Minutes
City of Keizer
River Road Redevelopment Board
Keizer City Hall Library
Wednesday, May 24, 1995

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Smith at 7:12 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

The following members were present: Stan Compton, Tim Smith, Jeff Taylor, and Shannon Blake-Thiess. Donald Porter arrived at 8:20 p.m.

Also present were: COG Consultant Robin Marshburn, Council Liaison Carl Beach, Community Development Director John Morgan, and Recording Secretary Nona Oxe'.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Action on the April 26, 1995 minutes was deferred until later in the meeting when a quorum was present.

4. APPEARANCE OF INTERESTED CITIZENS

No one came forward to present any issues to the Board.

5. PROJECT UPDATES

Urban Renewal Budget (added item)

Mr. Morgan reported that the Budget Committee met to discuss the Urban Renewal Budget two weeks ago. The Urban Renewal Budget, as proposed, will go to the Urban Renewal Agency on June 19 for public hearing and adoption. Mr. Morgan noted that copies of the proposed budget were mailed to the members of R3B. He pointed out that the budget is a status quo budget based on $1/thousand as the equivalent renewal tax rate.

There was discussion regarding the contingency funds in the budget. Mr. Morgan pointed out that the contingency can be spent only by Council action. Councilor Beach suggested that it would be appropriate for R3B to send recommendations to the Renewal Agency regarding any of the access streets such as Sunset or Iris Lane.

River Road Redevelopment Project

Mr. Morgan noted that in adopting the \$1/thousand renewal tax rate scenario, Council set the stage for next year's activities. He suggested that the Board might anticipate for next year four projects: Cherry Avenue; a North Gateway; what to do with banner bars on poles; and a revolving loan fund for businesses to use for property improvements such as facades, parking lot landscaping, etc. R3B would need to design such a loan fund program.

Undergrounding Project

Mr. Morgan reported that Salem Electric has almost completed work to place the cable underground. VIACOM has been told that Salem Electric will cut the poles off just above the VIACOM cable. Unless VIACOM's wire is promptly taken down, they will be responsible for getting the poles down and out of the ground.

Ms. Blake-Thiess questioned how R3B might encourage VIACOM to complete the cable removal. Mr. Morgan suggested that R3B could send a letter signed by the Chair to VIACOM encouraging prompt removal of the cable and poles. After discussion, Chairman Smith agreed to send a letter on behalf of R3B.

Mr. Morgan reported that PGE is moving along on its project. He noted, however, that because PGE charges an additional 10% to do the contract, it could work out more expensive for the City to use the reimbursement model used with Salem Electric. Staff is exploring doing the contracting, and will do whatever is most economical. PGE wishes to break ground in June.

Development Activity

Mr. Morgan reported that the Safeway project looks sound. It was his understanding that they had not yet executed the option, but were on the verge. They intend to file for building permits by July 1, and break ground by September.

Housing Rehabilitation

Mr. Morgan reported that yesterday he went to a mandatory workshop for grant recipients. He noted that the first rehab projects should begin within the month.

Chemawa Activity Center Land Use and Transportation Plan

Mr. Morgan reported that the Plan will be completed in June and up for review by the Planning Commission and City Council over the summer. He described the configuration of land uses identified in the proposed Plan. He pointed out that the Plan will require a developer to submit for approval a specific site plan with any development project. Mr. Morgan noted that the big issue is the provision of sewer and water and how to pay for it. He suggested that assembly of property and development would be rapid if sewer and water were in.

A serious obstacle to the project just recently came up. Mr. Morgan noted that modeling of what is shown in the Plan for the Radiant/Lockhaven intersection does not meet the air quality test. He explained the provision in air quality regulations allowing for offsetting transportation projects whereby development of a clean project can be considered an offset for a project identified as dirty. He noted that the task force is questioning the validity of the model, and is also looking for clean projects that would provide acceptable offsets. There was discussion of the possibility of doing a different and more sophisticated model.

Sign Code Notification Project

Mr. Morgan reported that the compliance letters went out about three weeks ago. Reaction has been mixed. Some businesses have requested grant money. One request was for funds to remove a sign from a business that plans to move. Mr. Morgan noted that grants have to be approved by the City Council based on a recommendation from R3B. At the next R3B meeting the grant fund requests will be considered.

