

Memorandum:

Bend Central District MMA

To: Wendy Robinson, City of Bend

From: Matt Hastie, Andrew Parish, Darci Rudzinski - Angelo Planning Group

Copy: Devin Hearing, Rod Cathcart, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)

Date: January 21, 2014

Re: Tech Memo #6 Summary of Impacts of MMA on Land Use¹, Draft

Overview

This memorandum evaluates the implications of implementing a Bend Central District MMA, within the context of recent work related to the 2007 Bend Central Area Plan (CAP) recommendations. Specifically, the memo explores the relationship of an MMA designation to the multimodal level of service analysis performed for the four CAP transportation options and compares draft zoning language meant to implement a mixed-use Special Plan District with the MMA requirements. Also included is an explanation of the special role Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) has in this particular MMA designation, due to the proximity of two US 97 interchanges.

As explored in Tech Memo #4, an MMA designation may be applied by local governments to downtowns, town centers, main streets, or other areas where the local government determines that there is:

- Potential for high-quality connectivity to and within the area by modes of transportation other than the automobile;
- A denser level of development of a variety of commercial and residential uses than in surrounding areas;
- A desire to encourage these characteristics through development standards; and
- An understanding that increased automobile congestion within and around the MMA is accepted as a potential trade-off.

A Preliminary Preferred MMA Boundary Alternative has been identified that meets these characteristics and is shown in Figure 1. The City continues to solicit input on a potential MMA boundary from community members. For example, participants in the second public workshop conducted for the

¹ This Project is partially funded by a grant from the Transportation and Growth Management (TGM) Program, a joint program of the Oregon Department of Transportation and the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development. This TGM grant is financed, in part, by federal Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21), local government, and the State of Oregon funds.

The contents of this document do not necessarily reflect views or policies of the State of Oregon.

project suggested shifting the eastern edge of the boundary one-half block to the east (between 4th and 5th Streets) and/or possibly shifting the boundary to accommodate additional areas to the north or south. These and/or other changes will be assessed by the project team and a proposed MMA boundary may be refined as the project moves forward. The objectives of the Bend MMA plan include exploring ways to improve connections for people traveling in the area by foot, bike, bus, car or freight truck and refining land use requirements in order to achieve a distinct and vibrant mixed-use district.

To this end, the following topics are addressed in this memorandum:

- An analysis of how an MMA designation may impact the transportation network, based on the four transportation options identified in the 2007 CAP;
- An evaluation of the CAP's proposed new Mixed Use Bend Central zone to determine if amendments are required to implement an MMA, including possible changes to allowed/prohibited uses, achievable residential density, and required urban design standards; and
- Discussion of ODOT's role and additional considerations for designating an MMA boundary within ¼ mile of two US 97 interchanges.

CAP Transportation Options: Multimodal Level of Service Analysis

CAP Transportation Options

Brief descriptions of the transportation options identified in the 2007 BCAP² are provided below and summary conclusions from the multimodal level of service analysis in Tech Memo #5.

CAP Option 1: One-way Couplet using 2nd and 3rd Streets

This option would involve developing a one-way couplet system using 2nd Street as the southbound half and 3rd Street as the northbound half. Widened sidewalks, bicycle lanes, narrowed pedestrian crossings, access management measures, and potential on-street parking would be provided to both 2nd and 3rd Streets. A variation of Option 1 would involve developing a one-way couplet system using 3rd and 4th Streets.

Option 1 provides improved motor vehicle operations at key intersections throughout the study area, moderately improved bicycle level of service, and significantly improved pedestrian level of service on 3rd Street.

CAP Option 2: Expanded Grid

This option would expand the grid system in the area between Revere Avenue on the north and Burnside Avenue on the south, keeping two-way traffic on all streets. This system could include potential widening on 2nd and 4th Streets with traffic signal control or roundabouts at major intersections. Option 2, as analyzed, includes a narrowing of 3rd Street to three travel lanes.

