

CITY OF FLORENCE PLANNING COMMISSION

May 22, 2012 ** MEETING MINUTES **

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, Bare, Muilenburg and Wise were present. Commissioner Hoile was absent and excused. Also present: Community Development Director (CDD) Belson.

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chairperson Nieberlein stated that there would be an addition to the agenda; the introduction of the city's new code enforcement officer.

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

2. INTRODUCTION OF CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER

Chairperson Nieberlein introduced the new code enforcement officer, Shari Fisher. Ms. Fisher said she had retired from the CA Department of Corrections in 2010 after 22 years. Chairperson Nieberlein said they were happy to have her on board and looked forward to working with her.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

* **Minutes of May 8, 2012 – (Public Hearing on PUD's temporary building)**

Commissioner Tilton moved to approve the minutes of May 8, 2012 as presented; second by Commissioner Muilenburg, by voice all ayes, motion carried unanimously. It is noted for the record that Commissioner Hoile was absent and excused.

4. 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.

CDD Belson informed the commissioners that those who had been in attendance at the beginning of the meeting and left; had come for the Coast Guard application which had been postponed to a future date. That application is for a major bank stabilization project and the applicant had asked for time to revise the drawings.

5. REVIEW THE DRAFT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN AND RELATED AMENDMENTS (Resolution PC 12 06 CPA 01 and PC 12 07 TA 02)

As the Commission had closed the public hearing for this item, there would not be any additional testimony taken at the meeting. However, the public will have an opportunity to comment on the Commission's recommendations when the city council holds a public hearing on the Draft Transportation Plan (TSP) in the future.

Chairperson Nieberlein stated that the commissioners would review the draft TSP PC 12 06 CPA 01 and PC 12 07 TA 02. She said the public hearing was closed; therefore, no additional comments would be taken that evening, it would be strictly discussion by the commissioners.

Staff Summarization of TSP

CDD Belson updated the Commissioners on the TSP including the amendments and update as of that evening. She said in their packet were the changes to the TSP and Comprehensive Plan and City Code which had been made by staff in response to public comments, referrals, the Commissioners discussion and further staff review. She said the consultants worked on the TSP document as a whole and staff received it from the consultants that morning (May 22, 2012). She acknowledged that the Commissioners did not have a lot of time to review the document. She pointed out that she had known for a while that the raw data for sidewalks given to Kittelson was not accurate; it had been done by reviewing aerial photos and they had noticed there were some problems with the data. Staff had been working on this project for some time but did not get the updates to Kittelson in time for them to incorporate into them into the draft. She went on to say that staff wanted the Commissioners to see the draft in terms of the existing sidewalk conditions that the city has on GIS. After the Commissioners had reviewed the document and approved it, it would be sent on to the consultants and they would incorporate it into their maps.

Lane County Planning Commission Approval

CDD Belson said the Lane County Planning Commission held a worksession and public hearing on the city's TSP draft and unanimously recommended approval; it will now go on to their Board of Commissioners. She said the Lane County Planning Commission's packet included the comments from the city; including public testimony, planning commissioner's comments and minutes from the meetings. Also included in their packet were the spreadsheets that showed the amendments to the priorities made by the city's planning commission along with the priorities as set forth by the Project Advisory Committee.

CDD Belson reviewed the comments made by the Lane County Planning Commissioners for the city's consideration.

Comments from Lane County Planning Commissioners:

