## NOTICE OF ADOPTED AMENDMENT

4/22/2010

TO: $\quad$ Subscribers to Notice of Adopted Plan or Land Use Regulation Amendments

FROM: Plan Amendment Program Specialist

SUBJECT: Jefferson County Plan Amendment DLCD File Number 013-09

The Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) received the attached notice of adoption. Due to the size of amended material submitted, a complete copy has not been attached. A Copy of the adopted plan amendment is available for review at the DLCD office in Salem and the local government office.

## Appeal Procedures*

## DLCD ACKNOWLEDGMENT or DEADLINE TO APPEAL: Wednesday, May 05, 2010

This amendment was submitted to DLCD for review prior to adoption pursuant to ORS 197.830(2)(b) only persons who participated in the local government proceedings leading to adoption of the amendment are eligible to appeal this decision to the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA).

If you wish to appeal, you must file a notice of intent to appeal with the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) no later than 21 days from the date the decision was mailed to you by the local government. If you have questions, check with the local government to determine the appeal deadline. Copies of the notice of intent to appeal must be served upon the local government and others who received written notice of the final decision from the local government. The notice of intent to appeal must be served and filed in the form and manner prescribed by LUBA, (OAR Chapter 661, Division 10). Please call LUBA at 503-373-1265, if you have questions about appeal procedures.
*NOTE: The Acknowledgment or Appeal Deadline is based upon the date the decision was mailed by local government. A decision may have been mailed to you on a different date than it was mailed to DLCD. As a result, your appeal deadline may be earlier than the above date specified. NO LUBA Notification to the jurisdiction of an appeal by the deadline, this Plan Amendment is acknowledged

Cc: Nick Snead, Jefferson County
Jon Jinings, DLCD Community Services Specialist Gloria Gardiner, DLCD
Mark Radabaugh, DLCD
Jon Jinings, DLCD Regional Representative
Angela Lazarean, DLCD Regional Representative
Bill Holstrom, DLCD
Constance Beaumont, DLCD
<paa> Y

[^0]Jurisdiction: Jefferson County / Madras
Date of Adoption: 4-14-10
Was a Notice of Proposed Amendment (Form
$\boxtimes$ Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment
Land Use Regulation Amendment
New Land Use Regulation
Local file number: 10-PA-01
Date Mailed: 3-14-10
No Date: 12-14-09
区 Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment
囚 Zoning Map Amendment
Other:
Summarize the adopted amendment. Do not use technical terms. Do not write "See Attached".An amendment to the City of Madras \& Jefferson County Comprehensive Plans and Zoning maps to expandthe Madras UGB by approx. 36.91 acres for residential, public and semi-public purposes. Madras has alsoadded a zoning compatibility table (Table 3-1) that lists Madras Comprehensive Land Use Plan Designationsand corresponding City and County zones that are deemed compatible. The table is needed because the MadrasComprehensive Land Use Plan map, which applies to incorporated and unincorporated properties, and thecity's zoning map are one in the same.

## Does the Adoption differ from proposal? Yes

Slightly, in that when the original notice was sent to DLCD (12-14-09) the City proposed to justify the UGB expansion based on the Jefferson County School Facility Plan (SFP). It was the opinion of the local DLCD Field Representative that the SFP didn't fully comply with ORS 195.110. As such, the City choose to change the manner in which the 36.91 acre UGB expansion would be justified from the SFP need to the identified 20year residential land need identified in the acknowledged Madras Urban Reserve Area Report.

## Plan Map Changed from: Only UGB expanded Zone Map Changed from: Only UGB expanded to: Only UGB expanded to: Only UGB expanded Location: East of existing Madras UGB, south of Ashwood Rd. See Findings Pg. 6 Acres Involved: ~ 36.91

Specify Density: Previous: N/A
New: N/A
Applicable statewide planning goals:


Was an Exception Adopted? $\square$ YES $\boxtimes$ NO
Did DLCD receive a Notice of Proposed Amendment...
45 -days prior to first evidentiary hearing?


DLCD file No.
Please list all affected State or Federal Agencies, Local Governments or Special Districts:
Jefferson County \& Oregon Department of Transportation

## Local Contact: Jon Skidmore

Address: 85 SE "D" St.
City: Madras
Jon.Skidmore@co.jefferson.or.us

Phone: (541) 475-4462 Extension:
Fax Number: 541-325-5004
E-mail Address:

## ADOPTION SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

This Form 2 must be received by DLCD no later than 5 days after the ordinance has been signed by the public official designated by the iurisdiction to sign the approved ordinance(s) per ORS 197.615 and OAR Chapter 660, Division 18

1. This Form 2 must be submitted by local jurisdictions only (not by applicant).
2. When submitting, please print this Form 2 on light green paper if available.
3. Send this Form 2 and One (1) Complete Paper Copy and One (1) Electronic Digital CD (documents and maps) of the Adopted Amendment to the address in number 6:
4. Electronic Submittals: Form 2 - Notice of Adoption will not be accepted via email or any electronic or digital format at this time.
5. The Adopted Materials must include the final decision signed by the official designated by the jurisdiction. The Final Decision must include approved signed ordinance(s), finding(s), exhibit(s), and any map(s).
6. DLCD Notice of Adoption must be submitted in One (1) Complete Paper Copy and One (1) Electronic Digital CD via United States Postal Service, Common Carrier or Hand Carried to the DLCD Salem Office and stamped with the incoming date stamp. (for submittal instructions, also see \# 5)] MAIL the PAPER COPY and CD of the Adopted Amendment to:

ATTENTION: PLAN AMENDMENT SPECIALIST<br>DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT<br>635 CAPITOL STREET NE, SUITE 150<br>SALEM, OREGON 97301-2540

7. Submittal of this Notice of Adoption must include the signed ordinance(s), finding(s), exhibit(s) and any other supplementary information (see ORS 197.615 ).
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## LAND CONSERVATIOA

ANR REVELOEMENHON

## United States Postal Service ${ }^{\circledR}$ <br> DELIVERY CONFIRMATION ${ }^{\mathrm{m}}$



## To:

ATTENTION: PLAN AMENDMENT SPEC DEPARTMENT OF LAṄD CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMIENT
635 CAPITOL STREET NE, SUITE 150
SALEM, OREGON 97301-2540


Community Development Department 71 S.E. D Street, Madras, OR, 97741 541-475-3388

# DEPT OF 

APR 152010
April 14, 2010

24TU

Plan Amendment Specialist Department of Land Conservation and Development 635 CAPITOL Street NE, Suite 150

Re: City of Madras Notice of Adoption of Comprehensive Plan Amendment to expand the City of Madras UBG by approximately 36.91 acres.

Enclosed is the Notice of Adoption of the Comprehensive Plan amendments to the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan map, the City of Madras and Jefferson County Zoning Maps, and text amendment to the City of Madras Comprehensive Plan.

On April 13, 2010 the Madras City Council adopted Ordinance 832 amending the Madras Comprehensive Plan and Zoning map. Later on April 14, 2010 the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners adopted Final Order \#0-039-10 which amended the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan map and Zoning map. Per ORS 197.615 this Notice of Adoption is being sent to DLCD as required.

If you should have any questions please contact me at 54-323-2916.
Respectfully,


Nicholas Snead
Community Development Director
Cc: Jefferson County Community Development Director, Jefferson County Administrator, Jefferson County Legal Counsel, City of Madras Administrator, City of Madras Attorney.

Enclosure: Notice of Adoption (JC File \#01PA-10)

## DLCD <br> Notice of Adoption

DLCD File \# Madras-002-09

# City of Madras Adopting Ordinance 

## ORDINANCE NO. 823

## AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING FINDINGS FOR AN URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY EXPANSION OF APPROXIMATELY 36.91 ACRES [JC FILE \#10-PA-01], AMENDING THE CITY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND PLAN MAP, AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

WHEREAS, the Madras Urban Reserve Area (URA) was approved in July 2009 by the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development; and

WHEREAS, land in the Urban Reserve Area is first priority land for inclusion in the Urban Growth Boundary pursuant to ORS 197.298; and

WHEREAS, the Madras Urbanization Study (April 2007) and the Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (August 2007) identified the need for residentially zoned land for housing and public/semi-public uses outside the existing UGB; and

WHEREAS, the City of Madras has initiated the Urban Growth Boundary amendment process to try to meet this need; and

WHEREAS, in order to facilitate the transition of rural zoning to urban zoning in the urban growth area, text amendments are proposed for Section IV (Land Use Element) of the Madras Comprehensive Plan that identify county zones allowed on land that is designated for future urban use on the Comprehensive Plan Map; and

WHEREAS, it is also being proposed that the Madras Comprehensive Plan be amended to include a table that presents the City zones and County zones that correspond, and are allowed under City Comprehensive Plan designations; and

WHEREAS, the City of Madras Comprehensive Plan and Zone Map are being amended to expand the Madras Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) to include 36.91 acres from the Madras Urban Reserve Area (URA); and

WHEREAS, a joint public hearing of the City of Madras Planning Commission and Jefferson County Planning Commission was held on February 11, 2010 to consider findings, and accept any written and oral testimony from the public on the proposed 36.91 acre Urban Growth Boundary Expansion; and

WHEREAS, after considering the Findings of Fact, and written and oral testimony from the public, both the City Planning Commission and Jefferson County Planning Commission took formal action to recommend to the City Council and Jefferson County Board of Commissioners that the proposed Urban Growth Boundary Expansion be approved; and

WHEREAS, the City Planning Commission's recommendation to approve the Urban Growth Boundary Expansion was forwarded to the Madras City Council during a joint public hearing with the Jefferson County Board of Directors on March 29, 2010; and

WHEREAS, after considering the Findings of Fact, and all written and oral testimony from the public, the Madras City Council took formal action to approve the Urban Growth Boundary Expansion [JC File \#10-PA-01], and forward a recommendation to the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners that the Commissioners approve the Urban Growth Boundary Expansion as proposed.

NOW, THEREFORE, the City of Madras ordains as follows:

## SECTION 1: FINDINGS FOR URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY EXPANSION

The "Findings of Fact" and its attachments, as submitted to the City Planning Commission and Madras City Council for consideration, are hereby adopted as Exhibit "A" and made a part of this ordinance.

## SECTION 2: AMENDMENTS TO THE CITY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND PLAN MAP

The proposed text amendments to Section IV (Land Use Element) of the Madras Comprehensive Plan that identifies county zones allowed on land that is designated for future urban use on the Comprehensive Plan Map shall hereby be adopted.

The Madras Comprehensive Plan shall be amended to add a table that presents the City zones and County zones that correspond and are allowed under City comprehensive plan designations.

The City Comprehensive Plan and Zone Map shall be amended to reflect the expansion of the Madras Urban Growth Boundary to include 36.91 acres from the Madras Urban Reserve Area (Attached Exhibit "B").

## SECTION 3: SEVERABILITY CLAUSE

A determination of invalidity or unconstitutionality by a court of competent jurisdiction of any clause, sentence, paragraph, section or part, of this Ordinance shall not affect the validity of the remaining parts of this Ordinance.

## SECTION 4: CORRECTIONS

This Ordinance may be corrected by order of the City Council to cure editorial and clerical errors.

## SECTION 5: SAVINGS CLAUSE

A prosecution which is pending on the effective date of this Ordinance and which arose from a violation of an ordinance repealed by this Ordinance, or a prosecution which is started within one year after the effective date of this Ordinance arising from a violation of an ordinance repealed by this Ordinance, shall be tried and determined exactly as if the ordinance had not been repealed.

## SECTION 6: EMERGENCY CLAUSE

The City Council of the City of Madras, having reviewed the Comprehensive Plan of the City of Madras, and the need for enactment of ordinances to regulate land use within the City does hereby determine that this ordinance is necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, and safety of the citizens of the City of Madras and an emergency is hereby declared to exist, and this Ordinance shall become in full force and effect from and after the date it is enacted and signed by the Mayor.

ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Madras and signed by the Mayor this 13 th day of $\qquad$ , 2010
Ayes:
Nays:
Abstentions:
Absent:
Vacancies:


ATTEST:

Karen J. Coleman, City Recorder

# BEFORE THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF THE STATE OF OREGON FOR THE COUNTY OF JEFFERSON 

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE JEFFERSON )
COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAP TO )

## 0-039-10

 EXPAND THE MADRAS URBAN GROWTH ) Ordinance No. $\qquad$ BOUNDARY BY APPROXIMATELY 37 ACRES )AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY (10-PA-01) )

WHEREAS, Jefferson County worked with the City of Madras and other stakeholders to establish a 50-year Urban Reserve Area surrounding the City of Madras; and

WHEREAS, the Madras Urban Reserve Area (URA) was acknowledged in February 2010 by the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development; and

WHEREAS, land in the Urban Reserve Area is first priority land for inclusion in the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) pursuant to ORS 197.298 and the land proposed for UGB expansion is within the URA; and

WHEREAS, the Madras Urbanization Study (April 2007) and the Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (August 2007) identified the need for residentially zoned land for housing and public/semi-public uses outside the existing UGB; and

WHEREAS, a joint public hearing of the City of Madras Planning Commission and Jefferson County Planning Commission was held on February 11, 2010 to consider findings and accept any written and oral testimony from the public on the proposed approximate 37 acre Urban Growth Boundary Expansion; and

WHEREAS, after considering the Findings of Fact, and written and oral testimony from the public, both the Jefferson County Planning Commission and the City of Madras Planning Commission took formal action to recommend to the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners and the Madras City Council that the proposed UGB expansion be approved; and

WHEREAS, the County Planning Commission's recommendation to approve the Urban Growth Boundary Expansion was forwarded to the Board of County Commissioners during a joint public hearing with the Madras City Council on March 29, 2010; and

WHEREAS, after considering the Findings of Fact, and all written and oral testimony from the public, the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners voted $2-0$ to approve the proposed Comprehensive Plan Map amendment and City of Madras Urban Growth Boundary expansion.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners hereby ORDAINS as follows:

## 1. Adoption of Findings

The Findings of Fact and Conclusions in the attached Findings Document and Staff Report are hereby adopted and incorporated herein by reference as the basis for the decisions to adopt the amendments to the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan Map.

## 2. Amendment to the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan Map

The amendment to the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan Map contained in the attached Exhibit A is hereby adopted and by this reference incorporated herein as if fully set forth.

## 3. Severability

The provisions of this ordinance are severable. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause or phrase of this ordinance or any exhibit thereto is, for any reason, held to be invalid or unconstitutional, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this ordinance or exhibits thereto.

## 4. Effective Date

These amendments being necessary for immediate implementation, an emergency is declared to exist, and the specified amendments shall therefore take place and be effective on April 14, 2010.

DATED this $14^{\text {th }}$ day of April, 2010.

## Attest:



# City of Madras <br> Comprehensive Plan Amendment 

Proposed Amendments to Madras Comprehensive Plan, Madras and Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan Maps, and Madras Zoning Map

## FINDINGS

City of Madras Planning Commission Jefferson County Planning Commission

Prepared for:
Jefferson County 66 S.E. "D" Street
Madras, OR 97741


City of Madras
71 S.E. "D" Street
Madras, OR 97741


Prepared by:


Angelo Planning Group
921 SW Washington, Suite 468
Portland, Oregon 97205
February 2010

## City of Madras Planning Commission

| Shelly | Tack | Chair |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lynn | Kowaleski | Vice-Chair |
| Alan | Hurley | Commissioner |
| Kasey | Cousens | Commissioner |
| Richard | Ladeby | Commissioner |
| Joe | Krenowicz | Commissioner |

## City of Madras City Council

| Melanie | Widmer | Mayor |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Tom | Brown | Councilor |
| Walt | Chamberlain | Councilor |
| Royce | Embanks Jr. | Councilor |
| Benjamin | Keeton | Councilor |
| Bob | McConnell | Councilor |
| Kevin | O'Meara | Councilor |

## Jefferson County Planning Commission

| Don | Martin | Chair |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Evan | Thomas | Vice Chair |
| Dick | Dodson | Commissioner |
| Bob | Powers | Commissioner |
| Roy | Hyder | Commissioner |
| Kay | Moon | Commissioner |
| Jim | Martin | Commissioner |

## Jefferson County Board of Commissioners

| John | Hatfield | Commission Chair |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Mike | Ahern | Commissioner |
| Wayne | Fording | Commissioner |

## Project Support and Consulting Team

| Angelo Planning Group | Land use planning, project management |
| :--- | :--- |
| Kittelson Associates | Transportation analysis |
| Jefferson County | Planning |
| City of Madras | Planning, technical support |
| Jefferson County School District 509-J | Planning, technical support |
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## I. Proposal Summary

| File No.: | 081-004 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Legislative Sponsor: | Nick Snead, Community Development Director City of Madras 71 SE D Street Madras, OR 97741 <br> (541) 475-3388 <br> (541) 475-7061 Fax <br> nsnead@ci.madtas.or.us |
| Planning Consultant: | D] Heffeman <br> Angelo Planning Group <br> 921 SW Washington, Suite 468 <br> Portland, Oregon 97205 <br> (503) 227-3664 <br> (503) 227-3679 Fax <br> dheffernan@angeloplanning.com |
| Proposal: | - To amend the Madras Comprehensive Plan - to add a table that presents the City zones and County zones that cortespond and are allowed under City comprehensive plan designations. (Table 3-1) <br> - To amend the Jefferson County and City of Madras Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Maps - to expand the Madras Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) to include 36.91 acres from the Madras Urban Reserve Area (URA); to annex 20 acres of City-owned land ("east site," Figure 4-1) to the City of Madras and apply City R-2, Multiple Family Residential zoning; to annex 16.22 acres of privately owned land plus 0.69 acres of land for County right-of-way ("west site," Figure 4-1) to the City and retain existing County RL, Range Land, zoning. |
| Location: | - West site: tax map of 16.91 -acre west site (outlined), directly east of the existing Madras UGB, south of Ashwood Road (Appendix A) <br> - East site: survey map of 20 -acre east site, east of the existing Madras UGB, south of Ashwood Road (Appendix B) |
| Legal Description: | West site: 11S 14E 7 Lots 101 ( 12.28 acres), 102 ( 0.69 acres for right-of-way), and 200 ( 3.94 acres), entire lots East site: 11S 14E 7 Lot 100 (20 acres), parcel of lot <br> Legal description of Lot 100 parcel (east site): A portion of Parcel 2 of Partition Plat No. 2002-12 as filed in the Jefferson County Clerk's Offrce, situated in the Northeast Quarter (NE $1 / 4$ ) of Section |

Proposed Amendments to Madras Comprehensive Plan and
Madras and Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Maps
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|  | 7, Township 11 South, Range 14 East of the Willamette Meridian, Jefferson County Oregon, more particularly described as follows: Commenting at the Northwest corner of said Northeast Quarter, monumented with a 2 inch diameter brass cap, from which the Northeast corner of said Section 7 bears South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 2640.53 feet; thence South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ East along the North line of said Section 7 a distance of 599.997 feet's thence South $0^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 40.00 feet to the Northwest comer of said Parcel 2 of Partition Plat No. 2002-12; thence continuing South $0^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ West along the West line of said Parcel 2 a distance of 40.00 feet to the South night-of-way line of East Astwood Road and the True Point of Beginning of this Description; thence South $0^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ East along said West line a distance of 935.13 feet to the Southeast corner of Parcel 1 of said Parrition Plat No. 2002-17; thence leaving said West line South $89^{\circ} 39^{3} 40^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 931.70 feet; thence Nortb $0^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 935.12 feet; to a point on the South right-of-way line of East Ashwood Road; thence North 89039'40"West along said right-of-way line a distance of 931.70 feet to the True Point of Beginning. <br> Contains 20.00 acres more or less. <br> End of Description (Appendix B) |
| :---: | :---: |

## II. Introduction

## Proposed Map Amendments

The Madras Urban Reserve Area (URA) was approved by DLCD in July 2009, and was sized to provide urbanizable land for the next 50 years. Land from the URA is the first priority for inclusion in the UGB pursuant to ORS 197.298. The City of Madras is not currently in periodic review or evaluating its existing UGB for a 20 -year land supply. The City, however, has initiated this UGB amendment and annexation process in order to begin to meet the land need identified by the Madras Urbanization Study (April 2007) and the Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (August 2007), prepared by ECONorthwest. The studies found a need for residentially zoned land for housing and public/semi-public uses outside the existing UGB.

There are two parts to the proposed Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) annexation: the east site and the west site. The City of Madras owns the east site. This land is proposed for annexation to the Madras UGB and city limits and for re-zoning as City Multi-Family Residential ( $\mathrm{R}-2$ ), a designation that will allow for a multi-family and single-family housing as well as public/semi-public uses typically sited on residentially zoned land. The 20 -acre parcel is within the Yarrow Master Plan area.

In addition to the east site, there are another 16.91 acres of land in the proposed UGB and City annexation, referred to as the west site. The west site is comprised of three lots that provide County right-of-way, better connect the east site to the existing UGB, and contribute toward meeting the long-tem need for residentially zoned land. The west site is privately owned and is not proposed for re-zoning at this time. Owners may apply for rezoning when they are prepared to file land development applications in the future. It is expected that the west-site land also will provide the same range of needed housing types and public/semi-public uses as the east site when re-zoning is approved. Both the east and west sites will be designated Residential on the Plan Maps if this proposal is approved.

## Proposed Text Amendments

In order to facilitate the transition of rural zoning to urban zoning in the urban growth area, text amendments are proposed for Section IV (Land Use Element) of the Madras Comprehensive Plan that identify county zones allowed on land that is designated for future urban use on the Comprehensive Plan map.

## III. Jefferson County and City of Madras Comprehensive Plan Amendments

Table 3-1 lists Madras Comprehensive Land Use Plan Designations and corresponding City and County zones that are deemed compatible. The table is needed because the Madras Comprehensive Land Use Plan map, which applies to incorporated and unincorporated properties, and the city's zoning map are one in the same. The table clanifies that unincorporated property may retain its county zoning when it is annexed into the UGB if the land is not immediately annexed into the city. Such properties may retain any of the listed County zones and be regulated under the County's land development ordinance consistent with adopted growth management policies and procedures that apply to all land inside the Madras UGB. When such land is ready for urban development, the owner may request city annexation and zoning that is consistent with the land use plan designation for their property. Practically speaking, the table simply allows rural zoning districts to be applied in the Madras urban growth area on an interim basis, even when the rural zone differs from the intended long range urban use for a subject property. The table does not alter anything in practice. County zoned properties that are inside the Madras UGB remain under county jurisdiction in all respects although they are subject to urban growth management policies and regulatory review procedures that have been jointly adopted by Jefferson County and the City of Madras. In this context, the conformity table serves as a zoning bridge between a property's planned urban future and its current unincorporated rural zoning.

Table 3-1 Proposed Table for Corresponding City of Madras Comprehensive Plan Map Deslgnations, Clity of Madras Zones, and Jefferson County Zones

| Plan <br> Map <br> Label | Designation | Description | City <br> Zones | County Zones |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| R-1 | Single-Family <br> Residential | Land primarily for single-family homes, <br> including manufactured home <br> subdivisions, and for duplexes | R-1 | EFU A-1, EFU <br> A-2, RL, FM, <br> RR-2, RR-5, <br> RR-10, RR-20, <br> ERD |
| R-2 | Multi-Family <br> Residential | Land for multi-family housing to be close <br> to businesses and services and to buffer <br> single-family residential and commercial <br> uses. Manufactured homes and <br> neighbornood commercial uses are <br> allowed. | R-2 | EFU A-1, EFU <br> A-2, RL, FM, <br> RR-2, RR-5, <br> RR-10, RR-20, <br> ERD |
| R-3 | Planned Residential <br> Development | Land for primarily residential <br> development that allows site design <br> flexibility to promote creativity and <br> protection of scenic and natural <br> resources | R-3 | EFUA-1, EFU <br> A-2, RL, RR-2, <br> RR-5, RR-10, <br> RR-20, ERD |
| C-1 | Corridor Commercial | Land for primarily motor vehicle-oriented <br> uses located along major roadways | C-1 | CC, ERD |
| C-2 | Downtown Commercial | Land for a mixture of smaller scale <br> businesses that supports redevelopment, <br> higher density, public spaces, and other <br> elements of pedestrian orientation | C-2 | CC, ERD |

Proposed Amendments to Madras Comprehensive Plan and
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| Plan <br> Map <br> Label | Designation | Descriptlon <br> Zones | County Zones |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| C-3 | Community <br> Commercial | Land for primarily motor vehicle-oriented <br> uses but on a smaller scale than Corridor <br> Commercial | C-3 | SC, CC, ERD, <br> EFU A-1, EFU <br> A-2, RL |
| NC | Neighborhood <br> Commercial | Land for small-scale commercial uses in <br> residential areas that includes public <br> spaces and promotes transportation <br> options | NC | SC, ERD EFU <br> A-1, EFU A-2, <br> RL |
| I Industrial | Land for industrial uses where industrial <br> uses already exist in the city and in the <br> Madras Industrial Park | I | EFU A-1, EFU <br> A-2, RL, FM, <br> PM, CI, IR, <br> ERD |  |
| A/S | Open Space | Land where parks, open space, or public <br> uses already exist or is othewise <br> publicly owned | OS/PF | EFU A-1, EFU <br> A-2, RL, FM, <br> PM |


| County Zones: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| AM | Airport Management |
| CC | County Commercial |
| CI | County Industrial |
| EFU A-1, EFU A-2, RL | Exclusive Farm Use Zones |
| ERD | Existing Rural Development |
| FM | Forest Management |
| IR | Industrial Reserve |
| PM | Park Management |
| RR-2, RR-5, RR-10, RR-20 | Rural Residential |
| SC | Service Community |

[^2]Madras and Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Maps
IV. Proposed Amendments to Madras Comprehensive Plan, Madras and Jefferson
County Comprehensive Plan Maps, and Madras Zoning Map Figure 4-1: Proposed UGB Amendment and Annexation Area

.


## V. Conformance with Statewide Land Use Goals

## Goal 1: Citizen Involvement <br> To develop a citizen involvement program that insures the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process.

Response: The proposed amendments have been reviewed during a series of public meetings and hearings in order to allow for consideration by public officials and public feedback.

The Jefferson County School District 509-J ("JCSD" or "District") Board ("Board") was generally briefed by the Superintendent about the 2009 Long Range Facility Plan at the December 14, 2009 School Board meeting where the need for the updated plan was discussed. The draft plan was brought to them first for formal review at a Board meeting on January 11, 2010. After the School Board reviewed the enrollment forecast, location and conditions of existing schools, and future potential school locations, they adopted the plan on January 25, 2010.

The proposed Madras Land Use Element Comprehensive Plan amendment and amendments to the Jefferson County and City of Madras Comprehensive Plan Maps and Zoning Maps were presented and reviewed in a series of meetings in early 2010.

A public hearing was scheduled before the Madras and Jefferson County Planning Commissions (joint) on February 11, 2010. Notice of the hearing was published in the January 13, 2010 Madras Pioneer. The public notice published in the newspaper was also posted at the Madras City Hall, Jefferson County Annex, US Postal Service Office, and the Jefferson County Library 20 days prior to the February 11, 2010 Planning Commission meeting.

Additionally, property owners within 750 feet of the properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB were notified of the proposed land use action. Adjacent property owners were notified that the file was available for review at the Jefferson County Community Development Department at 85 SE "D" Street and that copies of any information would be provided at a cost of $.25 /$ page. The agenda for the Planning Commission was posted at Madras City Hall, Jefferson County Annex, US Postal Service Office, and the Jefferson County Library 7 days prior to the February 11, 2010 joint Planning Commission meeting.

As discussed above the City proposes to include four (4) properties that total 36.91 acres into the City of Madras Urban Growth Boundary. This constitutes a potential "land use change" that would typically require notice to affected property owners. ORS 227.186 (Measure 56 notice) requires property owners to be notified of legislative acts relating to comprehensive plan, land use planning or zoning proposed by the City. Additionally, the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment is limited to the four properties identified on page 1 . As such, a city-wide notice is not needed rather notice to the individual properties is required.

[^3]7
11 Exhibit to Ordinance No. 823

The City owns property, has a signed Consent to Annex agteement or a letter from a property owner acknowledging the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment that verify that property owners are aware of the proposed land use action and a Measure 56 notice is not needed. Specifically, the City holds title and owns Tax Lot 100 and therefore is aware and consents to the proposed re-zone to a portion of the property it owns that represents a "land use change" that may limit use. Additionally, the City of Madras has signed consent forms from the property owners of tax lots 101 and 200. Jefferson County owns tax lot 102 and has provided a letter acknowledging and supporting the proposed land use action. As such, a formal notice as required by ORS 227.186 is not necessary as the affected property owners are aware of the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment. More over, the ensuing annexation and re-zoning of 20 acres of tax lot 100 is limited to City owned property.

45-day notice to DLCD was sent to DLCD staff on December 14, 2009. On January 13, 2010 DLCD Field Representative, Mark Radabaugh, notified the City of Madras that the contents of the 45 -day notice was incomplete. Later that day, City staff submitted the requested information to DLCD making the notice complete. The materials submitted on January 14, 2010 are noted as the Addendum to the notice.

The UGB expansion area is drawn from the Madras Urban Reserve Area (URA), which was developed through an intensive participatory process. A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Project Advisory Committee (PAC) were formed to provide guidance for the project. The TAC was comprised of staff from project team members, including Jefferson County, the City of Madras, ECONorthwest, Kittelson \& Associates, David Evans \& Associates, Ball Janik, LLP, and Angelo Planning Group. The PAC included representatives of the City of Madras, Jefferson County, Jefferson County School District 509-J, local farmers, housing advocates, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Region 4, and the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD).

## Findings:

- According to both their Comprehensive Plans and code, the City of Madras and Jefferson County Planning Commissions serve as their official citizen planning committees.
- Adoption of the Madras Urban Reserve Area (URA) complied with Goal 1.
- Materials were made available to the public at Madras City Hall and the Jefferson County Community Development Department.
- Measure 56 notice was not issued as the proposed post-acknowledgment plan amendments are property specific and do not propose additional regulations to the properties proposed to be annexed and, in the case of the east site, re-zoned to Multi-Family Residential (R-2).
- 45-day notice of proposed plan amendments was sent to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) on December 14, 2009 prior to the start of hearings held by County and City Planning Commissions and legislative bodies. On January 13, 2010 the City of Madras provided supplemental information to DLCD vial email.
- Notices of the public meetings were published in the City's local newspaper, including contact information for the City and County.

Conclusion: The proposed text and map amendments comply with State requirements for citizen involvement per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 1.

## Goal 2: Land Use Planning

To establish a land use planning process and policy framework as a basis for all decisions and actions related to use of land and to assure an adequate factual base for such decisions and actions.

## Response:

## Proposed Map Amendments

The Madras City Council adopted the Madras Urban URA and related provisions in October 2008 and the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners in November 2008. DLCD acknowledged and approved the URA and related amendments in July 2009, with stipulations that some of the proposed amendments to the Jefferson County development code be modified. Pursuant to ORS 197.298, the first priority for land to be included in a UGB is land designated as an urban reserve. Therefore, the land in the Madras URA is the first priority for UGB expansion when there is a demonstrated need for land in the next 20 years, as was found by the Madras Urbanization Study and Addendum.

The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is currently zoned Range Land by the County. Upon annexation to the UGB and Madras city limits, City R-2, Multiple Family Residential, zoning is being requested for the east site. The west site is proposed to be annexed to the city and to retain its existing County zoning, but the land is designated for multi-family residential use on the Plan Map.

Land zoned Range Land has been included in the Madras URA to meet long-term land needs and because of sewer service advantages over other areas around the existing UGB and because exception land alone would not meet land needs for the city over the next 50 years. Land in Study Areas 3 and 4 of the Madras URA - east and southeast of the city consistently ranked highest in sewer serviceability analysis, including land in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation. Land in the URA is subject to joint management under the terms of the City's and County's Urban Growth Area Management Agreement (UGAMA) once it is added to the City's UGB. Response and findings related to the UGAMA are provided later in this report.

Local criteria are relied upon to prioritize land from the URA to be included in the UGB. Local criteria ate found in Goal 14 (Urbanization) policies in the Madras Comprehensive Plan. The criteria require a Master Planned Community (MPC) plan or Area Master Plan (AMP), proposed urban zoning, an annexation program, sufficient public facilities, financing prospects, and protection for natural resources and natural hazard areas for the proposed UGB amendment area. Policy14J requires the following.
J. All land use applications or legislative proposals to expand the Madras UGB must be accompanied by information that documents the following:

1. The proposed uban zoning or land use program for the subject properties that address an identified urban land need;
2. An annexation program for all subject properties;
3. Evidence that public facilities required by OAR 660-011-000 that are necessary to serve the expansion area can be served either by system improvements outlined in adopted public facility master plans or by supplemental improvements that augment adopted public facility master plans;
4. Evidence that the proposed zoning or land use plan complies with requirements of OAR 660-0012-0060 either by demonstrating that planned improvements in the Madras Transportation System Plan (TSP) have capacity to meet transportation needs for the proposed expansion area or through supplemental transportation improvements that augment the adopted TSP to meet the need;
5. Evidence that providers of other crucial public facilities (e.g. schools, parks and recreation, emergency services and health care) are able to meet the projected demand for their services;
6. Evidence that financing for constructing needed public improvements is available so that the expansion area can be developed as planned within the planning horizon;
7. Evidence that development in areas subject to natural hazards are protected from these hazards;
8. Evidence that known or probable significant resources related to open space, scenic areas, historic places or structures, and fish and wildife habitat will be protected from development impacts or have development impacts offset using appropriate mitigation measures.

These criteria are addressed later in the report section on the Madras Comprehensive Plan, Goal 14.

The Madras Urbanization Study (ECONotthwest, April 2007) and Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, August 2007) identify a shortage of residentially zoned land to meet single-family and multi-family housing needs and public/semi-public use needs in the next roughly 20 years The needed number of housing units and acreage for residential uses is summarized in Table 4-18 of the August 2007 Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (Table 51).

These needs are compared to the available land supply in the existing UGB in Table 6-4 in the study (Table 5-2) in order to determine whether there is a surplus or deficit of land for residential, public and semi-public, and employment uses. The table documents a shortage of land zoned R-2 (Multiple Family Residential) and land zoned R-1 (Single Family Residential) inside the existing UGB as well as a need for roughly 350 acres of public and semi-public uses over the course of the next 15-20 years. These public/semi-public uses tend to be related to residential uses and are typically allowed and sited on residentially zoned land.

[^4]The proposed UGB amendment addresses part of the residential and public use land need presented above. Annexing 20 acres of the proposed amendment that are owned by the City (the east site) and rezoning it R-2 allows the City to fulfill its agreement with Jefferson County School District (JCSD) and provide land for a potential school site, which could address the need for a new school or replacement school as identified in the JCSD 2009 Long Range Facility Plan. The remainder of the land need identified in the urbanization studies will be addressed during the City's next cycle of periodic review.

Table 5-1: Housing Needs, Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, August 2007)

Table 4-18. Forecast of needed housing units and residential land, Madras, 2007-2027 and 2007-2057

| Housing Type | Hew OU | Percent | Denshy (Du/net res ac) | Nat Res. Acres | Net to Gross <br> Factor | Gross Res. Acres | Densily (DUigross res act |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Needed Units, 2007-2027 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-family types |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-famity delacheo | 1,791 | 61\% | 4.8 | 373.1 | 25\% | 497.5 | 3.6 |
| Hanufacturad | 206 | 7\% | 5.5 | 37.4 | 25\% | 49.8 | 4.1 |
| Condortoxnhomes | 206 | 7\% | 9.0 | 22.8 | 15\% | 26.9 | 7.7 |
| Subtotal | 2,202 | 75\% | 5.4 | 410.5 |  | 574.2 | 3.8 |
| Muli-family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PAutifamly | 734 | 25\% | 14.0 | 52.4 | $15 \% 6$ | 61.7 | 11.9 |
| Subtotal | 734 | 25\% | 14.0 | 52.4 |  | 61.7 | 11.9 |
| Tota) | 2.936 | 100\% | 6.3 | 462.9 |  | 635.8 | 4.6 |
| Heeded Units, 2007-2057 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-family types |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-Tamily detached | 5,516 | 61\% | 4.6 | 1.149.1 | 25\% | 1,532.1 | 3.6 |
| Manufactured | 633 | 7\% | 5.5 | 115.1 | 20\% | 143.8 | 4.4 |
| condortownhomes | 633 | 7\% | 9.0 | 70.3 | 15\% | 82.7 | 7.7 |
| Subiotal | 6.781 | 75\% | 5.4 | 1,334.5 |  | \$,759.7 | 3.9 |
| multh-family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mulitanlly | 2,260 | 25\% | 14.0 | 161.5 | 1046 | 179.4 | 12.6 |
| Sublotal | 2,260 | 25\% | 140 | 161.5 |  | 179.4 | 12.6 |
| Total | 9,042 | 100\% | 6.3 | 1.495.9 |  | 1,938.1 | 4.7 |

Source: ECOHLortirwest
 detached, $477.1 /(1-75)=636.1$. Conversety, $936.1 \times .75=4771$

Table 5-2. Land Needs, Rhadras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, August 2007)

Table 6-4. Comparison of land supply and demand, Madras UGB, 2007-2027 and 2007-2057

| Plan Desipnation | Land Demand |  | Supply 2007 | Surplus 2007.2027 | (deflcit) <br> 2007-2057 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential |  |  |  |  |  |
| R-1 | 451.9 | 1,355.7 | 3981 | (53.8) | (957.6) |
| R-2 | 46.1 | 136.2 | 23.5 | (22.5) | (114.6) |
| R-3 | 1480 | 444.0 | 242.3 | 94.8 | (201.2) |
| RRE | 0.0 | 0.0 | 32.7 | 32.7 | 32.7 |
| RR10 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 475 | 47.5 | 47.5 |
| RL | 0.0 | 0.0 | 38.7 | 38.7 | 30.7 |
| PubliclSemipulsic uses on res land | 359.3 | 770.7 | 0.0 | (358.3) | (770.7) |
| Subtotal (Residential) | 1,004.2 | 2,708.6 | 783.3 | (220.9) | [1,925.3) |
| Commercial (Retall 8 Services) |  |  |  |  |  |
| C-1 | 230.6 | 758.1 | 80.2 | (150.4) | (677.9) |
| NC. | 28.5 | 90.4 | 4.9 | (23.7) | (85.4) |
| CC | 0 | 0 | 326 | 32.6 | 326 |
| Subtotal Commercial | 259.2 | 848.5 | 117.7 | (141,5) | (730.8) |
| Industrial |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 251.4 | 749.9 | 296.9 | 45.5 | (452.9) |

## Proposed Text Amendments

As discussed above, the proposed UGB amendment and annexation is based on the buildable lands inventory and needs analysis performed by ECONorthwest in 2007 and for the Madras URA. The proposed table of corresponding City land use designations and City and County zones (Table 3-1) is proposed to facilitate the transition of land from rural to urban and the annexation of land in the URA to the Madras UGB and city limits.

## Findings:

- The proposed UGB amendment and annexation is drawn from land in the adopted Madras URA, which is the first priority land to be included in the UGB pursuant to state statute.
- The east site and west site are currently zoned Range Land by the County. Range land was included in the Madras URA because of sewer service advantages it had over other land surrounding the UGB and because including only exception land in the URA would not have provided enough land for the projected growth needs of the next approximately 50 years.
- The proposed annexation area meets some of the need for residentially zoned land outside the existing UGB over the next 20 years, as established in the 2007 Madras Urbanization Study and addendum. The studies found the need for more than 200 acres of land for housing and related public/semi-public uses.

Conclusion: The proposed map and text amendments comply with State requirements for land use planning per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 2.

Goal 3: Agricultural Lands
To preserve and maintain agricultural lands.
Response: The entire Madras URA includes land zoned for rural residential, range land, and agricultural uses, as shown in Table 5-3.

Table 5-3: Exception and Resource Land in the Madras URA

| Land Type | Zones | Acres |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Exception Land | RR2, RR5, RR10 <br> (Rural Residential) | 1,709 |
| Non-prime Resource Land | RL <br> (Range Land) | 2,038 |
| Prime Resource Land | A1 <br> (Agricultural) | 68 |
|  | Total | 3,815 |

Prime agricultural land makes up less than $2 \%$ of the total URA. When prime agricultural land is included, it is only when it is adjacent to the existing UGB, surrounded by exception land or non-prime resource land, and/or will be more easily served with public facilities sewer service, in particular. The rest of the URA is comprised of rural residential and range land. Rangeland was included in the URA because of serviceability advantages it has over other land surrounding the Madras UGB and because all the exception (rural residential) land adjacent to the Madras UGB would not fulfill the city's estimated land needs for the next 50 years.

The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is currently zoned Range Land by the County. Upon annexation to the UGB and Madras city limits, City R-2, Multiple Family Residential, zoning is being requested for the east site. The west site is proposed to be annexed to the city and to retain its existing County zoning, but the land is designated for multi-family residential use on the Plan Map.

As explained above, land zoned Range Land has been included in the Madras URA to meet land needs and because of sewer service advantages over other areas around the existing UGB and because exception land alone would not meet land needs for the city over the next 50 years. Land in Study Areas 3 and 4 of the URA consistently ranked highest in sewer serviceability analysis, including land in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation.

Pursuant to ORS 197.298(a), the first priority of land to be included in the UGB is land in a URA. Beyond that, local criteria can be relied upon to prioritize land from the URA to be included in the UGB. Local criteria are found in Goal 14 (Urbanization) policies in the Madras Comprehensive Plan. The criteria require a Master Planned Community (MPC) plan or Area Master Plan (AMP), proposed urban zoning, an annexation program, sufficient public facilities, financing prospects, and protection for natural resources and natural hazard areas for the proposed UGB amendment area. These policies are addressed in more detail in the response and findings for Madras Comprehensive Plan Goal 14.

Land in the URA is subject to joint management under the terms of the City's and County's Urban Growth Area Management Agreement (UGAMA) once it is added to the City's UGB. Response and findings related to the UGAMA are provided later in this report.

## Findings:

- The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is land from the Madras URA, top priority land for inclusion in the UGB pursuant to ORS 197.298(a).
- Some of the non-prime resource land (zoned Range Land) is easier to serve with sewer than other areas around the existing Madtas UGB, based on public facility analysis done during the development of the URA. Land in Study Areas 3 and 4 of the URA consistently ranked highest in sewer serviceability analysis, including land in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation.

Conclusion: The proposed map amendments comply with State requirements for agricultural lands per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 3.

## Goal 5: Natural Resources, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Open Spaces To protect natural resources and conserve scenic and historic areas and open spaces.

Response: The land being proposed for inclusion in the Madras UGB is currently located within the Madras URA, jointly managed by Jefferson County and the City of Madras pursuant to the terms of the Urban Reserve Area Management Agreement (URAMA), adopted in January 2009 (Appendix C). Pursuant to the URAMA, the County processes land use decisions in the URA. In addition, conversion plans must be submitted to the City for land divisions in the URA.

Madras Comprehensive Plan policy language regarding protection of open space, scenic, wildlife, and cultural resources was adopted as part of amendments to Goal 14 (Urbanization) concurrent with the adoption of the Madras URA.

## J. All land use applications or legislative proposals to expand the Madras UGB must be accompanied by information that documents the following:

8. Evidence that known or probable significant resources related to open space, scenic areas, historic places or structures, and fish and wildlife habitat will be protected from development impacts or have development impacts offset using appropriate mitigation measures.

The land in the proposal does not include floodways, floodplains, significant habitat, or cultural resources that are identified in the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan, Goal 5 inventory, or Jefferson County Geographic Information System (GIS) files. The only resources cited in Policy 14 J (8) that may apply to the site are open spaces. Open space will be a required part of school or multi-family residential development that occurs in the UGB amendment area. However, this proposal itself is not a development or entitlement proposal and, therefore, is not required to specify precisely where such open space will be designated.

## Findings:

- Recently adopted amendments to Goal 14 of the City's Comprehensive Plan require identification of protective measures for significant open space, scenic, historic, cultural and natural resources in proposed UGB expansion areas. The Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan and Goal 5 inventory does not identify natural, scenic, or cultural resources in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area.
- Open space designations will be made as part of development entitlement for the proposed UGB amendment and annexation.

Conclusion: The proposed map amendments comply with State requirements for open space, scenic and historic areas, and natural resources per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 5.

## Goal 6: Air, Water and Land Resource Quality <br> To maintain and improve the quality of the air, water and land resources of the state.

Response: According to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ) there ate no federally designated air quality management areas or federally designated hazardous waste sites in the Madras URA. Of Environmental Cleanup Sites reported on ODEQ's website, there are no sites identified in the URA. ${ }^{1}$ Further, R-2 zoning is proposed for the UGB amendment area to be brought in to the city, allowing residential uses and other compatible uses. These uses tend to produce less noise, air, land, and water pollution than commercial and industrial uses, which typically manufacture goods, produce by-products, and generate more vehicle traffic.

## Findings:

- There are not federal- or state-registered environmental quality sites within the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area.
- The amendment and annexation area is needed and planned for residential and related uses, which tend to have fewer adverse ait, water, and land quality impacts than commercial or industrial uses.

Conclusion: The proposed map amendments comply with State requirements for air, water and land resources per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 6.

## Goal 7: Areas Subject to Natural Hazards

To protect people and property from natural hazards.
Response: Primary potential natural hazards in Madras include steep slopes, floodway and floodplain, and wildfire. Statewide Goal 7 is reinforced in Madras Comprehensive Plan

[^5]policies (Goal 14) by requiring protection from natural hazards be demonstrated for proposed UGB amendments.
J. All land use applications or legislative proposals to expand the Madras UGB must be accompanied by information that documents the following:

## 7. Evidence that development in areas subject to natural hazards are protected from these hazards;

There are not steep slopes (slopes greater than $25 \%$ ), floodway, or floodplain land in the proposed annexation area. Fire protection service for the proposal area is currently provided by Jefferson County Fire Protection District \#1, and will continue to be provided by that district if the land is annexed to the city. Area in the district is subject to a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) that Jefferson County completed in 2005 in collaboration with the fire district and federal agencies.

## Findings:

- There are not steep slopes (slopes greater than $25 \%$ ), floodway, or floodplain land in the proposed UGB expansion and annexation area.
- Jefferson County Fire Protection District \#1 provides fire protection service to the proposed amendment and annexation area. The area is subject to the Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) developed and adopted by the County, the fire district, and federal agencies.

Conclusion: The proposed map amendments comply with State requirements for areas subject to natural hazards per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 7.

## Goal 10: Housing

To encourage the availability of adequate numbers of needed housing units at price ranges and rent levels which are commensurate with the financial capabilities of Oregon households and allow for flexibility of housing location, type and density.

Response: This proposal provides land for housing and related public and semi-public uses. The Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (August 2007) shows that there is a shortage of residentially zoned land inside the existing UGB for growth over the next 20 years (Table 5-2).

The proposed annexation to the Madras UGB and city limits addresses this need by including 36.91 acres of land from the URA for residential and public/semi-public uses. It is proposed that the east site be re-zoned from County RL (Range Land) zoning to City R-2 (Multi-Family Residential) zoning.

These proposed amendments are not part of a periodic review work program and the next periodic review process will ensure that the UGB does include enough land to meet all the land needs that are projected for the next 20 years as shown in Table 5-2.

## Findings:

- The Madras Urbanization Study and Addendum found a need for residentially zoned land for housing and public/semi-public uses outside the existing UGB for growth expected over the next 20 years.
- The remainder of land needs determined by the urbanization studies will be addressed during the next City of Madras periodic review.

Conclusion: The proposed map amendments comply with State requirements for housing per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 10.

## Goal 11 Public Facilities and Services

To plan and develop a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban and rural development.

## Goal Requirements

Urban Facilitles and Services - Refers to key facilities and to appropriate types and levels of at least the following: police protection; sanitary facilities; storm drainage facilities; planning, zoning and subdivision control; health services; recreation facilities and services; energy and communication services; and community governmental services.

## A. Goal 11 Planning Guidelines

5. A public facility or service should not be provided in an urbanizable area unless there is provision for the coordinated development of all the other urban facilities and services appropriate to that area.

Response: According to terms of the UGAMA between Jefferson County and the City of Madras, the City will be the primary service provider for land within its UGB, in particular coordinating police, sewer, stormwater, land use, recreation, energy, and governmental services. City urbanization regulations amended with the adoption of the Madras URA require either a Master Planned Community (MPC) plan or Area Master Plan (AMP) for UGB amendments in Madras for areas over five acres (Madras Comprehensive Plan Policy 14 I). Both MPC plans and AMPs must show "appropriate locations for transportation improvements, public facilities, protection for significant open space, scenic, historic, and natural resource areas" and how proposed land uses will integrate with existing development.

Transportation facilities are addressed in more detail in the response and findings for Statewide Goal 12 next in this report.

The adopted Yarrow Master Plan applies to the east site. This land is proposed for annexation both to the Madras UGB and city limits. It is also proposed that the east site be re-zoned to $\mathrm{R}-2$ upon annexation so that it can provide land for uses such as urban levels of housing and related public/semi-public uses. These uses are similar to and compatible with surrounding development of residential and public uses. The east site is tangent to the existing UGB and is bordered by Ashwood Road, a County collector road, which lends itself to the extension of services from inside the existing UGB and city limits. Sufficient water
and sewer service can be provided to the east site given existing and planned systems, and this is documented in the service provider letters from Deschutes Valley Water District and the City of Madras Public Works (Appendix D).

Pursuant to Madras Comprehensive Plan Urbanization Policy 14 I: "An AMP shall demonstrate efficient use of land, zoning consistent with an identified urban land need, appropriate locations for transportation improvements, public facilities, protection for significant open space, scenic, historic, and natural resource areas." It is proposed to annex the west site to the Madras UGB and city limits. While it is also proposed that the site retain its existing County Range Land ( RL ) zoning until the owners are ready to propose development, the site is surrounded by land designated for residential and public/semipublic uses, and its future designation as residential allows housing and compatible public/semi-public uses that can be: "integrated with the existing urban development pattern." (Madras Comprehensive Plan Urbanization Policy 14 I (2)) Further, the proposed addition of a table showing Madras and County zones that correspond with Madras land use designations to the Madras Comprehensive Plan Section IV, Land Use Element (Table 3-1), will facilitate the transition of existing County zoning for the west site to appropriate City zoning.

The west site is comprised of three lots - Lots 101 and 200 that total 16.22 acres and are privately owned and Lot 102 that is 0.69 acres designated for County right-of-way. Lots 101 and 200 are both adjacent to Ashwood Road, a County collector, and will not require additional public roads for sufficient internal or local circulation. At the time of proposed development, proposed land division or planned development plans must show an internal circulation system that satisfies City code requirements and street standards. The west site is adjacent to the existing Madras UGB and is bordered by Ashwood Road, which lends itself to the extension of services from inside the existing UGB and city limits. As with the east site, sufficient water and sewer service can be provided to the west site given existing and planned systems, as stated in service provider letters (Appendix D).

The County has not identified historic, scenic, or natural resources on the west site. City open space requirements for subdivisions or planned developments will apply to the site at the time of proposed development.

Finally both MPC plans and AMPs must have documented approval from a majority of landowners pursuant to Madras Comprehensive Plan Policy 14 I (3). Specifically, the City of Madras owns Tax Lot 100 and as the applicant, consents to the proposed UGB expansion to include 20 acres of Tax Lot 100 and the re-zoning of the property from Range Land (RL) to Multi-Family Residential (R-2). Tax Lot 102 is dedicated to Jefferson County for Ashwood right-of-way and consent for UGB expansion and re-zoning is not needed as inclusion in the UGB and re-zoning will not change how the right-of-way can be used. Consent from other landowners is provided in Appendix E.

## B. Goal 11 Implementation Guidelines

5. Additional methods and devices for achieving desired types and levels of public facilities and services should include but not be limited to the following: (1) tax incentives and disincentives; (2) land use controls and ordinances; (3) multiple use and joint
development practices; (4) fee and less-than-fee acquisition techniques; and (5) enforcement of local health and safety codes.

Response: The proposed land use designations and zoning for the annexation area - the east site and the west site - is appropriate for the type and level of public facilities and services that can be extended to the area. It is proposed to bring the west site into the Madras UGB and city limits but to retain its existing County Range Land (RL) zoning until landowners are ready to propose development. The site is surrounded by land planned for or developed as predominantly residential development. It is well situated for extension of urban facilities and services when they are needed. The proposed addition of a land use and zoning designation table to Section IV (Land Use Element) of the Madras Comprehensive Plan (Table 3-1) establishes the City and County zoning designations that correspond to City land use designations, and will guide the transition from County zoning to appropriate City zoning once a land use action is proposed.

It is proposed that the east site be re-zoned to $\mathrm{R}-2$ upon annexation so that it can provide land for uses such as urban levels of housing and related public/semi-public uses. These uses are similar to and compatible with surrounding development. The east site is tangent to the existing UGB and is bordered by Ashwood Road, a County collector road, which lends itself to the extension of services from inside the existing UGB and city limits. In that vein, service providers have determined that sufficient water and sewer service can be provided to the east and west sites given existing and planned systems (Appendix D).

The east site is part of the approved Yarrow Master Plan, a plan that envisions a variety of housing and then an internal circulation system, open space, public uses (including a school), and a small-scale commercial area to serve the primary residential uses.

Once the properties are annexed into the city limits and developed, wastewater and domestic water services will need to be extended to each developed property. The property owner will fund the extension of wastewater and domestic water services to their properties. Extension of these facilities will be completed as required in the City of Madtas Wastewater Master Plan and the Deschutes Valley Water District Master Plan.

As previously discussed, this proposal is not a development proposal that offers entitlements for construction. Subsequent to this land use action, the property owner will be requited to obtain development approvals (e.g. Site Plan Review, Conditional Use, or Subdivision). Any development approval will require public facilities to be extended to the subject property at the expense of the applicant.

## OAR 660-011-0010

The Public Facility Plan
(1) The public facility plan shall contain the following items:
(a) An inventory and general assessment of the condition of all the significant public facility systems which support the land uses designated in the acknowledged comprehensive plan;
(b) A list of the significant public facility projects which are to support the land uses designated in the acknowledged comprehensive plan. Public facility project descriptions or specifications of these projects as necessary;
(c) Rough cost estimates of each public facility project;
(d) A map or written description of each public facility project's general location or service area;
(e) Policy statement(s) or urban growth management agreement identifying the provider of each public facility system. If there is more than one provider with the authority to provide the system within the area covered by the public facility plan, then the provider of each project shall be designated;
(f) An estimate of when each facility project will be needed; and
(g) A discussion of the provider's existing funding mechanisms and the ability of these and possible new mechanisms to fund the development of each public facility project or system.
(2) Those public facilities to be addressed in the plan shall include, but need not be limited to those specified in OAR 660-011-0005(5). Facilities included in the public facility plan other than those included in OAR 660-011-0005(5) will not be reviewed for compliance with this rule.
(3) It is not the purpose of this division to cause duplication of or to supplant existing applicable facility plans and programs. Where all or part of an acknowledged comprehensive plan, facility master plan either of the local jurisdiction or appropriate special district, capital improvement program, regional functional plan, similar plan or any combination of such plans meets all or some of the requirements of this division, those plans, or programs may be incorporated by reference into the public facility plan required by this division. Only those referenced portions of such documents shall be considered to be a part of the public facility plan and shall be subject to the administrative procedures of this division and ORS Chapter 197.

## OAR 660-011-0015

Responsibility for Public Facillty Plan Preparation
(1) Responsibility for the preparation, adoption and amendment of the public facility plan shall be specified within the urban growth management agreement. If the urban growth management agreement does not make provision for this responsibility, the agreement shall be amended to do so prior to the preparation of the public facility plan.
(2) The jurisdiction responsible for the preparation of the public facility plan shall provide for the coordination of such preparation with the city, county, special districts and, as necessary, state and federal agencies and private providers of public facilities.

Response: The Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) that implements Goal 11 is OAR 660 011. The rule establishes requirements for the planning and provision of public facilities in Oregon. Pursuant to OAR 660-011-0005(5), a public facility "includes water, sewer, and transportation facilities, but does not include buildings, structures or equipment incidental to the direct operation of those facilities." Transportation facilities are addressed in detail in the response and findings for Goal 12 in this report.

The City of Madras is responsible for the planning and provision of sewer service in the proposed annexation area, and Deschutes Valley Water District (DVWD) for the planning and provision of sewer service in the area. The City and DVWD master plans for sewer and water provide an inventory and assessment of existing facilities, a list and map of planned projects, a timeline for their implementation, and a discussion of costs and financing mechanisms.

The City Public Works Director has submitted a letter that is included with this report (Appendix D) that affirms there is sufficient capacity in existing and planned sewer infrastructure to serve the east and west sites in the proposed annexation area. Similarly, the DVWD General Manager has prepared a statement that there is sufficient capacity in existing and planned water infrastructure to serve the proposed annexation area (Appendix D).

## Findings:

- Implementation of public facilities and services in Madras is primatily regulated by land use plans and ordinances and public facility master plans, which are elements of the City Comprehensive Plan.
- The City of Madras will be the primary provider of urban facilities and services in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area. The City will be able to coordinate service to the area with facilities and services already provided to adjacent land within the existing UGB.
- The approved Yarrow Master Plan applies to the east site and shows an internal transportation network and sites for housing and a school.
- The City of Madras Public Works Director and DVWD General Manager have provided letters that verify that there is sufficient capacity in existing and planned sewer and water infrastructure to serve the proposed annexation area.
- When development occurs on the properties to be included in the Madras UGB, the property owner will be responsible for cost to extend sewer and domestic water facilities to development.

Conclusion: The proposed map and text amendments comply with Goal 11 for public facilities and services subject to OAR 660, Division 11.

## Goal 12 Transportation

To provide and encourage a safe, convenient and economic transportation system.

## 660-012-0060

## Plan and Land Use Regulation Amendments

(1) Where an amendment to a functional plan, an acknowledged comprehensive plan, or a land use regulation would significantly affect an existing or planned transportation facility, the local govemment shall put in place measures as provided in section (2) of this rule to assure that allowed land uses are consistent with the identified function, capacity, and performance standards (e.g. level of service, volume to capacity ratio, etc.) of the facility. A plan or land use regulation amendment significantly affects a transportation facility if it would:
(a) Change the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility (exclusive of correction of map errors in an adopted plan);
(b) Change standards implementing a functional classification system; or
(c) As measured at the end of the planning period identified in the adopted transportation system plan:
(A) Allow land uses or levels of development that would result in types or levels of travel or access that are inconsistent with the functional classification of an existling or planned transportation facility;
(B) Reduce the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility below the minimum acceptable performance standard identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan; or
(C) Worsen the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility that is otherwise projected to perform below the minimum acceptable performance standard identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan.
(2) Where a local govemment determines that there would be a significant effect, compliance with section (1) shall be accomplished through one or a combination of the following:
(a) Adopting measures that demonstrate allowed land uses are consistent with the planned function, capacity, and performance standards of the transportation facility.
(b) Amending the TSP or comprehensive plan to provide transportation facilities, improvements or services adequate to support the proposed land uses consistent with the requirements of this division; such amendments shall include a funding plan or mechanism consistent with section (4) or include an amendment to the transportation finance plan so that the facility, improvement, or service will be provided by the end of the planning period.
(c) Altering land use designations, densities, or design requirements to reduce demand for automobile travel and meet travel needs through other modes.
(d) Amending the TSP to modify the planned function, capacity or performance standards of the transportation facility.
(e) Providing other measures as a condition of development or through a development agreement or similar funding method, including transportation system management measures, demand management or minor transportation improvements. Local govemments shall as part of the amendment specify when measures or improvements provided pursuant to this subsection will be provided.

Response: Reflecting Statewide Goal 12 and the Transportation Planning Rule, UGB amendment applications must provide the following pursuant to Madras Goal 14 policies:

> 4. Evidence that the proposed zoning or land use plan complies with requirements of OAR $660-0012$-0060 either bv demonstrating that planed improvements in the Madras Transportation Svstem Plan TSP) have capaciv to meet transportation needs for the proposed expansion area or through supplemental transportation improvements that augment the adopted TSP to meet the need; (Madras Comprehensive Plan Policy J-4)

City R-2 (Multi-Family Residential) zoning is proposed for the east site of the UGB amendment and annexation area. The zone allows mult-family and single-family housing outright and then allows associated uses such as schools, libraries, and community centers conditionally. The minimum lot size for single-family housing is 7,500 square feet and for
multi-family 10,000 square feet for the first two units and 2,000 square feet per each additional unit.

The east site is adjacent to Ashwood Road, an existing road built to County standards as a collector road. Ashwood Road borders the site to the north and provides primary access and connectivity to the proposed lands. Ashwood Road serves the Deer Creek Correctional Institute and other rural uses to the east of the site. To the immediate west Ashwood Road serves Juniper Hills Park and the Jefferson County Middle Schooh, and further west transitions into B Street and connects to US 97 and the City's downtown core. A recently constructed extension of City View to J Street connects the parcel to the southern City limits, and Bean Drive connects toward the northern portion of the City. Table 1 summarizes key characteristics of the existing roadway facilities (Appendix F).

The transportation analysis for annexing and re-zoning the east site to $\mathrm{R}-2$ was based on the assumptions below. Given that schools generate more peak hour traffic than housing alone, two scenarios were developed for Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) analysis that involved both housing and a school. The difference in the scenatios represents the typical range of an elementary school site, 5-10 acres. ${ }^{2}$ The enrollment assumption roughly approximates the average elementary school enrollment in Jefferson County School District 509-J. A maximum housing density of 11.6 units/acre was derived from standards for lot and building size, parking, setbacks, and infrastructure for multi-family residential uses in the R-2 zone.

1. 5-acre school site - 174 multi-family units on 15 acres and a 350 -student elementary school.
2. 10-acre school site - $\mathbf{1 1 6}$ multi-family units on 10 acres and a 350 -student elementary school.

The analysis found that all the stady intersections operate acceptably in the planning horizon ${ }^{3}$ with and without the proposed annexation and re-zoning of the east site, except the intersections of US 97 and J Street. These intersections exceed volume-to-capacity ( $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ) standards in 2025 with or withour the proposed annexation and re-zoning. Because the proposal increases traffic at these intersections, even if minimally, the proposal is deemed to have a "significant effect"; it would further degrade the performance of the failing intersections.

Improvements for the US 97/J Street intersection have been included in an amendment to the Madras TSP and in the ODOT 2010-2013 Draft STIP. The improvements involve realignment of northbound US 97 onto Adams Drive and two new traffic signals at the new J Street intersections, and would allow the US 97/J Street intersections to operate within adopted $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ standards. ODOT has deemed these improvements to be "reasonably likely" in the planning horizon and, thus, no significant would occur with the proposed annexation and re-zoning (Appendix G).

## Findings:

- Transportation analysis for the east site of the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area assumed that the area would be developed with a combination of housing and a school. This was because there is the potential for a school to be located on the site and schools generate more traffic, thus creating a "worse case" set of scenarios for the analysis.
- Transportation analysis showed that all the study intersections would perform within adopted operational standards at the end of the planning horizon with or without the proposed annexation and re-zoning of the east site, except the intersections of US 97 and J Street. These intersections exceed adopted standards and the proposed annexation and re-zoning produce a "significant effect" on the intersections.

[^6]However, improvements for the intersections that are included in the Madras TSP and the 2010-2013 Draft STIP have been deemed "reasonably likely" to occur in the planning horizon, thus mitigating the proposal's significant effect.

Conclusion: The proposed map amendments comply with Goal 12 and OAR 660-0150060.

## Goal 13 Energy Conservation To conserve energy.

Response: The east site of the UGB amendment and annexation area is part of the Yarrow Master Plan area. The master plan includes a range of land uses so that residents can meet many daily needs within the neighborhood. The plan designates land predominantly for housing, but for parks and open space, a school, other community services, and commercial services as well. This mix of uses will provide for these daily needs and reduce the need to drive outside the neighborhood to access these uses.

All public improvements within the Yarrow Master Plan area are required to be constructed to City of Madras standards, which includes the provision of sidewalks. The Master Plan also includes planned open space which will be accessed by a multi-use trail system that will connect to existing multi-use trails in the City of Madras. This supports the use of nonmotorized transportation and the conservation of fuel resources. This proposed UGB amendment and annexation does not provide all of the land needed to implement the master plan but provides part of it.

The west site is not part of the Yarrow Master Plan but will be subject to internal circulation and multi-modal standards when a land division or planned unit development is proposed. Like the east site, the west site is adjacent to Ashwood Road.

While water service was projected to be of similar cost to provide to all the study areas that comprise the Madras URA, there were differences in relative cost for providing sewer service given the need for pumping in some of the study areas. The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is part of a study area and a drainage area where no pumping or limited pumping would be required for sewer service. This minimizes the amount of energy needed to provide that service.

All residential development within the Yarrow Master Plan area are required be built to Earth Advantage/Energy Star standards and receive certification as stated in the Codes, Covenants, and Restrictions (CC\&R's) recorded for the development. Such requirement reduces energy consumption of each dwelling constructed in the Master Plan area and thereby conserves energy consumption which in part satisfies the Goal 13 requirements.

## Findings:

- The approved Yarrow Master Plan that applies to the east site of the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area proposes a variety of uses that will allow residents to take care of day-to-day needs without always having to drive out of the
neighborhood to do so. The plan also indicates multi-use paths and a continuous network of sidewalks to promote walking and bicycling. This supports fuel and energy conservation.
- Providing sewer service to the proposal area requires less pumping and, therefore, infrastructure, energy, and cost than other parts of the URA and other areas around the existing UGB.
- The CC\&R's recorded for the Yarrow Master Plan area require energy conservation by requiring future development to meet or exceed Earth Advantage/Energy Star standards.

Conclusion: The proposed map amendments comply with State requirements for energy conservation per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 13.

## Goal 14 Urbanization

To provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use, to accommodate urban population and urban employment inside urban growth boundaries, to ensure efficient use of land, and to provide for livable communities.

## (2) Orderly and economic provision of public facilities and services;

Response: The proposed map amendments respond to the need for more residentially zoned land as determined in the adopted Madras Urbanizalion Study and Addendum. The studies analyzed the potential for development inside the existing UGB and found that in addition to development that the existing UGB can accommodate, approximately 220 acres of land is needed outside the UGB for residential and related public/semi-public uses over the years until 2027. These studies provided the basis for the Madras URA and URAs are enabled by statewide rules that address orderly and efficient land use as well as an orderly and efficient process for amending UGBs when needed.

This proposed map amendment draws strictly from land in the URA, which is the first priority land to be included in the UGB pursuant to ORS 197.298 and Madras plan policies.

The proposed text amendments (Section III) contribute to orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use by clearly establishing the ways that Jefferson County and City of Madras zones correspond to Madras Comprehensive Plan designations.

Transportation, water, and sewer services are among the critical public facilities that must be provided for the proposed UGB amendment area. As discussed in the narrative and findings for Goals 11 and 12 above, these services can be provided to the UGB amendment area relying on planned capital improvements.

Transportation - Transportation analysis shows that all study intersections perform within adopted operational standards at the end of the planning horizon, with or without the proposed annexation and re-zoning of the east site, except for the intersections at US 97 and J Street. An analysis shows the performance of those intersections, as they are currently designed, exceed mobility standards with and without the proposed annexation and re-
zoning. Unless the intersections can be improved, the proposed annexation and re-zoning produce a "significant effect" on them by making worse an already failing condition.

Proposed improvements to the "J" Street and US 97 intersections are included in the Madras TSP. Those improvements also are listed in the 2010-2013 Draft STIP, in effect programming the necessary state resources for them. On that basis, ODOT has determined the "J" Street/US 97 intersection improvements are "reasonably likely" to occur in the planning horizon (Appendix G). With those planned improvements in place, the affect of the proposed annexation is mitigated and the proposal will not have a significant effect.

Water - During the development of the Madras URA, Deschutes Valley Water District (DVWD) reported that there would be no supply constraint for urban development in the URA. Significant expansion of the District's distribution system would be necessary to serve urban demand in each patt of the URA, and the water service study found that the marginal cost differences between the URA study areas were insignificant. Existing and planned facilities will provide sufficient water service to the area, as confirmed by Deschutes Valley Water District in a service provided letter (Appendix D).

Sewer - Public facility analysis conducted in developing the Madras URA showed that sewer service to the eastern study areas in the URA would be more cost-efficient because no pumping or limited pumping would be required as compared to areas to the north, south, and west. For the proposed UGB amendment area, existing and planned sewer facilities will provide sufficient service to the area according to City of Madras Public Works (Appendix D).

## Findings:

- The proposed map amendments address the residential land need established in the Madras urbanization studies. It draws from the Madras URA, which is the first priority land to be included in the UGB when land need is demonstrated.
- The text amendments facilitate the transition between County zoning and City land use designations and zoning.
- Water service can be provided to the proposal area using the existing and planned water facilities that are identified in the Deschutes Valley Water District's water master plan. Providing water service was not found to be significantly different in cost between different parts of the URA in studies done in developing the Madras URA.
- Studies conducted for the URA found that drainage areas in the eastern and southeastem parts of the URA were easier to serve in that they needed no pumping or minimal pumping of sewage when compared to other parts of the URA. Sewer service can be provided to the proposal area using the existing City of Madras sewer master plan.
- Sufficient transportation facilities and service can be provided to the proposed UGB amendment area given "reasonably likely" construction of improvements to the intersections of US 97/J Street before 2025.

Conclusion: The proposed map and text amendments comply with State requirements for orderly and economic urbanization and provision of public facilities and services per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 14.

## VI. Conformance with Oregon Revised Statutes (ORSs)

## ORS 197

197.298 Priority of land to be included within urban growth boundary. (1) In addition to any requirements established by rule addressing urbanization, land may not be included within an urban growth boundary except under the following priorities:
(a) First priority is land that is designated uman reserve land under ORS 195.145, rule or metropolitan senvice district action plan.
(b) If land under paragraph (a) of this subsection is inadequate to accommodate the amount of land needed, second priority is land adjacent to an urban growth boundary that is identified in an acknowledged comprehensive plan as an exception area or nonresource land. Second priority may include resource land that is completely surrounded by exception areas unless such resource land is high-value farmland as described in ORS 215.710.
(c) If land under paragraphs (a) and (b) of this subsection is inadequate to accommodate the amount of land needed, third prionity is land designated as marginal land pursuant to ORS 197.247 (1991 Edition).
(d) If land under paragraphs (a) to (c) of this subsection is inadequate to accommodate the amount of land needed, fourth priority is land designated in an acknowledged comprehensive plan for agriculture or forestry, or both.
(2) Higher priority shall be given to land of lower capability as measured by the capability classification system or by cubic foot site class, whichever is appropriate for the current use.
(3) Land of lower prionty under subsection (1) of this section may be included in an urban growth boundary if land of higher prionity is found to be inadequate to accommodate the amount of land estimated in subsection (1) of this section for one or more of the following reasons:
(a) Specific types of identified land needs cannot be reasonably accommodated on higher prionity lands;
(b) Future urban services could not reasonably be provided to the higher priority lands due to topographical or other physical constraints; or
(c) Maximum efficiency of land uses within a proposed urban growth boundary requires inclusion of lower priority lands in order to include or to provide senvices to higher priority lands. [1995 c.547 §5; 1999 c. 59 §56]

Response: The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is solely comprised of land from the Madras URA, which is the first priority of land to be included within the UGB pursuant to ORS 197.298(1)(a). There is sufficient land in the Madras URA to provide for the land needs estimated for the next 20 years in the Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, August 2007) and presented below.

The proposed UGB amendment and annexation provides land to meet a portion of the need for residentially zoned land over the next roughly 20 years (Table 6-1). The City's next periodic review process will ensure that the Madras UGB includes enough land to meet the remaining land needs projected to 2027.

Table 6-1: Housing Needs, Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, August 2007)
Table 6-4. Comparison of land supply and demend, Madras UGB: 2007-2027 and 2007-2057

| Plan Designation | Land Demand |  | Supply 2007 | Surplus (deffcit) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2007-2027 | 2007-2057 |  | 2007-2027 | 2007-2057. |
| Resldential |  |  |  |  |  |
| R-1 | 451.9 | 1,355.7 | 398.1 | (53.8) | (957.0) |
| R-2 | 46.1 | 138.2 | 23.5 | (22.5) | (114.5) |
| R-3 | 148.0 | 444.5 | 242.8 | 94.8 | (201.2) |
| RR5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 32.7 | 32.7 | 32.7 |
| RR10 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 47.5 | 47.5 | 47.5 |
| RL | 0.0 | 0.0 | 38.7 | 38.7 | 38.7 |
| Publicremitpubbic uses on res land | 356.3 | 770.7 | 0.0 | (356.3) | (7707) |
| Subtotal (Reslcential) | 1,004.2 | 2.708 .6 | 783.3 | (220.9) | [1.925.3] |
| Commercial (Retall \& Seryices) |  |  |  |  |  |
| C-1 | 230.6 | 758.1 | 80.2 | (150.4) | (677 9) |
| NC | 29.6 | 90.4 | 4.9 | (23.7) | (85 4) |
| CC | 0 | 0 | 32.6 | 32.6 | 326 |
| Subtotal Conmerctal | 259.2 | 848.5 | 117.7 | (141.5) | (730.8) |
| Industrial |  |  |  |  |  |
| I. | 251.4 | 749,9 | 296, 9 | 45.5 | (452.9) |

Hotes: all pubtic ant semi-puinlic land needs were allowed to residential zones
197.610 Local government notice of proposed amendment or new regulatlon; exceptions; report to commission. (1) A proposal to amend a local govemment acknowledged comprehensive plan or land use regulation or to adopt a new land use regulation shall be forwarded to the Director of the Department of Land Conservation and Development at least 45 days before the first evidentiary hearing on adoption. The proposal forwarded shall contain the text and any supplemental information that the local govemment believes is necessary to inform the director as to the effect of the proposal. The notice shall include the date set for the first evidentiary hearing. The director shall notify persons who have requested notice that the proposal is pending.
(2) When a local govemment determines that the goals do not apply to a particular proposed amendment or new regulation, notice under subsection (1) of this section is not required. In addition, a local govemment may submit an amendment or new. regulation with less than 45 days' notice if the local govemment determines that there are emergency circumstances requiring expedited review. In both cases:
(a) The amendment or new regulation shall be submitted after adoption as provided in ORS 197.615 (1) and (2); and
(b) Notwithstanding the requirements of ORS 197.830 (2), the director or any other person may appeal the decision to the board under ORS 197.830 to 197.845.
(3) When the Department of Land Conservation and Development participates in a local govemment proceeding, at least 15 days before the final hearing on the proposed amendment to the comprehensive plan or land use regulation or the new land use regulation, the department shall notify the local government of:
(a) Any concems the department has concerning the proposal; and
(b) Advisory recommendations on actions the department considers necessary to address the concerns, including, but not limited to, suggested corrections to achieve compliance with the goals.
(4) The director shall report to the Land Conservation and Development Commission on whether the director:
(a) Believes the local government's proposal violates the goals; and
(b) Is iparticipating in the local government proceeding. [1981 c. 748 §4; 1983 c. 827.

Response: Notice of the proposed map and text amendments was sent to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) at least 45 days before the first evidentiary hearing on the proposal. Notice was sent to DLCD on December 14, 2009, which was more than 45 days before the first advisory hearing before the Jefferson County and City of Madras Planning Commissions on February 11, 2010. A notice addendum was submitted to DLCD on January 14, 2010. Further hearing dates have yet to be determined but DLCD provided comments on the proposal on January 29, 2010, more than 15 days prior to the final adoption hearing date.

DLCD comments address the map amendments. They call for a boundary locational analysis pursuant to OAR 660-024-0060 and a "reasonably likely" determination from OODT for the proposed 20 -acre rezoning. The locational analysis is not necessarily applicable because the proposed map amendment draws from an adopted and acknowledged URA. Part of the idea behind URAs is to create a 20 - to 50 -year reserve of land for urbanization all at once so that the process for subsequent UGB amendments can be streamlined. For cities or regions that do not have URAs, it is understood that the locational analysis established in -0060 would definitely be applicable and needed.

As to the "reasonably likely" determination, ODOT rendered an affirmative determination on February 2, 1010. DLCD comments acknowledge that the set of needed improvements at the intersections of US 97/J Street is in the current draft STIP. lncluding them in the final STIP signifies a financial commitment to the improvements and thus makes a clear finding for "reasonably likely."
197.626 Expanding urban growth boundary or designating urban or rural reserves subject to periodic review. A metropolitan service district that amends its urban growth boundary to include more than 100 acres, or that amends the district's regional framework plan or land use regulations implementing the plan to establish urban reserves designated under ORS 195.145 (1)(b), a city with a population of 2,500 or more within its urban growth boundary that amends the urban growth boundary to include more than 50 acres or that designates urban reserve under ORS 195.145, or a county that amends the county's comprehensive plan or land use regulations implementing the plan to establish rural reserves designated under ORS 195.141, shall submit the amendment or designation to the Land Conservation and Development Commission in the manner provided for periodic review under ORS 197.628 to 197.650. [1999 c. 622 §14; 2001 c. 672 §10; 2003 c. 793 §4; 2007 c. 723 §7]

Response: The City of Madras has coordinated with Jefferson County regarding the proposed map and text amendments. The amendments to the City and County Comprehensive Plans are post-acknowledgement plan amendments. However, the adoption process for the amendments will follow periodic review procedures pursuant to ORS 197. As part of periodic review procedures, the proposed amendments are subject to review by DLCD and approval by LCDC. DLCD and LCDC will conduct their review process upon adoption of the proposed amendments by the Madras City Council and Jefferson County Board of Commissioners.

[^7]
## Findings:

- The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is entirely comprised of land from the Madras URA, the first priority of land to be included in the UGB pursuant to ORS 197.298(1)(a).
- There are 36.91 acres in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation. This meets some of the estimated need for residentially zoned land outside the existing UGB projected to 2027 by urbanization studies. The proposed R-2 zoning for the 20 -acre parcel (east site) allows housing and public/semi-public uses such as parks and schools. Other land needs for the next 20 years will be addressed during the next periodic review cycle.
- Notice of the first advisory hearing on February 11, 2010 was sent to DLCD on December 14, 2009, more than 45 days before the advisory and evidentiary hearings. A notice addendum was filed on January 13, 2010.
- The City of Madras and Jefferson County have coordinated this proposed set of amendments.
- This proposal is a post-acknowledgement plan amendment (PAPA) but will follow procedures for periodic review. DLCD review and LCDC approval of the amendment will be necessary for the proposal if it is adopted by both the Madras City Council and Jefferson County Board of Commissioners.

Conclusion: The proposed map and text amendments comply with applicable State requirements for urban reserve area planning, plan amendments, and UGB amendments pursuant to ORS 197.

## VII. Conformance with the Urban Growth Area Management Agreement (UGAMA)

## 4. UGA ADMINISTRATION RESPONSIBILITIES

4.1. The City shall have responsibility for administration and decision making authority regarding all land use application within the UGB except applications for amendments to the UGB, as provided in Section 6.
4.2. The City shall have responsibility for annexation of land in the UGB. Lands outside the UGA shall not be annexed unless the UGB is also amended to include the territory to be annexed.
6. PROCESS FOR URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY AMENDMENTS
1.1 Amendments to the UGB, including amendments to the City's and County's comprehensive plan maps, may be initiated by the City, the County, or a property owner(s).
1.2 An application to amend the UGB shall be filed with the City Community Development Department along with the applicable City and County plan amendment fees. The City shall forward a copy of the application to the County Community Development Department, together with the County's plan amendment fee, within five working days of the date the application is filed.
1.3 The City and County Planning Commission shall each conduct a public hearing regarding the application. At their discretion, the Planning Commissions may hold a joint hearing rather than separate hearings.
1.4 The recommendation of the City and County Planning Commissions shall be forwarded to City Council, who shall hold a public hearing to consider the proposed amendment to the UGB. The decision of the City Council shall be forwarded to the County Board of Commissioners.
1.5 The Board of Commissioners shall conduct a public hearing and make a final decision on whether the UGB should be amended.
1.6 If the City and County disagree on the proposed amendments, a joint hearing of the City Council and Board of County Commissioners may be held to attempt to resolve the differences. Both jurisdictions may also request a dispute resolution process to resolve the differences.
1.7 If the governing bodies are not able to come to mutual agreement there shall be no change to the UGB.

Response: The Urban Growth Area Management Agreement (UGAMA) (Appendix H) was adopted by the City of Madras and Jefferson County on April 5, 2006. Pursuant to UGAMA terms for UGB amendments, the City is an eligible applicant for a UGB amendment application (Section 6.1). The UGB amendment application and appropriate fees were forwarded to the Jefferson County Community Development Department within five working days of being initially filed (Section 6.2).

Hearings by the Madras Planning Commission and Jefferson County Planning Commission were first held jointly on February 11, 2010. The Madras City Council and Jefferson County

[^8] 33

Board of Commissioners held a joint public hearing on March 29, 2010 to review their recommendations from their respective Planning Commissions. On March 29, 2010, the Madras City Council approved the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments and forwarded it's recommendation that evening to the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners who then approved the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment. All of the public heanings before the Planning Commissions, Madras City Council, and Jefferson County Board of Commissioners were conducted in a manner consistent with the provisions of the UGAMA.

It is proposed to annex both the east site and west site to the Madras UGB and city limits, and it is proposed to re-zone only the east site at this time. Regardless, if both sites are brought into the UGB and city limits, Madras will assume land use administration and decision making authority for the sites pursuant to Section 4.1 of the UGAMA.

## Findings:

- The City is an eligible applicant for a UGB amendment application.
- Appropriate UGB amendment application materials and fees were forwarded to the Jefferson County Community Development Department in the prescribed amount of time.
- The proposal will be heard jointly by the County and City Planning Commissions and then separately by the County Board of Commissioners and City Council.
- Madras assumes administrative responsibility for any land annexed to its UGB and city limits.

Conclusion: The proposed map amendments comply with applicable local requirements for UGB amendments per the UGAMA between Jefferson County and the City of Madras, adopted April 5, 2006.

## VIII. Conformance with the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan

Goal 14: Urbanization
Policy 1: Changes to urban growth boundaries, the establishment of new urban growth boundaries or urban reserve areas, incorporation of a new city, or annexation of land into a city which is not in an established urban growth boundary requires an amendment to this Plan and the Zoning Map. The following factors should be used in considering such proposals:
A. Demonstrated need to accommodate long-range uban population consistent with a 20- to 50-year population forecast coordinated with the cities;
B. Demonstrated need for housing, employment opportunities, livability or uses such as public facilities, streets and roads, schools, parks or open space;
C. Orderly and economic provision of public facilities and services;
D. Maximum efficiency of land uses within and on the fringe of the existing urban area.
E. Comparative environmental, energy, economic and social consequences;
F. Compatibility of the proposed urban uses with nearby agricultural activities on land outside the UGB; and
G. Priority of land as required by ORS 197.298. Non-irrigated parcels may be added to the UGB before irnigated parcels that are in the same statutory priority.

Response: The proposed change to the UGB fulfills some of the need for residentially zoned land outside the existing UGB as identified in the Madras Urbanization Study and Addendum. The urbanization studies found the need for approximately 220 acres of residentially zoned land - for residential and public/semi-public uses - over the next 15-20 years. This is land that was found to be needed outside the existing UGB once all residential land inside the existing UGB is built out. Although the studies found a land need primarily for residential uses, employment and public/semi-public uses also were also determined to need land inside and outside the existing UGB in the next 20-50 years.