This option provides improved motor vehicle operations as it spreads vehicular traffic among three north-south facilities, improves bicycle level of service on 3rd Street, and significantly improves pedestrian level of service on 3rd Street.

CAP Option 3: One-way Couplet on 2nd and 4th Streets, 2-way Traffic 3rd Street

This option would entail development of a one-way couplet system using 4th Street for northbound traffic and 2nd Street for southbound traffic. Two-way traffic would be maintained on 3rd Street between the two legs of the couplet, and the existing cross-section could be narrowed to accommodate widened sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and potential on-street parking.

Option 3 also assumes a reduction of 3rd Street from five lanes to three, and further assumes speed reductions which calm the street and shift more traffic onto 2nd and 4th Streets. The result is improved motor vehicle operations, and a significantly improved bicycle and pedestrian level of service throughout.

CAP Option 4: Boulevard on 3rd Street with Median and Reduced Lane Widths

This option would widen sidewalks, reduce lane widths, and add streetscape enhancements to 3rd Street while maintaining two-way traffic. This option does not attempt to fully accommodate the traffic

² Central Area Plan Appendix F - Technical Memorandum #6 – Future Conditions, pages 27-28.

demand anticipated by the CAP, permitting a higher level of congestion along the 3rd Street corridor more consistent with a downtown environment.

Option 4 shows similar motor vehicle operations to the no-build condition, but shows a significantly improved bicycle level of service and a moderately improved pedestrian level of service on 3rd Street.

MMA Implications

Generally speaking, each transportation option represents a package of improvements that will improve mobility, enhance opportunities for redevelopment, and help achieve the objectives of a MMA (see Table 1). As explored in detail in Tech Memo #5 and summarized above, the improvements to level of service for each mode of transportation varies across options and location within the study area. When reviewing possible improvements within the district, it is important to keep in mind that within the transportation options there are opposing elements, where one characteristic optimally meets a mobility or urban design goal at the potential expense of another objective. The following opposing pairs represent trade-offs that will need to be discussed as part of implementing the Mixed Use Bend Central District and Preliminary Preferred MMA, should the City choose to pursue that:

- **Intersection character and vehicular capacity.** A key issue brought to light in the multimodal level of service analysis is the benefit and downside of right turn lanes at intersections. These are relatively inexpensive and easy improvements that enhance operations and help to make some of the transportation concepts function better. However, this additional paved vehicle lane does not enhance the pedestrian experience at an intersection. The trade-offs between intersection vehicular capacity and street/intersection character at specific locations should be explored.
- **On-street parking and multimodal streetscape enhancements.** On-street parking has emerged as another important tradeoff when considering how, or whether, to improve specific streets for non-vehicular modes as proposed under the transportation alternatives. While enhancing services and mobility for non-vehicular modes is consistent with MMA objectives, the availability of on-street parking will also be an important component of a successful MMA designation, as discussed in the next section of this memorandum. Exploring the roadway characteristics contextually, within the proposed MMA and at specific locations, and understanding what the benefits are for each mode and for businesses, residents and visitors in the area, will be important to developing an optimal set of recommended improvements.

Two additional findings from the multimodal level of service analysis further illustrate the inter-relatedness of multimodal transportation improvements:

- As a result of the transportation analysis, a new Hawthorne crossing of the Bend Parkway and parallel railway has emerged as an important east-west connection into and through the district. With a Hawthorne crossing of the Bend Parkway, traffic would increase between Franklin and Greenwood and the level of service for bicycles and pedestrians would drop significantly without improvements for non-vehicular modes. Currently, there are no sidewalks between 2nd

Street and 3rd Street and it will be important improve all of Hawthorne as a true multimodal street through the district.

- Mobility for all modes is generally improved along many roadways under each transportation improvement option. It should be noted, however, that good mobility along a segment of roadway can come at a cost to bicyclists and pedestrians crossing a section of roadway. Where vehicular mobility is good, there may be long delays for bicyclists and pedestrians at a cross section (i.e., it will take them more time to cross a street). Signalizing intersections along 2nd Street and/or 4th Street alleviates this problem and allows for lower-stress bicycle and pedestrian crossing of streets such as Greenwood, Franklin and Revere.

