SEAPAC #8 – June 4, 2020

Summary of Public Comments received by 2:30 pm June 4th

- 1. Christen Brown, June 1, 2020 email
- 2. Ken Atwell, June 1, 2020 two-page memo

1. Brown email

- Questions the current sewer plan for the Southeast (See Exhibit 2 on page 13 of packet)
- Advocates for adding a gravity sewer line to the Sewer Plan and that this line be included in the right-of-way for Knott Road

2. Atwell memo

- Summarizes some information about the proposed Easton project to the north of Southeast Expansion Area
- Frames discussion of infrastructure costs for SEAP by pointing out three owners west of the Arnold Irrigation lateral have infrastructure planned, lower costs
- Property owners east of lateral, in East catchment area, face significant costs per acre
- Transportation costs may divide property owners; sewer costs are more critical for the entire area
- Provides an example of how costs for transportation projects are/could be split between west and east catchment areas
- Comments on the sewer plan (See Exhibit 2, page 13 of packet) with specific comments on each line/project

 From:
 Christen Brown

 To:
 Damian Syrnyk

 Subject:
 2nd request

Date: Monday, June 1, 2020 9:46:05 AM

Damian:

I will continue to questions the proposed sewer development plan when it does not include the extension of the additional sewer line along the North side on Knott Road other than the 300 feet fEast from 15th street.

Christen M Brown

20950 Knott Road Bend, OR 97702

christen@cpa-wc.com

P: 541-382-3111 F: 541-322-9310

Any U.S. federal tax advice included in this communication (including any attachments) was not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of avoiding U.S. federal, state or local tax-related penalties. This message contains information that may be confidential and privileged. Unless you are the addressee (or authorized to receive for the addressee), you may not use, copy or disclose to anyone the message or any information contained in the message. If you have received the message in error, please advise the sender by reply, and delete the message. Thank you very much.

FR: Ken Atwell, SEBNA Land Use Chair

While the Pahlisch/Easton preapp proposal map shows the 15th Street RAB at the E/W collector access, the preapp announcement included a note that the plan included a TSP exception. The community presentation contained no mention of responsibility for that RAB, improvement of Raintree, or participation in the cost of street extensions and RABs to the east, leaving Easton's comparable backbone infrastructure costs at aprox. \$87k/acre for streets and \$2.7k/hsld (all RS) for sewer. This may be based on a traffic study, still unavailable online, suggesting that this development does not trigger such responsibility. So the following is based on SEA property owners carrying this responsibility.

This means that the SEAPAC infrastructure cost discussion starts with the three property owners west of Arnold ditch with their major street and sewer access substantially addressed by the Easton development. So the known backbone street costs presented by the City for Meeting 8, get divided \$11million to the west 62 acres - \$177k/acre or 57k after assumptions - and \$33 million to the east 320 acres - \$103k/acre or 90k after assumptions. Given the percentage of commercial/industrial use in the east portion this starts a discussion about parity divided.

The street issue may divide the interests of property owners, but the sewer cost becomes the critical issue. The Easton development will have installed a substantial portion of the \$1.8 million backbone for the west portion so these property owners will be responsible for possibly \$800k or less to serve approx. 450 households (75% RM) - \$1.8k/hsld - but the owners in the east portion will be responsible for between \$2.7 and \$4.5 million (see assumptions below) for 600 households (62% RM/H) - \$4k to \$7.5k/hsld.

After the June teleconference meeting I will update my cost projections per owner and make them available. Some way to balance the load per owner/land use needs to be found.

Street Options	West	East
15th/ Ferguson RAB* 15th/New Road 1 RAB** 27th/Ferguson RAB* 27th/Diamondback RAB	3.7	3.7 3.7
E/W -N/S Collector RAB E/W Collector N/S Collector	**	3.7 7.2 8.7
Local Framework Knott/New Road 1 Knott/New Road 2	0.1	2
Knott Rd TWSC	0.2	0.2
Knott Rd / 27 th Frontage*** Total Less per assumption	3.28 10.98 7.4 3.58	3.28 32.58 3.7 28.88
	15th/ Ferguson RAB* 15th/New Road 1 RAB** 27th/Ferguson RAB* 27th/Diamondback RAB E/W -N/S Collector RAB E/W Collector N/S Collector Local Framework Knott/New Road 1 Knott/New Road 2 Knott Rd TWSC Knott Rd / 27 th Frontage*** Total	15th/ Ferguson RAB* 3.7 15th/New Road 1 RAB** 3.7 27th/Ferguson RAB* 27th/Diamondback RAB E/W -N/S Collector RAB E/W Collector N/S Collector Local Framework Knott/New Road 1 0.1 Knott/New Road 2 Knott Rd TWSC 0.2 Knott Rd / 27 th Frontage*** 3.28 Total 10.98 Less per assumption 7.4

#3a This is a sewer line that would normally be developer installed and will tie to #2 and share that cost #4 This line as presented in Exhibit 1 serves properties unique from those served by #6 for only 2/3 of it's length and therefore the cost attributed to those properties should be 2.7 mil.

#5 The remaining 1/3 of #4 above should be combined with #5 and Pump Station as a project cost born by the City since it chose to include within UGB property with this topography

#6 This is a sewer line length that would have been required regardless of topography

Note: The East side distribution of cost is based on #4 serving approx. 145 acres and #6 serving approx. 155 acres, but it is the Use variation that upsets parity between impacted owners