

URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
Meeting Minutes – August 12, 2020 at 6:00 P.M.
Council Chambers

COMMISSIONERS:

Jim Coulter (Chair)
Eric Heesacker (Vice Chair)
Loree Arthur
Jennifer Aviles
Mark Collier
Susan Tokarz-Krauss
Vacant
Vacant

City/Staff/Council Liaisons:

Barry Eames (City Councilor)
Brad Clark, (Principal Planner)
Jason Maki (Assistant Planner)
Wade Elliot, (Assistant Director Public Works)

Guests:

Andy Mortensen, David Evans & Associates

We on? Okay. Urban Area Planning Commission will now come to order. The time is six o'clock. Roll call. Commissioner Arthur.

Here.

Commissioner Collier.

Here.

Commissioner Aviles.

Here.

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss.

Here.

And I'm here, so all six of us are here. That meets a quorum.

I'm here too. You didn't call my name, but I'm here.

Did I call your name?

No.

Commissioner Heesacker.

I'm here.

Okay. We don't have any members of the public. Do we have any remote, Director?

We do not.

Okay. We'll skip public comment. Approval of minutes are for the July 22nd, 2020 meeting. Are there any corrections to the minutes? And that there's no corrections, is there a motion to approve the minutes for the July 22nd, 2020 meeting?

Test.

I second.

I'll second.

Second somebody?

Well, you did. You know, you weren't at that meeting, but you can still make a second. So, it's okay. All right. All in favor of approving the minutes of the July 22nd, 2020 meeting, signify by saying aye.

Aye.

Post abstentions? One abstention.

MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner Collier moved and Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss seconded the motion to approve the July 22, 2020 minutes, as submitted. The vote resulted as follows: "AYES":

Chair Coulter and Commissioners Arthur, Collier, Tokarz-Krauss and Heesacker.

"NAYS": None. Abstain: Commissioner Aviles. Absent: None.

The motion passed.

Next, we will move to findings of fact. Project application number was 201003828, excuse me, 20100328-20, Redwood Avenue, minor site plan review, discretionary architectural review. Are there any comments or corrections to the findings of fact for that application? All right. I will entertain a motion to approve the findings of fact.

This Heesacker, I will move that. We adopt those findings of fact.

Second.

I'm a third second.

Okay. We have a motion to approve the findings of fact. All in favor, signify by saying aye.

Aye.

Opposed? Abstentions? Okay.

MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner Heesacker moved and Chair Coulter seconded the motion to approve the Findings of Fact for Nunn-Redwood Ave Minor Site Plan Review with Discretionary

**Architectural Review. The vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Chair Coulter and Commissioners Arthur, Aviles, Collier, Tokarz-Krauss and Heesacker. "NAYS": None. Abstain: None. Absent: None.
The motion passed.**

Next, we're going to move into project number is 40500119-20, comprehensive plan amendments to the urban area, master transportation plan, comprehensive plan, text amendment transportation system plan overlay rezoning planning Commission. The type of public hearing this is a Type 4.

Go ahead, sir.

Hey, good evening. My name is Wade Elliott. I'm the assistant public works director and we are presenting the transportation system plan update. And I'm going to introduce Mr. Andrew Mortensen from David Evans & Associates. He is our consultant that we've hired to help us through the process.

Good evening. And thanks for having me back. I'm Andy Mortensen with David Evans & Associates from Portland, Oregon, and I've been the project manager on the transportation system plan update for the last two years. That project was originally funded by ODOT (Oregon Department of Transportation) with the help of the City. And we've been engaged directly with the City and the state and the county and the plan development process.

We've had five technical advisory committee meetings and five citizens advisory committee meetings. And in our discussion of a few weeks ago last month, we gave you a quick overview of what the TSP documentation has. We have many of those same slides tonight that we can reference, but I would like to get to some of the topical pieces that I do believe you'll want to ask questions about. And we can back up and reference other slides in that presentation with the hopes that we'll be able to provide answers to your that questions that we anticipate you'll have tonight.

I'd like to start off first by saying, well, what is a transportation system plan, and why do you prepare one, and why would you update your current plan?

So in the general sense, a transportation system plan as a reflection of your comprehensive land use plan and an expression of your community's goals and objectives, and it's an ability for you to put together a host of programs and projects and policies to match what your community vision is for what typically we cover as a 20-year planning horizon.

Grants Pass original transportation master plan was developed in 1997 and it was updated in 2008. And as soon as we got engaged on the project, we noticed that it was remarkably absent of specific planning elements for pedestrian and bicycle, and to some degree transit systems within the City.

A TSP (Transportation System Plan) in Oregon, a transportation plan in Oregon is also needing to be developed to follow Oregon administrative rules in consistency with Oregon's transportation planning rule, very similar to requirements that comprehensive plans need to follow to Oregon administrative rules. The transportation plan needs to do that as well. And City plan needs to be consistent with the state transportation plan and the County plan.

And in your case, since you've been in a metropolitan planning organization for several years now, it needs to be consistent with the regional transportation plan. And so what do you get out of one of these plans and is a reflection of where the community wants to invest in its street, bicycle, pedestrian, and sometimes supportive transit systems development, consistent with your comprehensive plan and vision. And with an updated plan, you'll have a better perspective of what your funding capabilities are and an ability to coordinate with other plans to leverage local investments with federal and state investments in the transportation system, within the Grants Pass urban area. So that's kind of what a transportation system plan is and why do you do it.

Since it hasn't really been updated since 1997, except for some refinement in 2008, now is the time really for the City to adopt a revision to their transportation plan so that its current and gives the ability to implement its immediate vision and goals and objectives. So that's kind of the backdrop for the plan. And, and Eric had some comment from our last meeting. We would have included that, but I wanted to make sure you had that perspective tonight.

So since we last met, we gave an overview of what the documentation is and where you could find it, but I would like to... And these slides are in there for you. I think you've got a hard copy, so you can continue to reference the City's public's website for the existing 2040 Transportation System Plan documentation. But while we were meeting last month, there was an online open house for the TSP that we've since closed at the end of last week, or just recently this week. And I'd like to just give a quick summary of the public involvement process that's gone on today. In addition to the technical advisory committee and citizens advisory committee meetings, we've held three open house meetings over the last two years, roughly.

The first one was an in person open house meeting in September of 2018, and we had about 25 participants at that meeting. They were really good focused in-person conversations about what are the issues in the City? What are people's concerns about from a multimodal plan perspective? And we were able to kind of relate what some of the existing conditions for Grants Pass' existing transportation system is. So that gave us a good feel for, okay, let's make sure that we're paying attention to those topics as we start analyzing the City's transportation plan in that first year of assessment.

And later in October of 2019, a little bit more than a year later, we held an online open house meeting to cover some of our ideas about what the future multimodal improvement options are available for the City to consider over the next 20-year planning horizon. We had over 245 people visit the website and view it and we had 44 comments on a number of a multimodal plan topics.

So we had good participation in those first two meetings. This last roughly month period from mid-July to mid-August, we rolled out the draft transportation plan and put out an online open house where we with some disappointment only had 60 visitors and only 5 direct comments. Now why was that?

We gave a direct mail notification or at least billing notification to all of the City residents like we did back in 2019. I'm just surmising that people's schedule is now more consumed by COVID-19-related issues. And I can only, with an educated guess, assume that people are busier with their lives dealing with day to day stuff that a notification to "Come take a look at the 20 year transportation plan" just didn't rise to the level of importance for those to come in and participate

in that website and give us more comments. But we'll share some of those ideas that came out of that with you in a bit later in this discussion and conversation we'll have tonight.

Again, we have in your packet, a summary of the general goals and objectives, the more detailed policies and other policy-related information is included in your detailed transportation system plan packet. Generally eight major goals of the plan, and we talked about those at our last meeting, and each of those goals has specific objectives that are sought by the transportation plan. And we use those to gauge whether we were packaging a TSP that met the City's goals for its community and for the plan documentation itself.

And there was some example here on Goal 7, implementing the plan transportation improvements, and the specific objectives include a number of things like setting priorities and preserving and acquiring future corridor, and the keeping the transportation plan current. And then amongst those specific objectives, there are detailed policies that are included in your detailed documentation. So again, that, that gives us some backdrop to some of the policy oversight of the plan and plan process.

The plan context, again the importance of a plan being coordinated with other plans as required by Oregon administrative rules. The TSP is what you'll be using to regularly update and refine your annual budgets for what projects you anticipate to fund either through engineering and construction or both. And you'll be coordinating with the regional metropolitan planning organization on the regional transportation plan with the state and the county.

And then also, there's coordination with the state on the various statewide planning goals in the Oregon transportation plan, which is a multimodal plan that gives some guidance to the City's transportation plan as well. So last time we talked briefly about some of the transportation standards, functional classification policy, and mapping, and design guidance for the plan.

That's there for reference. If you have questions and we gave some cross sections for your arterial collector and local street, a functionally classified network in the community. We talked briefly a little about the variety of different bicycle facility types that are considered in the transportation plan and included in some of the plan project recommendations.

And then we talked a little bit about measuring the impacts growth in the transportation plan, and we showed you, we looked at the existing pedestrian system, we've measured pedestrian level of traffic stress, and there's details about that process and technical findings in the documentation, and we looked at specific pedestrian vehicle crash statistics in the community to understand where are the problem areas and what kinds of transportation plan solutions are necessary to create a more connected, comprehensive, and safer pedestrian environment in the community. We did the same thing for the bicycle system.

And in a little more detail, we analyzed the street system in terms of vehicular safety crash records, traffic performance, both today and into a 20-year planning horizon in the future, and then looked at critical intersections, over a hundred intersections throughout the City to identify where are the City hotspots in terms of vehicle congestion, and considered those findings as part of our analysis of future transportation improvements.

