



CITY OF REDMOND
Community Development Department

716 SW Evergreen Avenue
Redmond, OR 97756
(541) 923-7721
Fax: (541) 548-0706
www.ci.redmond.or.us

Meeting Summary

**South US 97 Corridor Plan Implementation
Technical Advisory Group – Meeting #4
Tuesday, July 2, 2013**

Redmond City Hall Conference Room A – 12:30 AM to 2:00PM

Attending: Karen Swirsky, DLCD, David Boyd, ODOT, James Lewis, Planning Manager, Mike Caccavano, City Engineer, David Pilling, Engineering Development Manager, Scott Woodford, Associate Planner

-AGENDA-

1. Review of PAC Meeting #3
 - a. What was resolved with access management trigger?
 - b. Do we have enough feedback?

Mr. Woodford reviewed the results of the last PAC meeting noting that we reviewed the Access Management section of the US 97 Corridor Plan and it's recommended code language for triggering access management requirements, such as dedicating a cross access easement, and we settled on the same thresholds as what ODOT requires for an Approach Permit – an increase in 50 PM peak hour trips or more and a 20% increase in overall traffic. There was discussion amongst the TAC on whether the PAC recommended threshold is too high and that it helps large development avoid the access management requirements and may penalize the small business as it is much easier for them to trip the threshold. There was also discussion that the relatively high PAC recommended threshold could result in not achieving the goals of the Corridor Plan for a very long time, so there was a recommendation that the trigger be changed to just the 50PM peak hour trip threshold. There also was a comment that the design charette exercise may help demonstrate to property owners that the requirements for cross access may not be that difficult to achieve and they may eventually support a lower threshold. The TAC also discussed that if we lower the threshold for when we require a cross access easement from a property owner that it be proportional to the level of development requested to avoid takings issues and that there may need to have two different thresholds – a lower one for dedicating the cross access easement and a higher one for actually building the cross access.

2. Remaining Unresolved Issues from Plan
 - a. Funding Mechanism (Next meeting's focus)
 - b. Responsibility for Construction and Maintenance of Frontage Improvements

There was brief discussion and that Mike Caccavano's memo he put together summarized the potential sources of funds and that this would be presented at the next PAC meeting.

3. Next Meeting Agendas

- a. July 18th: Funding Options/Responsibility for Construction/Maintenance of Improvements and Timing (public vs private)
- b. August 15th – Gateway Design & Financing
- c. September 19th – Design Charette for Access
- d. October 17th – Continue Design Charette?
- e. November – Public Meeting?
- f. December – Wrap up?

The group discussed how feasible it will be to pull together the design charette by September and that it might need to get pushed back due to getting consultants on board and up to speed. Mr. Woodford said he was sensitive to not having this process pushed out too far and the risk it might pose to continued PAC member participation and the need to capitalize on the momentum, but said that things need to get done right so more time may be necessary.

4. Access Design Charette

- a. Explain Quick Response Team process and eligibility

Mr. Woodford explained the process for getting a Quick Response Team from the State to pay for consultants (you must use their approved consultants) to aid in the design charette for an access demonstration project. Mr. Woodford felt that the project we want to do complies with their eligibility requirements except potentially for one, which had to do with the project being a “pressing, short range development” rather than a “long range planning” issue. The State asked if we have any imminent development projects in the area that this project would help out that may suffice to comply with is requirement. No one knew of any, so Mr. Woodford said he would inquire with his colleagues in the planning department.

TAC discussed what happens if we don't get the Quick Response grant in which case there may be City funds that would help pay for the design charette, but we'd have to inquire as to that availability. If not, maybe the charette can be done in-house.

- b. Discuss desired outcome of charette

TAC discussed what we want to get out of the charette and how many properties should be involved. The ideas ranged from doing one access block and then replicating it on the other blocks later to trying to do all of the access blocks for the whole corridor. The group decided that the scope depends on how much work you can get out of the Quick Response team, which is up to \$50,000. The consultants will likely have input on how much they think they can do in their proposal.

The group decided that it would probably be best to start the first charette out small and choose 3-4 different access blocks that include properties owned by the PAC members. If that process goes smoothly, we can discuss expanding it to other blocks along the corridor and bringing in

property owners who haven't been involved with the PAC process because it will be helpful to have their buy-in to make it successful.

The next discussion centered on the desired end result of the charette in terms of work product and how will that be used in the future. TAC discussed that end product will not be engineering level plans, but more refined versions of what the Access Framework Maps in the Corridor Plan currently show in terms of conceptual access. They will show alignments of frontage/backage roads, shared or consolidated access points, and inter-parcel circulation that take into consideration existing development constraints. The maps could show access points to US 97, but would have to be conditioned that final location of the access point would be up to ODOT and their review at the time of a site specific development.

We talked about including the Access Framework Plan in the Transportation System Plan (TSP) update-likely to take place in the fall – so that the improvements might be included as a project for potential System Development Charges (SDC) funding. Also, TAC was generally in agreement that an in-house charette might be necessary to avoid a gap in the process while waiting for the Quick Response Team and to help prepare for the charette.

It was discussed that these maps could form the basis of development agreements between property owners that they must adhere to in future development plans so that cohesive access across properties will result. Would the City approve those agreements? If they were just private agreements, what would ensure that they are enforced? The group hit on the idea that these maps could simply replace the Access Framework Maps in the Corridor Plan and then the Development Code Amendment for triggers would require a cross access easement and construction of the access, in accordance with the Access Framework Maps, at time of development/redevelopment.