# *JOINT CITY COUNCIL/PLANNING COMMISSION WORK SESSION*

***JANUARY 22, 2008***

The City Council and the Planning Commission for the City of Junction City met for a work session at 6:30 p.m. on Tuesday, January 22, 2008, in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 680 Greenwood Street, Junction City, Oregon.

***PRESENT WERE:*** **City Council:** Mayor Dwight Coon; Councilors Lance Stoddard, Bill DiMarco, Ethan Nelson, Scott Mehlbrech, and Dave Brunscheon; **Planning Commission:** Chairman Bob Nelson, Commissioners Sandra Dunn, Donna Bernardy, Jack Sumner, Brad Lemhouse, Matt Nelson, and Laurel Crenshaw; **City Staff:** City Administrator, David Clyne; City Planner, Kay Bork; Public Works Director Jason Knope; and City Recorder, Kitty Vodrup. Not Present: Councilor Randy Nelson and Commissioner Fernandez.

## *I. CALL TO ORDER*

Mayor Dwight Coon called the joint meeting to order at 6:32 p.m.

## *II. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA*

None.

## *III. TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN UPDATE/HIGHWAY 99 REFINEMENT PLAN*

**Introductions**
Planner Bork introduced John Bosket from DKS Engineering, the project consultant and engineer who has done all the analysis on the project and the preferred alternatives. She also introduced Petra Schuetz, LCOG (Lane Council of Governments) Planner, who is the project manager for the Transportation System Plan Update/Highway 99 Refinement Plan.

Planner Bork noted that they were ready to begin the adoption process within the next few months, and updates would mostly be provided by Planner Schuetz and Mr. Bosket.

**Work Session Objective/Background on Project**
Planner Schuetz stated that this was the first meeting in a series of eight meetings, until the final product could be adopted by the Oregon Transportation Commission. The focus on this work session is to provide a good idea on the scope of the project, how a preferred alternative was chosen, and to provide direction to staff on a few policy questions. She encouraged questions, at any time.

Planner Schuetz continued that one of the primary recommendations from the Junction City Transportation System Plan that was adopted in 2000 was that it needed a Highway Refinement Plan. In 2005, a Transportation Growth Management grant was awarded by the Department of Transportation and Department of Land Conversation and Development with a local match. The project began in July of 2006, and it expires January 31, 2008. There are several steps to the project and to developing a preferred project to address the issues on Highway 99 through Junction City. First, the project management and public involvement structure needed to be defined. There was also extensive data collection and review of new documentation on new state policies on transportation. Staff reviewed a transportation modeling simulation to develop some of the data and also looked at GIS mapping. An existing conditions analysis was done to analyze and validate existing safety on the corridor and to develop estimates for future traffic years, in which they are looking at a 20-year planning horizon.

Planner Schuetz stated that they also reviewed different alternatives to meet the criteria and looked at the range of facility management and improvement alternatives, as well as a quantitative screening process for evaluation criteria for the types of projects and solutions that would work for the highway system. A threshold analysis was conducted, and they looked at developing phasing concepts that could be implemented as a series of short-term improvements that would then lead to long-range solutions.

Planner Schuetz continued that the next step was to look at the top five alternatives. Through the process of the Technical Advisory Committee, Citizen Advisory Committee and two open houses, the design options were narrowed down to three options. Technical Memorandum #6 (included in the packet) identifies and describes those three

top alternatives, which includes two couplet options and a by-pass option. A couplet is two, one way streets that are parallel to one another, and the preferred alternative is one of the couplet options. Last August, it was the conclusion that the preferred alternative was the couplet, so additional analysis was finished. Mr. Boskett was able to finish the technical analysis and develop the preferred alternative. The primary material that is before the joint work group is the preferred alternative of using the existing Highway 99 or Ivy one way south bound and then to use Holly as the north bound portion of the couplet. The 14-page document has specific descriptions on what that couplet would look like and figures that illustrate different options.