And I'd like you to ask questions about what did we measure in terms of options for the fourth bridge? I anticipate that to be a topic for the community concern. That's what we heard in some of our public involvement, open house meetings. And I wanted to have a slide in here tonight to

take a part of that documentation, to give you a, an indication of why we concluded with recommendations for a fourth bridge, generally in the corridor where we've identified it in the community.

Today, your current 2008 transportation plan has a general fourth bridge location, generally in the Lincoln Road corridor. And what this chart shows is in red, what traffic is diverted from or shifted from the existing bridges across the Rogue River to any number of four new fourth bridge river crossing options. The first one at the top is roughly in the Hamilton Road, corridor orientation on the east side of US-199. And it would carry in the PM peak hour, about 700 vehicle trips in both directions. And it would take roughly that amount from both the Highway 99 and US-199 bridge corridors.

The second rough alignment option is about the Oak Street north-south alignment, just west of downtown. And that crossing would carry about 855 vehicles in the PM peak hour and would take considerably more traffic off the existing bridges. The alignment that's roughly in the Lincoln corridor, Lincoln Road corridor would carry about 1200 vehicles in the PM peak hour and quite a bit more from the existing bridges.

And then the further west you go roughly out around Lower River Road, the PM peak hour traffic is just shy of a thousand vehicles in the PM peak hour. So it's what it's demonstrating is the demand between central City and the, the growth areas in the southwest part of the community is really where a majority of that traffic demand is and the best seated alignment for that fourth bridge. No surprise, we're not changing recommendations is generally in the Lincoln Road corridor. And so I'd like to give you at least a little bit of that backdrop from what we've studied.

And we did some travel demand modeling with ODOT's, regional travel model and modeled those route ramifications specifically. And again, this is an indicator of showing in red, what traffic shifts from the existing street network to the new north-south bridge crossing, although the Rogue River isn't shown in this map, it's roughly in this location. And that's the detailed data we use to summarize those forecasts in the chart that's in your transportation plan. So does anyone have any questions on that? I'm hoping, I'm anticipating both the interest and maybe questions you might have from some of the details that are eventually included in our draft plan. I'd like to give you an opportunity to poke some questions forward.

Does the modeling on the Oak one, the Lincoln Road one, did that assume that Allen Creek was open to New Hope or not, or based on existing traffic?

No, it assumed an Allen Creek connection all the way through. It assumed... That is correct, it did assume that connection at the time of that modeling, we were presuming that it was going to be a project under construction at that time. But I do know that, back in 2018 and 2019, there was some pausing on that potential project, so in that modeling we assumed that connection all the way through

Commissioner, a quick update on that, is that we got the federal go-ahead to start expending some funds on it. And so ODOT is moving forward with the request for proposal system to hire a new design consultant. So you should start seeing some traction on that here pretty soon.

So I thought, I wanted to give you the most opportunity to ask questions about, what's in the transportation plan projects? What are the projects? That's what typically I would be interested in if I'm in your shoes and in your seat tonight. And quickly, what I'd like to just cover for you

before we get into some of those specifics is how did we come up with those projects? What process did we follow to come up with the list of pedestrian improvement projects, and the bicycle improvement projects, and the street improvement projects?

So the first step was certainly understanding with the existing conditions, knowing how much traffic is out there today, both vehicle, bicycle, travel and pedestrian travel and understanding where the hotspots are today. That was our first step.

Then we convened a meeting with our technical advisors. ODOT the MPO (Metropolitan Planning Organization), Josephine Community Transit and Josephine County and City staff. We convened and had a good long meeting from technical input with a number of ideas that the consultant team came up with in terms of a range of potential improvements that might be considered in the plan.

The third step was taking the technical input from our multi-jurisdiction participation and, and culling some of the projects that didn't make sense and bringing the projects forward that most made sense, including considering the public involvement that we had heard at our first open house meeting, and then drafting a set of multimodal projects that we called the "preferred alternative" that had some sense of, well, how much are they going to cost, and what projects have we heard that the community are really focused on in terms of priorities?

Then we took that information out to our second public open house meeting. And in your documentation of the plan, I think you'll see there, there was fairly consistent in comprehensive support for a lot of the priority improvements that were in that draft.

In the sixth step, we did funding assessment to more narrowly define the priorities in, in basic tiers of top priority, medium priority, and more longer-range lower priority projects as the City, and others could help participate in funding those projects. And then in the last half a year, we've brought all of that together in the draft TSP documentation that you have.

I would like to quickly summarize basically the funding assumptions in our plan. And one would say, "Yes, we we've crafted and refined this at the first of the year, right before COVID hit." So one would say, "Wait a minute, things are changing dramatically now," and I'd like to address that in a little bit, but I just would like to put that preamble here.

So we identified multimodal projects that best met the TSP objectives and goals, but we are also thinking about geographic parity throughout the community, making sure that transportation solutions are part of each of the neighborhoods of the community and then also considering the City's ability to pay for those improvements.

So in terms of forecasting transportation revenue, we looked at federal and state funding programs [CMAC and SDC 00:24:42], the regular revenue that the City will continue to get from the state highway fund, although that varies now a little bit with a decline in gasoline sales, and tax receipts, the City street utility fee, and transportation SDCs (System Development Charges), presuming no significant adjustment to the City's SDC program and assumptions about how much new development pays today on a per-unit basis.

Through year 2040 in our 20-year planning horizon, we've estimated that total revenue to be a little bit shy of 114 million in total. From that though, we wanted to subtract out the City's... A

conservative estimate about the operation and maintenance costs that the City needs to spend each year through that 20-year planning horizon to make sure that the City's system continues to operate as desired, and maintaining that system in a way that keeps the City ahead of any significant decline in the condition of the City's transportation network.

So we estimated the 20-year planning horizon to be about 42 million and what that leaves us in and what we've called Tier 1 project list is roughly just shy of 72 million in capital improvements for making multimodal plan project investments. We also added another assumption that said if our funding forecast is overly conservative and we were to incur more revenue, we did a Tier 2 designation for projects that if you had another 50% of revenue in upwards of almost 36 million, that would give us a little over 105 million over the 20-year planning horizon. And so that's why we categorize projects in Tier 1 and Tier 2. So it gave the City, you an ability to mix and match as life takes different turns and challenges in a long-range plan that we can't predict or estimate.

And then Tier 3 are projects that we think are necessary for the City to complete eventually, bringing some of the designated collector and arterial network up to standards, but they may happen as part of development and afforded and funded privately or from other means or they'll just wait beyond the 20-year planning horizon and may not occur at this time. So that's more of a round-out of a master plan rather than a 20-year transportation plan that's more tied to the City's funding capability. So does anyone have any questions on what our assumptions are in the funding part of this plan?

Thank you. So just so I'm understanding this correctly, Tier 1 is a projected funding between now and 2040 of just over \$70 million. And so looking at the list of different Tier 1 projects between the streets, the pedestrians and the bicycle... I was just wondering, is there a projected cost for those projects?

Yes, and we'll get into that because we did look at each project and we put cost estimates to all of those projects. And then with this funding capacity, we constrained our tier one project list to mean streets that are estimated to cost based on their size and extent, bicycle and pedestrian improvement projects to not exceed that 71.7 million. And I'll go through those maps and charts here shortly.

Then the next set of projects in Tier 2, don't exceed that additional 35.8 or 35.9 million. And Tier 3 is beyond that. And we can talk about those specifically in a bit.

That. And we can talk about those specifically in a bit.

Okay. And then one of the key tier one projects listed on page... I don't have a page number. The street system projects slide page. It has the fourth bridge approach has the first key to tier one.

Right. Jumping ahead of me a little bit, but let's go for it.

Just a quick question in terms of this. It's considered a street system project for the fourth bridge approach. I was just wondering if the bridge has bicycle, or pedestrian options added to it. Is funding then allocated within the three banks or just from one bank?

I'm going to put together our assumptions about that fourth bridge. We felt that it was important, even if you couldn't afford the whole bridge in tier one, is to get the right of way and get the approaches funded and paid for, so that you're not going to lose the ability to have to come back in and buy right of way, at a much higher cost, 24 years from now or 22 years from now.

It's hard to know exactly when the bridge should get designed and constructed, but we felt that design and getting the approaches and right of way in place within the City's funding capability, within 20 years, was really important. Ultimately, the bridge and that whole corridor though, will have a full bicycle and pedestrian design component. On both sides, you'll have bicycle and pedestrian facilities just like you would on an arterial street.

So, there's full continuity and connectivity in that corridor for both motorists, and then walking and cycling pedestrians. I hope that helps answer your question.

Yes. Thank you.

And if I could add one more thing, all new construction that we do on any roadway, upgrades things to our current standards, which are what the standards are in this plan. Every time we rebuild a street, we're rebuilding Sun glow. Right now, it's got bike lanes, sidewalks and so. Any new construction we do, we're putting it in. Yes, you're welcome.

While we're here, all start with the streets and then we'll back up, no plan intended to cover pedestrian and bicycle projects as well. For the street network, I think you'll see that... Like I mentioned, the fourth bridge approaches, but West park and a realignment of Redwood and tying in well with what would be Allen Creek to the South, new traffic signals there, new traffic signals on Lincoln, at Lower River Road, at Bridge and G Street.

That corridor is going to be remarkably different, but capable of carrying both vehicle, pedestrian and bicycle travel North South, making a link between North and South grants pass across the river. There's an extension of Lincoln through some undeveloped properties and over the railroad right of way to tie back in with B Street, so that we can provide a network for people to have alternatives to 6th and 7th Street and the US One 99 bridge.