- George Goldstein questioned the location of the speed limits signs on Rhododendron Drive and presented a photo that had one sign at 35 mph and another photo of a sign not very far up the street at 45 mph.
- He was also concerned about the turning radius for 9th Street onto Rhododendron Drive (turning north onto Rhododendron Drive from 9th Street) and he showed some photos that he had taken of some large trucks making that turn. CDD Belson told the Lane County Planning Commissioners that intersection had not been brought up in the city's process in terms of Rhododendron Drive and the turning radius. In the discussion they agreed the majority of the trucks were going to the Lane County transfer station. She said staff could contact Lane County about the number of trucks taking that route or talk about a possible alternate route. She did not know if their staff would follow up on that concern.
- Commissioner Goldstein also talked about the signal at Hwy 126 and Hwy 101 in terms of the timing of the signal.
- Commissioner Peterson emphasized having a place for electric carts such as golf carts (also usable by skateboards, etc.) and encouraged the city to think about how to provide a dedicated route for those vehicles. His point was to keep those carts off of Hwy 101 but

acknowledged that they would still need to access the businesses in town; but he also stated that he was not familiar enough with Florence to offer an alternate route.

- Commissioner Arkin referenced an article about electric vehicles in a recent planning magazine.
- Commissioner Noble had experience with airports so he asked about the airport to see if we have the protections in place for land uses that are not going to impede operations of the airport in the future; CDD Belson assured him that we have those types of protections in place now and that they will continue.
- Commissioner Noble also recommended that for streets with proposed multi paths on one side of the road, for instance; Rhododendron Drive, Heceta Beach Road, and Munsel Lake Road; still including a commitment to help build sidewalk on the opposite side of the street if necessary in the future. He went on to say that he had worked in a community where they had put their bicycle/ped path on one side and had not anticipated needing a sidewalk on the other side and it was difficult to go back later to get funding and permission to be able to build that sidewalk on the other side of the roadway.
- The Commissioners reviewed the list that the city's planning commission had prioritized for projects. They referred to the chart and stated they were confused by the word "dropped", as it appeared it could go away completely. CDD Belson said she explained why Urban Renewal Projects were no longer a priority for the Planning Commission in some cases. They recommended changing the wording from "dropped" to "moved to Urban Renewal" to better explain the differences between the Florence Planning Commission's list and the Advisory Committee's list.

She said these were the high points from Lane County's planning discussion and recommendation; at this point she said she had not had a chance to completely go through the draft from Kittelson to compare the information she had sent them.

Weight of Lane County's Suggestions

Commissioner Peters asked CDD Belson how much weight they should give to Lane County questions; they seem like reasonable questions; but what force do they have? Would any of these be deal breakers; can they withdraw their approval. CDD Belson said their authority is just the area between the city limits and the Urban Growth Boundary; as that is the part Lane County will implement. She said in terms of Mr. Goldstein's concerns with Rhododendron Drive and 9th Street; there is no authority; but she acknowledged that Lane County Commissioners do have ideas, and if they had questions or comments she would pass them on to you for your consideration. She said they did recommend approval as it was; so they did not require any changes be made.

Items not included by the consultants:

- They had not included the trail that goes from the water plant up to Munsel Lake Road; they continue to miss that link. She knew that was one project that they needed to get on the map and the scoping of that project needed to be done since they are only looking at it from Hwy 126 to the water plant and constructing some of that; but they don't have the portion from the Munsel Greenway Park all the way up to Munsel Lake Road by Munsel Lake.
- They had not reviewed the priority list in terms of making the funding source more specific. The funds would most likely come from grants funds if it was an Urban Renewal project, and there would be multiple funding sources, including the city. We have to include more specificity to the funding source.

Freight Routes

CDD Belson said we have not identified 9th beyond Kingwood as a freight route; we have 9th, Kingwood, 27th and 35th as the local freight routes. She was not sure how much of a concern that might be for Commissioner Goldstein. CDD Belson said she could make inquiries at the transfer station regarding the vehicle traffic and types of vehicles using that route.

Intersections of 9th/Rhododendron and 9th/Kingwood

Commissioner Muilenburg expressed his concern about freight route traffic on 9th street because the hospital, ambulance district and police departments were on that street. CDD Belson said she told Commissioner Goldstein that 9th and Kingwood would definitely have work done; we have a Rhododendron transportation plan that deals with the segments of the bicycle/ped access, but there are other components of that plan like the intersections and the viewing points along Rhododendron Drive. She said the question would be whether we would want to call out that intersection specifically for the turning radius for freight trucks. Commissioner Bare asked if the Public Works Director had reviewed that intersection. CDD Belson replied she had not yet mentioned it to him.