The studies were the basis for adopting the Madras URA, which the County adopted in November 2008 and DLCD acknowledged in July 2009. The proposed UGB and map amendments draw strictly from land designated as URA, which is the first priority land to include in the UGB pursuant to ORS 197.298. The proposed residential zoning and expected ptimarily residential uses are compatible with tesidential development on the edges within the existing UGB, and provide a similar buffer to resource land outside the UGB.

The URA is comprised of land that is classified as "exception" land as well as land zoned by the County as Range Land (RL). Range land was included in the URA because; exception land could not meet all the land needs of the next 20-50 years on its own; range land is lower value resource land; and range land surrounding the existing UGB - particularly to the east and southeast - would be more easily served with sewer than other land surrounding the existing UGB.

The ability to serve land on the east and southeast of the existing UGB and to urbanize land that is not parcelized like the exception land in the URA, as well as the lower resource value of the land, offer more land use efficiency and cost-effectiveness and fewer impacts on prime resource land than initially bringing other land in the URA into the UGB. This gives land on the east comparative advantages in economic, energy, environmental, and social terms.

## Policy 2: The County shall cooperate with each city to determine where and when an urban growth boundary should be expanded.

2.1 Expansion of an existing urban growth boundary shall be in accordance with state requirements, including the priority of land to be included within the urban growth boundary. Non-irrigated land should have a higher priority for inclusion in the boundary than irrigated land.

Response: Jefferson County and City of Madras staff have closely coordinated the proposed map amendments, and the first evidentiary hearing for the proposal will be a joint meeting of the County and City Planning Commissions. The two jurisdictions also worked closely together to adopt the Madras URA in 2008.

The proposed map amendments comply with applicable Statewide Planning Goals, statutes, and administrative rules as demonsttated in previous sections of this report. The proposed UGB amendment is comprised of land from the Madras URA, which is the first priority for inclusion in the UGB pursuant to ORS 197.298. The land is not irrigated.

## Findings:

- The proposed UGB and map amendments provide some of the residentially zoned land that is needed outside the existing UGB in the next $15-20$ years as found in Madras urbanization studies.
- The amendments draw only from non-irtigated land in the Madras URA, which is the first priority land to include in the UGB pursuant to state statute.
- Residential and related public/non-public uses will be compatible with residential development adjacent and inside the existing UGB, as it will with resource land outside the UGB that already borders residential uses just inside the UGB.
- The ability of the land in the proposed amendment area to be more easily served with sewer than other land in the URA or other land surrounding the existing UGB and to build more densely than developed exception land provides land use, energy, and investment efficiencies. Developing more efficiently and on low resource land instead of
high resource land also present social and environmental benefits when compared to other land surrounding the existing UGB.
- Jefferson County and City of Madtas have collaborated on the proposed map amendments.
- The proposed map amendments comply with applicable Statewide Planning Goals, statutes, and administrative rules.

Conclusion: The proposed map amendments comply with applicable policies from the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan.

## IX. Conformance with the City of Madras Comprehensive Plan

GOAL 14 - To provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land, and to provide for livable communitios.
[Paragraph amended by Ordinance No. 781, Passed by Council on December 12, 2006] POLICIES
A. The City, in cooperation with Jefferson County, shall establish an Urban Growth Boundary.
B. The City, in cooperation with Jefferson County, shall mutually agree to a management plan for the Urban Growth Boundary area.
C. The City, in cooperation with Jefferson County, shall establish an Urban Growth Boundary revision process to be utilized in a proposed change of the Uban Growth Boundary.
D. The City, in cooperation with Jefferson County, shall support adoption of an Urban Reserve Area boundary that, when taken together with land supplies in the Urban Growth Boundany, may contain up to a 50 -vear supply of land for the City of Madras to support housing, economic development, public facility, recreation needs and other urban land needs.
E. The City, in cooperation with Jefferson County, shall give priority to land in designated urban reserve areas over other land when considering urban growth boundary amendments.

Response: The Madras City Council approved the Madras URA in October 2008 and the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners in November 2008. DLCD and LCDC received the URA proposal for review in January 2009, and approved the proposal - but remanded sections of proposed County Zoning Ordinance amendments having to do with use restrictions in the URA - in July 2009. The land in the proposed UGB amendment that is the subject of this application is land entirely drawn from the Madras URA, land estimated to be needed for urbanization over the next 50 years.
F. The City shall favor UGB amendments that involve land in locations that are suitable to address identified urban land needs in order to minimize buildable land supply shortages and address identified needs. Factors that will be considered when evaluating UGB additions include:

1. Existing and planned capacity of the transportation system
2. Existing and planned capacity of the city waste water treatment plant
3. Existing and planned capacity of the city sanitary sower conveyance systom
4. Existing and planned capacity of the Deschutes Valley Water District supply system
5. Impacts on schools, parks, and public safety service providers
6. Impacts on future operating costs for public facilities and services
G. The Citv, in cooperation with Jefferson County, shall undertake an evaluation of the urban growth boundary land supply once every five vears or more frequently if certified population growth rates exceed $3.2 \%$ in three consecutive years. In the event certified population growth rates fall below $3.2 \%$ for three consecutive vears, the City and County may agree to postpone the evaluation of UGB land supply for up to three years.
H. During years when a comprehensive UGB land supply evaluation is not scheduled. individual applications for adding property to the UGB shall be limited to requests of less than 40 acres. UGB amendment applications must demonstrate consistency with applicable Oregon statutes and administrative rules and be accompanied bv information that addresses Policy 14 J below. Applications that involve more than 5 acres also must comply with provisions of Policy 14-I.

B I. The City, in cooperation with Jefferson County, shall encourage the development of complete, livable communities that include characteristics such as: a variety of lot sizes, dwelling unit types and ownership types, open spaces and other recreational amenities, a mix of land uses, school and community facilities, connected streets, proximity to downtown and other employment centers, and development that is scaled to the pedestrian and creates a sense of place. New growth areas of more than 5 acres that are added to the UGB shall sheuld be planned and developed in accordance either with a master planned community development plan approved under the city Master Planned Community Overlay zone, or an Area Master Plan. The City encourages Master Planned Communities as a means to meet city housing needs as explained in other comprehensive plan documents. It may be appropriate, however, for the city to add new growth areas to the UGB that are planned and developed in accordance with an approved Area Master Plan. A maiority of property owners subject to a Master Planned Community, or to an Area Master Plan, must consent to be included in the plan.

1. A Master Planned Community (MPC) Overlav may apply to large multi-phased development projects where the master plan is intended to quide future development patterns and serves to requlate the site-development approval process. A MPC requires generous open space and amenities, and encourages efficient use of land and public facilities and services, a variety of housing types, innovative designs and complete pedestrian-friendly communities. A MPC shall demonstrate efficient use of land consistent with an identified urban land need. show appropriate locations for transportation improvements, public facilities, and the protection of significant open space, scenic, historic, and natural resource areas. A MPC must show how planned land uses will be integrated with the existing urban development pattern. Physical barriers, such as highways, tend to disnupt complete communities and livability because they disconnect areas from downtown and result in an auto-oriented environment of sprawl along highway corridors.
2. An Area Master Plan (AMP) is appropniate for land added to the UGB where the approval of future urban development is expected to rely on conventional urban zoning and the application of codified development standards and review procedures. An AMP may be prepared for contiquous properties added to the UGB that are greater than 5 acres and are not subject to a MPC ovenlay. An AMP shall demonstrate efficient use of land, zoning consistent with an identified urban land need, appropriate locations for transportation improvements, public facilities, protection for significant open space, scenic, historic, and natural
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# resource areas. An AMP must show how planned land uses will be integrated with the existing urban development patterm. <br> 3. An approved Master Planned Community Plan or an Area Master Plan must include documentation that a maionity of property owners support the conversion of land to the planned urban uses and also consent to annexation by the city of Madras using a voluntary annexation process that is outlined in the plan. 

Response: The total area under consideration is 36.4 acres, which is less than the 40 acre maximum established for interim UGB annexation requests. The east site of the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is part of the approved Yarrow Master Plan area. The plan designates land for predominantly residential land uses, which is compatible with adjacent development in the UGB, while also designating land for open space and park uses, community services including schools, and limited neighborhood commercial services. The conceptual plan also shows an internal transportation system that includes sidewalks and multi-use paths.

The east site is being proposed for both annexation to the UGB and Madras city boundaries. The site can be adequately served with water and sewer facilities given existing and planned facilities, according to the service providers (Appendix D). The site is not projected to have a significant adverse effect on surrounding transportation facilities given planned improvements for the intersections of US 97/J Street (Appendices F and G). Its proposed designation as Multi-family Residential is consistent with land needs identified in the 2007 urbanization studies and with residential zoning in the area.

Pursuant to Policy 1-1: "An AMP shall demonstrate efficient use of land, zoning consistent with an identified urban land need, appropriate locations for transportation improvements, public facilities, protection for significant open space, scenic, historic, and natural resource areas." It is proposed to annex the west site to the Madras UGB and city limits but to retain its existing County Range Land ( RL ) zoning until the owners are ready to propose development. The site is surrounded by land designated for residential and related uses, and its future land use and zoning designation must allow for residential and compatible public/semi-public uses in order to show that land uses on the west site can be: "integrated with the existing urban development pattern." (Policy I-2) The proposed addition of a table showing Madras and County zones that correspond with Madras land use designations to the Madras Comprehensive Plan Section IV, Land Use Element (Table 3-1), will facilitate the transition of existing County zoning to appropriate City zoning.

The west site is comprised of three lots - Lots 101 and 200 that total 16.22 acres and are privately owned and Lot 102 that is 0.69 acres designated for County right-of-way. Lots 101 and 200 are both adjacent to Ashwood Road, a County collector, and will not require additional public roads for sufficient internal or local circulation. At the time of proposed development, proposed land division or planned development plans must show an internal circulation system that satisfies City code requirements and street standards. The west site is adjacent to the existing Madras UGB and is bordered by Ashwood Road, which eases extension of services from inside the existing UGB and city limits to the west site. Water and sewer service providers have attested that existing and planned facilities will be sufficient to serve the west site (Appendix D).

The County has not identified historic, scenic, or natural resources on the west site. City open space requirements for subdivisions or planned developments will apply to the site at the time of proposed development.
J. All land use applications or legislative proposals to expand the Madras UGB must be accompanied by information that documents the following:

1. The proposed urban zoning or land use program for the subject properties that address an identified urban land need;
2. An annexation program for all subiect properties:
3. Evidence that oublic facilities required by OAR 660-011-000 that are necessary to serve the expansion area can be served either by system improvements outlined in adopted public facility master plans or by supplemental improvements that augment adopted public facility master plans:
4. Evidence that the proposed zoning or land use plan complies with requirements of OAR 660-0012-0060 either by demonstrating that planned improvements in the Madras Transportation System Plan (TSP) have capacity to meet transportation needs for the proposed expansion area or through supplemental transportation improvements that augment the adopted TSP to meet the need.
5. Evidence that providers of other crucial public facilities (e.q. schools, parks and recreation, emergency services and health care) are able to meet the projected demand for their services:
6. Evidence that financing for constructing needed public improvements is available so that the expansion area can be developed as planned within the planning horizon:
7. Evidence that development in areas subiect to natural hazards are protected from these hazards:
8. Evidence that known or probable significant resources related to open space, scenic areas, historic places or structures, and fish and wildlife habitat will be protected from development impacts or have development impacts offset using appropriate mitigation measures.

## Response:

Zoning and Land Use Designations (Policy J1)
The east site is proposed to be re-zoned to a City R-2 designation. This meets some of the need for residentially zoned land outside the existing UGB that is projected for the next 15 20 years. Residentially zoned land will provide for housing and public/semi-public uses. This land need is documented in the Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, August 2007). (See Table 5-2)

The west site is proposed to retain its existing County Range Land (RL) designation until the time when further land use action and development is proposed. Existing zoning will allow only limited development, and appropriate future designations for the site will be City residential designations given that City open space and residential zoning currently surround the site

[^9]When rezoning is proposed for the west site and for other land being converted from rural to urban, the proposed text amendments (Table 3-1) will assist and regulate the rezoning that will occur when changing County zoning to City land use designations and zoning.

## Annexation Program (Policy J2)

The City is the applicant for this proposal, and annexation program pursuant to Article 7 of its Zoning Ordinance is described later in this report.

Goal It Public Facilities (Policy J3) and Transportation Planning Rule (Policy J4)
Kittelson \& Associates has performed the transportation analysis needed to deem whether the proposed UGB amendment constitutes a significant effect on the transportation system. Given that schools generate more peak hour traffic than housing alone, two scenarios were developed for Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) analysis that involved both housing and a school. Using these scenarios in a TPR analysis, it was found that the increase in traffic did constitute a significant effect on the US 97/J Street intersections. However, given improvements included in the City's amended TSP and Draft 2010-2013 STIP, the effect can be mitigated and removed.

Public facility analysis for establishing the Madras URA ranked drainage catchment areas around the existing UGB for sewer service costs and serviceability. Of the six study areas that comprised the preliminary and then final URA, Study Areas 3 and 4 on the east and southeast consistently ranked higher than other areas. This can, in part, be attributed to proximity to the new South Wastewater Treatment Plant (SWWIP) and being upslope of the plant. In particular, the proposed UGB amendment and annexation are is located in Catchment Area 180 and bordering on Catchment Area 179. These areas ranked $8^{\text {th }}$ and $12^{\text {th }}$ out of 60 catchment areas, making them among the more cost-effective and serviceable areas of the URA.

As was also determined during the URA public facility analysis, Deschutes Valley Water District (DVWD) found that there would be insignificant differences in providing water service to the different parts of the URA. Water supply in the region is adequate to ample. Similarly, existing and planned sewer facilities provided by the City will be sufficient to serve the proposal area. (See service provider letters in Appendix D)

## Other Public Facilities (Policy J5)

The east site has access to substantial park and recreation resources. Juniper Hills Park (County) and Bean Park (City) are nearby, as well as Jefferson County Middle School and its fields. The Yarrow Master Plan that applies to the site and surrounding land also designates open space and parks throughout the plan atea.

The City reports that Mountain View Hospital and City public safety and emergency services are sufficient to provide services for the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area. The sites are served by the Jefferson County School District 509-J.

## Financing for Improvements (Policy J6)

Financing for constructing the needed public improvements will be placed upon property owners. As demonstrated by the letters submitted by the City of Madras Public Works

Director and Deschutes Valley Water District General Manager, each respective utility has capacity to service the properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB To extend wastewater and domestic water services to the properties to be included in the UGB, each property owner will be responsible for extending services lines to their property, not with standing the requirements for annexing their property into the Madras city limits.

Similarly, the Oregon Department of Transportation has determined the proposed UGB expansion will significantly affect the US 97/J Street intersection but that the design concept is established, the City has implemented System Development Charges to partially fund the improvements for this particular intersection and in the Draft State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP) is funding for the intersection. With the design concept established and both funding sources identified, ODOT has determined that the US 97/J Street intersection improvements are Reasonably Likely to Occur and therefore, impacts of the proposed UGB expansion are mitigated.

Protection from Natural Hazards (Policy J7)
There are not steep slopes (slopes greater than $25 \%$ ), floodway, or floodplain in the proposed UGB expansion and annexation area. In fact, the proposed amendment and annexation are driven, in part, by the need to provide a school that is outside the floodway and floodplain of Willow Creek and its tributaries.

Fire protection service for the proposal area is currently provided by Jefferson County Fire Protection District \#1, and will continue to be provided by that district if the land is annexed to the city. The area is subject to a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) that Jefferson County completed in 2005 in collaboration with the fire district and federal agencies.

## Protection of Goal 5 Resources (Policy 18)

The Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan, Goal 5 inventory, or Jefferson County Geographic Information System (GIS) files do not identify floodways, floodplains, significant babitat, or cultutal resources in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area. The only resources cited above that may apply to the site are open spaces. While open space will be a required part of public use or residential development that occurs in this area, this proposal itself is not a development or entitlement proposal and, therefore, does not specify precisely where such open space will be designated.

## Findings:

- Amendments to zoning and land use designations are planned and proposed. The proposed City land use designation is residential and City zoning designation R-2 (Multiple Family Residential). A need for about 22 acres of land outside the existing UGB zoned R-2 was determined in the Madras Urbanization Study Addendum.
- Proposed text amendments facilitate the transition from urban to rural zoning, from County zoning to City land use designations and zoning.
- Existing and planned transportation facilities - including improvements for the US 97/J Street intersections in the Madtas TSP and the 2010-2013 Draft STTP, which ODOT has deemed reasonably likely - will allow the study intersections to operate
within adopted standards both in the case of the proposal area being annexed and rezoned and not.
- Existing and planned water and sewer facilities will be sufficient to serve the proposal area.
- The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area has access to nearby parks, a middle school, and a high school. Rezoning the 20 -acre east site to $\mathrm{R}-2$ will allow for residential and public/semi-public uses there.
- Financing of wastewater and domestic water services will be placed upon property owners once the properties are annexed and developed in a manner that is consistent with the service providers facility plans.
- In terms of natural hazards, there are not slopes greater than $25 \%$, floodway, or floodplain in the proposed UGB expansion and annexation area. The proposed amendments and annexation are based, in part, on the need to provide a school that is outside the floodway and floodplain of Willow Creek and its tributaries. Fire protection service for the proposal area is and will be provided by Jefferson County Fire Protection District \#1.
- There are not floodways, floodplains, habitat, or cultural resources that are identified in the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan, Goal 5 inventory, or Jefferson County Geographic Information System (GIS) files in the proposal area. Open space will be provided pursuant to Madras zoning ordinance (MZO) in which $30 \%$ of a Master Planned Community must be open space (MZO Section 3.12(D)(4)).

Conclusion: The proposed map and text amendments comply with the relevant policies of the Madras Comprehensive Plan.

## X. Conformance with the City of Madras Community Development Code

Clty of Madras Zoning Ordinance

## ARTICLE 7: ANNEXATION

SECTION 7.1: PURPOSE - The purpose of this section is to:
A. Implement the policies of the City of Madras Comprehensive Plan;
B. Provide for City review of all annexation requests for a determination of the availability of facilities and services as related to the proposal;
C. Provide for dissemination of public Information and for sufficient time for public review;
D. Provide for City and County coordination of a request for an annexation; and E. Provide for an expedited process by establishing procedures whereby the annexation and zoning, if applicable, may be considered concurrently.

SECTION 7.2: APPLICATION PROCEDURE. Annexation is a land use decision and is subject to applicable provisions of the Cily of Madras Comprehensive Plan, Oregon Revised Statutes, and Oregon Administrative Rules. In addition, the procedures below shall be followed:
A. The Planning Commission shall conduct a public hearing after notification of all property owners with two hundred fifty feet (250') outside of the boundary(ies) of the proposed annexation. The Planning Commission shall review the proposal for compliance with the annexation policies contained in this Ordinance and make a recommendation to the City Council, based on:

1. The annexation proposal which meets the application requirements; and
2. The Planning Commission shall conduct a public hearing to determine a recommendation to the City Council to approve, approve with conditions or modifications, or disapprove the feasibility of the annexation proposal based on the criteria set forth in Section 7.4 below; and
3. The Planning Commission shall state its recommendation and the reasons therefore in writing to the City Council.
B. Upon receipt of the Planning Commission recommendation, the City Council shall conduct a public hearing and consider an Ordinance declaring the requested lands to be annexed to the City of Madras.
4. The City Council shall review the record of the Planning Commission hearing their recommendation and shall determine whether to approve, approve with conditions or modifications, or disapprove the feasibility of the proposed annexation in accordance with the criteria set forth in Section 7.4 below.
5. The City Council may conduct additional public hearings to assist their making a determination.
6. The City Council shall state its determination and the reasons therefore in writing.

Response: The City of Madras sent public hearing notice to the surtounding property owners on February 1, 2010. The City and County Planning Commissions held their first public hearing on Februaty 11, 2010. The City Planning Commission decided upon a recommendation to approve the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment (10-PA-01) at its hearing on February 11, 2010 and forwarded it to the Madras City Council. The City

Council is held a public hearing jointly with the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners on March 29, 2010. The City of Madras has not provided notice to affected property and adjacent property owners, or noticed the public hearings for the annexation of 20 acres of the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment to expand the Madras UGB by approximately 36.91 acres.

SECTION 7.3: ANNEXATION APPLICATION. The petitioner for annexation shall complete an application form provided by the Community Development Department. The application fee, established by Resolution of the City of Madras City Council, shall be submitted with the application. The application shall include:
A. A map demonstrating that the proposed annexation is contiguous to the City Limits;
B. Specific information on each parcel within the proposed annexation area:

1. Current assessed valuation shown on Jefferson County Assessor's tax rolls.
2. Acreage of both public and private property to be annexed.
3. Map and tax lot(s) number.
C. Names and ages of all residents and list of registered voters in the proposed annexation area.
D. Addresses of all parcels within the proposed annexation area.
E. Consent to Annexation forms, provided by the City of Madras, with notarized
signatures of all property owners and electors within the proposed annexation area.
F. Written findings, which address the following:
4. Existing land uses within annexation area.
5. Existing zoning within the annexation area.
6. Existing improvements:
a. water system
b. streets
c. sanitary sewer
d. storm drainage
7. Special Districts within the area:
a. water districts
b. irrigation districts
c. fire district
d. school district
e. other
8. Urban services, the present availability of urban service systems to the proposed annexation area, their capacity and cost of extension andior improvement to urban standards:
a. sanitary sewers - streets - parks
b. storm drainage - water
c. fire-power
d. schools - police
G. Compliance with all applicable policies of the City of Madras Comprehensive Plan.

Response: The City is initiating and applying for the proposed annexation. Maps of the west site and east site in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area are included in this report as Figure 4-1. Parcel size and other parcel information is presented in Section I, Proposal Summary. The City owns the taxlot where the east site is located. The 20 -acte parcel that is being created from the taxlot has been surveyed. The west site is comprised of three taxlots, two taxlots that are privately owned and one small taxlot $(0.69$ acres $)$ that is

County right-of-way. Re-zoning is not proposed for this site at this time as there are no immediate development plans. However, this site does better connect the east site to the existing UGB and will be suitable for residential uses and compatible public/semi-public uses, for which Madras urbanization studies have found a long-term need.

The property proposed to be included in the UGB amendment and annexed currently is vacant and not in active use. It is land under Jefferson County jurisdiction and zoned Range Land (RL). There are not water, sewer, or storm water facilities and services extended to the site yet, but they can be extended using existing City facility master plans. The Deschutes Valley Water District (DVWD) provides water service to the area and can provide facilities and service to the site, to be financed primarily by development applicants. The same is true for sewer and storm water facilities and service, for which the City of Madras is the service provider. As part of its agreement with JCSD, the City will extend water and sewer to the edge of the east site. There is an irrigation district in the region - the Central Oregon Irrigation District - but the proposal area is not irrigated nor is it proposed to be.

There is a County collector road - Ashwood Road - along the northern border of the area that will not need imptovements according to transportation analysis conducted for this proposal. (See Appendix F)

Jefferson County Fire Protection District \#1 currently provides service for the area and will continue to do so. Public safety responsibility for the area will be transferted from the County to the City. In terms of parks and recreation, there are two parks and a middle school close to the site, and the Yartow Master Plan, which includes and surrounds the east site, includes the $30 \%$ of parks and open space required by local code (MZO Section 3.12(D)(4)).

As addressed in the previous section of this report, the application complies with the applicable policies of the Madras Comprehensive Plan.

## SECTION 7.4: ANNEXATION CRITERIA. Lands may be annexed only if the City

 Council finds that the following criteria are met:A. The property is contiguous to the City limits.
B. The property is located within the City's Urban Growth Boundary.
C. The annexation meets at least one of the following purposes:

1. To serve lands needing City water or sewer to alleviate a present or potential health hazard; or
2. To provide land to accommodate future urban development; or
3. To provide land for provision of needed transportation or utility facilities; or
4. To ensure that lands adjacent to the City are developed in a manner consistent with City standards.
D. The petitioner has adequately addressed infrastructure supply and demand issues The annexation is considered timely in that an adequate level of urban senvices and infrastructure can be provided upon annexation or a plan is in place for the provision of such services or infrastructure in a reasonable period of time.
$E$. The proposed annexation complies with the City's Comprehensive Plan. If the
Comprehensive Plan does not control the annexation, or substantial changes in

Proposed Amendments to Madras Comprehensive Plan and Madras and Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Maps
conditions have occurred which render the Comprehensive Plan inapplicable to the annexation, the proposed annexation complies with current Statewide Planning Goals. F. The City is capable of extending City services to the area proposed for annexation without negatively impacting existing systems and the City's ability to adequately serve all areas within the existing City limits.
G. The proposed annexation is compatible with the existing topography, potential for future land division, natural hazards and other related considerations.

Response: The proposal area is adjacent to the Madras city limits and is simultaneously seeking to be annexed to the Madtas UGB and to the city. The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area provides land for future urban development, specifically for a needed school and housing as demonstrated by the Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, 2007). The east site of the proposal area is part of the Yartow Master Plan area that the City has approved and found to be consistent with City development goals and standards.

The proposal area can be served by water and sewer using existing water and sewer master plans and being financed by the City and developers of the sites. Ashwood Road on the north side of the proposal area is a County collector road and does not need improvements in order to serve the area. Planned improvements for US 97/J Street are the only improvements needed in the vicinity in order to mitigate any potential significant effects associated with this proposal (Appendix F). Intemal circulation and transportation facilities will need to be shown in futute development applications.

## SECTION 8.2: ZONE/PLAN MAP AMENDMENTS

## A. Amendment to the Zone/Plan Map

1. Amendment to the Zone/Plan Map may be initiated by the Planning Commission, City Council, Community Development Director, Land Use Periodic Review, or by application of the property owner.
2. If the application is for a change of a quasi-judicial or legislative nature:
a. the Planning Commission shall conduct a public hearing on the proposed amendment at its earliest practical meeting date after the proposal is submitted and shall follow the adopted rules for quasijudicial hearings;
3. b. the Planning Commission shall provide a recommendation to the City Council based on findings-of-fact;
4. c. The City Council shall hold a public hearing and review the recommendation of the Planning Commission, along with any public testimony on the issue. The City Council must take final action on an amendment request and amendments shall be made by ordinance.
5. An application for a zone change for land annexed to the city that is subiect to an approved Master Planned Community Plan or an approved Area Master Plan may be considered as an administrative action per Article 9.3.
B. Criteria for Amendments: The burden of proof is upon the applicant. The applicant shall show the proposed change is:

Proposed Amendments to Madras Comprehensive Plan and
Madras and Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Maps

1. In conformity with all applicable state statutes.
2. In conformity with the applicable Statewide Planning Goals; and
3. In conformity with the Madras Comprehensive Plan, Zoning and Land Use Ordinance, and policies; and
4. In conformity with an approved Master Planned Community Plan or Area Master Plan, if applicable to the underlying properties; and
5. That there is a change of circumstances or further studies justifying the amendment or mistake in the original zoning.

Response: This application is being initiated by the City Community Development Department/Director. Also pursuant to the terms of the UGAMA between the County and the City, the City forwarded the UGB amendment application and appropriate fees to the Jefferson County Community Development Department within five working days of being initially filed.

This application is being processed pursuant to legislative procedures and will receive full review by the public, the City Planning Commission, and the City Council. Heatings by the Madras Planning Commission and Jefferson County Planning Commission will be held first jointly on February 11, 2010. The Madras City Council will review the City Planning Commission's recommendation at a hearing on February 11, 2010, and will forward its decision to the County Board of Commissioners for a heating on March 29, 2010.

As demonstrated by the previous findings, the proposed comprehensive plan, comprehensive plan map, and zoning map amendments comply with applicable Statewide Planning Goals, State statutes, and Madras Comprehensive Plan policies.

## Findings:

- The City has followed procedures for providing notice and holding public hearings for the proposal. Notice to adjacent property owners was mailed On February 1, 2010 to all properties within 750 feet of the properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB. A joint City and County Planning Commission hearing was held on February 11, 2010 and then a joint hearing before the Madras City Council and Jefferson County Board of Commissioners was held on March 29, 2010. The City Council and County Board of Commissioners heard the proposal on March 29, 2010 and approved the proposal on March 29, 2010.
- The City of Madras has initiated this proposal. It owns the east site of the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area and has an agreement with Jefferson County School District 509-J to exchange this land for land downtown upon annexation and re-zoning.
- The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area provides land needed for residential and public/semi-public uses, specifically for a needed school and housing as demonstrated by the Madras Urbanization Study Addendurn (ECONorthwest, 2007).
- All service providers - the City of Madras, Jefferson County, Deschutes Valley Water District, Jefferson County Fire Protection District \#1, Jefferson County School District 509-J - have capacity to serve the proposal area given implementation of existing water and sewer master plans, planned improvements to US 97/J Street intersections, and financing from future proposed development.

Proposed Amendments to Madras Comprehensive Plan and
Madras and Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Maps

- The east site of the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is part of the approved Yarrow Master Plan area, and the west site fulfills the requirements for an Area Master Plan. The set of proposed map and text amendments in this application comply with applicable Statewide Planning Goals, State statutes, and Madras Comprehensive Plan policies.

Conclusion: The proposed map and text amendments comply with the relevant provisions of the Madras Zoning Ordinance.

# Appendix A: West Site Tax Map (3 lots, 16.91 acres) 
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## Appendix B: East Site Legal Description and Survey Map (20-acre parcel)
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December 16, 2009
City of Madras
Job\# 09077

## PROPERTY DESCRIPTION FOR A $\mathbf{2 0 . 0 0}$ ACRE TRACT OF LAND FOR SCHOOL DISTRICT 509-J

A portion of Parcel 2 of Partition Plat No. 2002-12 as filed in the Jefferson County Clerk's Office, situated in the Northeast Quarter (NE $1 / 4$ ) of Section 7, Township 11 South, Range 14 East of the Willamette Meridian, Jefferson County, Oregon, more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the Northwest corner of said Northeast Quarter, monumented with a 2 inch diameter brass cap, from which the Northeast corner of said Section 7 bears South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 2640.53 feet; thence South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ East along the North line of said Section 7 a distance of 599.97 feet; thence South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 40.00 feet to the Northwest corner of said Parcel 2 of Partition Plat No. 2002-12; thence continuing South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ West along the West line of said Parcel 2 a distance of 40.00 feet to the South right-of-way line of East Ashwood Road and the True Point of Beginning of this Description; thence South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ East along said West line a distance of 935.13 feet to the Southeast corner of Parcel 1 of said Partition Plat No. 200217; thence leaving said West line South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 931.70 feet; thence North $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 935.12 feet to a point on the South right-of-way line of East Ashwood Road; thence North $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ 'West along said right-of-way line a distance of 931.70 feet to the True Point of Beginning.

Containing 20.00 acres more or less.
End of Description.


Renews: 12/31/2009
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# Appendix C: Urban Reserve Area Management Agreement (URAMA) (January 2009) 

## Urban Reserve Area Management Agreement

This agreement is entered into by the City of Madras, an incorporated municipality of the State of Oregon, hereby referred to as the "City" and Jefferson County, a political subdivision of the State of Oregon, hereby referred as "County".

## A. RECITALS

WHEREAS, the City of Madras and Sefferson County are authorized pursuant to Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) Chapter 190 to enter into an Intergovernmental Management Agreement for the performance of functions which either governmental entity has the authority to perform; and

WHEREAS the City and County have previously entered into an intergovernmental agreement on April 5, 2006 setting forth their respective rights and responsibilities with respect to the Urban Growth Bounardy (UGB); and

WHEREAS, the Management Agreement also constitutes a cooperative agreement under ORS Chapter 195; and

WHEREAS the City and County consider it mutually advantageous to establish this Urban Reserve Area Management Agreement (URAMA) for the purpose of facilitating the future conversion of lands in the Urban Reserve Area (URA) from rural to urban land uses.

## B. INTENT OF AGREEMENT

1. To establish standards and procedures for review and action on proposed land use actions and related matlers noted within this agreement pertaining to implementation of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan and Zoning Regulations as adopted by the City and County for the Urban Reserve Area (URA); and
2. To affirm Jefferson County's jurisdictional authority for current planning activities, land use decisions, building permilling, public improvements, and code enforcement within the URA ; and
3. To provide assistance to property owners in the URA by laying out a clear and cooperative process designed to make decisions on land use applications in a timely and consistent manner; and
4. To clarify plaming and zoning intents and to satisfy the requirements of $O A R$ Chapter 660, Division 21 relating to Urban Reserve Areas.

## C. DEFINITIONS

1. City: City of Madras.
2. Board: the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners.
3. Council: the Madras City Council.
4. County: Jefferson County.
5. Land Use Decision: A Land Use Decision is defined by ORS 197.015
6. Urban Reserve Arca: has the same meaning as set forth in OAR 660-021$0010(1)$, and means land outside of an Urban Growth Boundary identified as highest priority of inclusion in the Urban Growth Boundary when urbanizable land is needed in accordance with the requirements of Statewide Planning Goal 14.
7. Urban Growth Boundary: The boundary line which separates lands to be urbanized and eventually incorporated into the City of Madras from the surrounding rural lands under the County's jurisdiction.
8. Conversion Plan: has the same meaning as set forth in ICZO Section 105.

## D. AGREEMENT

Compliance with OAR Chapter 660, Division 21. In accordance with the applicable requirements of Chapter 660, Division 21, City and County agree as follows:

1. As required by OAR 660-021-0040(2)(e):
(a) The County shall ensure that conversion plans are required and processed as part of tentative land division decisions in the URA as outlined in tbe Jefferson County Zoning Ordinance (JCZO) Section 703.2(0).
(b) The County shall prohibit certain uses in the URA, including plan or zoning map amendments that allow a mimimum lot size less than ten acres as outlined in JCZO Section 323.3.
2. As required by $\operatorname{OAR} 660-021-0050(1)$ :
(a.) Jefferson County shall have authority and jurisdictional responsibility for current planning activities, land use decisions, building permitting, and code enforcement within the URA.
(b.) Upon inclusion of property from the URA within the Urban Growth Boundary, the property shall be subject to the Urban Growth Management Area Agreement.
3. Designation of service responsibility, as required by OAR 660-021-0050(2) is as follows:

| Service | Existing Service Provider | Future Urban Service <br> Provider |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sanitary Trash Disposal | No Public Service Provider | No Public Service Provider |
| Sanitary Sewer | No Public Service Provider | City of Madras |
| Water | Deschutes Valley Water <br> District | Deschutes Valley Water <br> District |
| Fire Protection | Jefferson County Fire District <br> $\# 1$ | Jefferson County Fire <br> District \#1 |
| Parks | Jefferson County | City of Madras <br> RecreationMadras Aquatic Center <br> District |
| Transportation | Madras Aquatic Center |  |
| District |  |  |

(a.) The local govemment or special district responsible for services (including sanitary trash disposal, sanitary sewer, water, fire protection, parks, transportation, storm water) for areas within the URA are designated and shown on the map(s) attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit " 1 A ".
4. As required by OAR 660-0210-0050(3), the terms and conditions under which service responsibility will be transferred or expanded, for areas where the provider of service is expected to change over time, is described in Exhibit "1B" attached hereto and incorporated herein.
5. As required by OAR 660-0210-0050(4), procedures for notification and review of land use actions to ensure involvement by all affected local govemments and special districts:
(a) Within the URA, the County shall process all land use applications for comprehensive plan amendments, zone changes, and other applications affecting land use (including conditional uses, Planned Unit Developments (PUDs), subdivisions and partitions) in a manner that is consistent with the procedures set forth in the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance for the respective land use actions.
(b) Prior to acceptance of a land division application within the URA, the County shall require the applicant to submit a conversion plan to the City of Madras as outlined in JCZO Section 703.2(O).

The intent of the couversion plan is that it:

1. Is not an engineered plan.
2. May be amended from time to time by property owners submitting a new conversion plan to the City and County.
3. Does not constitute a separate land use decision, as it is part of a land division decision.
4. Must be recorded with the County Clerk so that future buyers of newly-created parcels in the URA will become aware, prior to purchase, that roads and utility easements will be required when the property is further developed after annexation.
5. Serves a guide to placement of structures in the building permitting process.

The City shall review the conversion plan and work with the property owner to ensure that the locations of planned roads and rights-of-way; and the locations of future easements for water, sewer, and storm water facilities that will adequately serve the site when developed at an urban density; are protected. The City may recommend that the conversion plan be approved, denied, or be approved with conditions.

Wirhin 15 days of receiving a conversion plan for revicw, the City will forward its comments to boih the applicant and the County, and the applicant is required to include the conversion plan and City comments with their tentative land division application to the County.

The County shall review the conversion plan as part of the tentative land division application, and approve, deny, or approve with conditions. A condition of approval for the land division decision shall be that the property owner record the conversion plan with the final plat at the County Clerk's Office.

The County agrees to consult conversion plans prior to building permit approval of structures in the URA, where applicable.

The City or County may charge a separate fee for review of conversion plans.
(c) Notice of all land use applications within the URA shall be sent to the City of Madras Community Development Department and to any other affected City agencies and other applicable special service districts for review and comment prior to a decision by the County. Such agencies shall be given ten business days in which to provide comments on the land use application.
(d) In making its decision, the County shall consider all comments received under Section (c) above.
(e) The City, and agency, or any other special service district that provides comments on land use applications shall be mailed written notice of the land use decision and shall have standing to appeal the County's decision.

## E. AMENDMENT AND TERMINATION

1. This agreement may be amended at any time by mutual agreement of both parties, after public hearing and adoption by both the City Council and the Board of Commissioners.
2. Any modifications to this agreement shall be consistent with the City and County Comprehensive Plans, the Urban Growth Area Management Agreement for the City of Madras and the statewide planning goals.
3. This agreement may be ierminated by either party under the following procedure:
a. Written notice of intent to terminate this Agreement shall be sent to the other party at least forty-five (45) days prior to taking any action, including the publication of public hearing notices in order to provide ample time for resolution of differences, or amendment to comprehensive plans.
b. A public hearing shall be held by the parly considering termination. The party considering termination shall give the other party at least 20 days prior notice of the scheduled hearing date. The 20 day period shall be used by both parties to seek resolution of differences. Both parties shall also request a collaborative conflict resolution process to resolve differences that remain.
c. Public notice of hearings shall be in accordance with applicable statutes and local ordinances.
d. This agreement is necessary for compliance with, at minimum, statewide planning Goals 2 and 14. Unless the Urban Reserve Area is no longer an overlay zone in the County, this agreement may not be termined without adoption of a new agreement.

## F. TIME OF EFFECTIVENESS

$$
M-014=09
$$

This agreement shall not become effective until properly executed by both the City and the County. Upon execution, this agreement shall supersede all previous Urban Reserve Area Management Agreements.

## G. SEVERABILITY

The Provisions within this agreement are serverable. If any section, sentence, clause or phrase of this agreement is adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, said invalidity shall not impair or affect the validity of the remaining portions of the agreement.

ADOPTED this $3 \gamma^{T N}$ of January, 2009.

## CITY OF MADRAS, OREGON



Date: $1.27-2009$

ATTEST:


JEFFERSON COUNTY, OREGON
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## EXHIBIT 1B

## URBAN SERVICE TRANSITION POLICIES

Terms and Conditions under which Service Responsibility will be transferred or expanded.
A. Special Districts. The City shall agree to the formation of any special district within the Urban Reserve Area prior to the approval of the formation of the district by Jefferson County. This provision shall not apply to County-wide service districts formed under ORS Chapter 451.
B. Service Expansion Plans. Service expansion plans shall be consistent with the Madras Comprehensive Plan. As the future provider of, sanitary sewer, storm water and potable water services, the City shall prepare, and from time to time, update utility expansion plans. These plans shall provide a basis for the extension of services within the Urban Growth Boundary, and as such shall be referred to Jefferson County for information and comment.
C. Transition Policies Relating to Service Responsibility

1. Sanitary Sewer Service. There will be no public provider of sanitary sewer service until City services are available, except in the case of a state mandate due to a hcalith hazard. At the time of annexation, the City will require hook-up to City sanitary sewer services. There shall be no special sanitary sewer districts created in the Urban Reserve Area. Nothing in this provision shall limit the ability of individuals to provide septic services (i.e. septic sewer systems) on their own private property within the Urban Reserve Area.
2. Potable Water Service. The City of Madras and Deschutcs Valley Water District shall be the public providers of water in this area, unless new districts are expanded or created through mutual agreement by the City and the County. Nothing in this provision shall limit the ability of individuals to provide services on their own private property within the Urban Reserve Area.
3. Fire Protection. The Jefferson Counly Fire District \#1 provides fire protection services to property within the Urban Reserve Area, the Urban Growth Boundary, and the City limits.
4. Parks. Jefferson County provides parks services within the Urban Reserve Area. The City of Madras provides parks services within the city limits and the Urban Growth Boundary. The City of Madras will provide these services as park properties as they are included within the city's limits unless agreed otherwise.
5. Recreation. The Madras Aquatic Center is separate recreation district that serves Jefferson County.. The Madras Aquatic Center District will continue to provide aquatic recreational services when property is included in the City of Madras Urban Growth Boundary and city limits.
6. Transportation and Street Improvements. Jefferson County provides transportation services on county roads within the Urban Reserve Area. Upon annexation from the UGA, the City of Madras will accept all paved Jefferson County roads that have a pavement condition index $(\mathrm{PCl})$ of 70 or above. If the PCI is below 70 , the county may structurally overlay the road to raise the PCI above 70 at which time the City shall be obligated to accept jurisdiction of such road. Jefferson County policies for road design and construction standards to be used in the Urban Growth Boundary and Urban Reserve Area are outlined in the Jefferson County Code, Sections 12,18.070 and 12.18.080. Per Jefferson County ordinances, the Jefferson County Public Works Director may require roads to be constructed to City of Madras standards.

The Oregon Department of Transportation provides transportation services on state highways within the Urban Reserve area. The Oregon Department of Transportation retains jurisdiction and maintenance responsibilities on all state highways after incorporation into the UGB and annexation except in special cases where jurisdiction is transferred to the City or County by a specific agreement.
7. Storm Water Management. Jefferson County provides public storm water management services to property where required within the Urban Reserve Arca. The City will provide storm water management services to property witbin the city limits. Transition of public stom water management services will follow transition of road maintenance responsibilities.

## Jefferson County Code Section 12.18.070 :

12.18.070 Roads within an urban growth boundary.

Roads within an urban growth boundary (JGB) or urban reserve shall, at the discretion of the Jefferson County director of public works, conform to the design and construction specifications of the city contained within the UGB boundary and shall be subject to review and approval of that city's director of public works and the Jefferson County director of public works. (Ord. O-69-07 § 1 Exh. A (part), 2007: Ord. O-110-02 § 2 Exh. B (part), 2002)
12.18.080 Roads within one mile of an urban growth boundary.

At the discretion of the Jefferson County director of public works, design and construction standards and specifications for roads within one mile of a UGB may be modified to accommodate future reconstruction to city standards. Roads in zones contiguous to the UGB of Madras, Culver or Metolius may be required to be constructed in accordance with Section 12.18.070 of this chapter if, in the opinion of the director of public works, such roads would become connected to the city road system. (Ord. O-69-07 § 1 Exh. A (part), 2007: Ord. O-110$02 \S 2$ Exh. B (part), 2002)

Appendix D: Water and Sewer Service Provider Letters

S.E. D Street, Madras, OR, 97741-541-475-3388

## MEMORANDUM

| Date: | January 26, 2010 |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Jefferson County Planning Commission <br> Madras Planning Commission <br> Jon Skidmore, Jefferson County Community Development Director |
| Cc: | Nick Snead, City of Madras Community Development Director |
| From: | Gus Burnil, City of Madras Public Works Director |

## Overview:

The City of Madras (City) has filed a post-acknowledgement plan amendment application with Jefferson County to expand the current Madras Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) by approximately 37 acres and re-zone 20 of the 37 acres from Range Land (RL) to Multi-Family Residential (R-2) as shown in the attached map. To complete this land use action the City is required demonstrate that public facilities (i.e. wastewater, domestic water, stormwater, and transportation) can be extended to serve the area proposed to be included in the Madras UGB. The City provides wastewater and stormwater service and the properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB are located within the planning boundaries of the City of Madras Wastewater and Stormwater Master Plans.

## Wastewater:

The properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB are located within the study area of the City of Madras' Wastewater Master Plan. Figure 5-2B (attached) identifies a planned 8 inch wastewater service line to be constructed in the Ashwood right-of-way that would service the properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB. Additionally, the City constructed a 10 inch wastewater service line to Oregon Department of Corrections Deer Ridge Correctional facility in Ashwood Road adjacent to the properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB (see attached drawing).

When the proposed properties are developed, the City will require the property owner to extend wastewater service in accordance with City standards. Based on the planned improvements in the Madras Wastewater Master Plan, the existing wastewater facilities in Astwood Road, the City of Madras has capacity to provide wastewater service to the properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB at the time of development.

## Stormwater:

The properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB are located within the study area of the City of Madras' Stormwater Master Plan. Figure IV-5 (attached) identifies a planned 12 inch
An Equal Opportunity Provider
Page 1 of 2
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stormwater service line to be constructed in Ashwood Road adjacent to the properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB. Furthermore, Design Criteria (1) in the City of Madras Stormwater Masier Plan in Section IV, requires ${ }^{\text {T}}$
"Any property development or redevelopment shall include stormwater facilities designed to handle runoff from all tributary areas for the 24-hour, 25-uear design storm event. The facilities shall limit the peak discharge from the development in a 24-hour, 25-year design storm to the estimated pre-development peak fow rate in a 24 -hour, 10-year design sform."

Considering the planned stormwater facilities identified in the City of Madras Stormwater Master Plan and the existing stormwater design standards for development, the City has capacity to provide stormwater service to the properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB.

## Conclusion:

The City of Madras has capacity to serve the properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB with wastewater and stormwater service. Should there by any questions, please contact me at 541-475-2622.

Sincerely,

Gus Burril, P.E.
City of Madras
Public Works Director
71 SE "D" Street
Madras, OR, 97741
541-475-2622

## Attachments: Figure 5-2B Wasiewater Collection System

 Phase 1B Segment 2 Wastewater Improvements Figure IV-5 Stormwater System Improvements



## Nick Snead

From: Edson at DVWD [edson@dwwd.org]
Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2010 11:15 AM
To: Nick Snead
Subject: RE: Domestic water service availability
-->

Hi Nick-

DVWD should be able to serve that property. Naturally, the mainline upgrades and/or extensions would have to be paid for by the developer. When there is an engineered plan for the required infrastructure, I will be happy to do an estimate for the waterworks portion to be installed by DWWD.

## Feel free to call if you need more information.

Edson Pugh, P.E.

## General Manager

Deschutes Valley Water District
881 SW Culver Hwy.
Madras, OR 97741
Ph. \# (541) 475-3849

From: Nick Snead [mailto:nsnead@ci.madras.or.us]
Sent: Monday, January 25, 2010 8:45 AM
To: Ed Pugh
Subject: Domestic water service availability
Importance: High

Ed,

Good morning! You may have heard the City is proposing to expand the Urban Growth Boundary by approximately 37 acres and annex 20 acres into the City for the Jefferson County School District. The property proposed to be annexed is south of Ashwood Road. I have attached a map to quickly orient your to the property. I am wondering if DVWD domestic water service is available or if not, what facility improvements would future am wondering if responsible for constructing? This email is a formal request and I would like to put your response in the record to demonstrate (hoperuly) that water service is available and/or the facility improvements needed to serve the area proposed to be in the Madras UGB.

Let me know if you have any questions. Call me at 541-323-2916 if needed.

Take care,
"One may walk over the highest mountain one step at a time" -John Wanamaker-

## Nicholas S. Snead

Director
Community Development Department
City of Madras
(541) 475-3388

Email: nsnead@ci.madras.or.us

Visit the City of Madras at http://ci.madras.or.us/

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 8.5.432 / Virus Database: 271.1.1/2644 - Release Date: 01/25/10 07:36:00

# Appendix E: Property Owner Consent Letters 

 property to the City of Madras, Jefferson County, Oregon.
(Legal description of property):


The undersigned property owner hereby gives express, continuing, written consent to annexation of the property described herein to the City of Madras; and does hereby agree to execute such separate, further or additional application, petition, and consent as may be hereafter required by the City, or the laws of the State, as now or hereafter enacted for such annexation. This consent is given in consideration of City services that either have been or will be applied to the described property. The undersigned intends this consent to comply with all requirements of law for annexatlon of the property described. The undersigned and City intend that this consent shall consttute a covenant running with the land, binding on the undersigned and the undersigned's heirs, successors, or assigns.

The undersigned represents that the undersigned is the owner of this property and has the right to consent to its annexation.
DATED this 9th day of October

STATE OF OREGON
County of Jefferson
Personally appeared before me this $\qquad$ day of Octoler 20.03 the above named
$\qquad$
and acknowledged the foregoing instrument to be a voluntary act.



Jefferson County Omilal Records
After Recording Return to:
City of Madras
71 S.E. "D" Streat
Madras, Oregon 97741
Albert h. Zemke
(List name of individual(s) having signature notarized)

My Commission Expires: $9-14-2004$

81 $\square$

CONSENT TO ANNEXATION ONE-YEAR WAIVER
(INe), the undersigned, do hereby waive the one-year requirement on the attached "Consent to Annexation" for the following described property and acknowledge that the consent shall remain in effect indefinitely.
(Metes and Bounds Description and Map to be Attached to the Consent to Annexation)
"See Attached Exhibit "B"

Slgnature: Typed Name:


| STATE OF OREGON | , |
| :--- | :--- |
| County of Jefferson |  |

Personally appeared before me this $10^{\text {th }}$ day of $C \operatorname{CtALH} \quad 2003$ the above named

Albert L. Zemke
(List name of individual(s) having signature notarized)
and acknowledged the foregoing instrument to be a voluntary act.


After Recording Return to:

City of Madras
71 S.E. "D" Street
Madras, Oregon 97741


## EXHIBIT "B"

MAP \#11-14-7, TAX LOT \#101
ALBERT L. ZEMKE

PARCEL I: Northeast quarter, Northeast quarter of the Southeast quarter, North half of the Northwest quarter of the Southeast quarter, Southeast quarter of the Northwest quarter of the Southeast quarter of Section 7, Township 11 South, Range 14 East of the Willamette Meridian Jefferson County Oregon, and the Southwest quarter of the Northwest quarter of the Southeast quarter.

# RECORDED DOCUMENT <br> STATE OF OREGON COUNTY OF JEFFERSON 

## DO NOT REMOVE THIS CERTIFICATE

(This certificate constitutes a part of the original instrument in accordance with ORS 205.180(2). Removal of this certificate may invalidate this certificate and affect the admissibility of the original instrument into evidence in any legal proceeding.)

KATHLEEN B. MARSTON
JEFFERSON COUNTY CLERK

The undersigned property owners) hereby consents to the annexation of the following described property to the City of Madras, Jefferson County, Oregon.
(Legal description of property):
MAP $11-14-7$, TAX LOT \#200, MORE PARTICULARLT DESGRIBED OM ATTACHED EXHIBIT "A"

The undersigned property owner hereby gives express, continuing, written consent to annexation of the property described herein to the City of Madras; and does hereby agree to execute such separate, further or additional application, petition, and consent as may be hereafter required by the City, or the laws of the State, as now or hereafter enacted for such annexation. This consent is given in consideration of City services that either have been or will be applied to the described property. The undersigned intends this consent to comply with all requirements of law for annexation of the property described. The undersigned and City intend that this consent shall constitute a covenant running with the land, binding on the undersigned and the undersigned's heirs, successors, or assigns.

The undersigned represents that the undersigned is the owner of this property and has the right to consent to its annexation.


Address:
2465 E. ASHMOOD ROAD
MADRAS, OREGON 97741

STATE OF OREGON )
County of Jefferson )
Personally appeared before me this 28 day of MAy_ 208 the above
 named Dorothy Thomas to Dorothy Thomas Atom- and acknowededed the foregoing (List name of individuals) having signature notarized)
for PB B
instrument to be a voluntary act.

After Recording Return to:
City of Madras
71 S.E. "D" Street
Madras, Oregon 97741
Pitt CBarzunger
Notary -State of Oregon: $24 \nrightarrow \mathrm{Acg} 2009$
My Commission Expires:



## City of Madra

May 13, 2008
Job \# 08029B
Tax lot: 11-14-7-200
CITY OF MADRAS ANNEXATION \#2008-02
A Tract of land located in the Northeast One-Quarter of the Northwest One-Quarter (NE 1/4NW 1/4) and the Northwest One-Quarter of the Northeast One-Quarter (NW 1/4-NE 1/4) of Section 7, Township 11 South, Range 14 East of the Willamette Meridian, Jefferson County, Oregon, more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the North-South centerline of said Section 7 which bears South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 80.01 feet from the North One-Quarter comer of said Section 7; thence leaving said North-South Section centerline and along the South right-of-way line of Ashwood Road as described in Warranty Deed recorded in Book 2005, Page 005605 of Jefferson County official records South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 39^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 61.23 feet; thence leaving said right-of-way line South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 424.32 feet; thence South $89^{\circ} 42^{\prime} 25^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 61.22 feet to a point on the North-South centerline of said Section 7 which bears South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 505.00 feet from the North One-Quarter conner of said Section 7, being a point on the boundary of Parcel 1 of Partition Plat No. 2004-15 (recorded as MF\# 2004-4735); thence along the boundary of said Parcel 1 South $89^{\circ} 42^{\prime \prime} 25^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 354.87 feet; thence leaving said boundary 117.68 feet along a non-tangent curve to the right with a radius of 455.00 feet, the chord of which bears North $07^{\circ} 42^{\prime} 08^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 117.35 feet; thence North $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 18.24 feet; thence 123.03 feet along the arc of a tangent curve to the right with a radius of 240.00 feet, the chord of which bears North $14^{\circ} 23^{\prime} 32^{\prime \prime}$ East for a distance of 121.68 feet; thence 186.84 feet along the arc of a reverse curve to the left with a radius of 360.00 feet, the chord of which bears North 14 $4^{\circ} 12^{\prime} 33^{\prime \prime}$ East for a distance of 184.75 feet to a point on said South right-of-way line; thence along said South right-of-way line the following two (2) courses and one (1) curve:

South $88^{\circ} 42^{\prime} 59^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 170.57 feet;
18.12 feet along the arc of a tangent curve to the left with a radius of 1099.00 feet, the chord of which bears South $89^{\circ} 11^{\prime} 19^{\prime \prime}$ East for a distance of 18.12 feet; South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 39^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 104.28 feet to the point of beginning, the terminus of this description.
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## CONSENT TO ANNEXATION ONE-YEAR WAIVER

(IN), the undersigned, do hereby waive the one-year requirement on the attached "Consentto Annexation" for the following described property and acknowledge that the consent shall remain in effect indefinitely.
(Metes and Bounds Description and Map to be Attached to the Consent to Annexation)


## STATE OF OREGON )

County of Jefferson
Personally appeared before me this 28 day of MAy $\frac{20}{} 2008$, the above named Dorothy E. ThomAs AKA Dorothy Thomas and acknowledged the foregoing (Listrame of individuals) having signature notarized)' Dorothy Thomas, AHornoyg in fact
for EvaN W. Thomas instrument to be a voluntary act.


## PETITION FOR ANNEXATION BY CONSENT PURSUANT TO ORE 222.170

Ne, Evan W. ThomAS $\&$ Dorothy Thomas , 10 hereby respectfully petition the City Council of the City of Madras to annex contiguous property to the City pursuant to PRS 222.170 (1)(a).
(Metes and Bounds Legal Description and Map Required)
(These can be attached to the Consent to Annexation Form)

| Map\# 11-14-7 | Tax Lot\# 200 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Map \# | Tax Lot\# |
| Map\# | Tax Lot\# |
| Map\# | Tax Lot\# |

Attached hereto is the consent of the owners) of the property, and is incorporated herein as Exhibit "A". Petitioner hereby certifies that they are the owners) of said property as ownership is described in ORS 222.120(7). Petitioner further certifies to the City that they are the legal owners) of record and are the sole owners of the property.

Dated this 28 day of May 20.08.
Signature: Elenebty thenar
Typed or Printed Name: _DOROTEX thous


Signature: altourngy E-in-gench
Typed or Printed Name: Evan UN. ThomaS

Petition for Annexation by Consent

# JEFFERSON County Assessor's Summary Report 

Real Property Assessment Report
FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2009


Comments: SPLT CODE WITH *3134 Combined with account \#13134

# JEFFERSON County Assessor's Summary Report <br> Real Property Assessment Report 

FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2009


## Comments: $\quad$ SPLIT CODE WiTH \#13274



91 Exhibit to Ordinance No. 823

# JEFFERSON County Assessor's Summary Report <br> Real Property Assessment Report FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2009 

| Account\# | 2602 | Tax 3tatus | ASSESSABLE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hap \# | 111407-00-00200 | Acct Status | ACtive |
| Code - Tax \# | 0110-2602 | Subtype | NORMAL |
| Legal Descr | Metes \& Bounds - See legal repon for full description. |  |  |
| Malling Name | THOMAS, EVAN W\& DOROTHYE | Deed Reference ${ }^{\text {S }}$ | Sae Racord |
| Agent |  | Sales Date/Pice | See Record |
| In Care Of |  | Appralser | COX, DON |
| Maling Address 2465 E ASHWOOD R |  |  |  |
| 2465 E ASHWOODRMADRAS, OR 97741 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |




## City of Madras

71 SE D Street
Madras OR 97741

WARRANTY DEED
(Statutory Form)
(ORS 93.850)
MORROW PROPERTIES, INC., an Oregon corporation, Grantor, conveys and warrants to the CITY OF MADRAS, an Oregon municipality, Grantee, the following described real property, situate in Jefferson County, Oregon, free from encumbrances except as specifically set forth:

Parcel 1 of Partition Plat No. 2004-06, recorded April 15, 2004, as Instrument No. 2004-1610, Jefferson County, Oregon.

## SUBJECT TO:

1. 2004-2005 taxes, a lien in an amount to be determined, but not yet payable.
2. As disclosed by tax roll the premises herein described have been zoned or classified for farm use. At any time that said land is disqualified for such use, the property may be subject to additional taxes or penalties and interest.
3. The property lies within the boundaries of Deschutes Valley Water District and is subject to any charges or assessments levied by said District, and pipeline easements in connection therewith.
4. Rights of the public in and to that portion of the herein described premises lying within the boundaries of roads or highways.
5. Right of way, if any, of Public Usage Road No. 3053 as shown on tax assessor map but which the Grantor declares may be closed or vacated by prior Federal or County governmental action.
6. Mineral reservation by the United States of America as disclosed in Deed recorded April 28, 1983, Fee No. 147453.
7. Reservation by the United States of America for power line as disclosed in Deed, recorded April 28, 1983, Fee No. 147453.

The true consideration for this conveyance is an exchange of real property between the Grantee and Grantor.

[^10]8. Reservation by the United States of America for power line as disclosed in Deed, recorded April 28, 1983, Fee No. 147453.
9. Easement, including the terms and provisions thereof, for electrical transmission lines granted to Central Electric Cooperative, Inc., recorded April 28, 1983, Fee No. 147456.
10. Easement, including the terms and provisions thereof, for communication lines, granted to Pacific Northwest Bell Telephone Company, recorded April 28, 1983, Fee No. 147458.
11. Easements as shown on Partition Plat 2004-06, for utility and access.

THIS INSTRUMENT WILL NOT ALLOW USE OF THE PROPERTY DESCRIBED IN THIS INSTRUMENT IN VIOLATION OF APPLICABLE LAND USE LAWS AND REGULATIONS. BEFORE SIGNING OR ACCEPTING THIS INSTRUMENT, THE PERSON ACQUIRING FEE TITLE TO THE PROPERTY SHOULD CHECK WITH THE APPROPRIATE CITY OR COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT TO VERIFY APPROVED USES AND TO DETERMINE ANY LIMITS ON LAWSUITS AGAINST FARMING OR FOREST PRACTICES AS DEFINED IN ORS 30.930.

Dated this $\qquad$ day of
 2005
20060 m MORROW PROPERTIES, INC: 2. Authenemansur ANDREW J. MORROW, President

| STATE OF OREGON | ) ss. |
| :--- | :--- |
| County of Jefferson | ) |

Personally appeared ANDREW J. MORROW, who being duly sworn, did say that he is the President of MORROW PROPERTIES, INC., an Oregon corporation, and that the seal affixed to the foregoing instrument is the corporate seal of said corporation by authority of its Board of Directors, and heacknowledged said instrument to be its voluntary act and deed, before me this


Notary Public for Oregon
My commission expires: $3 \cdot 28-08$
-2- WARRANTY DEEDIIServerlKashyMMorrow MMorraw Properties - Warranty Decd.wod


JEFFERSON COUNTY ASSESSOR'S NAME LEDGER

 SEO YOUCHERID TAX YEAR DOCUMENTSOURCE TYPE ID\# ID\#2 PID SOUTEQID PT OPERATION TOIFROMMAP


\section*{| Size Totals | Code | Acres | SqEt |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 0110 | 213.70 | 0.00 |}

Page 1

$$
98
$$

Size Changes Code $\quad$ Al-Size $\quad$ Alternate Size Code Area Deleted Move to Acct Move to Code

$\begin{array}{llll}\text { Size Totals } & \text { Code } & \text { Acres } & \text { SqFt } \\ & 0110 & 155.14 & 0.00\end{array}$


AREA 110) CONVEYS TO THE PUBLIC FOR ROAD, 2.15 ACRES.

> | Size Totals | Code | Acres | SqFt |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 0110 | 152.99 | 0.00 |

Add:
Public Road Dedication
A portion of Parcel 2 of
A portion of Parcel 2 of Partition Plat No. 2002-12 as filed in the Jefferson CountyClerk's Office, situated
in the Northeast Quarter (NE A) of Section 7, Township 11South, Range 14 East of the Willamette
Meridian, Jefferson County, Oregon, moreparticularly described as follows:
Commencing at the Northwest corner of said Northeast Quarter, monumented with a 2 inch diameter brass
cap, from which the Northeast comer of said Section 7 bears South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40$ "East a distance of 2640.53 South 00 ${ }^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ West a distanceof 40.00 feet to the Northwest comer of said Parcel 2 of Partition Plat No.

2002-12 andthe True Point of Beginning of this Description; thence continuing South $0001736^{\prime \prime}$ West
along the West line of said Parcel 2 a distance of 40.00 feet; thence South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 39^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of
1690.17 feet; thence 374.44 feet along the arc of a 600.00 foot radius curve to the right, with a central angle
1690.17 feet; thence 374.44 feet along the arc of a 600.00 foot radius curve to the right, with a central angle
of 3 So4S\#24\#\# the long chord bearsSouth $71046 \#$ S $7 \# \#$ East a distance of 368.40 feet to the East line of

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{c}
\text { TAXLOT } \\
00100
\end{array} \text { SPECIAL INTEREST } \\
& \begin{array}{ccc}
\text { SECTION } & 1 / 4 & 1 / 16 \\
07 & 0 & 0
\end{array} \\
& \text { AF } 2007 \\
& \begin{array}{cc}
\text { TOWNSHIP } & \text { RANGE } \\
11
\end{array} \\
& \begin{array}{l}
117 \\
\text { SHOULD BE } 155.14 \text { ACRES. }
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

TOWNSHIP RANGE
11
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## JEFFERSON COUNTY ASSESSOR'S NAME LEDGER <br> JEFFERSON COUNTY ASSESSOR'S NAME LEDGER

Prinled on 01-13-10 $\vec{\square}$

$$
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\text { TOWNSHIP } & \text { RANGE } & \text { SECTION } & 1 / 4 & 1 / 16 & \text { TAXLOT } & \text { SPECIAL INTEREST }
\end{array}
$$

Effective Date 25 -Feb-2005 12:00 AM Transaction ID 143182 Entry Date 25-Feb-2005 Recorded Date 25-Feb-2005 Sale Date 25-Feb-2005

| SEQ | VOUCHER ID TAX YEAR | DOCUMENT SOURCE | TYPE | ID\# | ID\#2 | PID | SOURCQ ID | PT OPERATION | TOIFROM MAP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 141861 | 2005 | HISTORICAL - BOR | $U$ | 1900 | 41759 | 1 | 20050974 | CONVERSION NAME |  | CONVERSION NAME

CHANGE

## 

Ownership of
Effective Date 31-May-2005 12:00 AM Transaction ID 143183 Entry Date 31-May-2005 Recorded Date 31-May-2005 Sale Date 31-May-2005

## Name Changes $\begin{gathered}\text { Status } \\ \mathrm{D}\end{gathered} \underset{\text { ZEMKE, ALBERTL }}{\text { Name }}$



Ownorship Type
ID\#2 PID Source ID PT OPERATION
Size Changes Code _r_ $\quad$ Alternate Size Code Area Deleted Move to Acct Move to Code
Recorded Date 20-Jul-2006 Sale Date 23-Jun-2006

$\begin{array}{ccccccc}\text { TOWNSHIP } & \text { RANGE } & \text { SECTION } & 1 / 4 & 1 / 16 & \text { TAXLOT } & \text { SPECIAL INTEREST }\end{array}$


Size Changes Code $\quad+/-$ Size $\quad$ Alternate Size Code Area Deleted Move to Acct Move to Code $0110-0.60$ Acres 0.00
$\begin{array}{llrl}\text { Size Totals } & \text { Code } & \text { Acres } & \text { SqFt } \\ & 0110 & 8.28 & 0.00\end{array}$

Page 2
103




| Size Totals | Code | Acres | SGFt |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0110 | 8.28 | 0.00 |  |



## $\begin{array}{llcccc}\text { Size Changes } & \text { Code } & +/- \text { Size } & \text { Alternate Size } & \text { Code Area Deleted } & \text { Move to Acct Move to Codo- } \\ & 0020 & 4.00 \text { Acres } & \\ & & & \\ \text { Size Totals } & \text { Code } & \text { Acres } & \text { SqFt } \\ & 0110 & 8.28 & 0.00 \\ & 0020 & 4.00 & 0.00\end{array}$



Page 3
104
Ownership :




```
106
Order No. 0008661
```
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## EXDIBIT "A"

## Legal Desoripdion:

A parcel of land containing 12,28 acres, more or less, being a portion of Parcel 1 of Partition Plat No. 2002.12 located in the Northeast One-quarter of Section 7, Township 11 South, Range 14 East of the Willamette Meridian, Jefferson County, Oreyorn, being more particularly described as follows:

Comrnencing at a point on the north-south centerline of said Section 7 which bears South $00^{\circ} 17 / 35^{n}$ East a distance of 80.01 feet from the North One-quarter comer of said Seotion 7, thence leaving said north-eouth section centerline and along the south right-of-way line of Ashwood road as described in Warninty Deed recordei as instrument No. $2005-005605$ of Jefferson Coumty official records South 89039'39' East g distance of 61.23 feot to the true Point of Boginning of this description; thenee contimuing along said right-of-way hine South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 39^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 538.68 fect to a point on the cast boundary of said Parcel 1; thence along said cast boundary South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ Bast a distance of 935.15 feet to the Southeart comer of said Parcel $I_{i}$ thence along the sovth boumdary of said Parcel 1 North $89^{\circ} 40^{\prime} 13^{\prime \prime}$ West a distanse of 599.90 feet to the southwest corner of said Parcel 1, being a point on said north-south section senterline; thence along gaid northsouth seotion centerlino North $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\circ}$ West a distatee of 510.26 feet to a point which bears South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 505,00 feet from the North One-quarter comer of said Section 7; thence leaving gaid north-south seotion centerimo North $89^{\circ} 42^{\prime \prime} 25^{\prime \prime}$ Bast a distance of 61.22 feet thence North $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 424.32 feet to the point of beginning.

# JEFFERSON COUNTY ASSESSOR <br> REAL PROPERTY ASSESSMENT REPORT 

FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2009
Jan 13, 2010


## JEFFERSON COUNTY ASSESSOR'S NAME LEDGER

Printed on 01-93-70 $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\infty}$


## Noiloas

$\begin{array}{cccc}1 / 4 & 1 / 16 & \text { TAXLOT } & \text { SPLCIAL Nen } \\ 0 & 0 & 00102 & \\ \text { ransaction ID } 258092 & \text { Entry Date 25-Jul-2006 }\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{cc}\text { TOWNSHIP } & \text { RANGE } \\ 14\end{array}$
Effective Date 19-Sep-2006 2:46 PM


$\begin{array}{llll}\text { Size Totals } & \text { Code } & \text { Acres } & \text { SqFt } \\ & 0010 & 0.69 & 0.00\end{array}$
Intry Date 20-Sep-2006 Recorded Date 20-Sep-2006 Sale Date
ID\#2 PID Source ID PT OPERATION TOIFROM MAP
TAX STATAS CHANGE
TO NOAASSESSABLE

| Space above this line for Recording Office Use |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| After recording, return to: | Send Tax statements to: |  |
| Oregon Department of Corrections | (same) |  |
| Attn: Community Development Manager |  |  |
| 1793 13 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street SE |  |  |
| Salem, OR 97302-2595 |  |  |

## WARRANTY DEED

(ORS 93.850)
Lincicome Madras Development. LLC, an Oregon limited liability company Grantor, conveys and warrants to STATE OF OREGON, by and through its DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, Grantee, its successors and assigns, the real property described in Exhibit A (the "Property") free of encumbrances, except for easements, conditions, and restrictions contained in the public record, and except as specifically set forth herein (none).
BEFORE SIGNING OR ACCEPTING THIS INSTRUMENT, THE PERSON TRANSFERRING FEE TITLE SHOULD INQUIRE ABOUT THE PERSON'S RIGHTS, IF ANY, UNDER ORS 197.352. THIS INSTRUMENT DOES NOT ALLOW USE OF THE PROPERTY DESCRIBED IN THIS INSTRUMENT IN VIOLATION OF APPLICABLE LAND USE LAWS AND REGULATIONS. BEFORE SIGNING OR ACCEPTING THIS INSTRUMENT, THE PERSON ACQUIRING FEE TITLE TO THE PROPERTY SHOULD CHECK WITH THE APPROPRIATE CITY OR COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT TO VERIFY APPROVED USES, TO DETERMINE ANY LIMITS ON LAWSUTTS AGAINST FARMING OR FOREST PRACTICES AS DEFINED IN ORS 30.930 AND TO INQUIRE ABOUT THE RIGHTS OF NEIGHBORING PROPERTY OWNERS, IF ANY, UNDER ORS 197.352.

The true consideration for this conveyance is $\$ 39,021.00$.


## ACCEPTED BY:

The State of Oregon, acting by and through
its Department of Corrections


As: Dept. of Corrections, Community Manager


This instrument was acknowledged before me on this $30^{t h}$ day of $\int$ une $\qquad$ 2006, by BUBBI BURTON as the Community Manager and authorized representative of the Oregon Department of Corrections, acting under authority granted to him/her by the State of Oregon.

Cusathonepator
Notary Public for Oregon
My Commission expires: $1-11-09$

## EXHIBIT A

Legal Description for Warranty Deed ASHWOOD ROAD

Section 7 (East Property)
A 60.00 -foot wide strip of land, lying 60.00 on the south side of the following described centerline, over land located in the northwest $1 / 4$ of the northeast $1 / 4$ of Section 7 of Township 11 South and Range 14 East of the Willamette Meridian, Jefferson County, Oregon, described in the Warranty Deed recorded at 2005-002823 of the Jefferson County Official Records:

Beginning at Engineer's Centerline Station 5+00, on the section line between Sections 6 and 7 of Township 11 South and Range $1^{\prime} 4$ East of the Willamette Meridian, Jefferson County, Oregon, which bears North $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 17^{\prime \prime}$ West 1481.20 feet from the $1 / 4$ comer between said Sections 6 and 7; thence South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 17^{\prime \prime}$ East 138.33 feet, along the section line between said Sections 6 and 7; thence leaving said section line, 17.02 feet along the arc of a 1039.00 foot radius curve right (the long chord of which bears South $89^{\circ} 11^{\prime} 08^{\prime \prime}$ East 17.01 feet); thence South $88^{\circ} 43^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$ East 1205.50 feet; thence 17.13 feet along the arc of a 1039.00 foot radius curve left (the long chord of which bears South $89^{\circ} 11^{\prime} 20^{\prime \prime}$ East 17.13 feet); thence South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ East 2394.42 feet; thence 633.14 feet along the arc of a 660.00 foot radius curve right (the long chord of which bears South $62^{\circ} 10^{\prime} 44^{\prime \prime}$ East 609.14 feet); thence South $34^{\circ} 41^{\prime} 49^{\prime \prime}$ East 774.75 feet; thence 1709.82 feet along the arc of a 1000.00 foot radius curve left (the long chord of which bears South $83^{\circ} 40^{\prime} 47^{\prime \prime}$ East 1509.02 feet); thence North $47^{\circ} 20^{\prime} 15^{\prime \prime}$ East 542.88 feet; thence 2560.21 feet along the arc of a 1400.00 foot radius curve right (the long chord of which bears South $80^{\circ} 16^{\prime} 24^{\prime \prime}$ East 2218.09 feet); thence South $27^{\circ} 53^{\prime} 03^{\prime \prime}$ East 943.15 feet; thence 1158.98 feet along the arc of an 850.00 foot radius curve left (the long chord of which bears South $66^{\circ} 56^{\prime} 44^{\prime \prime}$ East 1071.26 feet); thence North $73^{\circ} 59^{\prime} 34^{\prime \prime}$ East 585.08 feet; thence 368.57 feet along the arc of a 340.00 foot radius curve right (the long chord of which bears South $74^{\circ} 57^{\prime} 06^{\prime \prime}$ East 350.79 feet); thence South $43^{\circ} 53^{\prime} 47^{\prime \prime}$ East 305.17 feet; thence 254.87 feet along the arc of a 340.00 foot radius curve left (the long chord of which bears South $65^{\circ} 22^{\prime} 17^{\prime \prime}$ East 248.94 feet); thence South $86^{\circ} 50^{\prime} 46^{\prime \prime}$ East 596.74 feet; thence 122.81 feet along the arc of a 660.00 foot radius curve right (the long chord of which bears South $81^{\circ} 30^{\prime} 56^{\prime \prime}$ East 122.63 feet); thence South $76^{\circ} 11^{\prime} 06^{\prime \prime}$ East 271.44 feet to engineer's centerline station $151+00$, the terminus for this description, from which the $1 / 4$ corner between Sections 9 and 10 bears North $89^{\circ} 14^{\prime} 59^{\prime \prime}$ East 2049.79 feet.

The parcel of land to which this description applies contains $\mathbf{3 0 , 0 1 6}$ square feet, more or less.
This description may include areas that are preexisting public right-of-way or easements, which are retained, and included herein to provide a clearer record of title in the future.


Warranty Deed Legal Description - East Property
Page 1 of 1

JEFFERSON COUNTY ASSESSOR'S NAME LEDGER


| Size Changes Code | $+/-$ Size | Alternate Size Code Area Deleted Move to Acct Move to Code |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0110 |  |  |


| Size Totals | Code | Acres | SgFt |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0110 | 4.36 | 0.00 |  |









| Size Totals | Code | Acres | SqFt |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0110 | 3.94 | 0.00 |  |



$\begin{array}{cccc}\text { Size Totals } & \text { Code } & \text { Acres } & \text { SqFt } \\ & 0110 & 3.34 & 0.00\end{array}$
Effective Date 03-Aug-2007 9:49 AM Transaction ID $344875 \quad$ Entry Date 12-Jun-2007 Recorded Date 11-Jun-2007 Sale Date 11-Jun-2007

| SEQ | VOUCHERID | TAX YEAR | DOCUMAENT SOURCE | TTPE | ID \#1 | ID\#2 | PID | SOURCO ID | PT OPERATION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 409849 | 2007 | CLERK - BOR | PLA | 2007 | 3081 | 1 |  | SIZE CHANGE |

Page 2
$\begin{array}{ccccccc}\text { TOWNSHIP } & \text { RANGE } & \text { SECTION } & 1 / 4 & 1 / 16 & \text { TAXLOT } & \text { SPECIAL INTEREST } \\ 11 & 14 & 07 & 0 & 0 & 00200 & \end{array}$

| Size Changes | Code | +/- Size | Alternate Size | Code Area Deleted | Move to Acct | Move to Code |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0110 | 0.60 Acres | 0.00 |  |  |  |
| Size Totals | Code | Acres | SgFt |  |  |  |
|  | 0110 | 3.94 | 0.00 |  |  |  |

$\begin{array}{llcc}\text { Size Totals } & \text { Code } & \text { Acres } & \text { SqFt } \\ & 0110 & 3.94 & 0.00 \\ \text { Add: } & & & \end{array}$
Add:
A parcel of land containing 3.94 acres, more or less, located in a portion of the Northwest One-quarter
(NW 1/4) and a portion of the Northeast One-Quarter (NE 1/4) of Section 07, Township 11 South, Range
(NW 1/4) and a portion of the Northeast One-Quarter (NE 1/4) of Section 07, Township 11 South, Range
described as follows: Beginning at a point on the north-south centerline of said Section 07 which bears
South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 80.01 feet from the North One-quarter comer of said Section 07; thence
South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 80.01 feet from the North One-quarter comer of said Section 07 ; thence
leaving said north-south section centerline and along the south right-of-way line of Ashwood Road as
described in Warranty Deed recorded in Book 2005, Page 005605 of Jefferson County official records
South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 39^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 61.23 feet; thence leaving said right-of-way line South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ Eastt
a distance of 424.32 feet; thence South $89^{\circ} 42^{\prime 2} 25^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 61.22 feet to a point on the
a distance of 424.32 feet; thence South $89^{\circ} 42^{\prime 2} 25^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 61.22 feet to a point on the
north-south centerline of said Section 07 which bears South $00^{\circ} 1735^{\prime \prime}$ Eastt a distance of 505.00 feet from
north-south centerline of said Section 07 which bears South $00^{\circ} 1735$ East a distance of 505.00 feet from
No. 2004-15 (recorded as MF\#2004-4735); thence along the boundary of said Parcel 1 South $89^{\circ} 42^{\prime 2} 25^{\prime \prime}$
West a distance of 354.87 feet, thence leaving said boundary 117.68 feet along a non-tangent curve to the
right with a radius of 455.00 feet, the chord of which bears North $07^{\circ} 42^{\circ} 08^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 117.35
feet; thence North $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 18.24 feet; thence 123.03 feet along the arc of a tangent
curve to the right with a radius of 240.00 feet, the chord of which bears North $14^{\circ} 23^{\prime} 32^{\prime \prime}$ East for a distance
of 121.68 feet; thence 186.84 feet along the arc of a reverse curve to the left with a radius of 360.00 feet,
the chord of which bears North $14^{\circ} 23^{\prime} 32^{\prime \prime}$ East for a distance of 184.75 feet to a point on said south
re chord of which bears North $14^{\circ} 23^{\prime} 32^{\prime \prime}$ East for a distance of 184.75 feet to a point on said south
right-of-way line; thence along said south right-of-way line the following two (2) courses and one (1)
curve:
South $88^{\circ} 42^{\prime} 59^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 170.57 feet
18.12 feet along the arc of a tangent curve to the left with a radius of 1099.00 feet, the chord or which
bears South $89^{\circ} 11^{\prime \prime} 19^{\prime \prime}$ East for a distance of 18.12 feet; South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 39^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 104.28 feet to
the point of beginning, the terminus of this description. description.


## $\begin{array}{llll}\text { Size Totals } & \text { Code } & \text { Acres } & \text { SgFt } \\ & 0110 & 3.94 & 0.00\end{array}$ <br> 

township range section $1 / 4$
116


| Size Totals Code | Acres | SqFt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.94 | 0.00 |


-
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KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS THAT, Evan W Thomes and Dorothy Thomas, as husband and wife, Grantor(s), for and in consideration of the sum of ZERO and 00/100 Dollars husband and wife, Grantor(s), for and in consideration oi the sum of ZERO and Eor100 Dollars and Dorothy Thomas, as husband and wife, Grantee(s), the described tract of land in County of Jefferson and State of Oregon, more particularly described as follows:

See Attached Legal Description as Tract 'B'

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD the granted premises unto the said Grantee, its heirs and assigns forever.


Dated: $6 / 20 / 07$

Until a change is requested all tax statements Should be sent to the following address:

Evan W Thomas and Dorothy Thomas


After Recording Please Return to:


Same as above

## TRACT B

A parcel of land containing 3.94 acres, more or less, located in a portion of the Northwest One-quarter (NW1/4) and a portion of the Northeast One-Quarter (NE1/4) of Section 07, Township 11 Sò̀uth, Range 14 East, Willamette Meridian, City of Madras, Deschutes County, Oregon, being more particularly described as follows:

Beginring at a point on the north-south centerline of said Section 07 which bears South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 80.01 feet from the North One-quarter corner of said Section 07; thence leaving said north-south section centerline and along the south right-of-way line of Ashwood Road as described in Warranty Deed recorded in Book 2005, Page 005605 of Jefferson County official records South 89 ${ }^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 39^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 61.23 feet; thence leaving said right-of-way line South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 424.32 feet; thence South $89^{\circ} 42^{\prime} 25^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 61.22 feet a point on the north-south centerline of said Section 07 which bears South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime \prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 505.00 feet from the North Onequarter comer of said Section 07, being a point on the boundary of Parcel 1 of Partition Plat No. 2004-15 (recorded as MF\#2004-4735); thence along the boundary of said Parcel 1 South $89^{\circ} 42^{\prime} 25^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 354.87 feet; thence leaving said boundary 117.68 feet along a non-tangent curve to the right with a radius of 455.00 feet, the chord of which bears North $07^{\circ} 42^{\prime} 08^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 117.35 feet; thence North $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 18.24 feet; thence 123.03 feet along the arc of a tangent curve to the right with a radius of 240.00 feet, the chord of which bears North $14^{\circ} 23^{\prime} 32^{\prime \prime}$ East for a distance of 121.68 feet; thence 186.84 feet along the arc of a reverse curve to the left with a radius of 360.00 feet, the chord of which bears North $14^{\circ} 12^{\prime} 33^{\prime \prime}$ East for a distance of 184.75 feet to a point on said south right-of-way line; thence along said south right-of-way line the following two (2) courses and one (1) curve:

South $88^{\circ} 42^{\prime \prime} 59^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 170.57 feet
18.12 feet along the arc of a tangent curve to the left with a radius of 1099.00 feet, the chord of which bears South $89^{\circ} 11^{\prime} 19^{\prime \prime}$ East for a distance of 18.12 feet; South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime \prime} 39^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 104.28 feet to the point of beginning, the terminus of this description.

Subject to: All easements, restrictions and right-of-ways of record and those common and apparent on the land.


April 11, 2007
S:ILand Projectsi051213-Cole subd in MadrasidocsITRACT B(2).doc Thomas to Thomas

# Appendix F: Transportation Planning Rule Analysis (Kittelson \& Associates, January 2010) 

# KITTELSON \& ASSOCIATES,INC. TRANEPORTATIONENGINEERING/PLANNING 354 SW Upper Terrace Drive. Sulte 101, Bend. Oregon 97702541312.8300 F 5413124585 

## MEMORANDUM

| Date: | January 22, 2010 |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Nick Snead, City of Madras |
| From: | Chris Brehmer, P.E. \& Joe Bessman, P.E. \& Matt Bell |
| Project: | Madras Elementary School UGB Amendment |
| Subject: | Transportation Planning Rule Analysis |

The purpose of this memorandum is to document compliance with the Transportation Planning Rule for the proposed rezone of 20 acres of land located in Jefferson County from Range Land (RL) zoning to Multiple Family Residential (R-2) zoning. This memorandum was prepared to address the requirements identified within Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 660-12-0060 (Transportation Planning Rule, TPR), which contains the applicable criteria for a zone change analysis. The intent of the TPR is to ensure the transportation system can accommodate the change of uses to the adopted system plan and that any resultant significant affects are mitigated.

