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South Albany Area Plan
Team Meeting
November 16, 2011

Agenda

Where we are in the process

List major issues for the plan (brief)

Review concept sketches by Otak, mark up

Conclude with “approach to the alternatives”

Key Issues

1. Overarching issue: amount and location of buildable lands
2. Potential for future adjustments to Open Space designation
3. Objectives and alternatives for “Oak Creek Greenway”
4. South Albany neighborhood framework
5. Mitigation strategy: on-site, off-site, roles for public and private parties
6. Transportation analysis: 20 year and build out
7. Number and acreage for neighborhood parks
8. Potential for an elementary school
9. Pedestrian connections east to west, and railroad crossings
10. Reservoir
Summary Notes

The following is a summary of key directional items discussed at the meeting.

a. City Community Park Site. Can alternatives for the park location be explored? Yes.

b. Mitigation. Potential mitigation sites north of Oak Creek were identified. Additionally, there is potential for enhancement or restoration of wetlands that have been modified by agriculture.

c. Where can we find information on mitigation banks applicable to this part of the valley? DSL web site.

d. Open space zone. Yes, it can be revised to “snap back” to the resource boundary. This is an administrative action, treated like a map correction. OS area cannot be made bigger. Otak may make adjustments in base mapping to approximate this, so that full developable area may be studied.

e. Oak Creek Parkway (note, not Greenway). Overall concept is for multiple objectives to be achieved by the location and design of the street-path-trail facilities:

   • Continuous trail/path corridor.
   
   • Transition and strong connection (physical, visual) between open areas and neighborhood areas.
   
   • East-west street connectivity.
   
   • Enhanced value to the neighborhood.

f. Oak Creek Parkway. Options for Oak Creek Parkway to will continue to be carried into the Alternatives phase of the project.

g. Regional Commercial and Village Center. City’s policy interest is to provide a pedestrian oriented village center (or multiple centers) within the project area east of the 53rd extension. The policy goal is to support complete, walkable neighborhoods and avoid reliance on Regional Commercial site for a grocery store and related local services, as this would promote reliance on auto-oriented development. A 2-acre scale is not enough for the Village Center. The Village Center should be a grocery-anchored, mixed use, pedestrian-oriented center for the community.

h. Otak, ECO and the City will follow-up with discussion on the above-noted policy direction, market analysis findings, and way forward.
i. As with other elements of the plan, recommendations and options for mixed use and commercial will be checked against the assumptions in the TSP.

j. Mennonite Village is interested in small scale neighborhood services (e.g. convenience store, hair salon).

k. Wetland mitigation strategies will emphasize opportunities, guidance, and community benefits, as opposed to mapped boundaries. The project objective is to establish a direction for mitigation, not site-specific requirements. A “policy approach” will be taken to mitigation.

l. Workshop. Otak to describe the concept of complete neighborhoods, with walkable scale (1/4 mile from center to edge). Workshop will include sketch concepts for neighborhood framework, Oak Creek Greenway options, “least mitigation” and “most mitigation” concepts.

m. Transportation analysis. 20 year growth will be modeled. Build-out growth will be evaluated as well, using estimation methods given the lack of regional information on growth beyond 20 years.
South Albany Area Plan
Team Meeting – December 20, 2011

Land Use and Transportation System Alternatives

1 – 4:00 PM, Tuesday, December 20, 2011
Otak Media Great Room
17355 SW Boones Ferry Road, Lake Oswego

Meeting purpose
Establish direction for the land use and transportation system alternatives to be evaluated for the South Albany Area Plan

Agenda

1. Overview of key input from the public workshop
2. Summary of assumptions for the alternatives
3. Review of working alternatives
4. Break (2:45 PM)
5. Continued review of working alternatives
6. Summary of direction for the land use and transportation system alternatives to be evaluated for the South Albany Area Plan
Project Overview
South Albany contains the largest remaining undeveloped industrial and urban residential reserve lands inside the City's urban growth boundary—approximately 1,900 acres. The Project study area is bounded by the City’s urban growth boundary on the south, Interstate 5 on the east, land developed to urban densities on the north and Oregon Route 99E on the west.

Project Objectives
The City seeks to create a vibrant new community that will be appealing to residents and businesses seeking new sites. The project objectives stated in the grant funding for the project are listed below.

- Identify feasible patterns of land uses that are consistent with the City's goals for urbanization and environmental protection.
- Consider the capacity of existing, planned, and needed infrastructure facilities to serve the new development in a logical and orderly manner.
- Identify transportation facilities needed for circulation of motor vehicles and people walking and cycling.
- Provide rail service to industrial properties by protecting existing and future right-of-way for service to industrial properties.
- Reduce reliance on automobiles for short trips within the area, and between the area and surrounding development.
- Prepare recommendations for Planning Commission and City Council consideration, including Comprehensive Plan and Zoning designations, plan and development code amendments, and facility standards to implement the Preferred Alternative for land use and transportation.
- Establish alignment and design standards for the Oak Creek Parkway to create a street that defines the southern edge of open space along Oak Creek, provides accessibility to parks and recreation facilities and that is integrated with surrounding development and other transportation facilities; prepare recommendations for low-impact development for environmentally-sensitive areas within the vicinity of Oak Creek.
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Memorandum

To: Heather Hansen and Greg Byrne
From: Joe Dills, AICP
Copies: David Helton, SAAP Project Team
Date: January 11, 2012
Subject: South Albany Area Plan – Buildable Lands Inventory and Analysis
Project No.: 16056

Introduction
This memorandum provides an inventory and analysis of buildable lands in South Albany. It has been prepared for use in preparation of the South Albany Area Plan. All estimates in this memo are for planning purposes only and subject to change.

The study area is 1,957 acres and contains Albany’s largest supply of undeveloped land. This area is approximately 48 percent (943 acres) inside the City Limits and 52 percent (1,014 acres) outside the City Limits.

Buildable Land Inventory and Analysis

Definitions
How much developable land is located in South Albany? How many homes will be in future neighborhoods? How many jobs and businesses will develop on the available acreage? To answer these questions, a Buildable Land Inventory and Analysis (BLI) has been prepared. In very simple terms, the BLI uses the following formulae:

Total Land
Less Committed Lands
Less Constrained Lands
Less Future Land Uses
Equals Buildable Lands
The definitions of constrained land and committed land are listed below.

Committed Land includes:

- Existing and planned right-of-way, including railroad right-of-way
- Developed lands per the committed lands map. Committed lands are parcels where the level of development makes it unlikely redevelopment will occur by 2030. This is a visual assessment, supplemented by selected checking of assessment records by the City. Residually developed parcels that are zoned for Commercial or Industrial uses are assumed to redevelop within 20 years.
- The South Albany Community Park site (owned by the City)

Constrained Land includes:

- Open Space - Lands zoned Open Space zone (within city limits) and lands with a Comprehensive Plan designation of Open Space (outside the City but within the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB).
- 100 year floodplain
- Lakes
- Slopes greater than 25 percent
- Significant wetlands as designated by the City of Albany
- Non-significant wetlands as designated by the City of Albany – See discussion below
- Riparian corridors as designated by the City of Albany
- Utility easements

Future Land Uses account for new village centers and community facilities that will be part of the plan. As of the writing of this memo, the Future Land Uses for the South Albany Area Plan include:

- Future Village Center(s) 10 acres
- Future Neighborhood Parks 17-19 acres
- Future Fire Station 2 acres
- Future Elementary School 10 acres
- Future Water Reservoir 5 acres
Non-Significant Wetlands – A Key Factor

One of the key factors in estimating the buildable land supply in South Albany is the presence of “non-significant wetlands.” These lands are potential wetlands that have been mapped by the City of Albany, using generalized wetland mapping from a Local Wetlands Inventory. The City does not regulate non-significant wetlands, but these lands are subject to state and federal wetland regulations. According to City GIS data, there are 514 acres of non-significant wetlands in the 1,957-acre project area. 391 acres of the non-significant wetlands are outside of the other constraints listed above.

It is important to note that the acreage and location of actual wetlands may be different from the City’s GIS data. On-site delineations, more detailed mapping, and coordination with state and federal wetland authorities will definitively determine the location and quality of wetlands. The City’s GIS data is used here for planning purposes only.