The Commissioners agreed that it would be prudent to wait until the improvements are made to the intersection and if it was still an issue, deal with it then.

Planning Commissioner's Priorities were not included in the Draft Plan from Consultants

Commissioner Muilenburg expressed his displeasure that they had spent considerable time prioritizing this list and he didn't see the list in the draft plan, and there was no explanation why.

CDD Belson said she would have expected the consultants to address the Quince/Hwy 126 intersection, as the consultants had asked her in terms of the Planning Commission priorities how to handle that. The consultants had requested to leave the priorities in the draft plan as they were with the discussion included. She said they expressed their concern about having time to revise the draft.

CDD Belson said given the fact that Commissioners had said they wanted the Council to see both; she agreed with the consultants and she planned to put those two sets of priorities in a separate document to give to the City Council explaining the Planning Commissioners reasoning for making the amendments to the priority list.

In summary Commissioner Muilenburg said, personally, he felt the Planning Commission's document should be in the draft plan right after the Advisory Committees priorities with an explanation as to why the Planning commissioners made those changes. He was concerned that the Council would not even find it to read. He thought it would be important to alert the Council and public that the Planning Commissioners had a different priority than was submitted by the Project Advisory Committee (PAC).

CDD Belson assured the Commissioners that a separate document with an explanation would be read by the City Council; especially since it was a shorter document.

Commissioner Peters he thought Commissioner Muilenburg's summary was so on target that for him it expressed how and why they prioritized as they did. He thought it would be useful to have that brief explanation accompany our priority. Chairperson Nieberlein stated that the Commissioners all nodded their heads in agreement to that statement.

Discussion of Left Turns onto Quince from Hwy 126

Commissioner Tilton referred to the discussion about the Hwy 126 and Quince Street intersection and some of the potential problems of closing off that shopping center; he asked the status of that project.

CDD Belson said it appeared that the consultants had not changed the intersection at Quince and Hwy 126; it had been restricted right in and right out before and the Planning Commission had requested that be changed; she would review that with the consultants.

Electric Car/Golf Cart

Commissioner Bare said he was interested in the electric/golf cart item that was brought up; and asked if there were any specific locations. CDD Belson replied the Lane County Planning Commissioner was speaking in generalities. He thought one should be able to get from their residence in Florence to a business using a dedicated route if possible; there should be a another way to get to the major businesses in Florence without using Hwy 101.

City Council Had Previously Ruled on Electric Carts

There was discussion about the use of electric carts and it was noted that a few years ago the City Council had passed an ordinance on the use of electric carts, and CDD Belson said she would bring that information back to the Commissioners.

Commissioner Peters suggested putting the use of electric carts in as a provisional goal but not as a high priority. Commissioner Muilenburg said it could be like Commissioner Tilton had a suggested about Rhododendron signs; it is a great idea but may not be appropriate for what we're doing here; so why take the time to look at that right now; it could be discussed later.

Timing of Approval

Commissioner Tilton suggested having a short discussion on the timing and said he when he had spoken about this with CDD Belson she mentioned that there was an option of having an extra meeting in a couple of weeks if the Commissioners wanted to wait to approve the TSP.

CDD Belson said the City Council was scheduled for a worksession and public hearing on June 18th; therefore the Planning Commissioners would have to call a special meeting if they did not make a decision that evening.

CDD Belson said she knew the Council would not make a decision at its first meeting. She suggested that the Planning Commission could recommend approval as it is; we could look at the electric vehicle issue at one of the June meetings and if they wanted to add anything about electric vehicles that could be passed on to the City Council in a separate document or memo, as a supplement to what you already have given them.