The land included in the proposed rezone is generally located south of Ashwood Road, east of Jefferson County Middle School, and south of the existing Juniper Hills County Park near Bean Drive. The property is within the Yarrow development and its rezone to accommodate a school was identified as part of the original Yarrow Concept Plan. The location of the property is generally shown in Figure 1, and the identification of the 20 -acre future school property on the Yarrow Concept Plan is illustrated in Figure 2. No specific development plans or entitlements are being pursued as part of this zone change.

This study determined that, with the exception of the US 97/J Street intersections, all of the study area intersections operate acceptably with the existing and proposed zoning in the horizon analysis period. The US 97/J Street intersections exceed ODOT mobility standards with or without the proposed rezone. The additional trips associated with the rezone create an incremental impact on the intersection, creating a Significant Effect. The City's Transportation System Plan (TSP) Amendment previously identified a mitigation plan for this intersection and, with the planned improvements in place, the transportation system will operate acceptably with the existing zoning and will continue to operate acceptably with the proposed rezone. Assuming that the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) is able to make a Reasonably Likely determination for the J Street improvements in the TSP, no unmitigated significant effects will occur with the proposed rezone. The study methodology, findings, and recommendations are detailed herein.


Madras Elementary School UGB Amendment Project \#: 10028.0
January 22, 2010 .

## BACKGROUND

The City of Madras, in partnership with the Jefferson County School District is proposing the UGB amendment and rezone to accommodate a potential future elementary school site. Jefferson County School District currently operates two elementary schools within the Madras City limits that served approximately 1,060 kindergarten through fifth grade students during the 2008 school year. The recent closure of the Westside Elementary School due to budget shortfalls has split Madras kindergarten through fifth grade students between Madras Elementary School (kindergarten through $2^{\text {nd }}$ grade) and Buff Elementary School ( $3^{\text {rd }}$ through $5^{\text {th }}$ grades).

Future building needs and the current location of Buff Elementary School within a 100 -year floodplain has created a need for the School District to look at alternative future sites. The location of the proposed land within the Yarrow neighborhood is expected to help accommodate future growth along Madras' east side, and the adjacent Jefferson County Middle School and Juniper Hills Park ball fields are expected to be complementary uses. A new school is not proposed for construction or entitlements at this time; the purpose of the zone change is to accommodate the long-term educational infrastructure needs in the City.

## EXISTING TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE

The existing transportation infrastructure assessment is provided herein to assist the City of Madras with the planning and prioritization of maintenance and infrastructure improvements within the study area. The existing conditions analysis is intended to identify operational and geometric conditions surrounding the site to ensure the necessary right-of-way will be available to accommodate needed system interconnectivity and accessibility, and to ensure existing transportation safety needs are addressed.

## Roadway Facilities

As illustrated in Figure 2, Ashwood Road borders the site to the north and provides primary access and connectivity to the proposed lands. Ashwood Road serves the Deer Creek Correctional Institute and other rural uses to the east of the site. To the immediate west Ashwood Road erves Juniper Hills Park and the Jefferson County Middle School, and further west transitions into B Street and connects to US 97 and the City's downtown core. A recently constructed extension of City View to J Street connects the parcel to the southern City limits, and Bean Drive connects toward the northern portion of the City. Table 1 summarizes key characteristics of the existing roadway facilities.

Table 1
Existing Transportation Facilities and Roadway Designations

| Roadway | Functional Classification | Number of Latres | Posted Speed | Sidewalks | Bleycle Lanes | On-Streat Parking |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ashwood - B Street | Major Collector | 2-Lanes | 25.45 mph | Partial ${ }^{2}$ | Yes | Partial ${ }^{1}$ |
| City View | Major Collector | 2-Lanes | 25 mph | Yes | Yes | No |
| Bean Drive | Minor Collector | 2-Lanes | 25 mph | No | No | No |
| Kinkade | Minor Collector | 2-Lanes | 25 mph | Partial ${ }^{2}$ | No | No |
| Ashwood - C Street | Major Collector | 2-Lanes | 25 mph | Partial ${ }^{2}$ | No | No |
| $10^{\text {th }}$ Street | Major Collector | 2-Lanes | 25 mph | Yes | No | Yes |
| 3 Street | Major Collector | 2-Lanes | 25 mph | Yes | Yes | No |

${ }^{1}$ On-street parking is provided along sections of roadway within the City limits.
2. Sidewalks are located on one side of the street only.

## Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities

Sidewalks are currently provided along the south side of Ashwood Road primarily where frontage improvements have been completed. As shown in Table 1, sidewalks are generally provided along a majority of the roadways within the site vicinity, with the exception of Bean Drive, where pedestrians may rely on the multi-use path within Juniper Hills Park.

Bicycle lanes are provided on both sides of Ashwood Road and extend west to the City center. Bicycle lanes are also provided on both sides of City View Road, which connect to J Street and the City center to the south.

Review of the project vicinity identified that pedestrian and bicycle connectivity and roadway crossing treatments should be considered to connect the existing Jefferson County Middle School with the Juniper Hills Park. Additional connections to the Yarrow neighborhood should also be provided concurrent with development, including appropriate pedestrian crossing treatments along Ashwood Road. These connections could help encourage non-vehicular trips between the complementary uses and increase pedestrian and bicyclist safety.

## Transit Facilities

Limited transit service is available throughout the site vicinity through services provided by the Cascades East Transit (Reference 1). Cascades East provides community connections from Madras to Redmond, Culver, and the Metolius City Hall on two trips in the morning and two trips during the afternoon period. Fares on the intercommunity connections are $\$ 5.00$ per day. Curb to curb on-call transit service is also available through Cascades East Transit Mondays through Friday with reservations. These services are available within a five-mile radius of the town center, and the fare for on-demand service is currently $\$ 1.25$ per trip. In addition, the Central Oregon Intergovernmental Council (COIC) also provides bus rides to Medicaid eligible clients within a nine-county area throughout Central Oregon.

## Existing Trafflc Counts

Historical traffic counts were obtained at City of Madras intersections from May 2007. Review of the manual turning movement counts showed that during the critical evening peak hour B Street near its intersection with $10^{\text {th }}$ Street carries approximately 145 vehicles in the eastbound direction and approximately 275 vehicles in the westbound direction during the evening peak hour. It was also noted that of the westbound vehicles approximately 20 percent were expected to travel south on City View with the remainder continuing westbound along Ashwood Road - B Street.

Figure 3 provides a summary of the historical year 2007 existing weekday p.m. peak hour turning-movement counts, which are rounded to the nearest five vehicles per hour. No historical traffic count data was available for the Ashwood Road/Bean Drive intersection, so new counts were conducted in January of 2010. The new traffic count showed similar but slightly lower through volumes along Ashwood Road as compared to the historical 2007 counts. Accordingly, it is expected that the 2006/2007 counts continue to reflect the existing roadway conditions. A summary of the existing traffic volumes throughout the study area is shown in Figure 3. Attachment " 1 " contains the traffic count worksheets used in this study as provided by City staff.

## Current Levels of Service and Performance Standards

Intersection performance thresholds vary throughout the study area based on the roadway jurisdiction. Jefferson County traffic study requirements included within the County's TSP (Reference 2) identify that a Level of Service "C" or higher should be maintained at all County intersections. The City of Madras TSP (Reference 3) identifies a target Level of Service (LOS) "D" for signalized intersections, LOS " $E$ " for unsignalized intersections (or LOS F with a volume-tocapacity ratio below 0.95). ODOT mobility standards included within the Oregon Highway Plan (add subsequent updates, Reference 4) require a volume-to-capacity ratio of less than 0.90 on the stop-controlled minor street approaches at the J Street intersections and a volume-to-capacity ratio of 0.80 at the signalized B Street intersections and future signalized J Street intersections. ${ }^{1}$

Intersection operations were reviewed to identify current capacity and safety constraints on the roadway network. Field review of the study area identified that all of the intersections are uncontrolled in the east-west direction along B Street - Ashwood Road and are stop-sign controlled along the north-south minor-street approaches. Relevant intersection performance standards for the study area intersections are summarized below in Table 2.
${ }^{1}$ Per the Oregon Highway Plan, US 26/US 97 are classified as Statewide Highways, Freight Routes, and part of the National Highway System and contain a posted speed of 30 miles per hour through the study area. Unsignalized highway mobility standards are based on a District/Local Interest Road in a nonMetropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) outside of Special Transportation Areas where the nonfreeway posted speed is less than 35 mph . Signalized highway mobility standards are based on a Freight Route along a Statewide Highway in a non-MPO outside of STAs where the posted speed is less than 35 mph .
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Table 2 Summary of Intersection Performance Standards |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection | Jurisdiction | Traffic Control ${ }^{1}$ | Performance Standard | Horizon Periad |
| Ashwood Road/ Bean Drive | Jefferson County | TWSC | LOS C | Yeas 2027 |
| Ashwood Road/ City View | Clty of Madras | TWSC | $\begin{gathered} \text { LOS E/ } \\ v / c<0.95 \end{gathered}$ | Year 2020 |
| B Street/ Kinkade Road | City of Madras | TWSC | $\begin{gathered} \text { LOS E/ } \\ v / c<0.95 \end{gathered}$ | Year 2020 |
| B Street/ Ashwood Road | City of Madras | TWSC | $\begin{gathered} \text { LOS E/ } \\ v / c<0.95 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Year 2020 |
| B Street/ $10^{\text {th }}$ Street | City of Madras | TWSC | $\begin{gathered} \text { LOS E/ } \\ \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}<0.95 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Year 2020 |
| B Street/ US 97 Northbound | ODOT | Signalized | $v / c<0.80$ | Year 2025 |
| B Street/ US 97 Southbound | ODOT | Signalized | $v / \mathrm{c}<0.80$ | Year 2025 |
| J Street/ US 97 Northbound | ODOT | TWSC | $v / \mathrm{c}<0.90$ | Year 2025 |
| 1 Street/ US 97 Southbound | ODOT | TWSC | $v / \mathrm{c}<0.90$ | Year 2025 |

Results of the existing conditions intersection operations during the weekday p.m. peak hour are illustrated in Figure 3. As shown in the figure, all of the study area intersections currently operate acceptably. It was noted that the J Street intersection with Southbound US 97 ( $4^{\mathrm{th}}$ Street) meets mobility standards but operates with high delays (Level of Service "E") along the stop-controlled east-west approaches. Existing conditions level-of-service worksheets are included in Attachment " 2 ".

## Existing Conditions Summary

The following transportation system improvement needs were identified based on review of the existing system conditions. Since mitigation of these existing deficiencies is not applicable to or caused by the proposed zone change, it is recommended that these safety and performance improvements be provided by the City of Madras as part of the City's regular maintenance or incorporated into the City's Capital Improvement Plans.

- Pedestrian and bicycle connectivity and roadway crossing treatments should be considered as part of future planning efforts to connect the existing Jefferson County Middle School with the Juniper Hills Park. Additional connections to the Yarrow neighborhood should also be provided concurrent with development, including appropriate pedestrian crossing treatments along Ashwood Road. These connections could help encourage non-vehicular trips between the complementary uses and increase pedestrian and bicyclist safety.
- All of the study area intersections operate acceptably, although the Southbound US 97 (4 $4^{\text {th }}$ Street)// Street intersection operates with high minor-street delay at a Level of Service "E".


## TRANSPORTATION PLANNING RULE COMPLIANCE

The applicable criteria for zone change analyses are found within Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 660-12-0060, also known as the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR, Reference 5). The TPR is intended to require that any changes to the adopted and recognized Transportation System Plan show consistency and compliance with the stated goals of the plan, the development and regular updates of which are a mandated requirement for cities. The overall purpose of a city's TSP is to 1) provide a safe, convenient, and economic transportation system that encourages and supports the availability, safety, convenience, and efficiency of a variety of transportation choices for moving people that balance vehicular use with other transportation modes, including walking, bicycling, and transit in order to avoid principal reliance upon any one mode of transportation; and 2) to protect existing and planned facilities for their identified functions.

The City's applicable Transportation System Plan was completed in 2001, with updates completed for the J Street connection with the US 97 in 2005 (Reference 6). The initial plan provides an assessment of roadway classifications throughout the City and potential intersection treatments at a sampling of collector and arterial intersections along with associated planning level improvement costs, and is the applicable planning document related to the City's Ashwood -B Street intersections. The J Street amendment reviewed improvement options specific to the US 97 intersections and is considered the relevant planning document for the J Street intersections.

The City's adopted TSP does not include a specific assessment of the long-term intersection needs at any of the City intersections along B Street-Ashwood, as the TSP focused on the more critical intersections along the US $97 /$ US 26 corridor through downtown Madras. The intent of this zone change analysis is to provide an assessment of the long-term system needs that should be considered for inclusion within the City's TSP (as summarized within the Existing Zoning section). In addition, to support the proposed zone change this report also includes an assessment of additional impacts that could occur with future development resulting from this zone change (as included within the Proposed Zoning section).

All analyses assess year 2020 conditions on City facilities and year 2027 conditions on County facilities for consistency with the adopted TSP horizon years. ODOT's US 97 intersections with J Street are assessed under year 2025 conditions, consistent with the TSP Update and meeting the minimum 15-year planning horizon required for consistency with the Oregon Highway Plan (Section 1F.2). ODOT's intersections with B Street are also assessed under year 2025 conditions for consistency with the 15 -year minimum planning horizon identified in the State's TSP, the Oregon Highway Plan (the City TSP assesses only 2020 conditions at B Street).

## Reasonably Likely Transportation Improvements

Transportation Planning Rule analyses allow the inclusion of planned improvements in the horizon analysis period for which a funding mechanism has been identified. The funding mechanism could be an established local Capital Improvement Project, local projects contained within a City's Systems Development Charge (SDC) list, or funded ODOT Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) projects. No funded improvements affect the study area intersections.

The US 97/J Street improvements are identified in the City's TSP Amendment as a needed facility improvement and included within the ODOT 2010-2013 Draft STIP list. Improvement plans include realignment of northbound US 97 onto Adams Drive and two new traffic signals at the new J Street intersections. A request for a "Reasonably Likely" determination for the planned improvements has been sent to ODOT and is pending approval. Attachment " 3 " includes an illustration of the planned J Street Improvements.

## Existing Zoning Conditions (Future Horizon Period)

An analysis was conducted for the horizon years as identified in the applicable City, County, and State TSPs. The existing zoning assessment was prepared to identify how the study area's transportation system operates in the horizon year with build-out of the subject parcel as currently zoned (without the impact of the proposed rezone). This analysis will supplement the City's TSP efforts along this segment of Ashwood Road and will provide a basis for comparison to potential future conditions with the proposed zone change.

Review of the City's TSP (TSP Technical Memorandum \#3, Reference 7) shows that future horizon volumes were developed through the application of an annual three percent growth rate for all turning and through movements to and from City facilities. ODOT facilities were assessed using a two percent annual growth rate for through movements along US 97/US 26. County facilities were assessed with a 3.2 percent growth rate through 2011 and 2.5 percent annual growth from 2012 through 2027.

To identify the existing trip generation potential of the subject property, review of the County zoning, allowable land uses, and site constraints was conducted. The existing Range Land zoning is one of three designations for Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) lands within Jefferson County. The RL zoning is intended to preserve predominantly non-irrigated agricultural lands for livestock grazing, and the $R L$ zoning requires that non-farm residences contain a minimum of 40 acres. A variety of non-residential uses are permitted within the $R L$ zoning, though these uses require more acreage than the 20 -acres proposed for the rezone and all are considered low intensity uses. Accordingly, under the existing zoning the trip generation potential is severely limited, and for analysis purposes it was conservatively assumed to be none.

## Intersection Level-of-Service Analysis

Figure 4 illustrates the weekday p.m. peak hour traffic volumes inclusive of regional growth and potential site build-out with the existing zoning. These volumes were used to conduct an operational analysis at each of the study intersections to determine the horizon year levels of service. As shown, all of the study intersections are forecast to operate at acceptable levels of service with exception of the US 97/J Street intersections, which exceed ODOT mobility standards. With the planned J Street improvements in place both the US 97 Northbound and Southbound intersections with J Street are forecast to operate acceptably. Attachment "4" contains the horizon period existing zoning level-of-service worksheets.
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## Proposed Zoning Conditions (Future Horizon Period)

Future horizon year conditions were developed based on the same methodology used to assess the existing zoning conditions. The proposed zoning conditions also include the incremental increase in trips that could be generated with the Multiple Family Residential (R-2) zoning, as described below.

The Multiple Family Residential (R-2) zoning category provides for higher-density single-family uses and attached residential uses, including apartments and townhomes. The R-2 zoning also allows parks and community centers as outright uses. Schools, churches, libraries, and other government buildings are allowed as conditional uses.

The City of Madras zoning provisions, as contained within Ordinance 723 (Reference 8), were reviewed to identify density ranges and allowable uses within the R-2 zoning. Conditional uses are typically not considered as part of a zone change analysis. However, as the intent of the rezone is to ultimately allow for a new school this specific conditional use was reviewed to ensure that a reasonable development scenario considers the potential impact of a school.
Review of the City zoning provisions identified the following outright allowable uses in the R-2 zoning:

- Single family residential
- Multi-family residential
- Public park, recreation areas, community centers

Based on the uses shown above, multi-family residential was identified as the most intense outright land use category from a trip generation perspective. Review of the required building space, parking allocations, lawn space, and typical road and infrastructure allocations identified a resultant reasonable maximum density of 11.6 attached residential units per acre, or approximately $\mathbf{2 3 2}$ total attached residential units on 20 -acres. Additional details on the deoelopment of residential densities are included in Attachment " 5 ".

Conversations with the project team identified that a future school would likely comprise ten acres of the overall land, with a minimum of five acres dedicated to the elementary school. Any additional lands would be retained for residential uses. The most likely school type would be an elementary school given the regional needs and recent closure of the Westside Elementary site. A new elementary school could be expected to serve an enrollment of approximately 350 students (historical records from the closed Westside Elementary School showed an enrollment of 325 students).

Accordingly, in addition to consideration of build-out of the 20 -acres with residential uses, this provides two additional R-2 development scenarios to consider:

1. 116 attached residential units on ten acres ( 11.6 units/acre * 10 acres $=116$ units) and a 350 student elementary school
2. 174 attached residential units on fifteen acres ( 11.6 units/acre * 15 acres $=174$ units) and a 350 -student elementary school on the remaining five acres.

While a ten acre school site is more typical, the minimum five-acre site provides a reasonable worst-case development scenario resulting in a more conservative analysis. The two scenarios forwarded for consideration include build-out of the parcel with residential and build-out of 15acres with residential and 5 -acres with a new school.

## R-2 Zoning Trip Generation Potential

Trip generation estimates were prepared for both $R-2$ zoning scenarios to determine which land use combination resulted in a higher overall trip generation potential during the critical weekday evening commute period (one hour between 4:00 and 6:00 p.m.). Trip generation estimates for each of the scenarios were prepared based on surveys of similar sites. Residential trip generation estimates were prepared based on data contained within ITE's standard reference Trip Generation, $8^{\text {th }}$ Edition, using the Apartment land use category (Land Use Code 220, Reference 9).

Trip generation estimates for the elementary school were prepared using surveys of schools within the City of Bend to better approximate local elementary school trends. The surveys of the Bend locations contain slightly lower trip generation rates than national surveys of elementary schools ( 0.13 trips/student versus 0.15 trips/student), but are expected to better reflect local characteristics of Central Oregon schools than the national data due to similarities in weather characteristics, mode splits, and after school activities.

All of the elementary school surveys were conducted in early fall at each of the five school sites and include an account of after school activities and public use of the adjacent ballfields. Because the evening commute period analysis of the school primarily reflects faculty trips (student trips typically occur in the afternoon), the increased student walking ratios during fair weather conditions are not expected to impact the results. The study found that the increased public use of the ballfields due to the fair weather likely results in a higher than typical trip rate. While the Bend Elementary School surveys were conducted at locations within developed residential neighborhoods, it is assumed that the City of Madras Urban Growth Boundary area will be fully developed by the horizon year providing similar characteristics at the proposed location. It was also noted that the surrounding neighborhoods have already been master planned, with portions of the roadway infrastructure for the first development phases already in place. Attachment " 6 " contains the Bend-La Pine Elementary School Trip Generation study.

While the location of the elementary school is expected to support the surrounding Yarrow neighborhood, complement with the adjacent middle school, recreational facility, and benefit from the adjacent Juniper Hills Park ballfields, additional trip discounts were not applied to the trip rates obtained from the Bend-la Pine School District facilities. Mixed-use incentives provided in Section 6 of the TPR were also omitted from the analysis, though the densities and integrated uses planned within the Yarrow development are expected to comply with the applicable definitions of a mixed-use pedestrian friendly neighborhood. Table 3 summarizes the trip generation potential of the two potential land use scenarios.

| Table 3 | R-2 Scenarios Trip Generation Potential |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use | ITE Code | Size | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |  |
|  |  |  | Total | In | Out |
| Proposed R-2 Zoning: Residential Only Scenario |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apartments (20 acres) | 220 | 232 Units | 145 | 94 | 51 |
| Proposed R-2 Zoning: Residential Plus Elementary School Scenario |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apartments (15 acres) | 220 | 174 Units | 113 | 74 | 39 |
| Elementary School (5 acres) | N/A | 350 Students | 46 | 25 | 21 |
| Total Trips |  |  | 159 | 99 | 60 |

As shown in Table 3, future development of the 20-acres with an elementary school (comprising five acres) and residential uses (comprising 15 acres) provides a reasonable worst-case development scenario. This scenario was found to generate 14 more weekday p.m. peak hour trips than build-out of residential uses alone and was used to assess the incremental system impacts associated with the proposed rezone.

## Trip Distribution and Trip Assignment

The estimated trip distribution pattern of primary site-generated trips associated with the UGB amendment was determined through review of existing traffic patterns, likely school faculty/employee housing, and residential destinations. The trip distribution patterns were separated by residential and school trips, with the resultant trip distribution pattern illustrated in Figure 5. As shown, the pattern highlights that the majority of trips would be headed west toward the City center and US 97 corridor. Trips destined toward US 97 are expected to distribute onto the available parallel routes (Loucks, City View, or B Street) based on their ultimate travel destination.

The difference between the Range Land zoning trip generation potential (assumed to be none) and the proposed Multiple Family Residential (R-2) zoning trips (shown in Table 4) during the critical weekday p.m. peak hour was assigned to the roadway network based on the trip distribution patterns and routing. These incremental trips were added to the existing zoning traffic volumes, with the resultant volumes illustrated in Figure 7.

## Study Area Intersections

Based on a review of the potential increase in trips with the proposed zoning, the following intersections of collector and arterial roadways were identified as study intersections due to their potential for being significantly affected by the proposed zone change. Scoping materials and conversations with the affected jurisdiction staff provided concurrence on the study area. The City of Madras roadway classification map is included in Attachment " 7 " and the scoping letter is included as Attachment " 8 ".



- Ashwood Road/Bean Drive (could be impacted by up to 137 additional weekday p.m. peak hour trips, a 46 percent increase from existing volume)
- Ashwood/City View (could be impacted by up to 119 additional weekday p.m. peak hour trips, a 34 percent increase from existing volume)
- B Street/Kinkade Road (could be impacted by up to 76 additional weekday p.m. peak hour trips, a 22 percent increase from existing volume)
- B Street/Ashwood (could be impacted by up to 66 additional weekday p.m. peak hour trips, an 18 percent increase from existing volume)
- B Street/10 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street (could be impacted by up to 55 additional weekday p.m. peak hour trips, a 12 percent increase from existing volume)
- US 97 Northbound/B Street (exceeds ODOT's 300 daily trip threshold)
- US 97 Southbound/B Street (exceeds ODOT's 300 daily trip threshold)
- US 97 Northbound (Fifth Street)/J Street (exceeds ODOT's 300 daily trip threshold)
- US 97 Southbound (Fourth Street)/J Street (exceeds ODOT's 300 daily trip threshold)

It should be noted that additional assessment of localized queuing and operations during the school peak periods may be required in the future as part of the entitlements process when a specific site plan is available. However, as the purpose of the Transportation Planning Rule is to provide consistency with the adopted Transportation System Plan only the weekday p.m. peak hour operations (design hour) are summarized herein for TPR purposes.

## Intersection Level of Service Analysis

The weekday p.m. peak hour turning-movement volumes shown in Figure 5 were used to conduct an operational analysis at each study intersection to determine the horizon year levels of service. As shown, with the application of regional growth and the incremental trip generation potential of the proposed R-2 zoning all of the study intersections are forecast to operate at acceptable levels of service during the weekday p.m. peak hour with exception of the US 97/J Street intersections. With the planned J Street improvements in place, both the US 97 northbound and southbound intersections with J Street are shown to operate acceptably. Attachment " 9 " contains the horizon year level-of-service worksheets.

## TRANSPORTATION PLANNING RULE COMPLIANCE

OAR Section 660-12-0060 sets forth the relative criteria for evaluating plan and land use regulation amendments. Table 4 summarizes the TPR criteria and their applicability to the proposed rezone application.

| Madras Elementary School UGB Amendment January 22, 2010 |  | Project \#: 10028 <br> Page |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Table 4 Summary of Criteria in OAR 660-01 | 12-0060 |
| Section | Criteria | Applicable? |
| 1 | Describes how to determine if a proposed land use action results In a slgnificantly affects transportation facillies. | Yes <br> See response below |
| 2 | Describes measures for complying with Criterla \# 1 where a significant effect is identified. | Yes <br> See response below |
| 3 | Describes measures for complying with Criteria \#1 and \#2 without assuring that the allowed land uses are consistent with the function, capacity and performance standards of the facility | No |
| 4 | Determinations under Criteria \#1, \#2, and \#3 are coordinated with other local agencles. | Yes <br> See response below |
| 5 | Indicates that the presence of a transportation facility shall not be the basis for an exception to allow development on rural lands. | No (Lands are part of a master plan area) |
| 6 | Indicates that local agencies should credit developments that provide a reduction in trips. | No (No concurrent site plan) |
| 7 | Outlines requirements for a local street plan, access management plan, or future street plan for commercial areas. | No (Commercial lands are not proposed) |
| 8 | Defines a mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly neighbortood | No (No concurrent site plan) |

As shown, there are eight criteria that apply to Plan and Land Use Regulation Amendments. Of these, Criteria \#1, \#2, and \#4 are applicable to the proposed land use action. Applicable sections of these criteria are provided below in italics with a corresponding response shown in standard font.

OAR 660-12-0060 (1) Where an amendment to a functional plan, an acknowledged comprehensive plan, or a land use regulation would significantly affect an existing or planned transportation facility, the local government shall put in place measures as provided in section (2) of this rule to assure that allowed land uses are consistent with the identified function, capacity, and performance standards (e.g. level of seroice, volume to capacity ratio, etc.) of the facility. A plan or land use regulation amendment significantly affects a transportation facility if it would:
(a) Change the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility (exclusive of correction of map errors in an adopted plan);
(b) Change standards implementing a functional classification system; or
(c) As measured at the end of the planning period identified in the adopted transportation system plan:
(A) Allow land uses or levels of development that would result in types or levels of travel or access that are inconsistent with the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility;

Response: Based on the incremental traffic increase from $R L$ to $R-2$ zoning, the functional classification of all the adjacent roadways will not be affected with the proposed zone change.
(B) Reduce the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility below the minimum acceptable performance standard identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan; or

Response: The intersections of US 97/J Street performs below the minimum acceptable performance standard in the City of Madras TSP and the OHP with the existing zoning.
(C) Worsen the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility that is otherwise projected to perform below the minimum acceptable performance standard identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan.

Response: The performance of the US 97/J Street intersections are degraded with the incremental trips from the proposed rezone, and therefore a Significant Effect occurring with the proposed rezone.

OAR 660-12-0060 (2) Where a local government determines that there would be a significant effect, compliance with section (1) shall be accomplished through one or a combination of the following:
(a) Adopting measures that demonstrate allowed land uses are consistent with the planned function, capacity, and performance standards of the transportation facility.
(b) Amending the TSP or comprehensive plan to provide transportation facilities, improvements or services adequate to support the proposed land uses consistent with the requirements of this division; such amendments shall include a funding plan or mechanism consistent with section (4) or include an amendment to the transportation finance plan so that the facility, improvement, or service will be provided by the end of the planning period.
(c) Altering land use designations, densities, or design requirements to reduce demand for automobile travel and meet travel needs through other modes.
(d) Amending the TSP to modify the planned function, capacity or performance standards of the transportation facility.
(e) Providing other measures as a condition of development or through a development agreement or similar funding method, including transportation system management measures, demand management or minor transportation improvements. Local governments shall as part of the amendment specify when measures or improvements provided pursuant to this subsection will be provided.

Response: The J Street intersections are significantly affected. An amendment to the City's Transportation System Plan identifies the long-term needs at these intersections, but at the time the TSP amendment was approved a funding mechanism was not simultaneously adopted. However, because the J Street improvements are located on US 97 and under the
jurisdiction of ODOT additional steps are required to provide a Reasonably Likely determination.

OAR 660-12-0060 (4) Determinations under sections (1)-(3) of this rule shall be coordinated with affected transportation facility and service providers and other affected local governments.
(a) In determining whether an amendment has a significant effect on an existing or planned transportation facility under subsection (l)(c) of this rule, local governments shall rely on existing transportation facilities and services and on the planned transportation facilities, improvements and services set forth in subsections (b) and (c) below.
(b) Outside of interstate interchange areas, the following are considered planned facilities, improvements and services:
(D) Improvements to state highways that are included as planned improvements in a regional or local transportation system plan or comprehensive plan when ODOT provides a written statement that the improvements are reasonably likely to be provided by the end of the planning period.
(e) For purposes of this section, a written statement provided pursuant to paragraphs (b)(D), (b)(E) or (c)(A) provided by ODOT, a local government or transportation facility provider, as appropriate, shall be conclusive in determining whether a transportation facility, improvement or service is a planned transportation facility, improvement or service. In the absence of a written statement, a local government can only rely upon planned transportation facilities, improvements and services identified in paragraphs (b)(A)-(C) to determine whether there is a significant effect that requires application of the remedies in section (2).

Response: A formal request has been provided to ODOT for a Reasomably Likely determination for the J Street improvements. The J Street improvements are included in the City of Madras TSP Amendment, conceptual design and cost estimates have been completed, and the project is included on the Draft 2010-2013 STIP, expected for approval in October 2010. Pending the anticipated receipt of the Reasonably Likely letter from the ODOT Region Manager the ability to assume completion of the J Street improvements as part of the horizon year transportation system will be conclusive.

## PROJECT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## Existing Transportation System Findings and Recommendations

Findings of the existing transportation system review and analysis are summarized below.

- All of the study area intersections currently operate acceptably. The Southbound US 97 (4 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street)/J Street intersection meets City and ODOT operational standards but operates with high peak hour delays on the stop-controlled east-west approaches.
- No marked pedestrian crossings or continuous sidewalks are provided between the Jefferson County Middle School/Yarrow and Juniper Hills Park.

Recommendations from the existing conditions assessment are provided below. The City of Madras should incorporate these recommendations into their scheduled maintenance plans or assess the priority of the improvements based on the potential system safety and performance benefit. The identified improvements are currently needed regardless of the proposed zone change.

- Pedestrian and bicycle connectivity and roadway crossing treatments should be considered as part of future planning efforts to connect the existing Jefferson County Middle School with the Juniper Hills Park. Additional connections to the Yarrow neighborhood should also be provided concurrent with development, including appropriate pedestrian crossing treatments along Ashwood Road. These connections could help encourage non-vehicular trips between the complementary uses and increase pedestrian and bicyclist safety.


## Transportation Planning Rule Findings and Recommendations

Key findings from the Transportation Planning Rule Analysis are summarized below.

- The proposed 20-acre rezone from the County's Rangeland zoning to the City's Multiple Family Residential zoning could generate an additional 159 weekday p.m. peak hour trips.
- With exception of the US $97 / \mathrm{J}$ Street intersections, all of the study area intersections operate acceptably with the existing and proposed zoning in the horizon analysis period.
- With or without the proposed rezone the US 97/J Street intersections exceed ODOT mobility standards. The additional trips associated with the rezone create an incremental impact on the intersection, creating a Significant Effect.
- The City's Transportation System Plan Amendment was prepared to identify the system improvement needs to address the $J$ Street needs. Identified improvements include a realignment of Northbound US 97 ( $5^{\text {th }}$ Street) east onto Adams Drive and two new signalized intersections along J Street for both northbound and southbound highway traffic. With the planned improvements in place the transportation system will operate acceptably with the existing zoning and will continue to operate acceptably with the proposed rezone.
- A request for a Reasonably Likely determination has been provided to ODOT. With a Reasonably Likely determination for the J Street improvements, no unmitigated significant effects will occur with the proposed rezone.
- Interconnectivity should be reviewed with subsequent Yarrow development (including within the subject parcel) to provide direct and convenient multimodal access to the potential school site. Additionally, pedestrian treatments should be considered between Yarrow, Juniper Hills Park, the adjacent recreational facility, and Jefferson County Middle School.

Please let us know if you have any questions regarding this zone change analysis at (541) 3128300.

## ATTACHMENTS:

1. Historical Turning Movement Count Data
2. Existing Conditions Level of Service Worksheets
3. J Street Concept Map
4. Horizon Year (Existing RL Zoning) Level of Service Worksheets
5. R-2 Residential Density Development
6. Bend-La Pine Elementary School Trip Generation Study
7. City of Madras Roadway Classification Map
8. Project Scoping Letter
9. Horizon Year (Proposed R-2 Zoning) Level of Service Worksheets
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## Attachment "1"

Manual Turning
Movement Counts


| TRAFFIC COUNT SUMMARY FORM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project titie： <br> Project No． <br> Location： <br> NS Street： <br> EW Street： |  | Madras <br> ODOT0000－0408 <br> OR <br> Hwy 97／5ih Streat 8 Streel |  |  |  | Condiltion： <br> Count Date： <br> Count Pariod： <br> Growth Rate： <br> ＊Compounding Years： |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2003 Eximing } \\ & \text { 1/28/2003 } \\ & \text { 4:00-6:00 } \\ & \text { NA } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |  | PRA |  | Weather： <br> Food Surface： Traffic Control： intorsect．type： Counted by： |  | Two－way Stop 4．Log <br> Tratic Smithy |  |
| APPROACH VOLUMES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TIME |  | EBL | EBT | E日R | WBL | WBT | WBA | NBL | NBT | N日R | SBL | S8T | SBA | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15-MIN } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | HOURIY Total |  |
| 16：00 | 16：15 | 2 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 20 | 5 | 141 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 256 | 984 | 0：00 |
| 16：15 | 16：30 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 6 | 12 | 133 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 238 | 1014 | 0.00 |
| 16：30 | 16：45 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 10 | 12 | 164 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 258 | 1035 | 16：30 |
| 16：45 | 17：00 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 12 | 11 | 143 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 234 | 1013 | 0：00 |
| 17：00 | 17：15 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 12 | 12 | 161 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 288 | 984 | 0：00 |
| 17：15 | 17：30 | 4 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 8 | 7 | 151 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 257 | 678 | 0：00 |
| 17：30 | 17：45 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 12 | 5 | 142 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 238 | 421 | 0.00 |
| 17：45 | 18：00 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 11 | 5 | 133 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 188 | 185 | $0: 00$ |
| Actual | PM | peak hour parlod is from： |  |  | 16：30 | 10 | 17：30 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1946 |  |  |

ACTUAL PEAK HOUR VOLUNE

| TIME |  | ACTUAPEAK HOUR VOLUE， |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 15-Min } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | Hourly Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | S8L | SBT | S日A |  |  |
| 16：30 | 16：45 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 10 | 12 | 164 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 258 |  |
| 16：45 | 17：00 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 12 | 11 | 143 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 234 |  |
| 17：00 | 17：15 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 12 | 12 | 161 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 288 |  |
| 17：15 | 17：30 | 4 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 8 | 7 | 151 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 257 |  |
|  | TOTAL | 18 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 170 | 42 | 42 | 619 | 108 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1035 |
| Mvmit | PHF | 0.64 | 0.75 | \＃DIVIO | aDIV／0！ | 0.70 | 088 | 0.88 | 0.94 | 061 | \＃DIV／0 | \＃DIV／OI | \＃DIV／01 | mL |  |
| Approach | PHF |  | 0.79 |  |  | 0.73 |  |  | 0.95 |  |  | miviol |  | PHF－＞ | 0.80 |
| The | PM | peak ho | ب上998d | from： | 16：30 | 10 | 17：30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | VOL | EFOR | AK HO | UBED |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TIN |  | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | W日R | NBL | NBT | NBR | S6t | SBT | S8R | 15－Min <br> Total | Hourly Total |
| 16：30 | 16：45 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 10 | 12 | 164 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 258 |  |
| 18：45 | 17：00 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 12 | 11 | 143 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 234 |  |
| 17：00 | 17：15 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 12 | 12 | 161 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 286 |  |
| 17：15 | 1730 | 4 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 8 | 7 | 151 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 257 |  |
|  | TOTAL | 18 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 170 | 42 | 42 | 619 | 108 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1035 |
| Murnnt | PHF | 064 | 0.75 | \＃DIV／o！ | aDIVIOT | 0.70 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.94 | 0.61 | aLIV／0！ | EDIV／01 | adivior | Int |  |
| Approach | PHF |  | 079 |  |  | 0.73 |  |  | 0.95 |  |  | WDIV／0！ |  | PHF：＞ | 0.90 |

ACTUAL PEAK HOUR LINK VOLUMEB
1820 10 1720
TIME

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | WB EB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | NB | S8 | Nig | SB | W ${ }^{\text {W }}$ | EB |  |  |
| 16：30 | 16：45 | 179 | 0 | 194 | 0 | 53 | 13 | 51 | 26 |
| 16：45 | 17：00 | 157 | 0 | 177 | 0 | 48 | 8 | 49 | 29 |
| 17：00 | 17：15 | 180 | 0 | 196 | 0 | 73 | 17 | 73 | 33 |
| 17：15 | 17：30 | 163 | 0 | 202 | 0 | 38 | 16 | 39 | 56 |
|  | TOTAL | 678 | 0 | 768 | 0 | 212 | 54 | 212 | 144 |

LHK VOLUAES FOR PEAK HOUR UBED

$$
18: 50 \text { to } 17150
$$



COMMENTS：


LOCATION: 4th St-B St
CITYISTATE: Madras, OR
C JOB : 1027400
DATE: 8/7/2007






## YEAR 2020 TRAFFIC CONDITIONS - WEEKDAY PM PEAK "WITH IMPROVEMENT" SCENARIO

|  | I | CITY OF MADRAS COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN UPDATE |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { FIGURE } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | MAY 2001 |  |  |



## Attachment "2"

Existing Conditions Level of Service Worksheets






| Fri Jan 22, 2010 11:47:19 |  |  | Page 4-2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kittelson a Associates, Inc. - Project $\$ 10026$ Madras Elementary school UGB Amendment - Madras, oregon Existing Traffic Conditions, Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |
| Service Detalled Computation Report (Permittad Left Turn Sat Ad: 2000 HCM Operations Mechod Base Volume Altesnacive |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection yl "8" Street/ith Street |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | North $y \cdot y \times x x x$ | South |  |  |
| Acrual Green |  |  |  | 62 |
| Effective Green Time Per lane Group. | xx×x*x | * $\times$ | **xx*x | 6.62 |
| Opposing Eifettive Green Time, go: | хx\%xssx. | xs | גxımx | 6.62 |
| Number of Opposing Lanes, No | ${ }_{x} \times \times \times \times \times x$ | \%x<xx m |  |  |
| Number of lanes In Lane Group, | x $\times \times \times \times x$ |  | x |  |
| Adjusted left-Turn flow rate, |  | кхкхххх | *xx<xx | 15 |
| Proportion of Left Turns in Lane Group, pl |  | x<xxx:\% | xx:sx ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| Proportion of Left Turns in |  |  | $x \times x \times x \times x$ $2 \times \times \times x$ | . 96 |
| Adjusted Opposing Flow Rate, |  | kxxixx | xxxxxx |  |
| Opposing flow per Lane ger cycle. Volc: | xxxxxx | xхжxNi | xı:<xx\% | 1.67 |
| Opposing Platoon Ratio. |  |  |  | 00 |
| lost Time Per phase. |  | 相 | x $\times$ x $\times \times \times \times$ |  |
| Eff grn uncil arrival of left-ruyn car, gf: | x×\%×x\% | x×\% | x*: | 0.00 |
| opposing queue racio, qro: |  |  |  | 0.63 |
| eff gin blockea by opposing |  | \%:xxxxx | x×x*xx | 0.50 |
| Eff grn while lett curns tilcer thru, gu: | x:xxsx | xxxs:x | くx×*s* | 3.12 |
| Max opposing cars arriving during gq-gi, n: |  |  |  | 0.25 |
| profortion of opposing thru 6 RT cars, ptho | xkxxxx | xexxsx | xуxx>x | 1.00 |
| Left-turn Sacuration factor, fs | xxxıxx | xxxxxx | xxxxxx |  |
| Proportion of left Turns in shared Lang, | x:xxx: |  | <xsxs:4 |  |
| Through-car Equivalents, ell: | xxs | xx:x<x\% | xxsxx** | 1.49 |
| Single Lane Through-car Equivalents, el2: | xrıxxx | xyxxxx | xxxxyx | 1.0 |
| Minimum left Turn Adjustment Factor, fmin | + |  | x×xx>* |  |
| ngle Lane Leet Turn Adjustment Factor, em: | xx $\times \times \times \mathrm{x}$ | x<<<<x* | x×××\% $\%$ | 72 |
| Turn Adjustm |  |  |  | . 72 |
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|  | Fri Jan 22, 2010 11:47:20 |  |  |  |  |  | Pacte |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kittelson \& Associares, inc. - Froject alanis <br> Mädras Elementary School UGB Anendment - Marras, Oregon Existing Traffac Conditions, Neekday Em Poák Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Laitel of sarvice decailed Compuration Repore iHCM2000 Queue tiethuct 2000 HCM Operatisins Method Base Voiume Altemative |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intarsectice \#2 "P" streetsth stree |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approsen: Movement: | Horen sound |  | South Bouns |  | East ${ }_{\text {Tound }}$ |  | West Bound |  |
| Green | 0.610 .61 | 0. 61 | 0.000 .00 | 0.00 | 9.3:0.31 |  |  |  |
| Arsivaliype |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Progfactor: | 1.001 .00 | 1.80 | 2.901 .00 | 1.00 | 1.001 .00 | 1.03 | 1.001 .00 |  |
| 01 | 6.96 .9 | 9 | $0.0 \quad 7.0$ | 0.0 | 1.41 .1 | - | 0.0 5. 6 |  |
| Upstr | 0.000 .00 | 0.00 | 0.000 .00 | 0.00 | 0.100 .10 | 3.00 | U.00 0.00 |  |
| UpstreamAdj: | 0.003 .00 | 0.00 | 0.000 .00 | 0.00 | 2.001 .00 | 0.00 | 4.000 .00 | 0.00 |
| Eariyarradj | 1.001 .00 | 1.00 | 0.000 .00 | 0.00 | 0.470 .47 | 0.10 |  |  |
| Q2 | $0.9 \quad 0.9$ | 0.9 | $0.0 \quad 0.0$ | 0.0 | 6.10 .1 | 0.0 | $0.0 \quad 0.9$ |  |
| HCM | 7.87 .8 | 7.8 | $0.0 \quad 0.0$ | 0.0 | 1.41 .4 | 0.0 | 0.06 .5 | 6.5 |
| 70 cher | . 161.18 | . 18 | . 20 1. 20 | . 20 | 1.201 .20 | . 20 | . 201.18 |  |
| HCM2k70che: | 9.29 | 9.2 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 1.71 .7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| 25ch*Factor: | 1.531 .53 | 1.53 | 1.601 .60 | 1.60 | 1.591 .59 | . 60 | . 60 |  |
| cmakestha | 11.911 .9 | 11.5 | 0.0 |  | 2.32 .3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 |
| odenampeor | 1.671 .67 | 1.67 | 1.301 .80 | 1.80 | 1.771 .77 | 1.80 | . 80 2. 59 | 1. |
| Hem2rsothy | 13.013 .0 | 13.9 | $0.0 \quad 0.0$ | 0.0 | 2.68 .6 | 0.0 | 0.012 .10 | 1 |
| 95 entactor: | 1.891 .89 | 1.89 | 2.102 .10 | 2.10 | 2.052 .05 | \%10 | 2.102 .92 |  |
| HCM2k95the | 14.714 .7 | 14.7 | $0.0 \quad 0.0$ | 0.0 | 3.03 .9 | 0.0 | 0.012 .5 | 12 |
|  | 2.252 .25 | 2.25 | 2.702 .70 | 2.70 | 2.59 2.59 | 2.70 | 2.702 .33 |  |
| CM2:9send | 17.517 .5 | $17.5$ | $0.0 \quad 0.0$ |  | 3.83 .8 |  | 0.015 .0 | 15 |

PM
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Level of Service Computat Ion Report
2000 HCM Unignalized Method Base Volum Aiternativel Intersection \#4 n ${ }^{n n}$ Street/Ashwood Average Delay (see/veh): ...... ${ }^{8}$ Worst Case Level of Service: 8 10.71 Screet Nane: "Q" Streeet $\quad$ Ashwood
Approach:
Movemant:
$L-T-R M$
Control: stop sign Ston Sign Uncontrolled Unconerolled
 Volume Module: >> Count Date: 17 May 2007 << 4:00 to 6:00 PM $\begin{array}{llllllllllll} \\ \text { Vose vol: } & 24 & 0 & 17 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 117 & 23 & 33 & 163\end{array}$
 $\begin{array}{lllllllllllll}\text { User Adj: } & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 2.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\ \text { PHF Adj: } & 0.85 & 0.85 & 0.85 & 0.85 & 0.85 & 0.85 & 0.85 & 0.85 & 0.85 & 0.05 & 0.85 & 0.85\end{array}$
 26 I 6乏
 Fо1о






 Shared LDS:
ApproachDel
Aperoachios:
Note: Mueue raported 1s che number of cars per Lane.
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$$
\begin{array}{lrrrrrrrrrrrr}
\text { EHF Adj: } & 0.45 & 0.85 & 0.85 & 0.85 & 0.85 & 0.85 & 0.85 & 0.85 & 0.85 & 0.85 & 0.85 & 0.85 \\
\text { RHF Yolume: } & 5 & 2 & 1 & 5 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 153 & 5 & 1 & 231 & 1 \\
\text { Reduct Vol: } & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{array}
$$









 Traffix 6.0.0715 (c) 2008 Dowizg Assoe. Licensed to Kittelson, Poptiand H: 1 proyfilel 10028 - Madras Elementary and Miedle ScheolsltraffixiTraffixOucput2.doc









Level of Service Module:









Tratfi: 8.0.0715 (c) 2008 Dowling Assoc. Licensed to Kittelson, ponthand
$H: \$ projfile 10028 - Martras Elementary and Middle Scheols $\operatorname{traffix\backslash 2rafiizoutput2,~doe~}$


[^12]



Traffix 8.0.0715 (c) 2008 Dowling Assoc. Licensed to KITtelson. PORTLQNO


## Attachment "3"

J Street Conceptual
Improvement Illustration


US97 @ J Street (Madras) Project
Alternative Concepts of US97 Realignment Shown



US97@ J Street (Madras) Project
Conceptual Drawing of Signalized Intersections @ J Street US97 Option B Realignment Shown


## Attachment "4"

## Existing RL Zoning LOS

 Worksheets
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Traffix 8.0 .0715 (c) 2008 Dowling Assoc. Licensed to kITTELSON, PORT:AND

PM Fis Jan 22, 2010 11:48:56
Kitcelson a Associates, Inc. - Project \#loo2a
Madras Elementary School UGB Amendmenc Mackras, oregon
Backg:ound Traffic Condstions, Weekday PM Peak Hour
Level of Service Decailed Computation Report
2000 REM Operations Methol
Future Volume Alternative
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Exilusivent:
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|  | vi Jan 22, 2010 21:48:56 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Page 4-3 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Kittelison Associates, Inc. - Project $\$ 1002$ 日 Madras Elementary School UGS Amendment - Madiras, Oragon Background Traffic Conditions, Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service Detailed Computation Report (HCM2000 Queus Nethod 2000 HCM Dperations Method Future volume Alternative |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| intersection "1 "B" street/ath street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach: | North Bound |  |  | South Bound |  |  | East Bound |  |  | West Bound |  |  |
| Movement: | $1-$ | T |  | 12 | - | - R | L | - | - R | L | - T |  |
| Green/Cycle: | 0.00 | . 00 | 0.00 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.00 | 0.56 | 0.56 |  | . 56 | . 00 |
| Arrivaltype: |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PragFactor: | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Q1: | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.1 | 8.1 | 8.1 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 1.4 | a. 2 | 8.2 | 0.0 |
| UpstreamVC: | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.58 | 0.58 | 0.00 |
| Upstreamadj: | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.00 |
| EarlyArrAdj: | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.46 | 0.45 | 0.00 |
| Q2: | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0. |
| HCM2K¢иuete: | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.7 | 9.7 | 9.7 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 9. | 9. | 0.0 |
| 70th8Factor: | 1.20 | 1.20 | 1.20 | 1.18 | 1.18 | 1.18 | 1.20 | 1.20 | 1.20 |  | 1.18 | 1.20 |
| HCM2k70the: | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 20.7 | 10.7 | 0.0 |
| 85thractor: | 1.60 | 1.80 | 1.60 | 1.52 | 1.52 | 1.52 | 1.60 | 1.58 | 1,58 |  | 1.52 | 1.60 |
| HCM2k85thQ: | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.8 | 14.8 | 14.8 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 2.5 |  | 13.8 | 0.0 |
| 90th8Factor: | 1.80 | 1.80 | 2.80 | 1.65 | 1.65 | 2.65 | 1.80 | 1.77 | 1.77 |  | 1.65 | . 80 |
| HCM2 K90che: | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 0.0 | 2. | 2 | 14 | 14.9 | 0.0 |
| 95thtractor: | 2.10 | 2.10 | 2.10 | 1.85 | 1.85 | 1.85 | 2.20 | 2.05 | 2.05 |  | 1.96 | 2.10 |
| HCM2 k95the: | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 15.8 | 15.8 | 0.0 |
| 98thfractor: | : 2.70 | 2.70 | 2.70 | 2.27 | 2.17 | 2.17 | 2.70 | 2.59 | 2.59 |  | 2.20 | 2.70 |
| HCM2. 98 chQ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.1 | 21.1 | 21.1 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 6.0 | 19.9 | 19.9 | O. |




|  | Fri Jan 22， 2010 11：48：57 |  |  |  |  |  | Page 5－3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kitcelson a Associaces，Ine．－Project $H 1002 e$ <br> Madras Elementary School UGE Amendment－Madtas，Oreyon Background Traffic Conditions，Weetday PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service Detailed Compuration Report（HEM200n queue Methor）？ <br> 2000 HCM Operations Method Euture Volume Alternative |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection ${ }^{\text {a }}$＂ $\mathrm{Bn}^{\text {\％Street／5th Street }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach： <br> Movement | North Bound |  | South Bound |  | ${ }_{\text {East }} \mathrm{F}_{\text {Bount }}$ |  | West Braun |  |
| Green／Cycle： Arrivaltype： | $0.35 \quad 0.35$ | 0.35 | $0.000 .00$ | $0.0$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.570 .57 \\ 3 \end{array}$ | $0.0$ | $0.000 .57$ |  |
| ProgFactor： | 1.001 .00 | 1.00 | 1.001 .00 | 1.00 | 1.001 .80 | 1.00 | 1.001 .00 |  |
|  | 7.17 | 7.1 | $0.0 \quad 0.0$ | 0.0 | 1.31 .3 |  | 8.39 |  |
| upsereamve： | 0.000 .06 | 0.00 | 0.000 .00 | 0.00 | 0.120 .12 | 0.08 | 1.000 .00 | 0.00 |
| Upstreandidy | 0.000 .00 | 0.00 | 0.000 .00 | 0.00 | 1.001 .00 | 0.00 | 0.000 .00 |  |
| Earlyar | ． 01 | 1.00 | ．${ }^{0}$ ． | 0.00 | 0.620 .62 | 0.00 | 0.001 .00 |  |
|  | 1.31 .3 | 1.3 | 0.00 .0 | 0.0 | 0.10 .1 | 0.0 | $0.0 \quad 1.4$ | 1.4 |
| HCM |  | 8.4 | 0.00 .0 | 0 |  | 0.0 | 0.021 .3 |  |
|  | 1.161 .18 | 1.18 | 1.201 .20 | 1.20 | 1.202 .20 | 1.20 |  |  |
| HCM2 $\times 70$ Chg： | 0.99 .9 | 9.9 | 0.00 .0 | 0.0 | 1.71 .7 | 0.0 | 0.02 .3 | 13． |
| 8Sthractor： | 1.531 .53 | 1.53 | 1.601 .60 | 1.60 | 1.591 .59 | ． 60 |  |  |
| HCM2 k\＆ 5 tho： | 12.912 .9 | 22.9 | $0.0 \quad 0.0$ | 0.0 | 2.38 .3 | ， | 0.017 .1 | 17 |
| 90 ch \％ | 1.661 .66 | 1.66 | 1.801 .30 | 1.80 |  | 80 | ． 801.63 | 1.63 |
| Hem2lispthp： | 14.014 .0 | 14.0 | $0.0 \quad 0.0$ | 0.0 | 2.52 | 0.0 | 0.018 .4 | 1月．4 |
| 95 th factoz | 1.881 .88 | 1.88 | 2.102 .10 | 2.10 | 2.052 .05 |  | 2.101 .32 | 1.8 |
| HCM2k95the： | 15.815 .8 | 15.8 | $0.0 \quad 0.0$ | 0.0 | 2.98 .9 | 0.0 | 0.020 .5 | 20 |
| S日thyfactor： <br> HCM2K9日the： | $\begin{aligned} & \\ & 2.222 .22 \\ & 18.718 .7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.22 \\ & 2.22 \\ & 18.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2.702 .70 \\ 0.0 \quad 0.0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.70 \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $2.50 \div 60$ | $2.70^{\circ}$ | $\begin{array}{rr} 2.70 & 2.12 \\ 0.0 & 23.4 \end{array}$ | 2．12 21.0 |
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$$
\begin{array}{lrrrrrrrrrrrr}
\text { Volume Module: } & 6 & 3 & 1 & 6 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 181 & 6 & 1 & 272 & 1 \\
\text { Base Vol: } & 6 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
\text { Growth Adj: } & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
\text { Initlal Bse: } & 6 & 3 & 1 & 6 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 181 & 6 & 1 & 272 & 1 \\
\text { Added Vol: } & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{array}
$$
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## Attachment "5"

R-2 Residential Density Development

Derivation of Potential Residential Density (based on provisions within City Ordinance 723)
5 acres * $43,560 \mathrm{SF} /$ acre $=217,800 \mathrm{SF}$
$217,800 \mathrm{SF}-25 \%$ roads, offsets, easements $=163,350$ SF Usable

- Assuming 18 units per typical apartment structure


## First two units

$=10,000$ SF (first two units) + ( 2 units * 200 SF lawn/unit) + ( 2 units * 300 SF parking/unit)
$=11,000 \mathrm{SF}$

## 16 Additional units

$=16$ units * 200 lawn +16 units * 300 parking +16 units *2,000 SF/unit
$=40,000 \mathrm{SF}$
18 Unit Apartment Building
$=11,000 \mathrm{SF}+40,000 \mathrm{SF}$
$=51,000 \mathrm{SF}$

## Total Buildings

$=163,350 / 51,000=3$ Buildings

- Assuming final building has more than 18 units to utilize remaining land
$=163,350 \mathrm{SF}-51,000 \mathrm{SF} /$ Building * 3 Buildings
$10,350 \mathrm{SF}=$ ( x units * 200 SF lawn/unit $+x$ * 300 parking/unit $+x$ * 2,000 SF/unit)
$x=4$ units


## Total Residential Units

$=3$ Buildings ${ }^{*} 18$ units per building +4 units
$=58$ units multifamily units, or 11.6 units per acre per five acres

- 232 apartment units on 20 acres or 174 units on 15 acres


## Attachment "6"

Bend-La Pine Trip Generation Study

Kittelson \& Associates, inc.
TRANSPORTATIONENGINEERING/PLANNING 354 SW Upper Terrace Drive, Suite 101, Bend Oregon 977025413128300554134585

MEMORANDUM

Date:
October 14, 2008
Project \#: 9140
To:
John M. Rexford
Bend-La Pine Schools
520 NW Wall Street
Bend, Oregon 97701-2699
From: Joe Bessman, P.E.
Subject: Elementary School Trip Generation Study

## PURPOSE

The purpose of this memorandum is to summarize measured trip generation rates for elementary schools in Bend during the weekday p.m. peak hour of adjacent street traffic. Standard reference manuals contain trip generation data for elementary schools during the weekday a.m. peak hour (7:00 to 9:00 a.m.) and during the afternoon school peak hour (2:00 to 4:00 p.m.), but no data is available for the evening commute period. This time period is commonly used to assess off-site impacts of schools to the transportation system.

This study identifies elementary school trip generation data during the weekday p.m. peak hour of adjacent street traffic, and was prepared based on surveys of four elementary schools located within Bend. The study methodology and resultant trip generation rates are summarized herein.

## AVAILABLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DATA

As defined within Trip Generation, $7^{\text {th }}$ Edition, elementary schools serve grades kindergarten through fifth or sixth grade, are typically centrally located within residential communities to facilitate access, and provide bus service to students within specific geographic boundaries. The ITE land use category for elementary schools includes both public and private elementary schools within the dataset, although data for this study was collected exclusively at public schools.

As identified within the Trip Generation manual, school bus utilization may vary significantly between elementary schools, and may result in varying trip rates between school sites. Potential factors for school bus utilization could include the proximity of bus service, service boundaries, transportation infrastructure, crime, income, or other factors. School bus utilization data was not collected as the purpose of this trip generation study is to identify characteristics specific to the Bend-La Pine School District, and specifically to elementary schools within the City of Bend.

Available data contained within the standard reference materials includes elementary school surveys during the weekday p.m. peak hour of the generator only. This coincides with the end of
the school day, which typically occurs between 2:00 p.m. and 4:00 p.m. However, the critical offsite transportation analysis period typically coincides with the evening commute period (4:00 to 6:00 p.m.), which does not occur simultaneously with elementary school peak trip generation. No standard data is available within the ITE manual related to elementary school trip characteristics during the weekday evening commute period, when limited after-school activities or staff trips represent the primary uses.

As part of new elementary school projects for the City of Hillsboro School District, trip generation studies were conducted at several locations during the critical weekday p.m. commute period (4:00 to 6:00 p.m.). These studies showed that the schools' trip generation rates during the evening commute period were approximately 30 percent of the peak school trip rates that occurred in the afternoon. Given the unique characteristics of Bend (population, service boundaries, and bus ridership), a trip generation study was conducted to assess trip generation rates applicable to local conditions.

## TRIP GENERATION STUDY

Four school sites were selected for analysis throughout the City of Bend. School sites selected were those that were in operation for at least two years, were centrally located within residential communities, include typical school hours and amenities, contain defined attendance boundaries, and include configurations that would allow the separation of trips from those associated with surrounding uses. The school sites selected for the survey, data collection dates, street address, and year 2008/2009 enrollment data are identified in Table 1. The attachments include the school attendance boundary map illustrating the location of the elementary schools and the areas served.

Table 1
Elementary School Characteristics

| School Name | Data Collection Dates | School Enroliment | Street Address |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pine Ridge Elementary | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tuesday September 16, } \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | 540 | 19840 SW Hollygrape St Bend, Oregon 97702 |
| R E Jewell Elementary | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tuesday September 16, } \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | 557 | 20550 Murphy Rd Bend, Oregon 97702 |
| Junlper Elementary | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tuesday September 16, } \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | 509 | 1300 NE Norton Ave Bend, Oregon 97701 |
| Elk Meadow Elementary | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tuesday September 16, } \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | 568 | 60880 Brookswood Blvd Bend, Oregon 97702 |

Each of the ingress/egress points at the school sites were videotaped on September 16, 2008, two weeks after the start of school to ensure that school attendance patterns had normalized. It should be noted that many of the schools are situated adjacent to public parks, and trips associated with the ball fields or adjacent parks could not be entirely separated. During the surveys, the weather was sunny with a high temperature of 90 degrees. Accordingly, it is expected that the trip generation studies are conservatively high given the higher usage of the adjacent ball fields than during the majority of the school year. As trips during the evening commute period likely reflect
low levels of student trips to and from the school, the potential impact of weather on student mode choice is not expected to have a significant impact on the measured trip generation rates.

Intersection traffic counts were simultaneously conducted at nearby collector and arterial intersections to identify the time period with peak traffic volumes on the adjacent roadway system. Given the relatively low school volumes, this hour represents the time period when the combination of site-generated traffic and roadway volumes are expected to peak. The peak hour of adjacent street traffic identified in the study typically occurred just prior to the 5:00 to 6:00 p.m. period, with exception of counts collected near Juniper Elementary which identified an earlier peak hour between 4:25 and 5:25 p.m.

## TRIP GENERATION RESULTS

Videotapes collected at the school ingress/egress points were manually reviewed in five-minute increments coinciding with the peak hour of adjacent street traffic. Trip rates on a per-student basis were calculated at each of the four school sites, and a weighted average was applied to generate a local elementary school trip generation rate on a per-student basis. A summary of the trip generation data for each school is provided in Table 2 and Figure 1, and worksheets from the data collection efforts are included in the attachments.

Table 2
Measured Trip Generation Rates (Weekday PM Peak Hour)

| School Name | Student <br> Enrollment | Weekday PM Peak Hour of <br> Adjacent Streat Traffic | Trips Per <br> Student | \% <br> Trips In | \% <br> Trips Out |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pine Ridge Elementary | 540 | $4: 50$ to 5:50 p.m. | 0.16 | 40 | 60 |
| R E Jewell Elementary | 557 | $4: 25$ to 5:25 p.m. | 0.09 | 68 | 32 |
| Juniper Elementary | 509 | $4: 25$ to 5:25 p.m. | 0.15 | 52 | 48 |
| Elk Meadow Elementary | 568 | $4: 55$ to 5:55 p.m. | 0.12 | 58 | 42 |
| Weighted Average Trip Generation Rate |  | $0.13^{1}$ | $55 \%$ | $45 \%$ |  |

'The welghted average is calculated by dividing the sum of all trips or trip ends by the sum of all independent variable units (total school trips / total student enrollment).

Based on the resultant trip generation rates, trip generation rates for elementary schools within the Bend La Pine School District were identified as 0.13 trips per student during the weekday p.m. peak hour of adjacent street traffic, with 55 percent of the trips inbound and 45 percent of the trips outbound. This local trip rate is approximately half of the national trip rate of 0.28 trips per student during the weekday peak hour of generator (2:00 to $\mathbf{4 : 0 0} \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. time period).

We trust that the information contain herein adequately summarizes the trip generation characteristics of elementary schools within the City of Bend. Please let us know if you have any questions or need any additional information to review the analysis findings.

Attachments: Traffic count worksheets<br>School Attendance Area Map

# Elementary School (520) 

Average Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Students
On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.

Number of Studies: 4
Average Number of Students: 544
Directional Distribution: 55\% entering, 45\% exiting

Trip Generation per Student

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.13 | $0.09 \cdot 0.16$ | 0.03 |

## Data Plot and Equation


$\times$ Actual Data Points

Fited Curve Equation; Not given
$R^{2}=* * *$
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## Bend Area Elementary School Boundaries



## Attachment "7" <br> City of Madras Roadway Classification Map



## Attachment "8" Project Scoping Letter

## MEMORANDUM

| Date: | December 10, 2009 | Project \#: 10028.0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| To: | Nick Snead, City of Madras |  |
|  | Jon Skidmore, Jefferson County |  |
|  | Ana Jovanovic, ODOT Region 4 |  |
| From: | Joe Bessman, Kittelson \& Associates, Inc. |  |
| Cc: | DJ Heffernan, Angelo Planning Group |  |
|  |  |  |
| Project: | Madras Elementary School UGB Amendment <br> Subject: |  |
|  |  |  |

The purpose of this memorandum is to document transportation analysis scoping to rezone 20 acres of land located in Jefferson County from Range Land (RL) to include this land within the City's Urban Growth Boundary as Multiple Family Residential (R-2) zoning. This scoping was prepared for consistency with the requirements identified within Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 660-12-0060 (Transportation Planning Rule, TPR), which contains the applicable criteria for a zone change analysis. The purpose of the TPR analysis is to ensure the transportation system can accommodate the allowable land uses and that any significant affects are mitigated.

The land included in the rezone is generally located south of Ashwood Road, east of the Jefferson County Middle School, and south of the existing ballfields near Bean Drive. The property is within the Yarrow Master Planned Community and its rezone to accommodate a school is consistent with the approved Yarrow Concept Plan. The location of the property is generally shown in Figure 1, and the identification of the approximately 20 -acre future school property on the Yarrow Concept Plan is illustrated in Figure 2. No specific development or entitlements are being pursued as part of this zone change.

Note that while specific parcel boundaries have not yet been identified, the general location of the property south of Ashwood and east of Bean Drive within the future school boundary location shown on the Yarrow Concept Plan provides adequate information to accurately assess the transportation system impacts. Specific definition of the property will be provided as part of the zone change application pending further area refinement with City and County staff.

## LAND DEVELOPMENT ASSUMPTIONS

Two reasonable development scenarios were identified to assess the potential transportation impact of rezoning 20 -acres from Range Land to Multiple Family Residential Zoning. The two scenarios reflect County and City zoning provisions and are presented below.



Kittelson \& Associates, Inc.
transportation engineering / planing

## Range Land (RL) Development Potential

The Range Land zoning is one of three designations for Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) lands within Jefferson County. The RL zoning is intended to preserve predominantly non-irrigated agricultural lands for livestock grazing. The RL zoning requires that non-farm residences contain a minimum of 40 acres. A variety of non-residential uses are permitted within the RL zoning, though these uses require more acreage than the 20 -acres proposed for the rezone and all are considered low intensity uses. Accordingly, under the existing zoning the trip generation potential is severely limited, and for analysis purposes it was conservatively assumed to be none.

## Multiple Family Residential (R-2) Development Potential

The Multiple Family Residential (R-2) zoning category provides for higher-density single-family uses and attached residential uses, to include apartments and townhomes. The R-2 zoning also allows parks and community centers as outright uses. Schools, churches, libraries, and other government buildings are allowed as conditional uses.

The City of Madras zoning-provisions, as contained within Ordinance 723, were reviewed to identify density ranges and allowable uses within the R-2 zoning. Conditional uses are typically not considered as part of a zone change analysis. However, as the intent of the rezone is to ultimately allow for a new elementary school, this specific conditional use was reviewed to ensure that a reasonable development scenario considers the impacts of this intended future use.

Review of the City zoning provisions identified the following outright allowable uses:

- Single family residential
- Multi-family residential
- Public park, recreation areas, community centers

Based on the uses shown above, multi-family residential was identified as the most intense outright land use from a trip generation perspective. Review of the required building space, parking allocations, lawn space, and typical road and infrastructure allocations identified a resultant reasonable maximum density of 11.6 attached residential units per acre, or approximately 232 total attached residential units on 20 -acres. Additional details on the development of residential densities are included as an attachment.

Conversations with the project team identified that a future school would likely comprise five acres of the overall land, with the remainder retained for residential uses. The most likely school type would be an elementary school given the regional needs. A new elementary school could be expected to serve an enrollment of approximately 350 students. This would result in a second potential development scenario that would include 174 attached residential units ( 11.6 units/acre * 15 acres $=174$ units) and a 350-student elementary school (remaining five acres)..

## TPR ANALYSIS SCOPING

## Trip Generation

Trip generation estimates were prepared for both R-2 zoning scenarios to determine which land use combination resulted in a higher overall trip generation potential during the critical weekday evening commute period (one hour between 4:00 and 6:00 p.m.). Trip generation estimates for each of the scenarios were prepared based on surveys of similar sites. Residential trip generation estimates were prepared based on data contained within the Institute of Transportation Engineer's (ITE's) standard reference Trip Generation, $\boldsymbol{8}^{\boldsymbol{1}}$ Edition, using the Apartment land use category (Land Use Code 220). Trip generation estimates for the elementary school were prepared using surveys of schools within the City of Bend, which contain slightly lower trip generation rates than national surveys of elementary schools ( 0.13 trips per student versus 0.15 trips per student) but are expected to better represent local characteristics. The attachments contain the BendLa Pine Elementary School Trip Generation study.

While the location of the elementary school is expected to support the surrounding Yarrow neighborhood, complement the adjacent middle school, and benefit from the adjacent ballfields, additional trip discounts were not applied to the trip rates obtained from the Bend-LaPine school district facilities. Table 1 summarizes the trip generation potential of the two scenarios.

Table $1 \quad$ R-2 Development Scenarios Trip Generation Potential

| Land Use | ITE Code | Size | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Total | In | Out |
| Proposed R-2 Zoning: Residential Only Scenario |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apartments | 220 | 232 Units | 145 | 94 | 51 |
| Proposed R-2 Zoning: Residential Plus Elementary School Scenario |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apartments | 220 | 174 Units | 113 | 74 | 39 |
| Elementary School | N/A | 350 Students | 46 | 25 | 21 |
| Total Trips |  |  | 159 | 99 | 60 |

*Trip rate reflects data collected at elementary schools in central Oregon
As shown in Table 1, future development of the 20-acres with an elementary school (comprising five acres) and residential uses (comprising 15 acres) provides a reasonable worst-case development scenario. This scenario was found to generate 14 more weekday p.m. peak hour trips than build-out with residential uses alone.

## Trip Distribution and TrIp Assignment

The estimated trip distribution pattern of primary site-generated trips associated with the proposed UGB amendment and rezone was determined through review of existing traffic patterns, the locations of other elementary schools, residential destinations, and review of existing
schooi attendance boundary maps. The resultañt trip distribution patterns were separated by residential and school trips, and are illustrated in Figures 3 and 4. As shown, the pattern highlights that the majority of trips would be headed west toward the City center and US 97 corridor. Trips destined toward US 97 are expected to distribute onto the paraliel routes (Loucks, City View, or B Street) based on their ultimate travel destination. Both trip distribution patterns reflect a regional draw as the school trips are primarily associated with faculty and staff during the evening commute period.

The difference between the Range Land zoning trip generation potential (assumed to be none) and the proposed Multiple Family Residential (R-2) zoning trips (shown in Table 1) during the critical weekday p.m. peak hour were assigned to the roadway network based on the trip distribution patterns and routing, as illustrated in Figure 5. Figure 5 includes a sum of the total additional vehicles that could occur at nearby collector and arterial intersections.

## Study Intersections

Based on a review of the potential increase in trips with the proposed zoning (as shown in Figure 5), the following five intersections of collector and arterial roadways are proposed for inclusion in the traffic study. $\qquad$

1. Ashwood/Bean Drive (could be impacted by 137 additional weekday p.m. peak hour trips)
2. Ashwood/City View (could be impacted by 119 additional weekday p.m. peak hour trips)
3. B Street/Kinkade Road (could be impacted by 76 additional weekday p.m. peak hour trips)
4. B Street/Ashwood (could be impacted by 66 additional weekday p.m. peak hour trips)
5. B Street/10 ${ }^{\text {Hn }}$ Street (could be impacted by 55 additional weekday p.m. peak hour trips)

These intersections are those that could experience more than 50 additional weekday p.m. peak hour trips with the rezone/UGB amendment, or those that could experience a significant increase in total volume with the amendment ${ }^{1}$. The City of Madras roadway classification map is included in the attachments.

It should be noted that additional assessment of localized queuing and operations during the school peak periods may be required at the time of site plan application/land use entitlements. However, as the purpose of the Transportation Planning Rule is to provide consistency with the adopted Transportation System Plan (TSP), only the weekday p.m. peak hour operations are applicable to the TPR analysis.

[^15]
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Jefferson County traffic study requirements identify that a Level of Service "C" or higher should be maintained at all County intersections. The City of Madras TSP identifies a target Level of Service (LOS) "D" for signalized intersections, LOS " E " for unsignalized intersections (or LOS F with a volume-to-capacity ratio below 0.95 ).

## Study Periods

The purpose of the Transportation Planning Rule is to ensure that the proposed zone change will continue to be consistent with the system planning required under OAR 660-12. To assess consistency, the horizon analysis period is selected based on the horizon period of the adopted Transportation System Plan. The Jefferson County TSP considers a horizon year of 2027 and the City's TSP assesses year 2020 conditions. Accordingly, the applicable horizon period will vary throughout the study area based on roadway jurisdiction. All traffic volume forecasts will be obtained from the applicable TSP or based on continued application of the approved growth rates where otherwise unavailable. Table 2 summarizes the study intersections, roadway jurisdiction, applicable performance standards, and horizon analysis year required for compliance with the TPR. ${ }^{2}$

${ }^{\text {T TWSC: }}$ Two-way stop-controiled (unsignalized)

## Recent or Upcoming Roadway Improvements

There are three identified public improvement projects within the vicinity of the property.

- The J Street improvements will include traffic signal upgrades at the US 97 northbound and southbound couplet, realignment of the southern couplet terminus, and roadway widening. The J Street project is identified on the Draft 2010-2013 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and is likely to be funded by the horizon period (note that
${ }^{2}$ Additional discussion on applicable horizon periods can be found within Section 3.2.01 of ODOT's publication Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) Reviews: Guidelines for Implementing OAR 660-12-0060, which can be found at the following link: http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/docs/TPR/tprGuidelines.pdf.
while the improvement is likely to occur, a reasonably likely determination has not been provided by ODOT).
- The Fairground Road extension is identified as a new east-west route within the City of Madras on the Transportation System Plan. Similarly, the roadway extension is likely to be provided within the planning horizon.
- The City View to J Street connection has been recently completed. This new connection provides convenient and direct access from the proposed lands to US 97.

The recent construction of the City View connection will provide convenient access to the south. The future funding and reasonably likely determinations for the $J$ Street realignment/improvements and the Fairgrounds extension are not critical to the proposed UGB amendment as it will not affect the selection of study intersections, assumed intersection configurations, or result in modifications to the demand-based regional trip distribution patterns included herein. As a result, to be conservative, neither the J Street realignment/improvements nor the Fairgrounds extension will be assumed in the traffic analysis.

## NEXT STEPS

Please provide written comments or concurrence on the proposed analysis scope at your earliest convenience. If you have any questions on these materials please call us at (541) 312-8300.

## Attachments

1. Residential Density Development
2. Bend - La Pine School District Elementary School Trip Generation Study
3. City of Madras Roadway Classification Map

Attachment "9"
Proposed R-2 Zoning
LOS Worksheets
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[^16]|  | Exi Jan 22, 20:0 11:50:20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Page 4-3 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kittelson ; Associates, Inc. - Project \$20028 <br> Madras Elementary School UGB Amendment - Madras, Oregon total Traffle Conditions, Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service Drtailed Computation Report ( HCM (1000 Queve Method) 2000 HCM Operations Method Future Volume dlternative |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection 43 " $B$ " Streer/4th Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach: Movement: | North Bound |  |  | South Bound |  |  | East Bound |  |  | West Bound |  |  |
|  |  | T | R | $\pm$ | T | R |  | - T | - R | 1 | T |  |
| Green/Cycle: | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.00 | 0.57 | 0.57 | 0.57 | 0.57 | 0 |
| Arrival rype: |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |
| ProgFactor: | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.80 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Q1: | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.2 | 9.2 | 8.2 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 1.9 | 8.5 | 8.5 | 0.0 |
| Upstreamvc: | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.00 |
| UpstreamAdj: | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.00 |
| E.arlyArchdj: | 0.00 | 0.80 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 3.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.15 | 0.45 | 0.60 |
|  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.0 |
| HCM2KQueve: | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.9 | 3.9 | 9.9 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 9.3 | 9.3 | 0.0 |
| 70the Enctor: | 1.20 | 1.20 | 1.20 | 1.18 | 1.18 | 1.18 | 1.20 | 1.20 | 1.20 | 1.18 | 1.18 | 3.20 |
| HCM2x ${ }^{\text {POthQ: }}$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.7 | 11.7 | 11.7 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 10.9 | 10.9 | 0.0 |
| 85thy factor: | 1.60 | 1.60 | 1.60 | 1.52 | 1.52 | 1.52 | 1.60 | 1.58 | 2.59 | 1.52 | 1. 52 | 1.60 |
| HCM2k85tho: | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 15.0 | 25.0 | 15.0 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 2. | 14.1 | 19.1 | 0.0 |
| $90 \mathrm{chqfactor:}$ | : 1.80 | 1.80 | 1.80 | 1.64 | 1.64 | 1.6. | 1.80 | 1.77 | 1.77 | 1.65 | 1.65 | 1.80 |
| HCM2k90the: | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 16.3 | 15.3 | 16.3 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 25.3 | 15.3 | 0.0 |
| 95 themactor: | 2.10 | 2.10 | 2.10 | 1.85 | 1.85 | 1.85 | 2.10 | 2.05 | 2.05 | 1.86 | 1.86 | 2.10 |
| HCM2k95thg: | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 18.3 | 318.3 | 18.3 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 17.2 | 17.2 | 0.0 |
| 98th8Factor: | : 2.70 | 2.70 | 2.70 | 2.17 | 2.17 | 2.17 | 2.70 | 2.59 | 2.59 |  |  | 2.70 |
| HCM2r98the: | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.5 | 21.5 | 21.5 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 20.3 | 20.3 | 0.0 |






$\qquad$
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| Critical Gap: | Module: | xxaxx | xx\%xx | xx:sx | xx $\times$ kx | 1 | 6.5 | x"xx: | \% | 6.5 | 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Followuptim: | 2.3 xxxx | xx | x | xxxx | $\times \times$ | 3.5 | 4.0 | yxxxpx | rxxxx | 4.0 | 3.3 |






 ApproachDel: xxxxxx xxxxxx Note: Queue reported is che number of cars per lane. Traffix 8.0.0715 (c) 200 B Dowling Agsoc. Licensed to KITTELSON, PORTLAND
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## Appendix G: ODOT Letter Regarding Reasonably Likely Determination for US 97/J Street Improvements

Department of Transportation
Robert W. Bryant
Region \& Manager
63055 N . Hwy 97
Bend, OR 97701
(541) $388-6180$
FAX: (541) $388-6231$

FILE CODE:

Febiuary 2, 2010

Nick Snead
Community Developinent Director
71 SE "D" St
Madras, OR 97740

## Subject: Madras UGB Expansion TPR Analysis; Reasonably Likely Determination

Dear Mr. Snead,
The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on the transportation study prepared for Madras UGB Expansion and related TPR Analysis. We received this study from Kittelson and Associates on January 22, 2010. Our planning staff also reviewed the City's plan amendment application and DLCD's recent response.

As part of the UGB expansion, the City of Madras is considering a 20-acre rezone of Range Land to R-2 Residential uses, including a new elementary school. The proposed amendment is located at the outskirts of town, near the intersection of Ashwood Road and Bean Drive. Neither roads are state facilities; however, the traffic study concluded that the proposed rezone has a significant effect on the US97/'J" Street intersections (degraded operation with incremental trips within the planning horizon). This is an important state facility where ODOT and the City are planning significant improvements in the near future.

On January 21, 2010, pursuant to OAR $660-012-0060(4)(b)$, the City has written ODOT requesting a determinntion as to whether planned state highway improvements at US97/ "J" Street are not only included in the City's TSP, but also:

- Funded for construction in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP);
- Part of a regional transportation system plan; or
- If neither of the above, the planned improvenents are reasonably likely to be provided by the end of the TSP planning period.

ODOT offers the following comments in response:

1. US97 is a Statewide level highway facility and a freight route.
2. The City of Madras completed a TSP Amendment in 2005 to address the anticipated failure of the US $97 /$ 'J" Street intersections.
3. A preferred concept was identified by the City and ODOT as shown on the project website $\downarrow$ ltp://ci.madras.or.us/public works/pw hwy97southY.shtml. The concept includes cost estimates, right-of-way needs, and a double-line sketch of the preferred roadway alignment.

Mr. Nick Snead
February 2, 2010
Page 2 of 2
4. Funding for the construction of the US97/'J' Street improvements is included in the Draft 2010-2013 STIP, which is expected to be approved in October 2010. The "J" Street improvements are not on the current 2008-11 STIP list. At this time, there is a gap between funding identified in the Draft STIP and cost estimates submitted by the project team. However, the City has been collecting transportation System Development Charges slated specifically for US97/"J" Street improvements.

Based on ODOT's review of the circumstances associated with future improvements to US97/"J" Street intersections, it is our opinion that the necessary improvements are reasonably likely to occur by the end of the planning period. ODOT has reached this conclusion based on the following factors:

1. The planned improvements are listed on the Draft 2010-2013 STIP and will likely be approved.
2. The planned improvements are located on a statewide freight route, an important facility that will likely receive future funding.
3. The City of Madras has land use regulations that allow the City to impose conditions on future development if such conditions are needed to avoid or remedy a significant effect. These include ordinainces enabling transportation System Development Charges for US97/'J" Street improvements and City approval of the proposed intersection redesign.
4. ODOT has a positive working relationship with the City of Madras and collaboratively fiuded other projects in the area. We are confident that the City, ODOT and other partners will be able to fund the needed US $97 /$ " F " Street improvements.

This reasonably likely determination does not constitute a commitment on the part of ODOT to fund the plamed improvements at US97/'J" Street. Further, this written statement applies only to the subject property and only to this specific proposed amendment. It does not apply to any future amendments that may rely upon the same project. Instead, future proposed amendments will require a new written statement from ODOT. (see http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/docs/TPR/tprGuidelines.pdf, Section 3.2.09)

ODOT appreciates the opportunity to provide you with this written statement. If you have any questions, or need more information, please contact Ann Jovanovic, ODOT Region 4 Planning office, at (541) 388-6046 or email ana.jovanovic@odot.state.or.us.

ce via e-mail: Mark Redabaugh, DLCD; Joe Bessman, Kittelson \& Assoc, Inc.; DJ Heffernan, Angelo Planning Group; Jon Skidmore, Jefferson County Planning Director; Matt Garrett, ODOT Director; Jeni Bohard, ODOT TDD Manager; Pat Creedican, ODOT District 10 Manager

## Nick Snead

From: JOVANOVIC Ana [Ana.JOVANOVIC@odot.state.or.us]
Sent: Thursday, February 04, 2010 4:34 PM
To: Nick Snead
Cc: RADABAUGH Mark; Joe Bessman; DJ Heffernan; Jon Skidmore
Subject: RE: Madras UBG expansion \& TRP Analysis
-->

Nick,

Here is ODOT's Reasonably Likely Determination letter for Madras UGB Expansion and TPR Analysis. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Thank you,
Ana

Ana Sovanovic
ODOT Region 4 Program and Planning
541388.6046
ana.jovanovic@odot.state.or us

From: Nick Snead [mailto:nsnead@ci,madras.or.us]
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2010 8:49 AM
To: JOVANOVIC Ana
Subject: Madras UBG expansion \& TRP Analysis

Ana,

Good morningl I hope you had a good weekend as well. I am writing to determine the status of ODOT's review of our TPR study submitted by Kittleson \& Associates related to the 37 acre UGB expansion proposal. Can you give me an update?
"There are no short cuts to any place worth going"
-Beverly Sills-

Nicholas S. Snead

## Community Development Director

City of Madras
(541) 475-3388

Email: nsnead@ci.madras.or.us

Visit the City of Madras at http://ci.madras or us/

## Appendix H: Urban Growth Area Management Agreement (UGAMA) (April 2006)

# Urban Growth Area Management Agreement For the City of Madras 

This agreement is entered into by the City of Madras, an incorporated municipality in the State of Oregon, hereby referred to as the "City" and Jefferson County, a political subdivision of the State of Oregon, hereby referred to as the "County".