The spatial pattern of non-significant wetlands in South Albany is as important as the quantity. They extend throughout the area and pose a significant challenge to creating a cohesive framework of neighborhoods and employment areas. To illustrate two extremes, two figures have been prepared. The first figure below shows the pattern of buildable land (white areas) if all committed and constrained lands (including 100 percent of non-significant wetlands) and are diagrammed (green areas). The second figure below shows the pattern of buildable land if all committed and constrained lands, except for non-significant wetlands outside of other constraints, are diagrammed. The second figure assumes that non-significant wetlands outside of other constraints are mitigated.

The first diagram displays a pattern of buildable land this is discontinuous. This pattern is not conducive to feasible and efficient urban development, and poses challenges to the creation of a walkable and vibrant community. The second diagram displays a much more workable framework for neighborhoods and employment areas in South Albany.
Buildable Land Scenarios
The following table summarizes an estimate of buildable lands in South Albany. Four scenarios are presented, using non-significant wetlands as a variable. To be considered “buildable,” these wetland areas would either have to be mitigated or would be determined to not be regulated wetlands through more detailed mapping and surveys. The four scenarios are:

- **A** – All non-significant wetlands are retained
- **B** – 50 percent of non-significant wetlands are buildable/mitigated
- **C** – 75 percent of non-significant wetlands are buildable/mitigated
- **D** – 100 percent of non-significant wetlands are buildable/mitigated
### TABLE 1 - SUMMARY OF BUILDABLE LANDS SCENARIOS IN SOUTH ALBANY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Area (1A)</th>
<th>Area in Existing Commercial and Industrial Designations</th>
<th>Area in Residential and Residential Reserve and Other Designations</th>
<th>Buildout Estimate Households (1B)</th>
<th>Buildout Estimate Population (1C)</th>
<th>Increment of Household Growth Beyond 20 Year Forecast (1D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenario A</strong></td>
<td>All non-significant wetlands retained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>2,558</td>
<td>6,215</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenario B</strong></td>
<td>50% of non-significant wetlands buildable/mitigated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>3,317</td>
<td>8,060</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenario C</strong></td>
<td>75% of non-significant wetlands buildable/mitigated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>993</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>3,684</td>
<td>8,952</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenario D</strong></td>
<td>100% of non-significant wetlands buildable/mitigated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>4,064</td>
<td>9,874</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
(1A) Total area adjusted by 1% to account for rounding.
(1B) Per ECONorthwest. Density of 6.3 du/acre.
(1C) Per ECONorthwest. UGB HH size is 2.48 people/HH. City HH size is 2.37 people/HH. Midpoint of 2.43 people/HH is used for estimating purposes.
(1D) Per ECONorthwest. 20 year forecast is 1200 households.
The detailed tables and assumptions for the buildable lands analysis are included in Appendix A.

As of the writing of this memorandum, the City has directed Otak to use Scenario C for further analysis in land use and transportation alternatives. The policy basis for this scenario is consistent with the City’s vision and urban strategy for South Albany. The rationale for Scenario C is:

- The land within Albany’s UGB should be efficiently used for urban uses, while still protecting key resources such as the Oak Creek corridor.
- Paying for infrastructure in South Albany will be made more feasible if more buildable land is served.
- A cohesive pattern of neighborhoods and developable employment lands fundamental to reaching the vision for a complete and walkable community in South Albany.

The 20-year forecast for household growth in South Albany is 1,200 households. Scenario C represents a land capacity for three times the number of households expected by the year 2030.
Appendix A
Buildable Lands Analysis Tables and Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>All non-significant wetlands retained</th>
<th>Total Area (1A)</th>
<th>Area in Existing Commercial and Industrial Designations</th>
<th>Area in Residential and Residential Reserve and Other Designations</th>
<th>Buildout Estimate Households (1B)</th>
<th>Buildout Estimate Population (1C)</th>
<th>Increment of Household Growth Beyond 20 Year Forecast (1D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenario A</strong></td>
<td>All non-significant wetlands retained</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>2,558</td>
<td>6,215</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenario B</strong></td>
<td>50% of non-significant wetlands buildable/mitigated</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>3,317</td>
<td>8,060</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenario C</strong></td>
<td>75% of non-significant wetlands buildable/mitigated</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>3,684</td>
<td>8,952</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenario D</strong></td>
<td>100% of non-significant wetlands buildable/mitigated</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>4,064</td>
<td>9,874</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
(1A) Total area adjusted by 1% to account for rounding.
(1B) Per ECONorthwest. Density of 6.3 du/acre.
(1C) Per ECONorthwest. UGB HH size is 2.48 people/HH. City HH size is 2.37 people/HH. Midpoint of 2.43 people/HH is used for estimating purposes.
(1D) Per ECONorthwest. 20 year forecast is 1200 households.
### TABLE 2 - SOUTH ALBANY BUILDABLE LANDS - SCENARIOS

*All land areas in acres*

#### SCENARIO A - All non-significant wetlands retained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Category</th>
<th>Total Area (1A)</th>
<th>Area in Existing Commercial and Industrial Designations</th>
<th>Area in Residential and Residential Reserve and Other Designations</th>
<th>Buildout Estimate Households (1B)</th>
<th>Buildout Estimate Population (1C)</th>
<th>Increment of Household Growth Beyond 20 Year Forecast (1D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Study Area</td>
<td>1,957</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>922</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Total Committed Lands</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Total Net Constrained Lands</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus Non-Significant Wetlands Assumed to be Mitigated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Future Land Uses</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,558</td>
<td>6,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Buildable Land</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>2,558</td>
<td>6,215</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Category</td>
<td>Total Area (1A)</td>
<td>Area in Existing Commercial and Industrial Designations</td>
<td>Area in Residential and Residential Reserve and Other Designations</td>
<td>Buildout Estimate Households (1B)</td>
<td>Buildout Estimate Population (1C)</td>
<td>Increment of Household Growth Beyond 20 Year Forecast (1D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Study Area</td>
<td>1,957</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>922</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Total Committed Lands</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Total Net Constrained Lands</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus Non-Significant Wetlands Assumed to be Mitigated</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>571</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Future Land Uses</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Buildable Land</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>3,317</td>
<td>8,060</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 2 - SOUTH ALBANY BUILDABLE LANDS - SCENARIOS**

*All land areas in acres*
### TABLE 2 - SOUTH ALBANY BUILDABLE LANDS - SCENARIOS

*All land areas in acres*

**SCENARIO C - 75% of non-significant wetlands buildable/mitigated**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Category</th>
<th>Total Area (1A)</th>
<th>Area in Existing Commercial and Industrial Designations</th>
<th>Area in Residential and Residential Reserve and Other Designations</th>
<th>Buildout Estimate Households (1B)</th>
<th>Buildout Estimate Population (1C)</th>
<th>Increment of Household Growth Beyond 20 Year Forecast (1D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Study Area</td>
<td>1,957</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>922</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Total Committed Lands</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Total Net Constrained Lands</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus Non-Significant Wetlands Assumed to be Mitigated</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>631</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Future Land Uses (1E)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Buildable Land</td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>3,684</td>
<td>8,952</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 2 - SOUTH ALBANY BUILDABLE LANDS - SCENARIOS

All land areas in acres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCENARIO D - 100% of non-significant wetlands buildable/mitigated</th>
<th>Total Area (1A)</th>
<th>Area in Existing Commercial and Industrial Designations</th>
<th>Area in Residential and Residential Reserve and Other Designations</th>
<th>Buildout Estimate Households (1B)</th>
<th>Buildout Estimate Population (1C)</th>
<th>Increment of Household Growth Beyond 20 Year Forecast (1D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Study Area</td>
<td>1,957</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>922</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Total Committed Lands</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Total Net Constrained Lands</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus Non-Significant Wetlands Assumed to be Mitigated</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>691</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Future Land Uses (1E)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Buildable Land</td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>4,064</td>
<td>9,874</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
(1A) Total Area includes land within Open Space designations and ROW.
(1B) Per ECONorthwest. Density of 6.3 du/acre.
(1C) Per ECONorthwest. UGB HH size is 2.48 people/HH. City HH size is 2.37 people/HH. Midpoint of 2.43 people/HH is used for estimating purposes.
(1D) Per ECONorthwest. 20 year forecast is 1200 households.
(1E) 2 acres added to Neighborhood Parks due to larger population.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Category</th>
<th>Total Area</th>
<th>Area in Existing Commercial and Industrial Designations</th>
<th>Area in Residential Reserve and Other Designations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future Village Center</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Neighborhood Parks (3A)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Fire Station</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Elementary School</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Water Reservoir</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Future Land Uses</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
(3A) Neighborhood park needs are calculated at 2.3 ac/1000 people, per Albany standards. For 7500 people (Scenario B), the neighborhood park need is 17.25 acres, rounded to 17.
### TABLE 4 - NET CONSTRAINED AND COMMITTED LANDS IN SOUTH ALBANY