Analysis of Proposed New Mixed Use Zone

MMA Requirements

Pursuant to the State Transportation Planning Rule, designation and application of a MMA requires cities to adopt a number of different design and development standards to attempt to ensure a future pattern of mixed use development within specified boundaries, consistent with the intent of a MMA. The following table summarizes the MMA requirements related to allowed uses and development standards.

Table 1 - MMA Land Use and Other Requirements

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	An MMA must meet each requirement in this column
<input type="checkbox"/>	MMA Boundary (10)(b)(A)
<input type="checkbox"/>	MMA entirely within a UGB (10)(b)(B)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Adopted plans & regulations that allow specified uses and require certain development standards: (10)(b)(C)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	An MMA must meet each requirement in this column
<input type="checkbox"/>	Allow a concentration of a variety of uses, including: (8)(b)(A)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	An MMA must meet each requirement in this column
<input type="checkbox"/>	Allow medium to high density residential development at 12 units per acre or more (8)(b)(A)(i)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Allow offices or office buildings (8)(b)(A)(ii)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Allow retail stores and services (8)(b)(A)(iii)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Allow restaurants (8)(b)(A)(iv)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Allow public open space or private open space open to the public (8)(b)(A)(v)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Allow civic or cultural uses (8)(b)(B)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Allow core commercial area with multi-story buildings (8)(b)(C)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Require buildings and building entrances to be oriented to streets (8)(b)(D)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Require street connections & crossings to access center (8)(b)(E)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Require pedestrian-centric network of streets & ways within center (8)(b)(F)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Require one or more transit stops in areas with transit service (8)(b)(G)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Limit or prohibit low-intensity uses e.g. drive through services (8)(b)(H)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Do not require off-street parking, or require less parking than other areas (10)(b)(D)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Located at least ¼ mile from an interchange, adopted in an IAMP, or with concurrence (10)(b)(E)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	An MMA must meet at least one requirement in this column
<input type="checkbox"/>	Located at least ¼ mile from a ramp terminal intersection (10)(b)(E)(i)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Located within the area of, and consistent with an adopted IAMP (10)(b)(E)(ii)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Written concurrence with the MMA provided by the mainline facility provider (10)(b)(E)(iii)

Mixed Use Bend Central District Land Use Assumptions and MMA Compliance

The Land Use Regulatory Recommendations Memo developed as part of the CAP recommends application of a new “Special Plan District” within the Central District, one that allows for a broader mix of uses and more intensive development. The memorandum also includes proposed design and development standards for new development within this Special Plan District. The Special Plan District would be implemented through the application of a new mixed-use zone district, the Mixed Use Bend Central District or CAP-MCEN.³

Specific allowed uses proposed for the new District were summarized in Tech Memo #4 as follows:

- **Residential:** Multi-family housing is allowed; single-family housing is not permitted.
- **Commercial:** The following would be allowed:
 - Retail sales with a maximum size of 20,000 square feet
 - Restaurants and food services (excluding drive-throughs)
 - Offices and clinics
 - Hotels and motels
 - Bed and breakfasts and vacation rentals (as a conditional use)
 - Entertainment and recreation (within an enclosed building)
 - Broadcasting/production studios
 - Wholesale sales (as a conditional use)
 - Hospitals (as a conditional use)
- **Government and Institutional:** A full range of these uses would be allowed.
- **Industrial:** The following would be allowed:
 - Production businesses (e.g., IT Support Centers, biotechnology, software/hardware development) and manufacturing uses under 5,000 square feet would be permitted outright
 - Industrial service uses (e.g., equipment cleaning and repair) would not be permitted
 - Other industrial uses such as larger manufacturing uses, warehouses and transportation, freight and distribution would only be allowed as conditional uses

Building heights allowed in the CAP-MCEN would be as follows:

- 35 feet along east/west “great streets” to build pedestrian scale.
- 35 feet bordering (1/2 block both sides) 4th Street to provide a transition scale to neighborhood.
- 65 feet on both sides of 3rd Street to facilitate redevelopment of current parking lots.
- Within the Tall Building District, the height limit would be 50 feet but would have opportunities in designated areas to go up to 100 and 150 feet if certain criteria are met. Criteria are related to the size of the site, setbacks, average area per floor and site orientation.

