

Minutes Juniper Ridge Management Advisory Board

Thursday, January 30, 2020 Staff Liaison: Matt Stuart

12:02 pm

 Roll Call: Katie Anderson (Chair), Ron Benton (Vice Chair), James Beauchemin, Craig Chenoweth, Jade Mayer, Corey Charon, Kristina Johnson (Alternate)

• Public Comment None.

• **Approve:** November 14, 2019 Meeting Minutes Minutes approved.

Review/Discussion: Draft Work Plan Memo

- Finalize JRMAB Guiding/Purpose Statements

 The role of the JRMAB is to advise Council and BURA on the future development of Juniper Ridge with regard to Bend's changing economy:
 - Assure quality development throughout Juniper Ridge.
 - Jade revisions to CC&Rs. Jade thinks should be removed from majority of property other than amended.
 - Katie memo from legal. Current documents may apply to existing. Thinks incorporates current state.
 - Can add in "applicability" to sentence. Group decided against – keep as is.
 - Generate revenue from land sales consistent with good business practices, ensuring land sale revenues support continued development at Juniper Ridge.
 - Enhance sustainable building and development in Juniper Ridge by promoting a development pattern that is resource efficient.
 - Guide the development of marketing strategies that serve existing Bend employers and specifically targets the identified economic clusters for Bend and Central Oregon.
 - Okay to present to Council as direction of group.
 Group acknowledged that is acceptable to present to Council.

Priority Tasks

Katie: Do we still want to tackle CC&Rs first?

It was mentioned that they are all interconnected; however, Matt suggested there could be lower hanging fruit. Design Guidelines sit separately. Look at and open up Use Table. Others agree that doing others first before CC&Rs is a good idea – don't get hung up with CC&Rs. Matt also said we need to look at process to plat land. If end goal is to offer 20- 30 acres at a time, currently not able to do efficiently and without planning and improving all necessary infrastructure. Smaller sites we can do. Can we get to a process where we can create final plat without having to build infrastructure the way Portland does with their large lot industrial platting process. This would allow us to sell property without infrastructure being done first, however, sales would be tied to an infrastructure agreement.

Suggests starting to work on things that need code changes - Use Table and platting land requires public process.

Katie – Overlay District Boundary and applicable area. Can Committee say we would like staff to investigate doing what block development standards that Portland does. Matt can do the work behind the scenes. How can we identify a platting process that would allow this (at least 20 acres at a time).

Subdistrict need to tackle. Provide directions back to Matt. Which first?

Corey asked if city can put out an RFP of 40 acres to a developer. Can they master plan? Response: yes, they have to fit our code and city would have to be a partner because to create a legal parcel and sell, all site design, platting, and infrastructure must be complete. Katie said if we change to block code standard, it does give ability for City to sell and get out of being a partner in deal. Matt said it would remove proprietary role of City; City would only remain in regulatory role. If City maintains both roles, feels it could be a conflict of interest. Also City does not have finances to build infrastructure. Only roads City should define are extensions of Cooley and 18th, major arterials and collectors.

Matt – subdivision plats are being looked at internally with staff to determine compliance with land use laws. City plans to move utilities departments to Juniper Ridge. Looking at performing a subdivision plat or partition, however, must present entire site plan. If used Portland's method, narrative would outline the plan which would reduce planning costs upfront for the city and would help developer who wants large acreage. Removes city from site planning as developer.

Katie asked if there were any tradeoffs. Matt said it depends on how much control the city wants. They wouldn't have control over internal local roads. Market dictates site planning. Would need to improve block standards. Would apply to nothing less than 20 acres so would need to be master planned per Bend Development Code.

Or can keep as is and city remains engaged in deal all the way through.

Craig said to open up to market. City does not need both roles. Let developers master plan and create own CC&Rs applicable to their development. Question asked regarding which lands are we talking about - subdistrict or larger. Response: could be either. Could do a chunk and would fall within master plan process. Outside subdistrict - have ODOT restriction. Hoping will go away with north corridor. Katie: memo from legal counsel. Limit size of deal that the City remains on. Under current code, City required to be on both sides. Get out of proprietary role. Will need to change current code. Wants developers to make decisions about local roads.

We need to decide. What recommendations to change code. Only in IL or across the board. Matt – 500 acres of JR only in overlay zone. Strictly preliminary. Limited because no other large acreage anywhere else in City. We would still be responsible for main arterials - Cooley and 18th. Asked if these are on TSP. Response: Yes. Get city off both sides of deals is way to move forward.

Corey suggested letting developers say what market is with RFP. Matt putting out as a piece of code that could decide later on. Council would ask to come up with final plat and block standards at some time in future. Not asking to plan plats now. Katie: staff move forward to bring recommendations. High level will bring back to group. All agreed. Matt only looked at Portland's platting process. Current code and block standards in IL doesn't allow us to do 10 acre site continuously. Need to change block standards to allow for this.

Platting, Land Use Table, new block standards for IL or employment subdistrict or overlay zone. What portions of code need to be adjusted? Katie: Change code to do preliminary plat to improve marketability.