**Current Status**

Planner Schuetz stated that a draft Refinement Plan has been prepared, which includes all of the steps that she discussed. The final draft document of the Refinement Plan will be seen by the Planning Commission and City Council sometime within the next couple of months. It includes any policy changes to the existing Transportation System Plan, so that there is consistency between the 2000 plan and the Refinement Plan. There will be an executive summary in the final plan and Chapter one will be the background information, Chapters two through six will describe the process, the alternatives, and the access management plan, and Chapter seven will be the preferred alternative, which includes phasing and cost estimates. There will also be a series of conclusions and recommendations for the next steps to see how the project can be championed if it is adopted, how it is integrated into the Transportation System Plan, and review of financing strategies.

**Advisory Committees/Other Agencies Involved**

Planner Schuetz stated that the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) were both on board at the very beginning. The TAC was compromised of Lane Transit District, the Junction City Police Department, a representative from the Junction City Planning Commission, Department of Transportation (including the rail division and freight mobility), Transportation Growth Management, Lane County, Department of Land Conservation and Development, Mr. Boskett, Planner Schuetz, and Planner Bork. The CAC was comprised of a wide range of citizens, who were very involved and provided good input and participation. The last open house included 90 participants from the community, and despite the diversity of these citizens, the overwhelming consensus was to choose the Ivy/Holly couplet as the preferred alternative. Planner Schuetz noted that she read through community surveys in 2000, and the couplet idea was presented at that time, but had some resistance from the community. She continued that it was interesting that a 180-degree turn has occurred, and the consensus of the group was that if it was viable to remove the rail line on Holly, this was an alternative that they preferred.

**Preferred Alternative Review**

Mr. Bosket reviewed the preferred alternative of the Ivy/Holly Couplet and the five phases of the project. (He referred to Figure 7-1). Southbound traffic would travel on Ivy and northbound would be on Holly Street. There is 60 feet of public right of way in each of these corridors down Ivy and down Holly, and the plans fit within the existing right of way. Within each roadbed there are wider sidewalks (current sidewalks on Ivy are six feet and could be widened to eleven feet). Once inside the curbs, there would be room for parallel parking. There would be two twelve-foot travel lanes and a six-foot bike lane. This would begin at the "Y" at the intersection of Highway 99E and Highway 99W, so that intersection would need to be modified.

Mr. Bosket continued that the existing signal placements would be mirrored on both sides of the highway. Additional improvements were needed at First Avenue, because the congestion was greater there than any other area. (He referred to Figure 7-3). Extra turn lanes need to be added, to accommodate all of the traffic and to meet the mobility standards that ODOT (Oregon Department of Transportation) has for congestion. He referred to Figure 7-2 and the continuation of enhancements at the south couplet.

Discussion occurred on the BPA 115 power line that runs along Holly Street. Mr. Bosket responded that he thought they could work around that.

Planner Schuetz stated that there would be significant costs to vacating the rail line, particularly if the railroad would like to continue utilizing the Junction City area. Conversations will need to occur with the rail companies for placement and acquisition of right of way. It appears that there might be enough room to relocate the rail line along the main line, so there are a lot of options. The possibility that Willamette Pacific had signed a twenty-year lease with Burlington Northern for use of that line was noted. Administrator Clyne added that the separate franchise agreement between the City and rail line has lapsed and is no longer in effect.

Chairman B. Nelson stated that the preferred choice is predicated on Burlington Northern renegotiating their lease with Willamette Pacific and leaving, and he asked what the realistic possibility of that happening was.

Administrator Clyne responded that he felt this was a realistic possibility. He stated that in conversations with the railroad, the line is antiquated and barely meets the current requirements. The railroad is looking to expand their business and they don't have a lot of options, so this is more a question of time and not a question of viability.

Chairman B. Nelson continued that the important thing to determine was to make sure the rail line issue did not become a monumental stumbling block.

Administrator Clyne responded that this is certainly one of the critical points in the path to success and that there is a challenge before us. He continued that it was clear from the TAC and CAC meetings, as well as the open houses, what the community wants to see happen. He stated that beyond that, ultimately the future of rail is away from that line. He continued that it would not be a quick or inexpensive process, but is a process that consists of state and federal goals and financial considerations.

Planner Bork stated that having this in the plan as a preferred alternative is a bargaining tool that can be used to have the rail line moved. She continued that originally the TAC was headed towards not suggesting the Ivy/Holly couplet because of the rail, but there was some movement and discussions that the railroad was having with the City that indicated interest in pursuing that option; consequently, it became more of a reality that this could be a possibility to have the couplet on Holly, and it then was chosen as the preferred alternative.

