



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

South US 97 Corridor Plan Implementation
Project Advisory Committee (PAC) - Meeting #4
Thursday, July 18, 2013
Redmond City Hall Conference Room A - 6:00PM-8:00PM
716 SW Evergreen Ave, Redmond, OR

Meeting Summary

In attendance: Tommy King, Keith Sides, Solomon Kaleialoha, Wendy Cummings, Charley Miller, Eric Jordan, Ed Fitch, Jay Battelson, Lori McCoy, Brianna Manfrass, Greg Hodecker, Pete Wilson, David Boyd, Mike Caccavano, Heather Richards, and Scott Woodford.

1. **Welcome** - Meeting called to order at 6:05PM
2. **Recap on June PAC Meeting/July TAC Meeting** - Mr. Woodford recapped the results of the June 20th PAC meeting where access management was discussed along with proposed code amendments related to triggers for the access management requirements. At the meeting, the PAC agreed that the triggers would be when development/redevelopment exceeded 50 P.M. peak hour trips or have a 20% or greater increase in peak hour trips and also discussed what would be required, such as demonstrating how alternative access would work (i.e. showing how a frontage/backage road would layout or requiring a signed cross access easement).

Mr. Woodford reported the discussion from the July 2nd TAC meeting (TAC is made up of City staff, ODOT and DLCD staff), including an observation that the triggers approved at the 6/20 PAC meeting may be too high to achieve the goals of the Corridor Plan in a reasonable timeframe because so many projects would not trip the threshold and that it may actually penalize smaller businesses because the 20% increase would be tripped sooner than a larger project.

The TAC also discussed the design charette for access in terms of the scope, timing, and outcomes. The group felt that the charette should start on the small side to make sure the outcomes are successful and then replicate it on other properties. The result of the charette could be a series of access maps covering each property that would need to be complied with and incorporated into a project at time of future redevelopment.

Mr. Fitch raised concern with creating too small of a group for the charette and felt it should be open to all property owners to give it the best buy in potential. Ms. Richards said doing all the property owners at once would be a "heavy lift", but we could do a sampling of different types of properties throughout the corridor that could be applicable to all properties, such as having examples from both sides of the highway and with constrained properties and some that are larger and have more access flexibility. Mr. Battelson offered that it might be helpful to do the charette over the course of multiple days and at different times so that as many people as possible could find time to attend and that a charette website could be set up for additional comment. Ms. Manfrass was concerned about the time it would take to do the charettes properly with a large group and supported doing three general concepts that could be applied corridor wide.

Mr. Fitch also said that we could revisit the triggers for access if an analysis shows that it might unfairly impact small business, but that he was concerned about the TAC changing decisions that the PAC made. Ms. Richards affirmed that the recommendation of the PAC is final.

- 3. Discussion on Funding Options** - Mr. Caccavano presented his memo on funding options explaining the mechanics and advantages/disadvantages of each. He explained that the Corridor Plan outlines the costs estimates for the improvements, which included sidewalks, trails, and frontage roads, at between \$28 and \$40 million.

Mr. Fitch urged the PAC to focus on smaller chunks of the total cost because the big numbers are intimidating to most folks and may result in nothing getting done. Better to prioritize the improvements and phase them in over time so that it is more financially palatable. He also urged City Council participation in this process so we don't run down a path that's not supported by them. He recommended a status meeting with Council.

Ms. Richards said that she could look into setting up a work session. Mr. Caccavano agreed that checking in with Council makes sense.

Mr. Fitch said that sidewalks could be done through an LID (local improvement district), the extension of Quartz Avenue could be financed by SDC (system development charges) or urban renewal dollars. These things would not cause "sticker shock" and big ticket items like frontage roads could be done later.

Ms. Richards inquired if the PAC was interested in including street trees with the sidewalks. Mr. Fitch responded that signage and street trees would need to be in synch so the trees don't block visibility.

Mr. Miller wanted the Council to adopt the Corridor Plan to give the funding efforts some backing and continue to pursue all possible funding sources, but agreed that starting with frontage improvements makes sense.

Mr. Fitch thought that the South US 97 corridor already has about a 1/3 of its length in existing sidewalks, which would cut down the cost estimates. Ms. Richards stated that the cost estimates already account for that.

Mr. Caccavano said we could break the costs down into individual parts, such as cost for sidewalks, landscaping, curb, stormwater, etc. so that the PAC could analyze which improvements they think should be included with the first phases.

Ms. Cummings felt that improved sidewalks would increase accessibility to stores and be good for business.

Mr. Sides questioned how good the pedestrian experience would be with all of the curb cuts along the way.

Mr. Hodecker was concerned about building sidewalks now before access changes and the need to tear out and replace improvements and questioned who would pay for that.

Mr. Fitch replied that existing accesses may be closed in the future, then sidewalks may get torn out and will need to be replaced and that the property owners would likely be responsible for those costs with development.

Mr. Caccavano said that before we decide what type of financing tool to use, we need to better know the costs. He explained that the City will be updating the TSP (transportation system plan) this fall and it is the basis for determining SDC funded projects. Since the south re-route won't be happening for a while, maybe the City can replace it with the South 97 project to get funding.

Mr. Fitch felt that the City has invested a lot of money into downtown and other areas, such as Highland Avenue, and that it was time to invest money into South US 97.

Ms. Richards offered that maybe the City and ODOT could do a project here in lieu of the south re-route. She also asked the group what else from the Corridor Plan cost estimate can be cut out. Do the frontage roads need sidewalks on both sides? Can we reduce the cost for the trail along the canal? The group felt that sidewalks along the frontage roads were not necessary because there will be better sidewalks along the highway and connections to the front doors of businesses. There was also discussion if the frontage roads should be public so they can take advantage of SDC funds, which would require dedication of property.

Ms. Richards said with the cuts, the total cost estimates have been reduced from \$40 million down to \$27 million and suggested that the TAC look at that estimate and apply the funding tools and see what the implications are and bring it back to the PAC.

4. **Discuss Gateway Feature/Electronic Reader Board** - Mr. Woodford introduced the concept of the gateway feature as recommended in the Corridor Plan and also the goal of investigating the feasibility of an electronic reader board near the south entrance to the City along US 97 as recommended by the RDC (Redmond Development Commission). The two projects had potential overlap, so it is recommended they proceed as one project. The Corridor Plan recommends that an advisory committee be set up to help guide the process, location and design. The PAC recommended that the RDC be the advisory committee for this project.
5. **Next Steps/Next Meeting** - Next meeting will be on August 15, 2013.
6. **Adjourn** - Meeting adjourned at 7:30PM.