

March 25, 2010

Supplement 1: Memorandum for a Third Reading on April 7, 2010

Ordinance First Reading Date: January 27, 2010

Ordinance Second Reading/Public Hearing Date: February 10, 2010

TO: Board of County Commissioners

DEPARTMENT: Public Works

PRESENTED BY: Mark Bernard, Public Works, Transportation Planning & Traffic

AGENDA ITEM TITLE: **Ordinance No. PA 1257**/In the Matter of Adopting the Junction City Highway 99 Refinement Plan as a Refinement to the Lane County Transportation System Plan, Amending the Lane County Transportation System Plan to incorporate the Refinement Plan by reference, and Co-Adopting the Plan as a Refinement Plan to the Junction City Transportation System Plan, and Adopting a Severability Clause.

On February 10, 2010, the Board of County Commissioners (Board) held a public hearing, closed the public hearing, and moved to hold a third reading on April 7th on the Junction City Highway 99 Refinement Plan (Refinement Plan). The record was left open until April 7th.

The Board directed staff to come back with a range of options for phasing the project, including options to move Phase 1 forward. Subsequent staff discussions and analysis yielded two options for the Board to consider.

Option 1: *Approve the Ordinance adopting the entire Refinement Plan.* The Highway 99 corridor functions as a system and the Refinement Plan addresses safety and operations along Highway 99 in and around Junction City through the 2026 planning period. The five phases comprise one project. The phases of the project are sequenced based upon engineering analysis and interact to address systemic issues. Each phase is not in and of itself a “project” that fixes any issue. Furthermore the Refinement Plan consists not only of construction phases but access management.

In addition, the Board Ordinance Findings address the entire project.

Option 2: *Take no action on the Ordinance.* If the Board decides to take no action on the Refinement Plan, Junction City’s 2009 adoption of it would still be valid within their city limits. As stated in Attachment 1 to this memo, ODOT can support Junction City’s 2009 adoption of the Refinement Plan and recommend that the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) adopt those portions of the Refinement Plan within Junction City’s jurisdiction. Two parcels in the northerly portion of the Phase 1 area are currently outside the city limits;

however the design of the project is far from site specific at this stage so it is premature to determine whether the city would need to annex these parcels for construction to move forward.

Junction City is currently in Periodic Review to update their Transportation System Plan (TSP). Elements of the Refinement Plan outside the city limits of Junction City could be incorporated into the TSP update and considered again by the Board when the TSP is co-adopted by Lane County. This will provide an opportunity for the Board to see how the Refinement Plan fits within the overall scheme of land use and all transportation modes that are required to be addressed by the City under the state land use Goal 12 and the Transportation Planning Rule.

The transportation improvements outside of the city limits and urban growth boundary were a concern during the Planning Commission process and to the Board. ODOT also found this part of the preferred alternative problematic, so much so they extended the consultant's contract to re-examine the issue. The result was 1) strengthening of language in the Refinement Plan regarding a possible goal exception; and 2) additional language stating that improvements on lands in County jurisdiction, like the Prairie Road extension, could not occur without additional analysis. As noted in Attachment 1, as part of Junction City's TSP update, ODOT is exploring alternatives to proposed county facilities articulated in the Refinement Plan located on lands outside the city limits of Junction City.

A third option, Board adoption of part of the Refinement Plan, such as only that portion within the city limits, was raised as a possible course of action. Taking no action would accomplish the same thing. If the Board decides to take no action on the Refinement Plan but would still like to support Junction City's efforts to secure funding for the Phase 1 improvements, a Board Order could be crafted conveying such support, and City staff reacted favorably to this approach.

Co-adopting only a part of the Refinement Plan raises numerous procedural and substantive questions that are not an issue if the Board takes no action. First, the County Board Ordinance Findings would become invalid and staff is unsure how to craft Findings that address only a portion of the Refinement Plan since all phases are interlaced. Note that in addition to Phase 1, Phases 2-Unit 1, 4, and 5 are either wholly or partially within the city limits, raising questions about whether the sequencing of construction would any longer make sense and the validity of the Refinement Plan's technical analysis. In addition the access management portion of the Plan would need to be examined with regard to its role in the preferred alternative analysis.

While the problems noted above are also questions if the Board takes no action, they do not need to be addressed in County findings unless the Board does take action. Therefore, Lane County adoption of a portion of the Refinement Plan is not seen as a viable option, unless the Board retains a consultant to revisit the Refinement Plan analysis and conclusions.

Commissioner Handy expressed concern regarding a perceived lack of transit facilities in the Refinement Plan. As noted in LTD's letter dated March 5, 2010 (Attachment 2) LTD Service Planner, Ruth Ruiz, participated on the Refinement Plan Technical Advisory Committee, and transit needs were explicitly addressed in the planning process. The letter identifies a number of elements in the Refinement Plan that will aid transit including wide sidewalks, bulb-outs to facilitate pedestrian crossings and on-street parking that provides opportunities to develop

bus stops along the Highway 99 couplet.

Additionally, Attachment 3 is a memorandum dated March 8, 2010 from Petra Schuetz, Administrative Project Manager for the Transportation and Growth Management (TGM) grant that funded the Refinement Plan. She acknowledges the importance of transit amenities in the design considerations for the Refinement Plan. Ms. Schuetz' letter also cites the many transit-friendly Refinement Plan elements, noting that a Park and Ride facility was recently built in Junction City at 7th Avenue and Holly Street, complementing the Park and Ride facility located at 10th Avenue and Maple Street.

Recommendation

Staff continues to recommend adoption of the Refinement Plan because although the improvements outside the urban growth boundary are a valid concern, the Refinement Plan acknowledges and addresses the issue.

The alternative is to take no action. If the Board decides to take no action on the Refinement Plan but would still like to support Junction City's efforts to secure funding for the Phase 1 improvements, a Board Order could be crafted conveying such support.

Attachments

1. March 15, 2010 letter from ODOT
2. March 5, 2010 letter from LTD
3. March 8, 2010 letter from Petra Schuetz