*All land areas in acres*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Category</th>
<th>Total Area</th>
<th>Area in Existing Commercial and Industrial Designations</th>
<th>Area in Residential and Residential Reserve and Other Designations</th>
<th>Area in Existing Open Space Plan and Zone Designations</th>
<th>Existing ROW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Constrained Lands (4A)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total net constrained lands (4A)</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>n\a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space outside of riparian corridor, floodplain, waterways, significant wetlands (4B)</td>
<td>n\a</td>
<td>n\a</td>
<td>n\a</td>
<td>n\a</td>
<td>n\a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non significant wetlands outside of all other constraints</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n\a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committed Lands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing and Planned ROW, including railroads (4C)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed Lands (4D)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Community Park Site</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Committed Lands</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes:
(4A) This table is a summary of net constrained lands. There is no double counting of constrained area. The acreage does not include constraints on committed lands - committed lands always “trump” to avoid double counting. Constrained lands include:
- Land with Open Space designations
- 100 year floodplain
- Lakes
- Slopes > 25%
- Significant wetlands
- Non-significant wetlands
- Riparian corridors
- Utility easements

(4B) There are 46 acres of land designated as Open Space that is not mapped as significant wetland, floodplain or other regulated areas, per Albany GIS data. This land is not added into the buildable land supply in this analysis.

(4C) Existing ROW is shown in the last column. The acreages shown under existing Commercial or Residential designations accounts for future ROW widening.

(4D) Committed lands are built-upon parcels, as mapped by Otak. The committed acreage does not include constraints on committed lands - committed lands always “trump” to avoid double counting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Category</th>
<th>Total Area</th>
<th>Area in Existing Commercial and Industrial Designations</th>
<th>Area in Residential and Residential Reserve and Other Designations</th>
<th>Area in Existing Open Space Plan and Zone Designations</th>
<th>Existing ROW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Year Floodplain</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slopes &gt; 25%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Wetlands</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Significant Wetlands</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riparian Corridors</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Easements</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree groves outside of Open Space (5B)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>n\a</td>
<td>n\a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
(5A) This table provides an inventory of gross constrained acreage, by type. Many of the constraints overlap. Addition of the acreages in this table will double-count the amount of constrained land. The numbers here are provided for informational purposes only.
(5B) Tree grove acreages based on aerial photography from City of Albany dated 2010.
Overview

The purpose of this memorandum is to describe the draft Land Use and Transportation System Alternatives for the South Albany Area Plan (SAAP). This memo fulfills Task 4.2 (Draft Project Memorandum #4) of the project scope of work. The graphics referenced in this memorandum are attached as Appendix A. The parts of the memo include:

- Description of Alternatives
- Transportation Evaluation
- Natural Resource Evaluation
- Archeological Resources Evaluation

The key goal for this memorandum is to present basic choices for the direction of the plan. These include fundamental elements such as: land use, street, and trail frameworks; general locations for neighborhood focal points; village centers; preliminary layout of medium and low density residential use; and the types of industrial and commercial uses in the west part of the study area.

At this stage of the process (Task 4), the objective is to build consensus for a preferred plan of the above-listed elements. With that established, the project will then address implementation, zoning, and other more detailed aspects of the South Albany Area Plan.

Description of Alternatives

The following figures comprise the plan set for the Land Use and Transportation System Alternatives (see Appendix A):

- Land Use and Neighborhood Framework
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- Street Framework Concept
- Trails Framework Concept
- Concept Alternative 1
- Concept Alternative 2
- Community Park – Alternative Sites
- Elementary School – Alternative Sites
- Lochner Realignment and Land Use Options

Each of the above are discussed below.

Land Use and Neighborhood Framework
The Land Use and Neighborhood Framework establishes the broad pattern for great neighborhoods, employment growth, and open space in South Albany. With 40-60 years of residential growth capacity in the study area, the clear identification of this framework is essential to fulfilling the project’s vision over the long term. The key components of the Land Use and Transportation Framework are described below.

Neighborhoods
Residential land use is organized into a series of neighborhoods that are approximately ¼ mile from center to edge (a comfortable 5-10 minute walk). The neighborhoods are intended to implement Albany’s Great Neighborhoods principles, policies, and standards, as tailored to South Albany. Walkable neighborhood design, a variety of housing, local parks and open spaces, and community uses are all part of the vision for the neighborhoods shown on the framework plan.

Neighborhood Focal Points
Neighborhood focal points are identified as Neighborhood Park/Community Facility. The location of these nodes reflects community input that the areas near Oak Creek are important for public and open space uses. The Trails Framework illustrates how these focal points are connected with other areas of the plan. The focal points are conceptually located. They will serve as guidance during future planning, development review, and plan implementation.

Regional Commercial and Employment Areas
The existing Regional Commercial site (the “piano” property) is shown as part of the framework. Zoning-related land use and design recommendations will be explored later in the process. The lands currently designated Industrial, and the Urban Reserve site east of the piano property, are designated as employment lands, based on recommendations in the market analysis and support shown by the community in the first public workshop. These job-supporting sites are important to the city as a whole. They also provide local job opportunities that help make South Albany a complete community.
Open Spaces
Oak Creek is a central feature of the framework, both geographically and from a community design perspective. It is envisioned as the “front door” of South Albany – integrated with, and accessible to, the community. The framework shows the various types of open space and resources that have been identified in the process: significant wetlands, riparian corridors, 100-year floodplain, Open Space zoning, utility corridors, and the oak groves. There is an extensive pattern of non-significant wetlands that are not shown on the land use framework.

The spatial pattern of the above-listed open spaces, and how they might be linked together, has been considered in preparing the other plans and alternatives in this memorandum.

Community Park
The City of Albany owns 27 acres east of Lochner Road for the purpose of a future community park. The park has been slightly reshaped to work with the conceptual street framework. The City has indicated that the park could be relocated – two Community Park alternatives are discussed later in this memorandum and shown in Appendix A.

Street Framework Concept
The Street Framework illustrates how the neighborhoods and employment areas of South Albany can be connected by future streets. The framework includes arterial, collector and “connector” streets – additional local streets will be included but are not shown at the framework level.

A transportation evaluation of the plan alternatives, including the Street Framework, is discussed later in this memo and in a separate memorandum prepared by Kittelson and Associates.

Key features of the Street Framework include:

- The arterial and collector streets (Highway 99E, 53rd-Ellingson Roads, Lochner Road, and Columbus Street are planned per the recommendations in Albany’s Transportation System Plan (TSP).
- Transportation system improvements outside of the study area are also planned per the recommendations of the TSP.
- All connector streets and intersections on the framework are conceptual and guiding. They are the recommended corridors and “point A to point B” connections for the plan. They have been drawn to implement the vision and plan objectives for South Albany, linking land use, transportation and open space. Site-specific location and design of these streets will be determined in future planning and development review.
- The connectors on the Street Framework Concept are assumed to be two lane streets.
**Heather Hansen and Greg Byrne**  
*South Albany Area Plan – Land Use and Transportation System Alternatives*  
*February 9, 2012*

- Two east-west connectors are provided between Ellingson Road and Oak Creek. These two-lane streets provide parallel routes to Ellingson Road and inter-neighborhood connectivity. They connect important designations in each of the neighborhoods: neighborhood focal points, village centers, the community park, Seven Mile Lane, etc.

- The connector street that parallels Oak Creek on the creek’s south side is Oak Creek Parkway. This two lane street connects five neighborhood focal points. It is the southern edge of the Oak Creek Transition Area. Where feasible, it will be an actual physical edge to the flood plain, or other undeveloped parts of the Oak Creek Greenway – this is intended as recommended and guiding, not mandatory.

- The minimum intersection spacing along Lochner Road and Columbus Street is 800 feet.

- A Lochner Road to Columbus Street connection is made north of Oak Creek, consistent with the TSP. This street is purposefully shown north of the Gerig historic home site – this property is an opportunity for a history museum or other use honoring its past. The potential street connection should support, not negatively impact, this site.

