

A Special Meeting
of the Planning Commission
George Fox College - Kershner Hall

7:30 PM, Thursday

July 6, 1989

Subject to P.C. Approval at 7/20/89 P.C. Meeting

Members Present:

Scott Bernard	Rob Molzahn
Bryce Fendall	Mary Post
Celine Hall	Kathleen Sullivan
Jack Kriz	Roger Veatch

Members Absent: None

Staff Present:

Duane Cole, City Manager
Terry Mahr, City Attorney
Bert Teitzel, Public Works Director
James Reitz, Associate Planner

Others Present:

James R. Hanks, Engineering Consultant
Cheryl Hampton, Recording Secretary
Approx. 40 citizens

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Roger Veatch who welcomed the public and expressed appreciation for their attendance.

Public Works Director, Bert Teitzel, introduced the purpose of the meeting to define the scope of work for the transportation study for the Springbrook area. The area of influence was defined as Bell Rd. on the North, Springbrook Rd./UGB on the East, Hwy 99W on the South, and Hwy 219/College St. on the West. He explained that the City would be asking the consultant to look at the minor arterial as defined in the Comprehensive Plan along Mountainview Rd. from Hwy 99W to Hwy 240. The study would also be divided into two sections: in the developed area, generally South of the railroad tracks, the consultant would look at the impact created by other roads on the existing system; and in the generally undeveloped area to the North, to locate minor arterials and collectors and look at alternative layouts for future systems. He explained that the consultant would be determining the number of lanes as well as signalization or other traffic controls that would be required. The consultant will also be determining the timing of improvements and expenditures. This study will be coordinated by with Southern Pacific and the State Highway Department.

Public Works Director, Bert Teitzel, furnished a proposed time table for the transportation study as follows:

July 20 - interim report from engineer re: technical data
- input from public re: concerns

August 17 - draft report completed containing alternatives
- public hearing at Planning Comm. meeting
re: comments/concerns

Sept. 5 - City Council meeting (tentative)

James R. Hanks, engineer/consultant, presented to the public the traditional pattern for a transportation study as follows:

1. Determine existing conditions, i.e. the street system, traffic volume, community concerns and other issues.
2. Study proposed development, i.e. trip generation and trip distribution.
3. Develop roadway alternatives through trip assignment, capacity analysis and evaluation with revisions if needed.

Chairman Roger Veatch opened the hearing to the public to express ideas and concerns on the scope of work by the consultant and discouraged the discussion of specific streets stating that specifics would be addressed at the July 20 meeting.

Dennis Farber, 1808 Leo Lane, asked when the volume study was being done and pointed out that during the summer months the traffic would be much lower since the schools and George Fox College are not in session. He also asked if foot traffic would be included in the study.

The consultant stated that the City has produced traffic studies for several years and will be able to correlate studies to account for the change in traffic volume. Mr. Hanks stated that foot traffic rarely exceeds actual capacity of the roads but that locations of foot traffic would be identified. He stated that he would appreciate input on the locations of foot traffic for the study.

Brian Murray, 304 Mountainview Ct., stated that the City is required by the State to perform a periodic review of the Comprehensive Plan and is in the appeals process. He asked if the consultant and the public would have that information available before the scheduled meetings on the transportation study.

The Public Works Director stated that the City is in the process of submitting the periodic review to the State and that all of the information would be available to the consultant. He pointed out that periodic review is a revision of the Comp Plan and that information is available in the Planning Department.

Bill Coffield, 3104 N. Zimri, asked if the consultant's report scheduled for the July 20 meeting was to report on the status of the study and suggested that the meeting may be too soon. He also asked if the traffic report may change the Comprehensive Plan thus requiring a public hearing to adopt the alternatives on the traffic plan.

The Public Works Director stated that the report scheduled for the July 20 meeting would be a status report of collected data. Mr. Teitzel indicated that it was possible that alternatives on the traffic plan would require a change in the Comprehensive Plan and approval of the City Council.

Marvin Heinz, 1507 Chehalem Drive, asked for expansion on remarks regarding the area west of College St. to Hwy 240.

The Public Works Director explained that the only item that is being researched west of College Street would be the location of a minor arterial, if needed, that is presently shown on the Comprehensive Plan.