It's not going to carry a tremendous amount of traffic. Our estimates were in about 12,000 ADT on the bridge. So, Lincoln's going to be in the 12 to 16,000 ADT range. It's more than you see today, but with these improvements, you'll be able to balance the vehicle and put bicycle and pedestrian travel demand with those. We see full street, urban design. I should say, urban cross section design standards development on some of your key North South routes.

I used to know this by name, but it's Highland Avenue, 10th and other North South streets. And in the Southwest area, we've got some minor sections of some of our collector street network in intersection improvements, planned improvements well into the future. And tier three as development occurs so that we have roughly an ability to go East West on the South side of US, One 99. Although there are design constraints and environmental conditions that make that tough, we still think, the pursuit of those East West connectors are important.

Full completion of Harvick roads so that we have sidewalks and bike lanes on both sides. And eventually the full connection out to highway two 38. There's East West connection near the middle school, so that one could travel East West across Two 38 without having to come up

with highway to highway 99 and US One 99 to travel East West on the South side of the river. East Park, Fruitdale, and a number of North South collector streets are in the plan depending on the tiers.

Tier one improvements are identified on highway 99 and on East Park so that there's a full complement of bicycle lanes and sidewalks and adequate traveling facilities on each of those roads. Those are a number of the key transportation improvements. And we've got a couple of projects that come out what we call cut sheets that you'll find in volume two of the documentation.

If you're interested in individual streets, you can kind of go through those cut sheets and see those in more detail. I think this would be a place where you could see the details on the fourth bridge and approaches. We're looking for roughly a two lane roadway facility, doesn't need to be four lanes, with the level of future traffic demand that's anticipated, but bicycle and pedestrian facilities on each side of those. And that makes a full connection from Lincoln down past the fairgrounds to Redwood Avenue.

There's additional plan improvements to do some realignment of Redwood Avenue for consistency with ODOT's expressway plan for US One 99. Those are included in other parts of the documentation. In these cut sheets, we try to put some pictures to what are the original problems that the projects are trying to address. Some level of traffic characteristics so you would understand whether what the traffic is today, or what the estimated traffic is going to be 20 years from now, and who these multimodal improvements are for, and for what reason.

Listing whether or not they're safety, traffic, congestion solutions, operation, or freight improvements, and whether that's for private vehicle, motorists, transit, or for cyclists and pedestrians. Then we summarize the tier one or tier two or tier three priority, and the project's cost estimate in specificity. That's where you see some of the individual project costs that are included in all of these. That's the fourth bridge approaches.

Another one is Dimmick Street. Taking upgrades of Dimmick Street to bring it into full on street standard. The City's pursuing a portion of that improvement as we speak right now on the North side of the railroad. It's swapping out the existing railroad crossing with a new one at Dimmick, and then bringing that down to G Street with probably a traffic signal at that location.

That allows a more continuous North South route on the West side of downtown, at least between G street and points North. We covered the same background information and give a cross section of what that might look like, and identify its total project cost estimates as well.

There are a number of cut sheets in volume two of your document if you wanted to see those details. I just wanted to give you some examples here of what that means.

I'd like to go back to the street system map and say, are we missing anything or things out of priority from what you would anticipate as you live and work and travel here? We just want to make sure that we are aligned and we think we have been with the public involvement to date. I'd like to have your perspective on whether there are things that you think are either more important or missing from our street systems project list.

I was mentally still stuck on the issue of the train track crossing. Moving it from Booth to Dimmick is exactly the distances from my house on Kenny to Dimmick, which is the long block of the old hospital complex. Were you implying that would rule out all the arrangements we've made for crossing out at the end of F Street? I can't see how moving it one long block West is.

No. So I don't think. The one at the end of F Street over there, actually the grades work out really well because that's sub division is pretty high. That's going to be an over the top. That won't cross or count as an at grade crossing.

That wasn't clear to me,

Yes. As long as we're high enough that we won't impede any real freight card stuff where, we'll be good on that one. However, with moving Booth to Dimmick, the latest we've heard is this not a clean swap one for one. There'll be some other mitigation, possibly remove two to get one, but we need to look into that further. This is what we wanted.

The two to one thing I didn't get. Because I didn't see any place else you could take one out either.

I don't either.

That's where private railroads try to exercise more of their authority that local communities don't necessarily see eye to eye with. Personally from a technical perspective, that makes sense if you've got high frequency cargo activity and passenger rail, but this is a low cargo route.

I just can't technically find a reason why they gain any benefit other than getting to strong arm a local community to reduce yet another crossing. I don't see any benefit.

I will add that there are other parts to the plan. It's a bringing highway 99 and highway Two 38 into a full urban cross street design. But some of those are in tier three.

Basically. We've been talking with ODOT to potentially move those up to tier two, but it's really a project that would get funded by the state, not by the City.

Well, I have a question. Although 4th Street is, I know it's not City's purview, it's state, right. Is the bridge itself the state?

On the fourth bridge?

Responsibility. Yes, the 4th Street bridge. The fourth bridge not the 4th Street.

I believe they would likely be City owned at that time. However, in order to actually feasibly get it done, we'd be looking at leverage state and federal funds, but we would own that bridge.

Okay. If we're at a 2040 plan and our approaches are to be done through 2040, where does the bridge sit? It doesn't sit within that plan. It's out 20 plus years, is what it looks like. Is there any guesstimate at all how far past those 20 years?

I don't really have one. Likely if it were to get funded, it would happen a lot, the same way that the expressway did in Medford. So that one got earmarked funding through the house bill 2017, that was actually earmarked to build that project. If that was left to ODOT and the City to come up with the funding, they wouldn't have been able to get their arms around.

One of my concerns is it's a double edged sword with the fourth bridge approaches being done. First is that's good for traffic flow on one hand. But on the other hand, you've got that wear and tear over if you do it early over 20 years. And so then you end up undoubtedly with a number... A certain level of cost to bring those approaches again back up to a standard for that fourth bridge. Is that been discussed?

Maybe I could add a little bit more the approaches themselves. It's making sure you have the right of way. That's what was important about getting that level of cost estimate in here. Not necessarily building the approach lanes themselves that don't get any travel demand.

For instance on the South side, if you bring Westpark in to a new alignment, then you've got new network that gives local travel options around the fairgrounds.

You'll get some benefit from those.

That's what I'm saying. I understand we'll get that upfront.

Yes.

I'm just on the other end. If you do that early on the other end and you've had the right of way some place and you're using those and that's all good. There's going to be a cost at the other end to bring the deterioration back up to standard, to attach to the bridge if you will. Correct? Is there been any thought like past 20, 40 cost and things, or we just don't go that far out? It's like the elephant in the room. It's like, we're doing everything, getting everything ready in 20 years. We need this bridge, but we don't have it yet. And 20 years is in one way a long time, and another way it's not.

So, how deficient are we right now without a fourth bridge? And if that's so, is there a mechanism through maybe the state, maybe federal grants or something to push that bridge timeframe below 20 years?

Now, I know that's a little bit out of this study. I know I'm a little bit out of it. I bring it up because it's still part of planning and it's crucial to what we're doing here, I think in terms of finances and funding and priorities,

There's few points I want to touch on in that. One is, a lot of those costs to maintain the things that we have are wrapped into that operations and maintenance costs. Those are our overlays that we do every year, chips, slurry, Scheels, you name it.

We did a pavement conditions analysis, and we'll keep doing that. And what that does is gives us a score based on a hundred and where we're up. So we'll make sure that we're not degrading faster than we can rebuild the roads. Another point I wanted to make was that the Y... The South Y was-

Yes, I was thinking about that too.

It is left out of this plan, and basically ODOT would like to tackle that in a special study of its own at a later date. It wasn't really part of this plan, but realistically, we won't be doing a fourth bridge or very much of this work towards the approaches until we have a solution at the South Y.

I was going to ask the second question about the South Y. I think you mentioned that last meeting, when is that study estimated? Was there an estimate on that study when it was going to begin?

It's to be determined. I believe that there would be a pretty high cost associated. They're going to be asking for that money for planning to get earmarked in the next funding cycle.

So, we have to be careful here. It sounds like if we're not careful, we're going to put the cart in front of the horse.

That would be true. And I see where you're coming from, but we're realistically not going to be doing any of this fourth bridge work until we know what ODOT is going to do with the South Y because it would be.

Yes, it's theirs.

And we need clarity on... And maybe, when they come up with an awesome solution, maybe it's a bunch of roundabouts, so we don't know, but maybe it's going to take a lot of the pressure off of this stuff and we need one.

Well, and now I'm talking like probably a City Councilor for a second here, but I can see the advantage by doing what the City is doing now. Maybe leveraging ODOT to be more proactive in doing a study because we're actually doing stuff in-house to try to make things better.

And the most important thing to me is that this is in a plan. The next time somebody wants to put in a big horse racing track or something like that, we've already put our flag in the ground and said, no, this alignment is for the future of Grants Pass. That's a lot of why we want it cemented in here.

Yes. Just question and some concerns I have it, I think-

You are right on the Mark and our technical group covered those questions.

Yeah. I think you've done a good job on this study.

So the strategy, just to give a little more depth, if we tried to put the full bridge cost into the first 20 years, it doesn't leave much left for the rest of the City. And what kind of a plan does any citizen wanna-

Exactly.

...up to what I don't get anything except a bridge 20, 19 years from now.

Now I understand. Appreciate it.

So the bridge cost is in tier two and it's the hope that if we can help leverage federal and state monies that aren't in our forecast and can bring that all together to bear on a project that's going to be meaningful within our foreseeable timeframe. That's the intent. The other major part is making sure you don't get boxed out from ever having the ability to do the project and [crosstalk 00:19:29].