## RECITALS

WHEREAS, the City of Madras and Jefferson County are authorized pursuant to Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) Chapter 190 to enter into an Intergovernmental Management Agreement for performance of functions which either governmental unit has the authority to perform; and

WHEREAS, this Management Agreement also constitutes a cooperative agreement under ORS Chapter 195; and

WHEREAS, Goal 14 [Urbanization] requires that the City and the County establish an urban growth boundary to identify and separate urbanizable land from nural and that the establishment and change of urban growth boundaries shall be through a cooperative process between the City and County; and $\qquad$
WHEREAS, pursuant to provisions in Goal 2 [Land Use Planning], the City and County are required to have coordinated and consistent comprehensive plans which establish an Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and a plan for the Urban Growth Area (UGA) within the boundary; and,

WHEREAS, the City and County share a common concern regarding the accommodation of population growth and utilization of lands within the UGB; and

WHEREAS, the City and County consider it mutually advantageous to establish this Urban Growth Area Management Agreement (UGAMA) for the purpose of facilitating the orderly transition from rural to urban land uses and to enable the City to plan for and provide urban services such as sewer, water and street facilities in a timely, orderly and cost effective manmer consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan;

NOW, THEREFORE THE CITY OF MADRAS AND JEFFERSON COUNTY MUTUALLY AGREE AS FOLLOWS:

## 1. INTENT OF AGREEMENT

1.1. To establish standards and procedures for review and action on proposed land use actions and related matters noted within this agreement pertaining to lands within the UGA;
1.2. To transfer authority and jurisdiction over current planning activities, land use decisions, provision of urban services and code enforcement within the UGA from the County to the City;
1.3. To benefit the public through reduction of governmental processes; and,
1.4. To establish procedures for City and County consideration of expansions to the UGA.

## 2. DEFINITIONS

For the purpose of this agreement, the following definitions shall apply:
2.1. Board: the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners.
2.2. City: the City of Madras.
2.3. Council: the Madras City Council.
2.4 County: Jefferson County.
2.5. Land Use Decision: A final decision or determination concerning the adoption, amendment or application of statewide planning goals, a comprehensive plan provision or a land use regulation.
2.6. Public Facilities Plan: A document or documents describing the water, sewer and transportation facilities which are to support the land uses designated in the appropriate acknowledged comprehensive plans.
2.7. Urban Growth Area (UGA): The area between the Madras City Limits and the Madras Urban Growth Boundary, as designated on the City's and the County's Comprehensive Plan Maps.
2.8. Urban Growth Boundary (UGB): The boundary line which separates lands to be urbanized and eventually incorporated into the City of Madras from the surrounding rural lands under the County's jurisdiction.
2.9. Urban Growth Area Management Agreement (UGAMA): This Intergovernmental Agreement between the City and County that coordinates the management of land use and development within the City of Madras UGA.
2.10. Urbanizable Lands: Lands inside the Urban Growth Area that are designated for future urban development when public facilities and services can be provided by the City.
3. URBANIZATION PROCESS
3.1 The UGA shall be managed to maintain the potential for future urban development until such time as the land is annexed into the City and is converted to urban land.
3.2. Conversion of urbanizable land to urban development can occur when public facilities and services are available and adequate to serve urban levels of development, or the land
is annexed into the City and zoned for uiban development.
3.3. Rural levels of development within the UGGA shail be sited in such a way as to not interfere with urban levels of development and services when conversion from urbanizable land to urban lands occurs.
3.4. Extension of City services within the UGA may be permitted when approved by the City. Establishment or extension of sewer systems ontside the UGB is prohibited except to mitigate a public health hazard in accordance with the provisions of OAR 660-011-0060.

## 4. UGA ADMINISTRATION RESPONSIBILITIES

4.1. The City shall have responsibility for administration and decision making authority regarding all land use applications within the UGA except applications for amendments to the UGB, as provided in Section 6.
4.2. The City shall have responsibility for annexation of lands in the UGA. Lands outside the UGA shall not be annexed unless the UGB is also amended to include the territory to be annexed.

## 5. PROCESS FOR LAND USE APPLICATIONS WITHIN THE UGA

5.1. Land Use applications shall be processed through the City Community Development Department.
5.2. Notice of all land use applications within the UGA shall be sent to the County Community Development Department and to any other affected County agencies and other applicable special service districts for review and comment prior to any decision by the City. Such agencies or districts shall be given ten business days in which to provide comments on the application.
5.3. In making its decision, the City shall consider all comments received under § 5.2.
5.4. The County, any agency or special service district that provides comments on the application shall be mailed a copy of the land use decision and shall have standing to appeal the City's decision.
6. PROCESS FOR URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY AMENDMENTS
6.1. Amendments to the UGB, including amendments to the City's and County's comprehensive plan maps, may be initiated by the City, the County, or a property owner(s).
6.2. An application to amend the UGB shall be filed with the City Community Development Department along with the applicable City and County plan amendment fees. The City shall forward a copy of the application to the County Community Development Department, together with the County's plan amendment fee, within five working days of

$$
M-41-06
$$

the date the application is filed.
6.3. The City and County Planning Commissions shall each conduct a public hearing regarding the application. At their discretion, the Planning Commissions may hold a joint hearing rather than separate hearings.
6.4. The recommendation of the City and County Planning Commissions shall be forwarded to the City Council, who shall hold a public hearing to consider the proposed amendment to the UGB. The decision of the City Council shall be forwarded to the County Board of Commissioners.
6.5. The Board of Commissioners shall conduct a public hearing and make a final decision on whether the UGB should be amended.
6.6. If the City and County disagree on the proposed amendments, a joint meeting of the City Council and Board of County Commissioners may be held to attempt to resolve the differences. Both jurisdictions may also request a dispute resolution process to resolve the differences.
6.7 If the governing bodies are not able to come to mutual agreement there shall be no change to the UGB.
7. OTHER LAND USE ACTIVITIES
7.1. The City and County agree to mutually review any proposed action on public improvement projects and similar programs, projects or proposals that apply to the UGA.
7.2. The City shall be responsible for public facilities planning within the UGA. The City shall coordinate with any affected County agency in the development of a public facilities plan for the UGA.
7.3. The County shall be responsible for administering the state Building Code and issuing building permits for all construction within the UGA, until such time as the City has its own state-approved building code program.

## 8. ROADS

8.1. Public rights-of-way within the UGA shall be accepted by the City upon amnexation of adjacent lands.
8.2. The City shall accept jurisdiction over County roads within the UGA that have a pavement condition index (PCI) of 70 or above. If the PCI is below 70, the County may structurally overlay the road to raise the PCI above 70, at which time the City shall accept jurisdiction over the road. Nothing contained in this subsection shall restrict the City from accepting jurisdiction over a road or public right-of-way within the UGA that does not meet such minimum standards.
8.3 When a parcel in the UGA is initially partitioned or subdivided and creation of a street is required, development shall proceed initially with streets to City road standards
8.4 Streets in subdivisions and PUDs shall be developed to the City's improvement standards
8.5. All unpaved county roads, excluding public usage roads, within the UGA shall be graded biannually by the County until the City has accepted jurisdiction over the road.
9. FEES
9.1. Applications for land use permits, including all land use appeals within the UGA, shall be accompanied by a fee set by the City.
9.2. Applications for UGB Amendments shall be accompanied by fees set by the County in addition to any City fees.
9.3. System Development Charges for lands within the UGA will be collected by the County, prior to the issuance of building permits.

## 10. ENFORCEMENT

The City shall be responsible for enforcement of land use regulations within the UGA.

## 11. AMENDMENT AND TERMINATION

11.1. This agreement may be amended at any time by mutual agreement of both parties, after public hearing and adoption by both the City Council and the Board of Commissioners.
11.2 Any modifications to this agreement shall be consistent with the City and County Comprehensive Plans and the statewide planning goals.
11.3. This agreement may be terminated by either party under the following procedure:
a. Written notice of intent to terminate this Agreement shall be sent to the other party at least forty-five (45) days prior to taking any action, including the publication of public hearing notices in order to provide ample time for resolution of differences, or amendment to comprehensive plans.
b. A public hearing shall be held by the party considering termination. That party shall give the other party at least 20 days prior notice of the scheduled hearing date. The 20 day period shall be used by both parties to seek resolution of differences. Both parties shall also request a collaborative conflict resolution process to resolve differences that remain.
c. Public notice of hearings shall be in accordance with applicable statutes and local ordinances.
e. This agreement is necessary for compliance with, at minimum, statewide planning Goals 2 and 14. If this agreement is terminated without adoption of a new agreement, jurisdiction and authority over all planning activities and land use decisions within the UGA shall revert to the County. Therefore, this agreement may not be terminated without adoption of a new agreement.

## 12. TIME OF EFFECTIVENESS

This agreement shall not become effective until properly executed by both the City and the County. Upon execution, this agreement shall supersede all previous Urban Growth Area Management Agreements.

## 13. SEVERABILITY

The Provisions within this agreement are severable. If any section, sentence, clause or phrase of this agreement is adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, said invalidity shall not impair or affect the validity of the remaining portions of the agreement.

ADOPTED this $5^{\text {sK }}$ day of $A_{\text {pis }}, 2006$.


## ATTEST:




Many Zembe
Mary zgake, Commissioner
Date:Cpril 5,2006


## Jefferson County Final Order

# BEFORE THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF THE STATE OF OREGON FOR THE COUNTY OF JEFFERSON 

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE JEFFERSON )
COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAP TO )

## 0-039-10

 EXPAND THE MADRAS URBAN GROWTH ) Ordinance No. $\qquad$ BOUNDARY BY APPROXIMATELY 37 ACRES )AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY (10-PA-01) )

WHEREAS, Jefferson County worked with the City of Madras and other stakeholders to establish a 50-year Urban Reserve Area surrounding the City of Madras; and

WHEREAS, the Madras Urban Reserve Area (URA) was acknowledged in February 2010 by the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development; and

WHEREAS, land in the Urban Reserve Area is first priority land for inclusion in the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) pursuant to ORS 197.298 and the land proposed for UGB expansion is within the URA; and

WHEREAS, the Madras Urbanization Study (April 2007) and the Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (August 2007) identified the need for residentially zoned land for housing and public/semi-public uses outside the existing UGB; and

WHEREAS, a joint public hearing of the City of Madras Planning Commission and Jefferson County Planning Commission was held on February 11, 2010 to consider findings and accept any written and oral testimony from the public on the proposed approximate 37 acre Urban Growth Boundary Expansion; and

WHEREAS, after considering the Findings of Fact, and written and oral testimony from the public, both the Jefferson County Planning Commission and the City of Madras Planning Commission took formal action to recommend to the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners and the Madras City Council that the proposed UGB expansion be approved; and

WHEREAS, the County Planning Commission's recommendation to approve the Urban Growth Boundary Expansion was forwarded to the Board of County Commissioners during a joint public hearing with the Madras City Council on March 29, 2010; and

WHEREAS, after considering the Findings of Fact, and all written and oral testimony from the public, the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners voted $2-0$ to approve the proposed Comprehensive Plan Map amendment and City of Madras Urban Growth Boundary expansion.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners hereby ORDAINS as follows:

## 1. Adoption of Findings

The Findings of Fact and Conclusions in the attached Findings Document and Staff Report are hereby adopted and incorporated herein by reference as the basis for the decisions to adopt the amendments to the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan Map.

## 2. Amendment to the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan Map

The amendment to the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan Map contained in the attached Exhibit A is hereby adopted and by this reference incorporated herein as if fully set forth.

## 3. Severability

The provisions of this ordinance are severable. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause or phrase of this ordinance or any exhibit thereto is, for any reason, held to be invalid or unconstitutional, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this ordinance or exhibits thereto.

## 4. Effective Date

These amendments being necessary for immediate implementation, an emergency is declared to exist, and the specified amendments shall therefore take place and be effective on April 14, 2010.

DATED this $14^{\text {th }}$ day of April, 2010.

## Attest:



$$
0-039-10
$$

## JEFFERSON COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

TO: Jefferson County Board of Commissioners<br>FROM: Jon Skidmore, AICP, Planning Director/CDD Manager<br>SUBJECT: Madras UGB Expansion (10-PA-01)<br>DATE: $03 / 22 / 10$


#### Abstract

This staff report provides background and findings in support of the proposed City of Madras Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) expansion as proposed by the City. The applicant (City of Madras) is proposing to amend the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan Map. The map will be amended to modify the UGB.


The City seeks approval to expand the UGB by approximately 37 acres to include the following properties:

- 11-14-07, Tax lot 100 (not all of this parcel will be included).
- 11-14-07, Tax lot 101
- 11-14-07, Tax lot 102
- 11-14-07, Tax lot 200

The application to amend the UGB is subject to compliance with the following documents:

- Urban Growth Area Management Agreement for the City of Madras (UGAMA).
- Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan (Goal 14 Section and Part 5).


## UGAMA Compliance:

The UGAMA sets forth the differing responsibilities for each jurisdiction for these types of proposals. The applicant's submitted draft findings outline these responsibilities beginning on page 32 of the draft findings document submitted by the City. As required by section 6 the UGAMA the City submitted an application to the County. A joint planning commission was scheduled for Februaty 11, 2010. The Jefferson County Planning Commission recommended approval of the UGB expansion to the Board of Commissioners by a vote of 4 to 0 . The Planning Commission and County Staff both recommend that the Board of Commissioners approve the UGB expansion. The review of the proposal has followed and will continue to follow the UGB expansion process outlined in the UGAMA.

## Comprehensive Plan Compliance:

The request is subject to Part 5 of the Comprehensive Plan and the Goal 14 section of the Plan. The application is a quasi-judicial application as this request will involve the administration of land use regulations to a small number of contiguous parcels. As such the application must comply with the following requirements of Part 5 of the Comprehensive Plan:

1. Comply with applicable Statewide Planning Goals, Oregon Revised Statutes and Administrative Rules, or comply with requirements for an exception to the goal(s);
2. Comply with all applicable Comprehensive Plan goals and policies; and
3. Be necessary due to changes in physical, economic or social conditions, population growth, or development patterns which require an adjustment in the land uses designations in the area where the amendment is proposed.

In terms of compliance with Statewide Planning Goals, Oregon Revised Statutes and Administrative Rules, the applicant's draft findings address these issues in Section V (compliance with Statewide Planning Goals) and Section VI (compliance with State Statutes) of the draft findings.

The primary Goals relating to this proposal are Goals 2 and 14:

## Goal 2: Land Use Planning

To establish a land use planning process and policy framework as a basis for all decisions and actions related to use of land and to assure an adequate factual base for such decisions and actions.

## Goal 14 Urbanization

To provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use, to accommodate urban population and urban employment inside urban growth boundaries, to ensure efficient use of land, and to provide for livable communities.

In order to expand the UGB the City must justify the need for the expansion. The City of Madras and Jefferson County worked with DLCD to establish the Urban Reserve Area (URA) over the past $3+$ years. Pursuant to ORS 197.298, the first priority for land to be included in a UGB is land designated as an urban reserve. Therefore, the land in the Madras URA is the first priority for UGB expansion when there is a demonstrated need for land in the next 20 years, as was found by the Madras Urbanization Study and Addendum. These studies found a need for approximately 220 acres of land for residential, public and semi-public land over the next 20 years. Therefore, the applicant's proposal provides acreage for the City's residential, public and semi-public needs as demonstrated through the URA planning process. The URA has been acknowledged by DLCD of which the urbanization study is a part. Further, the land the City is bringing into the UGB for this purpose is first priority as explained above and has the necessary access to urban services.

In terms of compliance with the Comprehensive Plan goals and policies, the applicant's draft findings address this starting on page 34. The Comprehensive Plan provides specific factors to be considered in changing UGBs. These factors include consideration of a demonstrated need for additional acreage for housing, public facilities, schools, orderly provision of urban services, maximum efficiency of land uses within the existing urban area and the priority of lands included in the expansion as outlined in ORS 198.298 among other considerations. The applicant explains that there is a demonstrated need as acknowledged through the URA planning process. Further, the applicant explains that this location can be served by public services in an efficient \& cost effective manner, allows for compatibility of uses in the area, and urban development in this location will have few impacts on prime resource land.

The Comprehensive Plan also requires that the expansion of the UGB be done in accordance with state requirements and that the statutory priorities in ORS 197.298 be followed. This requires that
expansions of UGBs include URA land first. The applicant's proposal complies with this requirement.

The applicant must also demonstrate that the expansion is necessary due to changes in physical, economic or social conditions, population growth, or development patterns which require an adjustment in the land uses designations in the area where the amendment is proposed. The application has been submitted to allow for an expansion of the UGB to provide for the long term housing needs of the City. It also has been proposed to accommodate a necessary public facility (school). The acreage needs for schools and housing are documented in the City's acknowledged Urban Reserve Area approval which was based on the urbanization study. Therefore, the proposed UGB expansion will provide for housing and educational needs of the City of Madras over the next 20 years and beyond.

## Summary:

The applicant has demonstrated that this UGB expansion complies with the UGAMA and the County regulations pertaining to UGB expansions. The Planning Commission recommended approval of this approximate 37 acre expansion to the Board of County Commissioners by a vote of 4 to 0 .

This proposed Comprehensive Plan Map amendment will change the UGB as it is reflected on the County's Comprehensive Plan map. Technically the applicant is changing the County Zoning Map as well. However, as the adjustment of the UGB will shift the lands in question to the City's jurisdiction and they will change/implement zoning from here forward (if approved) there is no separate Zone Map Change amendment request based on the direction of the County Planning Director.

Staff and the Planning Commission recommend approval.
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## I. Proposal Summary

| File No.: | 081-004 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Legislative Sponsot: | Nick Snead, Community Development Director City of Madras <br> 71 SE D Strect <br> Madras, OR 97741 <br> (541) 475-3388 <br> (541) 475-7061 Fax <br> nsnead@ci.madras.or.us |
| Planning Consultant: | DJ Heffernan <br> Angelo Planning Group <br> 921 SW Washington, Suite 468 <br> Portland, Oregon 97205 <br> (503) 227-3664 <br> (503) 227-3679 Fax <br> dheffernan@angeloplanning.com |
| Proposal: | - To amend the Madtas Comprehensive Plan - to add a table that presents the City zones and County zones that correspond and are allowed under City comprehensive plan designations. (Table 3-1) <br> - To amend the Jefferson County and City of Madras Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Maps - to expand the Madras Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) to include 36.91 acres from the Madras Urban Reserve Area (URA); to annex 20 acres of City-owned land ("east site," Figure 4-1) to the City of Madras and apply City R-2, Multiple Family Residential zoning; to annex 16.22 acres of privately owned land plus 0.69 acres of land for County right-of-way ("west site," Figure 4-1) to the City and retain existing County RL, Range Land, zoning. |
| Location: | - West site: tax map of 16.91 -acre west site (outlined), directly east of the existing Madras UGB, south of Ashwood Road (Appendix A) <br> - East site: survey map of 20 -acre east site, east of the existing Madras UGB, south of Ashwood Road (Appendix B) |
| Legal Description: | West site: 11S 14E 7 Lots 101 (12.28 acres), 102 ( 0.69 acres for right-of-way), and 200 ( 3.94 acres), entire lots <br> East site: 11S 14E 7 Lot 100 (20 acres), parcel of lot <br> Legal description of Lot 100 parcel (east site): <br> A portion of Parcel 2 of Partition Plat No. 2002-12 as filed in the Jefferson <br> County Clerk's Office, situated in the Northeast Quarter (NE $1 / 4$ ) of Section |

Proposed Amendments to Madras Comprehensive Plan and

|  | 7, Township 11 South, Range 14 East of the Willamette Meridian, Jefferson County Oregon, more particularly described as follows: Commencing at the Northwest corner of said Northeast Quarter, monumented with a 2 inch diameter brass cap, from which the Northeast corner of said Section 7 bears South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 2640.53 feet; thence South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ East along the North line of said Section 7 a distance of 599.997 feet; thence South $0^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 40.00 feet to the Northwest corner of said Parvel 2 of Partition Plat No. 2002-12; thence continuing South $0^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ West along the West line of said Parcel 2 a distance of 40.00 feet to the Soutth right-of-way line of East Ashwood Road and the True Point of <br> Beginning of this Description; thence South $0^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ East along said West line a distance of 935.13 feet to the Southeast corner of Parcel 1 of said Partition Plat No. 2002-17; thence leaving said West line South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 931.70 feet; thence North $0^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 935.12 feet; to a point on the South right-ofway line of East Asbwood Road; thence North $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ West along said right-of-way line a distance of 931.70 feet to the True Point of Beginning. <br> Contains 20.00 acres more or less. <br> End of Description. (Appendix B) |
| :---: | :---: |

## II. Introduction

## Proposed Map Amendments

The Madras Urban Reserve Area (URA) was approved by DLCD in July 2009, and was sized to provide urbanizable land for the next 50 years. Land from the URA is the first priority for inclusion in the UGB pursuant to ORS 197.298. The City of Madras is not currently in periodic review or evaluating its existing UGB for a 20 -year land supply. The City, however, has initiated this UGB amendment and annexation process in order to begin to meet the land need identified by the Madras Urbanization Study (April 2007) and the Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (August 2007), prepared by ECONorthwest. The studies found a need for residentially zoned land for housing and public/semi-public uses outside the existing UGB.

There are two parts to the proposed Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) annexation: the east site and the west site. The City of Madras owns the east site. This land is proposed for annexation to the Madras UGB and city limits and for re-zoning as City Multi-Family Residential ( $\mathrm{R}-2$ ), a designation that will allow for a multi-family and single-family housing as well as public/semi-public uses typically sited on residentially zoned land. The 20-acre parcel is within the Yarrow Master Plan area.

In addition to the east site, there are another 16.91 acres of land in the proposed UGB and City annexation, referred to as the west site. The west site is comprised of three lots that provide County right-of-way, better connect the east site to the existing UGB, and contribute toward meeting the long-term need for residentially zoned land. The west site is privately owned and is not proposed for re-zoning at this time. Owners may apply for rezoning when they are prepared to file land development applications in the future. It is expected that the west-site land also will provide the same range of needed housing types and public/semi-public uses as the east site when re-zoning is approved. Both the east and west sites will be designated Residential on the Plan Maps if this proposal is approved.

## Proposed Text Amendments

In order to facilitate the transition of rural zoning to urban zoning in the urban growth area, text amendments are proposed for Section IV (Land Use Element) of the Madras Comprehensive Plan that identify county zones allowed on land that is designated for future urban use on the Comprehensive Plan map.
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## III. Jefferson County and City of Madras Comprehensive Plan Amendments

Table 3-1 lists Madras Comprehensive Land Use Plan Designations and corresponding City and County zones that are deemed compatible. The table is needed because the Madras Comprehensive Land Use Plan map, which applies to incorporated and unincorporated properties, and the city's zoning map are one in the same. The table clarifies that unincorporated property may retain its county zoning when it is annexed into the UGB if the land is not immediately annexed into the city. Such properties may retain any of the listed County zones and be regulated under the County's land development ordinance consistent with adopted growth management policies and procedures that apply to all land inside the Madras UGB. When such land is ready for urban development, the owner may request city annexation and zoning that is consistent with the land use plan designation for their property. Practically speaking, the table simply allows rural zoning districts to be applied in the Madras urban growth area on an interim basis, even when the rural zone differs from the intended long range urban use for a subject property. The table does not alter anything in practice. County zoned properties that are inside the Madras UGB remain under county jurisdiction in all respects although they are subject to urban growth management policies and regulatory review procedures that have been jointly adopted by Jefferson County and the City of Madras. In this context, the conformity table serves as a zoning bridge between a property's planned urban future and its current unincorporated rural zoning.

Table 3-1 Proposed Table for Corresponding City of Madras Comprehensive Plan Map Designations, City of Madras Zones, and Jefferson County Zones

| Plan <br> Map <br> Label | Designation | Description | City <br> Zones | County Zones |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| R-1 | Single-Family <br> Residential | Land primarily for single-family homes, <br> including manufactured home <br> subdivisions, and for duplexes | R-1 | EFU A-1, EFU <br> A-2, RL, FM, <br> RR-2, RR-5, <br> RR-10, RR-20, <br> ERD |
| R-2 | Multi-Family <br> Residential | Land for multi-family housing to be close <br> to businesses and services and to buffer <br> single-family residential and commercial <br> uses. Manufactured homes and <br> neighborhood commercial uses are <br> allowed. | R-2 <br> A-2, RL, FM, <br> RR-2, RR-5, <br> RR-10, RR-20, <br> ERD |  |
| R-3 | Planned Residential <br> Development | Land for primarily residential <br> development that allows site design <br> flexibility to promote creativity and <br> protection of scenic and natural <br> resources | R-3 | EFU A-1, EFU <br> A-2, RL, RR-2, <br> RR-5, RR-10, <br> RR-20, ERD |
| C-1 | Corridor Commercial | Land for primarily motor vehicle-oriented <br> uses located along major roadways | C-1 | CC, ERD |
| C-2 | Downtown Commercial | Land for a mixture of smaller scale <br> businesses that supports redevelopment, <br> higher density, public spaces, and other <br> elements of pedestrian orientation | C-2 | CC, ERD |


| Plan Map Label | Designation | Description | City Zones | County Zones |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C-3 | Community Commercial | Land for primarily motor vehicle-oriented uses but on a smaller scale than Corridor Commercial | C-3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SC, CC, ERD, } \\ & \text { EFUA-1, EFU } \\ & \text { A-2, RL } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| NC | Neighborhood Commercial | Land for small-scale commercial uses in residential areas that includes public spaces and promotes transportation options | NC | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SC, ERD EFU } \\ & \text { A-1, EFU A-2, } \\ & \text { RL } \end{aligned}$ |
| I | Industrial | Land for industrial uses where industrial uses already exist in the city and in the Madras Industrial Park | 1 | EFU A-1, EFU A-2, RL, FM, $\mathrm{PM}, \mathrm{Cl}, \mathrm{IR}$, ERD |
| O/S | Open Space | Land where parks, open space, or public uses already exist or is otherwise publicly owned | OS/PF | EFU A-1, EFU A-2, RL, FM, PM |
| A/D | Airport Development | Land adjacent to airport facilities for future commercial and industrial uses, particularly those that rely on air transportation | A/D | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EFU A-1, EFU } \\ & \text { A-2, AM, ERD } \end{aligned}$ |

County Zones:

| AM | Airport Management |
| :--- | :--- |
| CC | County Commercial |
| CI | County Industrial |
| EFU A-1, EFU A-2, RL | Exclusive Farm Use Zones |
| ERD | Existing Rural Development |
| FM | Forest Management |
| IR | Industrial Reserve |
| PM | Park Management |
| RR-2, RR-5, RR-10, RR-20 | Rural Residential |
| SC | Service Community |

IV. Proposed Amendments to Madras Comprehensive Plan, Madras and Jefferson
County Comprehensive Plan Maps, and Madras Zoning Map


Madras and Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Maps
O-039-10

## V. Conformance with Statewide Land Use Goals

## Goal 1: Citizen Involvement

 To develop a citizen involvement program that insures the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process.Response: The proposed amendments have been reviewed during a series of public meetings and hearings in order to allow for consideration by public officials and public feedback.

The Jefferson County School District 509-J ("JCSD" or "District") Board ("Board") was generally briefed by the Superintendent about the 2009 Long Range Facility Plan at the December 14, 2009 School Board meeting where the need for the updated plan was discussed. The draft plan was brought to them first for formal review at a Board meeting on January 11, 2010. After the School Board reviewed the enrollment forecast, location and conditions of existing schools, and future potential school locations, they adopted the plan on January 25, 2010.

The proposed Madras Land Use Element Comprehensive Plan amendment and amendments to the Jefferson County and City of Madras Comprehensive Plan Maps and Zoning Maps were presented and reviewed in a series of meetings in early 2010.

A public hearing was scheduled before the Madras and Jefferson County Planning Commissions (joint) on February 11, 2010. Notice of the hearing was published in the January 13, 2010 Madras Pioneer. The public notice published in the newspaper was also posted at the Madras City Hall, Jefferson County Annex, US Postal Service Office, and the Jefferson County Library 20 days prior to the February 11, 2010 Planning Commission meeting.

Additionally, property owners within 750 feet of the properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB were notified of the proposed land use action. Adjacent property owners were notified that the file was available for review at the Jefferson County Community Development Department at 85 SE "D" Street and that copies of any information would be provided at a cost of $.25 /$ page. The agenda for the Planning Commission was posted at Madras City Hall, Jefferson County Annex, US Postal Service Office, and the Jefferson County Library 7 days prior to the February 11, 2010 joint Planning Commission meeting.

As discussed above the City proposes to include four (4) properties that total 36.91 acres into the City of Madras Urban Growth Boundary. This constitutes a potential "land use change" that would typically require notice to affected property owners. ORS 227.186 (Measure 56 notice) requires property owners to be notified of legislative acts relating to comprehensive plan, land use planning or zoning proposed by the City. Additionally, the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment is limited to the four properties identified on page 1. As such, a city-wide notice is not needed rather notice to the individual properties is required.

The City owns property, has a signed Consent to Annex agreement or a letter from a property owner acknowledging the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment that verify that property owners are aware of the proposed land use action and a Measure 56 notice is not needed. Specifically, the City holds title and owns Tax Lot 100 and therefore is aware and consents to the proposed re-zone to a portion of the property it owns that represents a "land use change" that may limit use. Additionally, the City of Madras has signed consent forms from the property owners of tax lots 101 and 200. Jefferson County owns tax lot 102 and has provided a letter acknowledging and supporting the proposed land use action. As such, a formal notice as required by ORS 227.186 is not necessary as the affected property owners are aware of the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment. More over, the ensuing annexation and re-zoning of 20 acres of tax lot 100 is limited to City owned property.

45-day notice to DLCD was sent to DLCD staff on December 14, 2009. On January 13, 2010 DLCD Field Representative, Mark Radabaugh, notified the City of Madtas that the contents of the 45 -day notice was incomplete. Later that day, City staff submitted the requested information to DLCD making the notice complete. The materials submitted on January 14, 2010 are noted as the Addendum to the notice.

The UGB expansion area is drawn from the Madras Urban Reserve Area (URA), which was developed through an intensive participatory process. A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Project Advisory Committee (PAC) were formed to provide guidance for the project. The TAC was comprised of staff from project team members, including Jefferson County, the City of Madtas, ECONorthwest, Kittelson \& Associates, David Evans \& Associates, Ball Janik, LLP, and Angelo Planning Group. The PAC included representatives of the City of Madras, Jefferson County, Jefferson County School District 509-J, local farmers, housing advocates, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Region 4, and the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD).

## Findings:

- According to both their Comprehensive Plans and code, the City of Madras and Jefferson County Planning Commissions serve as their official citizen planning committees.
- Adoption of the Madras Urban Reserve Area (URA) complied with Goal 1.
- Materials were made available to the public at Madras City Hall and the Jefferson County Community Development Department.
- Measure 56 notice was not issued as the proposed post-acknowledgment plan amendments are property specific and do not propose additional regulations to the properties proposed to be annexed and, in the case of the east site, re-zoned to Multi-Family Residential (R-2).
- 45-day notice of proposed plan amendments was sent to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) on December 14, 2009 prior to the start of hearings held by County and City Planning Commissions and legislative bodies. On January 13, 2010 the City of Madtas provided supplemental information to DLCD vial email.
- Notices of the public meetings were published in the City's local newspaper, including contact information for the City and County.

Conclusion: The proposed text and map amendments comply with State requirements for citizen involvement per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 1.

## Goal 2: Land Use Planning

To establish a land use planning process and policy framework as a basis for all decisions and actions related to use of land and to assure an adequate factual base for such decisions and actions.

## Response:

## Proposed Map Amendments

The Madras City Council adopted the Madras Urban URA and related provisions in October 2008 and the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners in November 2008. DLCD acknowledged and approved the URA and related amendments in July 2009, with stipulations that some of the proposed amendments to the Jefferson County development code be modified. Pursuant to ORS 197.298, the first priority for land to be included in a UGB is land designated as an urban reserve. Therefore, the land in the Madras URA is the first priority for UGB expansion when there is a demonstrated need for land in the next 20 years, as was found by the Madras Urbanization Study and Addendum.

The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is currently zoned Range Land by the County. Upon annexation to the UGB and Madras city limits, City R-2, Multiple Family Residential, zoning is being requested for the east site. The west site is proposed to be annexed to the city and to retain its existing County zoning, but the land is designated for multi-family residential use on the Plan Map.

Land zoned Range Land has been included in the Madras URA to meet long-term land needs and because of sewer service advantages over other areas around the existing UGB and because exception land alone would not meet land needs for the city over the next 50 years. Land in Study Areas 3 and 4 of the Madras URA - east and southeast of the city consistently ranked highest in sewer serviceability analysis, including land in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation. Land in the URA is subject to joint management under the terms of the City's and County's Urban Growth Area Management Agreement (UGAMA) once it is added to the City's UGB. Response and findings related to the UGAMA are provided later in this report.

Local criteria are relied upon to prioritize land from the URA to be included in the UGB. Local criteria are found in Goal 14 (Urbanization) policies in the Madras Comprehensive Plan. The criteria require a Master Planned Community (MPC) plan or Area Master Plan (AMP), proposed urban zoning, an annexation program, sufficient public facilities, financing prospects, and protection for natural resources and natural hazard areas for the proposed UGB amendment area. Policy14J requires the following.
J. All land use applications or legislative proposals to expand the Madras UGB must be accompanied by information that documents the following:

1. The proposed urban zoning or land use program for the subject properties that address an identified urban land need;

## 2. An annexation program for all subject properties;

3. Evidence that public facilities required by OAR 660-011-000 that are necessary to serve the expansion area can be served either by system improvements outlined in adopted public facility master plans or by supplemental improvements that augment adopted public facility master plans;
4. Evidence that the proposed zoning or land use plan complies with requirements of OAR 660-0012-0060 either by demonstrating that planned improvements in the Madras Transportation System Plan (TSP) have capacity to meet transportation needs for the proposed expansion area or through supplemental transportation improvements that augment the adopted TSP to meet the need;
5. Evidence that providers of other crucial public facilities (e.g. schools, parks and recreation, emergency services and health care) are able to meet the projected demand for their services;
6. Evidence that financing for constructing needed public improvements is available so that the expansion area can be developed as planned within the planning horizon;
7. Evidence that development in areas subject to natural hazards are protected from these hazards;
8. Evidence that known or probable significant resources related to open space, scenic areas, historic places or structures, and fish and wildlife habitat will be protected from development impacts or have development impacts offset using appropriate mitigation measures.

These criteria are addressed later in the report section on the Madras Comprehensive Plan, Goal 14.

The Madras Urbanixation Study (ECONorthwest, April 2007) and Madras Urbanixation Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, August 2007) identify a shortage of residentially zoned land to meet single-family and multi-family housing needs and public/semi-public use needs in the next roughly 20 years The needed number of housing units and acreage for residential uses is summarized in Table 4-18 of the August 2007 Madras Urbaniæation Study Addendum (Table 51).

These needs are compared to the available land supply in the existing UGB in Table 6-4 in the study (Table 5-2) in order to determine whether there is a surplus or deficit of land for residential, public and semi-public, and employment uses. The table documents a shortage of land zoned R-2 (Multiple Family Residential) and land zoned R-1 (Single Family Residential) inside the existing UGB as well as a need for roughly 350 acres of public and semi-public uses over the course of the next $15-20$ years. These public/semi-public uses tend to be related to residential uses and are typically allowed and sited on residentially zoned land.

The proposed UGB amendment addresses part of the residential and public use land need presented above. Annexing 20 acres of the proposed amendment that are owned by the City (the east site) and rezoning it R-2 allows the City to fulfill its agreement with Jefferson County School District (JCSD) and provide land for a potential school site, which could address the need for a new school or replacement school as identified in the JCSD 2009 Long Range Facility Plan. The remainder of the land need identified in the urbanization studies will be addressed during the City's next cycle of periodic review.

Table 5-1: Housing Needs, Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, August 2007)

| Housing Type | New DU | Percent | Density (DUinet res ac] | Met Res. Acres | Net to <br> Gross <br> Factor | Gross Res. Acres | Density (DU/gross fes ac) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Needed Units, 2007-2027 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-tamily types |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-family detached | 1,791 | 61\% | 4.8 | 373.1 | 2506 | 497.5 | 3.6 |
| Manulactured | 206 | 7\% | 5.5 | 37.4 | 25\% | 49.8 | 4.1 |
| condorTownhomes | 206 | $7 \%$ | 9.0 | 22.8 | 15\% | 26.9 | 7.7 |
| Subtotal | 2,202 | 75\% | 5.4 | 410.5 |  | 5742 | 3.0 |
| Muiti-Iamily |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Muldfamily | 734 | 25\% | 14.0 | 52.4 | 15\% | 66.7 | 11.9 |
| Subfotal | 734 | 25\% | 14.0 | 52.4 |  | 51.7 | 11.9 |
| Total | 2,936 | 100\% | 6.3 | 462.9 |  | 635.8 | 4.6 |
| Needed Units, 2007-2057 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-family lypes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-family dotached | 5,516 | 61\% | 4.8 | 1,149.1 | 25\% | 1,532.1 | 3.6 |
| Manufactured | 633 | 7\% | 5.5 | 115.1 | $26 \%$ | 143.0 | 4.4 |
| Condortownhomes | 633 | 7\% | 9.0 | 70.3 | 45\% | 82.7 | 7.7 |
| Sublolal | 6,781 | 75\% | 5.4 | 1,334.5 |  | f,758.7 | 3.9 |
| Multi-family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mulifamily | 2,260 | 25\% | 14.0 | 161.5 | 10\% | 179.4 | 42.6 |
| Subtotal | 2,260 | 25\% | 14.0 | 161.5 |  | 179.4 | 42.3 |
| Total | 9.042 | 100\% | 6.3 | 1,495.9 |  | 1,938.1 | 4.7 |

Smure: ECOHorthwest
ty divering nel ncres by ( 1 -net to apasa factor). For manmpe, for single-family
detached, $477.11(1-75)=636.1$. Conwersely, $638.1 \times .75=477.1$.

Proposed Amendments to Madras Comprehensive Plan and

Table 5-2. Land Needs, Madras Urbanization Study Addendum
(ECONorthwest, August 2007)
Table 6-4. Comparison of land supply and demand, Madras UGB, 2007-2027 and 2007-2057

| Plan Designation | Land Demand |  | Supply 2007 | Supplas (deficit) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2007-2027 | 2007-2057 |  | 2087-2027 | 2007-2057 |
| Residential |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{R}-1$ | 451.9 | 1,3557 | 398.1 | (53.8) | (957.6) |
| R-2 | 46.1 | 138.2 | 23.5 | (22.5) | (114.6) |
| R-3 | 148.0 | 444.0 | 242.8 | 94.8 | (201.2) |
| RR5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 32.7 | 32.7 | 32.7 |
| RR10) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 47.5 | 47.5 | 47.5 |
| RL | 0.0 | 0.0 | 38.7 | 38.7 | 38.7 |
| PublidSemi-pulitic uses on res land | 358.3 | 770.7 | 0.0 | (358.3) | (770.7) |
| Subtotal [Residentiall | f,004.2 | 2,708.6 | 783.3 | (220.9) | (1,925.3) |
| Commercal (Retail \& Services) |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}-1$ | 230.6 | 758.1 | 80.2 | (150.4) | (677.9) |
| NC | 28.6 | 90.4 | 4.9 | (23.7) | (85.4) |
| CC | 0 | 0 | 32.5 | 32.6 | 32.6 |
| Subtotal Commercias | 259.2 | 846.5 | 117.7 | (141.5) | (730.8) |
| Industrial |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{ }$ | 251.4 | 749.9 | 296.9 | 45.5 | (452.9) |

## Proposed Text Amendments

As discussed above, the proposed UGB amendment and annexation is based on the buildable lands inventory and needs analysis performed by ECONorthwest in 2007 and for the Madras URA. The proposed table of corresponding City land use designations and City and County zones (Table 3-1) is proposed to facilitate the transition of land from rural to urban and the annexation of land in the URA to the Madras UGB and city limits.

## Findings:

- The proposed UGB amendment and annexation is drawn from land in the adopted Madras URA, which is the first priority land to be included in the UGB pursuant to state statute.
- The east site and west site are currently zoned Range Land by the County. Range land was included in the Madras URA because of sewer service advantages it had over other land surrounding the UGB and because including only exception land in the URA would not have provided enough land for the projected growth needs of the next approximately 50 years.
- The proposed annexation area meets some of the need for residentially zoned land outside the existing UGB over the next 20 years, as established in the 2007 Madras Urbanization Study and addendum. The studies found the need for more than 200 acres of land for housing and related public/scmi-public uses.

Conclusion: The proposed map and text amendments comply with State requirements for land use planning per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 2.

## Goal 3: Agricultural Lands

To preserve and maintain agricultural lands.
Response: The entire Madras URA includes land zoned for rural residential, range land, and agricultural uses, as shown in Table 5-3.

Table 5-3: Exception and Resource Land in the Madras URA

| Land Type | Zones | Acres |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Exception Land | RR2, RR5, RR10 <br> (Rural Residential) | 1,709 |
| Non-prime Resource Land | RL <br> (Range Land) | 2,038 |
| Prime Resource Land | A1 <br> (Agricultural) | 68 |
|  | Total | 3,815 |

Prime agricultural land makes up less than $2 \%$ of the total URA. When prime agricultural land is included, it is only when it is adjacent to the existing UGB, surrounded by exception land or non-prime resource land, and/or will be more easily served with public facilities sewer service, in particular. The rest of the URA is comprised of rural residential and range land. Rangeland was included in the URA because of serviceability advantages it has over other land surrounding the Madras UGB and because all the exception (rural residential) land adjacent to the Madras UGB would not fulfill the city's estimated land needs for the next 50 years.

The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is curfently zoned Range Land by the County. Upon annexation to the UGB and Madras city limits, City R-2, Multiple Family Residential, zoning is being requested for the east site. The west site is proposed to be annexed to the city and to retain its existing County zoning, but the land is designated for multi-family residential use on the Plan Map.

As explained above, land zoned Range Land has been included in the Madras URA to meet land needs and because of sewer service advantages over other areas around the existing UGB and because exception land alone would not meet land needs for the city over the next 50 years. Land in Study Areas 3 and 4 of the URA consistently ranked highest in sewer serviceability analysis, including land in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation.

Pursuant to ORS 197.298(a), the first priority of land to be included in the UGB is land in a URA. Beyond that, local criteria can be relied upon to prioritize land from the URA to be included in the UGB. Local criteria are found in Goal 14 (Urbanization) policies in the Madras Comprehensive Plan. The criteria require a Master Planned Community (MPC) plan or Area Master Plan (AMP), proposed urban zoning, an annexation program, sufficient public facilities, financing prospects, and protection for natural resources and natural hazard areas for the proposed UGB amendment area. These policies are addressed in more detail in the response and findings for Madras Comprehensive Plan Goal 14.

Land in the URA is subject to joint management under the terms of the City's and County's Urban Growth Area Management Agreement (UGAMA) once it is added to the City's UGB. Response and findings related to the UGAMA are provided later in this report.

## Findings:

- The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is land from the Madras URA, top priority land for inclusion in the UGB pursuant to ORS 197.298(a).
- Some of the non-prime resource land (zoned Range Land) is easier to serve with sewer than other areas around the existing Madras UGB, based on public facility analysis done during the development of the URA. Land in Study Areas 3 and 4 of the URA consistently ranked highest in sewer setviceability analysis, including land in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation.

Conclusion: The proposed map amendments comply with State requirements for agricultural lands per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 3.

## Goal 5: Natural Resources, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Open Spaces

To protect natural resources and conserve scenic and historic areas and open spaces.
Response: The land being proposed for inclusion in the Madtas UGB is currently located within the Madras URA, jointly managed by Jefferson County and the City of Madras pursuant to the terms of the Urban Reserve Area Management Agreement (URAMA), adopted in January 2009 (Appendix C). Pursuant to the URAMA, the County processes land use decisions in the URA. In addition, conversion plans must be submitted to the City for land divisions in the URA.

Madras Comprehensive Plan policy language regarding protection of open space, scenic, wildlife, and cultural resources was adopted as part of amendments to Goal 14 (Urbanization) concurrent with the adoption of the Madras URA.

## J. All land use applications or legislative proposals to expand the Madras UGB must be accompanied by information that documents the following:

8. Evidence that known or probable significant resources related to open space, scenic areas, historic places or structures, and fish and wildlife habitat will be protected from development impacts or have development impacts offset using appropriate mitigation measures.

The land in the proposal does not include floodways, floodplains, significant habitat, or cultural resources that are identified in the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan, Goal 5 inventory, or Jefferson County Geographic Information System (GIS) files. The only resources cited in Policy 14 J (8) that may apply to the site are open spaces. Open space will be a required part of school or multi-family residential development that occurs in the UGB amendment area. However, this proposal itself is not a development or entitlement proposal and, therefore, is not required to specify precisely where such open space will be designated.

## Findings:

- Recently adopted amendments to Goal 14 of the City's Comprehensive Plan require identification of protective measures for significant open space, scenic, historic, cultural and natural resources in proposed UGB expansion areas. The Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan and Goal 5 inventory does not identify natural, scenic, or cultural resources in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area.
- Open space designations will be made as part of development entitlement for the proposed UGB amendment and annexation.

Conclusion: The proposed map amendments comply with State requirements for open space, scenic and historic areas, and natural resources per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 5.

## Goal 6: Air, Water and Land Resource Quality

To maintain and improve the quality of the air, water and land resources of the state.
Response: According to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ) there are no federally designated air quality management areas or federally designated hazardous waste sites in the Madras URA. Of Environmental Cleanup Sites reported on ODEQ's website, there are no sites identified in the URA. ${ }^{1}$ Further, R-2 zoning is proposed for the UGB amendment area to be brought in to the city, allowing residential uses and other compatible uses. These uses tend to produce less noise, air, land, and water pollution than commercial and industrial uses, which typically manufacture goods, produce by-products, and generate more vehicle traffic.

## Findings:

- There are not federal- or state-registered environmental quality sites within the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area.
- The amendment and annexation area is needed and planned for residential and related uses, which tend to have fewer adverse air, water, and land quality impacts than commercial or industrial uses.

Conclusion: The proposed map amendments comply with State requirements for air, water and land resources per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 6.

## Goal 7: Areas Subject to Natural Hazards To protect people and property from natural hazards.

Response: Primary potential natural hazards in Madras include steep slopes, floodway and floodplain, and wildfire. Statewide Goal 7 is reinforced in Madras Comprehensive Plan

[^20]policies (Goal 14) by requiring protection from natural hazards be demonstrated for proposed UGB amendments.
J. All land use applications or legislative proposals to expand the Madras UGB must be accompanied by information that documents the following:

## 7. Evidence that development in areas subject to natural hazards are protected from these hazards;

There are not steep slopes (slopes greater than $25 \%$ ), floodway, or floodplain land in the proposed annexation arca. Firc protection service for the proposal area is currently provided by Jefferson County Fire Protection District \#1, and will continue to be provided by that district if the land is annexed to the city. Area in the district is subject to a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) that Jefferson County completed in 2005 in collaboration with the fire district and federal agencies.

## Findings:

- There are not steep slopes (slopes greater than $25 \%$ ), floodway, or floodplain land in the proposed UGB expansion and annexation area.
- Jefferson County Fire Protection District \#1 provides fire protection service to the proposed amendment and annexation area. The area is subject to the Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) developed and adopted by the County, the fire district, and federal agencies.

Conclusion: The proposed map amendments comply with State requirements for areas subject to natural hazards per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 7.

## Goal 10; Housing

To encourage the availability of adequate numbers of needed housing units at price ranges and rent levels which are commensurate with the financial capabilities of Oregon households and allow for flexibility of housing location, type and density.

Response: This proposal provides land for housing and related public and semi-public uses. The Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (August 2007) shows that there is a shortage of residentially zoned land inside the existing UGB for growth over the next 20 years (Table 5-2).

The proposed annexation to the Madras UGB and city limits addresses this need by including 36.91 acres of land from the URA for residential and public/semi-public uses. It is proposed that the east site be re-zoned from County RL (Range Land) zoning to City R-2 (Multi-Family Residential) zoning.

These proposed amendments are not part of a periodic review work program and the next periodic review process will ensure that the UGB does include enough land to meet all the land needs that are projected for the next 20 years as shown in Table 5-2.

## Findings:

- The Madras Urbanization Study and Addendum found a need for residentially zoned land for housing and public/semi-public uses outside the existing UGB for growth expected over the next 20 years.
- The remainder of land needs determined by the urbanization studies will be addressed during the next City of Madras periodic review.

Conclusion: The proposed map amendments comply with State requirements for housing per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 10.

## Goal 11 Public Facilities and Services

To plan and develop a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban and rural development.

## Goal Requirements

Urban Facilities and Services - Refers to key facilities and to appropriate types and levels of at least the following: police protection; sanitary facilities; storm drainage facilities; planning, zoning and subdivision control; health services; recreation facilities and services; energy and communication services; and community governmental services.
A. Goal 11 Planning Guidelines
5. A public facility or service should not be provided in an urbanizable area unless there is provision for the coordinated development of all the other urban facilities and services appropriate to that area.

Response: According to terms of the UGAMA between Jefferson County and the City of Madras, the City will be the primary service provider for land within its UGB, in particular coordinating police, sewer, stormwater, land use, recreation, energy, and governmental services. City urbanization regulations amended with the adoption of the Madras URA require either a Master Planned Community (MPC) plan or Area Master Plan (AMP) for UGB amendments in Madras for areas over five acres (Madras Comprehensive Plan Policy 14 I). Both MPC plans and AMPs must show "appropriate locations for transportation improvements, public facilities, protection for significant open space, scenic, historic, and natural resource areas" and how proposed land uses will integrate with existing development.

Transportation facilities are addressed in more detail in the response and findings for Statewide Goal 12 next in this report.

The adopted Yarrow Master Plan applies to the east site. This land is proposed for annexation both to the Madras UGB and city limits. It is also proposed that the east site be re-zoned to R-2 upon annexation so that it can provide land for uses such as urban levels of housing and related public/semi-public uses. These uses are similar to and compatible with surrounding development of residential and public uses. The east site is tangent to the existing UGB and is bordered by Ashwood Road, a County collector road, which lends itself to the extension of services from inside the existing UGB and city limits. Sufficient water
and sewer service can be provided to the east site given existing and planned systems, and this is documented in the service provider letters from Deschutes Valley Water District and the City of Madras Public Works (Appendix D).

Pursuant to Madras Comprehensive Plan Urbanization Policy 14 I: "An AMP shall demonstrate efficient use of land, zoning consistent with an identified urban land need, appropriate locations for transportation improvements, public facilities, protection for significant open space, scenic, historic, and natural resource areas." It is proposed to annex the west site to the Madras UGB and city limits. While it is also proposed that the site retain its existing County Range Land (RL) zoning until the owners are ready to propose development, the site is surrounded by land designated for residential and public/semipublic .uses, and its future designation as residential allows housing and compatible public/semi-public uses that can be: "integrated with the existing urban development pattern." (Madras Comprehensive Plan Urbanization Policy 14 I (2)) Further, the proposed addition of a table showing Madtas and County zones that correspond with Madras land use designations to the Madras Comprehensive Plan Section IV, Land Use Element (Table 3-1), will facilitate the transition of existing County zoning for the west site to appropriate City zoning.

The west site is comprised of three lots - Lots 101 and 200 that total 16.22 acres and are privately owned and Lot 102 that is 0.69 acres designated for County right-of-way. Lots 101 and 200 are both adjacent to Ashwood Road, a County collector, and will not require additional public roads for sufficient internal or local circulation. At the time of proposed development, proposed land division or planned development plans must show an internal circulation system that satisfies City code requirements and street standards. The west site is adjacent to the existing Madras UGB and is bordered by Ashwood Road, which lends itself to the extension of services from inside the existing UGB and city limits. As with the east site, sufficient water and sewer service can be provided to the west site given existing and planned systems, as stated in service provider letters (Appendix D).

The County has not identified historic, scenic, or natural resources on the west site. City open space requirements for subdivisions or planned developments will apply to the site at the time of proposed development.

Finally both MPC plans and AMPs must have documented approval from a majority of landowners pursuant to Madras Comprehensive Plan Policy 14 I (3). Specifically, the City of Madras owns Tax Lot 100 and as the applicant, consents to the proposed UGB expansion to include 20 acres of Tax Lot 100 and the re-zoning of the property from Range Land (RL) to Multi-Family Residential (R-2). Tax Lot 102 is dedicated to Jefferson County for Ashwood right-of-way and consent for UGB expansion and re-zoning is not needed as inclusion in the UGB and re-zoning will not change how the right-of-way can be used. Consent from other landowners is provided in Appendix E.

## B. Goal 11 Implementation Guidelines

5. Additional methods and devices for achieving desired types and levels of public facilities and services should include but not be limited to the following: (1) tax incentives and disincentives; (2) land use controls and ordinances; (3) multiple use and joint
development practices; (4) fee and less-than-fee acquisition techniques; and (5) enforcement of local health and safety codes.

Response: The proposed land use designations and zoning for the annexation area - the east site and the west site - is appropriate for the type and level of public facilities and services that can be extended to the area. It is proposed to bring the west site into the Madras UGB and city limits but to retain its existing County Range Land (RL) zoning until landowners are ready to propose development. The site is surrounded by land planned for or developed as predominantly residential development. It is well situated for extension of urban facilities and services when they are needed. The proposed addition of a land use and zoning designation table to Section IV (Land Use Element) of the Madras Comprehensive Plan (Table 3-1) establishes the City and County zoning designations that correspond to City land use designations, and will guide the transition from County zoning to appropriate City zoning once a land use action is proposed.

It is proposed that the east site be re-zoned to $\mathrm{R}-2$ upon annexation so that it can provide land for uses such as urban levels of housing and related public/semi-public uses. These uses are similar to and compatible with surrounding development. The east site is tangent to the existing UGB and is bordered by Ashwood Road, a County collector road, which lends itself to the extension of services from inside the existing UGB and city limits. In that vein, service providers have determined that sufficient water and sewer service can be provided to the east and west sites given existing and planned systems (Appendix D.).

The east site is part of the approved Yarrow Master Plan, a plan that envisions a variety of housing and then an internal circulation system, open space, public uses (including a school), and a small-scale commercial area to serve the primary residential uses.

Once the properties are annexed into the city limits and developed, wastewater and domestic water services will need to be extended to each developed property. The property owner will fund the extension of wastewater and domestic water services to their properties. Extension of these facilities will be completed as required in the City of Madras Wastewater Master Plan and the Deschutes Valley Water District Master Plan.

As previously discussed, this proposal is not a development proposal that offers entitlements for construction. Subsequent to this land use action, the property owner will be required to obtain development approvals (e.g. Site Plan Review, Conditional Use, or Subdivision). Any development approval will require public facilities to be extended to the subject property at the expense of the applicant.

## OAR 660-011-0010

 The Public Facility Plan(1) The public facility plan shall contain the following items:
(a) An inventory and general assessment of the condition of all the significant public facility systems which support the land uses designated in the acknowledged comprehensive plan;
(b) A list of the significant public facility projects which are to support the land uses designated in the acknowledged comprehensive plan. Public facility project descriptions or specifications of these projects as necessary;
(c) Rough cost estimates of each public facility project;
(d) A map or written description of each public facility project's general location or service area;
(e) Policy statement(s) or urban growth management agreement identifying the provider of each public facility system. If there is more than one provider with the authority to provide the system within the area covered by the public facility plan, then the provider of each project shall be designated;
(f) An estimate of when each facility project will be needed; and
(g) A discussion of the provider's existing funding mechanisms and the ability of these and possible new mechanisms to fund the development of each public facility project or system.
(2) Those public facilities to be addressed in the plan shall include, but need not be limited to those specified in OAR 660-011-0005(5). Facilities included in the public facility plan other than those included in OAR 660-011-0005(5) will not be reviewed for compliance with this rule.
(3) It is not the purpose of this division to cause duplication of or to supplant existing applicable facility plans and programs. Where all or part of an acknowledged comprehensive plan, facility master plan either of the local jurisdiction or appropriate special district, capital improvement program, regional functional plan, similar plan or any combination of such plans meets all or some of the requirements of this division, those plans, or programs may be incorporated by reference into the public facility plan required by this division. Only those referenced portions of such documents shall be considered to be a part of the public facility plan and shall be subject to the administrative procedures of this division and ORS Chapter 197.

## OAR 660-011-0015

## Responsibility for Public Facility Plan Preparation

(1) Responsibility for the preparation, adoption and amendment of the public facility plan shall be specified within the urban growth management agreement. If the urban growth management agreement does not make provision for this responsibility, the agreement shall be amended to do so prior to the preparation of the public facility plan.
(2) The jurisdiction responsible for the preparation of the public facility plan shall provide for the coordination of such preparation with the city, county, special districts and, as necessary, state and federal agencies and private providers of public facilities.

Response: The Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) that implements Goal 11 is OAR 660011. The rule establishes requirements for the planning and provision of public facilities in Oregon. Pursuant to OAR 660-011-0005(5), a public facility "includes water, sewer, and transportation facilities, but does not include buildings, structures or equipment incidental to the direct operation of those facilities." Transportation facilities are addressed in detail in the response and findings for Goal 12 in this report.

The City of Madras is responsible for the planning and provision of sewer service in the proposed annexation area, and Deschutes Valley Water District (DVWD) for the planning and provision of sewer service in the area. The City and DVWD master plans for sewer and water provide an inventory and assessment of existing facilities, a list and map of planned projects, a timeline for their implementation, and a discussion of costs and financing mechanisms.

The City Public Works Director has submitted a letter that is included with this report (Appendix D) that affirms there is sufficient capacity in existing and planned sewer infrastructure to serve the east and west sites in the proposed annexation area. Similarly, the DVWD General Manager has prepared a statement that there is sufficient capacity in existing and planned water infrastructure to serve the proposed annexation area (Appendix D).

## Findings:

- Implementation of public facilities and services in Madras is primarily regulated by land use plans and ordinances and public facility master plans, which are elements of the City Comprehensive Plan.
- The City of Madras will be the primary provider of urban facilities and services in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area. The City will be able to coordinate service to the area with facilities and services already provided to adjacent land within the existing UGB.
- The approved Yarrow Master Plan applies to the east site and shows an internal transportation network and sites for housing and a school.
- The City of Madras Public Works Director and DVWD General Manager have provided letters that verify that there is sufficient capacity in existing and planned sewer and water infrastructure to serve the proposed annexation area.
- When development occurs on the properties to be included in the Madras UGB, the property owner will be responsible for cost to extend sewer and domestic water facilities to development.

Conclusion: The proposed map and text amendments comply with Goal 11 for public facilities and services subject to OAR 660, Division 11.

## Goal 12 Transportation <br> To provide and encourage a safe, convenient and economic transportation system.

## 660-012-0060

Plan and Land Use Regulation Amendments
(1) Where an amendment to a functional plan, an acknowledged comprehensive plan, or a land use regulation would significantly affect an existing or planned transportation facility, the local government shall put in place measures as provided in section (2) of this rule to assure that allowed land uses are consistent with the identified function, capacity, and performance standards (e.g. level of service, volume to capacity ratio, etc.) of the facility. A plan or land use regulation amendment significantly affects a transportation facility if it would:
(a) Change the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility (exclusive of correction of map errors in an adopted plan);
(b) Change standards implementing a functional classification system; or
(c) As measured at the end of the planning period identified in the adopted transportation system plan:
(A) Allow land uses or levels of development that would result in types or levels of travel or access that are inconsistent with the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility;
(B) Reduce the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility below the minimum acceptable performance standard identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan; or
(C) Worsen the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility that is otherwise projected to perform below the minimum acceptable performance standard identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan.
(2) Where a local government determines that there would be a significant effect, compliance with section (1) shall be accomplished through one or a combination of the following:
(a) Adopting measures that demonstrate allowed land uses are consistent with the planned function, capacity, and performance standards of the transportation facility. (b) Amending the TSP or comprehensive plan to provide transportation facilities, improvements or services adequate to support the proposed land uses consistent with the requirements of this division; such amendments shall include a funding plan or mechanism consistent with section (4) or include an amendment to the transportation finance plan so that the facility, improvement, or service will be provided by the end of the planning period.
(c) Altering land use designations, densities, or design requirements to reduce demand for automobile travel and meet travel needs through other modes.
(d) Amending the TSP to modify the planned function, capacity or performance standards of the transportation facility.
(e) Providing other measures as a condition of development or through a development agreement or similar funding method, including transportation system management measures, demand management or minor transportation improvements. Local governments shall as part of the amendment specify when measures or improvements provided pursuant to this subsection will be provided.

Response: Reflecting Statewide Goal 12 and the Transportation Planning Rule, UGB amendment applications must provide the following pursuant to Madras Goal 14 policies:
4. Evidence that the proposed zoning or land use plan complies with requirements of OAR 660-0012-0060 either by demonstrating that planned improvements in the Madras Transportation Svstem Plan (TSP) have capacitv to meet transportation needs for the proposed expansion area or through supplemental transportation improvements that augment the adopted TSP to meet the need; (Madras Comprehensive Plan Policy J-4)

City R-2 (Multi-Family Residential) zoning is proposed for the east site of the UGB amendment and annexation area. The zone allows multi-family and single-family housing outright and then allows associated uses such as schools, libraries, and community centers conditionally. The minimum lot size for single-family housing is 7,500 square feet and for
multi-family 10,000 square feet for the first two units and 2,000 square feet per each additional unit.

The east site is adjacent to Ashwood Road, an existing road built to County standards as a collector road. Ashwood Road borders the site to the north and provides primary access and connectivity to the proposed lands. Ashwood Road serves the Deer Creek Correctional Institute and other rural uses to the east of the site. To the immediate west Ashwood Road serves Juniper Hills Park and the Jefferson County Middle School, and further west transitions into B Strect and connects to US 97 and the City's downtown core. A recently constructed extension of City View to J Street connects the parcel to the southern City limits, and Bean Drive connects toward the northern portion of the City. Table 1 summarizes key chatacteristics of the existing roadway facilities (Appendix F).

The transportation analysis for annexing and re-zoning the east site to $\mathrm{R}-2$ was based on the assumptions below. Given that schools generate more peak hour traffic than housing alone, two scenarios were developed for Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) analysis that involved both housing and a school. The difference in the scenarios represents the typical tange of an elementary school site, 5-10 acres. ${ }^{2}$ The enrollment assumption roughly approximates the average elementary school enrollment in Jefferson County School District 509-J. A maximum housing density of 11.6 units/acre was derived from standards for lot and building size, parking, setbacks, and infrastructure for multi-family residential uses in the R-2 zone.

1. 5-acre school site - $\mathbf{1 7 4}$ multi-family units on 15 acres and a 350 -student elementary school.
2. 10-acre school site - 116 multi-family units on 10 acres and a 350 -student elementary school.

The analysis found that all the study intersections operate acceptably in the planning horizon ${ }^{3}$ with and without the proposed annexation and re-zoning of the east site, except the intersections of US 97 and J Strect. These intersections exceed volume-to-capacity ( $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ) standards in 2025 with or without the proposed annexation and re-zoning. Because the proposal incteases traffic at these intersections, even if minimally, the proposal is deemed to have a "significant effect"; it would further degrade the performance of the failing intersections.

Improvements for the US 97/J Street intersection have been included in an amendment to the Madras TSP and in the ODOT 2010-2013 Draft STIP. The improvements involve realignment of northbound US 97 onto Adams Drive and two new traffic signals at the new J Street intersections, and would allow the US 97/J Street intersections to operate within adopted $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ standards. ODOT has deemed these improvements to be "reasonably likely" in the planning horizon and, thus, no significant would occur with the proposed annexation and te-zoning (Appendix G).

## Findings:

- Transportation analysis for the east site of the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area assumed that the area would be developed with a combination of housing and a school. This was because there is the potential for a school to be located on the site and schools generate more traffic, thus creating a "worse case" set of scenarios for the analysis.
- Transportation analysis showed that all the study intersections would perform within adopted operational standards at the end of the planning horizon with or without the proposed annexation and re-zoning of the east site, except the intersections of US 97 and J Strect. These intersections exceed adopted standards and the proposed annexation and re-zoning produce a "significant effect" on the intersections.

[^21]However, improvements for the intersections that are included in the Madras TSP and the 2010-2013 Draft STIP have been deemed "reasonably likely" to occur in the planning horizon, thus mitigating the proposal's significant effect.

Conclusion: The proposed map amendments comply with Goal 12 and OAR 660-0150060.

## Goal 13 Energy Conservation To conserve energy.

Response: The east site of the UGB amendment and annexation area is part of the Yarrow Master Plan area. The master plan includes a range of land uses so that residents can meet many daily needs within the neighborhood. The plan designates land predominantly for housing, but for parks and open space, a school, other community services, and commercial services as well. This mix of uses will provide for these daily needs and reduce the need to drive outside the neighborhood to access these uses.

All public improvements within the Yarrow Master Plan area are required to be constructed to City of Madras standards, which includes the provision of sidewalks. The Master Plan also includes planned open space which will be accessed by a multi-use trail system that will connect to existing multi-use trails in the City of Madras. This supports the use of nonmotorized transportation and the conservation of fuel resources. This proposed UGB amendment and annexation does not provide all of the land needed to implement the master plan but provides part of it.

The west site is not part of the Yarrow Master Plan but will be subject to internal circulation and multi-modal standards when a land division or planned unit development is proposed. Like the east site, the west site is adjacent to Ashwood Road.

While water service was projected to be of similar cost to provide to all the study areas that comprise the Madras URA, there were differences in relative cost for providing sewer service given the need for pumping in some of the study areas. The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is part of a study area and a drainage area where no pumping or limited pumping would be required for sewer service. This minimizes the amount of energy needed to provide that service.

All residential development within the Yarrow Master Plan area are required be built to Earth Advantage/Energy Star standards and receive certification as stated in the Codes, Covenants, and Restrictions (CC\&R's) recorded for the development. Such requirement reduces energy consumption of each dwelling constructed in the Master Plan area and thereby conserves energy consumption which in part satisfies the Goal 13 requirements.

## Findings:

- The approved Yarrow Master Plan that applies to the east site of the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area proposes a variety of uses that will allow residents to take care of day-to-day needs without always having to drive out of the
neighborhood to do so. The plan also indicates multi-use paths and a continuous network of sidewalks to promote walking and bicycling. This supports fuel and energy conservation.
- Providing sewer service to the proposal area requires less pumping and, therefore, infrastructure, energy, and cost than other parts of the URA and other areas around the existing UGB.
- The CC\&R's recorded for the Yarrow Master Plan area require energy conservation by requiring future development to meet or exceed Earth Advantage/Energy Star standards.

Conclusion: The proposed map amendments comply with State requirements for energy conservation per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 13.

## Goal 14 Urbanization

To provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use, to accommodate urban population and urban employment inside urban growth boundaries, to ensure efficient use of land, and to provide for livable communities.

## (2) Orderly and economic provision of public facilities and services;

Response: The proposed map amendments respond to the need for more residentially zoned land as determined in the adopted Madras Urbanization Study and Addendum. The studies analyzed the potential for development inside the existing UGB and found that in addition to development that the existing UGB can accommodate, approximately 220 acres of land is needed outside the UGB for residential and related public/semi-public uses over the years until 2027. These studies provided the basis for the Madras URA and URAs are enabled by statewide rules that address orderly and efficient land use as well as an orderly and efficient process for amending UGBs when needed.

This proposed map amendment draws strictly from land in the URA, which is the first priority land to be included in the UGB pursuant to ORS 197.298 and Madras plan policies.

The proposed text amendments (Section III) contribute to orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use by clearly establishing the ways that Jefferson County and City of Madras zones correspond to Madras Comprehensive Plan designations.

Transportation, water, and sewer services are among the critical public facilities that must be provided for the proposed UGB amendment area. As discussed in the narrative and findings for Goals 11 and 12 above, these services can be provided to the UGB amendment area relying on planned capital improvements.

Transportation - Transportation analysis shows that all study intersections perform within adopted operational standards at the end of the planning horizon, with or without the proposed annexation and re-zoning of the east site, except for the intersections at US 97 and J Street. An analysis shows the performance of those intersections, as they are currently designed, exceed mobility standards with and without the proposed annexation and re-

[^22]zoning. Unless the intersections can be improved, the proposed annexation and re-zoning produce a "significant effect" on them by making worse an already failing condition.

Proposed improvements to the " $J$ " Street and US 97 intersections are included in the Madras 'TSP. Those improvements also are listed in the 2010-2013 Draft STIP, in effect programming the necessary state resources for them. On that basis, ODOT has determined the "J" Street/US 97 intersection improvements are "reasonably likely" to occur in the planning horizon (Appendix G). With those planned improvements in place, the affect of the proposed annexation is mitigated and the proposal will not have a significant effect.

Water - During the development of the Madras URA, Deschutes Valley Water District (DVWD) reported that there would be no supply constraint for urban development in the URA. Significant expansion of the District's distribution system would be necessary to serve urban demand in each part of the URA, and the water service study found that the marginal cost differences between the URA study areas were insignificant. Existing and planned facilities will provide sufficient water service to the area, as confirmed by Deschutes Valley Water District in a service provided letter (Appendix D).

Sewer - Public facility analysis conducted in developing the Madras URA showed that sewer service to the eastern study areas in the URA would be more cost-efficient because no pumping or limited pumping would be required as compared to areas to the north, south, and west. For the proposed UGB amendment area, existing and planned sewer facilities will provide sufficient service to the area according to City of Madras Public Works (Appendix D).

## Findings:

- The proposed map amendments address the residential land need established in the Madras urbanization studies. It draws from the Madras URA, which is the first priority land to be included in the UGB when land need is demonstrated.
- The text amendments facilitate the transition between County zoning and City land use designations and zoning.
- Water service can be provided to the proposal area using the existing and planned water facilities that are identified in the Deschutes Valley Water District's water master plan. Providing water service was not found to be significantly different in cost between different parts of the URA in studies done in developing the Madras URA.
- Studies conducted for the URA found that drainage areas in the eastern and southeastern parts of the URA were easier to serve in that they needed no pumping or minimal pumping of sewage when compared to other parts of the URA. Sewer service can be provided to the proposal area using the existing City of Madras sewer master plan.
- Sufficient transportation facilities and service can be provided to the proposed UGB amendment area given "reasonably likely" construction of improvements to the intersections of US 97/J Street before 2025.

[^23]Conclusion: The proposed map and text amendments comply with State requirements for orderly and economic urbanization and provision of public facilities and services per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 14.

## VI. Conformance with Oregon Revised Statutes (ORSs)

## ORS 197

197.298 Priority of land to be included within urban growth boundary. (1) In addition to any requirements established by rule addressing urbanization, land may not be included within an urban growth boundary except under the following priorities:
(a) First priority is land that is designated urban reserve land under ORS 195.145, rule or metropolitan service district action plan.
(b) If land under paragraph (a) of this subsection is inadequate to accommodate the amount of land needed, second priority is land adjacent to an urban growth boundary that is identified in an acknowledged comprehensive plan as an exception area or nonresource land. Second priority may include resource land that is completely surrounded by exception areas unless such resource land is high-value farmland as described in ORS 215.710.
(c) If land under paragraphs (a) and (b) of this subsection is inadequate to accommodate the amount of land needed, third priority is land designated as marginal land pursuant to ORS 197.247 (1991 Edition).
(d) If land under paragraphs (a) to (c) of this subsection is inadequate to accommodate the amount of land needed, fourth priority is land designated in an acknowledged comprehensive plan for agriculture or forestry, or both.
(2) Higher priority shall be given to land of lower capability as measured by the capability classification system or by cubic foot site class, whichever is appropriate for the current use.
(3) Land of lower priority under subsection (1) of this section may be included in an urban growth boundary if land of higher priority is found to be inadequate to accommodate the amount of land estimated in subsection (1) of this section for one or more of the following reasons:
(a) Specific types of identified land needs cannot be reasonably accommodated on higher priority lands;
(b) Future urban services could not reasonably be provided to the higher priority lands due to topographical or other physical constraints; or
(c) Maximum efficiency of land uses within a proposed urban growth boundary requires inclusion of lower priority lands in order to include or to provide services to higher priority lands. [1995 c. 547 §5; 1999 c. 59 §56]

Response: The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is solely comprised of land from the Madras URA, which is the first priority of land to be included within the UGB pursuant to ORS 197.298(1)(a). There is sufficient land in the Madras URA to provide for the land needs estimated for the next 20 years in the Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, August 2007) and presented below.

The proposed UGB amendment and annexation provides land to meet a portion of the need for residentially zoned land over the next roughly 20 years (Table 6-1). The City's next periodic review process will ensure that the Madras UGB includes enough land to meet the remaining land needs projected to 2027.

Table 6-1: Housing Needs, Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, August 2007)

| Table 6-4. Comparison of land supply and demand, Madras UGBs 2007-2027 and 2007-2057 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Plan Desigination | Land Demand |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Supply } \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ | Surplus (deficit)$2007-2027$ 2007-2057 |  |
|  | 2007-2027 | 2007-2057 |  |  |  |
| Residential |  |  |  |  |  |
| R-1 | 451.9 | 18355.7 | 398.1 | (53.8) | (957.6) |
| $\mathrm{R}-2$ | $40^{2} .1$ | 138.2 | 23.5 | (22.5) | (114.6) |
| R-3 | 148.0 | 444.0 | 242.6 | 94.8 | (201.2) |
| RR5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 32.7 | 32.7 | 32.7 |
| RR10 | 0.0 | 0.10 | 47.5 | 47.5 | 47.5 |
| RL | 0.0 | 0.0 | 38.7 | 38.7 | 38.7 |
| PubliciSemi-public ases on res land | 358.3 | 770.7 | 0.0 | (358.3) | (770.7) |
| Subtotal (Residential) | 1.004 .2 | 2,708.6 | 783.3 | (220.9) | [1,925.3) |
| Commercial (Retail \& Services) |  |  |  |  |  |
| C-1 | 230.6 | 758.1 | 50.2 | (150.4) | (677.9) |
| NC | 28.6 | 90.4 | 4.9 | (23.7) | (85.4) |
| CC | 0 | 0 | 32.6 | 32.5 | 32.6 |
| Subtotal Commercial | 259.2 | 848.5 | 117.7 | (141.5) | (730.8) |
| maustrial |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 254.4 | 749.9 | 296.9 | 45.5 | (452.9) |

197.610 Local government notice of proposed amendment or new regulation; exceptions; report to commission. (1) A proposal to amend a local government acknowledged comprehensive plan or land use regulation or to adopt a new land use regulation shall be forwarded to the Director of the Department of Land Conservation and Development at least 45 days before the first evidentiary hearing on adoption. The proposal forwarded shall contain the text and any supplemental information that the local government believes is necessary to inform the director as to the effect of the proposal. The notice shall include the date set for the first evidentiary hearing. The director shall notify persons who have requested notice that the proposal is pending.
(2) When a local government determines that the goals do not apply to a particular proposed amendment or new regulation, notice under subsection (1) of this section is not required. In addition, a local government may submit an amendment or new regulation with less than 45 days' notice if the local government determines that there are emergency circumstances requiring expedited review. In both cases:
(a) The amendment or new regulation shall be submitted after adoption as provided in ORS 197.615 (1) and (2); and
(b) Notwithstanding the requirements of ORS 197.830 (2), the director or any other person may appeal the decision to the board under ORS 197.830 to 197.845.
(3) When the Department of Land Conservation and Development participates in a local government proceeding, at least 15 days before the final hearing on the proposed amendment to the comprehensive plan or land use regulation or the new land use regulation, the department shall notify the local government of:
(a) Any concerns the department has concerning the proposal; and
(b) Advisory recommendations on actions the department considers necessary to address the concerns, including, but not limited to, suggested corrections to achieve compliance with the goals.
(4) The director shall report to the Land Conservation and Development Commission on whether the director:
(a) Believes the local government's proposal violates the goals; and
(b) Is participating in the local government proceeding. [1981 c. 748 §4; 1983 c. 827
§7; 1985 c. 565 §27; 1989 c. 761 §20; 1999 c. 622 §1]
Response: Notice of the proposed map and text amendments was sent to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) at least 45 days before the first evidentiary hearing on the proposal. Notice was sent to DLCD on December 14, 2009, which was more than 45 days before the first advisory hearing before the Jefferson County and City of Madras Planning Commissions on February 11, 2010. A notice addendum was submitted to DLCD on January 14, 2010. Further hearing dates have yet to be determined but DLCD provided comments on the proposal on January 29, 2010, more than 15 days prior to the final adoption hearing date.

DLCD comments address the map amendments. They call for a boundary locational analysis pursuant to OAR 660-024-0060 and a "reasonably likely" determination from OODT for the proposed 20 -acre rezoning. The locational analysis is not necessarily applicable because the proposed map amendment draws from an adopted and acknowledged URA. Part of the idea behind URAs is to create a 20 - to 50 -year reserve of land for urbanization all at once so that the process for subsequent UGB amendments can be streamlined. For cities or regions that do not have URAs, it is understood that the locational analysis established in -0060 would definitely be applicable and needed.

As to the "reasonably likely" determination, ODOT rendered an affirmative determination on February 2, 1010. DLCD comments acknowledge that the set of needed improvements at the intersections of US 97/J Street is in the current draft STIP. Including them in the final STIP signifies a financial commitment to the improvements and thus makes a clear finding for "reasonably likely."
197.626 Expanding urban growth boundary or designating urban or rural reserves subject to periodic review. A metropolitan service district that amends its urban growth boundary to include more than 100 acres, or that amends the district's regional framework plan or land use regulations implementing the plan to establish urban reserves designated under ORS 195.145 (1)(b), a city with a population of 2,500 or more within its urban growth boundary that amends the urban growth boundary to include more than 50 acres or that designates urban reserve under ORS 195.145, or a county that amends the county's comprehensive plan or land use regulations implementing the plan to establish rural reserves designated under ORS 195.141, shall submit the amendment or designation to the Land Conservation and Development Commission in the manner provided for periodic review under ORS 197.628 to 197.650. [1999 c. 622 §14; 2001 c. 672 §10; 2003 c. 793 §4; 2007 c. 723 §7]

Response: The City of Madras has coordinated with Jefferson County regarding the proposed map and text amendments. The amendments to the City and County Comprehensive Plans are post-acknowledgement plan amendments. However, the adoption process for the amendments will follow periodic review procedures pursuant to ORS 197. As part of periodic review procedures, the proposed amendments are subject to review by DLCD and approval by LCDC. DLCD and LCDC will conduct their review process upon adoption of the proposed amendments by the Madtas City Council and Jefferson County Board of Commissioners.

## Findings:

- The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is entirely comprised of land from the Madras URA, the first priority of land to be included in the UGB pursuant to ORS 197.298(1)(a).
- There are 36.91 acres in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation. This meets some of the estimated need for residentially zoned land outside the existing UGB projected to 2027 by urbanization studies. The proposed R-2 zoning for the 20 -acre parcel (east site) allows housing and public/semi-public uses such as parks and schools. Other land needs for the next 20 years will be addressed during the next periodic review cycle.
- Notice of the first advisory hearing on February 11, 2010 was sent to DLCD on December 14, 2009, more than 45 days before the advisory and evidentiary hearings. A notice addendum was filed on January 13, 2010.
- The City of Madras and Jefferson County have coordinated this proposed set of amendments.
- This proposal is a post-acknowledgement plan amendment (PAPA) but will follow procedures for periodic review. DLCD review and LCDC approval of the amendment will be necessary for the proposal if it is adopted by both the Madras City Council and Jefferson County Board of Commissioners.

Conclusion: The proposed map and text amendments comply with applicable State requirements for urban reserve area planning, plan amendments, and UGB amendments pursuant to ORS 197.

## VII. Conformance with the Urban Growth Area Management Agreement (UGAMA)

## 4. UGA ADMINISTRATION RESPONSIBILITIES

4.1. The City shall have responsibility for administration and decision making authority regarding all land use application within the UGB except applications for amendments to the UGB, as provided in Section 6.
4.2. The City shall have responsibility for annexation of land in the UGB. Lands outside the UGA shall not be annexed unless the UGB is also amended to include the territory to be annexed.
6. PROCESS FOR URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY AMENDMENTS
1.1 Amendments to the UGB, including amendments to the City's and County's comprehensive plan maps, may be initiated by the City, the County, or a property owner(s).
1.2 An application to amend the UGB shall be filed with the City Community Development Department along with the applicable City and County plan amendment fees. The City shall forward a copy of the application to the County Community Development Department, together with the County's plan amendment fee, within five working days of the date the application is filed.
1.3 The City and County Planning Commission shall each conduct a public hearing regarding the application. At their discretion, the Planning Commissions may hold a joint hearing rather than separate hearings.
1.4 The recommendation of the City and County Planning Commissions shall be forwarded to City Council, who shall hold a public hearing to consider the proposed amendment to the UGB. The decision of the City Council shall be forwarded to the County Board of Commissioners.
1.5 The Board of Commissioners shall conduct a public hearing and make a final decision on whether the UGB should be amended.
1.6 If the City and County disagree on the proposed amendments, a joint hearing of the City Council and Board of County Commissioners may be held to attempt to resolve the differences. Both jurisdictions may also request a dispute resolution process to resolve the differences.
1.7 If the governing bodies are not able to come to mutual agreement there shall be no change to the UGB.

Response: The Urban Growth Area Management Agreement (UGAMA) (Appendix H) was adopted by the City of Madras and Jefferson County on April 5, 2006. Pursuant to UGAMA terms for UGB amendments, the City is an eligible applicant for a UGB amendment application (Section 6.1). The UGB amendment application and appropriate fees were forwarded to the Jefferson County Community Development Department within five working days of being initially filed (Section 6.2).

Hearings by the Madras Planning Commission and Jefferson County Planning Commission were first held jointly on February 11, 2010. The Madras City Council and Jefferson County

Board of Commissioners held a joint public hearing on March 29, 2010 to review their recommendations from their respective Planning Commissions. On March 29, 2010, the Madras City Council approved the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments and forwarded it's recommendation that evening to the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners who then approved the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment. All of the public hearings before the Planning Commissions, Madras City Council, and Jefferson County Board of Commissioners were conducted in a manner consistent with the provisions of the UGAMA.

