all parking concerns are equal, not just for those living around the boat ramp. Should the City/County decide for no parking on the street in front of the homes along the river, those rules would also need to apply for the homeowners, who could no longer park in front of their own homes. This would have them parking on the other side, thus forcing the boat ramp visitors to surrounding areas. Simply put, this will not fix any issues. The only way to alleviate parking pressure would be for the City to convert part of the park to a parking lot, which would only encourage even more utilization of the ramp, which is just as bad of an idea. Lastly, will the City be funding a traffic impact study to understand the unbiased traffic seen today, and to understand what would be the impact of any proposed changes? There are a lot of complaints about things getting worse, more and more people using it, but there is no tangible evidence to support this. The City needs to be unbiased in its approach, and make decisions based on facts.

2. I am glad to see that the City recognizes that it can't limit what activity happens at the boat ramp.

3. The gates being cited as a safety concern is simply this year's "covid" concern. Now that the virus is not front and center, we are now seeing a pivot to the next argument for closures and limited access. Plain and simple, the gate is meant to be a deterrent to the use of the ramp. And while it's part of the 3 way tie for 5th place, the ADA compliance impacts are very much tied to the key issue of the gate. If the City is voting to maintain the gates, it should be recognized that the City is in turn voting to continue to have gates up that likely create an ADA obstruction.

4. Neighbor harassment of boat ramp visitors is nothing the City should be concerned with. We have no police force, so I honestly do not know what the expectation is of the Council on this one. That said, by continuing to allow the boat ramp to be discussed

year after year, those who are aggressively confronting others will continue to feel like they have a legitimate argument for changes to the ramp. They do not. They bought a home next to a boat ramp.

5. Property lines are easily identifiable by way of survey pins, or simply paying for a survey to be performed. If the neighbors on either side feel the the fencing/borders are not correctly located, they are free to pay for a property line survey to be conducted. This should NOT be a cost to the City.

I sincerely look forward to the City wrapping up the annual Boat Ramp Debate tradition by once and for all embracing such an important asset that belongs to ALL citizens of Rivergrove.

Jeff Williams
4550 Dogwood