Matt: Map shows areas that LSH Parcel has rights to control—west parcel has height limitations. South parcel - design authority. Ancillary parcel to north - if a requested change to the CC&Rs affect area, LSH Parcel has veto power. Suterra has not rights but sits on committee and architectural board. What does Class B allow us to do? City is a class B member. We are majority stakeholder. Can negotiate. Katie: all documents can be amended. CC&Rs amended with 75% of class A. City occupies approximately 83%, so are majority. City Utilities site is currently being evaluated further east in IL outside subdistrict. We have full control of design quidelines as Class B members.

Ancillary parcel is covered by current CC&Rs. LSH Parcel could say no if decided to change.

Katie – what benefits were added to the employment overlay district. Differences: defines uses more specifically and outlines streets, trip counts, permitted uses.

Matt: Underlying is IL in Comp Plan and is for employment. If eliminated overlay

would go back to standard IL code. Uses would be affected. Some may go away. Amend code to add uses or would go away are both options.

Katie trying to simplify everything. Not so many layers (IL/CC&Rs/Design Guidelines, etc). Matt: is size of employment subdistrict realistic? Change Use Table.

Katie: bring back recommendation and the comparison of uses in standard IL. What uses expand into employment subdistrict but what additional restrictions are in place.

Timeline for feasibility study. Boots on ground in February. Hopefully April will be done. Will highlight businesses that are growing. Where does Juniper Ridge sit as regional role and competitiveness. Will help make disposition recommendations - top dollar or tax revenue?

Matt: Use Table can bring back in February. Is it better to eliminate code or change use table. Overlay zone is directly tied to ODOT IGA. Can't remove overlay district until IGA goes away; however, can amend. Analysis of Use Table in comparison to IL. Add recommendations. Include subdistrict.

Question asked are we looking to maintain any integrity of initial vision or just get land developed. Katie: part of reason we are doing feasibility study is to inform data points in addition to what we are hearing from community on ultimate disposition strategy. There are two sides to that. But we are a bit restricted to sticking to original vision based on rights given away. What are long term requirements for rest of property?

Matt: we have had interest in the property and they are willing to work with height limitations. Want to master plan a full development. Rights are a challenge but not that much of a concern. How much do we want applying to rest of Juniper Ridge? Do we want to change uses now to allow more flexibility and then look to CC&Rs?

Katie – CCRs versus Design Guidelines. Do want to expand the applicable areas that those documents apply to? Originally thought to tackle CC&Rs first. Given memo from legal, think should move to other documents beside CCRs. Maybe move onto Design Guidelines.

What do you want Matt to bring forward each month?

February meeting - Use Table analysis; what we are presenting to Council in March March meeting – block length standards, IGA update, parcel platting April meeting – compare design guidelines to Industrial Land (IL) requirements May – Land disposition strategy (feasibility assessment)

Matt: IGA tied to rezone process. February meeting to discuss with ODOT and see

path forward to end IGA. We are meeting obligations. Cooley/97 intersection is key. Renegotiate to open things up. Katie: come back with report of that meeting.

CC&Rs setting aside for now. Let legal review and discuss later.

Design Guidelines – anything want staff to analyze or do so we can move forward? Jade suggests to leave as are to protect current folks. Wants to see what is allowed in IL to drive other areas. Wants to see what code allows. Possible adjust or remove for rest of area. Kristina: found complex, but not overtly offensive. Saw some inconsistencies. Green space versus larger developers. Sustainability standards might drive up costs. Not sure what they are. Matt can condense analysis of other Oregon areas guidelines and bring forward. Jim said it is important to keep some guidelines. Thinks it is important if going to be a key area in the city. Do need to see if anything is too prohibitive in terms of costs or requirements. Kristina also likes a standard. Maybe more loose like percentages, not specifics. Suggested to look at why Aloha project did not work. Design guidelines were too restrictive. Truck dock and flat façade was issue. Orientation should not be visual from roadway. Matt: maybe could get an analysis of what didn't work.

Katie: What does IL code require? Comparison of IL and Design Guidelines. Matt asked to work with Kristina. Requirements may overlap. Goal is to strip out unnecessary layers. For April meeting.

Connecting ECONorthwest with additional businesses in community. Need to throw net wider. Maybe use Chamber to connect directly to EcoNorthwest. To send out communication. Ask about their future needs. Maybe EDCO too. Looking for one-on-one feedback.

Infrastructure priorities are pretty much there. 18th and Cooley. North Interceptor moving forward. Mobilizing in mid-to-late April.

Staff Update

Election advocacy rules surrounding transportation bond. Matt will send out memo. Once Council makes decision and goes to ballot can no longer discuss and advocate as member of a committee. Can discuss personally.

February meeting will be held on February 20th from 2-4 pm at Aperion.

Public Comment

Gary Vodden: Why are we doing all of this? Why not let companies move to Redmond? Response: Majority of IL in Bend is in Juniper Ridge. Our charge is how to unwind to make it easier to develop.

Adjourned at 1:40 pm