It is proposed to annex both the east site and west site to the Madras UGB and city limits, and it is proposed to re-zone only the east site at this time. Regardless, if both sites are brought into the UGB and city limits, Madras will assume land use administration and decision making authority for the sites pursuant to Section 4.1 of the UGAMA.

## Findings:

- The City is an eligible applicant for a UGB amendment application.
- Appropriate UGB amendment application materials and fees were forwarded to the Jefferson County Community Development Department in the prescribed amount of time.
- The proposal will be heard jointly by the County and City Planning Commissions and then separately by the County Board of Commissioners and City Council.
- Madras assumes administrative responsibility for any land annexed to its UGB and city limits.

Conclusion: The proposed map amendments comply with applicable local requirements for UGB amendments per the UGAMA between Jefferson County and the City of Madras, adopted April 5, 2006.

# VIII. Conformance with the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan 

## Goal 14: Urbanization

Policy 1: Changes to urban growth boundaries, the establishment of new urban growth boundaries or urban reserve areas, incorporation of a new city, or annexation of land into a city which is not in an established urban growth boundary requires an amendment to this Plan and the Zoning Map. The following factors should be used in considering such proposals:
A. Demonstrated need to accommodate long-range urban population consistent with a 20- to 50-year population forecast coordinated with the cities;
B. Demonstrated need for housing, employment opportunities, livability or uses such as public facilities, streets and roads, schools, parks or open space;
C. Orderly and economic provision of public facilities and services;
D. Maximum efficiency of land uses within and on the fringe of the existing urban area.
E. Comparative environmental, energy, economic and social consequences;
F. Compatibility of the proposed urban uses with nearby agricultural activities on land outside the UGB; and
G. Priority of land as required by ORS 197.298. Non-irrigated parcels may be added to the UGB before irrigated parcels that are in the same statutory priority.

Response: The proposed change to the UGB fulfills some of the need for residentially zoned land outside the existing UGB as identified in the Madras Urbanization Study and Addendum. The urbanization studies found the need for approximately 220 acres of residentially zoned land - for residential and public/semi-public uses - over the next 15-20 years. This is land that was found to be needed outside the existing UGB once all residential land inside the existing UGB is built out. Although the studies found a land need primarily for residential uses, employment and public/semi-public uses also were also determined to need land inside and outside the existing UGB in the next 20-50 years.

The studies were the basis for adopting the Madras URA, which the County adopted in November 2008 and DLCD acknowledged in July 2009. The proposed UGB and map amendments draw strictly from land designated as URA, which is the first priority land to include in the UGB pursuant to ORS 197.298. The proposed residential zoning and expected primarily residential uses are compatible with residential development on the edges within the existing UGB, and provide a similar buffer to resource land outside the UGB.

Proposed Amendments to Madras Comprehensive Plan and
Madras and Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Maps

The URA is comprised of land that is classified as "exception" land as well as land zoned by the County as Range Land (RL). Range land was included in the URA because: exception land could not meet all the land needs of the next 20-50 years on its own; range land is lower value resource land; and range land surrounding the existing UGB - particularly to the east and southeast - would be more easily served with sewer than other land surrounding the existing UGB.
'The ability to serve land on the east and southeast of the existing UGB and to urbanize land that is not parcelized like the exception land in the URA, as well as the lower resource value of the land, offer more land use efficiency and cost-effectiveness and fewer impacts on prime resource land than initially bringing other land in the URA into the UGB. This gives land on the east comparative advantages in economic, energy, environmental, and social terms.

Policy 2: The County shall cooperate with each city to determine where and when an urban growth boundary should be expanded.
2.1 Expansion of an existing urban growth boundary shall be in accordance with state requirements, including the priority of land to be included within the urban growth boundary. Non-irrigated land should have a higher priority for inclusion in the boundary than irrigated land.

Response: Jefferson County and City of Madras staff have closely coordinated the proposed map amendments, and the first evidentiary hearing for the proposal will be a joint meeting of the County and City Planning Commissions. The two jurisdictions also worked closely together to adopt the Madras URA in 2008.

The proposed map amendments comply with applicable Statewide Planning Goals, statutes, and administrative rules as demonstrated in previous sections of this report. The proposed UGB amendment is comprised of land from the Madras URA, which is the first priority for inclusion in the UGB pursuant to ORS 197.298. The land is not irrigated.

## Findings:

- The proposed UGB and map amendments provide some of the residentially zoned land that is needed outside the existing UGB in the next $15-20$ years as found in Madras urbanization studies.
- The amendments draw only from non-irrigated land in the Madras URA, which is the first priority land to include in the UGB pursuant to state statute.
- Residential and related public/non-public uses will be compatible with residential development adjacent and inside the existing UGB, as it will with resource land outside the UGB that already borders residential uses just inside the UGB.
- The ability of the land in the proposed amendment area to be more easily served with sewer than other land in the URA or other land surrounding the existing UGB and to build more densely than developed exception land provides land use, energy, and investment efficiencies. Developing more efficiently and on low resource land instead of
high resource land also present social and environmental benefits when compared to other land surrounding the existing UGB.
- Jefferson County and City of Madras have collaborated on the proposed map amendments.
- The proposed map amendments comply with applicable Statewide Planning Goals, statutes, and administrative rules.

Conclusion: The proposed map amendments comply with applicable policies from the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan.

## IX. Conformance with the City of Madras Comprehensive Plan

GOAL 14 - To provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land and to provide for livable communities.
[Paragraph amended by Ordinance No. 781, Passed by Council on December 12, 2006]

## POLICIES

A. The City, in cooperation with Jefferson County, shall establish an Urban Growth Boundary.
B. The City, in cooperation with Jefferson County, shall mutually agree to a management plan for the Urban Growth Boundary area.
C. The City, in cooperation with Jefferson County, shall establish an Urban Growth Boundary revision process to be utilized in a proposed change of the Urban Growth Boundary.
D. The Citv, in cooperation with Jefferson Countv, shall support adoption of an Urban Reserve Area boundary that, when taken together with land supplies in the Urban Growth Boundary, mav contain up to a 50 -vear supplv of land for the City of Madras to support housing, economic development, public facility, recreation needs and other urban land needs.
E. The City, in cooperation with Jefferson County, shall give priority to land in designated urban reserve areas over other land when considering urban growth boundary amendments.

Response: The Madras City Council approved the Madras URA in October 2008 and the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners in November 2008. DLCD and LCDC received the URA proposal for review in January 2009, and approved the proposal - but remanded sections of proposed County Zoning Ordinance amendments having to do with use restrictions in the URA - in July 2009. The land in the proposed UGB amendment that is the subject of this application is land entirely drawn from the Madras URA, land estimated to be needed for urbanization over the next 50 years.
F. The City shall favor UGB amendments that involve land in locations that are suitable to address identified urban land needs in order to minimize buildable land supply shortages and address identified needs. Factors that will be considered when evaluating UGB additions include:

1. Existing and planned capacity of the transportation system
2. Existing and planned capacity of the city waste water treatment plant
3. Existing and planned capacity of the city sanitarv sewer conveyance system
4. Existing and planned capacity of the Deschutes Valley Water District supply system
5. Impacts on schools, parks, and public safetv service providers
6. Impacts on future operating costs for public facilities and services
G. The Citv, in cooperation with Jefferson County, shall undertake an evaluation of the urban growth boundary land supplv once everv five vears or more frequently if certified population growth rates exceed $3.2 \%$ in three consecutive vears. In the event certified population growth rates fall below $3.2 \%$ for three consecutive years, the City and County mav agree to postpone the evaluation of UGB land supply for up to three vears.
H. During vears when a comprehensive UGB land supply evaluation is not scheduled, individual applications for addinq property to the UGB shall be limited to requests of less than 40 acres. UGB amendment applications must demonstrate consistency with applicable Oregon statutes and administrative rules and be accompanied bv information that addresses Policy 14-J below. Applications that involve more than 5 acres also must comply with provisions of Policy 14-I.

Q1. The City, in cooperation with Jefferson Countr, shall encourage the development of complete, livable communities that include characteristics such as: a variety of lot sizes, dwelling unit types and ownership types, open spaces and other recreational amenities, a mix of land uses, school and community facilities, connected streets, proximity to downtown and other employment centers, and development that is scaled to the pedestrian and creates a sense of place. New growth areas of more than 5 acres that are added to the UGB shall should be planned and developed in accordance either with a master planned community development plan approved under the city Master Planned Community Overlay zone, or an Area Master Plan. The Citv encourages Master Planned Communities as a means to meet citv housing needs as explained in other comprehensive plan documents. It mav be appropriate, however, for the city to add new growth areas to the UGB that are planned and developed in accordance with an approved Area Master Plan. A majority of property owners subiect to a Master Planned Community, or to an Area Master Plan, must consent to be included in the plan.

1. A Master Planned Community (MPC) Overlav may apply to large multi-phased development projects where the master plan is intended to quide future development patterns and serves to requlate the site-development approval process. A MPC requires generous open space and amenities, and encourages efficient use of land and public facilities and services, a variety of housing types, innovative designs and complete pedestrian-friendly communities. A MPC shall demonstrate efficient use of land consistent with an identified urban land need, show appropriate locations for transportation improvements, public facilities, and the protection of significant open space, scenic, historic, and natural resource areas. A MPC must show how planned land uses will be integrated with the existing urban development pattern. Physical barriers, such as highways, tend to disrupt complete communities and livability because they disconnect areas from downtown and result in an auto-oriented environment of sprawl along highway corridors.
2. An Area Master Plan (AMP) is appropriate for land added to the UGB where the approval of future urban development is expected to relv on conventional urban zoning and the application of codified development standards and review procedures. An AMP mav be prepared for contiguous properties added to the UGB that are greater than 5 acres and are not subject to a MPC overlay. An AMP shall demonstrate efficient use of land, zoning consistent with an identified urban land need, appropriate locations for transportation improvements, public facilities, protection for significant open space, scenic, historic, and natural
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# resource areas. An AMP must show how planned land uses will be integrated with the existing urban development pattern. <br> 3. An approved Master Planned Community Plan or an Area Master Plan must include documentation that a maiority of property owners support the conversion of land to the planned urban uses and also consent to annexation bv the citv of Madras using a voluntary annexation process that is outlined in the plan. 

Response: The total area under consideration is 36.4 acres, which is less than the 40 acre maximum established for interim UGB annexation requests. The east site of the proposed UGB amendment and annexation arca is part of the approved Yarrow Master Plan arca. The plan designates land for predominantly residential land uses, which is compatible with adjacent development in the UGB, while also designating land for open space and park uses, community services including schools, and limited neighborhood commercial services. The conceptual plan also shows an internal transportation system that includes sidewalks and multi-use paths.

The east site is being proposed for both annexation to the UGB and Madras city boundaries. The site can be adequately served with water and sewer facilities given existing and planned facilities, according to the service providers (Appendix D). The site is not projected to have a significant adverse effect on surrounding transportation facilities given planned improvements for the intersections of US 97/J Street (Appendices F and G). Its proposed designation as Multi-family Residential is consistent with land needs identified in the 2007 urbanization studies and with residential zoning in the area.

Pursuant to Policy I-1: "An AMP shall demonstrate efficient use of land, zoning consistent with an identified urban land need, appropriate locations for transportation improvements, public facilities, protection for significant open space, scenic, historic, and natural resource areas." It is proposed to annex the west site to the Madras UGB and city limits but to retain its existing County Range Land (RL) zoning until the owners are ready to propose development. The site is surrounded by land designated for residential and related uses, and its future land use and zoning designation must allow for residential and compatible public/semi-public uses in order to show that land uses on the west site can be: "integrated with the existing urban development pattern." (Policy I-2) The proposed addition of a table showing Madras and County zones that correspond with Madras land use designations to the Madras Comprehensive Plan Section IV, Land Use Element (Table 3-1), will facilitate the transition of existing County zoning to appropriate City zoning.

The west site is comprised of three lots - Lots 101 and 200 that total 16.22 acres and are privately owned and Lot 102 that is 0.69 acres designated for County right-of-way. Lots 101 and 200 are both adjacent to Ashwood Road, a County collector, and will not require additional public roads for sufficient internal or local circulation. At the time of proposed development, proposed land division or planned development plans must show an internal circulation system that satisfies City code requirements and street standards. The west site is adjacent to the existing Madras UGB and is bordered by Ashwood Road, which eases extension of services from inside the existing UGB and city limits to the west site. Water and sewer service providers have attested that existing and planned facilities will be sufficient to serve the west site (Appendix D).

The County has not identified historic, scenic, or natural resources on the west site. City open space requirements for subdivisions or planned developments will apply to the site at the time of proposed development.
J. All land use applications or legislative proposals to expand the Madras UGB must be accompanied bv information that documents the following:

1. The proposed urban zoning or land use program for the subject properties that address an identified urban land need;
2. An annexation proaram for all subject properties:
3. Evidence that public facilities required by OAR 660-011-000 that are necessary to serve the expansion area can be served either by system improvements outlined in adopted public facility master plans or by supplemental improvements that augment adopted public facility master plans:
4. Evidence that the proposed zoning or land use plan complies with requirements of OAR 660-0012-0060 either by demonstrating that planned improvements in the Madras Transportation System Plan (TSP) have capacity to meet transportation needs for the proposed expansion area or through supplemental transportation improvements that augment the adopted TSP to meet the need;
5. Evidence that providers of other crucial public facilities (e.q. schools, parks and recreation, emergencv services and health care) are able to meet the proiected demand for their services;
6. Evidence that financing for constructing needed public improvements is available so that the expansion area can be developed as planned within the planning horizon:
7. Evidence that development in areas subject to natural hazards are protected from these hazards:
8. Evidence that known or probable significant resources related to open space. scenic areas, historic places or structures, and fish and wildlife habitat will be protected from development impacts or have development impacts offset using appropriate mitiqation measures.

## Response:

Zoning and Land Use Designations (Policy J1)
The east site is proposed to be re-zoned to a City R-2 designation. This meets some of the need for residentially zoned land outside the existing UGB that is projected for the next 15 20 years. Residentially zoned land will provide for housing and public/semi-public uses. This land need is documented in the Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, August 2007). (See Table 5-2)

The west site is proposed to retain its existing County Range Land (RL) designation until the time when further land use action and development is proposed. Existing zoning will allow only limited development, and appropriate future designations for the site will be City residential designations given that City open space and residential zoning currently surround the site.

When rezoning is proposed for the west site and for other land being converted from rural to urban, the proposed text amendments (Table 3-1) will assist and regulate the rezoning that will occur when changing County zoning to City land use designations and zoning.

## Annexation Program (Policy J2)

The City is the applicant for this proposal, and annexation program pursuant to Article 7 of its Zoning Ordinance is described later in this report.

Goal 11 Public Facilities (Policy J3) and Transportation Planning Rule (Policy J4)
Kittelson \& Associates has performed the transportation analysis needed to deem whether the proposed UGB amendment constitutes a significant effect on the transportation system. Given that schools generate more peak hour traffic than housing alone, two scenarios were developed for Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) analysis that involved both housing and a school. Using these scenarios in a TPR analysis, it was found that the increase in traffic did constitute a significant effect on the US 97/J Street intersections. However, given improvements included in the City's amended TSP and Draft 2010-2013 STIP, the effect can be mitigated and removed.

Public facility analysis for establishing the Madras URA ranked drainage catchment areas around the existing UGB for sewer service costs and serviceability. Of the six study areas that comprised the preliminary and then final URA, Study Areas 3 and 4 on the east and southeast consistently ranked higher than other areas. This can, in part, be attributed to proximity to the new South Wastewater Treatment Plant (SWWTP) and being upslope of the plant. In particular, the proposed UGB amendment and annexation are is located in Catchment Area 180 and bordering on Catchment Area 179. These areas ranked $8^{\text {th }}$ and $12^{\text {th }}$ out of 60 catchment areas, making them among the more cost-effective and serviceable areas of the URA.

As was also determined during the URA public facility analysis, Deschutes Valley Water District (DVWD) found that there would be insignificant differences in providing water service to the different parts of the URA. Water supply in the region is adequate to ample. Similarly, existing and planned sewer facilities provided by the City will be sufficient to serve the proposal area. (See service providet letters in Appendix D)

## Other Public Facilities (Policy J5)

The east site has access to substantial park and recreation resources. Juniper Hills Park (County) and Bean Park (City) are nearby, as well as Jefferson County Middle School and its fields. The Yarrow Master Plan that applies to the site and surrounding land also designates open space and parks throughout the plan area.

The City reports that Mountain View Hospital and City public safety and emergency services are sufficient to provide services for the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area. The sites are served by the Jefferson County School District 509-J.

Financing for Improvements (Policy J6)
Financing for constructing the needed public improvements will be placed upon property owners. As demonstrated by the letters submitted by the City of Madras Public Works

Director and Deschutes Valley Water District General Manager, each respective utility has capacity to service the properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB To extend wastewater and domestic water services to the properties to be included in the UGB, each property owner will be responsible for extending services lines to their property, not with standing the requirements for annexing their property into the Madras city limits.

Similarly, the Oregon Department of Transportation has determined the proposed UGB expansion will significantly affect the US 97/J Street intersection but that the design concept is established, the City has implemented System Development Charges to partially fund the improvements for this particular intersection and in the Draft State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP) is funding for the intersection. With the design concept established and both funding sources identified, ODOT has determined that the US 97/ J Street intersection improvements are Reasonably Likely to Occur and therefore, impacts of the proposed UGB expansion are mitigated.

Protection from Natural Hazards (Policy J7)
There are not steep slopes (slopes greater than $25 \%$ ), floodway, or floodplain in the proposed UGB expansion and annexation area. In fact, the proposed amendment and annexation are driven, in part, by the need to provide a school that is outside the floodway and floodplain of Willow Creek and its tributaries.

Fire protection service for the proposal area is currently provided by Jefferson County Fire Protection District \#1, and will continue to be provided by that district if the land is annexed to the city. The area is subject to a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) that Jefferson County completed in 2005 in collaboration with the fire district and federal agencies.

## Protection of Goal 5 Resources (Policy J8)

The Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan, Goal 5 inventory, or Jefferson County Geographic Information System (GIS) files do not identify floodways, floodplains, significant habitat, or cultural resources in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area. The only resources cited above that may apply to the site are open spaces. While open space will be a required part of public use or residential development that occurs in this area, this proposal itself is not a development or entitlement proposal and, therefore, does not specify precisely where such open space will be designated.

## Findings:

- Amendments to zoning and land use designations are planned and proposed. The proposed City land use designation is residential and City zoning designation R-2 (Multiple Family Residential). A need for about 22 acres of land outside the existing UGB zoned R-2 was determined in the Madras Urbanization Study Addendum.
- Proposed text amendments facilitate the transition from urban to rutal zoning, from County zoning to City land use designations and zoning.
- Existing and planned transportation facilities - including improvements for the US 97/J Street intersections in the Madras TSP and the 2010-2013 Draft STIP, which ODOT has deemed reasonably likely - will allow the study intersections to operate
within adopted standards both in the case of the proposal area being annexed and rezoned and not.
- Existing and planned water and sewer facilities will be sufficient to serve the proposal area.
- The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area has access to nearby parks, a middle school, and a high school. Rezoning the 20 -acre east site to R-2 will allow for residential and public/semi-public uses there.
- Financing of wastewater and domestic water services will be placed upon property owners once the properties are annexed and developed in a manner that is consistent with the service providers facility plans.
- In terms of natural hazards, there are not slopes greater than $25 \%$, floodway, or floodplain in the proposed UGB expansion and annexation area. The proposed amendments and annexation are based, in part, on the need to provide a school that is outside the floodway and floodplain of Willow Creek and its tributaries. Fire protection service for the proposal area is and will be provided by Jefferson County Fire Protection District \#1.
- There are not floodways, floodplains, habitat, or cultural resources that are identified in the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan, Goal 5 inventory, or Jefferson County Geographic Information System (GIS) files in the proposal area. Open space will be provided pursuant to Madras zoning ordinance ( $\mathrm{M} Z \mathrm{O}$ ) in which $30 \%$ of a Master Planned Community must be open space (MZO Section 3.12(D)(4)).

Conclusion: The proposed map and text amendments comply with the relevant policies of the Madras Comprehensive Plan.

## X. Conformance with the City of Madras Community Development Code

## City of Madras Zoning Ordinance

## ARTICLE 7: ANNEXATION

SECTION 7.1: PURPOSE - The purpose of this section is to:
A. Implement the policies of the City of Madras Comprehensive Plan;
B. Provide for City review of all annexation requests for a determination of the availability of facilities and services as related to the proposal;
C. Provide for dissemination of public information and for sufficient time for public review;
D. Provide for City and County coordination of a request for an annexation; and E. Provide for an expedited process by establishing procedures whereby the annexation and zoning, if applicable, may be considered concurrently.

SECTION 7.2: APPLICATION PROCEDURE. Annexation is a land use decision and is subject to applicable provisions of the City of Madras Comprehensive Plan, Oregon Revised Statutes, and Oregon Administrative Rules. In addition, the procedures below shall be followed.
A. The Planning Commission shall conduct a public hearing after notification of all property owners with two hundred fifty feet ( $250^{\prime}$ ) outside of the boundary(ies) of the proposed annexation. The Planning Commission shall review the proposal for compliance with the annexation policies contained in this Ordinance and make a recommendation to the City Council, based on:

1. The annexation proposal which meets the application requirements; and 2. The Planning Commission shall conduct a public hearing to determine a recommendation to the City Council to approve, approve with conditions or modifications, or disapprove the feasibility of the annexation proposal based on the criteria set forth in Section 7.4 below; and
2. The Planning Commission shall state its recommendation and the reasons therefore in writing to the City Council.
B. Upon receipt of the Planning Commission recommendation, the City Council shall conduct a public hearing and consider an Ordinance declaring the requested lands to be annexed to the City of Madras.
3. The City Council shall review the record of the Planning Commission hearing their recommendation and shall determine whether to approve, approve with conditions or modifications, or disapprove the feasibility of the proposed annexation in accordance with the criteria set forth in Section 7.4 below.
4. The City Council may conduct additional public hearings to assist their making a determination.
5. The City Council shall state its determination and the reasons therefore in writing.

Response: The City of Madras sent public hearing notice to the surrounding property owners on February 1, 2010. The City and County Planning Commissions held their first public hearing on February 11, 2010. The City Planning Commission decided upon a recommendation to approve the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment (10-PA-01) at its hearing on February 11, 2010 and forwarded it to the Madras City Council. The City

Council is held a public hearing jointly with the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners on March 29, 2010. The City of Madras has not provided notice to affected property and adjacent property owners, or noticed the public hearings for the annexation of 20 acres of the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment to expand the Madras UGB by approximately 36.91 acres.

SECTION 7.3: ANNEXATION APPLICATION. The petitioner for annexation shall complete an application form provided by the Community Development Department. The application fee, established by Resolution of the City of Madras City Council, shall be submitted with the application. The application shall include:
A. A map demonstrating that the proposed annexation is contiguous to the City Limits; B. Specific information on each parcel within the proposed annexation area:

1. Current assessed valuation shown on Jefferson County Assessor's tax rolls.
2. Acreage of both public and private property to be annexed.
3. Map and tax lot(s) number.
C. Names and ages of all residents and list of registered voters in the proposed annexation area.
D. Addresses of all parcels within the proposed annexation area.
E. Consent to Annexation forms, provided by the City of Madras, with notarized signatures of all property owners and electors within the proposed annexation area.
F. Written findings, which address the following:
4. Existing land uses within annexation area.
5. Existing zoning within the annexation area.
6. Existing improvements:
a. water system
b. streets
c. sanitary sewer.
d. storm drainage
7. Special Districts within the area:
a. water districts
b. irrigation districts
c. fire district
d. school district
e. other
8. Urban services, the present availability of urban service systems to the proposed annexation area, their capacity and cost of extension and/or improvement to urban standards:
a. sanitary sewers - streets - parks
b. storm drainage - water
c. fire-power
d. schools-police
G. Compliance with all applicable policies of the City of Madras Comprehensive Plan.

Response: The City is initiating and applying for the proposed annexation. Maps of the west site and east site in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area are included in this report as Figure 4-1. Parcel size and other parcel information is presented in Section I, Proposal Summary. The City owns the taxlot where the east site is located. The 20 -acre parcel that is being created from the taxlot has been surveyed. The west site is comprised of three taxlots, two taxlots that are privatcly owned and one small taxlot ( 0.69 acres) that is

[^24]County right-of-way. Re-zoning is not proposed for this site at this time as there are no immediate development plans. However, this site does better connect the east site to the existing UGB and will be suitable for residential uses and compatible public/semi-public uses, for which Madras urbanization studies have found a long-term need.

The property proposed to be included in the UGB amendment and annexed currently is vacant and not in active use. It is land under Jefferson County jurisdiction and zoned Range Land (RL). There are not water, sewer, or storm water facilities and services extended to the site yet, but they can be extended using existing City facility master plans. The Deschutes Valley Water District (DVWD) provides water service to the area and can provide facilities and service to the site, to be financed primarily by development applicants. The same is true for sewer and storm water facilities and service, for which the City of Madras is the service provider. As part of its agreement with JCSD, the City will extend water and sewer to the edge of the east site. There is an irrigation district in the region - the Central Oregon Irrigation District - but the proposal area is not irrigated nor is it proposed to be.

There is a County collector road - Ashwood Road - along the northern border of the area that will not need improvements according to transportation analysis conducted for this proposal. (See Appendix F)

Jefferson County Fire Protection District \#1 currently provides service for the area and will continue to do so. Public safety responsibility for the area will be transferred from the County to the City. In terms of parks and recreation, there are two parks and a middle school close to the site, and the Yarrow Master Plan, which includes and surrounds the east site, includes the $30 \%$ of parks and open space required by local code (MZO Section 3.12(D)(4)).

As addressed in the previous section of this report, the application complies with the applicable policies of the Madras Comprehensive Plan.

SECTION 7.4: ANNEXATION CRITERIA. Lands may be annexed only if the City
Council finds that the following criteria are met:
A. The property is contiguous to the City limits.
B. The property is located within the City's Urban Growth Boundary.
C. The annexation meets at least one of the following purposes:

1. To serve lands needing City water or sewer to alleviate a present or potential health hazard; or
2. To provide land to accommodate future urban development; or
3. To provide land for provision of needed transportation or utility facilities; or
4. To ensure that lands adjacent to the City are developed in a manner consistent with City standards.
D. The petitioner has adequately addressed infrastructure supply and demand issues. The annexation is considered timely in that an adequate level of urban services and infrastructure can be provided upon annexation or a plan is in place for the provision of such services or infrastructure in a reasonable period of time.
$E$. The proposed annexation complies with the City's Comprehensive Plan. If the Comprehensive Plan does not control the annexation, or substantial changes in
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conditions have occurred which render the Comprehensive Plan inapplicable to the annexation, the proposed annexation complies with current Statewide Planning Goals. $F$. The City is capable of extending City services to the area proposed for annexation without negatively impacting existing systems and the City's ability to adequately serve all areas within the existing City limits.
G. The proposed annexation is compatible with the existing topography, potential for future land division, natural hazards and other related considerations.

Response: The proposal area is adjacent to the Madras city limits and is simultaneously seeking to be annexed to the Madras UGB and to the city. 'The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area provides land for future urban development, specifically for a needed school and housing as demonstrated by the Madras Urbaniqation Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, 2007). The east site of the proposal area is part of the Yarrow Master Plan area that the City has approved and found to be consistent with City development goals and standards.

The proposal area can be served by water and sewer using existing water and sewer master plans and being financed by the City and developers of the sites. Ashwood Road on the north side of the proposal area is a County collector road and does not need improvements in order to serve the area. Planned improvements for US 97/J Street are the only improvements needed in the vicinity in order to mitigate any potential significant effects associated with this proposal (Appendix F). Internal circulation and transportation facilities will need to be shown in future development applications.

## SECTION 8.2: ZONE/PLAN MAP AMENDMENTS

A. Amendment to the Zone/Plan Map

1. Amendment to the Zone/Plan Map may be initiated by the Planning Commission, City Council, Community Development Director, Land Use Periodic Review, or by application of the property owner.
2. If the application is for a change of a quasi-judicial or legislative nature: a. the Planning Commission shall conduct a public hearing on the proposed amendment at its earliest practical meeting date after the proposal is submitted and shall follow the adopted rules for quasijudicial hearings
3. $\underline{b}$. the Planning Commission shall provide a recommendation to the City Council based on findings-of-fact;
4. $\underline{c}$. The City Council shall hold a public hearing and review the recommendation of the Planning Commission, along with any public testimony on the issue. The City Council must take final action on an amendment request and amendments shall be made by ordinance.
5. An application for a zone change for land annexed to the city that is subiect to an approved Master Planned Community Plan or an approved Area Master Plan may be considered as an administrative action per Article 9.3.
B. Criteria for Amendments: The burden of proof is upon the applicant. The applicant shall show the proposed change is:
[^25]1. In conformity with all applicable state statutes.
2. In conformity with the applicable Statewide Planning Goals; and
3. In conformity with the Madras Comprehensive Plan, Zoning and Land Use Ordinance, and policies; and
4. In conformity with an approved Master Planned Community Plan or Area Master Plan, if applicable to the underlying properties; and
5. That there is a change of circumstances or further studies justifying the amendment or mistake in the original zoning.

Response: This application is being initiated by the City Community Development Department/Director. Also pursuant to the terms of the UGAMA between the County and the City, the City forwarded the UGB amendment application and appropriate fees to the Jefferson County Community Development Department within five working days of being initially filed.

This application is being processed pursuant to legislative procedures and will receive full review by the public, the City Planning Commission, and the City Council. Hearings by the Madras Planning Commission and Jefferson County Planning Commission will be held first jointly on February 11, 2010. The Madras City Council will review the City Planning Commission's recommendation at a hearing on February 11, 2010, and will forward its decision to the County Board of Commissioners for a hearing on March 29, 2010.

As demonstrated by the previous findings, the proposed comprehensive plan, comprehensive plan map, and zoning map amendments comply with applicable Statewide Planning Goals, State statutes, and Madras Comprehensive Plan policies.

## Findings:

- The City has followed procedures for providing notice and holding public hearings for the proposal. Notice to adjacent property owners was mailed On February 1, 2010 to all properties within 750 feet of the properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB. A joint City and County Planning Commission hearing was held on February 11, 2010 and then a joint hearing before the Madras City Council and Jefferson County Board of Commissioners was held on March 29, 2010. The City Council and County Board of Commissioners heard the proposal on March 29, 2010 and approved the proposal on March 29, 2010.
- The City of Madras has initiated this proposal. It owns the east site of the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area and has an agreement with Jefferson County School District 509-J to exchange this land for land downtown upon annexation and re-zoning.
- The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area provides land needed for residential and public/semi-public uses, specifically for a needed school and housing as demonstrated by the Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, 2007).
- All service providers - the City of Madras, Jefferson County, Deschutes Valley Water District, Jefferson County Fire Protection District \#1, Jefferson County School District 509-J - have capacity to serve the proposal area given implementation of existing water and sewer master plans, planned improvements to US 97/J Street intersections, and financing from future proposed development.
- The east site of the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is part of the approved Yarrow Master Plan area, and the west site fulfills the requirements for an Area Master Plan. The set of proposed map and text amendments in this application comply with applicable Statewide Planning Goals, State statutes, and Madras Comprehensive Plan policies.

Conclusion: The proposed map and text amendments comply with the relevant provisions of the Madras Zoning Ordinance.

## Appendix A: West Site Tax Map (3 lots, 16.91 acres)



# Appendix B: East Site Legal Description and Survey Map (20-acre parcel) 



City of Madras
Job\# 09077

## PROPERTY DESCRIPTION FOR A 20.00 ACRE TRACT OF LAND FOR SCHOOL DISTRICT 509-J

A portion of Parcel 2 of Partition Plat No. 2002-12 as filed in the Jefferson County Clerk's Office, situated in the Northeast Quarter (NE 1/4) of Section 7, Township 11 South, Range 14 East of the Willamette Meridian, Jefferson County, Oregon, more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the Northwest corner of said Northeast Quarter, monumented with a 2 inch diameter brass cap, from which the Northeast corner of said Section 7 bears South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 2640.53 feet; thence South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ East along the North line of said Section 7 a distance of 599.97 feet; thence South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 40.00 feet to the Northwest corner of said Parcel 2 of Partition Plat No. 2002-12; thence continuing South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ West along the West line of said Parcel 2 a distance of 40.00 feet to the South right-of-way line of East Ashwood Road and the True Point of Beginning of this Description; thence South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ East along said West line a distance of 935.13 feet to the Southeast corner of Parcel 1 of said Partition Plat No. 200217; thence leaving said West line South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 931.70 feet; thence North $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 935.12 feet to a point on the South right-of-way line of East Ashwood Road; thence North $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ West along said right-of-way line a distance of 931.70 feet to the True Point of Beginning.

Containing 20.00 acres more or less.

## End of Description.



Renews: 12/31/2009



## Appendix C: Urban Reserve Ârea Management Agreement (URAMA) (January 2009)

## Urban Reserve Area Management Agreement

This agreement is entered into by the City of Madras, an incorporated municipality of the State of Oregon, hereby referred to as the "City" and Jefferson County, a political subdivision of the State of Oregon, hereby referred as "County".

## A. RECITALS

WHEREAS, the City of Madras and Jefferson County are authorized pursuant to Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) Chapter 190 to enter into an Jntergovermmental Management Agreement for the performance of functions which either governmental entity has the authority to perform; and

WHEREAS the City and County have previously entered into an intergovernmental agreement on April 5, 2006 setting forth their respective rights and responsibilities with respect to the Urban Growth Bounardy (UGB); and

WHEREAS, the Management Agreement also constitutes a cooperative agreement under ORS Chapter 195; and

WHEREAS the City and County consider it mutually advantageous to establish this Urban Reserve Area Management Agreement (URAMA) for the purpose of facilitating the future conversion of lands in the Urban Reserve Area (URA) from rural to urban land uses.

## B. INTENT OF AGREEMENT

1. To establish standards and procedures for review and action on proposed land use actions and related matiers noted within this agreement pertaining to implementation of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan and Zoning Regulations as adopted by the City and County for the Urban Reserve Area (URA); and
2. To affirm Jefferson County's jurisdictional authority for current planning activities, land use decisions, building permilting, public improvements, and code enforcement within the URA ; and
3. To provide assistance to property owners in the URA by laying out a clear and cooperative process designed to make decisions on land use applications in a timely and consistent manner; and
4. To clarify plaming and zoning intents and to satisfy the requirements of $O A R$ Chapter 660, Division 21 relating to Urban Reserve Areas.

## C. DEFINTIONS

1. City: City of Madras.
2. Board: the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners.
3. Council: the Madras City Council.
4. County: Jefferson County.
5. Land Use Decision: A Land Use Decision is defined by ORS 197.015
6. Urban Reserve Area: has the same meaning as set forth in OAR 660-0210010(1), and means land outside of an Urban Growth Boundary identified as highest priority of inclusion in the Urban Growth Boundary when urbanizable land is needed in accordance with the requirements of Statewide Planning Goal 14.
7. Urban Growth Boundary: The boundary line which separates lands to be urbanized and eventually incorporated into the City of Madras from the surrounding rural lands under the County's jurisdiction.
8. Conversion Plan: has the same meaning as set forth in JCZO Section 105.

## D. AGREEMENT

Compliance with OAR Chapter 660, Division 21. In accordance with the applicable requirements of Chapter 660, Division 21, City and County agree as follows:

1. As required by OAR 660-021-0040(2)(e):
(a) The County shall ensure that conversion plans are required and processed as part of tentative land division decisions in the URA as outlined in the Jefferson County Zoning Ordinance (JCZO) Section 703.2(O).
(b) The County shall prohibit certain uses in the URA, including plan or zoning map amendments that allow a miminum lot size less than ten acres as outlined in JCZO Section 323.3.
2. As required by OAR 660-021-0050(1):
(a.) Jefferson County shall have authority and jurisdictional responsibility for current planning activities, land use decisions, building permitting, and code enforcement within the URA.
(b.) Upon inclusion of property from the URA within the Urban Growth Boundary, the property shall be subject to the Urban Growth Management Area Agreement.
3. Designation of service responsibility, as required by OAR 660-021-0050(2) is as follows:

| Service | Existing Service Provider | Future Urban Service <br> Provider |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sanitary Trash Disposal | No Public Service Provider | No Public Service Provider |
| Sanitary Sewer | No Public Service Provider | City of Madras |
| Water | Deschutes Valley Water <br> District | Deschutes Valley Water <br> District |
| Fire Protection | Jefferson County Fire District <br> \#1 | Jefferson County Fire <br> District \#1 |
| Parks | Jefferson County | City of Madras <br> RecreationMadras Aquatic Center <br> District |
| Transportation | Jefferson County | District Aquatic Center |
| Storm Water | Jefferson County | City of Madras |

(a.) The local goveroment or special district responsible for services (including sanitary rash disposal, sanitary sewer, water, fire protection, parks, transportation, storm water) for areas within the URA are designated and shown on the map(s) attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit " 1 A ".
4. As required by OAR 660-0210-0050(3), the terms and conditions under which service responsibility will be transferred or expanded, for areas where the provider of service is expected to change over time, is described in Exhibit " 18 " attached hereto and incorporated herein.
5. As required by $\operatorname{OAR}$ 660-0210-0050(4), procedures for notification and review of land use actions to ensure involvement by all affected local govermments and special districts:
(a) Within the URA, the County shall process all land use applications for comprehensive plan amendments, zone changes, and other applications affecting land use (including conditional uses, Planned Unit Developments (PUDs), subdivisions and partitions) in a manner that is consistent with the procedures set forth in the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance for the respective land use actions.
(b) Prior to acceptance of a land division application within the URA, the County shall require the applicant to submit a conversion plan to the City of Madras as outlined in JCZO Section 703.2(O).

The intent of the conversion plan is that it:

1. Is not an engineered plan.
2. May be amended from time to time by property owners submitting a new conversion plan to the City and County.
3. Does not constitute a separate land use decision, as it is part of a land division decision.
4. Must be recorded with the County Clerk so that future buyers of newly-created parcels in the URA will become aware, prior to purchase, that roads and utility easements will be required when the property is further developed after annexation.
5. Serves a guide to placement of structures in the building permitting process.

The City shall review the conversion plan and work with the property owner to ensure that the locations of planned roads and rights-of-way; and the locations of future easements for water, sewer, and storm water facilities that will adequately serve the site when developed at an urban density; are protected. The City may recommend that the conversion plan be approved, denied, or be approved with conditions.

Within 15 days of receiving a conversion plan for review, the City will forward its comments to both the applicant and the County, and the applicant is required to include the conversion plan and City comments with their tentative land division application to the County.

The County shall review the conversion plan as part of the tentative land division application, and approve, deny, or approve with conditions. A condition of approval for the land division decision shall be that the property owner record the conversion plan with the final plat at the County Clerk's Office.

The County agrees to consult conversion plans prior to building permit approval of structures in the URA, where applicable.

The City or County may charge a separate fee for review of conversion plans.
(c) Notice of all land use applications within the URA shall be sent to the City of Madras Community Development Department and to any other affected City agencies and other applicable special service districts for review and comment prior to a decision by the County. Such agencies shall be given ten business days in which to provide comments on the land use application.
(d) In making its decision, the County shall consider all comments received under Section (c) above.
(e) The City, and agency, or any other special service district that provides comments on land use applications shall be mailed written notice of the land use decision and shall have standing to appeal the County's decision.

## E. AMENDMENT AND TERMINATION

1. This agreement may be amended at any time by mutual agreement of both parties, after public hearing and adoption by both the City Council and the Board of Commissioners.
2. Any modifications to this agreement shall be consistent with the City and County Comprehensive Plans, the Urban Growth Area Management Agreement for the Cily of Madras and the statewide planning goals.
3. This agreement may be terminated by either party under the following procedure:
a. Written notice of intent to terminate this Agreement shall be sent to the other party at least forty-five (45) days prior to taking any action, including the publication of public hearing notices in order to provide ample time for resolution of differences, or amendment to comprehensive plans.
b. A public hearing shall be held by the party considering termination. The party considering termination shall give the other party at least 20 days prior notice of the scheduled hearing date. The 20 day period shall be used by both parties to seek resolution of differences. Both parties shall also request a collaborative conflict resolution process to resolve differences that remain.
c. Public notice of hearings shall be in accordance with applicable statutes and local ordinances.
d. This agreement is necessary for compliance with, at minimum, statcwide planning Goals 2 and 14. Unless the Urban Reserve Area is no longer an overlay zone in the County, this agreement may not be termined without adoption of a new agreement.
F. TIME OF EFFECTIVENESS

This agreement shall not become effective until properly executed by both the City and the County. Upon execution, this agreement shall supersede all previous Urban Reserve Area Management Agreements.

## G. SEVERABILITY

The Provisions within this agreement are serverable. If any section, sentence, clause or phrase of this agreement is adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, said invalidity shall not impair or affect the validity of the remaining portions of the agreement.


CITY OF MADRAS, OREGON


Date: $1-27-2009$

ATTEST:


JEFFERSON COUNTY, OREGON


Date: furmenty 28,2009


## 阵 $=014-09$

## EXHIBIT 1B

 URBAN SERVICE TRANSITION POLICIESTerms and Conditions under which Service Responsibility will be transferred or expanded.
A. Special Districts. The City shall agree to the fomation of any special district within the Urban Reserve Area prior to the approval of the formation of the district by Jefferson County. This provision shall not apply to County-wide service districts formed under ORS Chapter 451.
B. Service Expansion Plans. Service expansion plans shall be consistent with the Madras Comprehensive Plan. As the future provider of, sanitary sewer, storm water and potable water services, the City shall prepare, and from time to time, update utility expansion plans. These plans shall provide a basis for the extension of services within the Urban Growth Boundary, and as such shall be referred to Jefferson County for information and commeni.
C. Transition Policies Relating to Service Responsibility

1. Sanitary Sewer Service. There will be no public provider of sanitary sewer service until City services are available, except in the case of a state mandate due to a hcalth hazard. At the time of annexation, the City will require hook-up to City sanitary sewer services. There shall be no special sanitary sewer districts created in the Urban Reserve Area. Nothing in this provision shall limit the ability of individuals to provide septic services (i.e. septic sewer systems) on their own private property within the Urban Reserve Area.
2. Potable Water Service. The City of Madras and Deschutes Valley Water District shall be the public providers of water in this area, unless new districts are expanded or created through mutual agreement by the City and the County. Nothing in this provision shall limit the ability of individuals to provide services on their own private property within the Urban Reserve Area.
3. Fire Protection. The Jefferson County Fire District \#1 provides fire protection services to property within the Urban Reserve Area, the Urban Growth Boundary, and the City limits.
4. Parks. Jefferson County provides parks services within the Urban Reserve Area. The City of Madras provides parks services within the city limits and the Urban Growth Boundary. The City of Madras will provide these services as park properties as they are included within the city's limits unless agreed otherwise.
5. Recreation. 'The Madras Aquatic Center is separate recreation district that serves Jefferson County. The Madras Aquatic Center District will continue to provide aquatic recreational services when property is included in the City of Madras Urban Growth Boundary and city limits.

$$
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6. Transportation and Street limprovements. Jefferson County provides transportation services on county roads within the Urban Reserve Area. Upon annexation from the UGA, the City of Madras will accept all paved Jefferson County roads that have a pavement condition index $(\mathrm{PCD})$ of 70 or above. If the PCI is below 70 , the county may structurally overlay the road to raise the PCI above 70 at which time the City shall be obligated to accept jurisdiction of such road. Jefferson County policjes for road design and construction standards to be used in the Urban Growth Boundary and Urban Reserve Area are outlined in the Jefferson County Code, Sections 12,18.070 and 12.18.080. Per Jefferson County ordinances, the Jefferson County Public Works Director may require roads to be constructed to City of Madras standards.

The Oregon Department of Transportation provides transportation services on state highways within the Urban Reserve area. The Oregon Department of Transportation retains jurisdiction and maintenance responsibilities on all state highways after incorporation into the UGB and annexation excepi in special cases where juisdiction is transferred to the City or County by a specific agreement.
7. Storm Water Management. Jefferson County provides public storm water management services to property where required within the Urban Reserve Area. The City will provide storm water management services to property within the city limits. Transition of public storn water management services will follow transition of road maintenance responsibilities.

## Jefferson County Code Section 12.18.070:

12.18.070 Roads within an urban growth boundary.

Roads within an urban growth boundary (UGB) or urban reserve shall, at the discretion of the Jefferson County director of public works, conform to the design and construction specifications of the city contained within the UGB boundary and shall be subject to review and approval of that city's director of public works and the Jefferson County director of public works. (Ord. O-69-07 § 1 Exh. A (part), 2007: Ord. O-110-02 § 2 Exh. B (part), 2002)
12.18.080 Roads within one mile of an urban growth boundary.

At the discretion of the Jefferson County director of public works, design and construction standards and specifications for roads within one mile of a UGB may be modified to accommodate future reconstruction to city standards. Roads in zones contiguous to the UGB of Madras, Culver or Metolius may be required to be constructed in accordance with Section 12.18.070 of this chapter if, in the opinion of the director of public works, such roads would become connected to the city road system. (Ord. O-69-07 § 1 Exh. A (part), 2007: Ord. O-11002 § 2 Exh. B (part), 2002)

# Appendix D: Water and Sewer Service Provider Letters 


S.E. D Street, Madras, OR, 97741-541-475-3388

## MEMORANDUM

| Date: | January 26, 2010 |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Jefferson County Planning Commission <br> Madras Planning Commission <br> Jon Skidmore, Jefferson County Community Development Director |
| Cc: | Nick Snead, City of Madras Community Development Director |
| From: | Gus Burril, City of Madras Public Works Director |

## Overview:

The City of Madras (City) has filed a post-acknowledgement plan amendment application with Jefferson County to expand the current Madras Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) by approximately 37 acres and re-zone 20 of the 37 acres from Range Land (RL) to Multi-Family Residential (R-2) as shown in the attached map. To complete this land use action the City is required demonstrate that public facilities (i.e. wastewater, domestic water, stormwater, and transportation) can be extended to serve the area proposed to be included in the Madras UGB. The City provides wastewater and stormwater service and the properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB are located within the planning boundaries of the City of Madras Wastewater and Stormwater Master Plans.

## Wastewater:

The properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB are located within the study area of the City of Madras' Wastewater Master Plan. Figure 5-2B (attached) identifies a planned 8 inch wastewater service line to be constructed in the Ashwood right-of-way that would service the properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB. Additionally, the City constructed a 10 inch wastewater service line to Oregon Department of Corrections Deer Ridge Correctional facility in Ashwood Road adjacent to the properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB (see attached drawing)

When the proposed properties are developed, the City will require the property owner to extend wastewater service in accordance with City standards. Based on the planned improvements in the Madras Wastewater Master Plart, the existing wastewater facilities in Ashwood Road, the City of Madras has capacity to provide wastewater service to the properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB at the time of development.

## Stormwater:

The properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB are located within the study area of the City of Madras' Stormwater Master Plan. Figure IV-5 (attached) identifies a planned 12 inch
stormwater service line to be constructed in Ashwood Road adjacent to the properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB. Furthermore, Design Criteria (1) in the City of Madras Stormwater Master Plan in Section IV, requires"
"Any property development or redevelopment shall include stormwater facilities designed to handle runoff from all tributary areas for the 24-hour, 25-uear design storm event. The facilities shall limit the peak discharge from the development in a 24-hour, 25-year design storm to the estimated pre-development peak flow rate in a 24 -hour, 10-year design storm."

Considering the planned stormwater facilities identified in the City of Madras Stormwater Master Plan and the existing stormwater design standards for development, the City has capacity to provide stormwater service to the properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB.

Conclusion:
The City of Madras has capacity to serve the properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB with wastewater and stormwater service. Should there by any questions, please contact me at 541-475-2622.

Sincerely,

Gus Burril, P.E.
City of Madras
Public Works Director
71 SE "D" Street
Madras, OR, 97741
541-475-2622

Attachments: Figure 5-2B Wastewater Collection System Phase 1B Segment 2 Wastewater Improvements Figure IV-5 Stormwater System Improvements



## Nick Snead

From: Edson at DVWD [éóson@óvwáiorg]
Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2010 11:15 AM
To: Nick Snead
Subject: RE: Domestic water service availability
-->

Hi Nick-

DVWD should be able to serve that property. Naturally, the mainline upgrades and/or extensions would have to be paid for by the developer. When there is an engineered plan for the required infrastructure, I will be happy to do an estimate for the waterworks portion to be installed by DWWD.

Feel free to call if you need more information.

Edson Pugh, P.E.
General Manager
Deschutes Valley Water District
881 SW Culver Hwy.
Madras, OR 97741
Ph. \# (541) 475-3849

From: Nick Snead [mailto:nsnead@ci.madras.or.us]
Sent: Monday, January 25, 2010 8:45 AM
To: Ed Pugh
Subject: Domestic water service availability
Importance: High

Ed,

Good morning! You may have heard the City is proposing to expand the Urban Growth Boundary by approximately 37 acres and annex 20 acres into the City for the Jefferson County School District. The property proposed to be annexed is south of Ashwood Road. I have attached a map to quickly orient your to the propetty. I am wondering if DVWD domestic water service is available or if not, what facility improvements would future development be responsible for constructing? This email is a formal request and I would like to put your response in the record to demonstrate (hopefully) that water service is available and/or the facility improvements needed to serve the area proposed to be in the Madras UGB.

Let me know if you have any questions. Call me at 541-323-2916 if needed.

Take care,
"One may walk over the highest mountain one step at a time" -John Wanamaker-

Nicholas S. Snead
Director
Community Development Department
City of Madras
(541) 475-3388

Email: nsnead@ci.madras_or.us

Visit the City of Madras at http://ci.madras.or.us/

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 8.5.432 / Virus Database: 271.1.1/2644 - Release Date: 01/25/10 07:36:00

# Appendix E: Property Owner Consent Letters 



## (Legal description of property):

## M-Map <br> (See Attached Exhibit "B")

The undersigned property owner hereby gives express, continuing, written consent to annexation of the property described herein to the City of Madras; and does hereby agree to execute such separate, further or additional application, petition, and consent as may be hereafter required by the City, or the laws of the State, as now or hereafter enacted for such annexation. This consent is given in consideration of City services that elther have been or will be applied to the described property. The undersigned intends this consent to comply with all requirements af law for annexation of the property described. The undersigned and City intend that this consent shall constitute a covenant running with the land, binding on the undersigned and the undersigned's heirs, successors, or assigns.

The undersigned represents that the undersigned is the owner of this property and has the right to consent to its annexation.

DATED this 9th day of $\qquad$ October Signature: Typed Name:

Signature: Typed Name:


Address:
Springyiey Farms, LLC 2519 E. Ashrood Road Madras, Oregon 97741
STATE OF OREGON
$\{$
County of Jefferson
Personally appeared before me this $\qquad$ day of Qctuber 2003 the above named

Albert L. Zemke
(List name of individual(s) having signature notarized)
and acknowledged the foregoing instrument to be a voluntary act.


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Notary Public for Oregon } \\ & \text { My Commission Expires: }\end{aligned} 9-14-2$ |
| :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

O-039-10
(INe), the undersigned, do hereby waive the one-year requirement on the attached "Consent to Annexation" for the following described property and acknowledge that the consent shall remain in effect indefinitely.
(Metes and Bounds Description and Map to be Attached to the Consent to Annexation)
"See Attached Exhibit "B"

Signature:
Typed Name:
 $\longrightarrow$

| STATE OF OREGON |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| County of Jefferson |  |

Personally appeared before me this $10^{\text {th }}$ day of $0 \mathrm{ctalult} 20 \quad 03$ the above named

Albert L. Zemke
(List name of individual(s) having signature notarized)
and acknowledged the foregoing instrument to be a voluntary act.

- Warem, Coltomam

Notary Public for Oregon My Commission Expires: 9 14-2004

## After Recording Return to:



71 S.E. "D" Street
Madras, Oregon 97741

## EXHIBIT "B"

MAP \#11-14-7, TAX LOT \#101
ALBERT L. ZEMKE

PARCEL I: Northeast quarter, Northeast quarter of the Southeast quarter, North half of the Northwest quarter of the Southeast quarter, Southeast quarter of the Northwest quarter of the Southeast quarter of Section 7, Township 11 South, Range 14 East of the Willamette Meridian Jefferson County Oregon, and the Southwest quarter of the Northwest quarter of the Southeast quarter.


D=ANXCON Cnt=1 Stn=2 KATE

## RECORDED DOCUMENT STATE OF OREGON

## COUNTY OF JEFFERSON

## DO NOT REMOVE THIS CERTIFICATE

(This certificate constitutes a part of the original instrument in accordance with ORS 205.180(2). Removal of this certificate may invalidate this certificate and affect the admissibility of the original instrument into evidence in any legal proceeding.)

KATHLEEN B. MARSTON
JEFFERSON COUNTY CLERK

## CITY OF MADRAS PROPERTY OWNER CONSENT TO ANNEXATION

The undersigned property owner(s) hereby consents to the annexation of the following described property to the City of Madras, Jefferson County, Oregon.
(Legal description of property):
MAP \#11-14-7, TAX LOT \#200, MORE PARTICULARLY DESGRIBED ON ATTACHED EXHIBIT "A"

The undersigned property owner hereby gives express, continuing, written consent to annexation of the property described herein to the City of Madras; and does hereby agree to execute such separate, further or additional application, petition, and consent as may be hereafter required by the City, or the laws of the State, as now or hereafter enacted for such annexation. This consent is given in consideration of City services that either have been or will be applied to the described property. The undersigned intends this consent to comply with all requirements of law for annexation of the property described. The undersigned and City intend that this consent shall constitute a covenant running with the land, binding on the undersigned and the undersigned's heirs, successors, or assigns.

The undersigned represents that the undersigned is the owner of this property and has the right to consent to its annexation.


STATE OF OREGON )
County of Jefferson )

instrument to be a voluntary act.

After Recording Return to:
City of Madras
71 S.E. "D" Street
Madras, Oregon 97741


63885 N Hwy 97 - Bend; OR 97701 A (541) 382-4192
City of Madras
May 13, 2008
Job \# 08029B
Tax lot: 11-14-7-200

CITY OF MADRAS ANNEXATION \#2008-02

A Tract of land located in the Northeast One-Quarter of the Northwest One-Quarter (NE 1/4NW 1/4) and the Northwest One-Quarter of the Northeast One-Quarter (NW 1/4-NE 1/4) of Section 7, Township 11 South, Range 14 East of the Willamette Meridian, Jefferson County, Oregon, more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the North-South centerline of said Section 7 which bears South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 80.01 feet from the North One-Quarter comer of said Section 7; thence leaving said North-South Section centerline and along the South right-of-way line of Ashwood Road as described in Warranty Deed recorded in Book 2005, Page 005605 of Jefferson County official records South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 39^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 61.23 feet; thence leaving said right-of-way line South $00^{\circ} 17$ ' $35^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 424.32 feet; thence South $89^{\circ} 42^{\prime} 25^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 61.22 feet to a point on the North-South centerline of said Section 7 which bears South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 505.00 feet from the North One-Quarter corner of said Section 7, being a point on the boundary of Parcel 1 of Partition Plat No. 2004-15 (recorded as MF\# 2004-4735); thence along the boundary of said Parcel 1 South $89^{\circ} 42^{\prime} 25^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 354.87 feet; thence leaving said boundary 117.68 feet along a non-tangent curve to the right with a radius of 455.00 feet, the chord of which bears North $07^{\circ} 42^{\prime} 08^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 117.35 feet; thence North $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 18.24 feet; thence 123.03 feet along the arc of a tangent curve to the right with a radius of 240.00 feet, the chord of which bears North $14^{\circ} 23^{\prime} 32^{\prime \prime}$ East for a distance of 121.68 feet; thence 186.84 feet along the arc of a reverse curve to the left with a radius of 360.00 feet, the chord of which bears North $14^{\circ} 12^{\prime} 33^{\prime \prime}$ East for a distance of 184.75 feet to a point on said South right-of-way line; thence along said South right-of-way line the following two (2) courses and one (1) curve:

South $88^{\circ} 42^{\prime} 59^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 170.57 feet;
18.12 feet along the arc of a tangent curve to the left with a radius of 1099.00 feet, the chord of which bears South $89^{\circ} 11^{\prime} 19^{\prime \prime}$ East for a distance of 18.12 feet; South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 39^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 104.28 feet to the point of beginning, the terminus of this description.


Renews: 12/31/2009

Page $1 \cdot$ of 1


## CONSENT TO ANNEXATION ONE-YEAR WAIVER

(INe), the undersigned, do hereby waive the one-year requirement on the attached "Consent to Annexation" for the following described property and acknowledge that the consent shall remain in effect indefinitely.
(Metes and Bounds Description and Map to be Attached to the Consent to Annexation)

Map \# 11-14-7 Tax Lot\# 200


## PETITION FOR ANNEXATION BY CONSENT

## PURSUANT TO ORE 222.170

IDe, Evan W. Thomas \& Dorothy Thomas IRS 222.170 (1)(a).
(Metes and Bounds Legal Description and Map Required)
(These can be attached to the Consent to Annexation Form)

| Map \# 11-14-7 | Tax Lot \# 200 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Map \# | Tax Lot \# |
| Map \# | Tax Lot \# |
| Map \# | Tax Lot \# |

Attached hereto is the consent of the owners) of the property, and is incorporated herein as Exhibit "A". Petitioner hereby certifies that they are the owners) of said property as ownership is described in ORS 222.120(7). Petitioner further certifies to the City that they are the legal owner(s) of record and are the sole owners of the property.


Signature:
Typed or Printed Name: porotix thomas
Ed Name: DOROTHX THOMAS

Signature: athomongy-aiz-flach.
Typed or Printed Name: Evan N. Thomas

# JEFFERSON County Assessor's Summary Report <br> Real Property Assessment Report <br> FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2009 



Comments:

# JEFFERSON County Assessor's Summary Report <br> Real Property Assessment Report <br> FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2009 

January 25, 2010 2:07:27 pm


Comments: SPLIT CODE WITH \#13274


#  <br> JEFFERSON County Assessor's Summary Report <br> Real Property Assessment Report <br> FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2009 



## Send tax statements to:

City of MADRAS
TI SE D.St.
Jefferson Coupin, Officlal Record5-039-18005-00026.
Kathleen E. M.

MADTAS OR. 97741
After recording return to:


City of Madras
71 SE D Street
Madras OR 97741

## WARRANTY DEED

(Statutory Form)
(ORS 93.850)
MORROW PROPERTIES, INC., an Oregon corporation, Grantor, conveys and warrants to the CITY OF MADRAS, an Oregon municipality, Grantee, the following described real property, situate in Jefferson County, Oregon, free from encumbrances except as specifically set forth:

Parcel 1 of Partition Plat No. 2004-06, recorded April 15, 2004, as Instrument No. 2004-1610, Jefferson County, Oregon.

## SUBJECT TO:

1. 2004-2005 taxes, a lien in an amount to be determined, but not yet payable.
2. As disclosed by tax roll the premises herein described have been zoned or classified for farm use. At any time that said land is disqualified for such use, the property may be subject to additional taxes or penalties and interest.
3. The property lies within the boundaries of Deschutes Valley Water District and is subject to any charges or assessments levied by said District, and pipeline easements in connection therewith.
4. Rights of the public in and to that portion of the herein described premises lying within the boundaries of roads or highways.
5. Right of way, if any, of Public Usage Road No. 3053 as shown on tax assessor map but which the Grantor declares may be closed or vacated by prior Federal or County governmental action.
6. Mineral reservation by the United States of America as disclosed in Deed recorded April 28, 1983, Fee No. 147453.
7. Reservation by the United States of America for power line as disclosed in Deed, recorded April 28, 1983, Fee No. 147453.

The true consideration for this conveyance is an exchange of real property between the Grantee and Grantor.
-1- WARRANTY DEEDiServer1MKathylMorrowlMorrow Properties - Warranty Deed.wpd


GLENN, SITES \& REEDER, LLP
8. Reservation by the United States of America for power line as disclosed in Deed, recorded April 28, 1983, Fee No. 147453.
9. Easement, including the terms and provisions thereof, for electrical transmission lines granted to Central Electric Cooperative, Inc., recorded April 28, 1983, Fee No. 147456.
10. Easement, including the terms and provisions thereof, for communication lines, granted to Pacific Northwest Bell Telephone Company, xecorded April 28, 1983, Fee No. 147458.
11. Easements as shown on Partition Plat 2004-06, for utility and access.

THIS INSTRUMENT WILL NOT ALLOW USE OF THE PROPERTY DESCRIBED IN THIS INSTRUMENT IN VIOLATION OF APPLICABLE LAND USE LAWS AND REGULATIONS. BEFORE SIGNING OR ACCEPTING THIS INSTRUMENT, THE PERSON ACQUIRING FEE TITLE TO THE PROPERTY SHOULD CHECK WITH THE APPROPRIATE CITY OR COUNTY PLANNING DEPAR'TMENT TO VERIFY APPROVED USES AND TO DETERMINE ANY LIMITS ON LAWSUITS AGAINST FARMING OR FOREST PRACTICES AS DEFINED IN ORS 30.930.

## Dated this <br> $\qquad$

 day of Comenciry 2005, 20040127 MORROW PROPERTIES, INC:

By: ANDREW J. MORROW, President

| STATE OF OREGON | ) |
| :--- | :--- |
| County of Jefferson | ) |

Personally appeared ANDREW J. MORROW, who being duly sworn, did say that he is the President of MORROW PROPERTIES, INC., an Oregon corporation, and that the seal affixed to the foregoing instrument is the corporate seal of said corporation by authority of its Board of Directors, and heacknowledged said instrument to be its voluntary act and deed, before me this



JEFFERSON COUNTY ASSESSOR'S NAME LEDGER



$\begin{array}{lccc}\text { Size Totals } & \text { Code } & \text { Acres } & \text { SqFt } \\ & 0110 & 152.99 & 0.00\end{array}$


#### Abstract

Add: Public Public Road Dedication A portion of Parcel 2 of Partition Plat No. 2002-12 as filed in the Jefferson CountyClerk's Office, situated in the Northeast Quarter (NE`A) of Section 7, Township 11South, Range 14 East of the Willamette Meridian, Jefferson County, Oregon, moreparticularly described as follows:


Commencing at the Northwest comer of said Northeast Quarter, monumented with a 2 inch diameter brass cap, from which the Northeast comer of said Section 7 bears South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 4 O^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 2640.53 South $0^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ West a distanceof 40.00 feet to the Northwest corner of said Parcel 2 of Partition Plat No. 2002-12 andthe True Point of Beginning of this Description; thence continuing South 0001 7'3 6"West 169017 fets the 37444 fet ale of 3So4S\#24\#\# the long chord bearsSouth 7lo46\#S7\#\# East a distance of 368.40 feet to the East line of

| $\begin{gathered} \text { TOWNSHIP } \\ 11 \end{gathered}$ | RANGE 14 | $\begin{gathered} \text { SECTION } \\ 07 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 / 4 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 / 16 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TAXLOT } \\ & 00100 \end{aligned}$ | SPECIAL INTERES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| said Northeast Quarter; thence North $\mathrm{OO}^{\circ} \mathrm{OO}^{\prime} 43^{\prime \prime}$ East along the East line of said Northeast Quarter a distance of 132.03 feet; thence North $64^{\circ} \mathrm{S} 9^{\prime} 31^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 12.90 feet; thence 34.51 feetalong the arc of a 710.00 foot radius to the left, with a central angle of $2^{\circ} 47^{\prime} 07^{\prime \prime}$ the longchord bears North $62^{\circ} 36^{\prime} 48^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 34.51 feet to the North line of saidParcel 2 ; thence North $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ West along said North line a distance of 1998.01 feet tothe True Point of Beginning. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Containing | 5 acres | or less. |  |  |  |  |

Containing 2.15 acres more or less.



JEFFERSON COUNTY ASSESSOR'S NAME LEDGER

 $\begin{array}{ccccccc}\text { TOWNSHIP } & \text { RANGE } & \text { SECTION } & 1 / 4 & 1 / 16 & \text { TAXLOT } & \text { SPECIAL INTEREST } \\ 11 & 14 & 07 & 0 & 0 & 00101 & \\ \text { Effective Date } 25-\text { Feb-2005 } & \text { 12:00 AM } & \text { Transaction ID } 143182 & \text { Entry Date 25-Feb-2005 }\end{array}$ |  | SEQ | VOUCHER ID | TAX YEAR | DOCUMENT SOURCE | TYPE | ID\#1 | ID\#2 | PID |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 141861 | 2005 | HISTORICAL - BOR | U | 1900 | 41759 | 1 | 20050974 |




[^26]\[

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text { TOWNSHIP } & \text { RANGE } & \text { SECTION } \\
11 & 14 & 07
\end{array}
$$
\]



$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Ownership Type } \\
& \text { OWNER } \\
& \text { OWNER }
\end{aligned}
$$

Ownership \%


Order No. 0008661
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## EXHIBIT "A"

## Legal Desoription:

A parcel of land containing 12,28 acres, more or less, being a portion of Parcel 1 of Partition Plat No. 2002.12 located in the Northeast One-quarter of Section 7, Township 11 South, Range 14 East of the Willamette Meridian, Jefferson County, Oregon, being more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at a point on the north-south centerline of said Section 7 which bears South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 80.01 feet from the North One-quarter corner of said Section 7, thence Ieaving said north-south section centerline and along the south right-of-way line of Ashwood road as described in Warranty Deed recorded as instrument No. 2005-005605 of Jefferson County official records South 89 $39^{\prime} 39^{\prime \prime}$ Bast a distance of 61.23 feet to the true Point of Beginning of this description; thence contimuing along said right-of-way line South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 39^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 538.68 feet to a point on the east boundary of said Parcel 1 ; thence along said east boundary South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 935.15 feet to the Southeast comner of said Parcel 1; thence along the south boundary of said Parcel 1 North $89^{\circ} 40^{\prime} 13^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 599.90 feet to the southwest comer of said Parcel 1 , being a point on said noth-south section centerline; thence along said northsouth section centerline North $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 510.26 feet to a point which bears South $00^{\circ} 17$ ' $35^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 505.00 feet from the North One-quarter comer of said Section 7; thence leaving said north-south section centerlime North $89^{\circ} 42^{\prime} 25^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 61.22 feet thence North $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 424.32 feet to the point of beginning.

## JEmFERSON COUNTY ASSESSOR

O-039-10

REAL PROPERTY ASSESSMENT REPORT
FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2009



| LAND BREAKDOWN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CODE AREA ID \# RFD |  |  | PLN ZN | VALUE SOURCE | TD\% | LS | SIZE | LND CLS | IRR CLASS | IRR SIZE |
| 0010 | R | 1 | RL | Market | 100 | A |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | TAL |  |  | TOTAL | 0.00 |

JEFFERSON COUNTY ASSESSOR'S NAME LEDGER



Space above this line for Recording Office Use

After recording, return to:
Oregon Department of Corrections
Attn: Community Development Manager
$179313^{\text {th }}$ Street SE
Salem, OR 97302-2595

Send Tax statements to:
(same)

## WARRANTY DEED

(ORS 93.850)
Lincicome Madras Development, LLC, an Oregon limited liability company $\qquad$ Grantor, conveys and warrants to STATE OF OREGON, by and through its DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, Grantee, its successors and assigns, the real property described in Exhibit A (the "Property") free of encumbrances, except for easements, conditions, and restrictions contained in the public record, and except as specifically set forth herein (none).

[^27]The true consideration for this conveyance is $\$ 39,021.00$.

Dated this $\qquad$ 23 day of $\qquad$ , 2006.

by James Mitch Cole, Managing Member of Lincicome Madras Development, LLC


## STATE OF OREGON )

County of
 )ss.

This instrument was acknowledged and executed before me on this
 , 2006, by James Mitch Cole, Managing Member of Lincicome Madras Development, LLC.


## ACCEPTED BY:

The State of Oregon, acting by and through its Department of Corrections

By:


## As: Dept. of Corrections, Community Manesjor

## STATE OF OREGON ) <br> County of Marion )ss

This instrument was acknowledged before me on this doth day of furze_, 2006, by BOBBI BLIRTIN as the Community Manager and authorized representative of the Oregon Department of Corrections, acting under authority granted to him/her by the State of Oregon.


Notary Public for Oregon My Commission expires: $\qquad$

## EXHIBIT A

Legal Description for Warranty Deed ASHWOOD ROAD

Section 7 (East Property)

A 60.00 -foot wide strip of land, lying 60.00 on the south side of the following described centerline, over land located in the northwest $1 / 4$ of the northeast $1 / 4$ of Section 7 of Township 11 South and Range 14 East of the Willamette Meridian, Jefferson County, Oregon, described in the Warranty Deed recorded at 2005-002823 of the Jefferson County Official Records:

Beginning at Engineer's Centerline Station 5+00, on the section line between Sections 6 and 7 of Township 11 South and Range 14 East of the Willamette Meridian, Jefferson County, Oregon, which bears North $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 17^{\prime \prime}$ West 1481.20 feet from the $1 / 4$ comer between said Sections 6 and 7 ; thence South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 17^{\prime \prime}$ East 138.33 feet, along the section line between said Sections 6 and 7 ; thence leaving said section line, 17.02 feet along the arc of a 1039.00 foot radius curve right (the long chord of which bears South $89^{\circ} 11^{\prime} 08^{\prime \prime}$ East 17.01 feet); thence South $88^{\circ} 43^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$ East 1205.50 feet; thence 17.13 feet along the arc of a 1039.00 foot radius curve left (the long chord of which bears South $89^{\circ} 11^{\prime} 20^{\prime \prime}$ East 17.13 feet); thence South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ East 2394.42 feet; thence 633.14 feet along the arc of a 660.00 foot radius curve right (the long chord of which bears South $62^{\circ} 10^{\prime} 44^{\prime \prime}$ East 609.14 feet); thence South $34^{\circ} 41^{\prime} 49^{\prime \prime}$ East 774.75 feet; thence 1709.82 feet along the are of a 1000.00 foot radius curve left (the long chord of which bears South $83^{\circ} 40^{\prime} 47^{\prime \prime}$ East 1509.02 feet); thence North $47^{\circ} 20^{\prime} 15^{\prime \prime}$ East 542.88 feet; thence 2560.21 feet along the arc of a 1400.00 foot radius curve right (the long chord of which bears South $80^{\circ} 16^{\prime} 24^{\prime \prime}$ East 2218.09 feet); thence South $27^{\circ} 53^{\prime} 03^{\prime \prime}$ East 943.15 feet; thence 1158.98 feet along the arc of an 850.00 foot radius curve left (the long chord of which bears South $66^{\circ} 56^{\prime} 44^{\prime \prime}$ East 1071.26 feet); thence North $73^{\circ} 59^{\prime} 34^{\prime \prime}$ East 585.08 feet; thence 368.57 feet along the arc of a 340.00 foot radius curve right (the long chord of which bears South $74^{\circ} 57^{\prime} 06^{\prime \prime}$ East 350.79 feet); thence South $43^{\circ} 53^{\prime} 47^{\prime \prime}$ East 305.17 feet; thence 254.87 feet along the arc of a 340.00 foot radius curve left (the long chord of which bears South $65^{\circ} 22^{\prime} 17^{\prime \prime}$ East 248.94 feet); thence South $86^{\circ} 50^{\prime} 46^{\prime \prime}$ East 596.74 feet; thence 122.81 feet along the arc of a 660.00 foot radius curve right (the long chord of which bears South $81^{\circ} 30^{\prime} 56^{\prime \prime}$ East 122.63 feet); thence South $76^{\circ} 11^{\prime} 06^{\prime \prime}$ East 271.44 feet to engineer's centerline station $151+00$, the terminus for this description, from which the $1 / 4$ corner between Sections 9 and 10 bears North $89^{\circ} 14^{\prime} 59 "$ East 2049.79 feet.

The parcel of land to which this description applies contains 30,016 square feet, more or less.
This description may include areas that are preexisting public right-of-way or easements, which are retained, and included herein to provide a clearer record of title in the future.


Warranty Deed Legal Description - East Property
Lincicome Madras Development, LLC


TIIS R14E WM
Sec 7, The $\mathbb{N} 475 \mathrm{ft}$ of the E 400 ft of the NET $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$.

> Exe: Co Rd No 809

Code Change Rural Madras Sanitary Dist
Dissolution of Rural Madras Sanitary District
Oregon Corner Restoration Record
Oregon Corner Restoration Record

Oregon Corner Restoration Record
Easement inside 11147 TL 302 for this tax lot (Granted to Thomas, E \& D) Included in a Warranty Deed worked on 11147 TL 302.
JEFFERSON COUNTY ASSESSOR'S NAME LEDGER
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## SPECIAL INTEREST

SPECIAL INTEREST
$\begin{array}{ccccccc}\text { TOWNSHIP } & \text { RANGE } & \text { SECTION } & 1 / 4 & 1 / 16 & \text { TAXLOT } & \text { SPECIAL INTEREST } \\ 11 & 14 & 07 & 0 & 0 & 00200 & \end{array}$ EASEMENT: $11-14-7$ 200 TO 11-14-7 101, EVAN W THOMAS \& DOROTHY THOMAS TO LINCICOME MADRAS DEVELOPMENT LLC, DOC. \#2007-3813.



-Space below for Recorder's use only-

## bARGAIN AND SALE DEED

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS THAT, Evan W Thomas and Dorothy Thomas, as husband and wife, Grantor(s), for and in consideration of the sum of ZERO and 00/100 Dollars to it paid by the grantee herein, do hereby grant, bargain, sell and convey unto Evan W Thomas and Dorothy Thomas, as husband and wife, Grantee(s), the described tract of land in County of Jefferson and State of Oregon, more particularly described as follows:

## See Attached Legal Description as Tract 'B'

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD the granted premises unto the said Grantee, its heirs and assigns forever.
WITNESS their Hand and Seal this $20^{-4}$ day of quere


This instrument will not allow use of the property described in this instrument in violation of applicable land use laws and regulations. Before signing or accepting this instrument, the person acquining fee litlo to the property should check with the appropriate city o the property phould check with to verify approved cily
and to determine any limits on lawsuits against
Farming or Forest practices as defined in ORS 30.930.

STATE OF OREGON
COUNTY OFGESEHUTES JEFRERSAN
I, cerify that I know or have satisfactory evidence that Evan W Thomas and Dorothy Thomas and is the person(s) who appeared before me, and said person(s) acknowledged that he/she signed this instrument and acknowledged it to be his/her free and voluntary act for the uses and purposes mentioned in the instrument.

Dated: $\qquad$ 6120102

Until a change is requested all tax statements Should be sent to the following address:

Evan W Thomas and Dorothy Thomas


After Recording Please Return to:

## TRACT B

A parcel of land containing 3.94 acres, more or less, located in a portion of the
Northwest One-quarter (NW1/4) and a portion of the Northeast One-Quarter (NE1/4) of Section 07, Township 11 Sơuth, Range 14 East, Willamette Meridian, City of Madras, Deschutes County, Oregon, being more particularly described as follows:

Beginming at a point on the north-south centerline of said Section 07 which bears South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 80.01 feet from the North One-quarter corner of said Section 07; thence leaving said north-south section centerline and along the south right-of-way line of Ashwood Road as described in Warranty Deed recorded in Book 2005, Page 005605 of Jefferson County official records South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 39^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 61.23 feet; thence leaving said right-of-way line South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 424.32 feet; thence South $89^{\circ} 42^{\prime} 25^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 61.22 feet a point on the north-south centerline of said Section 07 which bears South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 505.00 feet from the North Onequarter corner of said Section 07, being a point on the boundary of Parcel 1 of Partition Plat No. 2004-15 (recorded as MF\#2004-4735); thence along the boundary of said Parcel 1 South $89^{\circ} 42^{\prime} 25^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 354.87 feet; thence leaving said boundary 117.68 feet along a non-tangent curve to the right with a radius of 455.00 feet, the chord of which bears North $07^{\circ} 42^{\prime} 08^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 117.35 feet; thence North $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 18.24 feet; thence 123.03 feet along the arc of a tangent curve to the right with a radius of 240.00 feet, the chord of which bears North $14^{\circ} 23^{\prime} 32^{\prime \prime}$ East for a distance of 121.68 feet; thence 186.84 feet along the arc of a reverse curve to the left with a radius of 360.00 feet, the chord of which bears North $14^{\circ} 12^{\prime} 33^{\prime \prime}$ East for a distance of 184.75 feet to a point on said south right-of-way line; thence along said south right-of-way line the following two (2) courses and one (1) curve:

South $88^{\circ} 42^{\prime} 59^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 170.57 feet
18.12 feet along the arc of a tangent curve to the left with a radius of 1099.00 feet, the chord of which bears South $89^{\circ} 11^{\prime \prime} 19^{\prime \prime}$ East for a distance of 18.12 feet; South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 39^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 104.28 feet to the point of beginning, the terminus of this description.

Subject to: All easements, restrictions and right-of-ways of record and those common and apparent on the land.


April 11, 2007
S:ILand Projects1051213-Cole subd in MadrasidocsITRACT B(2).doc
Thomas to Thomas

## Appendix F: Transportation Planning Rule Analysis (Kittelson \& Associates, January 2010)

KITTELSON \& ASSOCIATES, INC.
TRANSPORTATIONENGINEERING/PLANNING
354 SW Upper Terrace Drive, Suite 101, Bend, Oregon $97702 \therefore 541.312 .8300 ; 541.312 .4585$

## MEMORANDUM

Date: January 22, 2010

To: Nick Snead, City of Madras
From: Chris Brehmer, P.E. \& Joe Bessman, P.E. \& Matt Bel
Project: Madras Elementary School UGB Amendment
Subjeci: Transportation Planning Rule Analysis


The purpose of this memorandum is to document compliance with the Transportation Planning Rule for the proposed rezone of 20 acres of land located in Jefferson County from Range Land (RL) zoning to Multiple Family Residential (R-2) zoning. This memorandum was prepared to address the requirements identified within Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 660-12-0060 (Transportation Planning Rule, TPR), which contains the applicable criteria for a zone change analysis. The intent of the TPR is to ensure the transportation system can accommodate the change of uses to the adopted system plan and that any resultant significant affects are mitigated.

The land included in the proposed rezone is generally located south of Ashwood Road, east of Jefferson County Middle School, and south of the existing Juniper Hills County Park near Bean Drive. The property is within the Yarrow development and its rezone to accommodate a school was identified as part of the original Yarrow Concept Plan. The location of the property is generally shown in Figure 1, and the identification of the 20-acre future school property on the Yarrow Concept Plan is illustrated in Figure 2. No specific development plans or entitlements are being pursued as part of this zone change.

This study determined that, with the exception of the US 97/J Street intersections, all of the study area intersections operate acceptably with the existing and proposed zoning in the horizon analysis period. The US 97/J Street intersections exceed ODOT mobility standards with or without the proposed rezone. The additional trips associated with the rezone create an incremental impact on the intersection, creating a Significant Effect. The City's Transportation System Plan (TSP) Amendment previously identified a mitigation plan for this intersection and, with the planned improvements in place, the transportation system will operate acceptably with the existing zoning and will continue to operate acceptably with the proposed rezone. Assuming that the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) is able to make a Reasonably Likely determination for the $J$ Street improvements in the TSP, no unmitigated significant effects will occur with the proposed rezone. The study methodology, findings, and recommendations are detailed herein.
Madras Elementary Schooi UGB Amendment


## BACKGROUND

The City of Madras, in partnership with the Jefferson County School District is proposing the UGB amendment and rezone to accommodate a potential future elementary school site. Jefferson County School District currently operates two elementary schools within the Madras City limits that served approximately 1,060 kindergarten through fifth grade students during the 2008 school year. The recent closure of the Westside Elementary School due to budget shortfalls has split Madras kindergarten through fifth grade students between Madras Elementary School (kindergarten through $2^{\text {nd }}$ grade) and Buff Elementary School ( $3^{\text {rd }}$ through $5^{\text {th }}$ grades).

Future building needs and the current location of Buff Elementary School within a 100 -year floodplain has created a need for the School District to look at alternative future sites. The location of the proposed land within the Yarrow neighborhood is expected to help accommodate future growth along Madras' east side, and the adjacent Jefferson County Middle School and Juniper Hills Park ball fields are expected to be complementary uses. A new school is not proposed for construction or entitlements at this time; the purpose of the zone change is to accommodate the long-term educational infrastructure needs in the City.

## EXISTING TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE

The existing transportation infrastructure assessment is provided herein to assist the City of Madras with the planning and prioritization of maintenance and infrastructure improvements within the study area. The existing conditions analysis is intended to identify operational and geometric conditions surrounding the site to ensure the necessary right-of-way will be available to accommodate needed system interconnectivity and accessibility, and to ensure existing transportation safety needs are addressed.

## Roadway Facilities

As illustrated in Figure 2, Ashwood Road borders the site to the north and provides primary access and connectivity to the proposed lands. Ashwood Road serves the Deer Creek Correctional Institute and other rural uses to the east of the site. To the immediate west Ashwood Road erves Juniper Hills Park and the Jefferson County Middle School, and further west transitions into B Street and connects to US 97 and the City's downtown core. A recently constructed extension of City View to J Street connects the parcel to the southern City limits, and Bean Drive connects toward the northern portion of the City. Table 1 summarizes key characteristics of the existing roadway facilities.

Table 1
Existing Transportation Facilities and Roadway Designations

| Roadway | Functional <br> Classification | Number of <br> Lanes | Posted <br> Speed | Sidewalks | Bicycle <br> Lanes | On-Street <br> Parking |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Ashwood - B Street | Major Collector | 2-Lanes | $25-45 \mathrm{mph}$ | Partial $^{2}$ | Yes | Partial ${ }^{1}$ |
| City View | Major Collector | 2-Lanes | 25 mph | Yes | Yes | No |
| Bean Drive | Minor Collector | 2 -Lanes | 25 mph | No | No | No |
| Kinkade | Minor Collector | 2-Lanes | 25 mph | Partial $^{2}$ | No | No |
| Ashwood - C Street | Major Collector | 2-Lanes | 25 mph | Partial ${ }^{2}$ | No | No |
| $10^{\text {th Street }}$ | Major Collector | 2-Lanes | 25 mph | Yes | No | Yes |
| J Street | Major Collector | 2-Lanes | 25 mph | Yes | Yes | No |

${ }^{1}$ On-street parking is provided along sections of roadway within the City limits.
${ }^{2}$. Sidewalks are located on one side of the street only.

## Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities

Sidewalks are currently provided along the south side of Ashwood Road primarily where frontage improvements have been completed. As shown in Table 1, sidewalks are generally provided along a majority of the roadways within the site vicinity, with the exception of Bean Drive, where pedestrians may rely on the multi-use path within Juniper Hills Park.

Bicycle lanes are provided on both sides of Ashwood Road and extend west to the City center. Bicycle lanes are also provided on both sides of City View Road, which connect to J Street and the City center to the south.

Review of the project vicinity identified that pedestrian and bicycle connectivity and roadway crossing treatments should be considered to connect the existing Jefferson County Middle School with the Juniper Hills Park. Additional connections to the Yarrow neighborhood should also be provided concurrent with development, including appropriate pedestrian crossing treatments along Ashwood Road. These connections could help encourage non-vehicular trips between the complementary uses and increase pedestrian and bicyclist safety.