Tech Memo #4 explored the implications application of an MMA would have on existing and future land use, referencing the vision established in the CAP and its implementation through the CAP-MCEN. The following table compares specific MMA requirements with the proposed uses and development standards in the CAP-MCEN, assuming that the CAP-MCEN would be applied to all parcels within the

³ Central Area Plan Land Use Regulatory Recommendations Appendix B, General Recommendations for New Zone Language.

Preliminary Preferred Alternative MMA boundary (Figure 1). Table 2 notes where implementing the new mixed-use zone would satisfy the MMA requirements and, where necessary, provides guidance on modifications to the draft CAP-MCEN and/or additional modifications to the existing development code to better meet the requirements.

Table 2- Comparison Table: Proposed Zone District and MMA Requirements

MMA Requirement	CAP-MCEN Reference	Compliance Notes
Allow medium to high density residential development at 12 units per acre or more	<i>Table 2.3.200 Permitted Land Uses</i>	Multi-family housing is allowed, consistent with this requirement. There are no minimum density requirements or density maximums.
Allow offices or office buildings	<i>Table 2.3.200 Permitted Land Uses</i>	Offices and Clinics are a permitted Commercial use. Government - point of service, uses which could administration offices, is a permitted Public & Institutional use.
Allow retail stores and services	<i>Table 2.3.200 Permitted Land Uses</i>	Retail Sales and Service uses, with size limitations, are permitted.
Allow restaurants	<i>Table 2.3.200 Permitted Land Uses</i>	Restaurants/Food Services without drive-throughs are permitted (drive-through restaurants are prohibited).
Allow public open space or private open space open to the public	<i>Table 2.3.200 Permitted Land Uses</i>	Parks and Open Space uses are permitted Public & Institutional uses.
Allow civic or cultural uses	<i>Table 2.3.200 Permitted Land Uses</i>	Public & Institutional uses permitted outright include schools – including daycares, colleges and vocational schools - clubs and religious institutions, and government uses (“point of service” uses, such as libraries or permitting offices; “limited point of service” uses, which include equipment yards, are prohibited).
Allow core commercial area with multi-story buildings	<i>Table 2.3.300 Mixed Use District Development Standards Refer to Central Area Height Map</i>	Multi-storied buildings are permitted, with heights ranging from 35 feet along “great streets” and in the transition area along Fourth Street to 50 feet or taller in the “Tall Building District.” Reflecting city staff and stakeholder concerns about the intensity and height of development assumed in the BCAP, development projections developed for the Central District MMA modified development assumptions by lowering height limitations and assuming fewer residential “towers.” However, the assumption remains that multi-story buildings will be permitted throughout the district. The Central Area Height Map should be modified to reflect the height limit of 6-8 stories in most portions of the MMA and 2-4 stories on the west side of 4 th Street (to provide a transition to the neighborhood to the east).
Require buildings and building entrances to be oriented to streets	<i>2.3.400 Building Orientation; A. Building Entrances</i>	All buildings are required to have an entrance that faces the street, or that is visible to the street and connected by a direct and convenient walkway.

