

CITY OF FLORENCE PLANNING COMMISSION
April 24, 2012 ** MEETING MINUTES – DRAFT**

CALL TO ORDER – ROLL CALL – PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairperson Nieberlein opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. Roll call: Chairperson Nieberlein; Vice Chairperson Tilton, Commissioners, Peters, Hoile, Bare and Wise were present. Also present: Community Development Director (CDD) Belson, Assistant Planner (AP) Pezley and minute recorder Barbara Miller.

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Commissioner Bare moved to approve the agenda as presented; second by Commissioner Wise, by voice all ayes, motion carried unanimously.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

*** Minutes of March 20, 2012**

Commissioner Wise moved to approve the minutes of March 20, 2012; second by Commissioner Bare; by voice all ayes, motion carried unanimously.

*** Minutes of April 10, 2012**

Commissioner Wise submitted changes to the minutes, which clarified a point he was making.

Commissioner Wise moved to approve the minutes as amended; second by Commissioner Bare, by voice all ayes, motion carried unanimously.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Chairperson Nieberlein welcomed everyone to the meeting and stated that this was an opportunity for members of the audience to bring to the Planning Commission's attention any items **NOT** otherwise listed on the agenda. Comments would be limited to **3 minutes per person**, with a maximum time of 15 minutes for all items.

With no one coming forward the public comment portion was closed.

Chairperson Nieberlein introduced Melissa Boles and Alex Huston who were attending for their economic class at the Siuslaw High School.

4. PUBLIC HEARING on RESOLUTION PC 12 03 CUP 02

An application from Central Lincoln Public Utility District for a conditional use permit to keep the temporary building located at 966 Highway 101

CDD Belson stated that the public hearing was not noticed in the newspaper; therefore she recommended that the commissioners continue the hearing until their next meeting to give the public the full opportunity to comment. She said since the building is already in place it will not hold up the applicant; staff will continue to work with the applicant on the landscaping plan so it can be part of the next packet.

She went on to say that if there was someone attending the meeting that evening that wanted to speak, they should be given the opportunity to do so as staff did send out notices to all the surrounding property owners and it had also been posted on site.

Chairperson Nieberlein asked if there was anyone in the audience that wished to address the issue of the PUD; no one came forward.

Chairperson Nieberlein opened the public hearing at 7:09 p.m. for Resolution PC 12 03 CUP 02.

An application from Central Lincoln Public Utility District for a conditional use permit to keep the temporary building located at 966 Highway 101

Commissioner Bare moved to continue the hearing until May 8, 2012 at 7:00 pm at city hall; second by Commissioner Peters. By voice all ayes, motion carried unanimously.

5. PRIORITIZE THE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

CDD Belson said we discussed last time that we would divide up the Rhododendron Drive project (the multiuse path). The segment between 9th and 35th would become two segments (1) from 9th to Wildwinds and (2) from Wildwinds to 35th. Within the Rhododendron Drive segment it was her understanding that the commissioners had agreed that the segment from 9th to Wildwinds be the highest priority and the 2nd highest priority would be the segment from 35th north to North Jetty Road and then the 3rd part is the connection between Wildwinds and 35th. She said the commissioners did not agree as to how those Rhododendron Drive segments fit within the overall priority list. She went on to say that it would be helpful for staff to provide some thought in terms how to look at this. She had spoken with Commissioner Tilton prior to the meeting and he had sent staff an email with questions and because she had a difficult answering them via email she met with Commissioner Tilton before the meeting and she then shared with the commissioners that discussion.

She pointed out the **criteria** listed at the beginning of Chapter 10 of the Plan that the Project Advisory Committee used to prioritize the projects. "...as a part of this transportation funding analysis, a list of high priority projects have been developed, based on:

1. *An immediate need to address capacity or safety deficiencies;*
2. *A value-driven project that has been identified as desirable and provides above-average benefit;*
3. *A project that is likely to be funded by identifiable grant monies or urban renewal funds, and;*
4. *A project that is relatively low cost, and may be easily implemented with limited City funds"*

CDD Belson said during the project advisory committee process it was suggested by Councilor Xavier; (Chairperson of the Urban Renewal Board), that urban renewal projects be included on that list because there was a likely funding source through urban renewal funding. Table 10-1 was created prioritizing key projects and that included some urban renewal projects. The rest of the urban renewal projects were listed on the 3rd page.

Urban Renewal Boundaries

Commissioner Wise asked about the boundaries of the urban renewal district and AP Pezley pointed out on the map the outline of the boundaries. AP Pezley said it starts on the corner of city limits and Hwy 126; up to Spruce Street through the public works property (the entire city property at public works is in the urban renewal district); over to Hwy to 101, to 9th and half of 9th street and zig

zags with the main street district and up to the alley. It was determined that the city council set the boundaries for the urban renewal district before taking the vote of the urban renewal to the citizens. It is noted for the record that the legal boundaries can be found on the city's website: <http://www.ci.florence.or.us/urbanrenewal/urban-renewal-district-boundaries>

Two Project Lists – City Projects/Urban Renewal Projects

CDD Belson said there are projects within the urban renewal district in the first two pages of that original prioritized list but there is also urban renewal projects listed on the 3rd page. She said that the commissioners take out the projects that would be within the urban renewal district and put them all together in one separate table. In taking this approach, all of the transportation projects identified within the city would be prioritized with the exception of the urban renewal projects. There would be one list with the urban renewal projects and another list with everything else that they were prioritizing.