Intercity Transit

Commissioner Peters said he was delighted to see the ODOT suggestions regarding intercity transit. He said that Mr. Helton had taken his suggestions very seriously and there was a very excellent three page summary in the packet said he wondered why the Commissioner's recommendation of furthering intercity transit link was deleted and asked where ODOT's excellent suggestions would appear in the plan. He assumed that the consultants did not have the advantage of having this when they put together their revision and he referred to page 134-135, of the first draft.

CDD Belson said if that was not included in the draft, staff would ask them to include it.

Proposed Amendments to the Comp Plan

Commissioner Tilton referred to the proposed amendments to the Comp Plan:

Cushman Rail Overpass

- Exhibit B-1 on page 12 of 17, line 38; the second item #20, “The city would strongly promote a feasibility study to take a look at the deficiencies of the rail overpass at Cushman.” He suggested rather than deleting that amendment he would be more comfortable including it. Possibly in the recommendations it could say, “The city should strongly promote.” He said we talked about the connectivity. Although there are other places needed work on the railway that the Coos Port District had purchased; he thought this was the one that affects Florence and our transportation plan. He conceded that it might go to the recommendations rather than in the amendments.

Commissioner Muilenburg said on the report, the rough cost estimates, puts this project somewhere between (page 141) \$100,000,000 and \$150,000,000 and the Coos Port District does not have the resources and does not expect to generate enough freight rail revenue to fund this project. Based on the cost; it was highly unlikely it would ever get done; he was not saying it should be deleted; but the cost factor makes it prohibitive.

Commissioner Tilton said maybe that would be a reason to move it to recommendations and find a more cost effective way of doing it and we won't say the city “shall” we'll say the city “should.” CDD Belson suggested take out the word “strongly” and just say “promote.” “The city should promote a feasibility study”. All Commissioners agreed.

Natural Gas Pipeline – Energy Sources

- Commissioner Tilton referred to page 13 of 17; #22; where it states “The city will continue to pursue the cooperative effort to bring a natural gas pipeline north to Florence.” He said that implies that we've looked at all the alternatives for developing more energy sources and that's the one we've chosen. He would be more comfortable with something that would state that the city would look at a natural gas pipeline, but other energy sources also. He read a draft statement to the commissioners:
 - “The city should continue to pursue the cooperative efforts of coastal cities and counties to evaluate the feasibility desirability and cost effectiveness of various strategies for increasing coastal energy supplies. Examples of potential strategies include but are not limited to:
 - Natural gas pipeline
 - Supported increased residential and commercial energy conversation
 - Increasing transmission line efficiency
 - Investment in smart grid technology
 - Off shore wind energy and wave energy
 - The objective is to increase energy supplies available to coastal communities, there are a lot of ways to do that besides the natural pipeline.

CDD Belson asked the Commissioners if they were in agreement to move these policies to recommendations. Commissioner Muilenburg asked about the list; would they be our comments or recommendations. CDD Belson said that #22 was a policy and it is the same policy that was in the previous plan which we had discussed changing.

She went on to say that the TSP by state law is supposed to look at the pipeline; being a way to transport fuel. It was noted that a policy is a law and is a higher priority than a recommendation which is a suggestion. She said there is another chapter in the Comprehensive Plan that deals more broadly with energy so we could recommend some type of policy or recommendation go into that chapter. She said the Commissioners would still need to decide if they want to leave this policy here. Chairperson Nieberlein asked if there was a position with Oregon coastal communities; she thought this had been discussed for a long time. She thought if we put commissioner Tilton's concerns in the other chapter and keep these going forward it would be something that is already agreed to by the coastal cities.

CDD Belson asked for clarification that the Commissioners would add "other energy sources to Chapter 13;" Commissioner Tilton and the other Commissioners said they would be comfortable with that suggestion.

CDD Belson asked if they would be comfortable with any policy that Commissioner Tilton came up with; acknowledging that they would have the opportunity to review it. She said there may be something already in Chapter 13, but if there was not, she asked if the Commissioners were comfortable with what Commissioner Tilton read to them that evening, and allow him to write the policy.