6. DISCUSSION

6.1 River Road Modal Opportunity Plan - River Road Zoning

Robin Marshburn of COG distributed copies of the North River Road Alternative Modal Opportunity Plan. He reviewed the background of the project to perform a study and develop recommendations related to increasing modal diversity along River Road. He noted that North River Road was selected because of interest in avoiding congestion such as is seen on Lancaster Drive, the opportunities for alternative land use and transportation designs, and the long-term redevelopment potential. The project was funded by grant funds totaling $62,000 and STATTS matching funds in the amount of $11,000.

Mr. Marshburn pointed out that by locating businesses and services closer to where people live and work and improving pedestrian connections between locations, people are given the option to walk rather than drive for some of their trips. He explained that the limitations of River Road for foot travel were understood. However, it was felt that there are opportunities for incremental changes, and with the right approaches more people will walk, thereby reducing vehicle miles traveled.

Mr. Marshburn pointed out three groups that are targeted in the effort to promote pedestrian transit: those who park once and shop at different stores; those who live about 1000 feet from shops and services on River Road; and employees who work along River Road and are willing to walk to a restaurant or do errands on foot.

Mr. Marshburn reviewed the Inventory and Analysis portion of the Plan which includes existing land uses, transportation infrastructure and transit service. Included was a color-coded, three-page map of the River Road corridor entitled *Land Use and Building Location.* Each page of the map represents a section of the corridor, identified as A, B, and C. Section A covers the southern end of Keizer, including a small area within the City of Salem, and extends north to Hollyhock. Section B extends north from Hollyhock to Linda Avenue. Section C covers the northern area from Linda Avenue to Lockhaven Drive. Mr. Marshburn explained how the color-coded map indicates the existing land uses and building sizes in each section. He noted that the commercial core boundary extends 1000 feet west and 1000 feet east of River Road. Mr. Marshburn explained how to use another reference document in concert with the color-coded map. It charts businesses and land uses, including size, Comp Plan designation, zoning, etc.

Mr. Marshburn indicated that a computer disk containing all the Plan data will be given to the City so that the data can be kept current. Mr. Morgan confirmed that the data including the digitizing will be read into the GIS (Geographic Information System), and staff will have the ability to make changes and update the information.

Mr. Marshburn pointed out *Land Use Category Definitions* included in the Plan handout. He explained how to use the definitions for reference in connection with the land uses identified on the color-coded map.

Mr. Marshburn reviewed the land uses identified in Sections A, B, and C of the corridor, and pointed out deficiencies relative to foot traffic. He noted that there was no grocery store located in section B.

Mr. Marshburn explained the term Pedestrian Supportive Land Uses (PSLU), used in the Plan. He described the types of uses that fall under this category, and pointed out uses that are considered not to be pedestrian supportive.

Mr. Marshburn noted the importance of density of development in achieving an environment with a significant amount of pedestrian and bicycle transit activity. He explained how the density of the corridor was measured, and confirmed that the River Road corridor is far below the desired density for pedestrian transit.

Ms. Blake-Thiess suggested that this pointed out the importance of nodes within the corridor to allow a concentration of uses at a single destination. Mr. Marshburn confirmed that corridor focal points are included in the Plan.

Mr. Marshburn called attention to another three-section map entitled *Pedestrian, Bicycle, Transit Infrastructure and Accident Data*. It depicts the location and condition of sidewalks, crosswalks and bicycle lanes in each section throughout the corridor. He noted that there are no bicycle lanes on River Road. The map also charts the location of pedestrian and bicycle accidents. Mr. Marshburn reviewed injury and non-injury accident statistics and locations.

In response to the indication that most crosswalks are in poor condition because the white paint has faded, Mr. Morgan pointed out that painting is done on a cycle. He noted that River Road crosswalks will probably get repainted this summer, and suggested that it might not be appropriate to call the condition poor based only on painting criteria.

Mr. Marshburn next referred to a three-page *Driveway Locations* map for areas A, B and C. As of May 24, all driveways on River Road were plotted, amounting to approximately 179. He noted that the excessive driveways on River Road create three problems: too many turning movements, unsafe conditions for pedestrians and bicycles due to sidewalks inundated with ramps, and use of valuable property that could be utilized for parking or landscaping.

Mr. Taylor asked if a standard existed for the appropriate number of driveways within a certain distance. Mr. Morgan answered that the River Road Design Plan includes policies for driveway locations based on speed limit.

