



CITY OF BEND

## Minutes

### Juniper Ridge Management Advisory Board

12:05 PM – 2:00 PM, Thursday, June 18, 2020

Meeting will be convened online via WebEx due to COVID-19 concerns

Staff Liaison: Matt Stuart

- 
- **Roll Call:** Katie Anderson (Chair), Ron Benton (Vice Chair), James Beauchemin, Craig Chenoweth, Jade Mayer, Corey Charon, Kristina Johnson, Levi McClain (Alternate)  
Councilor Piper
  - **Public Comment**  
None.
  - **Approve**
    - May 21, 2020 Meeting Minutes approved.
  - **Staff Update**
    - 50-Acre Industrial Lot Requirement  
Very complex on how this came about. Not a whole lot this board can do. Can make suggestions to change requirements.

Comprehensive plan shall provide an adequate supply of industrial land. Also dictated by State law. 2008 Economic Opportunity Analysis stated that 2 large industrial sites were needed. 2010 – Regional Economic Opportunity Analysis included cities, counties, Business Oregon, DLC, DSL, COIC, EDCO, COAR, etc. 2012 Central Oregon Large Lot Industrial Land Need Analysis recommended several sites throughout region. Documented in 2013 Regional IGA. Led to creation of COIC Regional Large Lot Development program.

Specific locations of site identified as Juniper Ridge and Department of State Land for Bend. 2017-2021 COIC CEDS Priority Issues and Strategies included maintaining the Central Oregon Large Lot Industrial program. Looking to update CED document. Also UGB. Opportunity to make a recommendation to reevaluate the land needs analysis. No activity on large industrial 50 acre seen by EDCO.

- Market Feasibility Assessment Update  
Hope to have at next meeting.
- Juniper Ridge Urban Renewal Development Assistance  
Looking to create a development assistance program for Juniper Ridge TIF District. Would provide assistance to Property Owners/Lessees for Rehabilitation,

Redevelopment, or Development. Authorizes assistance in making capital improvements. Also for Development Loans and/or Grants. Eligible for commercial and industrial land. BURA asked JRMAB to start developing rules and regulations for a rebate type program.

Would be used as an economic recovery and incentive too to encourage and reduce cost barriers to property development within Juniper Ridge and provide assistance to potential businesses required to relocate due to large infrastructure projects such as North Corridor/US 97.

Staff recommendations:

- Eligibility
  - Project/business must be considered commercial and/or industrial
  - Completely located within the Juniper Ridge Urban Renewal Area boundary
  - Is not eligible or been granted Enterprise Zone assistance
- Rules
  - Assistance value must not exceed 10% of total development costs.
  - Rebate does not being until Certificate of Occupancy and improvements have been certified by County Assessor.
  - Rebate does not exceed 75% of increase property tax increment for each year eligible.
  - BOLI and Prevailing Wage laws apply. If 750K or over.

Example of who might take advantage: New development on vacant land along US 20. There a lot of infrastructure costs. Developer pays upfront costs. Rebate applied following development completion for a period of years. Rebate is lower risk for agency and ensures incentive is applied following development.

- Application process
  - Description of project/business, how will benefit city's employment needs, if held for future development, a description of plans for anticipated development.
  - Estimation of development costs
  - Amount being sought
  - Estimated timeframe for development and to Certificate of Occupancy
  - Pro-forma showing yearly costs/payments without assistance and a statement showing yearly costs/payment with assistance
  - Certification statement
- Adoption process/legal
  - BURA reviews and approves/denies each application
  - Applicant then enters into development agreement with BURA.
- Post Certificate of Occupancy

- Staff to verify costs/numbers with Applicant and Assessor to finalize rebate amounts

Any thoughts?

Jade: what kind of dollars are we talking about? Response: because it is a rebate, would be based on whatever that project would generate in increased property taxes. If a big box store went in, they tend to generate almost an additional \$300,000 per year. Rebate would be \$250,000 and we would pocket \$50,000. Is new money because it would be on vacant land. Take applications for a limited time maybe 2-5 years. No cap if set up as a rebate.

Councilor Piper: what term is most common length? Response: Enterprise Zone sets up for 5 years. Anticipates that most projects could pay off in 4-5 years. From date of application, takes them 18 months to construct and then 5 years of rebate payments. Could pay off sooner.

Craig: is rebate tied to public improvements only? Does it impact what we are trying to accomplish if a lot come in? Response: language in plan is vague. We can qualify offsite improvements. Tied to their ability to achieve Certificate of Occupancy. Craig is worried about onsite improvements on private property. Response: could obtain help with grading on their property as long as increases property tax. Want to assist and speed up process of getting development to the site. We can make a recommendation to BURA to only look at capital improvement standpoint and if want to do private standpoint onsite, have them look to Enterprise Zone.

Katie: what sections besides Enterprise Zone is BURA overseeing right now? Response: Enterprise Zone counts on all of our industrial land and most of commercial so covers all of Juniper Ridge. Issue is Enterprise Zone expires next year. We anticipate it will be extended. Haven't looked at expanding the urban renewal area to south. If any relocation tied to US 97, then ODOT has to provide relocation assistance.

On the right track? Take back to BURA in August. Skinny strip that runs north to south is for Hunnell Road connection. Jade said he is unsure of what change in percentage means, 10% versus 20%. Response: is arbitrary. Could put at 20% and adjust down. Wants a consistent standard. Are we funding project or just trying to assist the project? Similar to a property tax exemption program, developer will have to show that will perform. Could require an outside party to do analysis for full tax exemptions. For smaller projects could be a negative.

- ODOT Coordination
  - Final alignment of North Corridor/US 97 between Empire and Cooley is being refined.
  - North Interchange study estimated to begin late July. Evaluating locations for future US 97 interchange along Juniper Ridge's north boundary.
  - Discussions ongoing regarding ODOT IGA (trip limit).