Commissioner Peters asked if the Urban Renewal Board had a role in prioritizing their projects and CDD Belson replied that the Board chooses the projects that it wants to fund; although it is the city council that will make the final decision on the prioritizing of the list within the Transportation System Plan (TSP).

Funding Column

CDD Belson noted that the funding column in the table was not necessarily accurate, or giving the full picture. For example it could state the primary funding source is the city, but that does not mean city taxes, it means the city would apply for grants for the funding. In fact most projects will have a variety of funding sources.

Commissioner Muilenburg noted that the funding for transportation is independent and asked if the urban renewal grant could be used for transportation projects.

CDD Belson said that the Urban Renewal Board would generally not give grants for public infrastructure projects; they would give grants to private developers or businesses like they did in the past. Through a tax increment program they are able to gather property taxes to spend or use for leveraging for funding such as bonds. She said the Quince Street sewer project was paid out of the tax increment from the urban renewal district.

Funding for a Restroom under the Bridge

Commissioner Peters said there was a public comment on the observation point under the bridge and the new piece of property along the river. He said some property owners had testified that it was important to have a restroom at the west end of Bay Street, but it wasn't included in the funding. He said later that evening a concept was proposed that possibly urban renewal funds could be used for that purpose.

CDD Belson referred to page 184 of the TSP and listed the urban renewal projects that could be removed from the priority list.

1. P3 - Kingwood Street sidewalks south of 20th Street.

The south part of Kingwood would be in the urban renewal district and the north part is not.

2. Prj-12 – Kingwood Street/9th Street Intersection
3. Prj-13-Hwy 126/Quince Street intersection.
4. P-2 – Old Town Sidewalks
5. P-10 – Bay Street/Nopal Street Mid block ped crossing

6. P-7 – Hwy 126 Ped crossing at Redwood Street.
7. B-9 – Quince Street bike lane
8. B-10 - 2nd Street Bike Sharrows

She reminded the commissioners that page 3, was totally Urban Renewal Projects.

Keep the Original List and Make a New One

Commissioner Wise reminded the commissioners that this is a legislative hearing and they are not making decisions; the commission is only recommending approval to the city council. He stated his concern about deleting the list made by the Project Advisory Committee and suggested the commissioners make a second list so the city council could compare the two without losing the work of those who made the first priority list. He said the commissioners could point out where their decision making differs and then list how they felt the prioritization should be.

Prioritization Lists – Original and Amended

After some discussion Chairperson Nieberlein asked the commissioners if they were comfortable with Commissioner Wise's recommendation to keep list made by the original committee and make their revised list based upon the testimony they had received; they would then send both lists to the city council for their review. She then asked if the commissioners agreed to put the urban renewal projects in a separate list; and they agreed to both recommendations by consensus.

CDD Belson said they may want to keep the projects on the state highway that fall within the urban renewal district on the overall list, because they affect more than urban renewal district, they involve big system improvements; if you want to you could leave all the local street projects in the urban renewal districts on one and move those on the state highways to an overall bigger list.

Commissioner Muilenburg agreed and said we have gotten a lot of public testimony that a need had arisen; based on the testimony he thought they should reprioritize it, but recommended leaving the 9th and Kingwood Street intersection in as well.

Commissioner Peters reminded the commission about Commissioner Wise's impassioned plea to reconsider the removal of the left and right turn at Hwy 126 and Quince as it would create a great hardship on the businesses in that area. He went on to say, that is why it is important to hold public hearings and for more people to review the plan and suggest possible changes or corrections.

Commissioner Peters asked about the projects on the list within the urban renewal district and asked who put them on the list. CDD Belson said the first two pages of the table were the initial set of prioritized projects. She said if one goes back to the criteria that we're using, funding availability factors into the list. Because the urban renewal has a funding source we added onto the original list the third page of other urban renewal projects. The first two pages were prioritized originally, the third page was added on.

The Commissioner had the following comments:

Commissioner Hoile asked about removing the left restriction at Hwy 126/Quince; she thought there could be alternate improvements.

Commissioner Muilenburg stated his concern about the Heceta Beach bike lane and the Munsel Lake bike lane.

Commissioner Peters noted that Heceta Beach road has been underwater and suggested that it might be addressed with this project; possibly an engineer could mitigate the water along with designing the bike path.

It was noted that the intersection at 9th and Kingwood is a safety issue and the consultants have stated it was going to be a bigger issue.

Bike Lane Hwy 101 to Bridge

Commissioner Muilenburg asked about the bike lane on Hwy 101 from 126 to the bridge; he thought it was not a high cost item, it was more of a decision of what do we want. ODOT has stated that they cannot restripe until they resurface that area. Commissioner Tilton agreed that we should include the bike lanes from 9th to Hwy 101/bridge which has to be done at the time of resurfacing is done. This would be done for safety and it would be a small expenditure for a big gain.