MMA Requirement	CAP-MCEN Reference	Compliance Notes
<p>Require street connections & crossings to access center</p>	<p><i>(Existing) Chapter 3.4 Public Improvement Standards</i></p>	<p>Pursuant to Section 3.4.200 Transportation Improvement Standards, street improvements anywhere within the City must comply with the TSP. The BCAP transportation alternatives evaluation provides information on the efficacy of a variety of street connections and configurations for multimodal trips into, and through, the district (see Technical Memorandum #5. Upcoming work will focus on determining the most suitable design treatment for transportation facilities serving the Preliminary Preferred Alternative MMA, including how optimally to address delay, comfort and safety at busy arterials for pedestrians and cyclists. Ultimately, it is expected that the City will amend the adopted TSP based on project recommendations. The City's existing requirements, such as those related to street alignment and connectivity (3.4.200.K) and sidewalks and bicycle lanes (3.4.200. L), should be reviewed for consistency with project recommendations, but no specific code modifications have been identified at this time.</p>
<p>Require pedestrian-centric network of streets & ways within center</p>	<p><i>2.3.400 Building Orientation; B. Walkway Connections (Existing) Chapter 3.1, Access, Circulation and Lot Design.</i></p>	<p>See the notes above pertaining to the connection between code requirement, the adopted TSP, and transportation analysis being completed for the Bend Central District MMA. In addition, the proposed CAP-MCEN language clarifies that walkways are required to provide direct and convenient pedestrian circulation between developments and neighborhoods. Walkways must conform to the standards in Chapter 3.1, Access, Circulation and Lot Design.</p>

MMA Requirement	CAP-MCEN Reference	Compliance Notes
<p>Require one or more transit stops in areas with transit service</p>	<p><i>Table 2.3.200 Permitted Land Uses</i></p>	<p>This requirement isn't necessary to codify. The Hawthorne Station is located within the Preliminary Preferred Alternative MMA boundary; seven Cascade East Transit (CET) bus lines leave from this primary transit center. Bus lines 1 (South Third Street), 4 (North Third Street) and 5 (Wells Acres Road) provide north/south travel through the Preliminary Preferred Alternative MMA boundary, with multiple stops within the area.</p> <p>Also of note is that Bend MPO's Public Transit Plan includes 3rd Street, Greenwood Avenue, and Franklin Avenue (west of 3rd Street) in the list of most transit-supportive corridors in the area.⁴</p> <p>However, it is recommended that allowed uses in Table 2.3.200 be expanded to include transit facilities to eliminate ambiguity regarding future transit-related improvements. "Transit facility" is defined in code as "public or private improvements at selected points along existing or future transit routes for passenger pick-up, drop off and waiting. Improvements may include pullouts, shelters, waiting areas, benches, information and directional signs or structures, and lighting (Chapter 1.2 Definitions)."</p>

⁴ See Transit discussion in Tech Memo #2 Future Baseline Conditions.

MMA Requirement	CAP-MCEN Reference	Compliance Notes
<p>Limit or prohibit low-intensity uses e.g. drive through services</p>	<p><i>Table 2.3.200 Permitted Land Uses</i></p>	<p>Several auto oriented and low-intensity uses are prohibited in the proposed zone. These include drive-through restaurants, auto oriented Retail Sales and Service,⁵ Retail Sales and Service uses over 20,000 sq ft, Commercial Storage (outdoor and mini-storage), and outdoor Entertainment and Recreation. Under Public & Institutional uses, government public works yards and vehicle storage are prohibited.</p> <p>A few uses that are currently proposed to be allowed (P), or allowed conditionally (C), may be considered as “low intensity.” Specific uses should be reexamined for how they meet the objectives of the Special Plan District and this MMA requirement. The City should consider eliminating, or limiting by area or specific uses under the category, the following new⁶ uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retail Sales and Service (auto dependent) (C)⁷ • Warehouse (P) • Transportation, Freight and Distribution (C) <p>Two additional uses are not necessarily “low intensity,” from the standpoint of employment, but require a large amount of land and do not contribute to a pedestrian-scale built environment. The following specific uses should be reexamined for how they meet the objectives of the Special Plan District and a MMA designation generally.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wholesale Sales (more than 75% of sales are wholesale) (P) • Manufacturing and Production - greater than 5,000 sq. ft. (C)
<p>Do not require off-street parking, or require less parking than other areas</p>	<p><i>2.3.400 Building Orientation; C. Parking (Existing) Chapter 3.3; Vehicle Parking, Loading and Bicycle Parking</i></p>	<p>As proposed, the CAP-MCEN zone requires off-street parking pursuant to (existing) Table 3.3.300 and does not modify parking minimums within the zone district. To satisfy this MMA requirement, the City will need to reexamine minimum parking requirements as applied within the Preliminary Preferred Alternative MMA boundary.</p>