## Transit Facilities

Limited transit service is available throughout the site vicinity through services provided by the Cascades East Transit (Reference 1). Cascades East provides community connections from Madras to Redmond, Culver, and the Metolius City Hall on two trips in the morning and two trips during the afternoon period. Fares on the intercommunity connections are $\$ 5.00$ per day. Curb to curb on-call transit service is also available through Cascades East Transit Mondays through Friday with reservations. These services are available within a five-mile radius of the town center, and the fare for on-demand service is currently $\$ 1.25$ per trip. In addition, the Central Oregon Intergovernmental Council (COIC) also provides bus rides to Medicaid eligible clients within a nine-county area throughout Central Oregon.

## Existing Traffic Counts

Historical traffic counts were obtained at City of Madras intersections from May 2007. Review of the manual turning movement counts showed that during the critical evening peak hour B Street near its intersection with $10^{\text {th }}$ Street carries approximately 145 vehicles in the eastbound direction and approximately 275 vehicles in the westbound direction during the evening peak hour. It was also noted that of the westbound vehicles approximately 20 percent were expected to travel south on City View with the remainder continuing westbound along Ashwood Road - B Street.

Figure 3 provides a summary of the historical year 2007 existing weekday p.m. peak hour turning-movement counts, which are rounded to the nearest five vehicles per hour. No historical traffic count data was available for the Ashwood Road/Bean Drive intersection, so new counts were conducted in January of 2010. The new traffic count showed similar but slightly lower through volumes along Ashwood Road as compared to the historical 2007 counts. Accordingly, it is expected that the $2006 / 2007$ counts continue to reflect the existing roadway conditions. A summary of the existing traffic volumes throughout the study area is shown in Figure 3. Attachment " 1 " contains the traffic count worksheets used in this study as provided by City staff.

## Current Levels of Service and Performance Standards

Intersection performance thresholds vary throughout the study area based on the roadway jurisdiction. Jefferson County traffic study requirements included within the County's TSP (Reference 2) identify that a Level of Service "C" or higher should be maintained at all County intersections. The City of Madras TSP (Reference 3) identifies a target Level of Service (LOS) "D" for signalized intersections, LOS "E" for unsignalized intersections (or LOS F with a volume-tocapacity ratio below 0.95). ODOT mobility standards included within the Oregon Highway Plan (add subsequent updates, Reference 4) require a volume-to-capacity ratio of less than 0.90 on the stop-controlled minor street approaches at the J Street intersections and a volume-to-capacity ratio of 0.80 at the signalized B Street intersections and future signalized J Street intersections. ${ }^{1}$

Intersection operations were reviewed to identify current capacity and safety constraints on the roadway network. Field review of the study area identified that all of the intersections are uncontrolled in the east-west direction along B Street - Ashwood Road and are stop-sign controlled along the north-south minor-street approaches. Relevant intersection performance standards for the study area intersections are summarized below in Table 2.

[^28]P KITTELSON \& ASSOCIATES, INC.

Table 2 Summary of Intersection Performance Standards

| Intersection | Jurisdiction | Traffic Control ${ }^{1}$ | Performance Standard | Horizon Period |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ashwood Road/ Bean Drive | Jefferson County | TWSC | LOS C | Year 2027 |
| Ashwood Road/ City View | City of Madras | TWSC | $\begin{gathered} \text { LOS E/ } \\ \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}<0.95 \end{gathered}$ | Year 2020 |
| B Street/ Kinkade Road | City of Madras | TWSC | $\begin{gathered} \text { LOS E/ } \\ \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}<0.95 \end{gathered}$ | Year 2020 |
| B Street/ Ashwood Road | City of Madras | TWSC | $\begin{gathered} \text { LOS E/ } \\ \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}<0.95 \end{gathered}$ | Year 2020 |
| B Street/ $10^{\text {th }}$ Street | City of Madras | TWSC | $\begin{gathered} \text { LOS E/ } \\ \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}<0.95 \end{gathered}$ | Year 2020 |
| B Street/ US 97 Northbound | ODOT | Signalized | $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}<0.80$ | Year 2025 |
| B Street/ US 97 Southbound | ODOT | Signalized | $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}<0.80$ | Year 2025 |
| J Street/ US 97 Northbound | ODOT | TWSC | $v / \mathrm{c}<0.90$ | Year 2025 |
| J Street/ US 97 Southbound | ODOT | TWSC | $v / \mathrm{c}<0.90$ | Year 2025 |

${ }^{1}$ TWSC: Two-way stop-controlled (unsignalized)
Results of the existing conditions intersection operations during the weekday p.m. peak hour are illustrated in Figure 3. As shown in the figure, all of the study area intersections currently operate acceptably. It was noted that the J Street intersection with Southbound US 97 (4 ${ }^{\text {hh }}$ Street) meets mobility standards but operates with high delays (Level of Service "E") along the stop-controlled east-west approaches. Existing conditions level-of-service worksheets are included in Attachment " 2 ".

## Existing Conditions Summary

The following transportation system improvement needs were identified based on review of the existing system conditions. Since mitigation of these existing deficiencies is not applicable to or caused by the proposed zone change, it is recommended that these safety and performance improvements be provided by the City of Madras as part of the City's regular maintenance or incorporated into the City's Capital Improvement Plans.

- Pedestrian and bicycle connectivity and roadway crossing treatments should be considered as part of future planning efforts to connect the existing Jefferson County Middle School with the Juniper Hills Park. Additional connections to the Yarrow neighborhood should also be provided concurrent with development, including appropriate pedestrian crossing treatments along Ashwood Road. These connections could help encourage non-vehicular trips between the complementary uses and increase pedestrian and bicyclist safety.
- All of the study area intersections operate acceptably, although the Southbound US 97 (4 ${ }^{\text {h }}$ Street)/J Street intersection operates with high minor-street delay at a Level of Service " E ".


## TRANSPORTATION PLANNING RULE COMPLIANCE

The applicable criteria for zone change analyses are found within Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 660-12-0060, also known as the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR, Reference 5). The TPR is intended to require that any changes to the adopted and recognized Transportation System Plan show consistency and compliance with the stated goals of the plan, the development and regular updates of which are a mandated requirement for cities. The overall purpose of a city's TSP is to 1) provide a safe, convenient, and economic transportation system that encourages and supports the availability, safety, convenience, and efficiency of a variety of transportation choices for moving people that balance vehicular use with other transportation modes, including walking, bicycling, and transit in order to avoid principal reliance upon any one mode of transportation; and 2) to protect existing and planned facilities for their identified functions.

The City's applicable Transportation System Plan was completed in 2001, with updates completed for the J Street connection with the US 97 in 2005 (Reference 6). The initial plan provides an assessment of roadway classifications throughout the City and potential intersection treatments at a sampling of collector and arterial intersections along with associated planning level improvement costs, and is the applicable planning document related to the City's Ashwood - B Street intersections. The J Street amendment reviewed improvement options specific to the US 97 intersections and is considered the relevant planning document for the J Street intersections.

The City's adopted TSP does not include a specific assessment of the long-term intersection needs at any of the City intersections along B Street-Ashwood, as the TSP focused on the more critical intersections along the US 97/US 26 corridor through downtown Madras. The intent of this zone change analysis is to provide an assessment of the long-term system needs that should be considered for inclusion within the City's TSP (as summarized within the Existing Zoning section). In addition, to support the proposed zone change this report also includes an assessment of additional impacts that could occur with future development resulting from this zone change (as included within the Proposed Zoning section).

All analyses assess year 2020 conditions on City facilities and year 2027 conditions on County facilities for consistency with the adopted TSP horizon years. ODOT's US 97 intersections with J Street are assessed under year 2025 conditions, consistent with the TSP Update and meeting the minimum 15-year planning horizon required for consistency with the Oregon Highway Plan (Section 1F.2). ODOT's intersections with B Street are also assessed under year 2025 conditions for consistency with the 15 -year minimum planning horizon identified in the State's TSP, the Oregon Highway Plan (the City TSP assesses only 2020 conditions at B Street).

## Reasonably Likely Transportation Improvements

Transportation Planning Rule analyses allow the inclusion of planned improvements in the horizon analysis period for which a funding mechanism has been identified. The funding mechanism could be an established local Capital Improvement Project, local projects contained within a City's Systems Development Charge (SDC) list, or funded ODOT Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) projects. No funded improvements affect the study area intersections.

The US 97/J Street improvements are identified in the City's TSP Amendment as a needed facility improvement and included within the ODOT 2010-2013 Draft STIP list. Improvement plans include realignment of northbound US 97 onto Adams Drive and two new traffic signals at the new J Street intersections. A request for a "Reasonably Likely" determination for the planned improvements has been sent to ODOT and is pending approval. Attachment "3" includes an illustration of the planned J Street Improvements.

## Existing Zoning Conditions (Future Horizon Period)

An analysis was conducted for the horizon years as identified in the applicable City, County, and State TSPs. The existing zoning assessment was prepared to identify how the study area's transportation system operates in the horizon year with build-out of the subject parcel as currently zoned (without the impact of the proposed rezone). This analysis will supplement the City's TSP efforts along this segment of Ashwood Road and will provide a basis for comparison to potential future conditions with the proposed zone change.

Review of the City's TSP (TSP Technical Memorandum \#3, Reference 7) shows that future horizon volumes were developed through the application of an annual three percent growth rate for all turning and through movements to and from City facilities. ODOT facilities were assessed using a two percent annual growth rate for through movements along US 97/US 26. County facilities were assessed with a 3.2 percent growth rate through 2011 and 2.5 percent annual growth from 2012 through 2027.

To identify the existing trip generation potential of the subject property, review of the County zoning, allowable land uses, and site constraints was conducted. The existing Range Land zoning is one of three designations for Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) lands within Jefferson County. The RL zoning is intended to preserve predominantly non-irrigated agricultural lands for livestock grazing, and the $R L$ zoning requires that non-farm residences contain a minimum of 40 acres. A variety of non-residential uses are permitted within the $R L$ zoning, though these uses require more acreage than the 20 -acres proposed for the rezone and all are considered low intensity uses. Accordingly, under the existing zoning the trip generation potential is severely limited, and for analysis purposes it was conservatively assumed to be none.

## Intersection Level-of-Service Analysis

Figure 4 illustrates the weekday p.m. peak hour traffic volumes inclusive of regional growth and potential site build-out with the existing zoning. These volumes were used to conduct an operational analysis at each of the study intersections to determine the horizon year levels of service. As shown, all of the study intersections are forecast to operate at acceptable levels of service with exception of the US 97/J Street intersections, which exceed ODOT mobility standards. With the planned J Street improvements in place both the US 97 Northbound and Southbound intersections with J Street are forecast to operate acceptably. Attachment " 4 " contains the horizon period existing zoning level-of-service worksheets.
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## Proposed Zoning Conditions (Future Horizon Period)

Future horizon year conditions were developed based on the same methodology used to assess the existing zoning conditions. The proposed zoning conditions also include the incremental increase in trips that could be generated with the Multiple Family Residential (R-2) zoning, as described below.

The Multiple Family Residential (R-2) zoning category provides for higher-density single-family uses and attached residential uses, including apartments and townhomes. The R-2 zoning also allows parks and community centers as outright uses. Schools, churches, libraries, and other government buildings are allowed as conditional uses.

The City of Madras zoning provisions, as contained within Ordinance 723 (Reference 8), were reviewed to identify density ranges and allowable uses within the R-2 zoning. Conditional uses are typically not considered as part of a zone change analysis. However, as the intent of the rezone is to ultimately allow for a new school this specific conditional use was reviewed to ensure that a reasonable development scenario considers the potential impact of a school.

Review of the City zoning provisions identified the following outright allowable uses in the R-2 zoning:

- Single family residential
- Multi-family residential
- Public park, recreation areas, community centers

Based on the uses shown above, multi-family residential was identified as the most intense outright land use category from a trip generation perspective. Review of the required building space, parking allocations, lawn space, and typical road and infrastructure allocations identified a resultant reasonable maximum density of 11.6 attached residential units per acre, or approximately 232 total attached residential units on 20 -acres. Additional details on the development of residential densities are included in Attachment " 5 ".

Conversations with the project team identified that a future school would likely comprise ten acres of the overall land, with a minimum of five acres dedicated to the elementary school. Any additional lands would be retained for residential uses. The most likely school type would be an elementary school given the regional needs and recent closure of the Westside Elementary site. A new elementary school could be expected to serve an enrollment of approximately 350 students (historical records from the closed Westside Elementary School showed an enrollment of 325 students).

Accordingly, in addition to consideration of build-out of the 20 -acres with residential uses, this provides two additional R-2 development scenarios to consider:

1. 116 attached residential units on ten acres ( 11.6 units/acre * 10 acres $=116$ units) and a $350-$ student elementary school
2. 174 attached residential units on fifteen acres ( 11.6 units/acre * 15 acres $=174$ units) and a 350 -student elementary school on the remaining five acres.

While a ten acre school site is more typical, the minimum five-acre site provides a reasonable worst-case development scenario resulting in a more conservative analysis. The two scenarios forwarded for consideration include build-out of the parcel with residential and build-out of 15acres with residential and 5-acres with a new school.

## R-2 Zoning Trip Generation Potential

Trip generation estimates were prepared for both $R-2$ zoning scenarios to determine which land use combination resulted in a higher overall trip generation potential during the critical weekday evening commute period (one hour between 4:00 and 6:00 p.m.). Trip generation estimates for each of the scenarios were prepared based on surveys of similar sites. Residential trip generation estimates were prepared based on data contained within ITE's standard reference Trip Generation, $8^{\text {th }}$ Edition, using the Apartment land use category (Land Use Code 220, Reference 9).

Trip generation estimates for the elementary school were prepared using surveys of schools within the City of Bend to better approximate local elementary school trends. The surveys of the Bend locations contain slightly lower trip generation rates than national surveys of elementary schools ( 0.13 trips/student versus 0.15 trips/student), but are expected to better reflect local characteristics of Central Oregon schools than the national data due to similarities in weather characteristics, mode splits, and after school activities.

All of the elementary school surveys were conducted in early fall at each of the five school sites and include an account of after school activities and public use of the adjacent ballfields. Because the evening commute period analysis of the school primarily reflects faculty trips (student trips typically occur in the afternoon), the increased student walking ratios during fair weather conditions are not expected to impact the results. The study found that the increased public use of the ballfields due to the fair weather likely results in a higher than typical trip rate. While the Bend Elementary School surveys were conducted at locations within developed residential neighborhoods, it is assumed that the City of Madras Urban Growth Boundary area will be fully developed by the horizon year providing similar characteristics at the proposed location. It was also noted that the surrounding neighborhoods have already been master planned, with portions of the roadway infrastructure for the first development phases already in place. Attachment "6" contains the Bend-La Pine Elementary School Trip Generation study.

While the location of the elementary school is expected to support the surrounding Yarrow neighborhood, complement with the adjacent middle school, recreational facility, and benefit from the adjacent Juniper Hills Park ballfields, additional trip discounts were not applied to the trip rates obtained from the Bend-La Pine School District facilities. Mixed-use incentives provided in Section 6 of the TPR were also omitted from the analysis, though the densities and integrated uses planned within the Yarrow development are expected to comply with the applicable definitions of a mixed-use pedestrian friendly neighborhood. Table 3 summarizes the trip generation potential of the two potential land use scenarios.

| Land Use | ITE Code | Size | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | rotal | In | Out |
| Proposed R-2 Zoning: Residential Only Scenario |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apartments (20 acres) | 220 | 232 Units | 145 | 94 | 51 |
| Proposed R-2 Zoning: Residential Plus Elementary School Scenario |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apartments (15 acres) | 220 | 174 Units | 113 | 74 | 39 |
| Elementary School (5 acres) | N/A | 350 Students | 46 | 25 | 21 |
| Total Trips |  |  | 159 | 99 | 60 |

As shown in Table 3, future development of the 20-acres with an elementary school (comprising five acres) and residential uses (comprising 15 acres) provides a reasonable worst-case development scenario. This scenario was found to generate 14 more weekday p.m. peak hour trips than build-out of residential uses alone and was used to assess the incremental system impacts associated with the proposed rezone.

## Trip Distribution and Trip Assignment

The estimated trip distribution pattern of primary site-generated trips associated with the UGB amendment was determined through review of existing traffic patterns, likely school faculty/employee housing, and residential destinations. The trip distribution patterns were separated by residential and school trips, with the resultant trip distribution pattern illustrated in Figure 5. As shown, the pattern highlights that the majority of trips would be headed west toward the City center and US 97 corridor. Trips destined toward US 97 are expected to distribute onto the available parallel routes (Loucks, City View, or B Street) based on their ultimate travel destination.

The difference between the Range Land zoning trip generation potential (assumed to be none) and the proposed Multiple Family Residential (R-2) zoning trips (shown in Table 4) during the critical weekday p.m. peak hour was assigned to the roadway network based on the trip distribution patterns and routing. These incremental trips were added to the existing zoning traffic volumes, with the resultant volumes illustrated in Figure 7.

## Study Area Intersections

Based on a review of the potential increase in trips with the proposed zoning, the following intersections of collector and arterial roadways were identified as study intersections due to their potential for being significantly affected by the proposed zone change. Scoping materials and conversations with the affected jurisdiction staff provided concurrence on the study area. The City of Madras roadway classification map is included in Attachment " 7 " and the scoping letter is included as Attachment "8".
Madras Elementary School UGB Amendment
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- Ashwood Road/Bean Drive (could be impacted by up to 137 additional weekday p.m. peak hour trips, a 46 percent increase from existing volume)
- Ashwood/City View (could be impacted by up to 119 additional weekday p.m. peak hour trips, a 34 percent increase from existing volume)
- B Street/Kinkade Road (could be impacted by up to 76 additional weekday p.m. peak hour trips, a 22 percent increase from existing volume)
- B Street/Ashwood (could be impacted by up to 66 additional weekday p.m. peak hour trips, an 18 percent increase from existing volume)
- B Street/ $10^{\text {th }}$ Street (could be impacted by up to 55 additional weekday p.m. peak hour trips, a 12 percent increase from existing volume)
- US 97 Northbound/B Street (exceeds ODOT's 300 daily trip threshold)
- US 97 Southbound/B Street (exceeds ODOT's 300 daily trip threshold)
- US 97 Northbound (Fifth Street)/J Street (exceeds ODOT's 300 daily trip threshold)
- US 97 Southbound (Fourth Street)/J Street (exceeds ODOT's 300 daily trip threshold)

It should be noted that additional assessment of localized queuing and operations during the school peak periods may be required in the future as part of the entitlements process when a specific site plan is available. However, as the purpose of the Transportation Planning Rule is to provide consistency with the adopted Transportation System Plan only the weekday p.m. peak hour operations (design hour) are summarized herein for TPR purposes.

## Intersection Level of Service Analysis

The weekday p.m. peak hour turning-movement volumes shown in Figure 5 were used to conduct an operational analysis at each study intersection to determine the horizon year levels of service. As shown, with the application of regional growth and the incremental trip generation potential of the proposed R-2 zoning all of the study intersections are forecast to operate at acceptable levels of service during the weekday p.m. peak hour with exception of the US 97/J Street intersections. With the planned I Street improvements in place, both the US 97 northbound and southbound intersections with J Street are shown to operate acceptably. Attachment "9" contains the horizon year level-of-service worksheets.

## TRANSPORTATION PLANNING RULE COMPLIANCE

OAR Section 660-12-0060 sets forth the relative criteria for evaluating plan and land use regulation amendments. Table 4 summarizes the TPR criteria and their applicability to the proposed rezone application.

Table 4 Summary of Criteria in OAR 660-012-0060

| Section | Criteria | Applicable? |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 1 | Describes how to determine if a proposed land use action results <br> In a slgnificantly affects transportation facilities. | Yes <br> See response befow |
| 2 | Describes measures for complying with Criteria \#1 where a <br> significant effect is identified. | Yes <br> See response befow |
| 3 | Describes measures for complying with Criteria \#1 and \#2 <br> without assuring that the allowed land uses are consistent with <br> the function, capacity and performance standards of the facility | No |
| 4 | Determinations under Criteria \#1, \#2, and \#3 are coordinated <br> with other local agencies. | Yes <br> See response below |
| 5 | Indicates that the presence of a transportation facility shall not be <br> the basis for an exception to allow development on rural lands. | No <br> (Lands are part of a <br> master plan area) |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | Indicates that local agencies should credit developments that <br> provide a reduction in trips. | No <br> (No concurrent site <br> plan) |
| Outlines requirements for a local street plan, access management |  |  |
| plan, or future street plan for commercial areas. | No <br> (Commercial lands are <br> not proposed) |  |
| 8 | Defines a mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly neighborhood | No <br> (No concurrent site <br> plan) |

As shown, there are eight criteria that apply to Plan and Land Use Regulation Amendments. Of these, Criteria \#1, \#2, and \#4 are applicable to the proposed land use action. Applicable sections of these criteria are provided below in italics with a corresponding response shown in standard font.

OAR 660-12-0060 (1) Where an amendment to a functional plan, an acknowledged comprehensive plan, or a land use regulation would significantly affect an existing or planned transportation facility, the local government shall put in place measures as provided in section (2) of this rule to assure that allowed land uses are consistent with the identified function, capacity, and performance standards (e.g. level of service, volume to capacity ratio, etc.) of the facility. A plan or land use regulation amendment significantly affects a transportation facility if it would:
(a) Change the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility. (exclusive of correction of map errors in an adopted plan);
(b) Change standards implementing a functional classification system; or
(c) As measured at the end of the planning period identified in the adopted transportation system plan:
(A) Allow land uses or levels of development that would result in types or levels of travel or access that are inconsistent with the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility;

Response: Based on the incremental traffic increase from $R L$ to $R-2$ zoning, the functional classification of all the adjacent roadways will not be affected with the proposed zone change.
(B) Reduce the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility below the minimum acceptable performance standard identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan; or

Response: The intersections of US 97/J Street performs below the minimum acceptable performance standard in the City of Madras TSP and the OHP with the existing zoning.
(C) Worsen the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility that is otherwise projected to perform below the minimum acceptable performance standard identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan.

Response: The performance of the US 97/J Street intersections are degraded with the incremental trips from the proposed rezone, and therefore a Significant Effect occurring with the proposed rezone.

OAR 660-12-0060 (2) Where a local government determines that there would be a significant effect, compliance with section (l) shall be accomplished through one or a combination of the following:
(a) Adopting measures that demonstrate allowed land uses are consistent with the planned function, capacity, and performance standards of the transportation facility.
(b) Amending the TSP or comprehensive plan to provide transportation facilities, improvements or services adequate to support the proposed land uses consistent with the requirements of this division; such amendments shall include a funding plan or mechanism consistent with section (4) or include an amendment to the transportation finance plan so that the facility, improvement, or service will be provided by the end of the planning period.
(c) Altering land use designations, densities, or design requirements to reduce demand for automobile travel and meet travel needs through other modes.
(d) Amending the TSP to modify the planned function, capacity or performance standards of the transportation facility.
(e) Providing other measures as a condition of development or through a development agreement or similar funding method, including transportation system management measures, demand management or minor transportation improvements, Local governments shall as part of the amendment specify when measures or improvements provided pursuant to this subsection will be provided.

Response: The J Street intersections are significantly affected. An amendment to the City's Transportation System Plan identifies the long-term needs at these intersections, but at the time the TSP amendment was approved a funding mechanism was not simultaneously adopted. However, because the J Street improvements are located on US 97 and under the
jurisdiction of ODOT additional steps are required to provide a Reasonably Likely determination.

OAR 660-12-0060 (4) Determinations under sections (1)-(3) of this rule shall be coordinated with affected transportation facility and service providers and other affected local governments.
(a) In determining whether an amendment has a significant effect on an existing or planned transportation facility under subsection (1)(c) of this rule, local governments shall rely on existing transportation facilities and services and on the planned transportation facilities, improvements and services set forth in subsections (b) and (c) below.
(b) Outside of interstate interchange areas, the following are considered planned facilities, improvements and services:
(D) Improvements to state highways that are included as planned improvements in a regional or local transportation system plan or comprehensive plan when ODOT provides $a$ written statement that the improvements are reasonably likely to be provided by the end of the planning period.
(e) For purposes of this section, a written statement provided pursuant to paragraphs (b) (D), (b) (E) or (c)(A) provided by ODOT, a local government or transportation facility provider, as appropriate, shall be conclusive in determining whether a transportation facility, improvement or service is a planned transportation facility, improvement or service. In the absence of a written statement, a local government can only rely upon planned transportation facilities, improvements and services identified in paragraphs (b)(A)-(C) to determine whether there is a significant effect that requires application of the remedies in section (2).

Response: A formal request has been provided to ODOT for a Reasonably Likely determination for the J Street improvements. The J Street improvements are included in the City of Madras TSP Amendment, conceptual design and cost estimates have been completed, and the project is included on the Draft 2010-2013 STIP, expected for approval in October 2010. Pending the anticipated receipt of the Reasonably Likely letter from the ODOT Region Manager the ability to assume completion of the J Street improvements as part of the horizon year transportation system will be conclusive.

## PROJECT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## Existing Transportation System Findings and Recommendations

Findings of the existing transportation system review and analysis are summarized below.

- All of the study area intersections currently operate acceptably. The Southbound US 97 (4 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street)/J Street intersection meets City and ODOT operational standards but operates with high peak hour delays on the stop-controlled east-west approaches.
- No marked pedestrian crossings or continuous sidewalks are provided between the Jefferson County Middle School/Yarrow and Juniper Hills Park.

Recommendations from the existing conditions assessment are provided below. The City of Madras should incorporate these recommendations into their scheduled maintenance plans or assess the priority of the improvements based on the potential system safety and performance benefit. The identified improvements are currently needed regardless of the proposed zone change.

- Pedestrian and bicycle connectivity and roadway crossing treatments should be considered as part of future planning efforts to connect the existing Jefferson County Middle School with the Juniper Hills Park. Additional connections to the Yarrow neighborhood should also be provided concurrent with development, including appropriate pedestrian crossing treatments along Ashwood Road. These connections could help encourage non-vehicular trips between the complementary uses and increase pedestrian and bicyclist safety.


## Transportation Planning Rule Findings and Recommendations

Key findings from the Transportation Planning Rule Analysis are summarized below.

- The proposed 20-acre rezone from the County's Rangeland zoning to the City's Multiple Family Residential zoning could generate an additional 159 weekday p.m. peak hour trips.
- With exception of the US $97 / \mathrm{J}$ Street intersections, all of the study area intersections operate acceptably with the existing and proposed zoning in the horizon analysis period.
- With or without the proposed rezone the US 97/J Street intersections exceed ODOT mobility standards. The additional trips associated with the rezone create an incremental impact on the intersection, creating a Significant Effect.
- The City's Transportation System Plan Amendment was prepared to identify the system improvement needs to address the J Street needs. Identified improvements include a realignment of Northbound US 97 ( $5^{\text {th }}$ Street) east onto Adams Drive and two new signalized intersections along J Street for both northbound and southbound highway traffic. With the planned improvements in place the transportation system will operate acceptably with the existing zoning and will continue to operate acceptably with the proposed rezone.
- A request for a Reasonably Likely determination has been provided to ODOT. With a Reasonably Likely determination for the J Street improvements, no unmitigated significant effects will occur with the proposed rezone.
- Interconnectivity should be reviewed with subsequent Yarrow development (including within the subject parcel) to provide direct and convenient multimodal access to the potential school site. Additionally, pedestrian treatments should be considered between Yarrow, Juniper Hills Park, the adjacent recreational facility, and Jefferson County Middle School.

Please let us know if you have any questions regarding this zone change analysis at (541) 3128300.
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## Attachment "1"

Manual Turning Movement Counts


## TRAFFIC COUNT SUMMARY FORM



| TIME |  | EBL | EBT | EBR | ACTUAL PEAK HOURVOULUME |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15－Min Total | Hourly Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | WBL |  |  | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |  |
| 16：30 | 16：45 |  | 5 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 10 | 12 | 164 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 258 |  |
| 16：45 | 17：00 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 12 | 11 | 143 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 234 |  |
| 17：00 | 17：15 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 12 | 12 | 161 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 286 |  |
| 17：15 | 17：30 | 4 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 8 | 7 | 151 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 257 |  |
|  | TOTAL | 18 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 170 | 42 | 42 | 619 | 108 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1035 |
| Mumnt | PHF | 0.64 | 0.75 | \＃DIVI！ | \＃DIVIO！ | 0.70 | 0.88 | 0．89 | 0.94 | 0.61 | WDIVIO1 | \＃Dive！ | \＃Div／ol | Int． |  |
| Approach | PHF |  | 0.79 |  |  | 0.73 |  |  | 0.95 |  |  | \＃Diviol |  | PHF－\％ | 0.90 |

$$
\text { The PM peak hour used is from: } 16: 30 \text { to } 17: 30
$$

VOLUME FOR：PEAK HOUR USED

| TIME |  | EBL | EBT | EBA | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | N日T | NBA | SEL | SBT | SBA | 15－Min Total | Hourly Totał |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16：30 | 16：45 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 10 | 12 | 164 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 258 |  |
| 16：45 | 17：00 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 12 | 11 | 143 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 234 |  |
| 17：00 | 17：15 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 12 | 12 | 161 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 286 |  |
| 17：15 | 17：30 | 4 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 8 | 7 | 151 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 257 |  |
|  | TOTAL | 18 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 170 | 42 | 42 | 619 | 108 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1035 |
| Mvinnt | PHF | 0.54 | 0.75 | WOW／0！ | fibivor | 0.70 | 0.88 | 0，89 | $0.94$ | 0.51 | HOIV／0， | 觡｜（V／0］ | \％DIV／01 |  |  |
| Approach | PHF |  | 0.79 |  |  | $0.73$ |  |  | $0.95$ |  |  | \＃D！v／0！ |  | PHF-> | 0.90 |
| ACTUAL PEAKHOUR LINK VOLUBES$16: 30 \quad 10 \quad 17: 30$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TIME |  | NORTH OF INT． |  | SOUTH | OF INT． | WES | FINT． | EAST OF INT． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | NB | SB | NB | SB | WB | EB | WB | EB |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16：30 | 16：45 | 179 | 0 | 194 | 0 | 53 | 13 | 51 | 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16：45 | 17：00 | 157 | 0 | 177 | 0 | 48 | 8 | 49 | 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17：00 | 17：15 | 180 | 0 | 196 | 0 | 73 | 17 | 73 | 33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17：15 | 17：30 | 163 | 0 | 202 | 0 | 38 | 16 | 39 | 56 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | TOTAL | 679 | 0 | 769 | 0 | 212 | 54 | 212 | 144 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TIME |  | LINK VOLLUMES FOR PEAK HOUR UBED$1030 \quad 10 \quad 17730$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | NORTH OF INT． |  | SOUTHOFINT． |  | WEST OF INT． |  | EAST OF INT． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | NB | SB | NB | SB | WB | EB | W日 | EB |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16：30 | 16：45 | 179 | 0 | 194 | 0 | 53 | 13 | 51 | 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16：45 | 17：00 | 157 | 0 | 177 | 0 | 48 | 8 | 49 | 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17：00 | 17：15 | 180 | 0 | 196 | 0 | 73 | 17 | 73 | 33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17：15 | 17：30 | 163 | 0 | 202 | 0 | $38$ | 16 | $39$ | 56 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | TOTAL | 679 | 0 | 769 | 0 | 212 | 54 | 212 | 144 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

COMMENTS：

## TRAFFIC COUNT SUMMARY FORM

| Project Tille: | Madras |
| :--- | :--- |
| Project No. | ODOT0000-040B |
| Locatlon: | OR |
| NS Street: | Hwy 97/4th Street |
| EW Street: | B Street |


| Condition: | 2003 Exjeling |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Count Date: | $1 / 28 / 2003$ |  |
| Count Perlod: | $4: 00-6: 00$ | PM |
| Growth Pate; | NA |  |
| \# Compounding Years: | NA |  |


| Wenther: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Foad Suriace: |  |
| Trafflc Control: | Two-way Stop |
| Intersect. type: | 4-Leg |
| Counted by: | Trafle Smithy |

APPROACH VOLUMES


ACTUAAL PEAK HOÜR VOLYME

| TIME |  | AYTUALPAKHONVOLUK. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15•Min Total | Hourly Tolal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | EBL | EBT | EBA | WBL | WET | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |  |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 46 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 166 | 4 | 238 |  |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 43 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 167 | 9 | 239 |  |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 54 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 181 | 3 | 264 |  |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 42 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 164 | 5 | 233 |  |
|  | TOTAL | 0 | 24 | 13 | 185 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 678 | 21 |  | 974 |
| Mumnt | PHF | HDV/O! | 0.67 | 0.65 | 0.86 | 0.63 | mpiviol | HDIV/O! | HDIV/0! | 4018/01 | 0.78 | 0.34 | 0.58 | Int. |  |
| Approach | PHF |  | 0.71 |  |  | 0.85 |  |  | \#DIV/01 |  |  | 0.94 |  | PHF: 7 | 0.92 |

The PM peak hour ysed is from: $\quad \underline{\underline{16: 30 ~ t o ~} 17: 30}$
VOLUME FOR PEAKH HOURUSED

| TIME |  | EBL | EBT | E日R | …….n- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15-Min Total | Hourty Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | WBL |  |  | WBT | WBA | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |  |
| 16:30 | 16:45 |  | 0 | 8 | 5 | 46 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 165 | 4 | 238 |  |
| 18:45 | 17:00 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 43 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 167 | 9 | 239 |  |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 54 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 181 | 3 | 264 |  |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 42 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 164 | 5 | 233 |  |
|  | TOTAL | 0 | 24 | 13 | 185 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 678 | 21 |  | 974 |
| Numnt | PHF | +DIvo! | 0.67 | 0.65 | 0.86 | 0.63 | \#Diviol | ADIVIO! | Holyol | HDVYO! | 0,78 | 0.94 | 0.50 | Int. |  |
| Approach | PHF |  | 0.71 |  |  | 0.85 |  |  | HDViol |  |  | 0.94 |  | PHF-> | 0.92 |

ACTUAL PEAKHOUR UNK VOLZUMES

| TIME |  | ACTUAL PEAK HOUR LUNK VOLUMES$16: 3010 \quad 1730$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | NORTH OF INT. |  | SOUTHOF INT. |  | WEST OF INT, |  | EAST OF INT. |  |
|  |  | NB | 58 | NB | 58 | WB | EB | WB | EB |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 0 | 176 | 0 | 217 | 7 | 13 | 49 | 14 |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 0 | 182 | 0 | 214 | 19 | 4 | 53 | 6 |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 0 | 193 | 0 | 235 | 11 | 9 | 62 | 18 |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 0 | 176 | 0 | 210 | 9 | 11 | 46 | 14 |
|  | TOTAL | 0 | 727 | 0 | 876 | 46 | 37 | 210 | 52 |

LINK VOLUMES FÖR PEAK HOUZ USED:

| TIME |  | $16: 30 \text { to } 17: 30$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | NORTH OF INT. |  | SOUTH OF INT. |  | WEST OF INT, |  | EAST OF INT. |  |
|  |  | NB | 88 | NB | SB | W8 | E8 | WE | EB |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 0 | 176 | 0 | 217 | 7 | 13 | 49 | 14 |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 0 | 182 | 0 | 214 | 19 | 4 | 53 | 6 |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 0 | 193 | 0 | 235 | 11 | 9 | 62 | 18 |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 0 | 176 | 0 | 210 | 9 | 11 | 46 | 14 |
|  | TOTAL | 0 | 727 | 0 | 876 | 46 | 37 | 210 | 52 |

COMMENTS:




YEAR 2020 TRAFFIC CONDITIONS - WEEKDAY PM PEAK "WITH IMPROVEMENT" SCENARIO


CITY OF MADRAS COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN UPDATE

## Attachment " 2 " <br> Existing Conditions Level of Service Worksheets



| Q | Yi $\operatorname{Jan} 22,201011: 47: 19$ | Past |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Kibuison a Associates，Ine．－Project \＃1ro2k Madras giementary scincol vG日 hinerument－Madras．Oregon <br>  |  |
|  | Level of Sexvice Detailed Comphoman Reporc 2000 HCM Operations Werhcod Base Volume Altermarive |  |










 blay Adjustment faceoz Modiule．
 Deladypei： $0.00 \quad 0.00$ 0．00 1.001 .0011 .00 0． 001.001 .001 .001 .00 0．00

Cycle（seci：
Loss time is


 Control：Split phase split phase Permicted parmitred 0
0
0
0
0 i


Fif Jan 22，2010 12：47：19

| Exi Jan 22，2010 11：47：19 |  |  | Fage 4－2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kittelson A Assoclates，Ine．－Project H100ns S Elementary school UGB Amendmenc－Madras，Oregon xisting Thatific Conditions，Weakiay FM Peak bour |  |  |  |  |
| Level of sonvice Dotming Computariom Report femitied Left turn Sac Ad． <br> 2000 HON Operazions Method <br> Base Volune Flterracive |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach： | North | South | East | West |
| Cycie Length，C： | Y： $2 \pi \%$ | ※×火 | 4\％ | 100 |
| Acrual Green＇rime Per Lane Group．G： | ¢ $6 \times \times 8 \mathrm{sx}$ | 8：\％xaks | 人くめく\％\％ | 36.62 |
| Effective Green Time Per fane kroup，g： | x2xx＜ix | $8 \times x \times x \times 8$ | ふx：xkx | 36.62 |
| Opposing Effertive Green Time，go： | ¢XXXX\％ |  | ג××＜2\％ | 36.62 |
| Number Of opposing Lanes，No： | 人3： | $x \times 2 \times 8 \times 2$ |  |  |
| Number Of Lanes In Linm Group，N： | 入れインスx |  | 又××xxN |  |
| Acljusted Left－rumm Flow Rate，Vlt： | ハxxxx | ＊2 | 人xえis | 215 |
| Proportion of Leftt Turns in tane Group，Ple： | xx20exs | $x \times k \times x$ | ¢x？ | 0.83 |
| Propurnicn of Left Turns in opp Flow，Plto： |  | y\％rxx\％ | ＊\％××\％x | 0.00 |
| Left Turns Fer Cycle，L．？C： | Yeck | ＞XXx：x | ExMssx | 5.96 |
| Adjusted Opposing Flow hate，Vo： | $x \times x \times N x$ | ghxikx | ¢ $\times$ ¢ $\times$ \％ | 60 |
| Opposing Flow Per Lane Per Cycle，Vols： | 8xaximi | x×6xari | м $\times$ K×＊＊ | 1.67 |
| Opposing Placoon Rutio，Rpo： | х\％\％\％：\％ | xx：\％8 | ※イx×x | 1.00 |
| Lost Tine Fer Fhase，ti： | xixxxxx | \％ Yxxxy | X $\times \times \times \times 8$ | 4.00 |
| Eftregrn until arrival of lefrothim caxp gǐ： | xスッィスxy | XX\％\％xis | ¢人x八2x | 0.00 |
| Opposimg Qufue Raxion，qro： | 人s | \％ | мイスヘx\％ | 0.63 |
| Eft grs blocked by opposing quave，ged | ニクス以及 | \％ $2 \times \times \times \times \times$ |  | 0.50 |
| Eff grr while left rurns fillter thru，gu： | \x×nix | ¢xain | K0xスxx | 36.12 |
| Max opposing caxs anriving during go－gi，$n$ ： | － |  | ： | 0.26 |
| Proportien of opposing thru \＆RT cars，ptho： | $x 8 \times x \times 2 x$ | x－xxys |  | 1.00 |
| Lext－turn Saturation Faccor，fs： | \％xxsysx | xxamex | xexesxa | x $\times$ |
| proporiton of Lext Turns in Shared Lane，gl： |  | ＂仿：\％x： |  | 人xachix |
| Throucgh－car Equtivalants，ell： |  | ※x：$\times$ ¢\％ | \％ $2 \times 3 \times 5$ | 1．49 |
| Sincle lane Through－car fexuvalente，el2： |  | 2xxxym | xxxxye： | 1．00 |
| Minimum Left Turn Mtjustment Factor，mmin： | кххス：\％ | xxx××× | kxxexx | 0.10 |
| Single Lame Left turn Aujustment Factos，fm： | －x\％xys | xsenx | x××x＞\％ | 0.72 |
| Left Turn Adjustment Factor，f1t： | x\％．8×2\％ | x，wx | xrixeyth | 0.72 |




Existing TraÉGic Conditions, heekelay pM Peak Roum

 $\begin{array}{lr}\text { Cysie (sec): } & 100 \\ \text { Loss Cime (sec): } & B\end{array}$


 0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0 1
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0 Volume Modile: $\gg$ Count D动e: 7 Avg 2007 << $4: 15$ to $5: 15 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$.




 $\begin{array}{lllllllllllll}\text { Red } \\ \text { Peq Adj: } & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\ \text { MLF Adj: } & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00\end{array}$



 Capacity Anelysis Module: $\begin{array}{lllllllllllll}\text { Yol/sat: } \\ \text { Criti Moves: } & 0.29 & 0.29 & 0.29 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.05 & 0.05 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.15 & 0.15\end{array}$ Green/cycie: $0.610 .61 \quad 0.6110 .00 \quad 0.00 \quad 0.00 \quad 0.310 .31 \quad 0.00 \quad 0.00 \quad 0.31 \quad 0.31$


 Nota: Queue reparced is the number ore cars per lane.















 volume Module: $\gg$ Count Date: 27 May 2007 《s $4: 00$ to $6: 00 \mathrm{PM}$



 $\begin{array}{lrlrlllllll}\text { Reduce Vol: } & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \text { Finalvolume: } & 2 a & 0 & 20 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 130 & 27 & 29 \\ 1.92\end{array}$












Apprcachid: Note: Rucue raported is the number of cass per lane









 | $c$ |
| :---: |
|  |
|  |
|  | $\begin{array}{lll}\text { HevVeh: } & 0 \% & 0 \% \\ & 0 \% & 0 \%\end{array}$ Pers/heur: 0


 rame period: 0. 25
Ypstream Sienals:




a
0
0
0
0
0
0
0 0.010
0.00000 .000
93
60
98
08
17: compurtition 2: Tine Incersectuon glockes because of upst
 beva: $\quad 0.000$
98
88
08
8
8
000
00
00
0








Eri $\operatorname{san} 22,2010$ 11:47:21
Fage $13 \times 2$

 Volume Modixe: $\gg$ Colint Dace: 17 May $2007 \ll 4: 00$ to 6:00, EM
 $\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrr}\text { Growth Adj: } & 1.00 & 1.00 & 2.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 2.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\ \text { Initial Ese: } & 24 & 0 & 33 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 122 & 23 & 40 & 173 & 0\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}\text { Jser Adj: } & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\ \text { OHE Adj: } & 0.85 & 0.85 & 0.35 & 0.85 & 0.85 & 0.85 & 0.05 & 0.85 & 0.85 & 0.85 & 0.85 & 0.85\end{array}$ 0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
 Exiticai Gap Module:







| henml of sorvice computation sepore <br> 2000 HCM Unsignalized Methed (Base Volume Alternative) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection \#7 "E" street/Bean Dri |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Averacte Delay (soc/veh\}: |  |  |  | 2.0 W |  | wo | ase Level of ser |  |  | 9.71 |  |  |
| street Name: <br> Approach: <br> Hovement: | "3" Srme |  |  |  |  |  | Bean Drive |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | North Bound |  |  | South Eound |  |  | East Bourse |  |  | West Bound |  |  |
| Control: <br> kishts: <br> Lenes: | Stop Sigm |  |  | soopsign |  |  | Uncontrolled |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | contro | l. 1 ed |  |  |  |
|  |  | Incl |  |  |  |  |  | Incl |  |  | anci |  |
|  |  | 0 | 00 |  |  |  |  | 110 | 0 |  | 0. | 00 | 0 | 00 |  |
| Voinme Mocule: $\ggg$ Couns Date: 14 Jan 2010 << 4:00 50 5:00 p.jn. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Binse Vo.t: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 30 | 83 | 62 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Growth Estj: | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | $\therefore .00$ | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 |
| Inderal Bse: |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 30 | 93 | 62 | 0 |  |  |  |
| User ade : | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| pHEx maj: | 1).85, | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.25 | $0 . a s$ | 0.25 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 |
| PHF Volume: |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 35 | 109 | 73 |  |  |  |  |
| Reduct Vol: |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Einalvolume: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 35 | 109 | 73 | 0 |  | 215 |  |

iotnpon deg tertata






 Approathbel: $\quad$ xxxx:
 Note: Queue repodted is the namber of cars per lane,
 Street Name: "B" Stroet Bean Drive
 Control: Stop Sikn bcop sian Uncontrolled Uncontroliked


 -1
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0 PHE Maj: $\quad 0.850 .85$ 0.85 0.850 .05 0.2S 0.050 .850 .85 PHE Volume: Enaivolume:
--110w-1












Traffix 0.0 .0715 (e) 2008 Dowing nssoe. Licensed to Kitrelsin, RORTLAND

Attachment "3" J Street Conceptual Improvement IIlustration

## 

US97@J Street (Madras) Project
Alternative Concepts of US97 Realignment Shown


US97@ J Street (Madras) Project
Conceptual Drawing of Signalized Intersections @ J Street US97 Option B Realignment Shown


## Attachment "4"

Existing RL Zoning LOS Worksheets

| PN | Fxi uan 22, 2010 $21: 46: 55$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5age $2-1$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kıtelson \& Associates, ine. - Project \#10020 Madras Elementary school LGB Amancmenc - Madras, onegon Background ramfie Condituons, weenday ent Ehk How |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Impact Analysis Eepart. Level de Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Incersection |  |  | ${ }_{\text {Le.ase }}^{\text {Eas }}$ |  |  | Furure |  |  | Change i.n |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Del/ | Vi |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Eveh | - |  | s veh | c |  |  |  |
| d | 1 " ${ }^{\text {B }}$ | Streatrath stuewt |  |  |  |  | 22.4 | 0.636 | 0 | 22.4 | 0.636 |  | 0.000 | 日-v |
|  | $2{ }^{\text {"E" }}$ | graeetich stremt | $\square$ | 20.3 | 0.581 | c | 20.3 | 0.581 |  | 0.1000 | biju |
|  | \% "3" |  |  | 22.8 | 0.038 | * | 11.8 | 0.036 |  | 0.000 | du |
|  | 4 "B" | Srieet/ashwcoes |  | 12.2 | 0.0184 |  | 12.2 | 0.094 |  | 0.000 | biv |
| " | 5 "8" | Strewtikankace Roed |  | 12.8 | 0.016 |  | 12.8 | 0.016 |  | 0.003 | E/V |
|  | 6 "B" | Stecoticity Vimw |  | 11.9 | 0.086 |  | 11.9 | U.06s | 4. | 0.000 | DN |
|  | 7 "B" | Strestísean Orive |  | 11.1 | 0.143 |  | 11.1 | 0.143 |  | 0.002 | DSV |
|  | 8 "J" | 3tweevideh streec |  | OVR2゙L | 4.750 |  | OVRE'L | 4.790 | + | 0.000 | ijv |
|  | - " | srmet/5th stret |  | 287.2 | 2.476 |  | 257.2 | 1.876 |  | 4.010 | 0 V |



$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Fx } \operatorname{Jan} 22,2010 \text { 11:48:55 }
\end{aligned}
$$

| 1\％rغ Jen $20,20101 \%: 40: 30$ |  |  | Prge in－2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kitrelson 6 Associates，Inc．－Project H20028 as Elementary School UGS Anendment－Madnas，Otegon <br>  |  |  |  |  |
| Level OS Service Detalied Compatation Report PPenitced hett Turn Sat ditij <br> 2000 Han Operations Method <br> Future Volume Alternative |  |  |  |  |
| Intersectiou ？＂R＂Street；fth Stract <br>  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach： | North | someh | Fanst |  |
| Cycle Lemoth，$¢$ | ※＜Kスス\％ | ：x\％N8\％ | ※インめと\％ | 100 |
| Astuat Grean Pine Per Lane Group，$G$ ： | ※\％\％\％\％\％ |  | \W：3x\％\％ | 58．25 |
| Eftoctive Grann Time rex Lane Group，g： | \％$\times$ x $8 \times \times$ | MMSExM | \％2：\％y．x． | 56.25 |
| Opposing Exteotive treen Tham，go： | ※xコこ以スs | ※＜K×\％ | ふくぶめの | 54.25 |
| Number of oppasinu baxes，No： | 20x | x！enkx， |  | 1 |
| Number Dr Lanes in Lanu droup，$N$ ： | xakx | ※ス××\％ | Mrux＞\％ | 1 |
| Adjusced Lext－rumf flow Rate，Vir： | y．c．$\times$ \％ixs |  | \％小心令 | 345 |
| Froporston of Left Tumas ith Lane Group．Plt： | x $2 \times 2 \times x$ | リスめ\％が | ＊K月， | 0．79 |
| Proporeion of tueft Tumis in Drep Flow，Pltio： | सx×xix\％ | バ×がメメ | いスs．8\％ | 0.00 |
| Lert Turas Foz Cumle，LTC： | x $\mathrm{CW} \times 1 \times \mathrm{x}$ |  |  | 4．59 |
| Afjusteut Opposime Flow Rate，vo： | $\times \times \times 9 \times 8$ | x－K＜＜＜x | xxxy，ix | 1．0．5 |
|  |  | $\times \times 8 \times \times \%$ | ＊ $2 \times \times \times m$ | 3．03\％ |
| Opposimg plakoon Ratio，Rpo： | 又x人心㐅\％ | ※：くくめッ | ¢ | 1.00 |
| Lost Time Per Phase，ti： |  | －xikyinic | x $\times \times \mathrm{y}$ \％ | 4.00 |
| Eff grn until erxival of lett－turn car，gf： | $\cdots \times 8 \mathrm{~N}$ | $\times \times \times \times \times$ \％ |  | 0.00 |
| Opposing Øuebt ratio，gro： | 人Yッスx×x | 20\％ス38 |  | 0.89 |
| Eff gen biocked by opposing queve，gas |  |  |  | 0.76 |
| Eff grn while left turns filler tinat gu： |  | \％$\times \times \times \times \times$ |  | S5．5＊ |
| Max opposing pera mixjuing during agmat，$n$ ： | xx＞0xs： | ¢ $\times \times \times \times 8$ |  | 0.35 |
| proportion ot opposing minu k kl curs，ptho： |  |  | x又：25\％\％ | 1．00 |
| Left－mura soburation Paetor，Es： | 8xexecic | Y．．xx×× | あ゙イくタッ： | － $3: \% \times \times \%$ |
| Proporcion of jueft Tums Ln Snaxpa hane，pi： | Kx\％mx | 8Kxスx： | KN心Wx | sxasex |
| Throughmear Equivalents，eld． |  |  | スイッスイス＂ | 1.56 |
| Single jane Through－car Equivulents，el2： |  | x×2xx× | ※×におx\％ | 1.00 |
| Minnumin teft Iurn axjustment Eactod，Emins | \％Rx\％\％ | 2：及xi：nis |  | 0.06 |
| Simgle bane datt Turn adjustment Eachor，fm： | xarixa | 2：3\％xs．x | rink\％x． | 0.70 |
| Left Turn Adjusmment Factor，filt： | 人x＞＞＞\％ | ※そく入め\％ |  | 0.70 |








$\begin{array}{lcccc}\text { Farking／Hr：} & \text { No } & \text { No } & \text { No } & 0 \\ \text { Bus stp／Hr：} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}$




$$
\text { :sTnPow } 6 \text { WH Wetuennes sdo wot }
$$

















| P | Fri Jan 2\％，2010 11：18：56 |  |  |  |  | Page ${ }^{\text {and }}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kitcelson s associates．Inc．－Project iloj28 Madias Elemertiany Schooi uga Amenciment－Matras，orevo： Backgrown Trafice Condstions，Weekday M Pak hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lidevi Oi Serxice Decailed compotation Report 2000 HM Operations Method Futura volume alternative |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tatersection H2＂B＂Street／5 in Street $^{\text {S }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ppproach： | Nortat Bound | South Bound |  | Eest Bound |  | West Emmo |  |  |
| Moverent： | L－T－R | L－T | － 3 | L－T | R | E． | T |  |
| HCM Ops Adjustec Larie Utilization Module： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tuans： | 01010 | 000 | － 0 | 010 | 00 | 0 | 0 |  |
| cane Grup： | LTR UTR LTM | kssex sxxx | x\％x | iT 4 T | xisx | \％KY\％ | R ${ }^{\circ}$ |  |
| \＃lnstnaras： |  | 00 |  | 1 | － |  | 1 | 1 |
| HCM Ops Input Satuvation Adij Module： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width： | $12 \quad 12 \quad 22$ | $12 \quad 12$ | 12 | 1212 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Creswalkwid： | 1 | 8 |  | 8 |  |  | 0 |  |
| \＆Hev Veh： | 8 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Grarde： | $0 \%$ | 08 |  | D） |  |  | $0:$ |  |
| Parknomm： | H\％ | Ho |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Bus stp／rit： | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | ， |  |
| neea Type： | $\lll \lll \ll$ | くくくくく | く＜Ot | r＞\％ | $>$ | ； | ， | $\therefore$ ： |
| Cnit Fedity： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Exclusivers？ | cructe | ancluc |  | Truciud |  |  | momed |  |
| 3 RI＇PEter： | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | a |  |
| HCM Ops fidet Ads Case Modulu： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ［（15）Case： | 5 Sr 5 S | mxx：c xxxx | $x \times \times$＊ | 5 | xxxx | $x \times$ \％ | ＊sses： | \％$\times$ |
| HCM Ops Satumation Ady Motule： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lri Wide Aolj ： | 1.00 i．00 1.00 | kxxx $\times$ xex | xx＜xs | 1.002 .00 | xzsuri |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Her Ven noj： | $: 0.530 .93 \quad 0.93$ |  | кекия | 1.001 .00 | xxyis． | － | 1.00 | 2.00 |
| Grade Adj： | $1.001 .00 \quad 1.00$ | у， | ＜＜x\％＜ | 1.001 .00 | x $\mathrm{CH} \times \mathrm{m}$ |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Parking Actj： | ： 1.001 .001 .00 | xxax xxax | ：3x\％： | 1.001 .00 | zкхкх |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| gus Stp Adj： | $: 1.001 .001 .00$ | xaxk xxax | xx：my | 1.001 .00 | 2xasx |  | 1．00 | 1.30 |
| Area did： | 1.001 .001 .00 | 2xact ：\％xp | सn＊＊＊ | 1.001 .00 | －xy：x |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| St Ady： | $0.970 .97 \quad 0.97$ |  | yxxs： | xx：x ：xxx | xakse | kskx | 0.96 | 0.80 |
| W Adj： | $0.990 .99 \quad 0.99$ | xxxy $\quad$ zrsx | xx：xs： | 0.750 .75 | x\％＜\％＜＜ |  | \％ $6 \times x$ | 2\％\％以 |
| Pedrithe Acij： | $: 1.001 .002 .00$ | 1.002 .00 | 1.00 | 1.001 .00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 2.00 |
| HCM Sat maj： | ： 0.880 .880 .88 | 1.001 .00 | 1.00 | 0.750 .75 | 2.00 |  | 0.96 | 0.46 |
| Isse Sar maj： | $1.002 .00 \quad 1.00$ | 1.001 .00 | 1.00 | 1.001 .00 | 3.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| MLis Sat endy： | 0.850 .950 .35 | 1.001 .00 | 1.80 | 1.001 .00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Enl Sat ACit： | ：0．84 0.34 0．84 | 1.001 .00 | 1.00 | 0.730 .75 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.96 | 0.56 |
| Delay Adjustment faruer modise： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| coondineted：\lll \ll ¢ \lll \lll \lll No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sigral Type：$<\pi \lll \lll \lll \lll<$ Actuated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Desmedectr： | 1.001 .001 .00 | 0.000 .00 | 0.00 | 1.002 .00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |



| m | Frs Uan 22.2010 11.98:37 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Page 6-3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kitrelson a Associates, the. - \#rotect H1002g Macras Elementary School UGe Anemiment-Madrias, Oregon Backuruand Taflic conducions, geekday ph pank hou: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Servies Detalied Computation Report (hempoo Queus Mesthod 2000 HCM Dperations methad "ucuze volume firerarive |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach: | Sun |  | , |  |  | East lound |  | , |  |
| Movement: | L - T | - |  | " | - R |  |  | 5-T |  |
| Grear/Cycle; | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.570 .57 | 0.00 | 0.00 0.5.9 |  |
| Aurivaltyme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Progutector: | 1.004 .00 | :.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 1.001 .00 | 1.00 | $1.001 .11)^{1}$ | 1.00 |
| Q: | 7.17 .1 | 7.1 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.31 .3 | 6.0 | 0.09 .9 |  |
| Upstreamve: | 0.000 .00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.120 .12 | 0.00 | 0.000 .00 | 0.00 |
| Upstruentudd : | 0.000 .00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.002 .00 | 0.00 | 0.010 .00 | 0.00 |
| EariyArtanty: | 2.001 .00 | 1.60 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.620 .62 | 0.00 | 0.001 .00 |  |
|  | 1.31 .3 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.10 .1 | 0.0 | 0.01 .4 |  |
| HCMEKMuene: | 3.48 .4 | 8.4 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.41 .4 | 0.0 | 0.011 .3 | , |
| 70chtrautor: | 1.1381 .18 | 1.18 | . 20 | 1.20 | 1.20 | 1.20 1.20 | 1.20 | . 20128 | 1.18 |
| HCM2K70che: | 9.7 9.9 | 9.9 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.71 .7 | 0.0 | 0.013 .3 |  |
| 85 thaterior: | 1.531 .53 | 1.93 |  |  | 1.6 | 1.593 .59 | 1.60 | 1.501. | 1.5. |
| HCM2k ${ }^{\text {chsthe }}$ | 12.912 .9 | 12.8 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.32 .3 | 0.0 | 0.017 .0 | 17.0 |
| 90themector: | 1.661 .65 | 1.66 | 1.80 | 1.90 | 1.ลิ | 1.771.77 | 1.80 | 1.801 .53 | 1.63 |
| HCM2k90cho: | . 014.0 | 14.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.52 .5 | 0.0 | 0.018 .4 | 18.4 |
| Ofthriactor: | L. 831.85 | 3.88 | 2.10 | 2.10 | 2.10 | 2.052 .05 | 2.10 | 2.101 .32 |  |
| FCM2kesmot | 15.815 .3 | 15.8 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.92 .8 | 0.0 | 0.020 .5 | 20.5 |
| 98minfactor: | 2 222.22 |  | 2.70 |  | 2.70 | 2.603 .60 | 2.70 | 2.702 .12 |  |
| HCM2ks 6 the: | 18.710 .7 | 18.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.73 .7 | 0.0 | 0.023 .9 | 23.1 |


| Fri $\operatorname{San} 22,2010$ 11:48:36 |  |  | Feye 6-2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kittelson a Associates, Ine. - project \#1002s Madras Elementary school lig Amendment - Marras, oregon Backgrounc Traftic Conditions, Weekday pm Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |
| ed Computation Report (Pamineed lefr Turn Sat Ady) 2000 HCM Cpezerisns Method Future Volume Alternative |  |  |  |  |
| Incersection it "B" St rees/sch Street |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | North |  |  |  |
| Gycle Length, | k:\%x\% |  |  |  |
| Actual green Tine Per hane Group, $\mathcal{G}$ | xxxyxx | \% $x^{\text {x }} \times \times x$ | 3\%.1.18 |  |
| Eteretive Green Time Per Lane Group, |  | \%xxxx | 57.16 | $\times$ |
| opposing Eifective cireer Time, go: | x | masmx | 5\%.15 |  |
| Number of opposing lenes, No: | 2x<xx* | × |  |  |
| Number of wanes In Lare Grouc, N : | xs: | :x:x $: \times x$ | 1 |  |
| Adjusted LeftuTum rrow rate, Vit: | xx | 芯 | 42 | x |
| atoportion of lext ruzns in hane group, | xxaxx* | x $x \times 1 \times \times \times$ | 0.4 |  |
| Proportion of Lext \%urns in Opp Elcw, plto: | $\times 2$ | sxxzzx | , |  |
| Lefte furns peat cyeiar Ltc: | x:x*xx | \%xx\%xк | 1.17 | $\times$ |
| Adjusted opposing flow kate. | nsxx | xasmax | 557 |  |
| Opposing Flow per Lane Rer cycle, Vole: | xsxxx: | xхжसs* | 15.47 |  |
| Opposing platoon ratio, | : $\times \times \times \times \times$ \% | ¢xx\%xx | 00 | k |
| Lostr Time Peer fhase, t 1: | x | x<x: |  |  |
| Eft gen until arxival of deftuturn car, gf: | KN0xx\% | x $\times$ k $\times x \times 1$ | 18.14 |  |
| Opposing queue Ratio, 970: | xy:zxx\% | $x \%$ xix | 0.43 | * |
| EER grn bloched by opposing queue, ga: | x×xxax | \%xx\% | 12.20 | x. |
| Eff gri while left curns filter thru, gu |  | \% | 39.04 |  |
| Max opposing cars arriving during ga-gix m: | xxexx: |  | 0.00 | xx:x |
| Proportion of Opposinitg Thet \& RT Cars, peho: | $x \times x \times y \times$ | \% $\times 1 \times x \times 2$ | 1.00 | x $\times \times \times \times 8 \times$ |
| Letr-tutn saturation factes, | x\$kxex | mxxym | xxaxx | x |
| groportion of Latt Turns in Shared Lane, pl: | x×xax | 2x<k<x | max |  |
| Through-car zquavaients, ell: | x: | xxax $\times$ : | 2.41 | x Nexsm |
| Single Lisne Through-car Equivalents, el2: | $x \% \times \times 2 \times$ | \% $\times 2 \times \times \times \times$ | 1.00 | xyxMy |
| Minimat Lefry Jurn Rajustment Factor, fim | x $x$ mxx $\times$ | xxwx | 0.05 |  |
| Single sane Lett turn adustuent factor, im: | $x \times x \times x$ | xK<<<x | 0.75 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |


8
Fu: Jan 22, 2010 11:48:57

| F10: Jan 22, 2010 11:48:57 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Paue 7 -3. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kitcelson \& Associates, Inc. - Project 110028 s Elementary School UCB Mmendment - Madras, Ozagor: kground Trafific Conditions, Weekday PM Feak Howr |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level Ot" Service Computation Report signalized Method (Funture VoJune Altenative) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| neexsection $H^{3}$ " $B^{\prime}$ Street/loth Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| O.9 Worst Cese Level OE Servict: I 11. S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ament: |  | P | k | 1. | - ' ${ }^{\text {a' }}$ | - A | Z | T | F | I. | 7 | $R$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{COl}: \\ & \mathrm{cos}: \end{aligned}$ | Stop Sign include |  |  | Scop Sign Include |  |  | Uncontrolled Include |  |  | Uncontrolled inciude |  |  |
| cs: |  | - 1! 0 | 0 | 00 | 00 | 0 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| lume Module: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| se Vol: | 13 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 183 | 17 | 24 | 360 | 0 |
| wth Adj: | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.00 | 1.60 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| tial Bse: | 13 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 183 | 17 | 24 | 360 | 0 |
| ed Vol: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Process: | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| tial Fut: | 13 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 183 | 17 | 24 | 360 | 0 |
| er: A.cij: | 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 3.00 | -. 00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Mctj: | 0.85 | 0.05 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0. 0.5 | 0.85 | 0.05 |
| F Volume: | 15 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 215 | 20 | 28 | 424 | 0 |
| duct voi: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| aly | 15 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 215 | 20 | 28 | 424 | 0 |






Level of Service Module:
2Wayguho








[^32]

路

Level of Service Computation Report
2000 HCN Unsj.gnalimed Meehoc (Euture Volume hiternative) Intergeetion $\mathrm{m}^{2}$ Street/kinkacie Roan
 Street Name: "B" Street Kinkede Road








 (1)


 Level. of service mocule:




 Shared Los: $\quad 12.8$ 12.8
 Note: quece reported is the numbar of cars per ane,
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$$
\begin{array}{lrrrrrrrrrrrr}
\text { Growth Adj: } & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
\text { Indiad ESe: } & 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 0 & 46 & 149 & 99 & 0 & 0 & 293 & 2 \\
\text { addea vol: } & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{array}
$$


 Capectity Module:


 Lavel of service Modinde:







Inmprocess:
Initiad Fut:
Vaer Adj:
PE Adj:
educt Voi
1aivolume: - 0


Copechty Modu
Coflict Vol:
Fotent Cap.:
Move Cap.:
Volume/Cap:
-
-
(1)

| PM Fri Jan 22, 2010 11:40:58 Paye 13-1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kittelson \& A:sacciates, Inc. - Project 110028 <br> Mariras Elementary school vas Anendment- Maciras, oreyon Background Traffice Conditions, weekiay pat Puak Hobr. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Leval of Service Computation Report asignalized Method (Euture Volume Altornative) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection \#9 "J" street/5ch street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| street Name: Approach: Movament: |  |  | rees 5 th streer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | North mound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | uth eo. |  |  | ast ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |  | Osi 3 |  |
|  | - " | - ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 1. | - T | - R | - | - T | - P |  |  | - R |
| Control: Rights: | Uncontwolled |  | Uncontronied |  |  | Stop Sigh |  |  | Stop Sign |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 010 | 10 | 00 | 00 |  | 10 | 01 | - | 00 |  |  |
| volume Moctiie: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base vol: | 70.1190 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.55 | 150 | 0 |  | 25 | 110 |
| Crawe Ady : | 1.001 .00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| initian Bst: | 70.1190 | 6 | , |  |  | 1.55 | 150 | 0 |  |  | 110 |
| Added Vol: | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tn-Process: |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| moltial Fut: | 701190 | Gs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 155 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 1.10 |
| User Adj : | 1.001 .00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1,00 |
| paf mjo | 0.950 .95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |  |  | 0.95 |
| prif Volume: | 741253 | 昭 | 0 | 0 |  | 163 | 1.58 |  |  |  |  |
| Reduce Yoh. | 0 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Finalvolume: | 741253 | \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 163 | 158 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 126 |


| Critical gr: | 4.2 | xxxx | x***x | xxxxx | xx:3x | kxx*x | 7.1 | 6.5 | $x \times \times \times \times$ | $x: \times \times$ | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Followuprim: | 2.3 | xxyx | x×x** |  | x*xx | xxxxx | 3.5 | 4.0 | x\%exs | xxxx | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Caparit ty Module: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cnilict vol: |  | xxxx | x×xx* | \%xx\% | x\%*x | x $\times$ x $\times$ x |  | 1466 | \%x** | kx\%x | 1434 | 66\% |
| potent Cap.: | 15\% | xxax | :xx\%x | xx*:x | sxx\% | x:x<x | 299 | 129 | xxxxx | : $\mathrm{x} \times \mathrm{x}$ | 135 | 46.6 |
| Moye Cap. | 1578 | кх\% |  | \% $\times$ \% | kxx | x:xx* | 111 | 122 | : $\times$ knx | xxxx | 128 | 486 |
| volume/Cap: | 0.05 | xxxx | xxyx | xxxx | x:x $\times$ | xkxx | 1.18 | 1.29 | \% $\mathrm{x} \times \mathrm{x} \times$ | : $\times \times x$ | 0.62 | 0.25 |






 mproachDea: Nowe: gueve reported 45 the number ve cary per iatie.


## Attachment "5"

R-2 Residential Density
Development

Derivation of Potential Residential Density (based on provisions within City Ordinance 723)
5 acres * 43,560 SF/acre $=217,800 \mathrm{SF}$
217,800 SF $-25 \%$ roads, offsets, easements $=163,350$ SF Usable

- Assuming 18 units per typical apartment structure


## First two units

$=10,000$ SF (first two units) $+(2$ units $* 200$ SF lawn/unit $)+(2$ units * 300 SF parking/unit $)$
$=11,000 \mathrm{SF}$

## 16 Additional units

$=16$ units * 200 lawn +16 units * 300 parking +16 units *2,000 SF/unit
$=40,000 \mathrm{SF}$

## 18 Unit Apartment Building

$=11,000 \mathrm{SF}+40,000 \mathrm{SF}$
$=51,000 \mathrm{SF}$

## Total Buildings

$=163,350 / 51,000=3$ Buildings

- Assuming final building has more than 18 units to utilize remaining land $=163,350 \mathrm{SF}-51,000 \mathrm{SF} /$ Building * 3 Buildings

10,350 SF $=(x$ units * 200 SF lawn/unit $+x * 300$ parking/unit $+x * 2,000$ SF/unit $)$
$x=4$ units

## Total Residential Units

$=3$ Buildings * 18 units per building +4 uníts
$=58$ units multifamily units, or 11.6 units per acre per five acres
$=232$ apartment units on 20 acres or 174 units on 15 acres

## Attachment "6"

 Bend-La Pine Trip Generation Study
## PURPOSE

The purpose of this memorandum is to summarize measured trip generation rates for elementary schools in Bend during the weekday p.m. peak hour of adjacent street traffic. Standard reference manuals contain trip generation data for elementary schools during the weekday a.m. peak hour (7:00 to 9:00 a.m.) and during the afternoon school peak hour (2:00 to 4:00 p.m.), but no data is available for the evening commute period. This time period is commonly used to assess off-site impacts of schools to the transportation system.

This study identifies elementary school trip generation data during the weekday p.m. peak hour of adjacent street traffic, and was prepared based on surveys of four elementary schools located within Bend. The study methodology and resultant trip generation rates are summarized herein.

## AVAILABLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DATA

As defined within Trip Generation, $7^{\text {th }}$ Edition, elementary schools serve grades kindergarten through fifth or sixth grade, are typically centrally located within residential communities to facilitate access, and provide bus service to students within specific geographic boundaries. The ITE land use category for elementary schools includes both public and private elementary schools within the dataset, although data for this study was collected exclusively at public schools.

As identified within the Trip Generation manual, school bus utilization may vary significantly between elementary schools, and may result in varying trip rates between school sites. Potential factors for school bus utilization could include the proximity of bus service, service boundaries, transportation infrastructure, crime, income, or other factors. School bus utilization data was not collected as the purpose of this trip generation study is to identify characteristics specific to the Bend-La Pine School District, and specifically to elementary schools within the City of Bend.

Available data contained within the standard reference materials includes elementary school surveys during the weekday p.m. peak hour of the generator only. This coincides with the end of
the school day, which typically occurs between 2:00 p.m. and 4:00 p.m. However, the critical offsite transportation analysis period typically coincides with the evening commute period (4:00 to 6:00 p.m.), which does not occur simultaneously with elementary school peak trip generation. No standard data is available within the ITE manual related to elementary school trip characteristics during the weekday evening commute period, when limited after-school activities or staff trips represent the primary uses.

As part of new elementary school projects for the City of Hillsboro School District, trip generation studies were conducted at several locations during the critical weekday p.m. commute period ( $4: 00$ to $6: 00 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. ). These studies showed that the schools' trip generation rates during the evening commute period were approximately 30 percent of the peak school trip rates that occurred in the afternoon. Given the unique characteristics of Bend (population, service boundaries, and bus ridership), a trip generation study was conducted to assess trip generation rates applicable to local conditions.

## TRIP GENERATION STUDY

Four school sites were selected for analysis throughout the City of Bend. School sites selected were those that were in operation for at least two years, were centrally located within residential communities, include typical school hours and amenities, contain defined attendance boundaries, and include configurations that would allow the separation of trips from those associated with surrounding uses. The school sites selected for the survey, data collection dates, street address, and year 2008/2009 enrollment data are identified in Table 1. The attachments include the school attendance boundary map illustrating the location of the elementary schools and the areas served.

Table 1
Elementary School Characteristics

| School Name | Data Collection Dates | School Enrollment | Streat Address |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pine Ridge Elementary | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tuesday September } 16_{\leftarrow} \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | ---540 - | 19840 SW Hollygrape St Bend, Oregon 97702 |
| R E Jewell Elementary | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tuesday September } 16 \text {, } \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | 557 | 20550 Murphy Rd Bend, Oregon 97702 |
| Juniper Elementary | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tuesday September } 16 \text {, } \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | 509 | 1300 NE Norton Ave Bend, Oregon 97701 |
| Elk Meadow Elementary | Tuesday September 16, 2008 | 568 | 60880 Brookswood Blyd Bend, Oregon 97702 |

Each of the ingress/egress points at the school sites were videotaped on September 16, 2008, two weeks after the start of school to ensure that school attendance patterns had normalized. It should be noted that many of the schools are situated adjacent to public parks, and trips associated with the ball fields or adjacent parks could not be entirely separated. During the surveys, the weather was sunny with a high temperature of 90 degrees. Accordingly, it is expected that the trip generation studies are conservatively high given the higher usage of the adjacent ball fields than during the majority of the school year. As trips during the evening commute period likely reflect
low levels of student trips to and from the school, the potential impact of weather on student mode choice is not expected to have a significant impact on the measured trip generation rates.

Intersection traffic counts were simultaneously conducted at nearby collector and arterial intersections to identify the time period with peak traffic volumes on the adjacent roadway system. Given the relatively low school volumes, this hour represents the time period when the combination of site-generated traffic and roadway volumes are expected to peak. The peak hour of adjacent street traffic identified in the study typically occurred just prior to the 5:00 to 6:00 p.m. period, with exception of counts collected near Juniper Elementary which identified an earlier peak hour between 4:25 and 5:25 p.m.

## TRIP GENERATION RESULTS

Videotapes collected at the school ingress/egress points were manually reviewed in five-minute increments coinciding with the peak hour of adjacent street traffic. Trip rates on a per-student basis were calculated at each of the four school sites, and a weighted average was applied to generate a local elementary school trip generation rate on a per-student basis. A summary of the trip generation data for each school is provided in Table 2 and Figure 1, and worksheets from the data collection efforts are included in the attachments.

Table 2
Measured Trip Generation Rates (Weekday PM Peak Hour)

| School Name | Student <br> Enrollment | Weekday PM Peak Hour of <br> Adjacent Street Traffic | Trips Per <br> Student | \%/o <br> Trips In | \% <br> Trips Out |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pine Ridge Elementary | 540 | $4: 50$ to 5:50 p.m. | 0.16 | 40 | 60 |
| R E Jewell Elementary | 557 | $4: 25$ to 5:25 p.m. | 0.09 | 68 | 32 |
| Juniper Elementary | 509 | $4: 25$ to 5:25 p.m. | 0.15 | 52 | 48 |
| Elk Meadow Elementary | 568 | $4: 55$ to 5:55 p.m. | 0.12 | 58 | 42 |
| Weighted Average Trip Generation Rate |  | $0.13^{1}$ | $55 \%$ | $45 \%$ |  |

${ }^{1}$ The weighted average is calculated by dividing the sum of all trips or trip ends by the sum of all independent variable units (total school trips / total student enrollment).

Based on the resultant trip generation rates, trip generation rates for elementary schools within the Bend La Pine School District were identified as 0.13 trips per student during the weekday p.m. peak hour of adjacent street traffic, with 55 percent of the trips inbound and 45 percent of the trips outbound. This local trip rate is approximately half of the national trip rate of 0.28 trips per student during the weekday peak hour of generator (2:00 to 4:00 p.m. time period).

We trust that the information contain herein adequately summarizes the trip generation characteristics of elementary schools within the City of Bend. Please let us know if you have any questions or need any additional information to review the analysis findings.

Attachments: Traffic count worksheets
School Attendance Area Map

## Elementary School (520)

## Average Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Students

 On a: Weekday,Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.

Number of Studies: 4
Average Number of Students: 544
Directional Distribution: $55 \%$ entering, $45 \%$ exiting

Trip Generation per Student

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.13 | $0.09-0.16$ | 0.03 |

Data Plot and Equation
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## Attachment "7"

City of Madras Roadway Classification Map


Attachment "8" Project Scoping Letter

Yo: Nick Snead, City of Madras
Jon Skidmore, Jefferson County
Ana Jovanovic, ODOT Region 4
From: Joe Bessman, Kittelson \& Associates, Inc,
Cc: DJ Heffernan, Angelo Planning Group
Project: Madras Elementary School UGB Amendment
Subject: Transportation Planning Rule Scoping

The purpose of this memorandum is to document transportation analysis scoping to rezone 20 acres of land located in Jefferson County from Range Land (RL) to include this land within the City's Urban Growth Boundary as Multiple Family Residential (R-2) zoning. This scoping was prepared for consistency with the requirements identified within Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 660-12-0060 (Transportation Planning Rule, TPR), which contains the applicable criteria for a zone change analysis. The purpose of the TPR analysis is to ensure the transportation system can accommodate the allowable land uses and that any significant affects are mitigated.

The land included in the rezone is generally located south of Ashwood Road, east of the Jefferson County Middle School, and south of the existing ballfields near Bean Drive. The property is within the Yarrow Master Planned Community and its rezone to accommodate a school is consistent with the approved Yarrow Concept Plan. The location of the property is generally shown in Figure 1, and the identification of the approximately 20-acre future school property on the Yarrow Concept Plan is illustrated in Figure 2. No specific development or entitlements are being pursued as part of this zone change.

Note that while specific parcel boundaries have not yet been identified, the general location of the property south of Ashwood and east of Bean Drive within the future school boundary location shown on the Yarrow Concept Plan provides adequate information to accurately assess the transportation system impacts. Specific definition of the property will be provided as part of the zone change application pending further area refinement with City and County staff.

## LAND DEVELOPMENT ASSUMPTIONS

Two reasonable development scenarios were identified to assess the potential transportation impact of rezoning 20 -acres from Range Land to Multiple Family Residential Zoning. The two scenarios reflect County and City zoning provisions and are presented below.



## Range Land (RL) Development Potential

The Range Land zoning is one of three designations for Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) lands within Jefferson County. The RL zoning is intended to preserve predominantly non-irrigated agricultural lands for livestock grazing. The RL zoning requires that non-farm residences contain a minimum of 40 acres. A variety of non-residential uses are permitted within the RL zoning, though these uses require more acreage than the 20 -acres proposed for the rezone and all are considered low intensity uses. Accordingly, under the existing zoning the trip generation potential is severely limited, and for analysis purposes it was conservatively assumed to be none.

## Multiple Family Residential ( $R$-2) Development Potential

The Multiple Family Residential (R-2) zoning category provides for higher-density single-family uses and attached residential uses, to include apartments and townhomes. The R-2 zoning also allows parks and community centers as outright uses. Schools, churches, libraries, and other government buildings are allowed as conditional uses.

The City of Madras zoning provisions, as contained within Ordinance 723, were reviewed to identify density ranges and allowable uses within the R-2 zoning. Conditional uses are typically not considered as part of a zone change analysis. However, as the intent of the rezone is to ultimately allow for a new elementary school, this specific conditional use was reviewed to ensure that a reasonable development scenario considers the impacts of this intended future use.

Review of the City zoning provisions identified the following outright allowable uses:

- Single family residential
- Multi-family residential
- Public park, recreation areas, community centers

Based on the uses shown above, multi-family residential was identified as the most intense outright land use from a trip generation perspective. Review of the required building space, parking allocations, lawn space, and typical road and infrastructure allocations identified a resultant reasonable maximum density of 11.6 attached residential units per acre, or approximately 232 total attached residential units on 20 -acres. Additional details on the development of residential densities are included as an attachment.

Conversations with the project team identified that a future school would likely comprise five acres of the overall land, with the remainder retained for residential uses. The most likely school type would be an elementary school given the regional needs. A new elementary school could be expected to serve an enrollment of approximately 350 students. This would result in a second potential development scenario that would include 174 attached residential units ( 11.6 units/acre * 15 acres $=174$ units) and a 350-student elementary school (remaining five acres)..

## TPR ANALYSIS SCOPING

## Trip Generation

Trip generation estimates were prepared for both R-2 zoning scenarios to determine which land use combination resulted in a higher overall trip generation potential during the critical weekday evening commute period (one hour between 4:00 and 6:00 p.m.). Trip generation estimates for each of the scenarios were prepared based on surveys of similar sites. Residential trip generation estimates were prepared based on data contained within the Institute of Transportation Engineer's (TTE's) standard reference Trip Generation, $8^{\text {th }}$ Edition, using the Apartment land use category (Land Use Code 220). Trip generation estimates for the elementary school were prepared using surveys of schools within the City of Bend, which contain slightly lower trip generation rates than national surveys of elementary schools ( 0.13 trips per student versus 0.15 trips per student) but are expected to better represent local characteristics. The attachments contain the BendLa Pine Elementary School Trip Generation study.

While the location of the elementary school is expected to support the surrounding Yarrow neighborhood, complement the adjacent middle school, and benefit from the adjacent ballfields, additional trip discounts were not applied to the trip rates obtained from the Bend-LaPine school district facilities. Table 1 summarizes the trip generation potential of the two scenarios.

Table $1 \quad$ R-2 Development Scenarios Trip Generation Potential

| Land Use | ITE Code | Size | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Total | In | Out |
| Proposed R-2 Zoning: Residential Only Scenario |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apartments | 220 | 232 Units | 145 | 94 | 51 |
| Proposed R-2 Zoning: Residential Plus Elementary School Scenario |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apartments | 220 | 174 Units | 113 | 74 | 39 |
| Elementary School | N/A | 350 Students | 46 | 25 | 21 |
| Total Trips |  |  | 159 | 99 | 60 |

*Trip rate reflects data collected at elementary schools in central Oregon
As shown in Table 1, future development of the 20 -acres with an elementary school (comprising five acres) and residential uses (comprising 15 acres) provides a reasonable worst-case development scenario. This scenario was found to generate 14 more weekday p.m. peak hour trips than build-out with residential uses alone.

## Trip Distribution and Trip Assignment

The estimated trip distribution pattern of primary site-generated trips associated with the proposed UGB amendment and rezone was determined through review of existing traffic patterns, the locations of other elementary schools, residential destinations, and review of existing
school attendance boundary maps. The resultant trip distribution patterns were separated by residential and school trips, and are illustrated in Figures 3 and 4. As shown, the pattern highlights that the majority of trips would be headed west toward the City center and US 97 corridor. Trips destined toward US 97 are expected to distribute onto the parallel routes (Loucks, City View, or B Street) based on their ultimate travel destination. Both trip distribution patterns reflect a regional draw as the school trips are primarily associated with faculty and staff during the evening commute period.

The difference between the Range Land zoning trip generation potential (assumed to be none) and the proposed Multiple Family Residential (R-2) zoning trips (shown in Table 1) during the critical weekday p.m. peak hour were assigned to the roadway network based on the trip distribution patterns and routing, as illustrated in Figure 5. Figure 5 includes a sum of the total additional vehicles that could occur at nearby collector and arterial intersections.

## Study Intersections

Based on a review of the potential increase in trips with the proposed zoning (as shown in Figure 5), the following five intersections of collector and arterial roadways are proposed for inclusion in the traffic study.

1. Ashwood/Bean Drive (could be impacted by 137 additional weekday p.m. peak hour trips)
2. Ashwood/City View (could be impacted by 119 additional weekday p.m. peak hour trips)
3. B Street/Kinkade Road (could be impacted by 76 additional weekday p.m. peak hour trips)
4. B Street/Ashwood (could be impacted by 66 additional weekday p.m. peak hour trips)
5. B Street/ $10^{\text {th }}$ Street (could be impacted by 55 additional weekday p.m. peak hour trips)

These intersections are those that could experience more than 50 additional weekday p.m. peak hour trips with the rezone/UGB amendment, or those that could experience a significant increase in total volume with the amendment ${ }^{1}$. The City of Madras roadway classification map is included in the attachments.

