



CITY OF REDMOND
Community Development Department

716 SW Evergreen, Redmond OR 97756
541-923-7713
Fax: (541) 548-0706
www.ci.redmond.or.us

SOUTH US 97 CORRIDOR PLAN IMPLEMENTATION PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING #3

Redmond City Hall, 716 SW Evergreen Ave.

Thursday, June 20, 2013

6:00-8:00 PM

Meeting Summary

In attendance: Tommy King, Keith Sides, Solomon Kaleialoha, Lynn Evans, Charley Miller, Eric Jordan, Craig Alacano, Ed Fitch, David Boyd, Jay Battelson, Lori McCoy, David Boyd CDOT, Mike Caccavano, Heather Richards, Scott Woodford City of Redmond.

- I. **CALL TO ORDER** - Meeting called to order about 6:03PM

- II. **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS** - Mr. Woodford welcomed everyone to the third PAC meeting and provided an overview of the agenda. He recapped briefly the May meeting in which the PAC discussed a slew of unresolved issues related to site planning and architecture and made good progress on resolving them. Mr. Woodford said that we weren't able to get to the trigger threshold for the access management requirements that night, but that there was much discussion about access at the tail end of the meeting, so tonight was going to be devoted to that subject.

Before doing that, he addressed a question that came up at the last meeting regarding the level of traffic enforcement the City utilizes on South US 97. At the last meeting, Mr. Paul Rodby inquired about this, feeling that increased enforcement could be another important method to reduce speeds. Mr. Woodford said he spoke to the City Police Chief, Dave Tarbet who said he's in favor of reducing the speed limit to 35MPH because of amount of traffic he sees on the road, especially truck traffic and the close calls he sees with them trying to stop at intersections. He also relayed that traffic enforcement is very important to him and he does what he can with resources he has, which have been reduced over the years. Due to budget cutbacks, he's had to shift officers from traffic unit to regular patrol, which has been very busy and this limits their traffic enforcement efforts. He did, however, propose to use increased, targeted enforcement of the stretch on an occasional overtime basis until the traffic unit reformed, along with use of the Radar Trailer, and using the Multi-Agency Traffic Team (MATT) to focus their efforts on this area when its Redmond's turn to use them.

- III. **UPDATE FROM TAC MEETING #3** - Mr. Woodford stated that the TAC met on June 4, 2013 and discussed that access was a major talking point at the 5/16 PAC meeting and that it continues to be the item most difficult to come to agreement on. The idea was brought up about doing a demonstration project for one area of the corridor to plan out how access management could work. More about this idea would be discussed later in the meeting.
- IV. **DISCUSSION OF ACCESS MANAGEMENT PLAN** - Mr. Woodford led the group through a Power Point Presentation on Chapter 6 of the South US 97 Corridor Plan, the Access Management Plan, including an overview of its purpose, goals, objectives, tools and recommendations.

In response to discussion about adding east-west public street connectivity so that private access can occur off of lower order streets, Mr. Jordan said Big R would support the transfer of the private street adjacent to his store to public ownership and that he thought its intersection with US 97 would be an ideal place for a stoplight. There was discussion whether there is enough separation between here and the Odem Medo intersection to meet ODOT's spacing standards for stoplights.

Mr. Alacano said that he was required to install landscaping in the rear of his property (Napa Auto Parts) facing the railroad to meet the minimum 15% landscaping requirement and if a backage road needs to go back there, it could wipe it out. Would there be flexibility from the City on landscaping to help us meet the access goals? Ms. Richards replied that the City could achieve a balance between access and landscaping and that we may need to change our landscaping requirements to do that. Mr. Woodford stated that providing street trees could make up for the loss of trees in the back. Someone else raised the parking requirement and how it might contribute to eating up land on site that could be used for a frontage/backage road. Mr. Woodford responded that we could look at the number of parking spaces required in the corridor at the same time we examine the landscaping.

Mr. Woodford stated that one of the remaining unresolved issues was the trigger for requiring compliance with the access management requirement for reducing the number of access points to US 97. He led the group through the recommended development code amendments recommended in the Corridor Plan by explaining first what would be required, then the applicability thresholds for when they'd be required. The proposed requirements:

- A. *Access Approval. Prior to approving access for tax lots that are identified in the Access Management Framework (see Figures X, X, X), the City shall require that:*
 - 1. *The applicant demonstrate how cross access can be accomplished for sites contiguous to the subject property or properties, consistent*

with the circulation and planned local street network shown in the Access Management Framework.

