

MINUTES

Springfield Planning Commission
Jesse Maine Room
225 Fifth Street–Springfield

Work Session

October 28, 2003
6 p.m.

PRESENT: Lee Beyer, James Burford, Bill Carpenter, David Cole, Gayle Decker, members; Greg Mott, Mel Oberst, Colin Stephens, Gary McKenny, Nick Arnis, Linda Pauly, Ken Vogeny, City of Springfield.

ABSENT: Steve Moe, Chair.

1. CONTINUATION FROM OCTOBER 21, 2003, MEETING--PEACEHEALTH MASTER PLAN

In the absence of Commissioner Moe, Commissioner Carpenter called the meeting of the Springfield Planning Commission to order.

Colin Stephens, Planner III led the commission through its continuing review of the PeaceHealth Master Plan. He indicated that at this point, he had not had time to complete the “placeholder” recommendations in the staff notes and would provide those in writing to the commission at a later date.

Mr. Stephens referred the commission to plan sheet 2.1, Transportation Improvement Projects. He invited additional questions about the information presented on the sheet.

Commissioner Beyer arrived. Commissioner Shaver arrived.

Commissioner Carpenter recalled that Commissioner Burford had asked a question regarding the timing of the Gateway-Beltline and the Pioneer Parkway extension. Mr. Stephens reminded the commission that Mr. McKenny had stated that the facility improvements would be completed when the hospitals opened its doors. He said that a condition of approval for the plan amendment sought by PeaceHealth was the completion of intersection improvements at Q Street and the intersection of Pioneer Parkway and I-105, which were ODOT improvements. Mr. Stephens said that many infrastructure improvements were tied to the date of occupancy to ensure that the traffic on the site could be handled by the transportation system.

Mr. Stephens referred the commission to plan sheet 22.a, the Proposed Striping Plan, and noted that it differed slightly from the sheet provided to the commission because staff asked the applicant to submit revised sheets showing more detail.

Commissioner Shaver questioned the role of the commission in reviewing the transportation improvements given that they would not be built by PeaceHealth and were not part of the master plan. He asked what planning document was relevant to the transportation system in the area. Mr. Stephens said that the McKinley-Horn Report, done in the mid-1990s, was employed when the council adopted the alignment of the parkway extension.

Commissioner Shaver noted his previously expressed concerns about the distance between the proposed signals and about “dumb” signals, when he was told that PeaceHealth was not responsible for the signals. Mr. Stephens said that if the commission had concerns about the signals, it could express them. Mr. Arnis clarified that staff had requested that PeaceHealth provide a traffic impact analysis (TIA) and layout the intersections to show how many travel lanes they thought would be needed. He said staff was discussing the intersections on Harlow and Hayden roads with the neighbors, and would go to the council in February 2004 with a design document showing the traffic layout. He was unsure what role the commission had given the council’s authority over the issue. Commissioner Shaver did not think the installation of three “dumb” signals would allow the parkway to serve as a major transportation route. He thought people would avoid the area instead.

Mr. Arnis noted that the City Council had already determined the number and location of the signals on the parkway. Mr. Stephens suggested that the commission could provide input to the council about the McKenzie Way intersection. It was not proposed to be signalized at this time. He believed the only way the intersection would be signalized was if another signal was removed. Commissioner Shaver wanted synchronization of the signals and wanted that stipulated in the master plan. Commissioner Carpenter pointed out that emergency vehicles would travel the area and trigger red lights so that synchronization may not be an issue.

Commissioner Beyer questioned whether through turns would be allowed on McKenzie Way, or if they were limited to right turns only. Mr. Stephens suggested that in the absence of signalization, that was a traffic safety issue. He said that staff had indicated that the intersection would be functional and safe. Mr. McKenny clarified that no left turn out was being proposed. Commissioner Beyer asked why those coming out of McKenzie Way could not turn to the left. Mr. McKenny explained that they would be crossing several lanes of traffic, which could potentially be dangerous. He emphasized that this was schematic representation, not a design drawing, and the engineers would do an engineered design for each facility. He said that the analysis indicated that the approach would work safely and efficiently at peak hours. Commissioner Burford asked how many cars would be backed up, and how far back it went. Mr. McKenny said he would have to follow-up on the question.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Carpenter, Mr. McKenny said that PeaceHealth analyzed traffic patterns and volumes for 2007, 2012, and 2018 (full development of the entire site). The left turn movement still worked in 2018 under the assumptions that PeaceHealth used.