Administrator Clyne stated that it needed to be clear that by 2015, Highway 99 will fail, and there has to be an answer to that failure. He continued that the choices that these two groups and the study explored were the by-pass and the two couplets. He stated that the by-pass rules itself out, if not for reasons of cost, but to the commercial impact on the community. He continued that the other couplet down Juniper would run past churches, a school, and existing residences and pulls traffic away from the downtown area, which was clearly unacceptable. He added that what was left was the Holly/Ivy couplet and although it is not an easy solution, it certainly is the best option and was agreed to by the citizens involved.

It was noted that a cost estimate to relocate the rail line was not known. Administrator Clyne responded that this would be a study that could be done, and discussions on this could be addressed with the Council.

Commissioner Lemhouse stated that he felt the cost of this was needed, in order to make a total assessment.

Administrator Clyne responded that his understanding is that this is a conversation that is occurring anyway by the railroad, and the City's goal is to speed up that plan and to partner for a good plan that works for all of us going forward.

In response to a question from Commissioner Sumner, Mr. Bosket stated that the assumption is that if Holly were changed to a highway, it would include a rebuilding of the road.

Discussion occurred on the storm drainage in Junction City.

Planner Bork added that the Refinement Plan and the preferred alternative can be adopted, and if needed, the plan can be updated in the future. She noted that by perhaps by having this in the plan, the discussion between ODOT and ODOT rail could be more strongly encouraged.

Mr. Bosket stated that they made it very clear in the open house with the public what the risk was with the Ivy/Holly couplet alternative, and the relocation of the rail road was a separate effort that included uncertainty on how or when that would happen. He noted that even when this was made clear it still was the strongly preferred option.

Chairman B. Nelson asked what the estimate for length of construction was in Phase One. Mr. Bosket responded that the engineering and construction could take three years.

Planner Schuetz stated that funding is identified through federal earmark or through a competitive process through the state's transportation improvement program. She expanded on funding options and the time frame for project completion/phasing.

In response to a question from Chairman B. Nelson, Planner Schuetz stated that the prison/hospital siting would have a significant impact to moving the project forward, especially in the area of system improvements. She added that she felt fairly confident that after the next round of census that Junction City would be eligible for incorporation into the Metropolitan Planning Organization, which is a federally designated, regional transportation obligation.

Mayor Coon stated that given the timeline and the growth that will take place, they are doing the north couplet, and he asked why they weren't they running the highway south at the same time.

Commissioner M. Nelson added that many people have asked him this same question and why not do Phases One and Five at the same time.

Mr. Bosket responded that you could do them at the same time, and he split them up only for a matter of funding, as the need to meet mobility on the congestion issues is addressed once you get south of First with Phase One. He continued that all the phases could be done at the same time, if the funding was available, and breaking into phases was done to hopefully provide more fundable pieces.

Planner Schuetz stated that the modeling took into account the 2002 Department of Corrections Transportation Impact Analysis. She continued that she assumed that the City would have some important criteria that they would want to integrate into the transportation analysis that the prison and hospital are going to need to do, and this could certainly re-prioritize the project, if there were significantly different findings for the type of traffic impact that it does have.

In response to a comment from Chairman B. Nelson, Planner Schuetz stated that all the development had been captured and factored into the model through the beginning of last year.

In response to a question from Mayor Coon, Planner Bork stated that the model took into account all of the land designations within the Urban Growth Boundary.

Planner Bork noted that adopting the plan does not lock them into doing the phasing in a certain order, and discussions would continue on prioritizing the project phases.

In response to a question from Chairman B. Nelson, Planner Bork stated that one of the goals of the Work Session was to achieve consensus approval that the Holly/Ivy Couplet is an alternative that both groups would be comfortable adopting.

Planner Schuetz stated that the Refinement Plan will fill the gap in the 2000 Transportation System Plan for consistency purposes, and the next step would be to open up the Transportation System Plan with new data and add something that reflects

the hospital and the prison. She continued that hopefully this would be something that the City would move forward on in the next year or so.