- In the Employment areas south of Ellingson Road, a series of loop connections north of the open space indicates a street pattern supportive of a business park. For the PepsiCo property, the perimeter street pattern is intended as supportive of larger lot industrial uses.

- Two alternatives for the realignment of Lochner Road are discussed in this memorandum and shown in Appendix A.

- The minimum intersection spacing along Ellingson Road is a key issue requiring further study, as discussed below.

**Ellingson Road Intersections**

Key questions for refining the street framework along Ellingson Road are: Where should “full movement” intersections be placed, and what should be the design (signals, roundabouts)? Where are “right-in/right-out” intersections a good solution? Where should access be limited?

To answer the above-listed questions, the following issues should be considered:

a. Allowing for convenient and safe movements across the corridor in order to effectively link land uses to the north and south.

b. The spacing of intersections that will balance distribution of traffic with good east-west mobility.

c. Providing safe pedestrian and bike crossings that align with the planned trails and support the walkability goals for the community.

d. Planning for a landscaped center median along Ellingson (that includes stormwater and water quality features).
e. How the intersection spacing will influence the 20-year and build-out cross-section, i.e. whether a 3-lane cross-section will work (as opposed to 5 lanes).

f. How the intersection spacing will help support retaining all of the neighborhood streets as 2-lane, walkable streets.

g. Setting the stage for future transit.

h. Limiting access along the grade-separated sections of the 53rd extension.

i. Access to the Business Park.

The project team will prepare intersection spacing and design options for review by the Committees.

**Trails Framework Concept**

One of the key outcomes of the first community workshop was the strong support for trails in South Albany. The Trails Framework combines this vision with the Land Use and Streets Frameworks to create a network of trails and support the goal of a walkable community. Specific trail elements include:

- Trail connections between all key destinations and focal points within the study area, forming a network of direct and convenient routes for walking.

- Trails lead to: neighborhood parks, a future elementary school site, the community park, Oak Creek (six crossings), the Gerig historic property, the oak groves, the village centers, the freeway lakes, Mennonite Village (present and future phases), and employment lands.

- The trail network provides opportunities for varying loops ranging from a 10 minute stroll within a neighborhood to a 4-mile hike encircling Oak Creek.

- All trails from the Transportation System Plan (TSP) are included, including the Oak Creek trail. The TSP routes are supplemented by many other trails, both on-street and off-street.

- Trails are planned within the power line rights-of-way.

- The trails shown paralleling the railroad rights-of-way are assumed to be: outside of the right-of-way; fenced from the railroad, and buffered from adjacent land uses.

- The trail connection at Highway 99E near Oak Creek (northwest corner of study area) is an opportunity for an undercrossing at the Oak Creek bridge.

**Concept Alternatives 1 and 2**

Two illustrative plan alternatives (of many possible combinations) have been prepared that show land uses combined with the framework plans described above. The land use elements added are the village centers, medium density residential, low density residential, industrial park (large lot and
business park), light industrial, heavy industrial, regional commercial, and neighborhood commercial. In addition, an overlay called the “Oak Creek Transition Area” is included. For the purposes of housing and population estimates, each alternative is assumed to have 75 percent of its non-significant wetlands mitigated and developed. The two alternatives differ in the distribution of the village centers, and the design of medium density residential uses and civic uses near the centers. This “transect” of land use is intended to activate the centers, organize the housing choices, meet housing needs identified in the market study, and support future transit.

The alternatives show broad patterns of land use integrated with transportation. In the next task of the project, implementing regulations and guidelines will be prepared. These may include changes to existing zoning, cluster development options, planned developments, etc.

**Residential – Low Density**

This designation provides a variety of low density detached and attached (duplexes) housing types at approximately five dwellings per acre. Approximately 65 percent of dwelling units would be low density, occupying approximately 78 percent of buildable residential land.

Example uses: single family homes, cottage homes, duplexes

**Residential – Medium Density**

This designation provides a variety of detached and attached housing types. The maximum density for apartments would be set at 20 dwelling units per acre, per the market analysis. The average density across all housing types would be 12.7 dwelling units per acre. Approximately 35 percent of dwelling units would be medium density, occupying approximately 22 percent of buildable residential land.

Example uses: cottage homes, tri-plexes, townhomes, apartments, condominiums, live-work units

**Village Center**

This designation would implement, in part, the village center designation in the Comprehensive Plan. The village center areas on the alternatives are intended for neighborhood serving retail, personal services, and community uses. The village centers comprise a total of 10 acres.

Example uses: grocery store, coffee shop, day care, civic center, library

The village center locations shown on the alternatives are based on input received at the first public workshop. There were many suggested locations, with an overall theme of providing multiple small centers serving the neighborhoods in South Albany.

Alternative 1 has a 5-acre center located at the intersection of Lochner and Ellingson Road. Two 2-acre centers are provided on Ellingson Road and the west side of Lochner Road. A one-acre center is provided at Mennonite Village.
Alternative 2 has two centers, approximately 4 acres each, located along the 53rd extension and Columbus Street (west and east sides). Two smaller centers, at approximately 1-acre each, are located on Lochner Road and at Mennonite Village.

**Neighborhood Commercial**
Properties currently zoned neighborhood commercial along Highway 99E are shown as neighborhood commercial on the alternatives.

Example uses: retail serving nearby businesses, Linn-Benton Community College, and neighborhoods west of Highway 99E

**Regional Commercial**
The 36-acre “piano” property is currently zoned Regional Commercial and shown as such on the alternatives.

Example uses: large format retail, regional shopping center, residential above or attached to a business

For this memorandum, the uses and development standards of RC site are not addressed. They will be discussed in Task 6 of the project.

**Industrial Uses**

**Industrial-Large Lot**
This designation reflects the market analysis recommendation to provide large lot sites for industrial uses. The concept is to retain the same or similar zoning as the current Industrial Park designation. While large lot industrial is a need, it is assumed flexibility would be retained to locate a range of employment uses in this area.

Example uses: manufacturing, regional warehousing

**Industrial-Business Park**
This designation is consistent with the market analysis findings for light industrial uses and medium sized sites in the area. Located south of the 53rd Extension, the site is a logical addition to the employment-oriented land on the west side of the study area. The business park would be a more compatible neighbor to the adjacent neighborhoods than other industrial uses. Development would have more of a campus setting than other industrial areas. It should be designed to create flexibility for parcels to be combined or divided to accommodate a diversity of users.

Example uses: assembly and light manufacturing within enclosed buildings, flex space, offices

**Industrial-Light and Heavy**
The pattern of Light Industrial and Heavy Industrial zoning has been included on the alternatives.

Example uses: manufacturing
Compatibility Measures
The following are initial ideas for promoting compatibility between the industrial properties and adjacent areas:

a. Continue the City’s current development review practices for conditional uses and review for environmental performance for some industrial uses.

b. Establish design guidelines for the east edge of the Industrial-Business Park site so it has appropriate landscaping, signage, building design, and other features.

c. To the extent possible, locate mitigation sites and stormwater features in the areas between industrial use and other uses to create a green buffer.

d. Increase setbacks when adjacent to residential uses.

e. Promote “good neighbor agreements” that are based on dialogue between area businesses and their neighborhoods. This is a non-regulatory approach intended to identify compatibility ideas based on a working relationship between industry and the community.

Community Park
The City-owned community park site is included on the plan. Per the Albany Park and Recreation Masterplan, this site is planned “…to provide space for other facilities (soccer/football fields, skate park) and to make certain facilities (picnic pavilion, community scale play area) more geographically accessible to residents living in this part of the City”.

Example uses: sports fields, skatepark

Oak Creek Transition Area
An “Oak Creek Transition Area” is shown on Concept Alternatives 1 and 2. Several key findings from Tasks 1-3 support this recommendation. They are:

- The vision statement cites Oak Creek as the “front yard” of the community.
- An “Oak Creek Greenway” is identified in the plan objectives. The Greenway is intended as integrating public and private open space, providing multiple benefits, being physically and visually accessible, having a multitude of public connections at its edge, including continuous east-west pathways, and connecting north-south pathways.
- The “edge” of buildable land versus unbuildable land is not a hard edge that can be mapped with certainty. It will be highly influenced by future wetland delineations, and state and federal decisions regarding permitting of wetland modifications and mitigation. On the ground, the process of site specific design and permitting – with resultant establishment of the Oak Creek Greenway edge – will occur over many, many years.
There are challenges to integrated planning, such as (a) protecting natural resources versus economic use of property, (b) the reality of multiple property ownership spread over a large area, and, (c) both private companies and public agencies may have plans and policies that potentially conflict with the SAAP.