On the balance, the proposed CAP-MCEN uses and development requirements match the definition of an MMA by allowing a denser level of development than in surrounding areas and a mix of supportive uses (e.g., housing in close proximity to employment and services). The notes provided in Table 2 predominantly point to how the proposed zone complies with the MMA requirements. Other CAP-MCEN requirements that are not noted in Table 2, but that are supportive of a MMA designation, are

⁵ The City definition: “Automobile-oriented use means automobiles and/or other motor vehicles are an integral part of the use, such as drive-up, drive-in, and drive-through facilities.”

⁶ Note that existing uses could be grandfathered and renovations/rebuilds allowed under prescribed conditions.

⁷ The City definition: “Automobile-dependent use means automobiles and/or other motor vehicles are served by the use and the use would not exist without them, such as vehicle repair, gas station, car wash or auto and truck sales.”

architectural standards related to building mass and pedestrian-scale building entrance treatments (2.3.500) and special design standards for the listed “great streets” (2.3.600).

In only a few areas do the recommendations in Table 2 point to possible modifications to the proposed CAP-MCEN. The recommendations from Table 2 are as follows:

- Modify the Central Area Height Map to reflect the height limit of 6-8 stories in most portions of the MMA and 2-4 stories on the west side of 4th Street.
- Expand allowed uses in Table 2.3.200 to include transit facilities.
- Consider eliminating, or limiting by area or specific uses under the category, identified “low intensity” uses.
- Reexamine minimum parking requirements, as applied within the MMA boundary.

The MMA requirement related to minimizing off-street parking requirements, in particular, is expected to require further analysis and discussion. As proposed, the CAP-MCEN requires that new development conform with existing parking standards (Chapter 3.3; Vehicle Parking, Loading and Bicycle Parking) and there is no apparent documented direction on the topic of reducing parking minimums or off-street parking requirements as part of the previous CAP work.⁸ Areas to explore and discuss include:

- Lowering or eliminating minimum off-street parking standards within the district, based on the availability of on-street parking and existing surface lots.
- Further analyzing actual parking demand in the MMA as a means to recalibrate parking standards.
- Examining the potential adverse impacts to density that currently allow unlimited surface parking to meet code requirements for off-street parking.
- Considering a floor area bonus for below grade parking.
- Relaxing requirements within the CAP-MCEN zone (or specific areas within the MMA) for the on-street parking credit,⁹ off-site parking and/or shared parking.
- Modifying minimum standards by use or size within the CAP-MCEN zone.
 - Waive parking requirement for small restaurant/café/deli uses.
 - Eliminate parking requirements for uses that are (a) 750 square feet or less and (b) fronted by curb space that provides on-street parking.
 - Streamline definition of “commercial uses” to parallel the CBD and establish one parking requirement for all commercial uses (nine standards currently apply to non-CBD areas, pursuant to Table Table 3.3.300).
 - Reduce minimum parking requirements that apply to any development that has more than one use. Current code requires parking for each individual use, as opposed to a “mixed use” parking standard.

⁸ Note that reduced minimum parking requirements may apply to any development that has more than one business through a shared parking agreement. A fee in lieu option for providing required off-street parking is also available to development in the CAP-MCEN zone, as currently drafted.

⁹ Under existing code, off-street required spaces may be met through on-street parking spaces at a 1 for 1 exchange, up to 50 percent of the requirement (3.3.300.B).