Planner Bork noted that the current 2000 TSP is based on 1990 employment population, but the Highway 99 Refinement Plan is using more current population.

Planner Schuetz stated that this is a revolving process and ideally the TSP should be updated every five years.

Councilor DiMarco asked how much flexibility is built into phasing. Mr. Bosket responded that there is 100% flexibility, as the phasing only serves as guidance and can be used any way the city wants.

Discussion continued on phasing.

**Consensus:** It was the consensus of the City Council and Planning Commission to support and to have staff move forward with the preferred alternative of the Ivy/Holly Couplet.

Discussion occurred on freight route considerations.

**TSP Policies**
Planner Schuetz reviewed the proposed policy text amendments to the TSP, for the purpose of providing consistency and referencing the Refinement Plan. It is planned the Refinement Plan will be attached to the back of the TSP.

**Consensus:** It was the consensus of the City Council and Planning Commission to support the text amendments to the TSP.

Planner Schuetz stated that part of what the state would like addressed is on the methodology that the City has for transportation system development charges. She continued that the scope of work for the TGM grant wanted an analysis that looked at any necessary amendments that would be needed to the City's SDC resolution to allow SDC's to be used to fund the recommended improvements. There are no other examples in the state of local collection of SDC's for state highway systems. She continued that the fact that ODOT placed this in the scope of work suggests that perhaps a formal policy change will occur in the future to mandate that local cities need to contribute to state improvements. She continued that this would mean to the City is setting up a system in the resolution that allows for this to happen, but does not mean in any way the City needs to designate or use a cost estimate associated with this project to actually implement a SDC specifically for improvements to the state system.

Planner Schuetz continued that they needed to allow for eligibility of the project, and a question is whether it would be an advantage to the City to look at the opportunity to include the SDC for this particular project. To change this, the City would need to add some road classification changes to the City's street SDC's, and including this is a matter of policy direction. Planner Schuetz noted that the City's SDC's fees could be reviewed, and they would be willing to make some recommendations on how to more efficiently implement the transportation portion of the methodology.

Discussion followed. It was noted that the language could be added later.

**Consensus:** It was the consensus to have the Council review this with legal counsel and to discuss at a later date.

Planner Schuetz reviewed the tentative Highway Refinement Plan adoption process. She emphasized that there were many more public hearings to receive public input and opportunities to make additional changes. The earliest that a final product would be seen is in June.

**Consensus:** It was the consensus to approve the tentative adoption process.

Planner Bork expressed her appreciation and thanks to Planner Schuetz and Mr. Boskett for doing a great job on the project.

## *IV. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE/CUSTOMIZED PERIODIC REVIEW WORK PLAN AND CITIZEN PARTICIPATION PLAN*

Planner Bork stated that the City received approval from the Land Conversation and Development Commission to enter into periodic review, and one of the first steps in doing this is for the City to adopt a Work Plan and a Citizen Involvement Plan. She provided the background information and the intent of providing needed Comprehensive Plan updates, such as Economic Opportunity Analysis, Buildable Land and Housing Needs Analysis, Urbanization Study (possible UGB Expansion), reviewing urban reserves, local Wetland Inventory, and Stormwater Management Plan. If approved by the Council, the plans would be submitted to DLCD for approval and for grant funding. Draft copies were provided for Council and Planning Commission review. It is planned that the final plans will go before the Council on February 12th.

Planner Bork noted that the plan goes out to 2010 or 2012, and it will cost approximately $43,000 to do the analysis and write findings for the Comp Plan Amendment. Administrator Clyne noted that they hope to also receive funding from the state, as part of the Intergovernmental Agreement with the prison/hospital to assist with the costs of Customized Periodic Review.

Discussion occurred on the Comprehensive Citizen Planning Committee (CCPC), which included that the membership will include the Planning Commission and three citizens. It was noted that two or three Council members should serve on this committee, as well.

Discussion continued.

**Consensus:** It was the consensus of the Council and Planning Commission to present the plans to the Council for adoption on February 12, 2008 and to appoint council members to serve on the CCPC.

## *V. ADJOURNMENT*

As there was no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:28 p.m.

ATTEST:

Kitty Vodrup, City Recorder

APPROVED:

Dwight Coon, Mayor