Even 20 plus years out, the technology of asphalt and concrete and all the things we're doing is changing so much. Who knows what the cost was going to look like down that road. So, yes.

I would also like to add, some of the projects that we... I'm sorry.

I'm curious as to the status of what used to be ODOT responsibility for Lower River Road and I thought part of Lincoln and so on, they completely out of that business now and who's responsible?

Josephine Counties and Mr.[Hisaka 00:20:12] are now responsible. Do you want to tackle that one?

Yes, that's right. The County inherited Lower River Road. And that was earlier this year. I want to say March, April. I can't remember the exact date, but that belongs to the County.

The thing I was wondering based upon his conversation is, it's pretty clear while we're talking about the West side that opening Allen Creek and getting a path through that runs North South will help people who don't want to go through why and everything to go to Redwood or someplace. But the same thing is true on the North side.

If you can come down from Merlin or Colonial Valley or someplace and come down Highland and get further than winding around through the little streets above Gee, if there would be benefit to that, or I'm just wondering where that was prioritized, because you still could connect there. You could do the railroad crossing before the bridge maybe. Or is that totally dependent upon the bridge for warrant, for justification?

Not at all Commissioner. I mean, very likely that one's going to happen far before any traction gets on the fourth bridge. That's a really high priority. It's a tier one project and it's something that we're going to be looking at and getting done within the next five to 10 years. We'll start the process soon. Okay.

Mr. Valdez, did you have a question?

Yeah. I just had a couple very quickly. When you had said earlier that the fourth bridge option was adopted in 2008, and then I guess what does that mean when it was adopted in 2008, versus knowing now that for the next 20 years were securing just the right of ways versus the actual construction of the bridge? I just have to guess, I don't understand how can something be adopted 12 years ago and then not even be built for 32 years? I don't understand that.

Wait, if you wanted, I'll take a crack at it. So when we looked at the older documentation, it just didn't look like the City was in the position to say, this is the route, and we need to make sure

that any development that happens within that corridor, that we have the ability to negotiate a fair market price to secure the right of way.

The earlier plan, your current plan does identify that corridor, but it's not very specific. We felt it just needed to be better specified in this plan so that you enable yourself to secure right of way more effectively. That's why we've updated, but not replaced or changed the plan.

The reason we've said, hey, it's still generally in the Lincoln Road corridor, it is still your adopted plan to have a fourth bridge. We just want the community to know that we're not changing that. We're just putting more specificity to what the alignment ought to be.

The impact on us has been that when subdivisions came in along Lincoln road in that area, we have forced them to not have any access to the arterial to Lincoln. They to turn the other direction and come in from the backside so that there's no more crossing and entrance on that whole section of Lincoln. So it had an effect on our planning and development for the last 10, 12 years.

And I would like to add on, why haven't we had any traction on it in 35 years. The previous plans weren't very fiscally constrained. It was basically just a whole list of projects that we could prioritize at any time to build when funding was available as long as they were on that list.

And so some things that were too large for people to get their arms around like Lincoln road or the fourth bridge. Those things were just continually kind of shuffled to the bottom of the pile, as things were taken care of when funding was available.

That's how something can be in a plan for that long. And we still have intentions of doing it and it's important and we recognize that, we just never had the funding to do it.

And then just the last question, the \$35 million that would be used for the bridge approach.

An approaches and right of way. Right of way and approaches.

Who actually is being paid that money? Is it the state? Or I guess whose it... [inaudible 00:54:08]

The right of way to the that question would be whoever owns the property would be compensated for that.

Okay. Let's currently estimated at costing \$35 million to do that.

In totality. Yes. That's right of way plus roadway improvements outside of the actual bridge abutment to bridge abutment.

Wow. Okay. Thank you.

Yes.

And then the balance of that money would be paid to a contractor through a proposal. That at beginning we would hire a contractor for it.

If there are no further questions on the street plan, I'd like to back up and cover the bike and pet plan. In similar fashion, this map has a bit more to it than meets the first eye. What you see on the state highway and collector and arterial network, the primary street network in white are corridor segments that have pedestrian facilities on both sides. They've got sidewalks on both sides today.

We didn't target except for a few locations where those existing sidewalks would be replaced by either a wider sidewalk or a different facility. We tried to target the first two tiers of priority pedestrian improvements on collector and arterial street routes that have missing sidewalks or crossings in the network that really speak to the need for protection for pedestrians in critical locations.

The tier one investments almost a little over three and a half million in the dark orange, on routes like B Street, Bridge Street sidewalk, filling in the sidewalks along Bridge Street, West of downtown, completing sidewalks along M street on the East side of highway One 99.

Those are key routes that serve resident in some places, schools. Those rise to the top of some of our priorities for pedestrian only improvements. Other tier two projects includes projects like end street, and replacing some of the sidewalks on 6th and 7th Street, North of Evelyn.

Those have driveway crosses that were built to what our today substandard ADA full accessibility treatments. And given the level of continued traffic growth in that area and the activity of land use within the corridor, we felt that those were important pedestrian improvements that ought to be identified in the plan.

That's the summary of the standalone pedestrian or sidewalk improvement projects that are included in the plan for tiers one, two, and three. And I think you can see those in the document. There are also a series of locations where we're looking at additional rapid flashing beacon signs for improved pedestrian crossings at certain junctions in the plan. So they're included there as well. Anybody have any questions on the pedestrian project map and list?

I cannot identify what the red line is up on the Northwest from they may go over to, it looks like a connection to the dollar mountain type trailer or something.

Is this what you're talking about here?

That's just I-5.

It's what?

It's Just I-5, It came out-

No, no. Not way up.

It's what?

It's just I5, it came out-

No, no, no. Not way up there down a ways. So it has a three above it. Some reason...

[inaudible 00:58:13].

It doesn't look like a street shape that exists and that's...

That's it, right there.

Oh yeah, so that's completing sidewalks all along the F Street corridor.

F Street?

Yes.

(Silence) E-F, okay.

There are some sections along one side, but a continuous connection on both. It's hard to find, right?

So it's not a... I thought maybe it was a path-utilizing railroad front?

No, uh-uh (negative). No, we kept it on F Street. We've had no indication that the railroad's going to change... to drop any rail service where you could get a rails-to-trails kind of thing done there. It would be great, certainly seize on that opportunity if ever freight service is discontinued in the corridor and the owner wants to sell, but all of our indications are they're going to continue to move timber products in that corridor.

Well, when they were doing the Foundry thing, there was a discrepancy detected of 50 feet of railroad right away, that may or may not belong to the railroad that... Do you remember that? It might expand into... And I was wondering whether that ran further than that lot, if it was something that ran the full distance.

You stumped us. I'm not sure. Well, we can look into it.

Is my recollection on that Foundry Street project that, I guess first and foremost, we didn't look further East or West. I think we really just looked at that, where Fry tees into that Foundry. So that's an interesting point, but yeah, I recall that you're right. That there's that... But I believe that just was pertaining to those two parcels that were right at the intersection of Fry and Foundry.

I just thought that'd be great, if you found out there was 50 more feet available to somebody in the world, the whole way.

Actually, I remember what that one was. Thanks for jogging my memory. Yeah, that was Old City right away. That was going to be for old connections through there, but now that we know we're never going to be able to connect there, we vacated those. I remember.

I have a question regarding the pedestrian system projects? So looking at the slide that appears earlier regarding pedestrian fatalities, it looks like there's several down in the...

Oh, in your document? Correct.

Yeah, and so just looking at some of the improvements that are the Tier Ones for pedestrian systems, it looks like there's a Tier One, and then it turns into Tier Two with some sort of pedestrian crossing improvement, but no identified safety enhancement. I was just curious about that, given the number of fatalities that happened in that section.

Are you talking about the Redwood Avenue junction area with 1-99?

Yeah, off where you would turn off? Well, coming into town from County or coming out, off near RCC. I know it was sometime last year, there was a walker who was hit. I was just curious in terms of just [crosstalk 01:01:42].

Now some of those, in this crash record, it only went up to 2016 in our analysis. So what's happened since 2016, we just don't have new data on that yet. But a number of those crashes happened before the City improved Redwood Avenue. Those improvements I'm hoping are helping resolve some of the inherent conflict within the corridor. Then this is generally the Allen Creek road corridor connection into 1-99 and Redwood. Our plan has improvements recommended for street pedestrian and bicycle facilities on that North-South connection, too. That's the intent for those projects is to make a better multimodal facility for all users. We would expect to see the pedestrian crash rate drop, and I can't predict when pedestrians are going to get hit and how severe they'll be, but typically when cars are hit, or when pedestrians are hit and cars are traveling faster than 25 miles an hour, you're usually going to see either a severe injury or sometimes a fatality. But we think that balance of the transportation plan recommended will help resolve that crash history of fatalities in that location.

(Silence) You'll not see that just on the pedestrian plan. If you go to the pedestrian plan, you'll see where we've shaded in the gray routes, where we have multimodal street projects that are identified on the street project map, but those are all included in that junction area, if you can see my mouse. (Silence) We have some cut sheets on the example pedestrian projects, I talked a little bit about 6th and 7th Street in the M-Street project. That's where we're filling in some of the details about the reasoning behind targeting some of those key projects. Bicycle system projects are also included in the plan, I think you've seen that map similar to the pedestrian system plan. Our team worked on trying to figure out how to get better bicycle facility and pedestrian facilities across the tandem bridges, directly linking Downtown and the immediate South core areas, South of the Rogue River.