- **Review/Discussion: Juniper Ridge Employment Sub-district**

- Design Guidelines (Matt & Kristina)

Will walk through guidelines. Kristina reached out to Emily Freed from BRLB Architects who worked on Thuren's design guidelines. Guidelines were new at time. Discovered some things that hindered design. Thuren is an industrial building and guidelines seemed to be more around retail/commercial. Led to a high-end industrial design but hindered the usability. Set backs and preserving rock outcroppings were issues. Rock outcropping was determined more important. Would have been more expensive to remove rock.

Clarification: Design Guidelines apply to area of CC&Rs and Employment SubDistrict. Want to stay at high level, concept wise.

Refers to 2008 Conceptual Master Plan which is no longer recognized. Should 2008 references be removed and instead focus on goals/policies from 2016 Bend Comprehensive Plan? Vision from Comprehensive Plan: attract and retain target industries, pay higher than median wages, maintain an adequate supply of commercial and industrial lands, continue to move toward a more diversified economy. Juniper Ridge inside UGB is designed to meet the future commercial and industrial needs for future development. Should we revise introduction to update to 2016. Seems like should be consistent with 2016 Comprehensive Plan. Consistency is the key. Comment that should be consistent but collectors and arterials maybe should maintain higher standards. Residential and mixed use is not a part of Juniper Ridge.

Site Guidelines:

Higher building height allowed in Juniper Ridge versus standard IL/IG, 65 feet vs 50 feet (higher tied to setback). Minimum front yard setback is same at 10 feet but there is a maximum front setback of 30 feet in Design Guidelines. 50 foot minimum street frontage. 30 foot setback and landscape buffer vs 20 feet front setback. Do we want to default to IL standards? Suggest going to IL standards but keep height. Jim is concerned over maximum height. There was concern with a use similar to a trampoline zone. Matt will look into more. Could make conditional. Katie mentioned that trampoline zone is slightly different, as impacted homes were directly across, somewhat unique scenario. There is not a lot of area in land we are discussing that could meet a similar scenario. Matt: remember that residential is along west and south boundary. West already has height limitations south of Talus Road (per CC&Rs).

Preservation of key site attributes:

Remove language referencing DRB can provide guidance – is this arbitrary? Remove entirely and reference 3.2.200 Landscape Conservation? Already in code regarding tree and rock outcropping guidelines. Agree with recommendations.

Grading and Walls:

Current: Grading: emphasizes 3:1 slopes within setback/buffer areas. Walls: cast in place or precast. Stone facing recommended. Walls: not exceed 4'. Development code for fences and retaining walls has wall heights with 6' maximum and no material requirements. Maybe rewrite fences with visual perspective from public right of ways. Corey: doesn't agree with wall guidelines. Less than 4' not a wall in

code. Short should be retaining wall. Taller should be cast in place. Prefer development code. Others agree. Align as much as can. Address In conjunction with how address setback and simplify fence guidelines.

Landscaping of public streets:

A bit more vegetation is required. Remove DRB review and approval? Code already dictates. Does it need 3<sup>rd</sup> party? Agreed that no additional review needed.

Screening, fencing, utility location:

Quite robust fencing guidelines in this document.

Suggests adding reference to 3.2.500.C.3 that allow exceptions for security fencing around public/quasi-public utility and recreational facilities. Eliminate need for upgraded fencing except along public right-of-way. Reference standard fencing.

Everything will have vegetation/landscape buffer in front of fence. Standard for all except – screen wall. Change visible to adjacent to secure parking lot. Agree.

Reemphasize upgraded with visual from right-of-way. Standard elsewhere.

Residential has a 20 foot setback with landscaping.

BDC:

Architectural Standards for Industrial

Kristina – some guidelines that were in conflict with programmatic needs. Looked at IL. Would like to reduce window requirements which are more stricter than IL/commercial code. Changing building envelope: allow for more flexibility (e.g. roof top mechanical).

Matt: Industrial standards are rather light. Sections in Commercial code are a bit more restrictive. Opportunity to utilize commercial design standards for commercial use. Also commercial along frontage to arterials. Industrial code for industrial buildings. If look at what is being done elsewhere in commercial and industrial areas. Do we want to require more? Comment that like where we are headed. In permitted use table could identify commercial vs industrial with stipulation that if along frontage of arterials and collectors would be commercial. Craig: Code is adequate especially with current building designs. Katie: these buildings (photos) meet current IL codes. So don't require more than what is currently in code. Are we making more complicated? Jim: are these examples exceeding minimums? If are way beyond, then not comfortable. Response: we would pull in some commercial standards where appropriate. Katie: don't want to be too restrictive beyond arterials. May not pencil. Matt: only talking about 6 additional developments. Ron wants to minimize especially those buildings off the beaten path. Agree. Corey: look at newer buildings off American Lane. Target user is going to be owner- operator so will get what we are looking for.

Street Cross sections:

Reduce from 6 cross sections to 3 sections:

100' 3-lane Arterial (Cooley and 18<sup>th</sup>)

80' 3-lane Collector (further east, along north interceptor line)

60' 2-lane and parking Local. (Talus)

Get rid of one way streets. All would have option of multi-use path. Agreement with recommendation.

Jim – open space, parks and pathways. Are we looking at preserving these enhanced features. Response: Utilize public right-of ways. Along westside, tie into Northpoint Park and school. Looking at more from multi-use paths developing along roadways, would be contained within public right-of-way. Private space is not geared toward public. Jim: Is there a 10% open space requirement. Response: There is landscaping required within parking areas as part of underlying code. There is preservation of key sites with trees and rock out croppings. Code already requires some.

- **Adjourned at 1:30 pm.**