Commissioner Peters asked if the proposal would be in lieu of the paragraph on page 142, "the natural gas line feasibility study." Commissioner Tilton said he was comfortable with adding it to the other chapter if there wasn't something like that already in the chapter and leaving what was written in there now. Chairperson Nieberlein stated for the record that "all the heads were shaken in consensus," to have Commissioner Tilton write the policy. It was noted for the record that Commissioner Hoile was absent and excused.

Notify ODOT and Lane County about Major Developments

Commissioner Tilton said on page 14 of 17, on line 16, item number 32, and "the city shall notify ODOT and Lane County about major developments..." He said we added more than 500 daily trips and wondered if they wanted to make clear that, "will generate "more" that 50 trips during an average peak hour, or more than 500 daily trips, or which would require a traffic study. Staff said it would just have to hit one of those thresholds, and decided they needed to add an "or" between "peak hour" "and more." Commissioner Muilenburg asked if daily considered 24 hours and staff replied yes. Commissioners agreed to add "or" prior to the "more than 500 daily trips."

Traffic Studies

Commissioner Tilton said he noticed in some of the traffic studies we don't see the number of daily trips; they just count during the peak hour. CDD Belson said usually it's the peak hour that is the most concern because that is when there is the most congestion. When you are doing a traffic study you are looking at "delay" caused by congestion particularly at intersections.

Commissioner Tilton said he ran into language that was talking about "if less than 3,000 trips per day," this was the requirement and if more trips there was another requirement. He said when he reviewed their data he didn't see the number of trips per day in a lot of things.

CDD Belson said it would depend upon the purpose of the study. For instance we charge our System Development Charges (SDC) on average daily traffic. When we calculate the impact of that new development on the whole system we are using the average daily traffic. If you are trying to look at whether your system can handle it, then you are looking peak hours.

Public Building Facilities – Senior Center/Visitor’s Center

Commissioner Muilenburg said he was curious about some of the language for the public (page 20) building facilities where it talks about potential public facilities to be funded, “may include, a senior center.” He said we have a senior center and asked if the plan was talking about another senior center.

CDD Belson replied this information was from the Urban Renewal Plan itself, at the time the Urban Renewal plan was put into place we didn’t have a new senior center; while we have one now, and the Urban Renewal Plan hasn’t been updated. She suggested adding a footnote that states, “Since the Urban Renewal Plan was adopted, a new senior center was built.” She said we’re not changing the plan language but we’re acknowledging that things have changed. When asked if the visitor’s center was something different from the Chamber of Commerce, she said she was not sure, but the Chamber was built since the Urban Renewal Plan was drafted and she thought that was also completed so staff would make a footnote on both of those buildings. Commissioner Muilenburg said they also mention the public fishing dock, wharf and ice facility.

CDD Belson said maybe we should take out the last whole bullet list so the last sentence is deleted and she thought it still got the point across of what the Urban Renewal agency may do. Commissioners agreed.

Multiuse Path on Rhody Drive - Pavement Condition Index (PCI)

Commissioner Muilenburg said the pavement condition index (PCI) on Rhody Drive, is a 44 out of 100; with 100 means it doesn’t need work, 10 or under means it is terrible and Rhody Drive is 44. He asked if there was a possibility of improvement, could that coincide with the multiuse path, or put the funds together to assist in both projects. CDD Belson said, ideally, yes, but practically, the grants that the city had been applying for would not fund road reconstruction. The Transportation Enhance Grant from ODOT, as well as the Bike and Ped Grant, would not pay for reconstruction, so we would have to obtain some other funding source to go along with the grant source.

Commissioner Muilenburg said in the funding it says, “when major reconstruction resurfacing, those type of things are done, bicycle lanes and the like are to be included.” He thought there was a possible potential there. CDD Belson said he was right and staff would try to do as much of that at the same time, but added that one doesn’t always have the funding to do it all at one time.

Responses to the Survey and Suggestions from Service Providers

Commissioner Muilenburg pointed out the city sent out surveys and 11 service providers responded with a couple of suggestions.