ODOT Concurrency

Concurrency Requirements

As shown in Figure 1, the boundary of the Preliminary Preferred Alternative includes areas that fall within one-quarter mile of both Highway 97 interchanges. When an MMA is located within one-quarter mile of an interchange, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) must concur with the designation. The traffic impact analysis that will support the proposed MMA designation will need to determine the impacts of the designation on state facilities. ODOT will base concurrence on the potential for operational or safety impacts to the interchange area and the mainline highway. Specifically, ODOT will look at the crash rates, whether or not either interchange is in a top ten percent of locations identified by the safety priority index system, and if there are existing or potential future traffic queues on the exit ramps. While capacity or mobility issues will not be the basis for decision-making regarding an MMA designation, the traffic analysis should also identify capacity improvements, in addition to any operational or safety issues at the interchanges.

As advisors to this project, ODOT staff noted earlier in the planning process that there were no known major barriers to establishing an MMA in relatively close proximity to existing Highway 97 interchanges at Revere Avenue and Colorado Avenue. Future development within the MMA is expected to have a minimal influence on interchange operations, due in part to ramp configurations and the barrier of the railroad tracks. Preliminary indications from the transportation analysis, which models future BCAP land use assumptions, also suggest that there will be no safety-related impacts to interchange ramps at either the Revere Avenue or Colorado Avenue interchanges. While not anticipated, in the event that there are operational or safety issues at either interchange, these would need to be addressed in a management plan, one that includes moving traffic away from the interchange and clearing queues on interchange ramps and that is accepted through an agreement between the City of Bend and ODOT. ODOT concurrence with the MMA designation, regardless of whether or not a safety management plan is necessary, will be documented in a written statement as part of the MMA adoption process.

Preliminary recommended transportation improvements that support an MMA will be included in Tech Memo #9, the Draft MMA Boundary Map and Assessment. The traffic analysis will be reviewed by the Project Team and Technical Advisory Committee, refined, and presented as the Preferred Alternative Plan at a Public Workshop for citizen review and comment. ODOT support of the analysis in Tech Memo #5 is a first step towards ensuring timely ODOT concurrence with an MMA designation; the results of sub-area transportation modeling in Tech Memo #9 will be the basis for this concurrence.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Level of service analysis shows that CAP transportation options can provide improved, and potentially adequate, motor vehicle capacity as well as increased opportunities for significant improvement to the bicycle and pedestrian environment. Generally speaking, each transportation option represents a package of improvements that has the potential to help achieve the objectives of an MMA. However, as explored in this memo, improvements for one mode in a specific area may come at the expense of improvements for another. These trade-offs should be discussed in the context of the benefits and potential expense to mobility and the comfort, safety and convenience of the user.

Also as part of this planning effort, it is expected that the City will explore ways to further bring the zoning requirements in closer alignment with those of the Transportation Planning Rule. The proposed CAP-MCEN zone district includes uses and development requirements that are largely consistent with the definition of an MMA. The proposed zone allows a denser level of development than in surrounding areas and a mix of supportive uses (e.g., housing in close proximity to employment and services). Possible modifications to the proposed CAP-MCEN are explored in Table 2. Most recommendations are related to reexamining or refining allowed uses and do not suggest that extensive modifications to the proposed CAP-MCEN are needed. However, more in-depth discussion is needed regarding the MMA requirement that pertains to off-street parking. A number of methods to reduce off-street parking in the district are mentioned in this memorandum and guidance is needed in identifying the most viable and how to best reflect the desired approach in existing or proposed development code language.

Ultimately, approval of an MMA designation will need Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) concurrence, due to the proximity of the Preliminary Preferred MMA Boundary Alternative to two highway interchanges. After technical, committee and public feedback regarding the transportation network alternatives, documentation to support a Preferred MMA Boundary and an associated package of proposed transportation network improvements will be prepared (Tech Memo #9). This evaluation will be reviewed by ODOT staff and will be the basis for ODOT's written concurrence with the proposed MMA designation.