

# MINUTES

Creswell City Council  
Creswell Planning Commission  
Work Session  
Creswell Community Center—99 South First Street  
Creswell, Oregon

December 16, 2010  
7:00 p.m.

CITY COUNCILORS PRESENT: Robert Hooker, Mayor; Mike Anderson, Jack Gradle, Bill McCoy, Jean McKittrick, members; Mark Shrives, City Administrator; Wes Johnson, Community Development Coordinator; Mark Russ, Lane County; David Helton, Oregon Department of Transportation; Brad Coy, Carl Springer, DKS Associates; Tom Litster, OTAK, Inc.

PLANNING COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Blake Oelke, Chair; David Christopher, Dennis Grice, Gary Ludeke, Alan Pointer, Lloyd Safley, members; Denise Walters, City Planner;

Mayor Hooker convened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. Those present introduced themselves.

## I. INTERCHANGE AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN UPDATE

Mr. Helton offered a PowerPoint presentation entitled *City of Creswell Interchange Area Management Plan Update, December 16, 2010*. The purpose of the plan was:

- To ensure continued safe and efficient operation of the Creswell I-5 interchange.
- Examine existing and future conditions in the interchange area.
- Identify improvements and policies needed to ensure safe and efficient operation.

Mr. Helton stated that in order for the IAMP to go into effect, both the City and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) had to adopt the plan. The City needed to take the first step of amending its comprehensive plan, transportation system plan, and other related plans. ODOT would then take the plan to the Oregon Transportation Commission for adoption at the State level. Referring to the document entitled *Creswell IAMP Preferred Alternative, Figure 8.10*, he reviewed the analysis that had been conducted to provide additional capacity on Oregon Avenue.

Mr. Springer reviewed the Oregon Avenue Concepts which were intended to reduce impacts to the businesses while providing the performance the City and ODOT would look for in the future. When the project was funded and construction underway, the biggest change would be installation of medians that would provide limited access to existing driveways. He reviewed the Recommended Alternatives Package that illustrated improvements to Oregon Avenue of \$2 to \$3 million, and a total of \$8 million of proposed improvements. The City had approximately \$1 million available and would need to identify additional funding mechanisms including:

- state, county, and federal grants.
- establishing a local improvement district.
- increasing the local systems development charges (SDCs).

Mr. Helton reviewed the Recommended Alternative Package. The focus on Oregon Avenue did not show the complete local street network proposed by ODOT. Changes on the south side called for preserving the current approach from the south bound ramp that would be signalized and other changes that would provide access and circulation and make the traffic in the area work. Traffic backing up at the rail crossing had been brought to his attention. ODOT would coordinate with the City to perform monitoring at the rail crossings to document the problems so they could be adequately addressed. Possible solutions included considering asking the rail line to alter rail operations during peak hours, improving trackage, and relocating the switching operations. The preferred and most expensive option was a grade separated bridge over the tracks. Another option that was outside of the current planning period was extending Highway 99 south down Mill Street, looping over the railroad track and Front Street, and looping back into downtown.

Mr. Helton said the solutions for the east side were simpler. He explained the plan would be phased over 20 years as funding became available. In addition to availability of limited funding from state and local government, private funding sources including limited improvement districts, SDCs, TIAs and taxing property owners along the road frontage could be considered.

Transportation improvement costs were approximately:

- \$8.53 million for all recommended IAMP projects:
  - \$4.68 million for required improvements when triggered by capacity or safety needs.
    - 4 lane Oregon Avenue improvements.
    - Traffic signals at Front Street, I-5 NB g , ramps, and Melton Road.
    - Cloverdale Road upgrade (Emerald Parkway to Melton Road).
  - \$3.81 million for optional improvements to consider in conjunction with required improvements.
    - Cloverdale Road upgrade (Melton Road to Dale Kuni Road).
    - Rail operation measures.
  - \$40,000 Potential Improvements if needs arise.
    - Temporary turn restrictions on Oregon Avenue.

Mr. Helton reviewed the Creswell IAMP Next Steps:

- Development of recommended plan and code amendment language, including funding mechanisms.
- City adoption of plan and code amendments to incorporate IAMP policies and projects.
- County co-adoption may be necessary.
- Oregon Transportation Commission adoption of IAMP.
- 

Mr. Helton stated the consultants would finish their work by December 31, 2010, after which ODOT Region II would continue to support the project until it was adopted by the state. The consultants were developing plan and code amendment language changes to incorporate the IAMP policies and put the projects in the City's Transportation System Plan (TSP). Funding mechanisms for review and adoption by the City may also be provided. Lane County may co-

adopt changes for areas outside of the urban growth boundary (UGB) or areas outside of the city limits.

Mr. Shrives asked how long it would take to work through all of the steps to get the IAMP ready for adoption.

Mr. Helton estimated it would take ODOT three to six months to refine the plan and code amendments prepared by the consultants to implement the IAMP. The City would need to know the potential impact for commercial development.

Mr. Shrives was very concerned about eliminating left turns on Emerald Parkway, the effect it would have on residents and the potential impacts for commercial development.

Mr. Helton would look at potential alternatives including talking with ODOT roadway designers, because alternatives would deviate from ODOT standards which would need to be justified. He added he and Mr. Shrives had discussed several options for providing access in that area.

Mr. McCoy asked if there was an existing plan for roadways coming off of Oregon Avenue to the south.

Mr. Shrives stated the City had prepared a quick response plan in 2004/2005 that had not been adopted which addressed Mr. McCoy's concerns.