- 2. If access across an adjacent parcel or parcels is necessary for the development of the subject site, as indicated by the Access Management Framework or because a planned street has not yet been constructed, a signed cross access agreement is submitted with the application granting this access.*
- 3. For applications reviewed as part of a subdivision approval process, necessary cross access easements are shown and recorded on the final plat. Access widths shall consistent with [City Public Works or Access Management Framework] standards.*
- 4. For applications that propose an alternate location for accessways across properties other than what is shown in the Access Management Framework, applicants must demonstrate that the proposed location does not inhibit safe, efficient, and logical circulation through neighboring parcels and, if applicable, that it is consistent with previously permitted and platted accessways in the vicinity of the site.*

Mr. Fitch provided an example to illustrate how this would work: If Mr. Miller wanted to do an expansion and didn't have direct access to a side street, he'd have to dedicate a cross access easement and agree to a condition of approval that he participate in an LID (local improvement district) to build the frontage road later when all of the adjacent property owners were subject to the same requirements. Ms. Richards asked Mr. Boyd if this would be all that Mr. Miller would be required to do and if he could still use his existing access. Mr. Boyd said that could be the way it works, but that ODOT would still look at the access to US 97 to ensure that it's not creating an unsafe condition, which may necessitate other mitigation.

The proposed thresholds for compliance with the above requirements are:

- 4. Applicability. All development proposals within the Corridor Overlay District that are subject to Article IV Site and Design Review shall be subject to the requirements of Section 8.0180. In addition, proposals that meet one or more of the following criteria shall also be subject to the requirements of Section 8.0180:*
 - A. Redevelopment proposals where the cost of proposed building improvements are greater than or equal to [75% of the Deschutes County Assessor's estimate of Market Value] of the existing site improvements.*
 - B. Development or redevelopment proposals where proposed building improvements are expected to generate up to or greater than [50 PM peak hour trips].*
 - C. Proposals for a Zoning Permit where a change in use is proposed that will generate up to or greater than [50 PM peak hour trips].*

Mr. Boyd from ODOT stated that the 50 PM peak hour trips threshold are the same as what ODOT requires for a new Approach Permit, so the two are

aligned. Discussion took place on whether trigger A above could be “gamed” by the applicant manipulating the cost of the project to stay below the threshold and also how staff would be reliant upon the applicant’s numbers and had no way to verify them. There was also discussion that criteria A is somewhat arbitrary in that it does not directly relate to the number of trips generated, which is what this is really about. Since criteria B and C above were in alignment with ODOT’s requirements, the group recommended going with them and striking criteria A. The group also recommended adding ODOT’s other criteria for triggering an Approach Permit: that there be at least an increase of 50 PM peak hour trips or more or represent a 20% or greater increase in the number of peak hour trips from that of the property’s previous use.

Mr. Battelson raised the idea of using incentives to get people to comply with the access management goals, such as rebates on System Development Charges.

- V. **DESIGN CHARETTE IDEA** - Mr. Woodford said the TAC for this project had an idea about doing an access demonstration project by taking one or more of the access blocks shown in the Corridor Plan in Figure 6-4 through 6-8 and doing conceptual access planning to show what the access management tools could result in on individual properties and which could form the framework for future development decisions. In order to do it properly, we would engage transportation consultants to help and do it in a design charette so that there is participation from the PAC and individual property owners. If there is enough money, we could do the conceptual planning for all of the access blocks. If not, we can do as many as we can and then replicate the process on the remainder later using City staff and PAC.

Mr. Woodford said that the State’s TGM’s Quick Response program is available to assist local governments with an immediate need for design assistance. The program offers the services of an approved set of consultants. Staff inquired to TGM about the possible use of the program in the context of US 97 and they felt it could be a good candidate if there is support from the property owners. Mr. Woodford asked the PAC what they thought. Mr. Fitch felt that we need to find sources of money to make this work and that we’re not going anywhere unless there is a financial commitment from all parties involved. He thought we need to do this prior to more planning. Mr. Miller felt that the planning could help build support for the financial component. In the end, the PAC felt that the design charette was a worthy endeavor. Staff said they would pursue the grant, but that it would probably not occur until August or September as it will take a while to go through the application process and get the consultants up to speed.

- VI. **NEXT STEPS/ADJOURN** - The meeting was adjourned at about 7:30PM