We landed on perhaps not the best type of improvement project, but there is a need for a better connection. So we've identified a 5th Street road river-bed bike bridge in the plan that would tie in with Park Street, and a series of connections. Then on the Park Street bicycle lane network, we're looking for recommendations to include better bicycle and pedestrian facilities on highway 1-99, both East and West in town. Certainly we have the connections for bicycle facilities that are offered by a number of the street projects, but then you'll see other places where we've identified improved bicycle lane facilities on 9th Street, Oak Street bike lanes, and then East-West along Bridge Street in M-Street, so that there's a continuous route for cyclists to stay within a travel lane, a bicycle lane for their use on key routes like that. That's the bicycle plan project map and list of projects.

I would say that if you're concerned about seeing more bicycle and pedestrian improvements in your plan, we're providing that in this document. We cover much of the bicycle system needs along the City's collector and arterial streets in Tier One funding. I think you've seen that we cover quite a bit of the pedestrian standalone projects in tiers One and Two, and then all of the

projects that are in tiers One and Two on the street plan include those pedestrian and bicycle improvement projects as well. What we saw as a deficiency in the original 1997 plan, we've tried to respond to the community's input and need to fully embrace street corridors that provide facilities for both vehicle cyclists and pedestrian users.

(Silence). I think we brought these slides to you before, as a summary of some of those general recommendations that got a little more specified in the draft plan documentation. In our online meeting in 2019, I think we had over 44 responses. The population was quite a bit stronger in terms of participation, but we asked general questions: "Do you agree with our multimodal project priorities, especially the roadway improvement projects?" And we had a super majority that supported, or supported with some modifications, and hear the urgency of the wide junction or the urgency of the fourth bridge.

I think the community is there, and your comments as well... There's only 3%, or excuse me, 8% of the population that's unsure about the urgent need for a wide junction solution, so that's a pretty significant statement in the community that you've got a super majority that treats that as a very urgent, and a near total majority or consensus that there's at least some urgency, for that solution. The fourth bridge, I think not as much. Again, a super majority for the urgency, but instead of 68% very urgent, it was only about 41%, and there are still some that are just not sure, or view it as not particularly urgent. I think the community feels that the wide junction is urgent, it just wasn't part of our purview to cover that state facility as part of our plan.

What's ODOT's standing on that, as far as the freight route timing is concerned?

I'm not sure what you mean by timing, or the timing of the study.

I mean, it's always been their argument that because 1-99 is the only [crosstalk 01:09:08] Southern-North-East-West freight route, and every minute counts, and you can't do this, and that, and that, and that, because it might slow down by 30 seconds a truck or something. Shouldn't that be a high priority for ODOT?

It is. They view it that way, we just don't know how quickly they can pull the study out and get it moving. We just don't know yet, but we've heard them say it's, it's a priority for them. A big priority, yep.

So our July through mid-August online open house, with the draft plan by review, we had 60 visitors and we had five comments. This is not statistical validity, but I would like to just share with you what we saw and heard. Looking at the proposed street standards, there were two comments and one was opposed and one was in favor, and I'll come back to the next page on that. Whether they felt that the plan was favored in terms of the street improvements, there was a total majority of the five participants who commented on that. Same thing for the pedestrian improvements, but there was one participant who didn't feel that the type and level of bicycle improvements in traffic calming sections of the plan suited their needs. I think that comment also came out on the I-5 interchange improvements that we identified at Exit 55. Working with ODOT, we modified those draft plan findings to include a new roundabout at the Southbound ramp termini to better facilitate a full US 1-99 and Interstate 5 off-ramp traffic. With that roundabout, the participant was opposed to roundabouts, so I think we heard that in the commentary.

On the proposed street standards, when I bring their comments to you, it's not as a reflection of the total community, but I think it is a very small fraction, but an expression of how you're going to hear community members chime in on your transportation plan and some of the detailed projects. When it comes to design standards, we put together complete street design standard recommendations, which is largely what the City does day to day, anyway. There's some nuances to that, and the commentary of the participant who favored it was looking for ways to slow down excessive speeds on some of the City street corridors. They favored calming devices that would bring speeds down for safety.

Whereas the person who commented and said, "I don't like any of the traffic calming devices, and I don't want you to turn Grants Pass into another Eugene or Boulder, Colorado." I put those out there because I think you're going to hear that. Most cities do, and it's not to say one is wrong and one is right, but we had so few comments, I wanted to at least share something from that online open house. But here's the dichotomy: you're going to have people who favor some of the plan recommendations and the use of City's ongoing street standards to provide facilities that are safe for all users, and you're going to have others who just want to make sure that they can maintain, to the greatest degree, efficient vehicle traffic movement.

Anyway, these were some of the comments that we heard from the online open house. That's just a very small fraction of the community, only two people. Not meant to mean what the resounding voice of the community is, but just an expression that there are people who have different points of view.

Is there any terminology that you can use in your surveys, or whatever? It seems like there would be a way to distinguish between on that right hand comment, the Boulder or Eugene thing, between the concept of wanting to be more European and have everybody ride their bike to work Downtown, and doing it as a recreational outdoor type activity, which is very different, and you want a different kind of setting to have it in, but it all gets lumped together in one, in our planning [Crosstalk 01:14:04].

Yeah, I would not take this comment to mean a large reflection of the whole community. The other part of it is the online... It doesn't have the ability for two-way communication. We were limited in budget, and we didn't see a lot of people participating directly in the first meeting, so we thought the online meeting was going to provide the most accessibility for the full range and number of Grants Pass residents. In that venue, you can't have an open dialogue to say, "Well, what do you mean by that? Don't you still, at the same time, favor that we should maintain lower vehicle speeds around schools so that we can make sure that students are walking and biking in a safer environment?" Because I think then you would get the response "Well of course I favor that, I just want to be able to get from this point here, to that point there with as little traffic congestion as possible," [crosstalk 01:14:59] but we don't have that ability, I'm sorry.

Nobody's proposing closing down 16th Street, Boulder here in Grants Pass. I'm just trying to figure out how in the future for planning, we could kind of separate out those things.

Are we beyond this? I mean, we take in two comments out of 60 and we're doing the deep dive. I'm kind of hoping that we... Because we got still got a long night, and you're talking about the way you polled it. I'm just wondering if we're we're past that right now. I don't know, Jim.

The way I'm going to view that is I want to make sure all the Commissioners have every question that they need to have answered in their manner. In saying that, I think that's

important, and the other thing, I think what he was saying is, given this was just an example, but I think it's a pretty good example of a couple of very apparent attitudes, if you will, that we have throughout the City. Where I want to address it again is yeah, if you need to ask a question and you need sufficient answers to get there, I'm okay with that. I understand where you're coming from Mark, but I think that's where I want to sit. Any comments on that?

Not particularly, maybe I was going off on a different tangent on your comment, but a lot of the bike facilities that you will see in this plan, it's not an agenda by the City that is cramming bicycles down people's throat. I mean, these are state and federal mandates and there's other municipalities in the Rogue Valley that have had their TSPs rejected because they didn't have adequate bicycle facilities or that enough attention was paid to them. A lot of it falls under equality and equity. Some demographics don't have the ability to use vehicles, and so if you favor one mode of transportation unfairly, then it can put you on uncertain legal footing. I would say if you are faced with some of those comments in public, that we're trying to make this as fair and equitable as we can for our demographics.

Yeah, there isn't any project that closes down a street for other users in order to get just bicycle facilities in. We've not... This has been a balanced, complete street plan. Any improvements are intended to take advantage of existing right of way, without having to buy significant new right of way or buildings, in order to add facilities. We're just trying to make sure that cyclists and pedestrians can get from points A to B throughout the community, and do it in a way that also supports vehicular traffic. The balance of the multimodal plan, I think, does meet those objectives and puts the City in a place to be defensible in making sure that they're providing appropriate network and facilities for all users.

The last thing I wanted to just bring to your attention tonight, if there are no other questions... Again, we talked about, in our last meeting, if you wanted to look at some of the other TSP elements and recommendations for refinement studies, those are in your documentation. The two interchange area management plans are included in Volume 2 of your documentation, those identify I5 Exit 55 specific improvements at the junction of the I5 Southbound ramp and the intersection of US 1-99 and Agnes. Largely those plans just affirm the policies that the City and the state already have in place to manage access and development in those areas, to ensure that operations in and through the interchange will be maintained over the 20-year planning horizon. There's not a lot of new rocket science in either of those two plans, but this one particular project is identified in both your draft TSP and the interchange area management plan.

And then similarly at Interchange 58, we have recommended sidewalk improvements on 6th Street and on Morgan Lane, and those are also identified in your transportation plan as well. Even though that interchange is really weird and awkward, and not replicated on the interstate system in any other state that I've seen in my lifetime, still will work without major modifications. Those are two important pieces that are in Volume 2 of your document. Unless you have other questions, I just wanted to remind you, this is your public meeting. We have a workshop scheduled for August 17th with the City Council and then anticipate their hearing and adoption of the plan on September 16th and procedurally, I'll leave it to staff to talk about your process of making recommendations to your Council.

Well, I think this Commission is pretty well versed at that. You have a Type 4 application in front of you, you have a public hearing that's open right now. I think it's really up to you where you... At the end of the day, you make a recommendation to the City Council, but you also... While you

heard Mr. Mortenson say that there is this schedule, I think if you have significant concerns or significant issues, I haven't heard any tonight that would cause delay. But if you for some reason had to have additional information in order to make your recommendation to the City Council, you'd want to be extremely explicit about what those are. Otherwise, yeah. I think you have similar to what you have on any other Type 4 application. You need to go through the process of making [crosstalk 01:21:59] the findings.

Time for me to do my... us do our thing.

Yep.

Yep, okay. The public portion of this application process is now closed. This transportation system plan to make a recommendation to the City Council, one way or the other, is now open and open for discussion amongst my fellow Commissioners. And if we don't have any discussion, then I would entertain a motion that we make a recommendation. I'm not making the motion, but we that make a recommendation or one for or against adopting the 20/40 transportation system plan and recommending that to the City Council. (Silence) I'm not making a motion, somebody's got to make a motion. I'm just entertaining it.