It should be noted that additional assessment of localized queuing and operations during the school peak periods may be required at the time of site plan application/land use entitlements. However, as the purpose of the Transportation Planning Rule is to provide consistency with the adopted Transportation System Plan (TSP), only the weekday p.m. peak hour operations are applicable to the TPR analysis.

[^34]
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Jefferson County traffic study requirements identify that a Level of Service "C" or higher should be maintained at all County intersections. The City of Madras TSP identifies a target Level of Service (LOS) "D" for signalized intersections, LOS "E" for unsignalized intersections (or LOS F with a volume-to-capacity ratio below 0.95 ).

## Study Periods

The purpose of the Transportation Planning Rule is to ensure that the proposed zone change will continue to be consistent with the system planning required under OAR 660-12. To assess consistency, the horizon analysis period is selected based on the horizon period of the adopted Transportation System Plan. The Jefferson County TSP considers a horizon year of 2027 and the City's TSP assesses year 2020 conditions. Accordingly, the applicable horizon period will vary throughout the study area based on roadway jurisdiction. All traffic volume forecasts will be obtained from the applicable TSP or based on continued application of the approved growth rates where otherwise unavailable. Table 2 summarizes the study intersections, roadway jurisdiction, applicable performance standards, and horizon analysis year required for compliance with the TPR. ${ }^{2}$

Table 2 Summary of Intersection Performance Standards

| Intersection | Jurisdiction | Traffic Control ${ }^{1}$ | Performance Standard | Horizon Period |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ashwood Road/ Bean Drive | Jefferson County | TWSC | LOS C | Year 2027 |
| Ashwood Road/ City View | City of Madras | TWSC | $\begin{gathered} \text { LOS E/ } \\ \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}<0.95 \end{gathered}$ | Year 2020 |
| B Street/ <br> Kinkade Road | City of Madras | TWSC | $\begin{gathered} \operatorname{LOS} E / \\ \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}<0.95 \end{gathered}$ | Year 2020 |
| B Street/ Ashwood Road | City of Madras | TWSC | $\begin{gathered} \text { LOS E/ } \\ \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}<0.95 \end{gathered}$ | Year 2020 |
| B Street/ $10^{\text {th }}$ Street | City of Madras | TWSC | $\begin{gathered} \text { LOS E/ } \\ \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}<0.95 \end{gathered}$ | Year 2020 |

${ }^{1}$ TWSC: Two-way stop-controlled (unsignalized)

## Recent or Upcoming Roadway Improvements

There are three identified public improvement projects within the vicinity of the property.

- The J Street improvements will include traffic signal upgrades at the US 97 northbound and southbound couplet, realignment of the southern couplet terminus, and roadway widening. The J Street project is identified on the Draft 2010-2013 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and is likely to be funded by the horizon period (note that

[^36]while the improvement is likely to occur, a reasonably likely determination has not been provided by ODOT).

- The Fairground Road extension is identified as a new east-west route within the City of Madras on the Transportation System Plan. Similarly, the roadway extension is likely to be provided within the planning horizon.
- The City View to J Street connection has been recently completed. This new connection provides convenient and direct access from the proposed lands to US 97 .

The recent construction of the City View connection will provide convenient access to the south. The future funding and reasonably likely determinations for the J Street realignment/improvements and the Fairgrounds extension are not critical to the proposed UGB amendment as it will not affect the selection of study intersections, assumed intersection configurations, or result in modifications to the demand-based regional trip distribution patterns included herein. As a result, to be conservative, neither the J Street realignment/improvements nor the Fairgrounds extension will be assumed in the traffic analysis.

## NEXT STEPS

Please provide written comments or concurrence on the proposed analysis scope at your earliest convenience. If you have any questions on these materials please call us at (541) 312-8300.

## Attachments

1. Residential Density Development
2. Bend - La Pine School District Elementary School Trip Generation Study
3. City of Madras Roadway Classification Map

## Attachment "9"

Proposed R-2 Zoning
LOS Worksheets

Fris Jan 22, 20:0 11:50:16
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Traffix \$0.0.071 (o) zocy Dowling Assoc. Licensed to KITTELSON, PORTLAND

| Eri Jan 22，2010 11：50：20 |  |  | Page 4 － |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kirteltson \＆Associates，Inc．－Project H1002等 Elementary Schod UGX Amemement－Modras，oregon <br>  |  |  |  |  |
| Conputation Report（Pernitutal Left：Taxn Sal Adj） 2000 HCN Operarions Method <br> Euture Voinme AIternative |  |  |  |  |
| Lntersection \＃l＂ $\mathrm{B}^{\prime}$ Screet／ath Street |  |  |  |  |
| Appioach： | North | Sout？ | East | West |
| Cycle Length，C： | Nr：x．5． |  | xxraxis | 100 |
| Actual Green wime fert wane Group，b； |  |  | ふと火＜\％\％ | 56.55 |
| seffective Green mime Per Jume Group，g： | YKイサ： | mssmxx | K | 56.55 |
| Opposing Erfective Green Time，go： |  | ¢xikxx | ※＜xix\％s | 56.55 |
| Number of opposing Lansw，Ro： | ※×××\％\％\％ | 人xax | 2x\％：\％\％\％ | ］ |
| Number of Lanes In Lane Eroup，N： | サンズ\％心 |  |  |  |
| Adjusted Left－Turn Elow Race，Vit： | ¥xarix | Sixxyxx | \％ | 354 |
| Propertion or̈ Lafe Thuns in Lene Group，plta | xと\％NX | ¢x×8× | くメズイメ\％ | 0.80 |
| Eroportion of Left Tunts in opp Elow，Eltos | x | ぶイx＊＊ | ッ：ブめ | 9.00 |
| Left ruxns Per Cycle，LTC： | x： | к＜xys： | 人\％x×\％ | 9．32 |
| Actjusted Opoosing Flow Race，Vo： | ：xxyex | xr＜x－x | Onxwns | 109 |
| Opposing flow fex Lane ver Cycie，Vole： |  | $x \times 2 \times \times \sim$ | く××＊＊＊ | 3.03 |
| Opposing pietron Ratio．Reo： |  | 小心\％及号 | 人リK\％ | 1.00 |
| Lost Thme Per Fhase，tl： | ※nx：\％\％ | \％心xv： | スイ | 4.00 |
| Eff gra mrtil arinvai of lext－Eurn ear．gf： | y\％欠イス×2： | к2ヶ8××\％ | かめにく＜\％ | 0.00 |
| Opposiog Queut Retis，gno： | ¢xxisis\％ |  | xy：\％к\％\％ | 0.4 .3 |
| EtE grn shockec by ppposing queue ga |  | ぶくらいく | MiくnごK | 0.75 |
|  | XXPKX | \％sxyxa | xイ\％$\times$ | 55.80 |
| Mas opposimg ears axriving dmeimg gexer，m： | \％x\％\％x× | Nx×××x | ふめめめ×\％ | 0.38 |
| Proportion of opposing thru \＆Ri fearsp ptios： | ぶ＊さん＊ |  | \％\％ | T．00 |
| Weたt－cum Saturation Facter，Es： | xツx．x： | x：ax | 人及x | ， |
| Exoporison of Lett Turns in shexurd Leme， PL |  | mspexk | ××： $8 \times 8$ | ：$\times \times \times 1 \times \times$ |
| Throughmean Equiwalents，ell： |  | ¢xxxex | 大x×くxx | ㄴ．．ㅈ． |
|  | 入れ\％以\％ | Sxanc\％ | xunsx\％ | 1．Mo |
|  | メ：$\times$ x | к＜xyise | とinseix | （1）．00 |
| Single Jmne dezt．Tian Acdustment Factore fim： | x\％\％\％メメ | ：$\times \times 2 \times 8 \times$ | －xnska | 0.69 |
| Left Turn mejustment factor，fitin： | s心\％Nx\％ | Nン\％スがx | хメンスマメス | 0.69 |
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|  | Fxi Jan 2\％，2010 3i：50．27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Page |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| KLtethson \＆msseciates，Inc．－Project H20028 s Elementary School Uüs Amenoment－Madras，aregon otal Praflic conditions．Weerday m Feak houx |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level in Semvice Detailed Computation Report（HCH2000 Dueue Method） 2000 HCM operations Method Future Volume Rlternstive |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach： | Norch Bound |  | South Eowr |  |  | ast Beune |  |  | near bound |  |  |
| Movenent： | L－T | R | L－ | －${ }^{\text {I }}$ | $R$ |  | T | R |  | T | － |
| Grena／cycle： | 0.0 .350 .35 | 0.35 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.87 | 0.57 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.57 | 0，5？ |
| Anrivaluype： | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |
| Pwocypactor： | 1.001 .00 | 1． 00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1．00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 |
| Q1： | 7.37 .3 | 7.3 | 0.0 | 9.0 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.3 | 10． 3 |
| Upstreamve： | 0.000 .00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0psereamady ： | $=0.00-60$ | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1． 00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| EarlyArradj： | 1.001 .00 | 2.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.62 | 0.62 | 0.00 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Q2： | 2．4 1．4 | 1． 4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1． 4 | 1.4 |
|  | 8.7 3．7 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11．7 | 11．？ |
| 70thrauctar： | ： 1.181 .70 | 2.18 | 1.20 | 1.20 | 1.20 | 1.20 | 1.20 | 1.20 | 1.20 | 1.17 | 1．27 |
|  | 10.310 .3 | 10.3 | 0.0 | O，D | 0.0 | 2， 6 | 1.8 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 23．8 | 23.8 |
| 25chemector： | ： 1.321 .52 | 1，52 | 1.60 | 1． 60 | 1．80 | 3．59 | 1．59 | 1.00 | 1.60 | 2.50 | 1.50 |
| MCM2k85tho： | 13．3 13．3 | 13.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0， 0 | 2.4 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 27.6 | 17.6 |
| Foxins racenc： | ：1．66 1．66 | 1．56 | 2.80 | 1．n0 | 1.90 | i． 77 | 1.77 | 1． 60 | 1.00 | 2.12 | 1.62 |
|  | 14.514 .5 | 14.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 19.15 | 19.0 |
| Q5thatactañ | ： 1.672 .37 | 1.87 | 2.10 | 2.10 | 2.30 | 2.05 | 2.05 | 2.10 | 2.10 | 1.67 | 1．31 |
| HCM\％kgsthe： | 16.326 .3 | 16.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3．${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 3．1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 动，\％ | 24.5 |
| 9¢tharactors | ： 2.212 .21 | 2．とi | 2.70 | 2.70 | 2.70 | 2.50 | 2.53 | 2.70 | 2.70 | 2.11 | 2.12 |
|  | 19.319 .3 | 19.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 0.0 |  | 24．7 | 24.7 |


| Fri Jan 22， 2015 11：50：20 |  |  | page 6－2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kiteolson a Assuciates，the．－Project \＃10028 <br> Madras Eiementaxy School UGS Amerdment－Macitas，oregon Total Traffic Conditions，weekey PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |
| Computation Report（Femitted Lert Tusn Sar Ady） <br> 2000 HCN Opezations Method <br> Buture Volume Alternative |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection \＃2＂3＂Street／5th street |  |  |  |  |
| Appreach： | Worth | South | ast | West |
| Cyche Length， | хжッжк |  | 106 |  |
| Actual grean Time Pex Lane Group， | уккхкх |  | 57.06 | \％ |
| effective green Time Per Lane Group，g： | ＊： | xNx＜xx | 57.05 | ＊ |
| opposing Effective trreen Time，go： | хкмкхх | גx＜xxx | 57.06 |  |
| Number ot Opposing lanes，No： |  | yxaxx： |  | x $\times \mathrm{xax} \times \mathrm{x}$ |
| Number of Lanes In Lane Group，N： | xx\％x＜x | 2x××\％$\times$ |  | ＊ |
| Adjusted Left－turn Flow rate，vat： |  | x＜\％x | 2 |  |
| Preportion oft ieft Turns in dane group，plt： |  | x $\times 2 \times \times \mathrm{x}$ | 0.39 |  |
| Froportion of tueft Tuzns in Opp Flow，Plito： | \％， | \％． | 0.00 | \％ |
| Luett Tunns yex Cyche，LTC： | x：xx：\％x | y $\times \times \times x \times x$ | 1.17 | ＊ |
| Acjusted Opposimg Flow rate，Vo： | kxxax | 4，\％ | 569 | x |
| opposing Flow Per Lane per cycle，Vole： | xx＜xxx | xxsx | 5.51 | x |
| opposing flatoon Ratio，Rpo： | \％ |  | 1.00 |  |
| Lost Time Per Phase，tl： | xxxxx＊ | Mxxsxx | 4.00 | \％ |
| Eff grn until arrival of left－turn car，git | ＊xx | x $\times$ ．$\times$ x $\times$ \％ | 18.09 | musx： |
| Opposing ounue ratio，gro： | $x \times \times \times$ | M×天хх： | 0.43 | \％ |
| eff grn blocked by opposing gueue， | \％＂wxs | жххххх\％ | 12.38 | －xasx |
| Eff gen while left．curns fitere thru，gu： | x××xa\％ | \％ $\mathrm{NXx} \mathrm{\times x}$ | 35.97 | \％ |
| Max opposing cars arriving during gq－gf，$n$ ： | x＜xxem | x×：×x： | 0.00 | N |
| Proportion of Opposimg Thru 6 RT cars，ptho： | \％rxa |  | 1.00 | х\％ххжх |
| Left－turn Saturation Factor，fs： | xxx\％xx | \％$\times$ xxxx | \％．xx×x | ＊ |
| Proportion ch lefto furns in shared lane，pl： |  |  |  | ＜x\％\％x： |
| Through－ciax Eguivalinats，eli； | x×＊＊x×\％ | 4x：1xx\％ | 2.44 | x）：\％＜x\％ |
| Single Lane Through－ast Equivaients，ell | x＊＊＊＊＊ | $x \times \times x \times x$ | 1.00 | \％xsmx |
| Narimum Left Turn Adjustment Factor，fmin | x×x＊＊＊ |  | 0.05 |  |
| Sinelim Lave Left turn adjustment Fbetor，fro | \％xass | x××××× | 0.75 | \％ |
|  |  | ymx | 0.75 |  |

Traffix a．0．0715（c） 2008 Dowling issoc．Licensed to Kittelson，Dortinnd



Level of Service Computation Report
2000 HCM Mnignalized Methoci future Volune Alernative)
Intersection \#3 "B" Streetrioth Street
 Street Narre: $\quad$ " $B$ " street loch Street








Level of service hoclule:




 Note: Queue reported is the number ot cars per lanta.





$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Volume Module: } \\
& \text { Base Vol: }
\end{aligned} 33 \quad 0 \quad 24 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 162 \quad 32 \quad 45227 \quad 0
$$

 $\begin{array}{lrrrrrrrrrrr}\text { Growth Adj: } & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 2.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\ \text { Initial Bse: } & 33 & 0 & 24 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 162 & 32 & 1.00 & 227\end{array}$


00
0800

| Critical Gap Medule: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cricical cp: | 6.4 | 6.5 | 6. $2 \times \times \times \times \times$ | xsmx | sxxisx | 2\% | 及NX* | ※3xx\% |  | z $\mathrm{x} \times \mathrm{x} \times \mathrm{x}$ |  | xx>x* |
| Foll 10 WOPTim: | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 x $3 \times \times \mathrm{x}$ | x\%xx | xxx\%x | xxyms | XKNK | \% | 2.2 | x,xx\% |  | xaxkr |










 Apyroach oed:
Approachios:
$+* *++*+*+4$,

[^38]$$
\text { Tafaffuc } 8.0 .0715 \text { (s) } 2006 \text { Dowling Assoc. Licensed so kLTTELSOL, HORTLANL }
$$


$刃$

[^39]תop. 67 adzaoxty

Traftix 8.0 .0715 (0) 2009 powing Assoc. Licensed to SITTELSON, RORTLANE
















 Note: Queue reported is the number or cars per lane. . Traffix 8.0 .0715 (c) $200 a$ Dowing Assoc. Licensed to KTTTEisen, MortLend


| PH | 5i－Jan 22， $201011: 50: 23$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Page 19－1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kittelson fi associntes，inc．－project tloozs <br> Madtus Enementary Sohool UGE Amencment－Madres，Orecon Total Trafeic Conditions，Weekray EM Peat hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service Computation Report <br> 2000 HCM Ungignaliged Method（Future Volume AIternative） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection $49 \mathrm{~m} \mathrm{~J}^{*}$ Streetrsth screet |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay \｛secfveh\}: S2. $8 \quad$ Worst Case Level Of Service：II $431.7!$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control： Ry．ghts： rames： | Uncontrol2ed xnclude |  | Unconerollem rociurie |  |  | Stce sign Tnclude |  |  | stop sign Include |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 010 | 10 | 0 | 00 | 0 O | I | 01 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Volume Moxicie： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ease Vol： | 701190 | 6.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 155 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 110 |
| Growth And： | 1．00 2．00 | 1．00 | 2.00 | i． 00 | $\cdots$ | 2.00 | 1． 100 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 1，00 | 1.00 |
| Initial Esw： | 701350 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 155 | 250 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 120 |
| Bached Vol： | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Actied Tiaxf： | 015 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 |
| Tnitial Fut： | 701205 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 255 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 98 | 110 |
| User Aaj： | 1.001 .00 | 1.00 | 3.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| PHF Acdj： | 0.950 .95 | 0.35 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| PHF Volume： | \％ 14 12680 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 163 | 258 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 126 |
| Reduct vol： | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Fintalvolume： | 76 1268 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 263 | 2.58 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 126 |


| Cricical gp： | 4．2 | xrxx | xxaxx | xxごx | 3x：3x | sxx：sx | 7，1 | 6.5 | x：mx： | ksxx\％ | 5.5 | 5.2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fol2uwuptim： | 2.3 | kxxx | xKxx | xatix\％ | х久xx | axcisx | 3.5 | 4.0 | \％xxrex | ххх\％\％ | 4.0 | 3.3 |






 Street Nane:
approach:
Novement: Control:

Rights:
Min. Green;
Y + .
Länes:
volume Module:




 $\begin{array}{lllllllllllll}\text { Lianes: } & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 1.00 & 0.00 & 1.00 & 0.00 & 1.51 & 0.49 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 0.00 \\ \text { Finaj Sat.: } & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1403 & 3135 & 0 & 2426 & 780 & 1075 & 1750 & 0\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllllllllllll}\text { Capacity analyis Medule: } \\ \text { volfsat: } & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.20 & 0.53 & 0.12 & 0.00 & 0.06 & 0.06 & 0.16 & 0.05 & 0.00\end{array}$




 Tratfly 8.0 .0715 (c) 2003 Dowling Assoc. Licensed to KITrELSON, POKTLAND



MCM ops Adjustec Lane Ittilitation Module: 1





Traifix 8.0 .0715 (0) 2008 Dowling Essac. Licensed to KIJTELSON, PORTLNND



 Intersection fis "IJ" street/5ch Strget - Mitighated




 $\begin{array}{lllllllllllll}\text { Lane width: } & 12 & 12 & 12 & 12 & 12 & 12 & 12 & 12 & 12 & 12 & 12 & 12\end{array}$ coswalhaid
\& Hev Veh:
Gimeie:

HCM Ops $f(I t)$ A立 Case Module:







SHTMMy



| Fri. Jan 22, 2010 11:51:11 |  |  | cage |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kithelson a Associates, Inc. - project $\# 10026$ <br> Madras Elementary School Vge kmendment Madras, Oregon Tetal Tratife Conditions - Mitigabed, Weekday FM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |
| d Computation Report (Permirted Left Turn Set Adj) 2000 HCM Operations Method Future Volume Alternative |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection 49 " J " Street/5in street - Mitigated |  |  |  |  |
| Approach: | North | south | Easc |  |
| Cycle Iengith, e: | $\times \mathrm{xs} \mathrm{\times x} \mathrm{\times}$ | \% $x: \times \times \times$ | 100 |  |
| Actual Grean Time Per Lane Group, G: | xxxxxx | こ: | 22.55 |  |
| zriective Green Time Per lane Group, g | xaxxsx | x\%x<x\% | 22.55 |  |
| Opposing Etifective Green Time, gr: | x××xsx | K... | 22.55 |  |
| Number of Opecesing zanes, No: | x $\times \times \times 3$ : ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | $x \times \times x \times x$ |  |  |
| Number of Lunes ta Lane Group, N: | x $\times \times \times \times x$ | yxx*xx |  |  |
| nojustad Leeft-Tum flow Rate, Vat | xx<xxx | x $\times x \times x$ \% | 163 |  |
| Pmoportion of Left turns in Lane Group, plt: | x×xxas | xх"хх\% | 1.00 |  |
| Proportion of lezt Turns in Opp Elow, plto: | ※<2 | х\% | xxxyx |  |
| Leftr turns per Cycle, wre: | mxxmxx | \%x | 4.5 .3 |  |
| Adjusted Cpposing flow Rate, Vo: | x:××x*x | zıxi | 208 |  |
| Opposing flow Per lane per Cycle, Vole: | $x \times$ | x̌x*xx | 2.89 |  |
| Opposing Piatoon Ratio, Rpo: | $x$ mxaxx | s:xxxxx | 1.00 |  |
| Lest Time Per Phase, tl: | \% | xxxxıx | 4.00 |  |
| Eff grn until arxival of deft-turn car, gt: | 员 | xxıxx* | 0.00 |  |
| Opposinq Queue Ratio, qro: | x | ухжмх\%: | 0.77 |  |
| eff gen blocked by opposing queue, gq: | xx | :xxxxx | 0.75 |  |
| Efi grn while leat tums filtax thru, gut | xx<xxxx | xxax:x | 21.80 |  |
| Max opposing cats axriving during ga-gr, \%: |  | xx\%x | x $\times$ \% $\times$ x $\times 1$ |  |
| Proportion of Opposhing Thre or RT Cars, prio: | \% | x $\times \times \times \times$ \% | x\%xxx* |  |
| Letr-tusn Seturation Factor, fis: | xxxy:xx | xxxaxx | 0.75 | xxax |
| Propertion of Leit \%urns in shered Lane, pla | екхкхж | xımexs | 1.00 | \%x:cx |
| Through-car Equivaignts, el1: | x×3sx* | хх<<x<: | 1.61 |  |
| single Lene through-car Equivalents, ela | x>x<xy\% | x×xxyx | xxxx |  |
| Minimum Lest rurn Rajustment. Factor, fmin | xxxxsx | хх<<<<x | 0.18 |  |
| Singie Lene Left Turn ladustment Fector, fm: | хגхххжк | x××3x\% | 0.60 |  |
| fr Turn Adjustment Factos, int |  | \% $\%$ x $\times$ \% | 0.60 |  |



## Appendix G: ODOT Letter Regarding Reasonably Likely Determination for US 97/J Street Improvements



FILE CODE:
Febiuary 2, 2010

Nick Snead
Community Development Director
71 SE "D"St
Madras OR 97740

## Subject: Madras UGB Expansion TPR Analysis; Reasonably Likely Determination

Dear Mr. Snead,
The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on the transportation study prepared for Madras UGB Expansion and related TPR Analysis. We received this study from Kittelson and Associates on January 22, 2010. Our planning staff also reviewed the City's plan amendment application and DLCD's recent response.

As part of the UGB expansion, the City of Madras is considering a 20 -acre rezone of Range Land to R-2 Residential uses, including a new elementary school. The proposed amendment is located at the outskirts of town, near the intersection of Ashwood Road and Bean Drive. Neither roads are state facilities; however, the traffic study concluded that the proposed rezone has a significant effect on the US97/"I" Street intersections (degraded operation with incremental trips within the plaming horizon). This is an important state facility where ODOT and the City are planning significant improvements in the near future.

On January 21, 2010, pursuant to OAR 660-012-0060(4)(b), the City has written ODOT requesting a determination as to whether planned state highway improvements at US97/ "T" Street are not only included in the City's TSP, but also:

- Funded for construction in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP);
- Part of a regional transportation system plan; or
- If neither of the above, the planned improvements are reasonably likely to be provided by the end of the TSP planning period.

ODOT offers the following comments in response:

1. US97 is a Statewide level highway facility and a freight route.
2. The City of Madras completed a TSP Amendment in 2005 to address the anticipated failure of the US $977^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{T}^{\prime \prime}$ Street intersections.
3. A preferred concept was identified by the City and ODOT as shown on the project website http://ci.madras.or.us/public works/pw hwy97south Y shtml. The concept includes cost estimates, right-of-way needs, and a double-line sketch of the preferred roadway alignment.

Mr. Nick Snead
February 2, 2010
Page 2 of 2
4. Funding for the construction of the US97/'J'Street improvements is included in the Draft 2010-2013 STIP, which is expected to be approved in October 2010. The "J" Street improvements are not on the current 2008-11 STIP list. At this time, there is a gap between funding identified in the Draft STIP and cost estimates submitted by the project team. However, the City bas been collecting transportation System Development Charges slated specifically for US97/"J" Street improvements.

Based on ODOT's review of the circumstances associated with future improvements to US97/"J" Street intersections, it is our opinion that the necessary improvements are reasonably likely to occur by the end of the planning period. ODOT has reached this conclusion based on the following factors:

1. The planed improvements are listed on the Draft 2010-2013 STIP and will likely be approved.
2. The planned improvements are located on a statewide freight route, an important facility that will likely receive future funding.
3. The City of Madras has land use regulations that allow the City to impose conditions on future development if such conditions are needed to avoid or remedy a significant effect. These include ordinances enabling transportation System Development Charges for US97P'5" Street improvements and City approval of the proposed intersection redesign.
4. ODOT has a positive working relationship with the City of Madras and collaboratively funded other projects in the area. We are confident that the City, ODOT and other partners will be able to fund the needed US97/"J" Street improvements.

This reasonably likely determination does not constitute a commitment on the part of ODOT to fund the plamed improvements at US 97 P'J' Street. Further, this written statement applies only to the subject property and only to this specific proposed amendment. It does not apply to any future amendments that may rely upon the same project. Instead, future proposed amendments will require a new written statement from ODOT. (see http://www.oregon, gov/ODOT/TD/TP/docs/TPR/tprGuidelines.pdf, Section 3.2.09)

ODOT appreciates the opportunity to provide you with this written statement. If you have any questions, or need more information, please contact Ana Jovanovic, ODOT Region 4 Planning office, at (\$41) 388-6046 or email ana.jovanovic@odot.state.or.us.

cc via e-nail: Mark_Radabaugh, DLCD; Joe Bessman, Kittelson \& Assoc, Inc.; DJ Heffernan, Angelo Planning Group; Jon Skidmore, Jefferson County Planning Director; Matt Garrett, ODOT Director; Jerri Bohard, ODOT TDD Manager; Pat Creedican, ODOT District 10 Manager

## Nick Snead

```
From: JOVANOVIC Ana [Ana.JOVANOVIC@odot.state.or.us]
Sent: Thursday, February 04, 2010 4:34 PM
To: Nick Snead
Cc: RADABAUGH Mark; Joe Bessman; DJ Heffernan; Jon Skidmore
Subject: RE: Madras UBG expansion & TRP Analysis
```

-->

Nick,
Here is ODOT's Reasonably Likely Determination letter for Madras UGB Expansion and TPR Analysis. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Ana

Ana Jovanovic
ODOT Region 4 Program and Planning
541388.6046
ana.jovanovic@odot.state.or.us

From: Nick Snead [mailto:nsnead@ci.madras.or.us]
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2010 8:49 AM
To: JOVANOVIC Ana
Subject: Madras UBG expansion \& TRP Analysis

Ana,

Good morning! I hope you had a good weekend as well. I am writing to determine the status of ODOT's review of our TPR study submitted by Kittleson \& Associates related to the 37 acre UGB expansion proposal. Can you give me an update?
"There are no short cuts to any place worth going"
-Beverly Sills-

Nicholas S. Snead

Community Development Director

City of Madras
(541) 475-3388

Email: nsnead@cimadras.or.us

Visit the City of Madras at http://ci.madras.or.us/

# Appendix H: Urban Growth Area Management Agreement (UGAMA) (April 2006) 

# Urban Growth Area Management Agreement For the City of Madras 

This agreement is entered into by the City of Madras, an incorporated municipality in the State of Oregon, hereby referred to as the "City" and Jefferson County, a political subdivision of the State of Oregon, hereby referred to as the "County".

## RECTTALS

WHEREAS, the City of Madras and Jefferson County are authorized pursuant to Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) Chapter 190 to enter into an Intergovernmental Management Agreement for performance of functions which either governmental unit has the authority to perform; and

WHEREAS, this Management Agreement also constitutes a cooperative agreement under ORS Chapter 195; and

WHEREAS, Goal 14 [Urbanization] requires that the City and the County establish an urban growth boundary to identify and separate urbanizable land from rural and that the establishment and change of urban growth boundaries shall be through a cooperative process between the City and County; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to provisions in Goal 2 [Land Use Planning], the City and County are required to have coordinated and consistent comprehensive plans which establish an Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and a plan for the Urban Growth Area (UGA) within the boundary; and,

WHEREAS, the City and County share a common concern regarding the accommodation of population growth and utilization of lands within the UGB; and

WHEREAS, the City and County consider it mutually advantageous to establish this Urban Growth Area Management Agreement (UGAMA) for the purpose of facilitating the orderly transition from rural to urban land uses and to enable the City to plan for and provide urban services such as sewer, water and street facilities in a timely, orderly and cost effective manner consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan;

## NOW, THEREFORE THE CITY OF MADRAS AND JEFFERSON COUNTY MUTUALLY AGREE AS FOLLOWS:

## 1. INTENT OF AGREEMENT

1.1. To establish standards and procedures for review and action on proposed land use actions and related matters noted within this agreement pertaining to lands within the UGA;
1.2. To transfer authority and jurisdiction over current planning activities, land use decisions, provision of urban services and code enforcement within the UGA from the County to the City;
1.3. To benefit the public through reduction of governmental processes; and,
1.4. To establish procedures for City and County consideration of expansions to the UGA.

## 2. DEFINITIONS

For the purpose of this agreement, the following definitions shall apply:
2.1. Board: the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners.
2.2. City: the City of Madras.
2.3. Council: the Madras City Council.
2.4 County: Jefferson County.
2.5. Land Use Decision: A final decision or determination concerning the adoption, amendment or application of statewide planning goals, a comprehensive plan provision or a land use regulation.
2.6. Public Facilities Plan: A document or documents describing the water, sewer and transportation facilities which are to support the land uses designated in the appropriate acknowledged comprehensive plans.
2.7. Urban Growth Area (UGA): The area between the Madras City Limits and the Madras Urban Growth Boundary, as designated on the City's and the County's Comprehensive Plan Maps.
2.8. Urban Growth Boundary (UGB): The boundary line which separates lands to be urbanized and eventually incorporated into the City of Madras from the surrounding rural lands under the County's jurisdiction.
2.9. Urban Growth Area Management Agreement (UGAMA): This Intergovernmental Agreement between the City and County that coordinates the management of land use and development within the City of Madras UGA.
2.10. Urbanizable Lands: Lands inside the Urban Growth Area that are designated for future urban development when public facilities and services can be provided by the City.

## 3. URBANIZATION PROCESS

3.1 The UGA shall be managed to maintain the potential for future urban development until such time as the land is annexed into the City and is converted to urban land.
3.2. Conversion of urbanizable land to urban development can occur when public facilities and services are available and adequate to serve urban levels of development, or the land
is annexed into the City and zoned for urban development.
3.3. Rural levels of development within the UGA shall be sited in such a way as to not interfere with urban levels of development and services when conversion from urbanizable land to urban lands occurs.
3.4. Extension of City services within the UGA may be permitted when approved by the City. Establishment or extension of sewer systems outside the UGB is prohibited except to mitigate a public health hazard in accordance with the provisions of OAR 660-011-0060.
4. UGA ADMINISTRATION RESPONSIBILITIES
4.1. The City shall have responsibility for administration and decision making authority regarding all land use applications within the UGA except applications for amendments to the UGB, as provided in Section 6.
4.2. The City shall have responsibility for annexation of lands in the UGA. Lands outside the UGA shall not be annexed unless the UGB is also amended to include the territory to be annexed.

## 5. PROCESS FOR LAND USE APPLICATIONS WITHIN THE UGA

5.1. Land Use applications shall be processed through the City Community Development Department.
5.2. Notice of all land use applications within the UGA shall be sent to the County Commumity Development Department and to any other affected County agencies and other applicable special service districts for review and comment prior to any decision by the City. Such agencies or districts shall be given ten business days in which to provide comments on the application.
5.3. In making its decision, the City shall consider all comments received under § 5.2.
5.4. The County, any agency or special service district that provides comments on the application shall be mailed a copy of the land use decision and shall have standing to appeal the City's decision.

## 6. PROCESS FOR URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY AMENDMENTS

6.1. Amendments to the UGB, including amendments to the City's and County's comprehensive plan maps, may be initiated by the City, the County, or a property owner(s).
6.2. An application to amend the UGB shall be filed with the City Community Development Department along with the applicable City and County plan amendment fees. The City shall forward a copy of the application to the County Community Development Department, together with the County's plan amendment fee, within five working days of

$$
m^{0.033 \cdot 41}-41-06
$$

the date the application is filed.
6.3. The City and County Planning Commissions shall each conduct a public hearing regarding the application. At their discretion, the Planning Commissions may hold a joint hearing rather than separate hearings.
6.4. The recommendation of the City and County Planning Commissions shall be forwarded to the City Council, who shall hold a public hearing to consider the proposed amendment to the UGB. The decision of the City Council shall be forwarded to the County Board of Commissioners.
6.5. The Board of Commissioners shall conduct a public hearing and make a final decision on whether the UGB should be amended.
6.6. If the City and County disagree on the proposed amendments, a joint meeting of the City Council and Board of County Commissioners may be held to attempt to resolve the differences. Both jurisdictions may also request a dispute resolution process to resolve the differences.
6.7 If the goveming bodies are not able to come to mutual agreement there shall be no change to the UGB.

## 7. OTHER LAND USE ACTIVITIES

7.1. The City and County agree to mutually review any proposed action on public improvement projects and similar programs, projects or proposals that apply to the UGA.
7.2. The City shall be responsible for public facilities planning within the UGA. The City shall coordinate with any affected County agency in the development of a public facilities plan for the UGA.
7.3. The County shall be responsible for administering the state Building Code and issuing building permits for all construction within the UGA, until such time as the City has its own state-approved building code program.
8. ROADS
8.1. Public rights-of-way within the UGA shall be accepted by the City upon annexation of adjacent lands.
8.2. The City shall accept jurisdiction over County roads within the UGA that have a pavement condition index $(\mathrm{PCD})$ of 70 or above. If the PCI is below 70 , the County may structurally overlay the road to raise the PCI above 70, at which time the City shall accept jurisdiction over the road. Nothing contained in this subsection shall restrict the City from accepting jurisdiction over a road or public right-of-way within the UGA that does not meet such minimum standards.
8.3 When a parcel in the UGA is initially partitioned or subdivided and creation of a street is required, development shall proceed initially with streets to City road standards
8.4 Streets in subdivisions and PUDs shall be developed to the City's improvement standands
8.5. All unpaved county roads, excluding public usage roads, within the UGA shall be graded biannually by the County until the City has accepted jurisdiction over the road.
9. FEES
9.1. Applications for land use permits, including all land use appeals within the UGA, shall be accompanied by a fee set by the City.
9.2. Applications for UGB Amendments shall be accompanied by fees set by the County in addition to any City fees.
9.3. System Development Charges for lands within the UGA will be collected by the County, prior to the issuance of building permits.

## 10. ENFORCEMENT

The City shall be responsible for enforcement of land use regulations within the UGA.

## 11. AMENDMENT AND TERMINATION

11.1. This agreement may be amended at any time by mutual agreement of both parties, after public hearing and adoption by both the City Council and the Board of Commissioners.
11.2 Any modifications to this agreement shall be consistent with the City and County Comprehensive Plans and the statewide planning goals.
11.3. This agreement may be terminated by either party under the following procedure:
a. Written notice of intent to terminate this Agreement shall be sent to the other party at least forty-five (45) days prior to taking any action, including the publication of public hearing notices in order to provide ample time for resolution of differences, or amendment to comprehensive plans.
b. A public hearing shall be held by the party considering termination. That party shall give the other party at least 20 days prior notice of the scheduled hearing date. The 20 day period shall be used by both parties to seek resolution of differences. Both parties shall also request a collaborative conflict resolution process to resolve differences that remain.
c. Public notice of hearings shall be in accordance with applicable statutes and local ordinances.
e．This agreement is necessary for compliance with，at minimum，statewide planning Goals 2 and 14．If this agreement is terminated without adoption of a new agreement，jurisdiction and authority over all planning activities and land use decisions within the UGA shall revert to the County．Therefore，this agreement may not be terminated without adoption of a new agreement．
12．TIME OF EFFECTIVENESS
This agreement shall not become effective until properly executed by both the City and the County．Upon execution，this agreement shall supersede all previous Urban Growth Area Management Agreements．

## 13．SEVERABILITY

The Provisions within this agreement are severable．If any section，sentence，clause or phrase of this agreement is adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid，said invalidity shall not impair or affect the validity of the remaining portions of the agreement．


ATTEST：


JEFFERSON COUNTY，OREGON


Mon Zeroth
Mary z的ke，Commissioner
Date：CApsid 5，2006

DLCD
Notice of Proposed Amendment (12-14-09)

# E 1 DLCD Notice of Proposed Amendment 

THIS FORM MUST BE RECEIVED BY DLCD AT LEAST 45 DAYS PRIOR TO THE FIRST EVIDENTIARY HEARING PER ORS 197.610, OAR CHAPTER 660, DIVISION 18
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## Chapter 1: Introduction

## District Characteristics

Jefferson County School District 509 .J (JCSD or District) covers 1,470 square miles in Jefferson and Wasco counties. It serves cities of Madras and Metolius, the Warm Springs Indian Reservation, of the southeastern part of rural Wasco County, and most of unincorporated Jefferson County. Three other smaller school districts - Culver School District 4, Black Butte School District 41, and Ashwood School District 8 - serve small communities in the rest of Jefferson County. Figure 1-1 shows the District's service boundaries.

Figure 1-1: Jefferson County School District Attendance Boundaries


Sourre: Jefferson Comm! School Distric/ [Question: can we get a better map?]

In 2008, the District had total enrollment of atound 2985 students. Elementary school students comprise about 48 percent of the District's enrollment while middle school students and high
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schools students account for approximately 23 and 29 percent respectively. The District employs around _ teachers, support staff, and administrators.

Student enrollment in the District has been increasing steadily over the last decade although at a slower rate than the population as a whole. That trend has changed somewhat in the past few years with a faster increase in elementary enrollment. Chapter three provides more detail about the District's enrollment trends and forecast.

## Student Enrollment and Distribution Patterns

The District's enrollment is clustered in four areas. The largest concentration of students, and the area where most enrollment growth is expected to occur, is in Madras. Madtas is the location for the District's only high school and middle school, as well as two elementary schools. The other areas of focus for the district include Warm Springs, Metolius, and Antelope. The District operates elementary school schools in Warm Springs and Metolius. There is a "satcllite" school facility in Antelope scrving southeastern Wasco County. Enrollment forecasts in Chapter 3 show that very little growth is anticipated in thesc outlying service areas. These schools will continue to serve the communities in which they are located and surrounding rural areas.

Going forward, the District will continue to adjust attendance boundarics to balance enrollment with capacity in its rural community schools and will expand capacity in Madras where most of the enrollment and population growth is projected to occur. A detailed enrollment forecast is presented in Chapter 3.

## Funding for School Facilities

As is the case with most school districts in Oregon, JCSD receives the majority of its operating budget from state and federal revenue sharing but has relied on local ad-valorem bond measures to finance capital expansion for school facilities. [Insert bond measure history]

## Facilities

The school district encompasses five elementary schools, one $\mathrm{K}-8$ school, one middle school, and one high school. JCSD does not own the K-8 school in Antelope, whose enrollment is very small,
$\square$ Introduction
but this part of Wasco County is included in the district's attendance boundaries. Further, the District closed Westside Elementary School before the 2008-2009 school year; it retains ownership of the school facilities and land. Table 1-1 provides a summary of all District facilities, except for the K-8 school and including support facilities such as the administration center and maintenance and transportation facilities. As can be seen from the table, the District owns, operates and maintains over $\qquad$

Table 1-1: District Facilities Site Acreage and Building Area, 2009

| Facility | Total Acreage | Total Building Area |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Elementary Schools (5) | 70 acres | 234,500 square feet |
| Middle Schools (1) | 23 acres | 124,300 square feet |
| High Schools (1) | 48 acres | 138,366 square fcet |
| Support Facilities \& District Property | acres | square feet |
| Totals | acres | square feet |

A facility assessment performed by the District in Summer 2009 and mapping of FEMA floodplains and floodways have been used to established facility needs discussed in this plan. The following issues have been identified:

- Madras High School - Madras High School has capacity to serve the District for the next ten (10) years. Tt was recently renovated and expanded. However, the school does sit squarely in the floodplain and floodway of a Willow Creek side channel.
- Buff and Madras Elementary Schools - Currently, these schools combine to serve a full set of K-5 elementary school grade levels. Buff Elementary School lies outside of the Willow Creek floodplain but Madras Elementary School lies within it. Madras Elementary School environmental control systems need to be overhauled or replaced.
- Warm Springs Elementary School - Warms Springs Elementary School faces capacity and other building issues that led the District to recommend building a replacement school almost a decade ago. Replacing this school is the District's highest priority.
- Westside Elementary School - Westside Elementary School, amongst the oldest in the district, suffers from many major systems needs in addition to being located on a state highway, which causes safety concerns for students walking to school. The school was closed in June 2008 and its students transferred to Metolius, Buff, and Madras Elementary Schools.
- Other District facilities - The District's maintenance and transportation facilities are cast of the high school and are also in the floodway and floodplain. District offices adjacent to Buff Elementary School are not in the mapped floodplain but staff have reported high water there.
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While there are not facilities on them, the District also owns property on Loucks Road and has been involved in an exchange with the City of Madras for land in the Yarrow Master Plan site.

A detailed evaluation of the District's facilities is presented in Chapter 4.

## Facility Plan Summary

The District has developed facility plans in the past to address specific needs. This plan is intended to provide the basis for a more comprehensive assessment of facility needs that is integrated with local and regional land use planning. The plan also complies with recent amendments to ORS 195.010 that requires "large" school districts to prepare facility plans and link those plans with locally adopted land use plans. The Jefferson County School District 2009 Facility Plan includes the following elements:

- Chapter 2 - Policy Framework. This chapter identifies local land use policies and regulations that influence school facility decisions, as well as state rules that guide how school facilities are addressed from both a policy and development perspective. This chapter also includes the District's policies and criteria that it uses to guide expansion and investment decisions.
- Chapter 3 - Enrollment Projections. Student entollment trends (both historic and future) are examined and summarized. The forecast methodology and results were peer-reviewed by Portland State University Population Research Center. The forecast was developed from approved county population forecasts and provides the basis for determining future school facility needs.
- Chapter 4 - Facility and Property Evaluation. This chapter provides a condition assessment of existing facilities. An overview of existing conditions of District facilities is presented, with an emphasis on school facilities. In addition, current enrollment figures are compared against estimated existing school capacity.
- Chapter 5 - School Facility Needs and Location Analysis. This chapter provides an analysis of school facility needs for each category of school, including the need to address condition problems with existing facilities and the need to expand capacity to meet projected enrollment growth.
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- Chapter 6 - Recommendations. This chapter presents recommendations for addressing facility needs, including both short-range and long-range needs and financing strategies. It also presents recommendations for updating local plans and procedures consistent with the analysis and conclusions in this plan.


## Chapter 2: School Facility Planning Guidelines

This chapter reviews state and local planning requirements for preparing school facility plans. State criteria include statutory guidance for the preparation of school facility plans. Local requirements include adopted land use plans, policies, and implementing regulations that affect school locations. Jefferson County School District (JCSD) also has adopted policies that guide the location and development of primary and secondary school facilities. A summary of these planning requirements is presented here. State and federal laws and rules also require school districts that receive state and federal financial assistance to develop educational plans but those plans primarily focus on curriculum and student achievement needs. This planning document only deals with facility needs and does not address educational curriculum requirements.

## State Requirements for School Facility Planning

Under Oregon law and planning rules, there are two levels of school facility planning that schools districts and local governments need to address. The first involves general land use planning requirements consistent with Oregon's Statewide Land Use Planning Goals. Under the goals, school facilities are addressed in Goal 11 - Public Facilities. The Goal requires that locally adopted land use plans include provisions for coordinating this public service and integrating the needs associated with that service into locally adopted land use plans. This includes documentation of an agreement between school service providers conceming service area boundaries, and allowances in local plans for the development of school facilities. Goal 2 - Land Use Planning, requires local land use plans to include a fact basis for school facilities that helps determine the need for future school facilities and estimates the amount of land needed to accommodate this use. Local governments also need to adopt land use regulations that govern development approval for school needs consistent with locally adopted land use plans.

Generally speaking, the locally adopted land use plans for the cities and counties that JCSD serves comply with state land use planning requirements for schools, and those jurisdictions have adopted regulations governing the development of school facilities. Appendix A includes a summary of local city and county planning policies and regulations that affect the location and approval of school facilities in Jefferson and Wasco Counties. The preparation of this plan, however, renders some planning assumptions in cxisting local plans obsolete. As such, recommendations for updating local
plans and procedures consistent with the analysis and conclusions in this plan are set forth in Chapter 6 --Recommendations.

The second level of school facility planning involves special facility planning requirements that apply to "large" school districts. In 1993, the Oregon Legislature enacted ORS 195.110 setting forth specific requirements for school facility platning. The legislation was updated in 2001 and 2007 by House Bill (HB) 3045 and Senate Bill (SB) 336. Presently, Oregon school districts with enrollments greater than 2,500 students are required to prepare facility plans that meet the requirements set forth in the law. A summary of the major planning requirements in the law is presented in Table 2-1, as well as other regulatory provisions. A copy of the ORS 195.110 is included in Appendix B.

Table 2-1: Summary of Regulatory Provisions

| Reference | Provision |
| :---: | :---: |
| Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 195.110 (2)(a) and (4) | The city or county in which a "large" school district (more than 2,500 students) is located and that includes more than $10 \%$ of the district's student population must adopt a long-term school facility plan as an element of its comprehensive plan. The plan is to be prepared by the district in consultation with the city or county. The district must appoint a representative to meet regularly with local planning staff. |
| ORS 195.110 (5)(a), (5)(b), and (6) | Required elements of a school facility plan include: <br> - Enrollment projections by school level <br> - Identification of desirable school sites <br> - Descriptions of improvements needed in existing schools <br> - An analysis of potential measures to meet facility needs, including financial plans <br> - An analysis of alternatives to new school construction and major renovation and measures to efficiently use school sites <br> - An estimation of land needed for projected enrollment over the next 10 years and an analysis of meeting those land needs inside the UGB. If insufficient suitable land is available, then the district and the local jurisdiction must work together to meet the land need by means |


| Reference | Provision |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | such as re-zoning land, assembling multiple lots or parcels, or expanding the UGB. <br> - A 10-year capital improvement plan <br> - A site acquisition program. |
| ORS 195.110 (8)(b) | The school district must update the plan during the local jurisdiction's periodic review or more often according to an agreement between the district and the local jurisdiction. |
| ORS 195.110 ( 9 )(a) and (13) | The school district may adopt objective criteria for determining school capacity in consultation with the local jurisdiction. Once adopted by the district, the local jurisdiction must use those criteria when reviewing comprehensive plan amendment and residential land use regulation amendment applications. The local jurisdiction may also use the criteria to deny a residential development application if the district identifies that there is insufficient capacity and the district and local jurisdiction have explored options to address this lack of capacity. |
| Statcwide Planning Goal 11 (Public Facilities and Services) | - "To plan and develop a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban and rural development." <br> - This statewide planning goal provides the basis for public facilities plans to be coordinated between scrvice providers and local jurisdictions and to, ulumately, incorporate public facilitics plans into local jurisdictions' comprehensive plans. |
| [Placeholder] | [To the District: are there any other policies or regulatory provisions that need to be identified here?] |

## Local School Facility Planning Policies and Guidelines

School facility plans identify long-range needs for a school district's physical facilities, such as new schools, additional classrooms, alternative educational space, and supporting facilities and programs.
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School Facility Plans also may include program strategies to meet identified needs. Planning for current and future needs requires balancing long-term educational facility needs with improving the quality of educational programming.

State, regional and local agencies are increasingly tecognizing that school facility planning is important for growing communities. According to existing regulations, new school facilities serving urban school districts must be located within the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). Population and employment growth continue to put pressure on schools to expand, while at the same time residential and commercial uses compete with school districts and other service providers for land within the existing UGB. In utban ateas, schools and associated facilities often are constrained by surrounding development or ownership patterns on adjacent land. These factors make it important for districts to determine what facilities are currently needed and what facilities will be needed in the future. Planning for future facilities includes the identification of land for new or expanded schools, and planning the supporting infrastructure for transportation, municipal utilities, parks, and other related public investments that coincide with schools.

It is important to note that legislation governing school facility planning in the state requires that the facility plan be adopted by jurisdictions in which the school district is found, as an element of their comprehensive plans. ${ }^{1}$ This affords school districts the opportunity to plan proactively for capital investment, including planning sites for future schools and enacting programs that help finance new school facilities.

In this vein, the following local facility planning policies ate to be used by the District for assessing needs and identifying appropriate locations for school facilities.

## School Facility Design and Location Policies

The following policies shall guide the development of facility plans and decisions affecting the location of school facilities.
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## Site Size Guidelines

Site size guidelines vaty greatly depending on the context and the educational program desired for each school; however, the ranges in Table 2-2 are generally accepted for school facility planning.

Table 2-2: School Site Guidelines

| School <br> Type | Grade <br> Levels | Site Size | Enrollment | Amenities |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Elementary | K-5 | $7-15$ acres | 300 | $15-18$ classrooms, gym, <br> playgrounds |
| Middle | $6-8$ | $10-20$ acres | $600-800$ | $40-50$ classrooms, gym, arts and <br> entichment rooms, science lab, <br> sports fields |
| High | $9-12$ | $20-50$ actes | $800-1000$ | $50-70$ classrooms, science labs, <br> computer labs, gyms, art and <br> enrichment facilities, performing <br> arts |

Note that existing District school sites are on the larger end of the size ranges presented above, and that the smaller site sizes may be more appropriate in a high-density urban setting than in a lowdensity rural setting.

## Minimum Site Suitability Criteria

In addition to the physical size of its school facilities and sites, the District has established the following site selection criteria to be used to inform the identification and selection of new sites for schools.

- Land use condition: The site must be unimproved land (not counting parks and open space) or land with improvements valued at less than $\$ 50,000$. This keeps costs down and avoids the need to use eminent domain. If in the future undeveloped land becomes scarce
within the UGB, this criterion may need to be revised to allow for consideration of redevelopment opportunities.
- Size: See size guidelines above for suitable site sizes by grade level. Aggregation of smaller parcels to meet these site sizes may be considered where feasible.
a Environmental hazards / buildability: The site must have sufficient level ground to accommodate the school building, parking, and playing fields without the need for excessive grading. This requires an area large enough for the building, parking areas, and playing fields with slopes of $5 \%$ or less. (In the case of an elementary school, for example, this would require at least 5 acres of flat land.) In addition, the building must not be located in a floodplain, so that schools can be safe from hazard and serve as a resource in times of emergency. Playing fields and parking may be located within a floodplain, however. (For an elementary school, this requires a minimum of 2.5 acres of land that is both flat and outside the floodplain.)
* Zoning and existing uses: The site must not be zoned for industrial use. Industrial areas are not suitable for locating schools. Elementary schools should be located in residential areas; middle and high schools can be located in areas with a mix of residential and commercial uses.
- Serviceability: Water and sewer systems to serve the site should be available by the time the school is expected to be built and should have sufficient capacity to serve the anticipated demand from the school facility.
* Geographic distribution: New schools should not be located within a half mile of existing schools of the same type and grade level. This supports the development of neighborhood schools and increases the efficiency of transporting children to schools. In addition, new schools should be located where they can best serve existing and future residential development.
- Traffic safety: New elcmentary school sites should not be located on a highway or arterial. Middle and high schools may locate on arterials if traffic conditions in the vicinity permit safe walking and biking to the site.
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- Availability: The District will not consider sites that have approved development applications to be available for use as schools.


## Additional School Siting Considerations

In addition to the minimum criteria listed above, the following considerations should also help guide school siting where multiple options exist:

- Co-location: To maximize the efficient use of school facilities, co-locating schools of different grade levels and/or schools with community or neighborhood parks is desitable.
- Bus access: For safety and traffic management reasons, sites with direct access from a collector street for buses transporting students from rural parts of the district are preferred.
- Allowed use: To minimize the time and cost associated with permitting, sites that are currently zoned in a manner that allows the school use outright or conditionally are preferred. Similarly, the project should not require rezoning properties in the vicinity of the school to avoid conflicting uses (e.g. adult businesses, taverns, and bars).
- Walkable neighborhoods: Sites that will provide for safe walking and biking routes from surrounding neighborhoods arc preferred, especially for elementary schools.
- Minimizing life-cycle costs: Sites that allow for the use of design techniques that reduce lifecycle energy costs (e.g. passive solar, active solar, geothermal, landscaping, etc.) are preferred.
- Planned uses: Where a public agency or non-profit organization has long-term plans for the use of a site that do not include a school, these sites will be given a lower priority.


## Chapter 3: Enrollment Forecast

Three enrollment forecasts were prepared by Angelo Planning Group using three different data sources:

1. A short-range projection covering the 2009-10 school year through the 2018-19 school year was derived from existing enrollment, recent grade progression rates, and recent birth trends in the school district. This forecast is likely to best capture expected enrollment in the next 5 to 10 years.
2. A long-range forecast based on age-group population projections for Jefferson County from the Oregon Office of Economic Analysis (OEA) provides estimates in 5-year increments from 2000 to 2040. The OEA data is based on demographic trends and seems to be a fairly good fit with historic data (in years 2000 and 2005).
3. A second long-range forecast was generated based on the county's coordinated population forecast, prepared by the economic consulting firm EcoNorthwest, Inc (EcoNW). The EcoNW projections are based on past growth rates, and, having been prepared in 2007 at the height of a building boom, are likely to overestimate future population. This forecast is included in this chapter to represent the high end of the spectrum, but was not relied upon in in the final enrollment forecasts used to project future facility needs.

These three projections for total enrollment are shown in Figure 3-1, along with historic enrollment data provided by the District. Enrollment forecasts and historic enrollment data broken down by grade level (elementary, middle school, and high school) are shown in Figures 3-2 through 3-4.
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Figure 3-1: Actual \& Projected Enrollment: 'Total Enrollment (Grades K-12)


Figure 3-2: Actual \& Projected Enrollment: Elementary School (Grades K - 5)


Figute 3-3: Actual \& Projected Enrollment: Middle School (Grades 6-8)


Figure 3-4: Actual \& Projected Enrollment: High School (Grades 9-12)
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A weighted average of the short-range and OEA long-range forecasts (weighting the short-range more heavily in the near-term and shifting gradually to give the OEA long-range forecast more weight) was calculated to provide the best estimate of future enrollment over the next 10 years. Table 3-1 below shows actual enrollment data for 2008, weighted averages of the short-range and OEA long-range projections for 2010 and 2015, and OFA long-range forecasts for 2020 through 2040.

Table 3-1: Projected Enrollment by Grade Level

| Yeat | Elementary <br> School | Middle <br> School | High <br> School | Total <br> Entollment |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}^{*}$ | 1,445 | 677 | 853 | 2,985 |
| 2010 | 1,487 | 715 | 773 | 2,979 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | 1,685 | 746 | 838 | 3,279 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | 1,898 | 850 | 911 | 3,659 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 5}$ | 2,061 | 938 | 998 | 3,997 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 3 0}$ | 2,210 | 1,021 | 1,099 | 4,329 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 3 5}$ | 2,377 | 1,097 | 1,193 | 4,667 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ | 2,378 | 1,187 | 1,289 | 4,854 |

* 2008 data shown is actual entollment provided by the school district.

Table 3-2 below shows the projected enrollment increases relative to actual 2008 enrollment by grade level based on the combined forecast described above.

Table 3-2: Projected Change in Enrollment Compared to 2008

| Year | Elementary <br> School | Middle <br> School | High <br> School | Total <br> Entollment |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 32 | 38 | -80 | -6 |
| 2015 | 230 | 69 | -15 | 294 |
| 2020 | 443 | 173 | 58 | 674 |
| 2025 | 606 | 261 | 145 | 1012 |
| 2030 | 755 | 344 | 246 | 1344 |
| 2035 | 922 | 420 | 340 | 1682 |
| 2040 | 923 | 510 | 436 | 1869 |
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## Chapter 4: Existing School Facility Conditions

This chapter provides an overview of existing facility conditions in the Jefferson County School District with an emphasis on facility needs. The conditions described below are based on reports from District staff, including a written summary of elementary school conditions (Appendix ${ }^{\text {V }}$ ), as well as the District's 2000-2010 Long. Range Facility Plan (Appendix

## Schools

A summary of school facility data is presented below in Tables 4-1 and 4-2, and an excerpt of a map of attendance boundaries for elementary schools in the district is shown below in Figure 4-1.

Figure 4-1: Jefferson County School District Attendance Boundaries
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## Madras High School

Madras High School is the District's only high school and is located on the east side of Madras in close proximity to Madras Elementary School, Buff Elementary School, and District offices. As called for in the 2000-2010 Facility Plan, Madras High School underwent major renovation and expansion that was completed in 2005 . Total building area was increased from about 84,000 square feet to 138,000 square feet. The school was registered as having 838 students in 2008-2009 and the most recent figures available show the school has capacity for roughly $\qquad$ students. Staff reinforced this finding about available capacity, reporting that there are not crowding issues at the school. 'The 2000-2010 Long-Range Plan did not identify school replacement as a need, but rather expansion and the addition of a new performing arts facility.

Based on county-provided FEMA floodplain maps and Google Earth aerial photography, the high school site lies in the 100-year floodplain and, in patt, in the floodway of a Willow Creck side channel, although the building itself lies outside the mapped floodway (see Figure 4-2 below).

Figure 4-2: Willow Creck 100-year Floodplain and Side Channel Floodway near Madras Elementary School and Madras High School


Note: 100-year floodplain is shown in light blue, floodway is shown in darker blue.


#### Abstract

Chapter 4 Existing Conditions


Staff report high water issues at the high school, Madras Elementary School, and District offices, which all are in the same Willow Creek side-channel area. Staff also report that the City has installed piping to help alleviate high water situations.

## Jefferson County Middle School

Jefferson County Middle School was built relatively recently (1995) on the east side of Madras, and no substantial service or conditions issues are reported for the facility. In particular, it features plenty of capacity; 2008-2009 enrollment ( 673 students) represents not even two-thirds of the school's capacity (see Table 4.1). The 2000-2010 Long-Range Facility Plan did not identify replacement or expansion needs, but did recommend potential modernization needs.

## Big Muddy School

The District does not own this school near Antelope in Wasco County, although it is technically included in the Jeffcrson School District servicc area. The school is a very small one; it is a K-8 facility that served 11 students in the 2008-2009 school year. No outstanding conditions or capacity issues are reported for the school.

## Buff Elementary School

The Buff facility has served as an annex facility in the past, and this school year is supplementing Madras School; the two facilities are in effect operated as one complete elementary school. Buff Elementary School is serving grade levels 3-5 this school year while Madras Elementary School serves grade levels K-2. The two sites are located in close proximity to each other and to Madras High School on the east side of Madras. Unlike Madras Elementary School and Madras High School, however, Buff Elementary School does not stand in the Willow Creek side channel floodplain (see Figure 4-3).

The school is not reported to have any major conditions issues. It was renovated in 2005, increasing its building area from approximately 34,000 square feet to 41,000 square feet. Its 2008-2009 enrollment is below its reported capacity by approximately __ students. Buff Elementary School is one of three schools - the other two being Madras Elementary School and Metolius Elementary School - that have absorbed student population from Westside Elementary School after it closed in 2008. The opening of either a renovated Wcstside Elementary School or a new clementary school will alleviate future capacity issues at Buff Elementary School.
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Figure 4-3: Buff Elementary and Willow Creek 100-year Floodplain and Side Channel Floodway


Note: 100-year flondplain is shown in light blue, floodway is shown in darker blue.

## Madras Elementary School

Madras Elementary School is located in close proximity to Madras High School and Buff Elementary School. It splits elementary school setvice with Buff Elementary School and serves only grade levels K-2. Given this shared service, the school had sufficient capacity in the 2008-2009 school year with an average class size that was comparable to Buff Elementary School and Metolius Elementary School (see Tables 4-1 and 4-2).

Madras Elementary School, however, lies in the Willow Creek floodplain as shown in Figure 4-2 above. District staff also report significant HVAC systems conditions issues. The school's boiler and heating system is in need of complete overhaul and its insulation must be replaced, involving asbestos remediation. In the 2000-2010 Long-Range Fiacility Plan, Madras Elementary School was rated in the worst repair behind Westside Elementary School and was recommended for closing along with expanding another school or opening a new school in its place. The plan also suggested that this site be considered as an opportunity for future expansion of Madras High School. Fxpanding Madras High School on this site, however, is inadvisable due to its location in the floodplain and the presence of the floodway running between the two buildings.

## Metolius Elementary School

As is shown in Figure 4-1, the attendance area boundary for Metolius Elementary School extends into southern Madras. The boundary runs along J Street and Adams and these students are bussed to the school in Metolius. Fiven with absorbing overflow attendance from south Madras, the school does not have any capacity issucs. Its 2008-2009 enrollment was below its design and functional capacity (see Table 4-1).
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A conditions assessment by the District did identify major systems needs for the school, including an update of the heating and plumbing systems (Attachment . The District has not necessarily determined that these needs rise to the level of closing or replacing the school, but involve significant costs that the District needs to plan for.

## Warm Springs Elementary School

The Jefferson County School District operates Warm Springs Elementary School through lease agreements and memoranda of understanding with the Warm Springs Tribal Council.
The school has undergone a series of renovations since its original construction in 1938, and currently relies on four sets of modular classrooms; Warm Springs is the only school in the district with modular units. The school has a larger number of students than other schools in the district and also a larger average class size (see Tables 4-1 and 4-2).

The elementary school has been slated for replacement dating at least back to the 2000-2010 LongRange Facility Plan. A Memorandum of School Construction and Lease Intent (April 2001) and a Memorandum of Understanding for Education of Tribal Students (June 2003) reiterate this need and suggests steps to take for the school's replacement. However, a new school has not yet been built.

## Westside Elementary School

Westside Elementary School was closed for the last full school year (2008-2009). Students that had previously attended the school were distributed among Metolius, Madras, and Buff Elementary Schools. As reported in the 2000-2010 Long-Range Facility Plan, the school facility itself was reported to have the worst conditions of elementaty schools in the district. The most recent conditions assessment from the District (Attachment and the previous assessment for the 20002010 plan call out the need for boiler and heating system overhauls, insulation replacement and asbestos removal, and a plumbing system update in addition to addressing safety issues associated with its location on Highway 97.

The 2000-2010 facility plan identified as a priority selling the school site and making the site available for more appropriate uses given its location downtown on a major arterial. Sale proceeds would be directed to constructing a new school in a more suitable location. The process of updating the facility plan should be used to explote options for replacing Westside Elementary School, including rebuilding the school in its current location but with access reoriented away from the highway, as well as building a new school in a new location guided by the location criteria set forth in Chapter 2. It should be noted that an approved bypass for US 97 will reduce truck traffic and other heavy traffic from this roadway.

## Other District Facilities

District facilities also include administration offices and a set of maintenance and transportation facilities. All of these uses are located in the vicinity of Madras Elementary School, Madras High School, and Buff Filementary School. The administration offices are directly east of Buff Elcmentary School and the maintenance and transportation facilities are east of Madras High School. The maintenance and transportation site is squarely in the floodplain and floodway of the Willow Creek side channel. District offices are not in the floodway or floodplain (sec Figure 4-3), however, staff report occasional high water issues at the offices. More information about the administration offices and maintenance and transportation facilities is presented below in Table 4-3.

The District also owns vacant property north and east of Madras, and has prospects for acquiring additional land. The following sections describe these sites.

## Loucks Road Site

The District owns a site on Loucks Road outright (Taxlot ID 11S, 14E, Section 6, Lot 1000). The property straddles the existing UGB. Of its 67.3 total acres, 24.8 acres are inside the UGB, and 42.5 acres are outside the UGB in Urban Reserve Area (URA). Land in the URA is first priority for being brought into the UGB.

## Yarrow Master Plan School Site

'I'he District has a financial interest in a 20 -acre site identified in the Yarrow Development Master Plan as a future school site. The site is outside but adjacent to the existing UGB, south of Ashwood Road and across from Juniper Fill County Park. The site is in the Madras Urban Reserve Area (URA), which is first priority land for inclusion in the UGB when it needs to be expanded. 'The District's interest in this site is linked to a land exchange with the City of Madras. Terms of the exchange include a condition that the City completc land use planning steps for the site so that the school district may develop it when the need for a new school arises. The Yarrow Master Plan calls for co-locating a city park on the site to serve Yarrow and urban areas to the north and west. The City is working to fulfill its obligation to complete planning for this site.

## Calculating Capacity

Table 4-1 reports both the design and functional capacity of schools in the district. [Note: the statute requires that the District explain in detail its methodology for calculating school enrollment capacity and any changes to the methodology that have altered how the district previously estimated entollment capacity at its schools.]
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| School | Grade <br> Levels | Site <br> Area <br> (acres)' | Building <br> Area (sq <br> ff) ${ }^{2}$ | Year Built, Renovated ${ }^{3}$ | Number of Teaching Stations, Without Specialty Rooms ${ }^{4}$ | Enrollment $2008-20095$ | Design <br> Capacity/ <br> Functional <br> Capacity ${ }^{6}$ | Capacity <br> Surplus or (Deficit) (\#) | Capacity Utilization (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Madras ITigh School | 9-12 | 48 acres | 138,366 | $\begin{aligned} & 1964,2003, \\ & 2005 \end{aligned}$ | 36 | 838 | [update] |  |  |
| Jefferson County Middle School | 6-8 | 23 acres | 124,288 | 1995 | 51 | 673 | 1,058/1,058 | 385 | 64\% |
| Big Muddr School | K-8 |  |  |  |  | 11 |  |  |  |
| Buff Elementary School | 3-5 | 15 acres | 41,554 | $\begin{aligned} & 1956,1960, \\ & 2005 \end{aligned}$ | 15 | 368 | [update] |  |  |
| Madras Elementary <br> School | K-2 | 16 acres | 52,428 | 1938,1951 | 23,19 | 356 | 575/475 | 119 | 75\% |
| Metolius Elementary School | K-5 | 6.5 acres | 31,080 | 1949, 2000 | 15,12 | 277 | 375/300 | 23 | 92\% |
| Warm Sptings <br> Elementary School | K-5 | 20 acres | 54,945 | $\begin{aligned} & 1938,1964, \\ & 1994,1998, \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | 24, 20 | 454 | [update] |  |  |
| Westside Elementary School | Closed | $\begin{aligned} & 12.5 \\ & \text { actes } \end{aligned}$ | 54,540 | 1938, 1998 | Closed | Closed | 500/425 | Closed | Closed |
| Reported by District staff <br> ${ }^{2}$ From 2000-2010 Long-Rang <br> ${ }^{3}$ From 2001-2002 ()regon D <br> District rvebsite <br> ${ }^{\dagger}$ Reported by District staff <br> ${ }^{3}$ From 2008-2009 ()DE (Octo <br> ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{Capaciry}$ Analysis Attachme | Faciliv partment <br> ber 1 Enr (PowerI | lan and "Dis of Education <br> llment Repo oint slide) to | srict Facts" , (()DE) Schoo $2000-2010 \mathrm{~L}$ | tachment (2007) Facilities Repo <br> ng-Range Facilir | "District Facts" <br> Plan | Attachment (2007) | 7) to 2000-201 | Long-Range | Facility Plan, and |

Table 4-2: Number of Classrooms and Class Size Data for Jefferson County School District Elementary Schools

| School | Average Class <br> Size | Number of K-5 <br> Classrooms |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Buff <br> Elementary <br> School | 23.5 | 15 |
| Madras <br> Elementary <br> School | 24 | 15 |
| Metolius <br> Elementary <br> School | 23 | 12 |
| Warm Springs <br> Elementary <br> School | 27.5 | 19 |

Source: Jefferson County School District

Table 4-3: Other Jefferson County School District Facilities

| School | Site Area | Building <br> Area |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Administration <br> Offices | - | - |
| Maintenance <br> and <br> Transportation <br> Facilities | - | - |

Source: Jefferson County School District

## Chapter 5: Facility Needs and Location Analysis

This chapter presents information about facility needs in the near term and long term for all types of school facilities. The analysis uses enrollment forecasts and facility conditions information from the previous chapters to cstablish existing and future facility needs. The school location criteria in Chapter 2 were used to evaluate different options for addressing these needs.

## School Facility Need Analysis

## Existing Need

This plan is intended to address needs both related to future enrollment growth and existing facility conditions. With regard to existing needs, the Warm Springs Elementary School, one of the oldest schools in the district, needs insulation, a new and larger cafeteria, and more capacity (Attachment X - conditions report). As discussed in Chapter 4, a replacement school on reservation land has been an identified need for at least nine years. Also as discussed in Chapter 4, Madras Elementary School and High School are in the floodplain and floodway of a Willow Creek side channel, and Madras Elementary School is in need of major systems overhauls. Westside Elementary School is currently closed, and is in need of major systems updates as well. The school faces serious safety issues because of its location and access on a state highway, however - as noted in Chapter 4 - some of the safety issues may be alleviated by the construction of the planned US 97 truck bypass west the highway's existing location. The District's facility needs related to age, condition, location, capacity, and hazards at its existing facilities are summarized in Table 5-1 below. The choices presented are not discrete and there are many possible combinations of solutions.

Table 5-1: Existing Facility Needs

| Facility | Action/Need | Location |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Westside Elementary | Upgrade or Replace | TBD |
| Madras Elementary | Upgrade/Protect or Replace | TBD |
| Warm Springs Elementary | Replace | In place |
| Metolius Elementary | Upgrade | In place |
| Buff Elementary | Expand or reuse | In place |
| Madras H.S. | Protect | In place |
| District Admin Offices | Protect or replace | TBD |
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## Future Need

Chapter 4 shows that existing facilities have capacity for current enrollment levels but the enrollment is projected to grow beyond that capacity within ten years for elementary grades. Table 5-2 compares current capacity with projected enrollment by grade level for the District. Figure 5-1 shows the projected enrollment ycar by ycar compared to existing capacity. The data indicate that elementary school capacity will be exceeded in the year 2020 by more than 160 students. As shown in Figure 5-1, enrollment is projected to exceed capacity for the first time in the year 2017. This date is significant because it is within the 10 -year planning horizon for which ORS 197.010 requires large school districts to develop plans to address deficiencies. Middle and High School capacity is projected to be sufficient for the next 10 years. Capacity constraints for those facilities are not projected to arise until sometime between 2030 and 2040.

Table 5-2: Projected Enrollment vs. Available Capacity

|  | nction |  | 2008/09 |  |  |  | jectio |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | apacit |  | Actual | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2035 | 2040 |
|  |  | Enrollment | 1455 | 1487 | 1685 | 1898 | 2061 | 2210 | 2377 | 2378 |
| School |  | Remaining Capacity | 280 | 248 | 49 | -163 | -326 | -475 | -642 | -643 |
|  |  | Enrollment | 677 | 715 | 746 | 850 | 938 | 1021 | 1097 | 1187 |
| School | 1062 | Remaining Capacity | 385 | 346 | 315 | 212 | 124 | 41 | -35 | -125 |
|  |  | Enrollment | 853 | 773 | 838 | 911 | 998 | 1099 | 1193 | 1289 |
| School |  | Remaining Capacity | 377 | 457 | 392 | 319 | 232 | 131 | 37 | -59 |

Soure: Capacity numbers provided by JCSD; entolmem projections performed by Angelo Plannity Group (see Chapter 3 for full entollment projections and methodology).
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Figure 5-1: Enrollment vs. Available Capacity


Source: Capacity mmbers provided by JCSD; enrollmemt projections performed by Angelo Planning Group (see Chapter 3 for full eumolhnent projections and methodology).

## Options for Improving Existing Conditions

The previous analysis shows that most of the District's immediate facility needs relate to condition issues at its elementary schools. It may appear that the District has capacity to manage elementary enrollment levels for most of the next decade, but that assessment ignores serious problems with individual facilities and significant operating costs associated with managing elementary enrollment using busing to balance the distribution of available capacity. As noted above, the solutions are not necessarily discrete; there are interactive effects that need to be considered to develop solutions.

In addition, there is a persistent flood risk to Madras High School and Madras Elementary School that cannot be alleviated without significant investment in protective infrastructure. The problem is especially challenging because protecting these facilities from flood hazard may endanger other properties that are not currently threatened. The risk to school facilities is amplified because schools typically are used as places of refuge in times of emergency. These schools, however, are located in
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the hazard zone for the natural disaster most likely to affect Madras making them unavailable in an emergency. It is inadvisable to expand either of these facilities unless they can be adequately protected from flood danger. Determining a course of action to address this problem is beyond the scope of this analysis and more work needs to be done to establish a reliable course of action.

The following discussion presents a series of possible solutions to address existing problems at school facilities; some solutions also will help the District meet forecast capacity needs.

## Warm Springs Elementary School

1. Replace and expand the existing elementary school.

The needs at Warm Springs Elementary School have been documented for years and replacing the school has long been a priority. Unlike other schools being considered for expansion, replacement or relocation, Warm Springs Elementary School either needs to be replaced on the existing site or replaced at another suitable site on the reservation. If the school cannot be rebuilt on the existing site, the location suitability criteria from Chapter 2 may help guide the selection of a new site.

## Madras Elementary School

1. Expand and protect the existing school or;
2. Close Madras Elementary School and;
a. Expand Buff Elementary School facilities to accommodate all elementary school grade levels at that location, or
b. Build a new elementary school at a new location in Madras that better serves the community's youngest students on one of the sites identified in the next section of this report.

As noted earlier, expanding this school is a significant problem because of its location in the Willow Creek floodplain. Furthermore, repairing the facility will be very expensive because of hazardous materials in the building. Moreover, the investment would be at risk of loss in a flood event. For these reasons, Alternative 2 seems the better choice. Expanding Buff Elementary School has the advantage of letting elementary students that live in southwest Madras continue to walk to school. That location may not, however, be in an ideal location to promote high walk rates because the school is pinched between US 97 and the Willow Creek floodplain. There simply is not as much residential development in this part of Madras compared to other parts of the city. If Buff
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Elementary School is not expanded, it could be used to meet other District facility needs, such as for administrative offices, as a location for additional high school facilities, or as a special needs or enrichment school facility.

## Westside Elementary School

1. Re-build Westside Elementary School on the existing site but re-orient the building away from the highway.
2. Relocate the school to one of the sites identified inside the next section of this report.
3. If relocating the school:
a. Sell the school site and use the proceeds to finance other capital needs; or
b. Reserve/landbank the site for a future school or other District facilities (e.g. admin offices, special education needs).

The Westside Elementary school site has the advantage of being located south of downtown in an area with a grid street pattern and on the edge of a neighborhood where almost all students currently must either be bused or driven to school. As noted earlier, however, repairing this facility will be expensive because of hazardous matetials in the building and the need to reorient the building away from the busy highway. In addition, the surrounding property to the north and east is zoned for commercial use and this part of Madras is expected to become more employment-oriented over time. That trend also may include mixed use development that could accommodate both employment and residential uses and provide much needed higher-density affordable housing. Until the redevelopment pattern for the area immediately south of the downtown becomes clearer which may not happen until the truck by-pass is built - it is too early to judge whether the Westside Elementary site will meet the District's aim to locate elementary schools in walkable neighborhoods. Given the depressed market for commercial property statewide, it may be in the District's best interest to hold this property until development trends for the southern part of the city become clearer and preserve the school, possibly leasing the space on an interim basis.

## Madras High School

1. Protect the site from the flood hazard and keep the school in this location for the long term, or
2. Adopt a policy to relocate the high school at some point in the future to a location outside the floodplain:
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a. At the Loucks Road District Property (approximately 67 actes total, 25 acres inside the UGB, and 42 acres outside the UGB in the URA); or
b. At another of the suitable sites of at least 20 acres that are identified in Figure 5-2.

## Options for Adding Capacity

The District also must address future growth in enrollment and, in particular, the situation in which elementary student enrollment is forecast to outstrip capacity as shown in Table 5-1 and Figure 5-1. The District could potentially accommodate the growing demand for elementary schools by using portables for the first few years in which the capacity of existing facilities is exceeded. Portable units could also accommodate the small over-runs in capacity forccast after 2030 for the middle school and high school. Portables are intended as a short-term solution, however, and at the very least the District will nced to add permanent elementary school capacity to accommodate the growing student population by 2020 if not sooner.

The options for adding capacity are sitrilar to those identified above for replacing existing capacity. A key element in increasing capacity is that new elementary school capacity should be constructed in Madras where most of the enrollment growth is expected to occur. The schools in Metolius and Antelope and the new school in Warm Springs (when constructed) have capacity to accommodate cnrollment in their respective rural areas. Metolius Elementary also has enough capacity so that the school may continue to balance overflow enrollment from south Madras and the southern urban fringe. To meet its other elementary enrollment needs, the District needs to have two full size elementary schools in Madras. Options to meet this need include:

1. Locate two full size schools with one at Buff Elementary School and one at Westside Elementary School; or
2. Build one full-size clementary school either at Buff or Westside and one new elementary school on one of the sites reviewed in the next section; or
3. Build two new elementary schools on two of the sites reviewed in the next section.

## Location Suitability Analysis for New Schools

A number of different properties were evaluated against the site criteria established in Chapter 2 to determine their suitability for siting new elementary school facilities. The Buff Flementary School site was consideted for expansion, and the Westside Elementary School site was considered for
redevelopment. Eight properties inside the existing UGB that meet the District's minimum site suitability criteria (from Chapter 2) also were evaluated for siting a new school. Those sites are shown in Figure 5-2. Also included in the analysis is an evaluation of the two undeveloped sites that the District owns, both of which currently straddle the UGB. As the portion of the Loucks Road Site that is within the UGB meets the District's minimum criteria, that portion was included for consideration along with other properties within the existing UGB. Development on District owned land outside the UGB, however, may not proceed until that property is brought into the UGB.

## - Buff Elementary School Site - expanding and replacing Madras Elementary School

The site is already developed with a school. At 15 acres, the site is ample in size for an elementary school and can accommodate expanded facilities. However, only partially new construction would make it more difficult to incorporate. The site is relatively level and is outside of the Willow Creek system's floodway and floodplain. The site is already served with water and sewer, and is contrally located for the growing student population projected for the city of Madras. The school fronts local roads, which are appropriate for an elementary school. That coupled with adjacent residential development makes this a walkable school site. [Bus access?] Life-cycle cost-saving and energy efficiency features could more easily be incorporated into the expansion and new construction than the existing buildings.

- Westside Elementary School Site - rebuilding existing school, or selling, or saving for relocation of other District facilities
This site is also already developed with a school. Its site size - approximately 12 acrcs - is sufficient for an elementary school or a small middle school, although there is not a need for a middle school in the planning horizon. The sitc is relatively flat and outside floodways and floodplains. It is zoned for open space/public facilities and is surrounded by land zoned commercial on the north and east and residential on the west. The site is already served by water and sewer and is located west of Highway 97, making it walkable and suitable for serving students on the west side of Madras while posing a large barrier to students coming from any other part of Madras. The site is served by both a state highway and local streets, but its current orientation to the state highway presents serious safety concerns, although its proximity to such a major arterial allows it easy access to bus and other transportation services. Rebuilding or relocating this facility would allow for new construction and easier integration of life-cycle cost-saving features than would retrofitting existing development.

Figure 5-2: Potential School Sites Inside the UGB
Identification of Parcels Inside the UGB for Potential School Sites
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## - Sites 1 and 2 -Relocating Madras High School, or building a new elementary scbool

Sites 1 and 2 are vacant land under common private ownership and together total 35.6 acres. Site 1 , at 25.7 acres, is large enough on its own to accommodate a middle school or small high school. Site 2, at 9.9 actes, could potentially accommodate an elementary school. When aggregated, the sites present an opportunity for a large high school or for co-locating a park or other community facilities. Currently, no development applications have been submitted or are pending on the sites. They are relatively level sites, outside of local floodways and floodplains. They are zoned residential (R3) and are surrounded by residential zoning. They are just inside the border of the UGB and the city limits, and are adjacent to land that is already developed with housing and on the east with land in the URA that is expected mainly to provide land for housing. Their location would serve students in north, central, and east Madras. A collector (Loucks Road) runs along the northern border of the sites and all other adjacent roads are local roads. Loucks Road would need safety treatments to border an elementary school but otherwise the classification of the surrounding roads and surrounding residential development supports walking. New construction on the sites would allow for integration of life-cycle cost-saving features. Sewer service is problematic, however. The prefcrred service solution would be to connect to a south-flowing sewer trunk in ___ road, but that line is not in place. A significant amount of vacant land south of these sites must be developed before the sewer trunk would be extended to this site.

## - Sites 3 and 4 - Relocate Madras High School, or build a new elementary scbool

Sites 3 and 4 are located just to the southeast of Sites 1 and 2. They are inside the UGB and immediatcly inside the city limits. Like Sites 1 and 2, Sites 3 and 4 consist of vacant land under common private ownership. Site 3, at 8.5 acres, is potentially large enough to accommodate an elementary school, although its long, narrow shape could make it less than ideal. Site 4 , at 40.2 acres is large enough to site a high school with room to spare or to co-locate multiple facilities. Both sites are also relatively flat and outside floodway and floodplain zones. The sites are zoned low-density residential (R1) and are surrounded by other residential zoning and development, in addition to open space zoning for open space and public facilities. As with Sites 1 and 2, the location of Sites 3 and 4 would most easily serve students in north, central, and east Madras. All adjacent roads are local roads; without direct access to a collector like Loucks Road, the sites may be more suitable for a neighborhood elementary school than a high school. The relatively gentle grades between the sites and residential arcas to the west suggest that these are the most walkable connections and conditions. As with sites 1 and 2, sewer service is problematic. The preferred service solution would
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be to connect to a south-flowing sewer trunk in $\qquad$ road, which is not in place. Vacant land south of these sites must be developed before the sewer trunk would be extended to this site.