Discussion followed regarding previous driveway analyses and access management planning. Mr. Morgan pointed out that in drafting an access management ordinance it was felt that the issues were so complex along River Road that there needed to be a specific driveway plan. It will be included in the new zoning ordinance. Mr. Morgan noted that the direction of the driveway plan, based on Council input, is to not target driveways for closure, but to identify ones appropriate for closure and provide incentives to the property owners. He noted that the main objective of the driveway plan is to identify where driveways are not appropriate for new construction. Mr. Marshburn indicated that the consultants will be making recommendations regarding businesses with excessive driveways. It was suggested that every effort should be made to educate, and to encourage property/business-owner involvement in the planning of aesthetic and safety improvements.

Mr. Porter arrived and took his seat at the table.

Discussion followed regarding specific problem driveway locations.

Mr. Marshburn referred to the remaining map entitled *Transit Ridership*. He explained that the map shows the three transit routes through the corridor. It also indicates where stops are, and the transit amenities at each stop. He pointed out that in place of flag stops, more bus stops will be installed, with an attempt to have a stop every two blocks. Mr. Marshburn explained how the ridership percentages were developed, and noted that the map gives a representation of where people ride the bus. It indicates which stops are more heavily used relative to other stops, and indicates where bus pullouts are appropriate.

Mr. Marshburn pointed out the need to have a couple corridor focal points to create a pedestrian friendly environment. The focal points should include pedestrian-supportive land uses and provide interesting architectural and landscaping qualities. It was felt that the two sites where they would be most appropriate were the Chemawa intersection and the Fun Factory/Bi-Mart Center north to Manbrin Drive. He pointed out how the proposed corridor focal points would dovetail with the Cherry Avenue master plan being developed by Spencer and Kupper.

Discussion followed regarding transit issues as they relate to proposed improvements for River Road and Cherry Avenue. Mr. Marshburn indicated that the next step for the consultants would be to develop preliminary recommendations based on the analysis. He noted that a planners charrette meeting will be held next week to discuss and define preliminary recommendations. Planers from Keizer, Salem, and the urban area will participate. The recommendations will be brought back to R3B around the middle of June for review and comment, with final recommendations and study documentation completed by the end of June.

Mr. Taylor asked if similar data could be assembled for Cherry Avenue so that the entire area could be viewed together. Mr. Marshburn indicated that they didn't know about the Cherry Avenue project when they started in January. They had collected data only for the River Road corridor.

Mr. Morgan indicated that he would talk with John Spencer to see if data for Cherry Avenue could be put together in a similar manner by contract with COG or another group with the capability.

Mr. Morgan noted that as an adjunct project, the firm of SRI/Shapiro was retained through the Council of Governments to do a specific design plan for the Chemawa/River Road intersection. The first meeting was held two weeks ago and 27 people attended. All the input from the meeting is being cogitated, and design plans and schemes will be developed for another meeting, possibly the end of next week.

Mr. Marshburn requested that comments regarding the North River Road Modal Opportunity Plan be given to Mr. Morgan.

6.2 Cherry Avenue Design Plan

Consultant John Spencer was unable to attend the meeting.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Mr. Porter that the minutes of April 26, 1995 be approved. The motion was seconded by Mr. Compton and carried, all present voting aye.

7. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND AGENDA INPUT

7.1 Urban Renewal Agency Meeting - June 19, 1995 - 7:00 PM

Ms. Blake-Thiess indicated that she will be out of town and unable to attend the meeting.

7.2 Regular Meeting - June 28, 1995 - 7:00 PM

7.3 Report on District One Community Policing Committee Meeting to Discuss Urban Renewal (added item)

Mr. Smith noted that Mr. Compton represented R3B at the District One (Cherry Avenue/South River Road) Community Policing meeting to discuss urban renewal issues.

Mr. Compton reviewed the following points/concerns expressed at the meeting, and responded to by Consultant John Spencer.

- What is the progress of Iris Lane?
- What will happen to trailer park residents?
- What will happen to the recycling center?
- Concern about parks within their community - along Cherry Avenue or side streets
- Signs, trees, landscaping - concern about graffiti possibilities
- More information on Plymouth Avenue improvement - How can the Urban Renewal Program be amended to include Plymouth Avenue?
- Concern about additional housing and who would live there
- How to get speed limit changes on Cherry Avenue
- Where will higher-end apartments be located?
- When will the development begin?

Mr. Compton reported that the residents of the area are very enthused about the proposed improvements, and are anxious for the work to begin.

8. ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned by Chairman Smith at 8:58 p.m.