Given the above, the alternatives seek to create a balance of: (1) certainty for the vision for Oak Creek; and, (2) flexibility to address unknowns and long term implementation. The Oak Creek Transition Area is the proposed concept and tool to strike that balance. The Transition Area includes approximately 63 acres of land outside of constrained lands (e.g. Open Space zoning, significant wetlands).

The following describes the proposed Oak Creek Transition Area.

a. Purpose - The purpose of the Oak Creek Transition Area is to guide development review and more detailed planning for the transitional edge of the Oak Creek Greenway. The Greenway is intended to integrate open space areas, both public and private, near Oak Creek. Per the Plan Objectives, the Greenway will:

- Be the centerpiece of the South Albany open space system, providing multiple benefits: wetland protection and mitigation, habitat, flood storage, pathways, recreation, archaeological and historic resources, environmental education, and visual identity for the area;
- Be South Albany’s “front yard” - physically and visually accessible to adjacent development;
- Include “Oak Creek Parkway” (an east-west street), and other public uses
- Include a continuous east-west pathway, and other pathways that connect north and south to community destinations; and
- Have a multitude of public connection (parks, trails, trailheads, visual, etc.) between “Oak Creek Parkway” (an east-west street) and the public edge of the Greenway.

b. Preferred Uses - The Transition Area is the preferred location for neighborhood parks, community facilities, the elementary school, wetland mitigation areas, storm-water facilities, community gardens, and other community-oriented and open space uses.

c. Uses in Base Zone Permitted - The “preferred” uses listed above are guiding, not binding. In addition to the preferred uses, the transition area may be developed for uses permitted by the base zoning, where development is allowed by the comprehensive plan, development code, and state/federal permitting. All development would be required to meet the City’s standards and design guidelines.
d. Design Review - All development in the transition area would undergo design review. A new Transition Area Overlay or similar tool would be created. Design review would ensure that the purposes of the Greenway are met by proposed development. The standards and guidelines would ensure that development does not “wall off” Oak Creek. Industrial and other non-neighborhood areas will be addressed on a case-by-case basis, with standards and guidelines tailored to their needs.

e. Oak Creek Parkway - The east-west connector street south of Oak Creek is Oak Creek Parkway. The alignment shown is conceptual – the specific alignment will be established in future planning or development review. It is preferred, but not mandatory, that the Parkway be located at the interface of the developed area and open area. This will place residential and other neighborhood uses to the south of the Parkway and the “preferred” open space and community uses listed above to the north.

f. Oak Creek Trail - A continuous east-west pathway is planned to parallel Oak Creek within the transition area. Other trails will be also be provided per the Trails Framework Concept.

g. Historic and Archeological Resources - Historic resources, such as the Gerig home site, are included in the transition area to assist with their preservation as an honored part of the area’s heritage and integrated part of its future. The Transition Area also encompasses much of the area with potential for archeological resources.

In addition to the design review recommended above, Annexation Agreements may also be a tool to help achieve the vision for Oak Creek. Annexation agreements are a tool used by the City to ensure that the proposed annexation is in the public interest. The terms of annexation agreements may include, but are not limited to, dedication of land for future public facilities, construction of public improvements, waiver of compensation claims, or other commitments and public benefits deemed valuable to the City of Albany. The agreement is recorded as a covenant running with the land.

The key to long term success for the Oak Creek vision is that it does not rely solely on regulation. There should be a combined, collaborative effort of public investments, land owner initiatives, pilot projects, wetland banking/coordinated permitting, and community involvement that collectively help implement the plan.

Community Park - Alternative Sites

Two sites for a future community park are shown on the plan titled Community Park – Alternative Sites.

Site 1 is the city’s existing 27-acre site east of Lochner Road. This property has several assets: it is in public ownership, flat, and has good access from Lochner Road. Adjacent lands are currently undeveloped, but would eventually be residential and a village center. At 27 acres, Site 1 is a relatively large individual use within its neighborhood. It would provide a signature open space, but would also disrupt the continuity of the street and block pattern within the neighborhood.
Site 2 is located north of Oak Creek along Lochner Road. This property is also flat and has good access from Lochner Road. It is privately owned (Irwin Gehrig). Adjacent uses are residential (east), vacant (north, the GAPS property), and industrial/youth correction center (west). The presence of the historic Gerig home site creates a unique opportunity to combine the community park with the historic site. A history museum or “living farm” could be located adjacent to the park, expanding its attraction and perceived acreage. The utility corridor at the north end of Site 2 provides a trail connection over to Columbus Street.

Elementary School – Alternative Sites
An elementary school is part of the future land uses anticipated for South Albany. One elementary is potentially needed within the 20-year time, and a second may be needed for growth beyond the 20-year timeframe. Eight potential alternative sites have been identified and mapped on the plan titled Elementary School – Alternative Sites. Sites 4, 6, and 7 provide the best implementation of the Oak Creek Transition Area concept and are therefore labeled as recommended. Good access to the transportation system and adjacent neighborhoods are important considerations for the school site.

Lochner Road Realignment Alternatives
The potential for a realignment of Lochner Road and its connection to Marion Street was identified by the City. The plan titled Lochner Realignment and Land Use Options shows how land uses might be organized around this realignment. The realignment would support expansion of industrial land use with rail access to the east of the Sno-Temp property and substantially reduce the cost of arterial street and infrastructure improvements needed to serve the area.

Transportation Evaluation - Summary
A transportation evaluation for the alternatives has been prepared by Kittelson and Associates – please see memorandum dated January 25, 2012. The following is a summary of the conclusions from the memorandum, with comments from City staff incorporated. There are several recommended transportation facilities and improvements for the study area based on the two concept alternatives, described below.

The plans for the extension of 53rd Avenue and Ellingson Road include a three-lane cross section. There is a potential need for a future five-lane cross-section, but this needs further analysis in the next phase of the SAAP. Full build-out of the study area may make a five-lane cross section necessary; however three-lanes are anticipated to be adequate for the 20 year horizon depending on how development concentrates around the study area. The traffic volumes assumed in the TSP reflect approximately one-third of the full development potential of the study area. Full build-out will likely require additional roadways, such as Columbus Street and the Ellingson Road Extension, to also need five-lanes. This will be further analyzed in the next phase of the project.
Relocating the Lochner Road-Marion Street connection to just south of the large industrial parcels should be considered. It has the potential to eliminate an existing railroad crossing of the spur line, allow for additional spur access to the undeveloped industrial property on Lochner Road, provide a more cost effective way to improve the Lochner-to-Marion Street connection, and reduce the infrastructure costs needed for development.

The proposed concept alternatives will both add significant traffic to the intersections in the study area, which could require intersection treatments, particularly at the un-signalized intersections. Roundabouts should be the first intersection design considered at several intersections, particularly at the Columbus Street/Ellingson Road and Lochner Road/Ellingson Road intersections. In addition to the safety and capacity benefits that roundabouts often have over traffic signals, roundabouts would provide the area with better bicycle and pedestrian connections between land uses on opposite sides of corridors. Roundabouts also have the advantage of being able to be installed during the early stages of development in an area, while construction of traffic signals generally need to be delayed until development in the area is dense enough for traffic volumes to meet MUTCD signal warrants. Single-lane or multi-lane roundabouts may be able to serve the traffic volumes at these intersections and provide operational and safety benefits. Single-lane roundabouts can service up to 25,000 vehicles per day, while multi-lane roundabouts can typically service up to 45,000 vehicles per day. The next phase of the project will provide more details on the specific intersections needs for 2030 and for build-out of the area.

A series of trails have been proposed for the study area, illustrated in the Trails Framework Concept. These trails serve to connect residential areas to neighborhood parks and community facilities. They also provide connections to bike lanes and sidewalks proposed in the TSP for the 53rd Extension, Ellingson Road, Columbus Street, and Lochner Road. These trails, bike lanes, and sidewalks will significantly enhance pedestrian and bicycle connectivity. Additional bicycle treatments, such as bicycle boulevards, bicycle signals or intersection treatments could also be considered.