- Extend Munsel Lake Road west across Hwy 101
- Extend Heceta Beach Road east across Hwy 101
- Need for a greater number of multiuse paths

He said there is more evidence or community support for the things they had talked about.

Intersections

Commissioner Muilenburg said he had six intersections that do not meet standards and he pointed out that most of them were on their list.

- Hwy 101/Munsel Lake Road
- Hwy 101/27th Street
- Hwy 101/15th Street

- Hwy 126/Quince
- Kingwood/9th Street

He stated he was disappointed that we don't have their list included with the breakdown of their information; personally he would like to see that and see what it would look like within the plan as a presentation in order for him to move forward.

Chairperson Nieberlein asked Commissioner Muilenburg for clarification, that before he would take action on this he would want to see the Commissioners recommendations incorporated into this, he replied, yes.

Priorities

CDD Belson said there are two questions in terms of the priorities.

- Do you want the plan to fully incorporate the Planning Commissioner's priorities, and if so that would be something the consultant would have to complete.
- The second option would be to not fully incorporate everything, for example, move the Plan forward without the analysis but include a table with an explanation that staff would provide with the Commissioner's comments and recommendations.

Once she had the direction from the Commissioners they would then talk about how to achieve it.

Commissioner's Comments

Commissioner Muilenburg said it seemed to him that they had spent two or three meetings on this and as a Planning Commission, what we input should be incorporated into the document that the Council is approving. He asked why it wasn't taken seriously enough to have it incorporated before that evening.

CDD Belson replied that she would take partial responsibility for that; she had given the consultants the information she had received from the Planning Commissions from the last meeting. She told them that the priorities had been changed and requested that the City Council be provided both tables of priorities. She agreed that she would have expected there to have been some mention that the Planning Commission had different priorities. The consultants asked her if would be okay to leave the analysis in there as it had been presented and she had agreed to their request to try to save time. It wasn't that there wasn't an emphasis on the Planning Commission priority it was more trying to save time in going through the revision process.

She acknowledged that consultants did not do some of what she had asked, but in this case they had asked and she told them to leave it like that, and she intended to have a separate document that explained the two documents. She told them that staff would do what they wanted and she was not trying to be an obstacle; she wanted it to be clear how they are going to present both versions of the priority lists.

Lane County Received Both Priority Lists

Commissioner Muilenburg asked if the Lane County Planning Commission had seen the Planning Commission's priority list and CDD Belson replied, yes she gave it to them. She did not put in the packet that evening as she thought it was decided upon at the last meeting.

Refer to Exhibits that Explain Their Changes

Commissioner Wise agreed with CDD Belson, and said if we put all of our thoughts into a single document it is more likely to be read and understood by City Council. He suggested in the sections where we had discussed and made changes, a simple statement might be added; "See Planning Commission comments in Exhibit N," that way they will know we have commented on this but our comments are centralized, and are more likely to be read in their entirety by Council.

Chairperson Nieberlein said she agreed with both Commissioner Wise and CDD Belson, when they get a stack of paper, compared to two sheets they would more likely read the smaller document.

CDD Belson said the separate document would include Commissioner Muilenburg's write up, and explain that the Planning Commissioners wanted to have the City Council see the priorities of both the Project Advisory Committee and the Planning Commissioners, side by side with explanations as to why the Planning Commission had put each of those projects on the list in the table format. She would add an explanation about the projects in the Urban Renewal District, and why the Commission had chosen to move those projects out of the list. Chairperson Nieberlein said to go one step further when they take it under consideration if the Planning Commissioners are at the meeting we can make sure they understand what the Planning Commissioners were trying to accomplish; the commissioners agreed. CDD Belson received consensus from the commissioners that they agreed with Commissioner Wise's suggestion that we incorporate into the priority section a paragraph that says, "please see..."

Hwy 126/Quince Left Turn

CDD Belson said the Hwy 126 to Quince, left turn was a separate issue and staff would make sure that the Commissioners had made it clear that they were against removing that left turn; she acknowledged that it needed to be put in the Plan.

