

Dan Fleishman

From: Susan Wright <swright@kittelson.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2019 4:04 PM
To: Dan Fleishman
Cc: Bryan Graveline
Subject: RE: Request for Comments on Applications for Annexation and Comprehensive Plan Amendment

Hello Dan,

We've reviewed the applicant's TPR Analysis and application and have the following comments based on the code requirements provided below:

- The developer needs to submit a TIA showing the effects of the reasonable worst-case proposed zoning on the surrounding transportation system in the TSP horizon year. The TSP made no assumptions for areas outside of the city limits including this site despite having a residential designation in the comprehensive plan therefore the comparison should be to existing County zoning. If the transportation system cannot support this zone change they may utilize a trip cap; however, a trip cap cannot be used to avoid completing the TIA.
- The submitted TPR analysis states that the TPR allows a 15% increase in estimated zone changes. We are not familiar with this. The applicant should state specific OARs. The definition of a "significant impact" in the TPR is shown below. The finding of no significant impact needs to be documented in a TIA with reference to the criteria in the TPR.
- The "interchange development zone" description should not apply to this property, since there are no ramps at the adjacent OR 22 intersection.

Comprehensive Plan Amendments:

SMC 17.12.170 deals addresses comprehensive plan amendments:

- In order to meet submittal requirements, the applicant must submit a traffic impact analysis incorporating the full range of development potential under current vs. proposed land use designations. This has not been provided.
- For all quasi-judicial comprehensive plan amendments, the developer must submit a TPR analysis (see next section)

Transportation Planning Rule Analysis:

OAR 660-012-0060 outlines the transportation planning rule:

- In order to satisfy the applicable TPR requirement, the developer will need to show that their development would have "no significant effect" on the surrounding transportation system. OAR describes a "significant effect" as:
 - o Types or levels of travel that are inconsistent with the functional classification of an existing facility
 - o Trip generation that degrades the performance of an existing facility that is such that it would not meet or that is otherwise projected to not meet identified performance standards.
 - o Per OHP, when a significant effect has occurred, a development that contributes less than 400 daily trips can be shown to have no significant degradation of the impacted facility.
- A worst-case scenario analysis of the proposed (commercial) zoning must be demonstrated in a TIA.
- The trip cap shown in the submitted TPR analysis of 122 PM Peak Hour trips appears to be calculated by taking 106 PM peak hour trips (reasonable worst-case from existing residential zoning) and increasing by 15%. This is based on the statement that the TPR allows a 15% increase in estimated traffic in zone changes. However, there

is no reference to this in the TPR and the comparison should be to County zoning as the existing comprehensive plan designation of residential was not included in the TSP. The 122 PM Peak Hour trip cap should not be used.

Interchange Development Zone:

SMC 17.16.060 states that the interchange development zone pertains to land located within 1,500 feet of a highway entrance/exit ramp. The Fern Ridge Road/OR 22 intersection does not have an entrance/exit ramp, so I don't believe this standard should apply.

Dan –SMC 17.12.210 indicates this would be a major annexation requiring a general election referendum approval. Is this accurate?

Please let us know if you have any further questions at this time.

Susie

Susan Wright, PE, PMP
Principal Engineer



[Kittelson & Associates, Inc.](#)

Transportation Engineering / Planning
851 SW 6th Avenue, Suite 600
Portland OR 97204
503.228.5230 (Portland)
503.535.7432 (direct)

From: Dan Fleishman <dfleishman@ci.stayton.or.us>

Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2019 9:23 AM

To: Adam Maurer <amaurer@santiamhospital.com>; Alan Meyer (alan.meyer@pacificorp.com) <alan.meyer@pacificorp.com>; Andy Gardner <Andy.Gardner@nsantiam.k12.or.us>; Brandon Reich <breich@co.marion.or.us>; Brent Stevenson (brents.swcd@wvi.com) <brents.swcd@wvi.com>; Brent Tomlinson <brent.tomlinson@wavebroadband.com>; brian.kelley@nwnatural.com; Bryan Graveline <bgraveline@kittelson.com>; Darrell Hammond (d5h@nwnatural.com) <d5h@nwnatural.com>; Jack Carriger (Jack.Carriger@staytonfire.org) <Jack.Carriger@staytonfire.org>; Janelle Shanahan <jshanahan@co.marion.or.us>; Jay Alley <jay.alley@staytonfire.org>; John Ashley, P.E. <jashley@ashleyengr.com>; John Eckis <johneckis@sctcweb.com>; John Rasmussen (jrasmussen@co.marion.or.us) <jrasmussen@co.marion.or.us>; Lance Ludwick <lludwick@ci.stayton.or.us>; Lisa Meyer <lmeyer@ci.stayton.or.us>; Max Hepburn <mhepburn@co.marion.or.us>; Michael Schmidt <mschmidt@ci.stayton.or.us>; Phil Jones <PRJONES@co.marion.or.us>; Rich Sebens <rsebens@ci.stayton.or.us>; Robert Lee <rlee@wavebroadband.com>; Susan Wright <swright@kittelson.com>; Troy Wheeler <twheeler@co.marion.or.us>

Subject: RE: Request for Comments on Applications for Annexation and Comprehensive Plan Amendment

Click on the link in my email below. Then Click on the tab in the middle of the page for Public Hearing Notices. Scroll down. Click on tab for Jones Annexation...