Transit service could be extended to the study area, which is currently only served by routes along 99E. The study area will be transit supportive at build-out; however, if development occurs in an unconcentrated manor over the next 20 years, it may not be transit supportive by 2030. If development is concentrated around one or two village centers, transit supportive areas are possible by 2030. Service currently runs along Columbus Street to Del Rio Avenue. This service could be continued further down Columbus Street to Ellingson Road to serve residential areas and village centers in these areas. The concept alternatives concentrate residential developing along the 53rd Avenue Extension and Ellingson Road, making this also a likely route for transit. A bus route along Ellingson Road and 53rd Avenue could connect to any of the three routes currently running along 99E. Transit stops along the Ellingson Road and 53rd Avenue corridor should be designed with turn outs to avoid impacting the capacity of the corridor.
Natural Resource Evaluation - Summary

A natural resource evaluation for the alternatives has been prepared by Mason, Bruce and Girard – please see memorandum dated January 19, 2012. The following is a summary of the conclusions from the memorandum, with comments from City staff incorporated.

In order to minimize impacts to sensitive natural resources while also meeting the land use and transportation goals of the City of Albany, the SAAP alternatives have taken into consideration the locations of significant wetlands, Oak tree groves and the Oak Creek riparian corridor. The SAAP provides a strategic, collaborative approach to land use planning by locating community centers, schools, neighborhoods and principal roadways and trails outside of sensitive natural resources to the degree practical. This is a good approach to integrating environmental and development objectives. Without it, the area would likely experience a small, piece meal development approach that typically results in larger impacts to sensitive resources.

The SAAP recognizes that the Oak Creek corridor is significant natural resource and a focal point for recreation and community sustainability for the residents of the area. The SAAP has identified a trail network that incorporates trails that parallel much of the length of the corridor to provide recreational opportunities and direct access to the corridor for residents. To the greatest extent practical, proposed trail alignments have been located outside of wetlands with the goal of preserving the continuity of these sensitive areas within the study area. The SAAP also identifies several trail and road crossings of the Oak Creek corridor. Where possible, the locations of crossings have been selected to take advantage of the narrowest points of the corridor and to provide important connections between community centers. Future planning of new crossings should be conducted to maintain the integrity of the riparian area by minimizing the number of future crossings and selecting crossing locations at the narrowest points of the corridor. When crossings are necessary, utilizing perpendicular road/trail alignments, retaining walls to minimize fill, boardwalks for trails, and full-span bridges over stream crossings will minimize habitat disturbances and impacts to the fluvial dynamics of Oak Creek. Stormwater management should also be incorporated as development of the transportation system and residential areas is expanded so that water quality and quantity conditions in Oak Creek and its tributaries can be maintained or improved.

Other resource-related planning efforts by the City will affect how development occurs in South Albany, such as (a) the regional general permit for wetland mitigation for the PepsiCo property (part of a regional efforts coordinated by the Council of Governments), and (b) the new water quality regulations that will be adopted as part of the NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) Phase 2 process. The new standards related to water quality and NPDES will be developed over the next year.

The SAAP alternatives also take into consideration the locations of significant wetlands for the co-location of schools, trails, community centers, and roadways. Many of the wetlands immediately adjacent to the Oak Creek corridor will be maintained and all of the wetlands designated significant by the City will be protected except for those impacts allowed through Goal 5 “ESEE” review.
The Oak Creek corridor, existing significant wetlands, and other wetlands that currently function as agricultural land provide significant opportunities for on-site wetland mitigation through restoration or enhancement of existing wetlands or direct wetland creation. The study area is also located within the service area for several wetland mitigation banks that can provide additional mitigation for those elements of the SAAP that impact wetlands.

In addition, the SAAP does take into account the need for an additional setback or buffer from the Oak Creek corridor by focusing the majority of future land development actions away from Oak Creek. Potential Oak Creek buffer/setbacks should be maintained during future planning in order to facilitate development and planning of natural transitional areas between the Oak Creek corridor and proposed developments. The proposed Oak Creek Greenway will also serve as an important transitional area between proposed developments and Oak Creek. The Greenway has the potential to preserve open space areas and provide recreational opportunities while also providing protection to wetlands and the Oak Creek riparian area. In addition to the Greenway, existing breaks in topography (e.g., old stream banks or channels) and distinct abrupt changes in vegetation (e.g., forested edges along agricultural fields) should be utilized to define additional transitional areas between habitats where possible to increase the organic aesthetic nature of the area. If feasible, existing wetland and waterway location data (LWI, City of Albany, 1999) should be updated or modified to clearly reflect the contemporary conditions within the study area. A compilation of existing jurisdictional wetland/waters delineations would allow for a better estimate of potential impacts within the study area. Furthermore, additional delineations will be required on an individual site basis as land uses are proposed and developed throughout the study area.

The significant oak tree groves within the study area may be small and discontinuous in comparison to the continuous forested vegetation of the Oak Creek corridor; nonetheless, they may provide a specialized niche for sensitive species. Existing significant oak tree groves outside the Oak Creek corridor should be considered for protection through incentives built into the development review process. Botanical surveys are also recommended within the limits of any proposed development alternatives associated with the SAAP. These surveys will need to be conducted during the appropriate flowering window for the sensitive species discussed above to confirm their presence or absence. Prior to initiating any development alternatives associated with the SAAP that may impact sections of Oak Creek, it is recommended that additional fish and amphibian surveys be conducted to determine detailed fish and amphibian distribution within the study area.

The following are suggested conservation measures to reduce impacts to sensitive wildlife, plant, and fish species. It is not assumed these would be regulations. They are intended as ideas to be considered in the implementation of the plan.

- Clearly identify sensitive wildlife, plant, and fish habitats in the field prior to development.
- Improve degraded wildlife habitat or abandoned agricultural areas within the proposed project areas with new plantings of native species. Introduce native shrub and tree species that provide cover and food sources for wildlife during landscaping. Mitigation plantings would include a diverse assemblage of species native to the proposed project areas.
Monitor all new mitigation and restoration areas until they meet compliance criteria established by applicable environmental permits.

Incorporate noxious weed removal and management into any future proposed actions.

Restrict tree removal activities to between September 30 and March 1 to avoid conflicts with nesting migratory birds in compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA).

Archeological Evaluation

One of the objectives of project design is to avoid impacts to archaeological resources and historic sites to the fullest extent feasible. Although only a portion of the study area had been previously surveyed for archaeological resources, the results of those studies were used to identify a zone of archaeological potential that overlaps to a great extent with wetlands and with the Oak Creek Transition Area.

While the concept design succeeds in minimizing impacts from residential development and village centers, even the creation or modification of recreation areas, wetland mitigation areas, and other recreational and habitat enhancements can result in the disturbance or destruction of an archaeological site through earth-moving activities. For example, a majority of the neighborhood park facilities are situated in the zone of archaeological potential in the Oak Creek-wetland transition area in order to take advantage of the recreational opportunities afforded by the open spaces of the wetlands. If archaeological sites can be identified through field survey early in the planning process, they can likely be avoided and protected to a great extent through design adjustments.

Overall, more than one-third of the proposed planning area has been previously surveyed for cultural resources, which will enable avoidance measures to be implemented on those parcels. It is recommended that the remainder of the project be surveyed for archaeological resources in concert with the early stages of design. An archaeological management plan should be developed to outline efficient means of surveying area parcels and for identifying specific options for the treatment of identified archaeological sites.

In addition to archaeological sites, three potentially significant historic properties were identified in the project area: (1) 6732 Seven Mile Way, (2) 6061 Columbia Street, and (3) 3795 Lochner Road. These three properties have been identified from a records review, and have not been investigated to verify the age, condition, or significance of structures on the properties, but these sites are potentially important as they all date to the nineteenth century. In particular, the assessor’s database identifies the year built for 3795 Lochner Road as 1860 which would make it of particular significance. Properties from the 1800s are becoming increasingly rare in Oregon as structures become more fragile through weathering and difficulties with maintenance. For those historic structures that can survive and even be rehabilitated, they can become anchor points for historic parks—such as the Dorris Ranch Living History Filbert Farm in Lane County—providing broad-reaching opportunities to the community for education, recreation, and historic interpretation.
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Lochner Realignment and Land Use Options
MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 19, 2012

TO: Joe Dills, Otak Inc.

FROM: Mark Hynson, Jenny McKay and Alexis Casey; MB&G

SUBJECT: South Area Albany Plan Alternatives, Draft Project Memorandum #4 – Land Use and Transportation System Alternatives

A. Introduction

This memo is intended to provide a review of existing environmental constraints within the South Area Albany Plan (SAAP) as identified in Project Memorandum #2 (MB&G 2011) and provides a summary analysis of how the proposed SAAP Alternatives take into consideration the principal environmental constraints of the Project Study Area (PSA). In addition, this memorandum provides recommendations and conservation measures to be considered in future planning efforts to protect sensitive environmental resources within the PSA.