CDD Belson asked the Commissioners if they wanted to see this all again before you pass the resolution; if so do you want to see it in a meeting format where you can talk about it again, or another option, we get it incorporated and you take a look at it, if you are uncomfortable with it, you can call a meeting.

Commissioner Peters said he would feel comfortable making a recommendation tonight, provided that each of the Commissioners that had a question or two feel that there is an answer. For instance he had raised the question of public transit service connection to Eugene and on B-2, number 9, deletes that as a priority but then the ODOT memo appears to be a suggestion for a change in the language of the Transit Plan, which would then very adequately cover the issue.

He said his question would be is this going to be part of the Kittelson next draft just as it is? CDD Belson replied she would expect it would be included and if he found it was not incorporated it would be totally appropriate for him tell staff "it is okay, or it is not okay." It was noted that the changes as requested by Commissioner Peter's on the intercity public transit was included in the document on pages 137-139.

Review of Planning Commissioners Changes

CDD Belson reviewed the changes recommended by the planning commission:

- Priorities, how would they be incorporated
- Funding sources for the priority projects, more specificity as to how they would be paid for
- Multiuse path up to Munsel Lake

- Quince/Hwy 126 intersection to allow more turn movements, both in the main part of the document and in the appendix
- Follow up separately with the Commissioners in terms of the electric vehicles and what Council had decided
- Changes that were made to the Comp Plan policies
- Removing the language regarding the public facilities, Chamber and Visitors Center

Deleting the Request to Remove the Left turn off of Hwy 126 onto Quince

After further discussion, Chairperson Nieberlein said she thought they were all in agreement of leaving the left hand turn in. (Hwy 126 going west to Quince)

David Helton from ODOT

CDD Belson reported that after the last Planning Commission meeting David Helton from ODOT spoke with her and said he didn't think ODOT had fully thought through the impacts of removing that left hand turn. She said that Mr. Helton could make those comments at the City Council's public hearing.

It was noted that at this time the Plan states the left hand turn would not be eliminated until 8th Street was extended to Spruce Street. (Page 175) It was also noted that it would still be problematic getting into the shopping center.

Commission Peters moved to recommend to the City Council adoption of legislative amendments to the Florence Realization 2020 Comprehensive Plan and Florence City Code Title 10 to adopt and implement the draft 2012 Florence Transportation System Plan with the amendments that have been accepted that evening. Second by Commissioner Bare, by voice all ayes, motion carried unanimously. It is noted for the record that Commissioner Hoile was absent and excused.

CDD Belson thanked the Planning Commissioners for their work and said she would let the Commissioners know when the revised draft was available so they could review it individually to make sure she and the consultants had captured the changes as they had understood them.

Commissioner Muilenburg reminded everyone that they would have the opportunity to make comments at the City Council public hearing. Chairperson Nieberlein added it was scheduled for June 18th and encouraged the Commissioners to attend.

6. PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION ITEMS

Property on Rhody Drive by Hospital Entrance

Commissioner Tilton asked about the situation on Rhododendron Drive across from the south entrance to Peace Harbor hospital, where there had been a line of bark mulch put out along with "No Trespassing" signs that seem to be within the right-of-way.

CDD Belson said there is an owner who owns the house just to the north of that driveway and he had recently purchased the property you are referring to. The owner had contacted the city to find out what he could do to stabilize the area because there is a fair amount of erosion on the bank side caused by people going down the bank to the river. In conversations staff had with him he has said he was going to hire a surveyor to identify his property lines; public works had agreed to move the boulders toward the road and take away the parking, there will be less tendency for people to park on the shoulder. The owner had constructed a berm which according to the public works director is within the right-of-way and the city would want that moved out of the right of way onto his

property. She said the city was not finished with it yet; the public works director will follow up after the survey was completed.