Grant for Hwy 126 Redwood Street Ped Crossing

Commissioner Bare asked if there were any projects that the city had requested grants funding. CDD Belson said what is not on the list is the ped crossing on Hwy 126 at Redwood Street and there has been a grant applied for that includes that crossing.

Widening Hwy 101 from 42nd Street to Munsel Lake Road

Commissioner Muilenburg said he thought the widening of Hwy 101 from 42nd street to Munsel Lake Road would be very important. CDD Belson said Cannery station will pay for part of it and Commissioner Muilenburg said we should do this in conjunction with the Cannery Station development. It was noted that ODOT wants to keep that project in the plan where they had originally wanted to delete it.

CDD Belson said Cannery Station was putting in a right turn lane into their project and asked the commissioners if this should be a high priority. It was decided not a high priority but to kept on the overall list.

Crosswalk North of 35th

Commissioner Muilenburg said there should be a crosswalk on 42nd street, it's a safety need. Commissioner Hoile agreed. CDD Belson said any pedestrian crossing north of 9th Street would not have the bulb outs as there is no on street parking. It was noted that the ped crossing north of 35th Street was listed on page 176 of the Plan was at 43rd street. Commissioners suggested moving the time frame up on the ped crossing at 43rd street.

CDD Belson then brought out the white board so the Commissioners could list their priorities. She said the commissioners could assume that all the urban renewal projects were not on the list unless the commissioner put an individual project back on. She said for example, if you want the Kingwood/9th Street intersection on the city's prioritized list, you would request that be added to the list.

The Commissioners discussed the projects, prioritizing the list. Each Commissioner named his/her top three priorities. Staff typed up a Transportation Priority List so the commissioners could take the form home and list their top priority down to the last priority. Staff asked that they bring their score sheets back to so they could be tallied and put into the next meeting's packet.

The Priority List is as follows:

Bike lane on Hwy 101 (9th to Bridge)
Oak Street Sidewalks along the east side of the road
Rhody (9th & Wildwinds)
Rhody (Wildwinds and 35th)
Rhody (35th to North Jetty)
Oak Street Bike Lanes
Spruce Street Bike Lanes
Spruce Street Sharrows
Mid-Block Hwy 101 Ped Crossing at 15th and 16th
Kingwood Sidewalks from 20th street south
9th & Kingwood – intersection improvement
Heceta Beach Road – bicycle lanes or path
Munsel Lake Road – bicycle lanes or path

Immediate Safety Project

Commissioner Tilton said he felt there was a low cost safety project on Rhody Drive that should be implemented as soon as possible.

1. Double Yellow Line
2. Signs
3. Enforcement

He said this was not in the TSP, but from the testimony they had received he felt that it was something the council should be made aware of right away. Chairperson Nieberlein said she could send a memo to the city council requesting that temporary action be taken based on the public input they had received at their public hearing.

Commissioner Tilton moved to send a memo to the city council with a recommendation for an low cost interim safety improvement plan on Rhody drive prior to the multiyear build out of the multi use path; it would include inexpensive safety improvements such as: signage, double yellow line, and enforcement of the speed laws. Commissioner Bare seconded the motion.

Commissioner Muilenburg asked if ODOT had to sign off on the double yellow. CDD responded that ODOT did not need to grant approval. It was determined that Rhododendron Drive was not a city street from Sebastian to Heceta Beach Road.

Chairperson Nieberlein called for the vote, by voice, all ayes, motion carried unanimously. Chairperson Nieberlein added that a copy of the memo should be sent to the Chief of Police. Commissioner Tilton offered to work on the draft and bring it back for the commission's approval.

Commissioner Muilenburg left the meeting at 9:00 p.m.

6. PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION ITEMS

Letter of Support for Grant Application

CDD Belson said Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) is seeking funding through the Ford Foundation; and Commissioner Tilton had offered to write a letter of support for the grant application to support the Oregon Planning Institute. Commissioner Bare moved to approve Commissioner Tilton's letter of support; second by Commissioner Hoile, by voice all ayes, motion carried unanimously.

7. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

CDD Belson said the monthly report was in their packet.

8. CALENDAR

- * Tuesday, May 8, 7:00 p.m. – Regular Meeting – Continuation of the Public Hearing, for PUD
- * Tuesday, May 22, 7:00 p.m. – Regular Meeting
- * Siuslaw Estuary Partnership Open House on Monday, April 30 from 4-7 pm at the FEC

Commissioner Bare said it was a great meeting and commented on how well CDD Belson facilitated the meeting.

With no further business to come before the Florence Planning Commission, Chairperson Nieberlein adjourned the meeting at 9:17 p.m.

APPROVED BY THE FLORENCE PLANNING COMMISSION ON THE ____ DAY OF _____ 2012.

JAN NIEBERLEIN, CHAIRPERSON
FLORENCE PLANNING COMMISSION