B. Overview of Existing Environmental Constraints

In general, the PSA has experienced significant historic alterations to the natural landscape resulting from highway and road construction, agricultural practices and some industrial development. However, the PSA also includes the Oak Creek riparian corridor which has the potential to support a number of different sensitive species and allows for educational and recreational opportunities to the residents of South Albany.

Sensitive Wildlife Species: Based upon records searches conducted during the development of Project Memorandum #2, two sensitive wildlife species have the potential to occur within the PSA – the Northern Pacific pond turtle and painted turtle. The Oak Creek riparian area appears to serve as a valuable wildlife corridor for these species because it is relatively intact and provides connectivity to other habitats in an otherwise fragmented environment. This corridor is most likely utilized by wildlife for travel between undeveloped areas located east and west of the PSA.

Sensitive Botanical Species: Five sensitive botanical species have the potential to occur within the PSA – Nelson’s checkermallow, Kincaid’s lupine, thin-leaved peavine, Howell’s montia, and meadow checkermallow. Most areas within the PSA have undergone disturbances to habitat that likely limit the ability for sensitive plants to be present (e.g., agricultural cultivation, suburban development, etc.).
However, the riparian corridor surrounding Oak Creek provides potentially suitable habitat for these sensitive species due to its continuity and structure.

**Sensitive Fisheries:** Four sensitive fish species – bull trout, Oregon chub, steelhead, and Chinook salmon - were identified as potentially occurring within 2 miles of the PSA; however, none of these species are known to occur within the segment of Oak Creek that traverses the PSA. The Calapooia River, located approximately 1.5 miles downstream of the PSA, has been mapped as critical habitat for steelhead and Chinook salmon. In addition, occurrences of these sensitive species have been documented downstream of the confluence of Oak Creek and the Calapooia River. As such, the Calapooia River and the Oak Creek riparian corridor appear to serve as important habitat for sensitive fish species.

**Habitat Communities:** The PSA contains eight habitat communities based on Johnson and O’Neil (2001) habitat conditions. Three of the largest groups include Agriculture, Pastures, and Mixed Environments; Agricultural Lands with herbaceous wetland inclusions; and Westside Riparian Wetlands. The Lakes, Rivers, Ponds, and Reservoirs and Westside Oak Woodlands habitat communities occupy much smaller portions of the PSA.

- The Agriculture, Pastures and Mixed Environments habitat community is the dominant habitat type within the PSA and includes a broad range of agricultural uses including mowed, hayed and grazed fields, and associated structures including fences, roadsides, field borders, barns, outbuildings, and silos. This habitat type is not considered high quality habitat for sensitive wildlife or botanical species due to the amount of extensive ground disturbance associated with agricultural activities and frequent human presence.

- Agricultural lands with herbaceous wetland inclusions are the second most common habitat type in the PSA and likely do not support sensitive species within the PSA. They are also considered to be low quality habitat due to ongoing agricultural activities and frequent human disturbances common to this habitat. However, if these areas are managed as herbaceous wetland (abandoned from agriculture), they have the potential to support such sensitive species as the Northern Pacific pond turtle, the painted turtle and Nelson’s checkermallow.

- The Westside Riparian Wetlands habitat community is associated with the Oak Creek riparian corridor that extends across the northern portion of the PSA, as well as the riparian area associated with the tributary of Oak Creek located in the southwestern portion of the PSA. This community includes those wetlands identified as ‘Significant Wetlands’ in the SAAP. This habitat community may provide high quality habitat for sensitive species due to its connectivity and structure. Species such as the Northern Pacific pond turtle, the painted turtle, and Howell’s montia; along with sensitive fish species have the potential to be present within this habitat type within the PSA.

- The Lakes, Rivers, Ponds, and Reservoirs habitat community is associated with stream channels and open water areas such as Oak Creek, tributaries to Oak Creek, Freeway Lakes adjacent to Interstate 5, agricultural ponds and ornamental ponds in commercial and urban settings. Oak Creek and Freeway Lakes are considered to be of higher ecological value within this habitat type and may support sensitive amphibian and fish species and sensitive plants such as Howell’s montia.

- The PSA encompasses several significant oak tree groves located outside the Oak Creek corridor. This Westside Oak Woodlands habitat community is located in small discontinuous pockets within the PSA and is dominated by deciduous broadleaf trees or a
mixture of deciduous and coniferous species with moderately drained soils and water availability. Although significant oak tree woodlands demonstrate valuable habitat due to their rarity within the PSA, segmentation of this habitat type has diminished its overall ecological value. These habitats have the potential to support sensitive plant species such as Nelson’s checkermallow, Kincaid’s lupine, and thin-leaved peavine within the PSA. The above-cited habitat values are noted from an ecological perspective. The Oak Woodlands provide other qualities for the area, including aesthetic qualities and an identity with the iconic landscapes of the Willamette Valley.

C. Alternatives Plan Analysis and Recommendations

In order to minimize impacts to sensitive natural resources while also meeting the Land Use and Transportation Goals of the City of Albany, the SAAP has taken into consideration the locations of significant wetlands, Oak tree groves and the Oak Creek riparian corridor. The SAAP provides a strategic, collaborative approach to land use planning by locating community centers, schools, neighborhoods and principal roadways and trails outside of sensitive natural resources to the degree practical. This type of land use planning is a good approach to integrating environmental and development objectives. Without it, the area would likely experience a small, piece meal development approach that typically results in larger impacts to sensitive resources.

The SAAP recognizes that the Oak Creek corridor is significant natural resource and a focal point for recreation and community sustainability for the residents of the area. The SAAP has identified a trail network that incorporates trails that parallel much of the length of the corridor to provide recreational opportunities and direct access to the corridor for residents. To the greatest extent practical, proposed trail alignments have been located outside of wetlands with the goal of preserving the continuity of these sensitive areas within the PSA. The SAAP also identifies several trail and road crossings of the Oak Creek corridor. Where possible, the locations of crossings have been selected to take advantage of the narrowest points of the corridor and to provide important connections between community centers. Future planning of new crossings should be conducted to maintain the integrity of the riparian area by minimizing the number of future crossings and selecting crossing locations at the narrowest points of the corridor. When crossings are necessary, utilizing perpendicular road/trail alignments, retaining walls to minimize fill, boardwalks for trails, and full-span bridges over stream crossings will minimize habitat disturbances and impacts to the fluvial dynamics of Oak Creek. Stormwater management should also be incorporated as development of the transportation system and residential areas is expanded so that water quality and quantity conditions in Oak Creek and its tributaries can be maintained or improved.

The SAAP plan also takes into consideration the locations of significant wetlands for the co-location of schools, trails, community centers and roadways. Many of the wetlands immediately adjacent to the Oak Creek corridor will be maintained and all of the wetlands designated significant by the City will be protected. The Oak Creek corridor, existing significant wetlands and other wetlands that currently function as agricultural land provide significant opportunities for on-site wetland mitigation through restoration or enhancement of existing wetlands or direct wetland creation. The PSA is also located within the service area for several wetland mitigation banks that can provide additional mitigation for those elements of the SAAP that impact wetlands.

In addition, the SAAP does take into account the need for an additional setback or buffer from the Oak Creek corridor by focusing the majority of future land development actions away for Oak Creek. Potential Oak Creek buffer/setbacks should be maintained during future planning in order to facilitate development and planning of natural transitional areas between the Oak Creek...
corridor and proposed developments. The proposed Oak Creek Greenway will also serve as an important transitional area between proposed developments and Oak Creek. The Greenway has the potential to preserve open space areas and provide recreational opportunities while also providing protection to wetlands and the Oak Creek riparian area. In addition to the Greenway, existing breaks in topography (e.g., old stream banks or channels) and distinct abrupt changes in vegetation (e.g., forested edges along agricultural fields) should be utilized to define additional transitional areas between habitats where possible to increase the organic aesthetic nature of the area. If feasible, existing wetland and waterway location data (LWI, City of Albany, 1999) should be updated or modified to clearly reflect the contemporary conditions within the PSA. A compilation of existing jurisdictional wetland/waters delineations would allow for a better estimate of potential impacts within the PSA. Furthermore, additional delineations will be required on an individual site basis as land uses are proposed and developed throughout the PSA.