I'm not ready to make a motion, but I-

You want to discuss more?

I have one kind of question/observation. Maybe Eric would have a response. If you're talking about, and I hadn't thought about that kind of thing before, all parts of the town get something out of the plan. I hadn't really looked at it that way, and I don't see that on that, but it seems to me that that's because the existing is not pulled out. The existing arterials and, main thing, I want to be sure that's a correct assumption.

Well, as a point of order, before I move forward, I said that the public portion was closed. However, because this was a Type 4 legislative hearing, I was incorrect. It's still open to the public. So yeah, anybody can answer that question, but we're going to end up making a vote. I just want to make that clear. It's not like quasi-judicial.

Yeah. I'd like to just add, you don't see a lot of street projects out here because Redwood was just finished. It was a big one and Willow was under construction. Just finished, sorry, I didn't drive out there to see the complete one, but those are two significant project needs that were on our table for discussion when we first opened the planning process, but they got completed right away. You don't see that on the street map, but you do see sidewalk improvement projects in critical sections.

This is a relatively new part of the community, and a lot of the collector and arterial streets had either already been built to standard, or were under construction or due for construction to standard. We were just trying to make sure that all of the needed fixes were well-balanced amongst all of the community, but that doesn't mean there are further deficiencies out here that are left unattended. I just want to be clear on that. If you were to look at one map, the street map, you may not get that "Is there geo equity in the placement of improvements," but I just wanted to provide that backdrop for you on that. There are pedestrian and bicycle projects that are identified for other parts of the community as well.

(Silence) Yeah, I was going to, as we finish up, I was going to say my view of the transportation plan we have in front of us is a good one. I think, with all the players that have been involved in what I have read so far, I think the data points with the information is pretty fresh, pretty new. And it looks to me, been a lot of effort put into that part of it. I think that the transportation plan is something that I am going to vote to recommend to approve, and I'd say you guys did a good job on it, and appreciate it. So now I entertain a motion or comment.

I'd agree.

That you want to make a motion?

No, I'll make a second.

I can't make them. Well, how about our great motion, or motion then here?

So did you get your question answered?

Yeah.

Yeah, The next arterial improvement I see for the town is going to be Allen Creek Road. Am I right? That'll be the next big one for the County. It'll be lower river. We got that from ODOT and we're going to be resurfacing it. I haven't heard about any sidewalks along there. I do know that we're applying for grants to put sidewalks along Fruitdale, and we saw that on the map that he showed us. What I like most, what I like-

Oh, that on the map that he showed us, what I like most, what I like best about this TSP process is that the City and the County went through this process at the time. I've never seen that before. And I thought that was great on the part of both jurisdictions to go through this at the same time. I too think that both consultants on both projects did a great job. So I will make the motion that we recommend forwarding approval to the City Council of the TSP, the 2040 TSP.

Second.

We have a motion and a second to recommend approval of 2040 transportation system plan to the City of grants pass to the City Council. All those in favor signify by raising your hand pose none abstentions none six to nothing. Thank you very much. Good presentation. Good stuff.

MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner Heesacker moved and Chair Coulter seconded the motion to approve the 2040 Transportation System Plan. The vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Chair Coulter and Commissioners Arthur, Aviles, Collier, Tokarz-Krauss and Heesacker. "NAYS": None. Abstain: None. Absent: None.

The motion passed.

Okay. Now we're going to move on to matters from staff. Before we go to the vice chair, election staff, you have anything?

just two quick things. So starting on September 23rd, we have a number of comp plan amendments ordinance amendments coming before you. We're trying to sort of just ease those

in and only have one per meeting, but I was going to just wanted to give you that heads up. We're we're, you have between now and the end of the year. I think four fairly substantial applications. One of them we talked about, about two months ago, and that's the multifamily residential code amendment. There's also a flood plain code amendment, and there's a scenic resources amendment to the comprehensive plan and about two or three the others. But I just, because of the size of these, we're just going to kind of put one on your agenda per time. Assuming that you might have some other land use applications as well. And I can actually send out if you're interested, what those are specifically and kind of how they're coming at you, the dates that they're there, we have them scheduled. Other than that, I think just let you know. We, we have tailored Grable, I think was announced here. He was our assistant planner for two years to tailor or went back to California a few weeks ago, we had put a position advertisement Out.

We had over 60 people apply for his replacement, 40 of which passed through the human resources process. So we have some interviews with six of those set up here in a couple of weeks. And so you'll start to see a new assistant planner face in front of you in a couple of months. That's all I had.

Right. We will now open up the floor to vice chair election, and I'm going to open up the floor right away for nominations.

I'd like to nominate Eric Heesacker.

Second,

Do you accept that?

Sure. I'll accept that nomination. And second, thank you very much. Thank you.

Are there any other nominations for the position of vice chair?

Okay, well we'll just go right to a vote. All those in favor of Commission of Heesacker being vice chair signified by saying aye. Opposed. Congratulations. And I'm going to have to have you buy my rights or left side.

MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner Arthur moved and Commissioner Collier seconded the motion to nominate Eric Heesacker as Vice Chair. The vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Chair Coulter and Commissioners Arthur, Aviles, Collier, Tokarz-Krauss and Heesacker.

"NAYS": None. Abstain: None. Absent: None.

The motion passed.

Okay. Next meeting up there.

Yes you will, sir.

I got it. And my pay goes up I hope.

now I got somebody to keep me squared away up here. Okay. We have also on our agenda two UAPC applications. There are both City, they're going through the City for appointment and we can only nominate or recommend approval of one to the City Council. So I'm going to open up to the floor for discussion on these two. One is L. Ward Nelson and the other one is Sam Engel from, I'm just going to open it, open it up for your discussion. Don't all speak at once.

So I'd like to nominate Sam Engel. I know him personally, and I know the work that he's done with warming centers and other communities, especially out at the rock and over at the, the farm on lower river road. I've worked with him personally. I know him pretty well. So that's my thoughts.

[Inaudible]

Yeah. I noticed

That Sam also sits on the Housing Committee and I was curious if the, I know at some point in time, the City Council had discussed their preference for members sitting on multiple Commissions or committees. And so I just wanted to be reminded about what their thoughts were on that moving forward.

Wasn't that more of having too much on the plate? I don't remember the preferential as much as the, maybe, maybe there was,

Unfortunately, I'm not going to be of any help on that question at all being fairly new. And haven't been in those discussions. I don't know if Barry has any thoughts on that.

I don't, I don't think correct me if I'm wrong, but I don't think he likes to come in or discuss anything at these meetings. So I don't want to put them on the spot. Sure.

I've worked with Sam. I don't know. It's been two years now on the housing advisory, you were there at the beginning. And I think he, he would be a great addition because if we're ever going to get anything accomplished, we need some people who really are strong on the getting various kinds of housing in. And he has a lot of resources that he can bring to help with information and examples and so on. And the other gentleman I think is fine, but his recent, and I think can't He apply for the County position. Isn't that possible?

Only by definition. It is. Cause I live in the City and I applied for the County. So if he's in the City, then he's anywhere he could apply for the County position.

Well, that's, that's a good comment that we can bring back a course. As of whoever we don't nominate here was just a general thought prob possibility of bringing it to the County because I'm looking at Mr. Nelson's application. And I see he's only lived here two months, so he doesn't have the experience yet of living in the Valley. However, he's caught a lot of good qualifications here. So when I look at these two applications, I would, what I see on paper anyway, I would be happy with either one of them or both of them. So that's my 2 cents worth. But I want to, I want you guys to discuss more. So you're comfortable with who you, you recommend to the City Council. Cause that's what we're doing fiscally

Well, keeps up. I'm sorry.

That's okay. I think there's a lot of value in bringing in someone who is new to the community. We have a tendency, it seems to not value the efforts of those coming into the community to bring their experience. You're a perfect example. Coming back with the experience you gained and this gentleman, the first gentleman was Mr. Ward, very involved in our neighbor to the North and that's experienced that. Certainly we could benefit from. And my experience having been a guest speaker at the housing advisory was that, well, that was almost more or less just a political committee, but someone who has a lot of experience in contacts and certainly is familiar with our own community is valuable as well. I just, it sounds like, you know, the, who we know is coming across as the more favorable than maybe perhaps somebody who could bring new light to our humble pond here. So that's just the only come on. I'd like to make either gentlemen seems to be, if they're enthusiastic enough to raise their hand by all means, grab them. So

That's how I kind of liked that about what you were saying to have talent Mr. Nelson. And I was impressed the fact that he's only been here two months and he's ready to jump in and serve. It kind of impressed me. And the fact that I looked at his reasons that he wants to serve. And he also has obviously being a City counselor for 17 years. It's got a lot of, got a lot of talent or a lot of experience, doing that. So it's it. These are guys, these two gentlemen are really qualified. And so I see advantages both ways. It's an all win.

The thing I've appreciated about Sam and some of the other people on that advisory committee is they are up with all this government stuff that's available on all the different programs and all those kinds of things that we don't really know anything about. I mean, we're not keeping up with it. And I think Taylor did a good job on trying to keep up with those two for that committee, but I don't know who else is going to be doing that. And I agree with you about, the other gentleman's experience, but people who are new here sometime are in for a big shock when it comes to learning land use regulations. And it's a good time to take a little time to learn those. Is it totally different from any other state? So is that true or not? Didn't you come from out of state

Mark?