Commissioner Carpenter asked what speeds would be posted on Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. Mr. McKenny said that the road was being designed for a posted speed of 45 miles per hour. He anticipated that traffic would slow in both directions during peak hours.

At the request of Commissioner Carpenter, Mr. McKenny reviewed the internal traffic system. Commissioners asked questions clarifying the details of the system.

Commissioner Carpenter asked why the City was not requiring PeaceHealth to build public roads with the “correct” public easement. Mr. McKenny said that PeaceHealth proposed a road system that would serve itself and the property to the north, and its traffic consultant did not believe a full-width public street was required for its development. PeaceHealth was limiting its work to the property that it owned, and the road ended at the property line to the north. Mr. McKenny added that the City’s requirements for private roads were that they be built to the same design and structural standards as City streets in case the City must assume responsibility for them at some time in the future.

Mr. Stephens said that staff could look into the potential of making RiverBend Drive a local public street.

Commissioner Carpenter postulated a hypothetical situation wherein an accident occurred north of RiverBend and

Cardinal Way, and asked where the traffic would go. Mr. McKenny said that there would be two ways out, back down RiverBend Drive and up RiverBend Drive as it was a continuous route.

Mr. Stephens referred the commission to the Site Access and Circulation Diagram on page 2.2 of the plan set. Responding to a question from Commissioner Cole, Mr. Stephens confirmed that the loop road would not dead-end.

Commissioner Burford referred to the proposed connection of RiverBend to Deadmond Ferry Road and asked how much private property was involved. Mr. Stephens said that there were three properties involved, and staff had met with the owners to explain what was proposed and to discuss acquisition of their land. He said the City would have to buy three properties, and potentially a part of another property, to complete the connection.

Mr. Stephens referred the commission to the Street Improvements and Transit Sections on page 2.3 of the plan set.

Commissioner Beyer determined from Mr. Stephens said that many of the trees being proposed were in the public right-of-way, and as a condition of approval PeaceHealth would provide landscaping maintenance at a higher level than the City was able to. Commissioner Beyer asked if that was an enforceable condition. Ms. Kieran said that she would look into how to make the maintenance requirement binding on subsequent owners. She noted that the subsequent owner would be the City. Commissioner Beyer said that trees were nice, but expensive to maintain. Mr. Stephens agreed, and said that the City's maintenance division voiced similar concerns during the staff review of the application. Commissioner Beyer suggested that the required trees could be placed on private property rather than in the public right-of-way.

Mr. Stephens referred the commission to the Non-Vehicular Circulation and Pedestrian Amenities plan, page 2.4 of the plan set. He noted the location of multi-use paths throughout the site. He confirmed, in response to a question from Commissioner Shaver, that there would be connectivity between the multi-use paths as they were connected by on-street bicycle lanes.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Carpenter, Mr. Stephens confirmed that staff was still seeking a southern accessway to the neighborhood. As part of the process of planning for Martin Luther King Boulevard, staff was discussing the provision of a bicycle and pedestrian link in that area with neighborhood residents. If there was neighborhood support, the link would occur. The master plan contained a condition that stated any future site plan application must accommodate that link. Mr. Stephens noted that staff was also contemplating a multi-modal accessway north through to the campus industrial property.

Mr. Stephens said that there were two types of pedestrian paths, one a link that connects two rights-of-way or a right-of-way to a multi-use path, and staff recommended that type be constructed to the City's accessway standards and protected by a public easement. The other type of path served the property internally, and could remain in private ownership and constructed to an alternative standard.

In response to a question from Commissioner Beyer, Mr. McKenny confirmed that staff contemplated a connection between McKenzie Way and Deadmond Ferry Road in the future.

Commissioner Beyer anticipated that the property to the south would be developed with a mix of commercial and mixed-use, and that the property now in low-density residential (LDR) use would be too valuable to maintain in that use in the future. Mr. Stephens said that the only reason the property remained in LDR was because it was already developed with that use and the property owners desired it to remain so. He said that if someone wanted to develop the property in another use, it would require a refinement plan amendment. Any local street connections would be contemplated at that point. Commissioner Beyer asked why the City did not initiate such a plan amendment so it could design an infrastructure network to serve the area in the future. He acknowledged that the City

would not force the existing uses out, but he thought it prudent to plan for what realistically would happen in the future. Mr. Oberst suggested that was a policy decision, and recommended the Planning Commission consider such an action in a separate work session.