The significant oak tree groves within the PSA may be small and discontinuous in comparison to the continuous forested vegetation of the Oak Creek corridor; nonetheless, they may provide a specialized niche for sensitive species. Any existing significant oak tree groves outside the Oak Creek corridor should be protected using Open Space designations. Botanical surveys are also recommended within the limits of any proposed development alternatives associated with the SAAP. These surveys will need to be conducted during the appropriate flowering window for the sensitive species discussed above to confirm their presence or absence. Prior to initiating any development alternatives associated with the SAAP that may impact sections of Oak Creek, it is recommended that additional fish and amphibian surveys be conducted to determine detailed fish and amphibian distribution within the PSA.

D. Conservation Measures

Recommended conservation measures to reduce impacts to sensitive wildlife, plant and fish species include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Clearly identify sensitive wildlife, plant and fish habitats in the field prior to development.

- Improve degraded wildlife habitat or abandoned agricultural areas within the proposed project areas with new plantings of native species. Introduce native shrub and tree species that provide cover and food sources for wildlife during landscaping. Mitigation plantings would include a diverse assemblage of species native to the proposed project areas.

- Monitor all new mitigation and restoration areas until they meet compliance criteria established by applicable environmental permits.

- Incorporate noxious weed removal and management into any future proposed actions.

- Restrict tree removal activities to between September 30 and March 1 to avoid conflicts with nesting migratory birds in compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA).
The TAC reviewed Memo #4: Land Use and Transportation Alternatives on February 16, 2012. Their comments are listed in text boxes below. The PAC reviewed Memo #4 and the TAC’s input on February 23, 2012. The PAC’s comments follow each TAC text box.

1. Land Use and Neighborhood Framework
   a. Overall, do you support the broad organizational land use framework shown, i.e. the broad pattern of neighborhoods, employment, and open spaces?
   b. What comments, questions and level of support do you have for the neighborhood park/community facility conceptual locations?

   PQ: Support for framework

   PAC:
   • Consensus support for the Land Use and Neighborhood Framework
   • Existing zones will be used as starting point, with refinements and overlays to achieve SAAP recommendations
   • There was a suggestion for looking at recent zoning discussion in Salem in their IBC and IC zones

2. Street Framework – What comments, questions, and level of support do you have for the:
   a. East-west connector streets.
   b. Oak Creek Parkway.
   c. North-South Connectors

   PQ: If the community park site moves, it E-W connectors should be adjusted
   • RR crossings are critical for access to employment lands; Need to have conversation with ODOT-Rail to come to some agreement about crossings that has flexibility to respond to the industrial uses that eventually locate there; Need secondary emergency access to employment lands

   PAC:
   • Overall support by PAC for the Street Framework
   • Proposal from PAC member Wellner to evaluate the number of intersections needed along Ellingson Road between Columbus and Lochner. Proposal requested one less intersection to save costs. Discussion covered varying perspectives: costs, mobility, connectivity, character, access to neighborhoods. One key issue related whether the Community Park is
located at current City-owned site. A straw poll was taken: 10 supported the proposal, 3 did not support it. **Closure:** the PAC decided to forward the option of one less intersection between Columbus and Lochner for technical review during the transportation analysis (Task 6). This will be looked at “with park” and “without park”.

- Proposal from PAC member Wellner to evaluate change of the section of Oak Creek Parkway just west of Columbus. **Closure:** the PAC decided to forward this idea into the technical review during the transportation analysis (Task 6).
- The PAC directed the team to describe the intersection location and types for the intersections along Lochner and Columbus, during transportation analysis.

3. **Ellingson Intersections** – What comments and questions do you have on the options presented? Is there a preferred option that you favor?

| TAC: Prefer Option A *(separate handout at TAC with updated options)* with 3 roundabouts -- Lower maintenance; keeps traffic moving, can accommodate large semis! Serve as ”gateways” to City and South Albany neighborhoods. |

- Consensus support for Option A, utilizing roundabouts.
- Roundabouts should be larger than the one in North Albany. It is undersized.
- The PAC noted that Roundabouts are “scalable” – they can be built as one lane initially, then modified later (if needed) to add lanes on the inside. This is an advantage over signals.
- Further technical work will evaluate the transportation network, and intersections, with both options for the Community Park.
- Question: will the plan prescribe the locations and types of intersections? Answer: Yes.

4. **Trails Framework**
   a. What comments do you have on the Trails Framework?
   b. Are the additions or deletions you would like to see?

| TAC: Variety of trail types that connect at the end is the goal; Trails crossing Oak Creek are likely to be soft trails, except where there are existing bridges; If community park is to the north and school to the south, then a good connection across Oak Creek is needed; Multi-use paths could be on one side of street with no sidewalks on other side should be considered; Desirable to have partnership pay for trails – City and developer; If sidewalk is trail in some sections, it will need to meet city standards for trails. |

- Consensus support for Trails Framework, with concerns to be address:
  - How and where the trails will cross Oak Creek – how many can be feasibly be done considering flooding?
  - Initial concept for which trails are public and which are public.
5. Concept Alternatives 1 and 2  
   a. What comments and questions do you have regarding the options for Village Centers and adjacent medium density residential? Which option do you favor?  
   b. What comments, questions, and level of support do you have for the employment land uses in the western part of the study area?  

   - TAC: Preference for Concept Alternative 1; Walkability to village centers is important;  

   PAC:  
   - **Consensus support** for the Village Centers and adjacent medium and low residential shown on Alternative 1 (more developable and better walk-ability from neighborhoods)  
   - Question: do the Village Centers need to be split by connector roads as shown on the plans?  
     Answer: to be evaluated during Code work.  
   - **Consensus support** for Business Park and Large Lot Industrial recommendations  

6. Oak Creek Transition Area  
   a. What comments, questions or changes do you have regarding the description the Oak Creek Transition Area on pages 8-10 of the February 9 memorandum?  

   - TAC: Support for transition area concept; Uses allowed in the base zone would have a design guideline overlay so objectives are achieved  

   PAC:  
   - **Consensus support** for Transition Area as described on pages 8-10 of the February 9 memorandum.  

7. Community Park Alternatives – What questions and comments do you have? Is there an alternative you favor?  

   - TAC: Pros and cons for each alternative; Soccer fields will be well lit and noisy when in use; May want to try to acquire Site #2 regardless; School can look at co-location; Neighborhood parks are planned as well, this is a regional facility  
   - Site #1: "Bird in the hand" since the City owns it; Could be made available for other uses if needed, but another site is needed; Better transit options; Closer to new South Albany populations  
   - Site #2: More compatible; Preferred over the long-term; Great synergy with possible "heritage farm"; No village center nearby; Fewer conflicts with future residential uses next to the park (traffic, noise, lights), With Site #2 selected, it results in a more cohesive area for neighborhood south of Oak Creek, between Lochner and Columbus  

   PAC:  
   - The PAC identified pros and cons for each alternative.  
   - The PAC was comfortable with carrying forward both alternatives in SAAP, noting pros and cons.  
   - Site #1: City-owned; lots of lights and edge conditions next to future residential uses; may serve as “place-making” use for the neighborhoods south of Oak Creek
• Site #2: concerns with proximity to Youth Corrections Facility; adjacency to the historic farm a positive; With Site #2 selected, it results in a more cohesive area for neighborhood south of Oak Creek, between Lochner and Columbus

8. Elementary School Alternatives
   a. Are there sites you would add or delete?
   b. Are there changes to the “recommended” sites?

   ✓ TAC: #4, #6, #7 are preferred by school district – also in transition area; want mostly walkers to schools; #1 and #2 are not options for school district

   PAC:
   • Consensus support for school sites #4, #6, #7 as the recommended sites.
   • Agreed with points made by school district and TAC
   • Questioned whether slope within Site #6 would be a problem – the team will look at topography

9. Lochner Realignment and Land Use Options
   a. Do you agree with the concept to realign Lochner?
   b. Is there a land use option that you favor?

   ✓ TAC: Support realignment; Prefer Option B. Park would be buffer for industrial to the north.

   PAC:
   • Consensus support for the realignment concept, on the condition that it works for Sno-Temp
   • Staff and Sno-Temp will study the realignment further for pros and cons
   • If land use to the east of Lochner is changed to Industrial, it should be a limited light industrial with minimum impacts and compatibility with adjacent uses.