Mr. Helton stated there was fractured property ownership on the north and south sides of Oregon Avenue. If the property was owned by one party, the property owner would be required to provide the street when the property was developed. Code language would be developed to establish a local improvement district or other mechanism that would allow those property owners to contribute a proportional portion of the costs for the street improvements.

Mr. Safley asked how future rail traffic volumes would be determined.

Mr. Helton said while motor vehicle traffic volumes could be estimated based on well-established mathematical formulas, rail traffic was seasonal and the state did not have the data available nor the ability to predict future volume. He opined the volume of rail traffic could increase in the future which would provide funding to improve tracks to increase speed.

## **II. NORTH OF OREGON AVENUE STUDY AND PLAN**

Mr. Litster explained the study area consisted of approximately 28 acres mostly under a single ownership. He reviewed the plan objectives:

- Assess development potential of the study area.
- Determine access points and circulation.
- Integrate the Oregon Avenue concept design.
- Develop an Area Plan and code amendments.

Mr. Litster reviewed the Economic Opportunity Report which consisted of the following elements.

- Market profile – regional and local.
- Site and context characteristics.
- Range of development opportunities.
- The I-5 advantage.
- Need for through connections.
- Medium to smaller scale commercial uses.
- Affordable housing choices.
- Potential for mixed use projects.

Mr. Litster said several alternatives were developed, three of which were identified as options to study further. A key consideration was maintaining the residential character of the area that would be supported by zoning that would help implement and control the development. The preferred alternative would result in creation of a new zone, the mixed use residential (MUR) zone. This plan needed to be coordinated with the TSP update so that required connections for parking, circulation, and traffic would be provided.

Mr. Oelke stated the Planning Commission had concerns about arterial streets needing to be included in the upgrade project with Oregon Avenue but there was no funding available. The proposal called primarily for commercial development. He assumed the commercial developers would fund the improvements through SDCs and other taxing mechanisms. He feared the traffic problem on Oregon Avenue would happen before commercial development would occur. He noted the City had experienced a ten year commercial boom but there were still significant vacancies of commercial sites. He asked who would pay for construction of the infrastructure that would allow Oregon Avenue to function properly after it was upgraded.

Mr. Christopher asserted Mr. Cuddeback would not improve the shopping mall to help pay for the streets.

Mr. Litster said the whole transportation system and the development needed the street network. In a perfect world, there would be public funding available to complete the work, but that money was hard to find.

Mr. Oelke said Creswell was a bedroom community for Eugene. He saw Creswell growing residentially and adding to the traffic problem, but many people shopped in Eugene after work. He liked the mixed use proposal, but he was not sure a developer would build that in Creswell.

Mr. Litster confirmed the market needed to be in place to support such a development. Mr. Hooker noted the supply of interchange property continued to decrease, and it would become more appealing as less was available. The City would need to create a funding package for the interior streets and recoup some of the costs from developers in the future.

Mr. Shrives concurred the City could build the infrastructure and the costs of which could be recovered from developers. He was concerned that the street funds were already depleted and he did not know how the City could begin to develop the funding package. He opined that

increasing SDCs would price the City out of the market and developers would not build in the City.

Mr. Helton averred the big picture called for development at the interchange over a 20 year planning period within the existing UGB. As he looked at other interchange areas in the state, he emphasized the need to look beyond what was on the ground now, consider the underlying plan designations and zoning, and what was allowed. He saw the potential for development at the interchange and said it was prudent to plan for the possibility of development in that area. He concurred there could be residential growth on the east and west sides that would generate traffic through the interchange, and growth on the west side would generate traffic on Oregon Avenue. If Oregon Avenue became highly congested and there was not commercial development to help fund it, the State would do access control which would call for building the median and restricting driveways and turn movements. This would result in people having a difficult time accessing the businesses in that area. In the current three lane configuration, if Oregon Avenue became highly congested and safety issues arose with people turning into the driveways, ODOT may install a median on the street as it was currently configured to control the turning movements and restore safety and mobility. If Oregon Avenue was expanded to five lanes, it would not be possible to continue to have so many private driveways with expected traffic volumes that would meet safety and mobility standards. Thus, in the worst case scenario of residential growth without commercial development to generate the local street network, it was likely there would be implementation of turn restrictions to make Oregon Avenue work, with or without the plan.

Mr. Grice did not see the existing left turn lanes being a problem for congestion. He felt ODOT was holding the City hostage by threatening to build a median and close the driveways. The problem was at the signal.

Mr. Helton did not intend to threaten the City, but was attempting to be realistic about the types of approaches ODOT was likely to take. As the population increased and more people needed to make left turns, it could become an issue in the future even if it was not a problem today.

Mr. Shrives said he had talked with several developers who had lost interest in developing in the area since the IAMP came to the forefront. It was important to resolve the issue so that the developers knew what the rules were.

Mr. Helton said there was vacant greenfield space on the east side which was more easily developed than sites on the west side and it would be good to have answers soon so any potential development could move forward.

### **III. REMAINING QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION POINTS**

Mr. Helton said the consultants would provide him with a draft IAMP and a series of recommended plan and code amendments, some of which would be straight forward and were needed to implement the IAMP. There would be optional policies that would require negotiation and discussion to tailor them to the City's needs. He would also talk with ODOT staff in Salem regarding what could be done on the east side other than using ODOT's standard approach.

Mr. Hooker adjourned the meeting at 8:42 p.m.

*(Recorded by Linda Henry)*