So my thoughts are knowing Sam and the work that he's done at the warming center and listening to him talk, and then he engaged with the senior players there in problem solving. So I've seen him problem solve and knowing what I know about him, if the opportunity is to grab him and I've listened to the questions, for the last several meetings. And I know what Sam knows. And when I look at our questions, when we're here, I noticed that we ask questions that are particular about the report. We'll say, okay, you helped me define this, that and the other Sam comes to the table with a breadth and depth of knowledge that says, I've looked through this. This is what he works. When the healthcare system with a Santee, things like that, he's maybe at a 50,000 foot level where we might be pouring over the details of a particular slide.

So my opinion was, Sam is, and it'll be my vote that if you have the chance to grab sang Sam Engel, you grab him and you tell the other guy, you just say, look, I appreciate you been here for a couple months. There's a seat in the County. Why don't we slide your application over and then go from there. And if he really is interested and you'll take it, cause being here 60 days, he'll slide it on over and you can get them there too. That would be what I would do. You get a chance to grab someone with a quality of Sam Engel? You grab him.

I like that. Can we do that? Can we pick up Sam? I don't know either one of these guys. So I'm going to take your word for it. That Sam knows what he's doing. I have heard that when you get

people, one person on too many Commissions, after a while, if you're not watching it, he's making a recommendation to himself on the next committee.

So that's, that's one, if there's a negative about Sam, that would be at that. He's already on a committee. Maybe he's going to be saying yes to himself. I don't know how the committees work in the hierarchy here so much. But having said that, I do like his qualifications. I like both qualifications. Why can't we make the decision right now? Say, let's pick them both up. We'll put Sam on the City portion and put this other guy in the County seat. Can we not do that?

No, we can't do that because we have no authority because he hasn't went through the County. It's like a strong man. We don't have anything to support.

So the County Commissioners have to approve of his application before we see it. Is that how it works.

They have to receive it. It has to be received by the County.

So they've acknowledged it, that they have received it before we can act on it. So we don't have anything to act on, but what we can do, we can, we can make a motion, second motion and recommend cause we can do it and recommend that the other one to slide them over to, to the County.

So moved. Can we do that?

That's perfect.

Now what we'll do on that though is okay, first of all, I will do a vote one at a time on which one you want, which, which one of the two you're recommending approval to, to the City Council. Okay. Number one, number two. Then somebody can make a motion to slide the other individual to the County, recommended that the County take, them on board as an applicant. Second. That, and if we approve that, then and if, if it's better to ask permission for forgiveness, so I'm going to do that, right?

Okay.

You're the vice chair. Am I okay?

Yes, you are.

All right, good. Okay. So any other conversation or are we ready to go to a vote?

Okay. We're ready to go to a vote. Which Commissioner? Aviles. Who do you recommend?

I would recommend Sam Engel.

Commissioner Collier?

Sam Engel.

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss?

Sam Engel.

Commissioner Arthur,

Sam Engel.

Sam Engel.

Okay. Or vice chair? Heesacker.

Sam Engels.

Okay. Chair votes. Well, it's a tough one, but he does vote for Sam Engels. All right. Okay.

MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner Collier moved and Vice Chair Heesacker seconded the motion to nominate Eric Heesacker to the position of Urban Area Planning Commissioner. The vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Chair Coulter, Vice Chair Heesacker, and Commissioners Arthur, Aviles, Collier, and Tokarz-Krauss. "NAYS": None. Abstain: None. Absent: None. The motion passed.

So our recommendation to the City Council or the position of, of urban area planning Commissioner will be Sam Engels now we already talked about the other that we can do. Does anybody want to make a motion?

I just need his full name.

Ward Nelson. Isn't it.

L. Ward Nelson.

I will recommend that we have Ward Nelson's application go to the County Commissioners for their review and approval.

Is there a second?

Second?

Okay. All those in favor of that motion signify by saying aye posed nobody. Okay. So you didn't object Mr. Director. So I figured you figured we were okay. Doing that. All right.

MOTION/VOTE

Vice Chair Heesacker moved and Commissioner Collier seconded the motion to forward L. Ward Nelson's application to the County Commissioners for their review and approval. The vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Chair Coulter, Vice Chair Heesacker, and

**Commissioners Arthur, Aviles, Collier, and Tokarz-Krauss. "NAYS": None. Abstain: None. Absent: None.
The motion passed.**

Okay. Now we will go to each Commissioner for their comments. Last comments, Ms. Jen, do you got any comments,

No I have no comments.

Mark?

Nope.

Susan?

Nope. Loree?

Worse. Just to have to wait. I don't know that there was anything that we could have done or that we had any real role in the, in the situation with the property on Ramsey Avenue that was put up, was made available for housing project. But the people on the Housing Advisory Committee were very upset that it was not specified to be for certain section 202 or whatever. Again, I don't know all the numbers that people like Sam know that it met all the qualifications for certain kinds of affordable and senior housing, the location, the land and everything, but the RFP (Request for Proposal) wasn't written to require that kind. And I heard the discussion. I think maybe Barry was one that saw the company that came in and offered a million dollars for the property. I mean, if you're looking at it strictly from a profit point of view, that would have been a better deal, but it wasn't the original reason that the Council had. And, and the housing advisory committee was promoting for him for finding land that could be used for those other purposes. And it's really important that, we get those kinds of perspectives when something came in like that. Anyway, that, that was why I thought it was important to have a little more expertise in that area.

Well, it's something that I have rolled around in my head. Is there a point at the Housing Advisory Committee and Urban Area Planning Commission could have a workshop. I'm not talking about making any decisions, but maybe some kind of workshop because you hear bits and pieces. At least I do of where the housing advisory committee is going and I know where they end up and then we make you make text changes and we go from there, but it would be nice to kind of get a good up, we'd get a co you know, a good kind of presentation and status of what their, what their action items are right now. What kind of things may it, they may have already recommended. So at least that we have the chance to know where they're working from. We could make some comments, Ask some questions, and then in our minds, we also have a framework for what direction they're going in on some different things, because I would like to already be, at least have my mind on the code and whatever they're doing. Also be looking at the applicable portions of the code, just so I'm familiar with it and more familiar as it comes up. Does that make any sense to anybody?

Yeah, it does make sense. I was just going to comment that prior to his departure Taylor's was liaison to both us and to the hack or, yeah. And so oftentimes he was the linchpin, so to speak,

to share some of the other things that I think he was actually tasked at some point in the past with creating some sort of, document that kind of demonstrated to us things that we, that were coming to us from HACCC. So I don't know if that fell through, but, besides Commissioner Arthur, Taylor was another consistent piece.

I just thought maybe we've we've hesitated. And I think we should have to meet with them in any kind of workshop for quite a while. It just, in my opinion, it's a good timing thing now.

Sure. No, I agree. We can certainly get a joint workshop can work on that. If that, if that's what you would like to do, we can bring that forward to the Housing Advisory Committee, they meet next Friday and there we're putting together their agenda for that meeting right now. So I'm happy to bring forward that you UAPC would like to meet in a joint workshop with them to talk about some of those topics that cross over both of your groups.

Yeah. Whatever priorities you that were the priority process that you see where it's at, but yeah, that'd be great.

Yeah. There is a work plan that Commissioner Aviles is right.

That if that's what you were referring to, that the Housing Advisory Committee put together, and of course, Loree sits on both and it's a pretty comprehensive document. Taylors, put a lot of work into that and it's, it's sort of hits those big goals and that's one of their priorities next Friday is to kind of start working through that document to kind of put down some actions.

So I saw that somewhere, it might even been sitting on the front desk at your office that I saw it pretty thick. Isn't it. If I remember, I don't remember.

It's about 18 pages.

Yeah, yeah. I think I did see that. So yeah,

I did just want to clarify one point, am I in the, on the Ramsey, Nebraska, the, you know, the RFP, there has been no decision on it.

My recollection is that while there were a couple of members of the Housing Advisory Committee that did feel strongly about the 202 and senior housing that the overall vote of the HAC and the motion that came out was to not have the RFPB specific to senior housing. We could very well still see that that's, you know, that's not out of, out of the realm of possibility that that two acre piece would, would still have that type of housing, but the HAC didn't want to see it only section 202 or senior housing restricted to that.

So we have the, the RFP review committee, which has three Housing Advisory Committee members on it, as well as a public works person and a couple of planning division staff meeting on August 25th to go over the fork. There's three questions that we went back to the four RFP respondents and ask them to give a little bit more information. So that review committee meets on August 25th and then the Council will have this discussion again in early September. I don't have that date in front of me, I think. Well, actually I do have that date, I think, no, I don't. I'm sorry. It's just,

How was the RFP committee, how was that formed?

So we asked to all of the Housing Advisory Committee members who was interested in participating and three of them stepped up. Otherwise we had one of our Dennis Lewis, who is our temporary senior planner who had done quite a bit of the work on repairing the RFP.

He seemed like a logical fit. So he was on it as well as those three others, myself. And then the, we wanted somebody from public works, who kind of was looking at it from an infrastructure standpoint. So we had the, the business operations supervisor from public works department as well.

You know, it's an interesting, it's less common here, just a side comment, but it's almost like, like the spin offs on TV series. We interesting. And I think it might've been Commissioner Archer, even that recommended that Housing Advisory Committee from a planning Commission meeting. So that's kind of how that ended up starting. And then now if the RFP went off the Housing Advisory Committee, so it was kind of interesting. So anyway, anything else? Nobody else what's that I was going to ask a Vice Chair Heesacker Eric, sir

Sure. Quick. I wanted to say to Commissioner TK, that that was a great input that you had on Ward Nelson's application, the new blood. I think that's very valuable and I thought that was great input. I want to thank you all for your vote of confidence in me being vice chair. I appreciate that. And sir, I don't see City Councilors at planning commission meetings all the time, but you're here a lot. And I appreciate that too. So thanks.