Linda Miller, 1009 Sitka, stated that the street she lives on is greatly affected by school traffic which is steadily increasing and it has been 2-3 years since she has seen a traffic count taken on her street.

The Public Works Director stated that he did not remember specifically when the last traffic count was done on Sitka, but they would be looking at the counts. He stated that they were aware of Sitka being heavily traveled by the high school students.

Stewart Low, 212 N. Springbrook Rd., asked if the County had been omitted in the coordination plans of the traffic study or if that was an oversight.

The Public Works Director stated that the County does have jurisdiction on any property outside of the city limits and the City will be coordinating with the County so that the road systems hook together.

Barbara Kirk, 1808 Leo Lane, asked why the scheduling of meetings was so tight especially during the summer months when many people are busy and away on vacations.

The Public Works Director acknowledged that it was a tight time frame but that it was necessary so that the process does not stretch out too long. He stated that the Planning Commission would take written input and testimony submitted to the Planning Department prior to the July 20 meeting.

Barbara Kirk asked for further explanation of the process of the traffic counts. The consultant explained that the typical traffic count is taken for at least a 24 hour period using a hose counter which records counts every 15 minutes. These counts are taken over several years and patterns emerge involving the total neighborhood rather than one particular street. He further explained that Hwy 99W is a State highway and that the State takes extensive counts and has that information available.

Bill Coffield asked if the scope includes the south by-pass or changes in First St./Hancock St. and others that might be affected.

The Public Works Director stated that the study was limited to the northeast section as defined and that the south by-pass would affect the scope area. He stated that a public meeting was to be conducted by the State Highway Department on July 18 regarding the by-pass issue. He stated that the information from the State would be available to the consultant.

Dennyece Wheeler, 3112 Crestview Dr., asked if there would be new traffic counts performed for this particular study.

The Public Works Director stated that the City would supply the consultant with all pertinent information that is available and will perform new traffic counts if the consultant requests.

Commission member Bryce Fendall asked if a study was done before placing the arterial in the present location on the Comprehensive Plan.

The Public Works Director stated that he did not know of any studies done at that time and presented the question to former Planning Commission member Bill Coffield.

Bill Coffield related that there was no formal road study made but that the arterial was placed at this location in response to public testimony after many public hearings on the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Fendall asked the reason for selecting Hwy 219 as the west boundary for the transportation study.

The Public Works Director stated that it was more cost effective for the City to limit the transportation to the problem areas at this time. An exception to this will be to look past Hwy 219 regarding the minor arterial.

Chairman Veatch asked that if during the transportation study the boundaries needed to be expanded, at that time could Hwy 219 be included. The Public Works Director stated that it could.

Commissioner Kriz stated he felt that the area defined for the transportation study may need to be enlarged and was concerned that the time schedule as presented may be too quick to deal with all issues.

The Public Works Director stated that the Planning Department has been directed by the City Council to perform the transportation study and they determined the area of influence for the study.

Dennyece Wheeler stated that she would like to have the information from the State Highway Department meeting to be held July 18 before the July 20 meeting of the Planning Commission.

The Public Works Director stated that the information to be received from the State would be a study determining if it was physically feasible as well as cost effective to build the by-pass and that there would be no real benefit in delaying the Planning Commission meeting to wait for results from the State. He encouraged the public to attend the State Highway Department meeting on July 18 and speak on their concerns regarding the by-pass.

Brian Murray paraphrased several concerns over the timetable of the transportation study.

Chairman Veatch asked the engineering consultant if the time frame given was adequate to perform the study. Mr. Hanks stated that the timetable was quite ambitious but was within the scope of his firm's capabilities.

Commissioner Fendall stated that as the process continues, if there is difficulty in meeting the deadlines, the Planning Commission has the authority to delay the matter if necessary.

Commissioner Sullivan stated that the Planning Commission could decide after the July 20 meeting to schedule an additional meeting if necessary.

The Public Works Director asked the Commission for clarification and approval to set the next meeting for July 20 for public input and then set another meeting if necessary. The Commission voiced their consensus.

Chairman Veatch expressed his desire for many citizens to attend the July 18 meeting of the State Highway Department and voice their concerns and desires for the by-pass as well as the next scheduled Planning Commission meeting on July 20 at 7:30 PM to be held at the Springbrook Middle School.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

s:/shared/pc7-6