Mr. Mott suggested that planning for the area now allowed the City to plan for any eventually for those properties, no matter the designation or use now. He pointed out that the area in question was only five or six acres and was flanked by two major thoroughfares. All services necessary to serve the property would be in place when it developed. He said that the issue of planning was irrelevant in terms of infrastructure planning.

Mr. Stephens referred the commission to page 2.5, Transit Routes. He said that a BRT route was proposed to go through the property, although the exact alignment was unknown at this time. He anticipated resolution of that issue shortly. Mr. McKenny clarified that the site would be served by both bus and BRT, and the question of the BRT service was one of timing.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Beyer, Mr. McKenny confirmed that PeaceHealth wanted to extend RiverBend Drive all the way to International Way in Phase 1.

Commissioner Carpenter asked if staff had considered any conditions related to, for example, the provision of bus passes to reduce automobile trips. Mr. McKenny said that currently, the City's transportation demand management (TDM) policies were voluntary. However, PeaceHealth has identified a wide range of TDM measures it intended to pursue, and the City had asked PeaceHealth to be explicit about those programs. He noted that the hospital in Eugene on Hilyard Street had an active TDM program that included the provision of bus passes to employees. Commissioner Carpenter asked if the City needed to know that information for the master plan if the commission wished to include some "trigger" numbers for such programs. Mr. McKenny said that if the City was to mandate a TDM program, it had a challenge in enforcement as Springfield did not have an enforcement program. Springfield had enjoyed voluntary compliance in a number of instances, such as Sony's decision to rotate shifts on 12-hour intervals to reduce peak hour trips. Mr. McKenny said that Springfield did not mandate that program or check on it. Commissioner Carpenter said that it was pretty easy to check things such as the number of bus passes sold to employees. Mr. McKenny said that was true, but then the question was, what did Springfield do if PeaceHealth did not meet the condition?

Mr. Stephens pointed out that there were two incentives for PeaceHealth to operate an aggressive TDM program. The first was the trip cap; if PeaceHealth could reduce the number of trips to the site that increased its development potential. The second was the number of parking spaces. PeaceHealth needed a lot of parking, and the parking lots that it built could be smaller if the TDM programs were in place, preserving additional developable space.

Commissioner Decker determined from Mr. McKenny that the trip cap applied to the land that was being rezoned. That condition was established through the plan amendment process, and monitored through the trip monitoring plan, which he likened to a checkbook from which trips were subtracted. Commissioner Carpenter determined from Ms. Kieran that the trip cap was based on 99 acres of development.

Commissioner Carpenter wondered whether the trip cap was a "bump or an incentive" until 2006, when the last acreage was being developed. Mr. Stephens said that as far the question related to TDM, it might not be as much an incentive at the beginning of development as it was at the end, when PeaceHealth sought to develop more of the property. He believed that in terms of Phase 1, the incentive to reduce parking would exist very strongly. He agreed with a statement from Commissioner Carpenter that initially, parking would be more of a restraint than the trip cap.

Commissioner Beyer asked how the City could ensure that the area developed into a node and not just a medical campus. Mr. McKenny said that the TIA estimated the number of trips the hospital would generate. If the site

plan was consistent with the master plan assumptions, the development would be below the trip cap. If, between now and the submission of the site plan, PeaceHealth proposed more hospital uses or medical office development, staff would look at that issue during site plan review and check it against the trip cap. If the trip cap was exceeded, staff would know that before development could occur. Mr. Beyer asked if all trips anticipated as a result of the master plan fit under the trip cap. Mr. McKenny confirmed that all assumed uses on the 99 acres being rezoned fit in the trip cap. He said that the MDR land was not affected by the trip cap because it had not been rezoned.

Commissioner Burford expressed concern that pressure on the intersections serving the hospital would be exacerbated if RiverBend Drive was not connected to Deadmond Ferry Road prior to development. Mr. Stephens said that the property would still generate the same number of trips but the system would be less desirable if the roads did not go through as being suggested by staff. Commissioner Burford wanted to condition approval on the connection.