He's never missed actually a meeting. He had to do a timeout because they said he was trying to determine if the quasi-judicial rules, if he could come or not to our meetings, but they finally decided that yes, he could come to our meeting. So it's a good thing. I don't have anything else. So the meeting is adjourned at 7:54

Meeting adjourned: 7:54 pm.

Next meeting: August 26, 2020

Jim Coulter, Chair
Urban Area Planning Commission

Date

Minutes transcribed by www.rev.com and given a cursory review/edit by Julia Wright, City of Grants Pass Administration.

CITY OF GRANTS PASS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT:
AMENDMENTS TO THE URBAN AREA MASTER TRANSPORTATION PLAN,
COMP PLAN TEXT AMENDMENT,
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN OVERLAY REZONE
FINDINGS OF FACT ~ PLANNING COMMISSION**

Procedure Type:	Type IV: Planning Commission Recommendation and City Council Decision
Project Number:	405-00119-20
Project Type:	Comprehensive Plan Amendment
Applicant:	Community Development & Public Works Departments
Staff Assigned:	Bradley Clark (CD) & Wade Elliott (PW)
Application Received:	06/11/20
Application Complete:	06/11/20
Date of Planning Commission Staff Report:	08/06/20
Date of Planning Commission Hearing:	08/12/20
Date of Planning Commission Findings:	08/26/20

I. PROPOSAL:

The proposal is an ordinance that amends the Comprehensive Community Development Plan of the City of Grants Pass & Urbanizing Area by taking the following actions:

1. Repeal the Grants Pass Urban Area Master Transportation Plan (MTP), 1997 and
2. Adopt the Grants Pass Urban Area 2040 Transportation System Plan (TSP), 2020.

II. AUTHORITY AND CRITERIA:

Policies 13.5.5 and 13.8 of the Comprehensive Plan provide that joint review by the City Council and Board of County Commissioners shall be required for amendment and revision to Comprehensive Plan findings, goals, policies, and land use maps of the Comprehensive Plan.

The review shall be in accordance with the procedures of Section 13.8.1 of the Comprehensive Plan, which provides for a recommendation hearing by the Urban Area Planning Commission prior to a joint hearing of the City Council and Board of County Commissioners.

However, with adoption of the 1998 Intergovernmental Agreement, this provision requiring a joint hearing is modified with the result that City Council will make the decision, and the County will have automatic party status, as summarized below:

Section III of the 1998 Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) provides for transfer of authority for provision and management of planning services from the County to the City for the Urbanizing Area. It provides:

The City is hereby vested with the exclusive authority to exercise the County's legislative and quasi-judicial powers, rights, and duties within the Urbanizing Area...

Section V of the IGA contains provisions pertaining to notification and appeals for quasi-judicial and legislative decisions within the Urbanizing Area.

For legislative decisions, the IGA provides:

The City agrees to provide written notice of all proposed legislative actions to the County at least 45 days prior to the public hearing at which the action is first considered. The County shall be deemed to have automatic party status regarding all such decisions for the purposes of standing for appeals.

Section 13.9.3 of the Comprehensive Plan provides that notice shall be as provided in Section 2.060 of the Development Code for a Type IV procedure. Section 13.9.3 further provides that the hearing shall be conducted in accordance with the Legislative Hearing Guidelines of Section 9 of the Development Code.

Therefore, the application will be processed through a "Type IV" procedure, with a recommendation from the Urban Area Planning Commission and a final decision by City Council. The County has automatic party status for appeals.

The text or map of the Comprehensive Plan may be recommended for amendment and amended provided the criteria in Section 13.5.4 of the Comprehensive Plan are met.

III. APPEAL PROCEDURE:

The City Council's final decision may be appealed to the State Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) as provided in state statutes. A notice of intent to appeal must be filed with LUBA within 21 days of the Council's written decision.

IV. PROCEDURE:

- A. An application for a Comprehensive Plan text amendment was submitted on June 11, 2020 and deemed complete on June 11, 2020. The application was processed in accordance with Section 13.5.5 & 13.8 of the Comprehensive Plan.
- B. Notice of the proposed amendment was sent to the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) on July 8, 2020, in accordance with ORS 197.610 and OAR Chapter 660-Division 18.

- C. A public hearing was held by the UAPC on August 12, 2020, to consider the proposal and make a recommendation to City Council. The UAPC made a recommendation of approval to the City Council for the proposed amendment.

V. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE:

- A. The basic facts and criteria regarding this application are contained in the August 6, 2020 UAPC staff report and its exhibits, which are attached as Exhibit “A” and incorporated herein.
- B. The minutes of the public hearing held by the UAPC on August 12, 2020 which are attached as Exhibit “B,” summarize the oral testimony presented and are hereby adopted and incorporated herein.
- C. The PowerPoint presentation given by the City’s TSP consultant at the August 12, 2020 UAPC hearing is attached as Exhibit “C” and incorporated herein.

VI. FINDINGS OF FACT:

The Urban Area Planning Commission found that based upon the testimony given at the public hearing and the staff report, the proposal meets the criteria found in the Comprehensive Plan Policy 13.5.4 based on the reasons stated in the findings included below.

VII. GENERAL FINDINGS:

The amendment of the Comprehensive Community Development Plan of the City of Grants Pass & Urbanizing Area is proposed as follows:

- 1. Repeal the Grants Pass Urban Area Master Transportation Plan (MTP), 1997 and
- 2. Adopt the Grants Pass Urban Area 2040 Transportation System Plan (TSP), 2020

VIII. FINDINGS IN ACCORDANCE WITH APPLICABLE CRITERIA:

For Comprehensive Plan amendments, Comprehensive Plan Policy 13.5.4 requires that all of the following criteria be met:

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN POLICY 13.5.4:

CRITERION (a): Consistency with other findings, goals, and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied. The current Urban Area Master Transportation Plan, which is part of the City of Grants Pass’s Comprehensive Plan, provides in “Goal 1” that a Comprehensive Transportation System Plan should keep up to date with current transportation policies and directives from the federal and state

levels. The updated Transportation System Plan incorporates all current requirements of transportation system plans.

CRITERION (b): A change in circumstances, validated by and supported by the data base or proposed changes to the data base, which would necessitate a change in findings, goals, and policies.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied. Recent, emerging and proposed residential, commercial and work-place developments are placing significant pressure on the City's arterial street system and state highways. The City has undertaken this significant update to its transportation plan in ways to ensure a well-connected city as it guides new development and implements its Economic Development Strategic Plan.

CRITERION (c): Applicable planning goals and guidelines of the State of Oregon.

Goal 1, Citizen Involvement:

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied. Public involvement has included Open House venues, online forums, property owner notification, and an ongoing Citizen's Advisory Committee. Additional findings of fact and conclusions of law may be required following public hearings on the subject application. Prior to public hearing, there is no basis upon which to make any findings or conclusions with respect to the cited criterion. Public notice of the proposal has been provided. The proposal is scheduled for public hearing and all public comment will be included in the record.

Goal 2, Land Use Planning:

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied. The proposed changes will amend the Master Transportation Plan, adopted by the City and County in December 1997, and amended in 2008. Amending the Plan requires compliance with the procedures for reaching a land use decision.

Goal 10. Housing:

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied: A primary function of a street system is to provide access to all categories of land use. As part of the update to the City's Transportation System Plan much thought has been given to the current and forecasted need for housing and the transportation infrastructure needs required to meet that housing demand. Specific zoning changes will take affect as part of the adoption of the updated Transportation System Plan which will allow more dense development and associated transportation infrastructure improvements in order to help meet the housing needs of the City.

Goal 12. Transportation:

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied. The City is currently in compliance with Goal 12 and Middle Rogue Metropolitan Planning Organization Regional Transportation Plan (2020-2040) through its acknowledged Comprehensive Plan and Transportation System Plan as required by Oregon Administrative Rule 660-012 (Transportation Planning Rule (TPR)). The amendments do not alter the City's compliance with Goal 12 and are consistent with this goal.

CRITERION (d): Citizen review and comment.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied. The proposed legislative action requires proper public notice, ongoing efforts to solicit and incorporate public input have included; an ongoing Citizen's Advisory Committee, several open house forums, online forums, individual Citizen inquiry appointments, and property owner mailings. Following the public hearing all public comments will be made part of the record.

CRITERION (e): Review and comment from affected governmental units and other agencies.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied. The Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD), the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and Josephine County were notified of the proposed amendment.

CRITERION (f): A demonstration that any additional need for basic urban services (water, sewer, streets, storm drainage, parks, and fire and police protection) is adequately covered by adopted utility plans and service policies, or a proposal for the requisite changes to said utility plans and service policies as a part of the requested Comprehensive Plan amendment.

Planning Commission Response: The purpose of the proposal is to refine a street plan that provides guidance for evaluating how well new projects fit into the City's long-range plans. Continuing to show street locations or design criteria that are unfeasible will impede efficient development in the City.

The proposed updated Transportation System Plan acknowledges an updated street plan and standards.

CRITERION (g): Additional information as required by the review body.

Planning Commission Response: Not Applicable

CRITERION (h): In lieu of item (2) above, demonstration that the Plan was adopted in error.

Planning Commission Response: Not applicable.

IX. RECOMMENDATION:

The Planning Commission **RECOMMENDS APPROVAL** to the City Council of the proposed amendment to the Comp Plan. This Comp Plan amendment would replace the existing Urban Area Master Transportation Plan with the updated 2040 Transportation System Plan. The vote was 6-0, with Commissioners Coulter, Arthur, Aviles, Collier, Tokarz-Krauss, and Heesacker voting in favor. There were none against. There are two vacancies on the commission.

X. FINDINGS APPROVED BY THE URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION this ____ day of August 2020.

Jim Coulter, Chair