Cactus BBQ

Commissioner Muilenburg asked about the Cactus BBQ and noted the land use was approved and asked if the owner was in business. CDD Belson said no, he had intended to open the beginning of May; after he got his land use approval something happened financially, so he could not open. She was not sure if he had applied for a building permit; but they had not issued one for him.

Dog Park

Commissioner Muilenburg asked about the dog park near the Senior Center and noted that they would have to clear brush. CDD Belson reported on the dog park in her Director's report below.

7. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

*Monthly Report – Was included in the packet

Dog Park

CDD Belson said regarding the dog park, the city had submitted an application for a CUP to construct a dog park within Singing Pines. The portion that will be the dog park is south of the Senior Center and it will include a small parking area and a fenced in area for two sizes of dogs. This application will be coming to the Commission; and pointed out that the dog park was a Council goal; it was one of the highest priority projects that came out of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan, with trails at number one and the dog park number two.

She went on to say that there is a contingent of volunteers from the Church of Latter Day Saints that will come and help for a day; there will be hundreds of people here to provide volunteer labor in July as part of "make a difference day." The city is under a time crunch to be able to get it all in place; we don't yet have a complete application and we have a full agenda for June 12th – we have Central Lincoln PUD continued hearing, the Dialysis clinic, they have gone back to the drawing board and redesigned to make it cheaper to construct and are changing the fence which is part of their variance approval in terms of the buffer with the school district property.

We also have as an action item the change use for the single family house on 20th Street that is now the RV barn being converted to commercial use as part of the Black Diamond Flooring. There are three items for the 12th so the question would be if the Planning Commission could have a meeting sooner than the 26th, hopefully June 14th because in the next day or two the application would be complete and the notices will be able to be sent out. Crystal Shoji who is the consultant processing the application would be able to attend; if the Planning Commission was agreeable staff would schedule that public hearing for Thursday the 14th on the dog park and cancel the meeting of the 26th.

After some discussion the consensus was to hold the special meeting on the dog park on Thursday, June 14th; although Commissioner Tilton stated he may have a conflict.

Roger Center's Request of Change of Use

Chairperson Nieberlein said the action on 20th Street, Roger Center's request for a change of use could be done as an administrative decision, she had requested that it be placed in front of the Commissioners because they had dealt with it originally, and gave their approval originally and she thought they should stay consistent and carry the project through to the end.

Water Quality Testing

Commissioner Tilton referred to pages 10 and 11 which show the results from the water quality testing. He requested that in the future he would like to see labels or numbers of the wells on the map. In a related item on page 13, where there are the results from the surface water testing; all they have to identify those sites were PWS, MGP MLK, it would be nice to have those filled out more and potentially have those on the map too; having those spelled out would give them a better idea of where they are located.

CDD Belson said she had not sent this report out to the Stakeholder Group and she will get better maps before sending out the report and she would include the Planning Commission in the email as well.

Map for Bike Ways in TSP

Chairperson Nieberlein asked if staff was going to do a map showing the bikeways. CDD Belson said she wasn't going to make a new one and referred them to the map in the TSP, Figure 4-5 page 37.

Miles of Bicycles Lanes

Commissioner Tilton said he needed to have an idea of how many miles of bike lanes the city has, as he is a member of a bicycle advisory committee and they are working on filling out an application that designates Florence is a bicycle friendly city. Chairperson Nieberlein said she thought we had that information in the 12th Street grant application and she offered to send it to him.

8. CALENDAR

- * Tuesday, June 12, 7:00 pm – Regular Meeting
- * Thursday, June 14, 7:00 pm – Special Meeting – Dog Park
- * Tuesday, June 26, 7:00 pm – Cancelled

With no further business to come before the Florence Planning Commission, Chairperson Nieberlein adjourned the meeting at 8:48 p.m.

APPROVED BY THE FLORENCE PLANNING COMMISSION ON THE 12 DAY OF
June 2012.


JAN NIEBERLEIN, CHAIRPERSON
FLORENCE PLANNING COMMISSION