



CITY OF BEND

## Minutes

### Juniper Ridge Management Advisory Board

12:00 PM – 2:00 PM, Thursday, August 27, 2020

Meeting convened online via WebEx due to COVID-19 concerns

Staff Liaison: Matt Stuart

---

12:11 PM

- **Roll Call:** Katie Anderson (Chair), James Beauchemin, Craig Chenoweth, Corey Charon, Kristina Johnson

Councilors Livingston and Piper

- **Public Comment**

No comments.

- **Approve**

- June 18, 2020 Meeting Minutes approved.

- **Council Update**

- Chris Piper & Justin Livingston

Update on Council and the role of the Advisory Board. Agreement with PacifiCorp made a while ago. It became beneficial to City to find an alternative to the original agreement. The Resolution in place refers to disposal of current lots. Council wants JRMAB's help in moving forward beyond current lots and wants the role of City defined, developer or different path. They like the idea of larger tracts and letting developers come in plan or even a master developer. Intention of Council at time of creation of JRMAB was that transactional functions need to reside with Council. Wants JRMAB to bring back recommendation on other things like vision, uses, guidelines. JRMAB is being watched. Interest is being driven by JRMAB as well as ODOT, and the north interceptor. Councilors thanked the members and are looking forward to the prospects of Juniper Ridge developing and what JRMAB comes up with.

Katie: thanked Councilors. Board asks that we keep transactional work in tandem with JRMAB recommendations so conflicts do not arise. Councilor Piper says they heard JRMAB and will keep lines of communication open. Councilor Livingston appreciates comments but noted it is in an odd position. Resolution is in place regarding current lots. Offers come to Council during Executive Session. City needs to be careful of harming negotiating position and they have to respond to offers. Will keep what JRMAB is discussing in mind. Staff can bring forward JRMAB's perspective. Katie mentioned that the

southern area anchors the development. Restrictions will be in effect in that area. Training center was a slight deviation from work JRMAB was doing. Because we are moving in tandem, please take into consideration what JRMAB is considering. Jim mentioned that Public Works moving to JRMAB might be a similar issue. Councilor Livingston said the decision will be made after JRMAB finalizes their work.

- **Staff Update**

- ODOT Coordination

Update: still talking with ODOT acquisition team. Discussion of new northern interchange is being held and Matt is part of discussion. Would help with employment land in Juniper Ridge. ODOT looking to wrap up by end of fall. Important in regards to the IGA. ODOT wants to transition trip count to north interchange and restructure IGA. They seem willing to increase trip count. They want to tie to results of study of new interchange. Jim: are looking at trips numbers or percentages. Response: Not looking at specifics. Improvements would increase counts. Once get to November/December, ODOT will feel more comfortable negotiating. Matt feels is positive.

- **Review/Action: Juniper Ridge Overlay Code**

- Recommend Employment Subdistrict Code Changes

Matt needs final approval if JRMAB is comfortable moving forward with the usage tables. Edits were made based on previous discussion. City is scheduled to perform a code update this fall. Does not address large lot platting, or the reduction in the applicable area, as previously discussed, presented and directed. To be done by a separate process following changes to Design Guidelines.

If move forward now will create a place holder for the code changes that need to be made.

Kristina said her concerns are more specific than general regarding Section M, block design, traffic patterns. Still some negotiations to get through. If looking for high level approval, then she is okay. Katie if needs language changes, need to do now. Matt suggested having engineering re-evaluate Section M. Kristina asks the City look at these guidelines and make sure not it is not imposing stricter guidelines. Katie: how to align with existing code. Corey agrees. Fears that Section M does not take into account specifics of sites with rock outcroppings or trees. Matt said this is more restrictive than development code. Would like to simplify. Jim suggests making an exception for small lots. Matt: will review against development code, create exception for smaller lots that don't have a 300' frontage.

Kristina also asked about trip counts and whether they were inclusive of additional uses. Response: In process. Why the removal of prohibition of nuisance activities wording? Removed requirements for standard uses. Fencing: recommended reducing the table and would still read the same.

Matt – Development Code has a section about nuisances. Don't have in other

overlays except Northwest Crossing. He said either way is fine. Discussion regarding whether it should be included or not. Might be problematic in terms of impression to neighbors. Wants to be sensitive to neighborhoods. Katie mentioned that this is specific to Overlay. Kristina – noises from commercial use that wasn't previously expected. Matt said is not a literal statement as other codes. Katie – statement is general. What would be an example? If allowable use, what are we trying to address? Would it rely back on City Code? Matt said the Bend Development Code would supersede. Is there a land use that qualifies as a nuisance? In Northwest Crossing, commercial adjacent to residential. Mary Winters: criteria for a development standard. Would come up during construction or design. Maybe shouldn't be mandatory. Nothing can do about general terms (odor, dust, etc). She would rather it be less mandatory and not a prohibition. Is an additional development standard.