Mr. McKenny suggested that the extension of RiverBend Drive northward to Deadmond Ferry Road and the connection of the Loop Road to that intersection were two independent things. He said that Commissioner Burford's concern was based on what was proposed, and that had been analyzed in the TIA, which indicated that the system worked satisfactorily from a capacity standpoint. Mr. McKenny emphasized that did not mean the street pattern was the best or most efficient. The TIA looked at road capacity.

Commissioner Decker was concerned about requiring a road improvement not on the property owned by PeaceHealth a condition of approval. Mr. Stephens pointed out that Springfield had an annexation agreement with PeaceHealth that obliged it to build the roadway. He said that the City was also obligated to participate in the project. Condemnation may be needed if the City was unable to reach agreement with the affected property owners.

Commissioner Beyer asked about the timing of construction of the loop road. Mr. Stephens indicated that construction would occur in Phase 2. That portion of the property would need to go through a site plan review or subdivision process and the City would look at the road alignment and connections at that time. Commissioner Beyer asked why the City did not require the right-of-way to be dedicated at this time. Mr. McKenny said there was no advantage to the City as it became an administrative burden to manage the property until it had a function.

Mr. Stephens called the commission's attention to page 2.6 in the plan set, Emergency Access Routes, 500-year Flood Event. He clarified that the information was not a City requirement, but was submitted by PeaceHealth to demonstrate it would still have access to the site in the case of a 500-year flood.

Mr. Stephens referred the commission to page 3.1 in the plan set, Stormwater & Drainage Master Plan. Responding to a question from Commissioner Beyer, he indicated that the 1996 flood entered the property at Baldy View Road because of a failed revetment. The revetment in question had since been repaired. Mr. Stephens noted that the Gateway Refinement Plan included policies that spoke to the use of open drainageways where practical on the site, and staff was still analyzing the impact of those policies on the application. Commissioner Beyer asked if the ponds being proposed by PeaceHealth were part of the stormwater management system. Mr. Stephens said that the ponds were decorative.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Decker, Mr. Vogeney said that the City did not place private infiltration facilities inside public rights-of-way due to the desire to avoid conflicts between the two systems. He confirmed that the prohibition against such facilities within ten feet of a building was typical, and intended to avoid saturating the building's foundation.

Commissioner Beyer asked if the proposed bioswale design was adequate to meet any future standards associated

with the Clean Water Act. Mr. Vogeney said that the bioswale concept being proposed to treat parking lot runoff was consistent with the City's engineering design standards manual and design standards for treating runoff. During site plan review staff would be able to determine if the standards were actually being met. Mr. Stephens added that the master plan vested the property owners with the developments standards in place at the time the development was approved, but the property would be subject to changes in State and federal law, including those affecting the Clean Water Act.

Commissioner Decker noted that one proposed condition of approval called for the possible planting of ash and cottonwood trees in a section of the riparian area, and asked if the City could instead require poplar trees to be planted to take up possible contamination in the soil. Ms. Pauly indicated that local cottonwood trees performed the same function as poplar trees.

Commissioner Shaver determined from Mr. Vogeney that the proposed pipe system would be a pure gravity system. There would be pumping required for the sanitary system, but that existed already.

Mr. Stephens referred the commission to page 3.2 of the plan set, the Conceptual Mass Grading Plan. He indicated that more detail would be submitted prior to plan review. Commissioner Shaver asked how much fill was involved. Mr. Vogeney said that staff did not know at this point. In some areas of the site, there would be cut needed to achieve the 100-year elevation; it depended on the existing contour of the ground.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Shaver, Mr. Vogeney said that the applicant prepared two geotechnical analyses for the foundation design. The fill used depended on the foundation selected. If the applicant filled with native material and an engineered fill, it would not have to wait to build. Commissioner Shaver asked what the applicant was doing on the site now. Mr. Vogeney said the applicant was excavating a basement underneath the hospital. The material had been spread out over the area where parking would be constructed.

Commissioner Beyer asked if the impact of the proposed fill on adjacent properties had been analyzed. Mr. Vogeney said yes. The plans had been sent out for peer review, and the reviewers confirmed that the flood studies prepared by PeaceHealth met Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) standards and were done correctly. He said that the involvement of other regulatory agencies depended on the direction that PeaceHealth took. If PeaceHealth wanted to remove the property from the 100-year floodplain map, it would make application to FEMA, and the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) would be involved in that review. He confirmed that there were small pockets of wetlands on the property totaling less than one acre, but those would not be affected during Phase I. Responding to a follow-up question from Commissioner Shaver, Mr. Vogeney described the parameters of the study done by PeaceHealth. He indicated that staff had requested that PeaceHealth provide the commission with maps prior to the next meeting.

Commissioner Decker asked staff to speculate on how the riparian setback would be affected by a flood that caused significant erosion. Ms. Kieran said that development must be set back 75 feet from the top of the bank, and that distance would move if the bank moved. Mr. Stephens said that PeaceHealth would have to move any development or landscaping out of the setback if the riverbank moved.

Mr. Stephens referred the commission to page 3.3 in the plan set, Proposed Off-Site Drainage Easements. He confirmed, in response to a question from Commissioner Beyer, that a new stormwater outfall would be required. Mr. Vogeney added that the facility would be a vegetated meander. Commissioner Carpenter confirmed with staff that the new outfall would require several permits. Financing for those permits was a subject of discussion between the City and PeaceHealth.

Commissioner Beyer suggested that the outfall would benefit several properties, including Sony. Mr. Stephens concurred.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Beyer, Mr. Vogeney traced the route of the drainageway on the diagram. He said that the water would be filtered onsite and cooled by shade trees as it traveled through the meander. The drainageway would be routed along property line because it was easier for the City to deal with existing easements rather than attempting to direct the drainageway cross country.

Mr. Stephens reviewed page 4.1 of the plan set, the Public Utility Concept Plan. Mr. Vogeney pointed out location of the proposed sanitary sewer system and associated facilities, and confirmed, in response to a question from Commissioner Beyer, that the system would be adequate to serve adjacent properties. Commissioner Burford asked if existing residents would be required to hook up to the system. Mr. Vogeney said that in general, no, although some existing septic systems may be disturbed as a result of the construction of Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard, and the City would have to provide some kind of replacement, possibly in the form of connection to sewer system.

Commissioner Carpenter asked if the hospital needed a pretreatment permit to discharge into sanitary sewer system. Mr. Vogeney said that any nonresidential use may have to have a pretreatment permit. The City's industrial pretreatment staff had been in contact with the hospital designers about the systems being proposed and any chemicals that might be used on site. He said that the staff recommendation included a placeholder condition related to the subject.

Mr. Stephens reviewed page 4.2 of the plan site, Water Infrastructure, noting that the information was requested by the Springfield Utility Board (SUB). Commissioner Burford asked if any municipal wells were planned for in the area. Mr. Stephens said no. The area in question would be served by City water.

Mr. Stephens referred the commission to page 4.3 of the plan set, Sanitary Sewer and Franchise Utilities. He reported that the City was conditioning approval of the application on the inclusion of a private sanitary sewer line in Cardinal Way to serve the area to the west when needed. There could be either a private or public line extended to the south. That level of detail would be addressed during site plan review.

Commissioner Shaver said that it appeared the sewer lines would travel down the center of the parkway extension. Mr. Vogeney concurred. He said that generally, sanitary sewers were installed in the center of the street to ensure minimum separation from the water system. He said that the City avoided placing manholes in the wheel path of the street. He said that the placement of such facilities was often a challenge.

Commissioner Beyer asked about the placement of electrical service in the parkway right-of-way. Mr. Vogeney indicated that was the subject of ongoing discussions between the City's Engineering staff, County staff, and SUB staff. He said that several approaches were under discussion, including relocating the line to Game Farm Road.

Commissioner Stephens showed the commission a brief video showing the proposal, submitted by PeaceHealth, entitled "Building for the Future at River Bend."

Members discussed the proposed schedule and agreed to cancel the public hearing scheduled for November 12 and hold a work session instead. The public hearing would occur on November 13, and notice would be provided to the public of the change.

Commissioner Carpenter asked if the commission would have time to receive the peer review reports by November 12. Mr. Stephens said yes.

Commissioner Shaver and Commissioner Beyer indicated that they would not be available for the meeting sched-

uled November 4.

The meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)