Katie said this was noted in market feasibility report. Implications that development blended with areas bordering the property. Is there a way to address what Jim and Kristina are saying? Adjacent to residential. Kristina said that striking it from here would be okay. There are other venues to handle. If can resolve by other processes that exist would be fine removing. Matt said it is in Bend Development Code and Architectural Guidelines. Applies where residential abuts. Discussion on whether to remove or soften. Katie cautioned that we don't want to give perspective that makes someone think can affect what is allowed. Matt – could also kick to design guidelines if want. Katie would agree with that. Kristina agrees too. Mary: run by planning department. Wants them to be able to implement. What would it look like? How best to do from a regulatory perspective. No reason to be redundant to other sections of code. Matt said that in his mind, was originally added to address OSU. Matt suggested tabling until look at design guidelines. Matt will look into.

Jim asked if want to identify acreage under Purpose and description of zone. Matt said he can add to map and text. Jim asked why height limit was expanded. Matt was existing to this area. Tied to setback. Corey in support of 65'. Extra height is valuable. Katie okay with 65'. Only applies to east of 18<sup>th</sup>, not adjacent to neighborhoods. Craig is fine with 65'. Natural resource identification and map- what language would apply to preserving trees, rock outcroppings, etc. Matt: must note on plans, also will live in design review.

Pending staff's comments, are comfortable with changes discussed and can move forward. **JRMAB recommends the discussed changes with clarification of nuisance and recommends the City amend the Bend Development Code to incorporate the changes.**  
**Kristina Johnson made motion and Corey Charon seconded.**  
**All in favor.**

- **Review/Action: Juniper Ridge Urban Renewal Development Assistance**
  - Recommend Policy for BURA considerationJim asked to clarify number of years to receiving reimbursement. Suggest 5 years or less. Matt: There is a cap on amount. Can put a cap on year but

allow developer to ask for modification. Worried about math. In terms of application could put 5, they can ask and BURA can decide. Katie – what is benefit of capping at 5 years? Jim, only looking for clarification. Do we want to leave open ended? Craig, can add clarification. Matt said is not inappropriate. Has to be reviewed. Katie – as long as not adding language to add language. Matt could help developers set expectations. Jim said he is fine with either way.

**JRMAB recommends the Bend Urban Renewal Agency (BURA) utilize the BURA Policy for Development Assistance at Juniper Ridge, when developing the rules and regulations for the administration Development Assistance Program for the Juniper Ridge Urban Renewal Area.**

**Craig Chenoweth made motion and Kristina Johnson seconded. All were in favor.**

- **Review/Discussion: Market Feasibility Assessment Update**
  - Questions/Comments

Katie said document affirms a lot of our conversations. Did not read anything that was overly surprising. How do others feel? Matt said we can use or we don't have to if don't think will help. Felt there were common threads with the JRMAB. Jim said disposition strategy felt paralleled what we are doing. Felt vision was similar. Feels dovetailed nicely with what we are trying to do. Kristina said it aligned pretty well but did not deep dive into. Looks good. Katie felt there were a couple of things in report. Tied industrial and office uses together. Will be hard to separate numbers. Perspective of needs is there. Plays into ultimate working plan for Council.

What are overarching goals for this development? How many jobs? What percentage of growth was industrial? Matt: Do we want to do a build out analysis? We have a bit of money left. Look at different scenarios. Katie asked if it would be a big add or only would be carving out part of data. How does it help us in future UGB or Economic Opportunity Analysis? Katie – Visions and goals of community needs to be clear. How do we frame working plan for Council. Kristina – when would it happen? Feels might want to wait due to uncertainty in economy. Matt said we are seeing increased demand in certain areas like manufacturing and production. Katie thinks now is the time to have this discussion. Numbers in growth and job perspectives were combination of all uses. If carve out data for what would be allowed in Juniper Ridge, would have valuable information. What can we expect for jobs at Juniper Ridge? Matt will ask and create something supplemental. Katie agrees if there is enough information and if it would solve and provide pertinent information. Matt will look at what they have generated and what they could generate. Craig – thinks it is good information to have to justify any changes we are making. We have a commitment to ensuring Juniper Ridge gets developed for jobs. Feels it would be a good use of funds. Kristina would be valuable to support changes we are making. Jim asked about expectations about original vision. Thought we were pursuing a mixture. Katie replied is zoned industrial. Matt said Use Table goes to mix of business uses that would allow some commercial uses that serve nearby residential. Definition currently is employment based. Katie said the Resolution

specified jobs per acre. Matt – original from 2016 was 6-10/acre. We are exceeding. Maybe there are alternative opportunities that could also benefit community. Katie – if achieve number of jobs within smaller acreage, could reclassify some to other usage. Matt – will reach out to ECONorthwest. Will get back to group. Katie said there is no action we need to take on report today. Goal by October that we review and finalize workplan and take to Council in November. We can still meet timelines. Please review documents prior to meeting.

- September 17, 2020
  - Review and recommend changes to the Design Guidelines. Will send out before next Friday to review.
  - Review Draft Council Work Plan Memo
  
- October 15, 2020
  - Review and recommend Juniper Ridge Work Plan for Council consideration and adoption
  
- **Adjourned at 1:51 pm.**