## - Site 5/Loucks Road Site -Relocating Madras High School, or building new elementary school

The District owns a property that is referred to in this plan as the Loucks Road site. Because the property is divided into parts inside and outside the UGB, for planning purposes it is essentially two sites. The portion within the Madras UGB (from here on referred to as Site 5), is about 25 acres; the rest of the Loucks Road property, which is located just outside of the UGB, is about 42 acres. Both sites are vacant and are not currently the subject of any submitted or pending development applications. Site 5 is of sufficient size for an elementary school and a park or other community facility, or for a middle school, or for a small high school. The shape of Site 5, however, would pose a design challenges for upper grade facilities. When taken as a whole, the property is large enough to co-locate a high school, and a middle school or elementary school, and other community facilities. The sitc as a whole is not constrained by slope, although significant slope is found to the east and west of it. There is no floodplain or floodway identified on the site. That part of the property within the UGB is zoned as Open Space, which would allow development of public facilities such as schools, while the rest of the site is zoned for rural uses - agriculture and range land. The whole site is surrounded by a combination of low-density rural and urban residential zoning (R1, RR2, RR5, and RR10), with existing rural subdivisions directly to the north and subdivisions within the UGB to the west. As with Sites 1, 2, 3, and 4, the site's location would serve students in north, central, and east Madras. Steeper slopes to the east and west may make the site less walkable from those directions but less so to the north and south. Residential zoning and a predominantly local road network in the area - with Loucks Road as the only higher classified road for now - can support walkability. New construction on the sites will allow for integration of life-cycle cost-saving features. Sewer service is a significant problem, however. The preferred service solution would be to connect to a south-flowing sewer trunk in $\qquad$ road, but that line is not in place. A significant amount of vacant land south of this site must be developed bcforc the sewer trunk is extended to the northeastern most corner of the Madras UGB.

## - Site 6 -building a new elementary school.

Site 6 is located southeast of the existing Jefferson County Middle School. It is made up of two parcels, both owned by the Bean Foundation, and both unimproved. The two parcels together total 8.4 acres. This makes it an appropriate size for an elementary school, especially because it is adjacent to the existing middle school, allowing for potential efficiencies and sharing of certain

Chapter 5
Facility Needs and Location Analysis
facilities. The site is zoned residential (R3) and is mainly surrounded by residential zoning, including a developed subdivision to the west. Its eastern border lies along the UGB, and rural land on the other side of the UGB is zoned for low-value resource use (range land). Floodways or floodplains are not found on the site, nor are siguificant slopes. However, land to the west, south, and northeast is significantly sloped and may present challenges to the site's walkability despite predominantly residential zoning and local roads in the area that can make walking more viable. Site 6 is not located on a collector or arterial - the nearest collector is Ashwood Road adjacent to the north side of the middle school site. Yet this site is also relatively isolated in terms of a road system. Services are available. Like most of the other candidate sites, new construction on the sites will allow for integration of life-cycle cost-saving features.

## - Sites 7 and 8 - Relocating Madras High School, or building ney elementary school

Sites 7 and 8 are adjacent although separated by Hall Road. Site 7 is made up of 3 parcels, totaling 16.6 acres; Site 8 is a single parcel of 11.1 acres. All parcels in both sites are vacant and under common private ownership. Individually, either site could accommodate an elementary school. Site 7 also could provide for a small park along with a small elementary school facility. Combined, if Hall Road were not used as a through street, Sites 7 and 8 ( 27.7 acres total) could accommodate a small high school, or a middle school co-sited with an elementary school, or park, or other community facility. The sites are located between the city limits and the UGB in south Madras. The sites and land south of them are currently zoned by the County as County Commercial (CC), which does not allow schools, and they have been identified as possible sites for light industrial use. Currently there are no submitted or pending development applications for the sites. Sites 7 and 8 are flanked by Corridor Commercial (C1) zoning inside the city and residential zoning (RR5) outside the UGB and inside the URA, which allow schools at least conditionally and provide a student population. These sites would serve students in the south, west, and east portions of the Madras area. They are relatively flat and do not contain floodplain or floodway. The sites are close to but not adjacent to US 97, a major arterial, and are served by local roads - Hall Road and Merritt Lane. Services are available. Despite their location on local roads, commercial zoning to the west and south and stecp slopes to the east where there is residential zoning call into question how much residential development will be within walking distance and how viable walking conditions will be. Like most of the other potential sites, though, new construction on the sites will allow for integration of life-cycle cost-saving features.
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- Yarrow Site - relocating Madras or Westside Elementay Scbool, relocating Madras High School, or building new elementary school
The Yarrow site includes as much as 20 acres that is identified in the approved Yatrow community master plan for school use. Its location directly south of Ashwood Road, a collector, which allows a higher level of access while also being part of a planned development that will include local roads toward which the school could be oriented. The site is outside but adjacent to the UGB in the URA and is first in line for UGB expansion given it is master planned status. It could serve students from the north, east, and south parts of the Madras urban area. It is a vacant site that is relatively flat, although the southern part of the property rises up gradually to an upper plateau; the site does not intersect with floodways or floodplains. It is currently planned and zoned as range land in the County plan and is bourdered by range land zoning on the east and City open space/public facility and residential (R3) zoning to the north and south. To the north is a large county park. Land to the northeast, east, and southeast is all zoned for open space/public facility and range land. This land also provides an opportunity for residential development in close proximity to the school site where it would provide a walkable environment using local roads and, with proper safety treatments, via Ashwood Road. Services are available. At 20 acres the site is large enough for an elementary school co-sited with other community facilities. Last, as with most of the other potential sites, new construction on the Yarrow site would allow for integration of life-cycle cost-saving energy features.
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## Chapter 6: Recommendations

This chapter presents combinations of the options outlined in Chapter 5 for addressing the existing and projected facility needs of Jefferson County School District. The combinations represent recommendation "packages" based on the findings of the locational analysis in Chapter 5.

Based on that information, the following tecommendations and actions are proposed by the School Board:

## Immediate ( 1 to 5 years)

- Secure adoption of the Facility Plan and related implementation measures by local governments;
- Prepare and enact a district wide excise tax on new development to help finance school construction;
- Secure financing, select a site and then design and construct a replacement elementary school on Tribal Lands in Warm Springs;
- Secure financing, sclect a site, and then design and construct a replacement elementary school in Madras;
- Secure financing to assess and repair Metolius Elementary School;
- Secure funding to conduct a site search for a new elementary school in Madras;
- Secure funding for a study to determine how to address catastrophic flood hazard problems at Madras High School and the District's Administration Building.


## Near Term ( 5 to 10 years)

- Secure a site and funding to construct a new elementary school in Madras;
- Secure funding to resolve flood hazard problems at Madras High School and the Administration Building.
[To be modified after consulting with the City, District staff, and the School Board. More detail on how to proceed may be included in the plan depending on the wishes of the Board.] planning óroup landuse planning - transportation planning . project management


## Transmittal

Date: December 29, 2009
To: Plan Amendment Specialist
From: DJ Heffernan
Phone: (503) 227-3488
Firm: DLCD
Address: 635 Capitol Street NE, Suite 150 Salem, OR 97301-2540
RE: Proposed Jefferson County School District 2009 Long Range Facility Plan and Madras UGB Amendment and Annexation - ADDENDUM

This is an addendum to the original notice form. The proposed UGB amendment and annexation is being amended to add 16.91 acres that comprise two additional parcels that lie between tax lot 100 - the previous subject site - and the existing UGB.

Lots 101, 102, and 200 are proposed to be added to the Madras UGB and annexed to the city, but would not rezoned at this time. Those parcels will retain their existing County zoning (Range Land) and will be considered for rezoning once the private landowners are prepared for further land use action. The additional land is intended for residential land use designation to help meet the need for resideritial and public/semi-public uses in Madras for the next 15-20 years, as determined in the Madras Urbanization Study (ECONorthwest, April 2007) and Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, August 2007).

Therefore, the entire subject site is now comprised of the following parcels in Township 11S, Range 14E, Section 7:

1) Parcel of Lot $100-20.0$ acres
2) Lot 101-12.3 acres
3) Lot $201-0.69$ acres (County right-of-way)
4) Lot 200-3.9 acres.

The attached maps show:

1) The taxlots for Section 7 (Attachment A); and
2) The survey map for the parcel in Lot 100 (Attachment B).

As described in the original notice form, the parcel in Lot 100 is proposed for annexation to the UGB and the city, with a change in zoning to from County Range Land (RL) to City MultiFamily Residential (R-2).

In addition to these map amendments, the following table is proposed for addition to the Land Use Element (Section IV) of the Madras Comprehensive Plan. The table lists city and county zoning districts that are allowed within the various land use plan designations that are used to depict future land uses on the Madras Comprehensive Plan map. The table is needed to clarify how City Comprehensive Plan designations correspond to City and County zoning designations.

| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Plan } \\ & \text { Map } \\ & \text { Label } \end{aligned}$ | Designation | Description | City Zones | County Zones |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R-1 | Single-Family <br> Residential | Land primarily for single-family homes, including manufactured home subdivisions, and for duplexes | R-1 | EFU A-1, EFU A-2, RL, FM, RR-2, RR-5, RR10, RR-20, ERD |
| R-2 | Multi-Family Residential | Land for multi-family housing to be close to businesses and services and to buffer single-family residential and commercial uses. Manufactured homes and neighborhood commercial uses are allowed. | R-2 | EFU A-1, EFU A-2, RL, FM, RR-2, RR-5, RR10, RR-20, ERD |
| R-3 | Planned Residential Development | Land for primarily residential development that allows site design flexibility to promote creativity and protection of scenic and natural resources | R-3 | EFUA-1, EFU A-2, RL, RR-2, RR-5, RR-10, RR-20, ERD |
| C-1 | Corridor Commercial | Land for primarily motor vehicle-oriented uses located along major roadways | C-1 | CC, ERD |
| C-2 | Downtown Commercial | Land for a mixture of smaller scale businesses that supports redevelopment, higher density, public spaces, and other elements of pedestrian orientation | C-2 | CC, ERD |
| C-3 | Community Commercial | Land for primarily motor vehicle-oriented uses but on a smaller scale than Corridor Commercial | C-3 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { SC, CC, ERD, } \\ & \text { EFUA-1, EFU } \\ & \text { A-2, RL } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| NC | Neighborhood Commercial | Land for small-scale commercial uses in residential areas that includes public spaces and promotes transportation options | NC | SC, ERD, EFU <br> A-1, EFU A-2, <br> RL |
| 1 | Industrial | Land for industrial uses where industrial uses already exist in the city and in the Madras Industrial Park | 1 | EFUA-1, EFU A-2, RL, FM, PM, CI, IR, ERD |
| O/S | Open Space | Land where parks, open space, or public uses already exist or is otherwise publicly owned | OS/PF | EFUA-1, EFU A-2, RL, FM, PM |
| A/D | Airport Development | Land adjacent to airport facilities for future commercial and industrial uses, particularly those that rely on air transportation | A/D | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EFU } \overline{A-1, ~ E F U ~} \\ & \text { A-2, AM, ERD } \end{aligned}$ |


| County Zones: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| AIM | Airport Management |
| CC | County Commercial |
| CI | County Industrial |
| EFU A-1, EFU A-2, RL | Exclusive Farm Use Zones |
| ERD | Existing Rural Development |
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| FM | Forest Management |
| :--- | :--- |
| IR | Industrial Reserve |
| PM | Park Management |
| RR-2, RR-5, RR-10, RR-20 | Rural Residential |
| SC | Service Community |

Please contact me with information requests or follow-up questions.
Thank you for your time and consideration.

# Jefferson County and City of Madras Comprehensive Plan Amendment 

# Jefferson County and City of Madras Comprehensive Plan Map and Zoning Map Amendments - DRAFT 
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## I. Proposal Summary

| File No.: | 081-004 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Applicant: | Nick Snead, Community Development Director <br> City of Madras <br> 71 SE D Street <br> Madras, OR 97741 <br> (541) 475-3388 <br> (541) 475-7061 Fax <br> nsnead@ci.madras.or.us <br> Jon Skidmore, Community Development Director <br> Jefferson County <br> 85 SE D Street <br> Madras, OR 97741 <br> (541) 475-4462 <br> (541) 325-5004 Fax <br> jon.skidmore@co.jefferson.or.us |
| Applicant's Representative: | DJ Heffernan <br> Angelo Planning Group <br> 921 SW Washington, Suite 468 <br> Portland, Oregon 97205 <br> (503) 227-3664 <br> (503) 227-3679 Fax <br> dheffernan@angeloplanning.com |
| Request: | - To amend the Jefferson County and City of Madras Comprehensive Plans - to incorporate the Jefferson County School District 509-J 2009 Long Range Facility Plan as an element of the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan and the City of Madras Comprehensive Plan (Attachment A). <br> - To amend the Madras Comprehensive Plan - to add a table that presents the City zones and County zones that correspond and are allowed under City comprehensive plan designations. (Table 3-1) <br> - To amend the Jefferson County and City of Madras Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Maps - to expand the Madras Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) to include 36.91 acres from the Madras Urban Reserve Area (URA); to annex 20 acres of City-owned land ("east site," Figure 4-1) to the City of Madras and apply City R-2, Multiple Family Residential zoning; to annex 16.22 acres of privately owned land plus 0.69 acres of land for County right-of-way ("west site," Figure 4-1) and retain existing County RL, Range Land, zoning. |
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| Location: | - West site: tax map of 16.91-acre west site (outlined), directly east of the existing Madras UGB, south of Ashwood Road (Appendix A) <br> - East site: survey map of 20 -acre east site, east of the existing Madras UGB, south of Ashwood Road (Appendix B) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Legal Description: | West site: 11S 14E 7 Lots 101 (12.28 acres), 102 ( 0.69 acres for right-of-way), and 200 ( 3.94 acres), entire lots <br> East site: 11S 14E 7 Lot 100 (20 acres), parcel of lot <br> Legal description of Lot 100 parcel (east site): <br> A portion of Parcel 2 of Partition Plat No. 2002-12 as filed in the Jefferson County Clerk's Office, situated in the Northeast Quarter (NE $1 / 1$ ) of Section 7, Township 11 South, Range 14 East of the Willamette Meridian, Jefferson County Oregon, more particulary described as follows: Commencing at the Northwest corner of said Northeast Quarter, monumented with a 2 inch diameter brass cap, from which the Northeast corner of said Section 7 bears South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 2640.53 feet; thence South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40$ " East along the North line of said Section 7 a distance of 599.997 feet; thence South $0^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ "West a distance of 40.00 feet to the Northwest corner of said Parcel 2 of Partition Plat No. 2002-12; thence continuing Soutb $0^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ West along the West line of said Parcel 2 a distance of 40.00 feet to the South right-of-way line of East Ashyood Road and the True Point of Beginning. of this Description; thence South $0^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ East along said West line a distance of 935.13 feet to the Southeast corner of Parcel 1 of said Partition Plat No. 2002-17; thence leaving said West line South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime 2} 40^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 931.70 feet; thence North $0^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 935.12 feet; to a point on the South right-of-way line of East Asbwood Road; thence North $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ West along said right-of-way line a distance of 931.70 feet to the True Point of Beginning. <br> Contains 20.00 acres more or less. <br> End of Description. (Appendix B) |

## II. Introduction

The Madras Urban Reserve Area (URA) was approved by DLCD in July 2009, and was sized to provide urbanizable land for the next 50 years. Land from the URA is the first priority for inclusion in the UGB pursuant to ORS 197.298. The City of Madras is not currently in periodic review or evaluating its existing UGB for a 20 -year land supply. The City, however, has initiated this UGB amendment and annexation process in order to abide by terms of an agreement it has with the Jefferson County School District 509-J ("JCSD" or the "District").

In September 2006, the City of Madras and JCSD signed a land exchange agreement. The District owns property - "Friendship Park" - on Highway 97 that is basically too small to site a new school and is poorly located along a state highway. The agreement specified an exchange of this land in the city for 20 acres of land that the City owns just outside the existing UGB (Appendix D). This land is proposed for annexation to the Madras UGB and city limits and for re-zoning as City Multi-Family Residential (R-2), a designation that will allow for a multi-family and single-family housing às well as public/semi-public uses typically sited on residentially zoned land. The 20 -acre parcel is within the Yarrow Master Plan area. The plan conceptually identifies a school site along its northern border with Ashwood Road.

The terms of the land exchange agreement concerning this land is cited below.
...(T)he City has agreed to the following conditions as part of the property's conveyance, all of which are to be completed within five (5) years:
(a) The City and its Planning Department will take such efforts as are reasonable and practicable to expand the Urban Growth Boundary for the City so that the parcel described in Exbibit 'B" is within the Madras Urban Growth Boundary within five years of the signing of this Agreement, and that said property, when brought within the Urban Growth Boundary, shall be zoned to permit siting and construction of school facilities on said land; and
(b) At no cost to the School District, the City agrees to have sewer lines and water service lines adequate to accommodate a 600 student public school extended to the lot line of the parcel described in Exbibit ' $B$ "; and
(c) A Warranty Deed containing a legal description of the 20.0 acre parcel described in Exbibit ' $B$ ' shall be signed by the appropriate representative for the City and placed in escrow, with instructions that allow the School District to removed the Deed for recording in favor of the School District as soon as the parcel described in Exhibit ' $B$ " can be legally partitioned from the other property owned by the City in which said parcel is located; and
(d) The City will cooperate with the School District to process and complete any necessary partitioning and other legal procedures to segregate the School's parcel from the City's contiguous real property so that the Warranty Deed may be lawfilly recorded in the records of the Jefferson County Clerk.

As part of the process of fulfilling its obligation under terms of this agreement, the City of Madras prepared an update to the Jefferson County School District 509-J Long Range Facility Plan. The facility plan, which the District has adopted, complies with ORS 195.110. The plan includes enrollment forecasts to 2025, an assessment of current conditions for
existing District facilities (Appendix C) and recommendations to address identified capacity problems. The plan recommends that Warm Springs Elementary School be re-built, that Metolius Elementary School undergo repairs, and that Westside Elementary School and Madras Elementary Schools either be renovated on site or replaced. The projections, assessments, and recommendations of the 2009 Long Range Facility Plan provide a basis for studying the efficacy of these alternative solutions to inform a potential bond measure campaign and possibly adopt an excise tax program.

In addition to the 20 -acres of school district land, herein referred to as the east site, there are an additional 16.91 acres of land in the proposed UGB annexation, herein referred to as the west site. The west site is comprised of three lots that provide County right-of-way, better connect the east site to the existing UGB, and contribute toward meeting the long-term need for residentially zoned land. The west site is privately owned and is not proposed for rezoning at this time; it will apply for re-zoning when the owners are prepared to file land development applications in the future. It is planned that the west-site land also will provide the same range of needed housing types and public/semi-public uses as the east site when re-zoning is approved.

In order to accommodate rural zoning in the urban growth area, text amendments are proposed for Chapter 2 of the Madras Comprehensive Plan that identify county zones allowed on land that is designated for urban residential use on the comprehensive plan map.

## III. Jefferson County and City of Madras Comprehensive Plan Amendments

- Language adopting the Jefferson County School District 509-J 2009 Long Range Facility Plan (Appendix C)
- Language amending Madras Comprehensive Plan Section IV, Land Use Element that identifies the appropriate location for this table.

Table 3-1 Proposed Table for Corresponding City of Madras Comprehensive Plan Map Designations, City of Madras Zones, and Jefferson County Zones

| Plan Map <br> Label | Designation | Description | City Zones | County Zones |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R-1 | Single-Family Residential | Land primarily for single-family homes, including manufactured home subdivisions, and for duplexes | R-1 | EFU A-1, EFU A-2, RL, FM, RR-2, RR-5, RR-10, RR-20, ERD |
| R-2 | Multi-Family Residential | Land for multi-family housing to be close to businesses and services and to buffer single-family residential and commercial uses. Manufactured homes and neighborhood commercial uses are allowed | R-2 | EFU $\bar{A}-1, E F \bar{U}$ A-2, RL, FM, RR-2, RR-5, RR-10, RR-20, ERD |
| R-3 | Planned Residential Development | Land for primarily residential development that allows site design flexibility to promote creativity and protection of scenic and natural resources | R-3 | EFU $\bar{A}-1, E F \bar{U}$ A-2, RL, RR-2, RR-5, RR-10, RR-20, ERD |
| C-1 | Corridor Commercial | Land for primarily motor vehicle-oriented uses located along major roadways | C-1 | CC, ERD |
| C-2 | Downtown Commercial | Land for a mixture of smaller scale businesses that supports redevelopment, higher density, public spaces, and other elements of pedestrian orientation | C-2 | CC, ERD |
| C-3 | Community Commercial | Land for primarily motor vehicle-oriented uses but on a smaller scale than Corridor Commercial | C-3 | SC, CC, ERD, <br> EFU A-1, EFU <br> A-2, RL |
| NC | Neighborhood Commercial | Land for small-scale commercial uses in residential areas that includes public spaces and promotes transportation options | NC | SC, ERD EFU A-1, EFU A-2, RL |
| 1 | Industrial | Land for industrial uses where industrial uses already exist in the city and in the Madras Industrial Park | 1 | EFU A-1, EFU A-2, RL, FM, $\mathrm{PM}, \mathrm{Cl}, \mathrm{IR}$, ERD |
| 0/S | Open Space | Land where parks, open space, or public uses already exist or is otherwise publicly owned | OS/PF | EFU A-1, EFU <br> A-2, RL, FM, <br> PM |
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| Plan <br> Map <br> Label | Designation | Description | City <br> Zones | County Zones |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| A/D | Airport Development | Land adjacent to airport facilities for <br> future commercial and industrial uses, <br> particularly those that rely on air <br> transportation | A/D | EFU A-1, EFU <br> A-2, AM, ERD |


| County Zones: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| AM | Airport Management |
| CC | County Commercial |
| CI | County Industrial |
| EFU A-1, EFU A-2, RL | Exclusive Farm Use Zones |
| ERD | Existing Rural Development |
| FM | Forest Management |
| IR | Industrial Reserve |
| PM | Park Management |
| RR-2, RR-5, RR-10, RR-20 | Rural Residential |
| SC | Service Community |

IV. Jefferson County and City of Madras Comprehensive Plan Map and Zoning Map
Amendments
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## V. Conformance with Statewide Land Use Goals

## Goal 1: Citizen Involvement

To develop a citizen involvement program that insures the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process.

Response: The proposed amendments have been reviewed during a series of public meetings and hearings in order to allow for consideration by public officials and public feedback.

The Jefferson County School District 509-J ("JCSD" or "District") Board ("Board") was briefed by the Superintendent about the 2009 Long Range Facility Plan in meetings [when, covered what]. The draft plan was brought to them first for formal review at a Board meeting on January 11, 2010. After [describe deliberations], they adopted the plan on DATE.

The proposed Madras Land Use Element Comprehensive Plan amendment and amendments to the Jefferson County and City of Madras Comprehensive Plan Maps and Zoning Maps were presented and reviewed in a series of meetings in early 2010.

## ASK THE CITY FOR MEETING AND HEARING SCHEDULE AND INFO

Notice methods
Measure 56 notice
45-day notice to DLCD
December 14, 2009
Addendum
January -, 2010
Info available on City website?
The UGB expansion area is drawn from the Madras Urban Reserve Area (URA), which was developed through an intensive participatory process. A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Project Advisory Committee (PAC) were formed to provide guidance for the project. The TAC was comprised of staff from project team members, including Jefferson County, the City of Madras, ECONorthwest, Kittelson \& Associates, David Evans \& Associates, Ball Janik, LLP, and Angelo Planning Group. The PAC included representatives of the City of Madras, Jefferson County, Jefferson County School District 509-J, local farmers, housing advocates, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Region 4, and the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD).

A combination of bi-weekly TAC teleconferences, public forums, PAC meetings, and meetings of the Madras Planning Commission and City Council, and Jefferson County Planning Commission and Board of Commissioners informed the final URA recommendation. Public events included the following:

- PAC Meeting 1 - May 2, 2007

[^43]- Public Meeting 1 - May 15, 2007
- PAC Meeting 2 - May 24, 2007
- PAC Meeting 3 - October 22, 2007
- Public Meeting 2 - November 6, 2007
- Joint City Council/County Commission Work Session - November 20, 2007
- PAC Meeting 4 - December 3, 2007
- Joint City/County Planning Commission advisory hearing - April 3, 2008
- Joint City/County Planning Commission advisory hearing - May 8, 2008
- County Planning Commission hearing - May 22, 2008
- City Planning Commission hearing - June 11, 2008
- City Council/County Commission evidentiary hearing - August 13, 2008
- City Council hearing/deliberations - September 9, 2008
- City Council hearing/ $1^{\text {st }}$ ordinance reading - September 23, 2008
- City Council hearing/final adoption - October 7, 2008
- County Commission hearing - September 24, 2008


## Findings:

- According to both their Comprehensive Plans and code, the City of Madras and Jefferson County Planning Commissions serve as their official citizen planning committees.
- Adoption of the Madras Urban Reserve Area (URA) complied with Goal 1.
- Members of the public have been able to participate in reviewing the proposed amendments. [DATES FOR MEETINGS, WORK SESSIONS AND HEARING]
- [WEBSITES AND OTHER PLACES MATERIALS ARE AVAIL.ABLE]
- Measure 56 notice about upcoming County and City Planning Commissions and legislative hearings was mailed to [specify which property owners] on DATE.
- 45-day notice of proposed plan amendments was sent to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) on December 14, 2009 prior to the start of hearings held by County and City Planning Commissions and legislative bodies.
- Notices of the public meetings were published in the City's local newspaper, including contact information for the City and County. The paper also published articles [about what, if articles were published].
- ANY OTHER NOTICE AND PUBLIC ANNOUCEMENT INFORMATION FOR ADOPTION HEARINGS?

Conclusion: The City of Madras has complied with State requirements for citizen involvement per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 1.

## Goal 2: Land Use Planning

To establish a land use planning process and policy framework as a basis for all decisions and actions related to use of land and to assure an adequate factual base for such decisions and actions.

[^44]Response: The state statute governing long-term school district facility planning - ORS 195.110 - was revised in 2007 and expanded the definition of which districts were subject to the planning requirements. The statute is addressed in more detail later in this report. The Jefferson County School District 509-J 2009 Long Range Facility Plan (Appendix C) includes elements pursuant to ORS $195.100(5)(\mathrm{a})$ such as enrollment forecasts, an assessment of existing facility conditions, and an analysis of options to meet forecasted needs. Given projected future need, the plan recommends that the District proceed with implementation of re-building a school on the Warm Springs Reservation and providing a new elementary school to replace substandard existing facilities in Madras. The 2009 Long Range Facility Plan was adopted by the JCSD Board on DATE and is now proposed for inclusion as an element in the Jefferson County and City of Madras Comprehensive Plans pursuant to ORS 195.110(2)(a).

The proposed UGB amendment and annexation is based on the buildable lands inventory and needs analysis performed by ECONorthwest in 2007 and for the Madras Urban Reserve Area (URA) adopted in 2008 and acknowledged by the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) in 2009. The proposed table of corresponding City land use designations and City and County zones (Table 3-1) facilitates the annexation of land in the URA to the Madras UGB and city limits.

## Madras Urban Reserve Area

The Madras City Council adopted the Madras Urban URA and related provisions in October 2008 and the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners in November 2008. DLCD acknowledged and approved the URA and related amendments in July 2009, with stipulations that some of the proposed amendments to the Jefferson County development code be modified. Pursuant to ORS 197.298, the first priority for land to be included in a UGB is land designated as an urban reserve. Therefore, the land in the Madras URA is the first priority for UGB expansion when there is a demonstrated need for land in the next 20 years, as was found by the Madras Urbanization Study and Addendum.

The URA and its related plan and code amendments were developed over the course of Spring 2007 to Summer 2008. They were developed using the guidance and input of a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and a Project Advisory Committee (PAC) as well as City and County Planning Commissioners, City Councilors, County Commissioners, and participating members of the public. These various elements of public involvement are described in more detail in the response and findings for Goal 1.

At the same time, amendments to the County and City's Comprehensive Plans and Development Codes were developed in order to implement the URA. Proposed amendments to the Madras Comprehensive Plan addressed Goal 14 (Urbanization) and recommended the following:

- Description of the Madras URA, its role in providing a 20 - to 50 -year land supply to the City, the cooperation between the City and the County in establishing a URA, its priority for inclusion in the City's UGB;
- Master planning provisions for areas added to the City's UGB, including cooperation with the County and new master planning requirements (Area Master Plans or AMPs); and
- UGB expansion proposal requirements including proposed zoning, an annexation program, adequate public facilities and transportation facilities, protection of cultural and natural resources, protection from natural hazard, and area property owner support.

Land in the URA is the first priority when designating land for a UGB expansion and the land in this proposed amendment to the UGB, Comprehensive Plan Maps, and Zoning Maps is drawn entirely from the adopted and acknowledged Madras URA. The selection of land from the URA is based on criteria that Madras adopted as a Goal 14 policy as part of adopting the URA.
J. All land use applications or legislative proposals to expand the Madras UGB must be accompanied by information that documents the following:

1. The proposed urban zoning or land use program for the subject properties that address an identified urban land need;

## 2. An annexation program for all subject properties;

3. Evidence that public facilities required by OAR 660-011-000 that are necessary to serve the expansion area can be served either by system improvements outlined in adopted public facility master plans or by supplemental improvements that augment adopted public facility master plans,
4. Evidence that the proposed zoning or land use plan complies with requirements of OAR 660-0012-0060 either by demonstrating that planned improvements in the Madras Transportation System Plan (TSP) have capacity to meet transportation needs for the proposed expansion area or through supplemental transportation improvements that augment the adopted TSP to meet the need;
5. Evidence that providers of other crucial public facilities (e.g. schools, parks and recreation, emergency services and health care) are able to meet the projected demand for their services;
6. Evidence that financing for constructing needed public improvements is available so that the expansion area can be developed as planned within the planning horizon;
7. Evidence that development in areas subject to natural hazards are protected from these hazards;
8. Evidence that known or probable significant resources related to open space, scenic areas, historic places or structures, and fish and wildlife habitat will be protected from development impacts or have development impacts offset using appropriate mitigation measures.

These criteria are addressed later in the report section on the Madras Comprehensive Plan, Goal 14.

## Madras Urbanization Study - Residential Land

The Madras Urbanization Study (ECONorthwest, April 2007) and Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, August 2007) identify a shortage of residentially zoned land to meet single-family and multi-family housing needs and public/semi-public use needs in the next roughly 20 years The needed number of housing units and acreage for residential uses is summarized in Table 4-18 of the August 2007 Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (Table 51).

These needs are compared to the available land supply in the existing UGB in Table 6-4 in the study (Table 5-2) in order to determine whether there is a surplus or deficit of land for residential, public and semi-public, and employment uses. The table documents a shortage of land zoned R-2 (Multiple Family Residential) and land zoned R-1 (Single Family Residential) inside the existing UGB as well as a need for roughly 350 acres of public and semi-public uses over the course of the next $15-20$ years. These public/semi-public uses tend to be related to residential uses and are usually allowed and sited on residentially zoned land.

Table 5-1: Housing Needs, Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, August 2007)

Table 4-18. Forecast of needed housing units and residential land, Madras, 2007-2027 and 2007-2057

| Housing Type | New DU | Percent | Density (DUinet res ac) | Net Res. Acres | Net to Gross Factor |  | Density (Dujgross res ac) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Needed Units, 2007-2027 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-family types |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-family detached | 1,791 | 61\% | 4.8 | 373.1 | 25\% | 497.5 | 3.6 |
| Manufactured | 206 | 7\% | 5.5 | 37.4 | 25\% | 49.8 | 4.1 |
| Condortownhomes | 206 | 7\% | 9.0 | 22.8 | 15\% | 26.9 | 7.7 |
| Sultotal | 2,202 | 75\% | 5.4 | 410.5 |  | 574.2 | 3.8 |
| Multi-family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Multifamily | 734 | 25\% | 14.0 | 52.4 | 15\% | 61.7 | 11.9 |
| Subtotal | 734 | 25\% | 14.0 | 52.4 |  | 61.7 | 11.9 |
| Total | 2,936 | 100\% | 6.3 | 462.9 |  | 635.8 | 4.6 |
| Needed Units, 2007-2057 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-family types |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-family detached | 5,516 | 61\% | 4.6 | 1,149.1 | 25\% | 1,532.1 | 3.5 |
| Manufactured | 633 | 7\% | 5.5 | 115.1 | 20\% | 143.8 | 4.4 |
| Condortownhomes | 633 | 7\% | 9.0 | 70.3 | 15\% | 82.7 | 7.7 |
| Subtotal | 6,781 | 75\% | 5.4 | 1,334.5 |  | 1,758.7 | 3.9 |
| multi-family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Multifamily | 2,260 | 25\% | 14.0 | 161.5 | 10\% | 179.4 | 12.6 |
| Subtotal | 2,260 | 25\% | 14.0 | 161.5 |  | 179.4 | 12.6 |
| Total | 9,042 | 100\% | 6.3 | 1,495.9 |  | 1,938.1 | 4.7 |

Source: ECONorthwest
Note: Cross acres calculeted by dividing net acres by (1-net to gross factor). For example, for single-family
detached, $477.1(1-75)=636.1$. Corversely, $636.1 \times .75=477.1$.

Proposed Amendments to Jefferson County and Madras Comprehensive Plans and

Table 5-2. Land Needs, Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, August 2007)

Table 6-4. Comparison of land supply and demand, Madras UGB, 2007-2027 and 2007-2057

|  | Land Demand |  | Supply | Surplus (deficit) <br> 2007-2027 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2007-2057 |  |  |  |  |

Notes: all public and semi-pubic 'and needs were allocated to residential zones

The proposed UGB amendment of about 37 acres addresses part of the residential and public use land need presented above. Annexing 20 acres that are owned by the City (the east site) and rezoning it R-2 allows the City to fulfill its agreement with JCSD, dated September 2006 (Appendix D). The proposed UGB amendment provides land to meet part of the need for residentially zoned land. The remainder of the land need will be addressed during the City's next cycle of periodic review.

## Findings:

- The 2009 Long Range Facility Plan was adopted by the Jefferson County School District Board on DATE and is now proposed for inclusion as an element in the Jefferson County and City of Madras Comprehensive Plans pursuant to ORS 195.110(2)(a).
- The JSCD 2009 Long Range Facility Plan includes an enrollment forecast and analysis of options for meeting projected needs, and recommends that a replacement school be built for the existing elementary school in Warm Springs and that Westside Elementary School and Madras Elementary School in Madras be renovated on site or re-built on new sites.
- The proposed UGB amendment and annexation is drawn from land in the adopted Madras URA and meets some of the need for residentially zoned land the next 20 years as established in the 2007 Madras Urbanization Study and addendum.

Conclusion: Jefferson County and the City of Madras have complied with State requirements for land use planning per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 2.

[^45]
## Goal 3: Agricultural Lands

To preserve and maintain agricultural lands.
Response: The entire Madras URA includes land zoned for rural residential, range land, and agricultural uses, as shown in Table X.

Table X: Exception and Resource Land in the Madras URA

| Land Type | Zones | Acres |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Exception Land | RR2, RR5, RR10 <br> (Rural Residential) | 1,709 |
| Non-prime Resource Land | RL <br> (Range Land) | 2,038 |
| Prime Resource Land | A1 <br> (Agricultural) | 68 |
|  | Total | 3,815 |

Prime agricultural land makes up less than $2 \%$ of the total URA. When prime agricultural land is included, it is only when it is adjacent to the existing UGB, surrounded by exception land or non-prime resource land, and/or will be more easily served with public facilities sewer service, in particular. The rest of the URA is comprised of rural residential and range land. Rangeland was included in the URA because of serviceability advantages it has over other land surrounding the Madras UGB and because all the exception (rural residential) land adjacent to the Madras UGB would not fulfill the city's estimated land needs for the next 50 years.

The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is currently zoned Range Land by the County. Upon annexation to the UGB and Madras city limits, City R-2, Multiple Family Residential, zoning is being requested for the east site. The west site is proposed to be annexed to the city and to retain its existing County zoning.

As explained above, land zoned Range Land has been included in the Madras URA to meet land needs and because of sewer service advantages over other areas around the existing UGB and because exception land alone would not meet land needs for the city over the next 50 years. Land in Study Areas 3 and 4 of the URA consistently ranked highest in sewer serviceability analysis, including land in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation.

Pursuant to ORS 197.298(a), the first priority of land to be included in the UGB is land in a URA. Beyond that, local criteria can be relied upon to prioritize land from the URA to be included in the UGB. Local criteria are found in Goal 14 (Urbanization) policies in the Madras Comprehensive Plan. The criteria require a Master Planned Community (MPC) plan or Area Master Plan (AMP), proposed urban zoning, an annexation program, sufficient public facilities, financing prospects, and protection for natural resources and natural hazard areas for the proposed UGB amendment area. These policies are addressed in more detail in the response and findings for Madras Comprehensive Plan Goal 14.

Land in the URA is subject to joint management under the terms of the City's and County's Urban Growth Area Management Agreement (UGAMA) once it is added to the City's UGB. Response and findings related to the UGAMA are provided later in this report.

## Findings:

- The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is land from the Madras URA, top priority land for inclusion in the UGB pursuant to ORS 197.298(a).
- The adopted Madras URA includes primarily land that is "exception land" (zoned Rural Residential) or non-prime resource land because exception land alone cannot meet land needs for the next 50 years.
- Some of the non-prime resource land (zoned Range Land) is easier to serve with sewer than other areas around the existing Madras UGB, based on public facility analysis done during the development of the URA. Land in Study Areas 3 and 4 of the URA consistently ranked highest in sewer serviceability analysis, including land in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation.

Conclusion: Jefferson County and the City of Madras have complied with State requirements for agricultural lands per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 3.

## Goal 5: Natural Resources, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Open Spaces To protect natural resources and conserve scenic and historic areas and open spaces.

Response: The land being proposed for inclusion in the Madras UGB is currently located within the Madras URA, jointly managed by Jefferson County and the City of Madras pursuant to the terms of the Urban Reserve Area Management Agreement (URAMA), adopted in January 2009 (Appendix E). Pursuant to the URAMA, the County processes land use decisions in the URA. In addition, conversion plans must be submitted to the City for land divisions in the URA.

Madras Comprehensive Plan policy language regarding protection of open space, scenic, wildlife, and cultural resources was adopted as part of amendments to Goal 14 (Urbanization) concurrent with the adoption of the Madras URA.

## J. All land use applications or legislative proposals to expand the Madras UGB must be accompanied by information that documents the following:

8. Evidence that known or probable significant resources related to open space, scenic areas, historic places or structures, and fish and wildlife habitat will be profected from development impacts or have development impacts offset using appropriate mitigation measures.

The land in the proposal does not include floodways, floodplains, significant habitat, or cultural resources that are identified in the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan, Goal 5 inventory, or Jefferson County Geographic Information System (GIS) files. The only resources cited in Policy $14 J(8)$ that may apply to the site are open spaces. Open space will be a required part of school or multi-family residential development that occurs in the UGB

[^46]amendment area. However, this proposal itself is not a development or entitlement proposal and, therefore, is not required to specify precisely where such open space will be designated.

## Findings:

- Recently adopted amendments to Goal 14 of the City's Comprehensive Plan require identification of protective measures for significant open space, scenic, historic, cultural and natural resources in proposed UGB expansion areas. The Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan and Goal 5 inventory does not identify natural, scenic, or cultural resources in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area.
- Open space designations will be made as part of development entitlement for the proposed UGB amendment and annexation.

Conclusion: Jefferson County and the City of Madras have complied with State requirements for open space, scenic and historic areas, and natural resources per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 5.

## Goal 6: Air, Water and Land Resource Quality

To maintain and improve the quality of the air, water and land resources of the state.
Response: According to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ) there are no federally designated air quality management areas or federally designated hazardous waste sites in the Madras URA. Of Environmental Cleanup Sites reported on ODEQ's website, there are no sites identified in the URA. ${ }^{1}$ Further, R-2 zoning is proposed for the UGB amendment area to be brought in to the city, allowing residential uses and other compatible uses. These uses tend to produce less noise, air, land, and water pollution than commercial and industrial uses, which typically manufacture goods, produce by-products, and generate more vehicle traffic.

## Findings:

- There are not federal- or state-registered environmental quality sites within the URA boundary recommendation and proposed UGB amendment and annexation area.
- The amendment and annexation area is needed and planned for residential and related uses, which tend to have fewer adverse air, water, and land quality impacts than commercial or industrial uses.

Conclusion: Jefferson County and the City of Madras have complied with State requirements for air, water and land resources per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 6.

[^47][^48]
## Goal 7: Areas Subject to Natural Hazards

To protect people and property from natural hazards.
Response: Primary potential natural hazards in Madras include steep slopes, floodway and floodplain, and wildfire. Statewide Goal 7 is reinforced in Madras Comprehensive Plan policies (Goal 14) by requiring protection from natural hazards be demonstrated for proposed UGB amendments.

## J. All land use applications or legislative proposals to expand the Madras UGB must be accompanied by information that documents the following:

## 7. Evidence that development in areas subject to natural hazards are protected from these hazards;

There are not steep slopes (slopes greater than $25 \%$ ), floodway, or floodplain in the proposed UGB expansion area. In fact, the proposed amendment and annexation are driven, in part, by the need to provide a school that is outside the floodway and floodplain of Willow Creek and its tributaries.

Fire protection service for the proposal area is currently provided by Jefferson County Fire Protection District \#1, and will continue to be provided by that district if the land is annexed to the city. Area in the district is subject to a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) that Jefferson County completed in 2005 in collaboration with the fire district and federal agencies.

## Findings:

- There are not steep slopes (slopes greater than $25 \%$ ), floodway, or floodplain in the proposed UGB expansion and annexation area.
- Jefferson County Fire Protection District \#1 provides fire protection service to the proposed amendment and annexation area. The area is subject to the Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) developed and adopted by the County, the fire district, and federal agencies.

Conclusion: Jefferson County and the City of Madras have complied with State requirements for areas subject to natural hazards per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 7.

## Goal 10: Housing

To encourage the availability of adequate numbers of needed housing units at price ranges and rent levels which are commensurate with the financial capabilities of Oregon households and allow for flexibility of housing location, type and density.

Response: This proposal provides land for housing and compatible public and semi-public uses. The Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (August 2007) shows that there is a shortage of land zoned R-2 (Multi-Family Residential) and R-1 (Single Family Residential) inside the
existing UGB in the next 20 years, in addition to roughly 350 acres of residentially zoned land needed for public and semi-public uses ('Table 5-2).

The proposed annexation to the Madras UGB and city limits addresses this need by including 36.91 acres of land from the URA for residential and public/semi-public uses. It is proposed that the east site be re-zoned from County RL (Range Land) zoning to City R-2 (Multi-Family Residential) zoning. It is anticipated that this land will be used for a combination of housing and a school. The need for a new elementary school in Madras is established in the Jefferson County School District 509-J 2009 Long Range Facility Plan (Appendix C).

These proposed amendments are not part of a periodic review work program and the next periodic review process will ensure that the UGB does include enough land to meet all the land needs that are projected for the next 20 years as shown in Table 5-2.

## Findings:

- The Madras Urbanization Study and Addendum found a need for about 22 acres of land zoned R-2 and 53 acres of land zoned R-1 outside the existing UGB in the next 20 years.
- The urbanization studies as well as the 2009 Long Range Facility Plan indicate the need for public uses on residentially zoned land, specifically one new elementary school in Madras. The proposed UGB amendment provides 36 acres for residential and public/semi-public uses. A majority of this land - 20 acres is being made more readily available for development of these uses by proposing its annexation to the Madras UGB and city limits.
- The remainder of land needs determined by the urbanization studies will be addressed during the next City of Madras periodic review.

Conclusion: Jefferson County and the City of Madras have complied with State requirements for housing per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 10.

## Goal 11 Public Facilities and Services

To plan and develop a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban and rural development.

Goal Requirements
Urban Facilities and Services - Refers to key facilities and to appropriate types and levels of at least the following: police protection; sanitary facilities; storm drainage facilities; planning, zoning and subdivision control; health services; recreation facilities and services; energy and communication services; and community governmental services.

## A. Goal 11 Planning Guidelines

5. A public facility or service should not be provided in an urbanizable area unless there is provision for the coordinated development of all the other urban facilities and services appropriate to that area.

Response: According to terms of the UGAMA between Jefferson County and the City of Madras, the City will be the primary service provider for land within its UGB, in particular coordinating police, sewer, stormwater, land use, recreation, energy, and governmental services. City urbanization regulations amended with the adoption of the Madras URA require either a Master Planned Community (MPC) plan or Area Master Plan (AMP) for UGB amendments in Madras for areas over five acres (Madras Comprehensive Plan Policy 141). Both MPC plans and AMPs must show "appropriate locations for transportation improvements, public facilities, protection for significant open space, scenic, historic, and natural resource areas" and how proposed land uses will integrate with existing development.

Transportation facilities are addressed in more detail in the response and findings for Statewide Goal 12 next in this report.

The adopted Yarrow Master Plan applies to the east site, land proposed for annexation both to the Madras UGB and city limits. It is also proposed that the east site be re-zoned to R-2 upon annexation so that it can provide land for uses such as a school and urban levels of housing. These uses are similar to and compatible with surrounding development. The east site is tangent to the existing UGB and is bordered by Ashwood Road, a County collector road, which lends itself to the extension of services from inside the existing UGB and city limits. SERVICE PROVIDER LETTERS
How do existing water and sewer plans fold in? Updates needed?
Pursuant to Madras Comprehensive Plan Urbanization Policy 14I: "An AMP shall demonstrate efficient use of land, zoning consistent with an identified urban land need, appropriate locations for transportation improvements, public facilities, protection for significant open space, scenic, historic, and natural resource areas." It is proposed to annex the west site to the Madras UGB and city limits. While it is also proposed that the site retain its existing County Range Land (RL) zoning until the owners are ready to propose development, the site is surrounded by land designated for residential and related uses, and its future designation must allow for residential and compatible public/semi-public uses in order to show that land uses on the west site can be: "integrated with the existing urban development pattern." (Madras Comprehensive Plan Urbanization Policy 14I(2)) Further, the proposed addition of a table showing Madras and County zones that correspond with Madras land use designations to the Madras Comprehensive Plan Section IV, Land Use Element (Table 3-1), will facilitate the transition of existing County zoning for the west site to appropriate City zoning.

The west site is comprised of three lots - Lots 101 and 200 that total 16.22 acres and are privately owned and Lot 102 that is 0.69 acres designated for County right-of-way. Lots 101 and 200 are both adjacent to Ashwood Road, a County collector, and will not require
additional public roads for sufficient internal or local circulation. At the time of proposed development, proposed land division or planned development plans must show an internal circulation system that satisfies City code requirements and street standards. The west site is adjacent to the existing Madras UGB and is bordered by Ashwood Road, which lends itself to the extension of setvices from inside the existing UGB and city limits.

## SERVICE PROVIDER LETTERS

How do existing water and sewer plans fold in? Updates needed?
The County has not identified historic, scenic, or natural resources on the west site. City open space requirements for subdivisions or planned developments will apply to the site at the time of proposed development.

This application also proposes to adopt the Jefferson County School District 509-J 2009 Long Range Facility Plan as an element of the Jefferson County and City of Madras Comprehensive Plans, pursuant to ORS 195.110(2)(a). The Jefferson County School District 509-J Board adopted it on DATE. The plan (Appendix C) establishes school facility needs over the next $10-20$ years and will facilitate coordination with financing opportunities and the provision of other public facilities and services. The 20 -acre east site is the subject of an agreement between the City of Madras and the District (Appendix D). Upon annexation, re-zoning, and transfer of the land to the District, the land will be available to meet projected school facility needs, such as the need for rebuilding Westside Elementary School and/or Madras Elementary School on a new site in Madras. With Jefferson County Middle School and Madras High School nearby, the east and west sites will be adequately provided with school services.

Finally both MPC plans and AMPs must have documented approval from a majority of landowners pursuant to Madras Comprehensive Plan Policy 14I(3).
Documented consent of landowners?

## B. Goal 11 Implementation Guidelines

5. Additional methods and devices for achieving desired types and levels of public facilities and services should include but not be limited to the following: (1) tax incentives and disincentives; (2) land use controls and ordinances; (3) multiple use and joint development practices; (4) fee and less-than-fee acquisition techniques; and (5) enforcement of local health and safety codes.

Response: The proposed land use designations and zoning for the annexation area - the east site and the west site - is appropriate for the type and level of public facilities and services that can be extended to the area. It is proposed to bring the west site into the Madras UGB and city limits but to retain its existing County Range Land (RL) zoning until landowners are ready to propose development. The site is surrounded by land planned for or developed as predominantly residential development. Given that the site will have little or no development for at least the short-term and its location adjacent to the existing Madras UGB and Ashwood Road, the site will not need many facilities or services for a while and is well situated for extension of facilities and services when they are needed. The proposed addition of a land use and zoning designation table to Section IV (Land Use Element) of the

[^49]Madras Comprehensive Plan (Table 3-1) establishes the City and County zoning designations that correspond to City land use designations, and will guide the transition from County zoning to appropriate City zoning once a land use action is proposed.

It is proposed that the east site be re-zoned to R-2 upon annexation so that it can provide land for uses such as a school and urban levels of housing. These uses are similar to and compatible with surrounding development. The east site is tangent to the existing UGB and is bordered by Ashwood Road, a County collector road, which lends itself to the extension of services from inside the existing UGB and city limits.
SERVICE PROVIDER LETTERS, any changes to master plans?
The site is part of the approved Yarrow Master Plan, a plan that overall features mostly a mixture of housing and then an internal circulation system, open space, public uses (including a school), and a small-scale commercial area to serve the residential uses.

Funding for public facility improvements?

## Findings:

- The text amendment adopting the Jefferson County School District 509-J Long Range Facility Plan as an implementing element of the Madras Comprehensive Plan addresses goal requirements for coordinating land use planning with school districts and other urban service providers.
- The Jefferson County School District 509-J 2009 Long Range Facility Plan meets statutory requirements (ORS 195.110) and provides an updated capital improvement and financing plan for school district facilities in Madras.
- Implementation of public facilities and services in Madras is primarily regulated by land use plans and ordinances and public facility master plans, which are elements of the City Comprehensive Plan.
- The City of Madras will be the primary provider of urban facilities and services in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area. The City will be able to coordinate service to the area with facilities and services already provided to adjacent land within the existing UGB.
- The approved Yarrow Master Plan applies to the proposal area and shows an internal transportation network and sites for housing and a school.
- Updates to water and sewer plans or service provider letters saying existing infrastructure and plans sufficient?
- Funding for public facility improvements?

Conclusion: The proposal complies with Goal 11 for public facilities and services subject to OAR 660, Division 11.

Goal 12 Transportation - OAR 660-015-0060(12)
To provide and encourage a safe, convenient and economic transportation system.
660-012-0060

## Plan and Land Use Regulation Amendments

(1) Where an amendment to a functional plan, an acknowledged comprehensive plan, or a land use regulation would significantly affect an existing or planned transportation facility, the local government shall put in place measures as provided in section (2) of this rule to assure that allowed land uses are consistent with the identified function, capacity, and performance standards (e.g. level of service, volume to capacity ratio, etc.) of the facility. A plan or land use regulation amendment significantly affects a transportation facility if it would:
(a) Change the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility (exclusive of correction of map errors in an adopted plan);
(b) Change standards implementing a functional classification system; or
(c) As measured at the end of the planning period identified in the adopted transportation system plan:
(A) Allow land uses or levels of development that would result in types or levels of travel or access that are inconsistent with the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility;
(B) Reduce the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility below the minimum acceptable performance standard identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan; or
(C) Worsen the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility that is otherwise projected to perform below the minimum acceptable performance standard identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan.
(2) Where a local government determines that there would be a significant effect, compliance with section (1) shall be accomplished through one or a combination of the following:
(a) Adopting measures that demonstrate allowed land uses are consistent with the planned function, capacity, and performance standards of the transportation facility. (b) Amending the TSP or comprehensive plan to provide transportation facilities, improvements or services adequate to support the proposed land uses consistent with the requirements of this division; such amendments shall include a funding plan or mechanism consistent with section (4) or include an amendment to the transportation finance plan so that the facility, improvement, or service will be provided by the end of the planning period.
(c) Altering land use designations, densities, or design requirements to reduce demand for automobile travel and meet travel needs through other modes.
(d) Amending the TSP to modify the planned function, capacity or performance standards of the transportation facility.
(e) Providing other measures as a condition of development or through a development agreement or similar funding method, including transportation system management measures, demand management or minor transportation improvements. Local governments shall as part of the amendment specify when measures or improvements provided pursuant to this subsection will be provided.

Response: Reflecting Statewide Goal 12 and the Transportation Planning Rule, UGB amendment applications must provide the following pursuant to Madras Goal 14 policies:
4. Evidence that the proposed zoning or land use plan complies with requirements of OAR 660-0012-0060 either by demonstrating that planned improvements in the Madras Transportation System Plan (TSP) have capacity to meet

[^50]transportation needs for the proposed expansion area or through supplemental transportation improvements that augment the adopted TSP to meet the need; (Madras Comprehensive Plan Policy 14J)

City R-2 (Multi-Family Residential) zoning is proposed for the east site of the UGB amendment and annexation area. The zone allows multi-family and single-family housing outright and then allows associated uses such as schools, libraries, and community centers conditionally. The minimum lot size for single-family housing is 7,500 square feet and for multi-family 10,000 square feet for the first two units and 2,000 square feet per each additional unit.

The east site is adjacent to Ashwood Road, an existing road built to County standards as a collector road.
More description of the surrounding system, from the analysis (Appendix F)
The transportation analysis for the annexation and re-zoning of the east site was based on assumptions of a combination of multi-family housing and a school. A mixture of housing and a school is anticipated for the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area. Specifically, the analysis assumed [describe assumptions]. Findings of transportation analysis (Appendix F)

## Findings:

- Transportation analysis for the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area assumed that the area would be developed with amount of] housing and a [specify type or size] school.
- Transportation analysis showed that [analysis findings]. The proposal does not change functional classifications of any roadways and nor the standards that apply to them. It complies with mobility standards established in IDENTIFY DOCUMENTS for IDENTIFY ROADS. Therefore, the proposed UGB amendment and annexation was found to have no significant effect on the surrounding transportation system.

Conclusion: The proposed Comprehensive Plan and Map amendment complies with Goal 12 and OAR 660-015-0060(12).

## Goal 13 Energy Conservation

 To conserve energy.Response: The east site of the UGB amendment and annexation area is part of the Yarrow Master Plan area. The master plan includes a range of land uses so that residents can meet many daily needs within the neighborhood. The plan designates land predominantly for housing, but for parks and open space, a school, other community services, and commercial services as well. This mix of uses will provide for these daily needs and reduce the need to drive outside the neighborhood to access these uses. The subject of this application is part of that plan area- a 20 -acre site for housing and a school.

[^51]The Yarrow Community Master Plan also includes amount] miles of sidewalks and [amount] miles of multi-use paths. This supports the use of non-motorized transportation and the conservation of fuel resources. This proposed UGB amendment and annexation does not provide all of the land needed to implement the master plan but provides part of it.

The west site is not part of the Yarrow Master Plan but will be subject to internal circulation and multi-modal standards when a land division or planned unit development is proposed. Like the east site, the west site is adjacent to Ashwood Road.

The JCSD 509-J Facility Plan includes location policies that call for siting elementary school facilities in residentially zoned areas to promote walking to school within urban neighborhoods. This policy is included to reduce the need for bussing in urban areas.

While water service was projected to be of similar cost to provide to all the study areas that comprise the Madras URA, there were differences in relative cost for providing sewer service given the need for pumping in some of the study areas. The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is part of a study area and a drainage area where no pumping or limited pumping would be required for sewer service. This minimizes the amount of energy needed to provide that service.

Last, the City of Madras has adopted energy conservation standards for building. Or is it Yarrow? Describe.

## Findings:

- The approved Yarrow Master Plan that applies to the east site of the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area proposes a variety of uses that will allow residents to take care of day-to-day needs without always having to drive out of the neighborhood to do so. The plan also indicates multi-use paths and a continuous network of sidewalks to promote walking and bicycling. This supports fuel and energy conservation.
- Providing sewer service to the proposal area requires less pumping and, therefore, infrastructure, energy, and cost than other parts of the URA and other areas around the existing UGB.
- Local energy conservation (building) standards

Conclusion: The proposed UGB amendment and annexation complies with State requirements for energy conservation per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 13.

## Goal 14 Urbanization

To provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use, to accommodate urban population and urban employment inside urban growth boundaries, to ensure efficient use of land, and to provide for livable communities.
(2) Orderly and economic provision of public facilities and services;

Response: Transportation, water, and sewer services are among the critical public facilities that must be provided for the proposed UGB amendment area. Also discussed in the narrative and findings for Goals 11 and 12, these services can be provided to the UGB amendment area according to existing facility plans [no updates needed?] and [transportation improvements required of developers?].

## Transportation - transportation analysis findings

Water - During the development of the Madras URA, Deschutes Valley Water District (DVWD) reported that there would be no supply constraint for urban development in the URA. Significant expansion of the District's distribution system would be necessary to serve urban demand in each part of the URA, and the water service study found that the marginal cost differenccs between the URA study areas were insignificant. Updated or existing plan can service the UGB amendment area?

Sewer - Public facility analysis conducted in developing the Madras URA showed that sewer service to the eastern study areas in the URA would be more cost-efficient because no pumping or limited pumping would be required as compared to areas to the north, south, and west. For the proposed UGB amendment and in particular, updates to the/the existing Madras Sanitary Sewer Service Master Plan have capacity to provide sewer service to the annexation area.

Schools are also another important public facility and service, and the Jefferson County School District 509-J 2009 Long Range Facility Plan determines the need for a new elementary school in Madras over the next $10-20$ years. The Yarrow Master Plan that applies to the east site of the proposal area identifies land for schools. The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area of 20 acres will provide land that can accommodate a school and housing.

## Findings:

- Water service can be provided to the proposal area using the existing and planned water facilities that are identified in the Deschutes Valley Irrigation District's water master plan. Providing water service was not found to be significantly different in cost between different parts of the URA in studies done in developing the Madras URA.
- Sewer service can be provided to the proposal area using the existing sewer master plan. Studies did find, however, that drainage areas in the eastern and southeastern parts of the URA were easier to serve in that they needed no pumping or minimal pumping of sewage when compared to other parts of the URA.
- General transportation analysis findings
- The proposal provides land for a school site, and need for potentially one or two new elementary school sites in Madras was found in the Jefferson County School 509-J 2009 Long Range Facility Plan (Appendix C). The City owns the land being proposed for UGB expansion and annexation, and has an agreement with the

[^52]District to exchange the land with the District once it is annexed into the UGB and city limits and re-zoned (Appendix D). The site can serve as a replacement site for Madras or Westside Elementary School.

Conclusion: The proposal complies with State requirements for urbanization and orderly and economic provision of public facilities and services per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 14.

## VI. Conformance with Oregon Revised Statutes (ORSs)

ORS 195
195.110 School facility plan for large school districts. (1) As used in this section, "large school district" means a school district that has an enrollment of over 2,500 students based on certified enrollment numbers submitted to the Department of Education during the first quarter of each new school year.
(2) A city or county containing a large school district shall:
(a) Include as an element of its comprehensive plan a school facility plan prepared by the district in consultation with the affected city or county.
(b) Initiate planning activities with a school district to accomplish planning as required under ORS 195.020.

Response: Jefferson County School District 509-J registered 2,985 students enirolled in the 2008-2009 school year and, thus, qualifies as a "latge school district" pursuant to ORS 195.110. This application proposes that the Jefferson County School District 509-J 2009 Long Range Facility Plan (Appendix C) be adopted as an element in the Jefferson County and City of Madras Comprehensive Plans. The City of Madras has coordinated with the District in developing the plan.
(3) The provisions of subsection (2)(a) of this section do not apply to a city or a county that contains less than 10 percent of the total population of the large school district.
(4) The large school district shall select a representative to meet and confer with a representative of the city or county, as described in subsection (2)(b) of this section, to accomplish the planning required by ORS 195.020 and shall notify the city or county of the selected representative. The city or county shall provide the facilities and set the time for the planning activities. The representatives shall meet at least twice each year, unless all representatives agree in writing to another schedule, and make a written summary of issues discussed and proposed actions.

Response: Jefferson County and the City of Madras are the jurisdictions in which most of the students in Jefferson County School District 509-J live. The District has met with the City at least twice this year in developing the facility plan, and the District and City have both worked with a consultant firm - Angelo Planning Group - to prepare the plan. The firm has worked on other school district facility plans in the state.
(5)(a) The school facility plan must cover a period of at least 10 years and must include, but need not be limited to, the following elements:
(A) Population projections by school age group.
(B) Identification by the city or county and by the large school district of desirable school sites.
(C) Descriptions of physical improvements needed in existing schools to meet the minimum standards of the large school district.
(D) Financial plans to meet school facility needs, including an analysis of available tools to ensure facility needs are met.
(E) An analysis of:
(i) The alternatives to new school construction and major renovation; and

[^53](ii) Measures to increase the efficient use of school sites including, but not limited to, multiple-story buildings and multipurpose use of sites.
(F) Ten-year capital improvement plans.
(G) Site acquisition schedules and programs.
(b) Based on the elements described in paragraph (a) of this subsection and applicable laws and rules, the school facility plan must also include an analysis of the land required for the 10-year period covered by the plan that is suitable, as a permitted or conditional use, for school facilities inside the urban growth boundary.

Response: The Jefferson County School District 509-J 2009 Long Range Facility Plan features forecasts that extend to 2040 and programs for financing, acquisition, and capital improvement that cover a 10 -year period. The plan (Appendix C) includes the required elements as follows:

- Chapter 3 - Enrollment forecasts
- Chapter 4 - Existing facility conditions and needed facility improvements
- Chapter 5 - Analysis of needed improvements, additional capacity, and potential school sites
- [REFERENCE when plan complete/updated] - 10-year financing, acquisition, and capital improvement programs.

The analysis of additional capacity considers the re-use and expansion of existing facilities. Ultimately, the plan does recommend re-building Warm Springs Elementary School on site and building a new elementary school in Madras (Chapter 6 - Recommendations). The locational analysis in Chapter 5 looks first at sites within the UGB, using the following criteria.

- Land use - unimproved land, except for parks and open space, or land with improvements valued $<\$ 50,000$.
- Size - at least 7 acres
- Environmental hazards/buildability - at least 5 acres flat (slopes $<5 \%$ ), at least 2.5 flat acres outside the floodplain.
- Zoning - not zoned for industrial use.
- Serviceability - not in areas with constrained sewers.
- Geographic distribution - not fully within a half mile of an existing elementary school.
- Traffic safety - not on a highway or arterial.
- Availability - not committed to another use, built or in the planning process.

Eight sites in the UGB were evaluated using these criteria and, while most of the sites performed well on some to most of the criteria, none of them met all of the criteria. In particular, the sites would not be easily served with sewer and transportation or, in the case of sites 7 and 8, they are not necessarily close to existing or planned residential neighborhoods and students.
(6) If a large school district determines that there is an inadequate supply of suitable land for school facilities for the 10-year period covered by the school facility plan, the city

[^54]or county, or both, and the large school district shall cooperate in identifying land for school facilities and take necessary actions, including, but not limited to, adopting appropriate zoning, aggregating existing lots or parcels in separate ownership, adding one or more sites designated for school facilities to an urban growth boundary, or petitioning a metropolitan service district to add one or more sites designated for school facilities to an urban growth boundary pursuant to applicable law.

Response: The eight sites in the UGB were evaluated using the criteria from the response above and none of them met all of the criteria, particularly serviceability criteria. Because issues such as zoning and parcel aggregation were not the reasons that the evaluation sites within the UGB failed to meet criteria, the District and City added the proposal area - a City-owned site outside and adjacent to the UGB - to the evaluation. It met the criteria.

The site is located within the Madras URA and complies with regulations for including land in the UGB, pursuant to ORS 197.298, which is addressed next in this report.
(9)(a) In the school facility plan, the district school board of a large school district may adopt objective criteria to be used by an affected city or county to determine whether adequate capacity exists to accommodate projected development. Before the adoption of the criteria, the large school district shall confer with the affected cities and counties and agree, to the extent possible, on the appropriate criteria. After a large school district formally adopts criteria for the capacity of school facilities, an affected city or county shall accept those criteria as its own for purposes of evaluating applications for a comprehensive plan amendment or for a residential land use regulation amendment.
(b) A city or county shall provide notice to an affected large school district when considering a plan or land use regulation amendment that significantly impacts school capacity. If the large school district requests, the city or county shall implement a coordinated process with the district to identify potential school sites and facilities to address the projected impacts.
(11) The capacity of a school facility is not the basis for a development moratorium under ORS 197.505 to 197.540.
(12) This section does not confer any power to a school district to declare a building moratorium.
(13) A city or county may deny an application for residential development based on a lack of school capacity if:
(a) The issue is raised by the school district;
(b) The lack of school capacity is based on a school facility plan formally adopted under this section; and
(c) The city or county has considered options to address school capacity. [1993 c. 550 §2; 1995 c. 508 §1; 2001 c. 876 §1; 2007 c. 579 §1]

Response: The facility plan establishes calculations for capacity in Chapter 4.

## INSERT/SUMMARIZE HERE IF DETERMINED

When the Board approved and adopted the facility plan in January 2010, this included these capacity formulas. The County and City understand that these formulas must be used in

[^55]evaluating future amendments to comprehensive plans and land use regulations, and may be used in denying a residential development application but not in instituting a development moratorium.

## Findings:

- Jefferson County School District 509-J is required to prepare a facility plan, and it has coordinated with the City of Madras in developing its 2009 Long Range Facility Plan (Appendix C). The plan was approved and adopted by the Jefferson County School District 509-J Board on DATE.
- Jefferson County and the City of Madras must adopt the facility plan as an element of their comprehensive plans and that has driven this proposal for an amendment to their comprehensive plans.
- The facility plan uses at least a 10 -year horizon in projecting enrollment, estimating future facility needs, evaluating ways of addressing these needs, and preparing financing, acquisition, and capital improvement programs.
- The 2009 Long Range Facility Plan evaluated eight sites in the UGB using land use, site size, zoning, buildability, serviceability, geographic distribution, and traffic safety criteria in order to address land needed beyond existing facility sites. The sites were either difficult to serve with sewer or roads, or were not located near existing or planned residential neighborhoods.
- The plan evaluated one site in the Madras URA, adjacent to the existing UGB, that the City owns. The site met the land use, site size, zoning, buildability, serviceability, geographic distribution, and traffic safety criteria.
- The adopted facility plan includes capacity criteria that the County and City must use in reviewing land use plan and regulation amendments.

Conclusion: The proposal complies with State school district facility planning requirements in ORS 195.110.

ORS 197
197.298 Priority of land to be included within urban growth boundary. (1) In addition to any requirements established by rule addressing urbanization, land may not be included within an urban growth boundary except under the following priorities:
(a) First priority is land that is designated urban reserve land under ORS 195.145, rule or metropolitan service district action plan.
(b) If land under paragraph (a) of this subsection is inadequate to accommodate the amount of land needed, second priority is land adjacent to an urban growth boundary that is identified in an acknowledged comprehensive plan as an exception area or nonresource land. Second priority may include resource land that is completely surrounded by exception areas unless such resource land is high-value farmland as described in ORS 215.710.
(c) If land under paragraphs (a) and (b) of this subsection is inadequate to accommodate the amount of land needed, third priority is land designated as marginal land pursuant to ORS 197.247 (1991 Edition).
(d) If land under paragraphs (a) to (c) of this subsection is inadequate to
accommodate the amount of land needed, fourth priority is land designated in an acknowledged comprehensive plan for agriculture or forestry, or both.
(2) Higher priority shall be given to land of lower capability as measured by the capability classification system or by cubic foot site class, whichever is appropriate for the current use.
(3) Land of lower priority under subsection (1) of this section may be included in an urban growth boundary if land of higher priority is found to be inadequate to accommodate the amount of land estimated in subsection (1) of this section for one or more of the following reasons:
(a) Specific types of identified land needs cannot be reasonably accommodated on higher priority lands;
(b) Future urban services could not reasonably be provided to the higher priority lands due to topographical or other physical constraints; or
(c) Maximum efficiency of land uses within a proposed urban growth boundary requires inclusion of lower priority lands in order to include or to provide services to higher priority lands. [1995 c. 547 §5; 1999 c. 59 §56]

Response: The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is solely comprised of land from the Madras URA, which is the first priority of land to be included within the UGB pursuant to ORS 197.298(1)(a). There is sufficient land in the Madras URA to provide for the land needs estimated for the next 20 years in the Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, August 2007) and presented below.

The proposed UGB amendment and annexation provides land to meet a portion of the need for residentially zoned land over the next roughly 20 yeats (Table 6-1). The City's next periodic review process will ensure that the Madras UGB includes enough land to meet the remaining land needs projected to 2027.

Table 6-1: Housing Needs, Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, August 2007)
Table 6-4, Comparison of land supply and demand, Madras UGB,
2007-2027 and $2007-2057$

Proposed Amendments to Jefferson County and Madras Comprehensive Plans and Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Maps
197.610 Local government notice of proposed amendment or new regulation; exceptions; report to commission. (1) A proposal to amend a local government acknowledged comprehensive plan or land use regulation or to adopt a new land use regulation shall be forwarded to the Director of the Department of Land Conservation and Development at least 45 days before the first evidentiary hearing on adoption. The proposal forwarded shall contain the text and any supplemental information that the local government believes is necessary to inform the director as to the effect of the proposal. The notice shall include the date set for the first evidentiary hearing. The director shall notify persons who have requested notice that the proposal is pending.
(2) When a local government determines that the goals do not apply to a particular proposed amendment or new regulation, notice under subsection (1) of this section is not required. In addition, a local government may submit an amendment or new regulation with less than 45 days' notice if the local government determines that there are emergency circumstances requiring expedited review. In both cases:
(a) The amendment or new regulation shall be submitted after adoption as provided in ORS 197.615 (1) and (2); and
(b) Notwithstanding the requirements of ORS 197.830 (2), the director or any other person may appeal the decision to the board under ORS 197.830 to 197.845.
(3) When the Department of Land Conservation and Development participates in a local government proceeding, at least 15 days before the final hearing on the proposed amendment to the comprehensive plan or land use regulation or the new land use regulation, the department shall notify the local government of:
(a) Any concerns the department has concerning the proposal; and
(b) Advisory recommendations on actions the department considers necessary to address the concerns, including, but not limited to, suggested corrections to achieve compliance with the goals.
(4) The director shall report to the Land Conservation and Development Commission on whether the director:
(a) Believes the local government's proposal violates the goals; and
(b) Is participating in the local government proceeding. [1981 c. 748 §4; 1983 c. 827 §7; 1985 c. 565 §27; 1989 c. 761 § $20 ; 1999$ c. 622 §1]

Response: Notice of the proposed amendments to the Jefferson County and City of Madras Comprehensive Plan, Comprehensive Plan Maps, and Zoning Maps was sent to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) at least 45 days before the first evidentiary hearing on the proposal. Notice was sent to DLCD on December 14, 2009 before the first advisory hearing before the Jefferson County and City of Madras Planning Commissions on February 3, 2010. Further hearing dates have yet to be determined but it is expected that DLCD will provide appropriate comment on the proposal at least 15 days prior to the final adoption hearing date.

## DLCD comments/application revisions, once received

197.626 Expanding urban growth boundary or designating urban or rural reserves subject to periodic review. A metropolitan service district that amends its urban growth boundary to include more than 100 acres, or that amends the district's regional framework plan or land use regulations implementing the plan to establish urban reserves designated under ORS 195.145 (1)(b), a city with a population of 2,500
or more within its urban growth boundary that amends the urban growth boundary to include more than 50 acres or that designates urban reserve under ORS 195.145, or a county that amends the county's comprehensive plan or land use regulations implementing the plan to establish rural reserves designated under ORS 195.141, shall submit the amendment or designation to the Land Conservation and Development Commission in the manner provided for periodic review under ORS 197.628 to 197.650. [1999 c. 622 §14; 2001 c. 672 §10; 2003 c. 793 §4; 2007 c. 723 §7]

Response: The City of Madras is coordinating with Jefferson County regarding the proposed amendments to their Comprehensive Plans, Comprehensive Plan Maps, and Zoning Maps. Adoption of the UGB amendment involves amendments to the City and County Comprehensive Plans that are post-acknowledgement plan amendments. However, the adoption process for the amendments will follow periodic review procedures pursuant to ORS 197. As part of periodic review procedures, the proposed amendments are subject to review by DLCD and approval by LCDC. DLCD and LCDC will conduct their review process upon adoption of the proposed amendments by the Madras City Council and Jefferson County Board of Commissioners.

## Findings:

- The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is entirely comprised of land from the Madras URA, the first priority of land to be included in the UGB pursuant to ORS 197.298(1)(a).
- There are 36.91 acres in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation. This meets some of the estimated need for residentially zoned land outside the existing UGB projected to 2027 by urbanization studies. The proposed R-2 zoning for the 20 -acre parcel (east site) allows housing and public/semi-public uses such as parks and schools. Other land needs for the next 20 years will be addressed during the next periodic review cycle.
- Notice of the first advisory hearing on February 3, 2010 was sent to DLCD on December 14,2009 , more than 45 days before the advisory and evidentiary hearings.
- The City of Madras and Jefferson County are coordinating this proposed set of amendments.
- This proposal is a post-acknowledgement plan amendment (PAPA) but will follow procedures for periodic review. DLCD review and LCDC approval of the amendment will be necessary for the proposal if it is adopted by both the Madras City Council and Jefferson County Board of Commissioners.

Conclusion: The proposed amendments to the City and County Comprehensive Plans, Comprehensive Plan Maps, and Zoning Maps comply with applicable State requirements for urban reserve area planning, plan amendments, and UGB amendments pursuant to ORS 197.

[^56]
## VII. Conformance with the Urban Growth Area Management Agreement (UGAMA)

## 4. UGA ADMINISTRATION RESPONSIBILITIES

4.1. The City shall have responsibility for administration and decision making authority regarding all land use application within the UGB except applications for amendments to the UGB, as provided in Section 6.
4.2. The City shall have responsibility for annexation of land in the UGB. Lands outside the UGA shall not be annexed unless the UGB is also amended to include the territory to be annexed.
6. PROCESS FOR URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY AMENDMENTS
1.1 Amendments to the UGB, including amendments to the City's and County's comprehensive plan maps, may be initiated by the City, the County, or a property owner(s).
1.2 An application to amend the UGB shall be filed with the City Community Development Department along with the applicable City and County plan amendment fees. The City shall forward a copy of the application to the County Community Development Department, together with the County's plan amendment fee, within five working days of the date the application is filed.
1.3 The City and County Planning Commission shall each conduct a public hearing regarding the application. At their discretion, the Planning Commissions may hold a joint hearing rather than separate hearings.
1.4 The recommendation of the City and County Planning Commissions shall be forwarded to City Council, who shall hold a public hearing to consider the proposed amendment to the UGB. The decision of the City Council shall be forwarded to the County Board of Commissioners.
1.5 The Board of Commissioners shall conduct a public hearing and make a final decision on whether the UGB should be amended.
1.6 If the City and County disagree on the proposed amendments, a joint hearing of the City Council and Board of County Commissioners may be held to attempt to resolve the differences. Both jurisdictions may also request a dispute resolution process to resolve the differences.
1.7 If the governing bodies are not able to come to mutual agreement there shall be no change to the UGB.

Response: The Urban Growth Area Management Agreement (UGAMA) (Appendix G) was adopted by the City of Madras and Jefferson County on April 5, 2006. Pursuant to UGAMA terms for UGB amendments, the City is an eligible applicant for a UGB amendment application (Section 6.1). The UGB amendment application and appropriate fees were forwarded to the Jefferson County Community Development Department within five working days of being initially filed (Section 6.2).

Hearings by the Madras Planning Commission and Jefferson County Planning Commission were first held jointly on February 3, 2010 and then separately on DATE and DATE
respectively. OTHER PC HEARINGS? The Madras City Council will review the City Planning Commission's recommendation at a hearing on DATE, and will forward its decision to the County Board of Commissioners for a hearing on DATE (Sections 6.3-6.5). OTHER LEGISLATIVE HEARINGS?

It is proposed to annex both the east site and west site to the Madras UGB and city limits, and it is proposed to re-zone only the east site at this time. Regardless, if both sites are brought into the UGB and city limits, Madras will assume land use administration and decision making authority for the sites pursuant to Section 4.1 of the UGAMA.

Conclusion: The proposed amendments to the City and County Comprehensive Plans, Comprehensive Plan Maps, and Zoning Maps comply with applicable local requirements for UGB amendments per the UGAMA between Jefferson County and the City of Madras, adopted April 5, 2006.

## VIII. Conformance with the City of Madras Comprehensive Plan

Note: the highlighting in the policy text below indicates text that may not have been adopted by the City

GOAL 14 - To provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land, and to provide for livable communities.
[Paragraph amended by Ordinance No. 781, Passed by Council on December 12, 2006]
POLICIES
A. The City, in cooperation with Jefferson County, shall establish an Urban Growth Boundary.
B. The City, in cooperation with Jefferson County, shall mutually agree to a management plan for the Urban Growth Boundary area.
C. The City, in cooperation with Jefferson County, shall establish an Urban Growth Boundary revision process to be utilized in a proposed change of the Urban Growth Boundary.
D. The Citv, in cooperation with Jefferson County, shall support adoption of an Urban Reserve Area boundary that, when taken together with land supplies in the Urban Growth Boundary, may contain up to a 50-year supply of land for the City of Madras to support housing, economic development, public facilitv, recreation needs and other urban land needs.
E. The City, in cooperation with Jefferson County, shall give priority to land in designated urban reserve areas over other land when considering urban growth boundary amendments.

Response: The Madras City Council approved the Madras URA in October 2008 and the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners in November 2008. DLCD and LCDC received the URA proposal for review in January 2009, and approved the proposal - but remanded sections of proposed County Zoning Ordinance amendments having to do with use restrictions in the URA - in July 2009. The land in the proposed UGB amendment that is the subject of this application is land entirely drawn from the Madras URA, land estimated to be needed for urbanization over the next 50 years.
F. The City shall favor UGB amendments that involve land in locations that are suitable to address identified urban land needs in order to minimize buildable land supply shortages and address identified needs. Factors that will be considered when evaluating UGB additions include:

1. Existing and planned capacity of the transportation system
2. Existing and planned capacity of the city waste water treatment plant
3. Existing and planned capacity of the city sanitary sewer conveyance system
```
4. Existing and planned capacity of the Deschutes Valley Water District supply
system
5. Impacts on schools, parks, and public safety service providers
6. Impacts on future operating costs for public facilities and services
```

Response:
G. The City, in cooperation with Jefferson County, shall undertake an evaluation of the urban growth boundary land supply once every five years or more frequently if certified population growth rates exceed $3.2 \%$ in three consecutive years. In the event certified population growth rates fall below $3.2 \%$ for three consecutive years, the City and County may agree to postpone the evaluation of UGB land supply for up to three vears.
H. During years when a comprehensive UGB land supply evaluation is not scheduled, individual applications for adding property to the UGB shall be limited to requests of less than 40 acres. UGB amendment applications must demonstrate consistency with applicable Oregon statutes and administrative rules and be accompanied by information that addresses Policy 14-J below. Applications that involve more than 5 acres also must comply with provisions of Policy 14-I.
$\theta$ !. The City, in cooperation with Jefferson County, shall encourage the development of complete, livable communities that include characteristics such as: a variety of lot sizes, dwelling unit types and ownership types, open spaces and other recreational amenities, a mix of land uses, school and community facilities, connected streets, proximity to downtown and other employment centers, and development that is scaled to the pedestrian and creates a sense of place. New growth areas of more than 5 acres that are added to the UGB shall should be planned and developed in accordance either with a master planned community development plan approved under the city Master Planned Community Overlay zone, or an Area Master Plan. The City encourages Master Planned Communities as a means to meet city housing needs as explained in other comprehensive plan documents. It may be appropriate, however, for the city to add new growth areas to the UGB that are planned and developed in accordance with an approved Area Master Plan. A maiority of property owners subject to a Master Planned Community, or to an Area Master Plan, must consent to be included in the plan.

1. A Master Planned Community (MPC) Overlay may apply to large multi-phased development projects where the master plan is intended to guide future development patterns and serves to regulate the site-development approval process. A MPC requires generous open space and amenities, and encourages efficient use of land and public facilities and services, a variety of housing types, innovative designs and complete pedestrian-friendly communities. A MPC shall demonstrate efficient use of land consistent with an identified urban land need, show appropriate locations for transportation improvements, public facilities, and the protection of significant open space, scenic, historic, and natural resource areas. A MPC must show how planned land uses will be integrated with the existing urban development pattern. Physical barriers, such as highways, tend to disrupt complete communities and livability because they disconnect areas from downtown and result in an auto-oriented environment of sprawl along highway corridors.

[^57]2. An Area Master Plan (AMP) is appropriate for land added to the UGB where the approval of future urban development is expected to rely on conventional urban zoning and the application of codified development standards and review procedures. An AMP may be prepared for contiguous properties added to the UGB that are greater than 5 acres and are not subject to a MPC overlay. An AMP shall demonstrate efficient use of land, zoning consistent with an identified urban land need, appropriate locations for transportation improvements, public facilities, protection for significant open space, scenic, historic, and natural resource areas. An AMP must show how planned land uses will be integrated with the existing urban development pattern.
3. An approved Master Planned Community Plan or an Area Master Plan must include documentation that a maiority of property owners support the conversion of land to the planned urban uses and also consent to annexation by the city of Madras using a voluntarv annexation process that is outlined in the plan.

Response: The total area under consideration is 36.4 acres, which is less than the 40 acre maximum established for interim UGB annexation requests. The east site of the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is part of the approved Yarrow Master Plan area. The plan designates land for predominantly residential land uses, which is compatible with adjacent development in the UGB, while also designating land for open space and park uses, community services including schools, and limited neighborhood commercial services. The conceptual plan also shows an internal transportation system that includes sidewalks and multi-use paths.

For the east site:
Connections and improvements to the surrounding transportation network - transportation analysis results
Existing water and sewer master plans are adequate to address facilities and service in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area.
The designation for medium density Residential use is consistent with an un-met land need and identified housing need in the 2005 Urbanization Report.

Pursuant to Policy 14I: "An AMP shall demonstrate efficient use of land, zoning consistent with an identified urban land need, appropriate locations for transportation improvements, public facilities, protection for significant open space, scenic, historic, and natural resource areas." It is proposed to annex the west site to the Madras UGB and city limits but to retain its existing County Range Land (RL) zoning until the owners are ready to propose development. The site is surrounded by land designated for residential and related uses, and its future land use and zoning designation must allow for residential and compatible public/semi-public uses in order to show that land uses on the west site can be: "integrated with the existing urban development pattern." (Policy 14I(2)) The proposed addition of a table showing Madras and County zones that correspond with Madras land use designations to the Madras Comprehensive Plan Section IV, Land Use Element (Table 3-1), will facilitate the transition of existing County zoning to appropriate City zoning.

The west site is comprised of three lots - Lots 101 and 200 that total 16.22 acres and are privately owned and Lot 102 that is 0.69 acres designated for County right-of-way. Lots 101

[^58]and 200 are both adjacent to Ashwood Road, a County collector, and will not require additional public roads for sufficient internal or local circulation. At the time of proposed development, proposed land division or planned development plans must show an internal circulation system that satisfies City code requirements and street standards. The west site is adjacent to the existing Madras UGB and is bordered by Ashwood Road, which eases extension of services from inside the existing UGB and city limits to the west site.

The plan map designation of medium density residential ( $\mathrm{R}-2$ ) is consistent with an un-met land need and identified housing need in the 2005 Urbanization Report.

## For the west site:

## SERVICE PROVIDER LETTERS

How do existing water and sewer plans fold in? Updates needed?
The County has not identificd historic, scenic, or natural resources on the west site. City open space requirements for subdivisions or planned developments will apply to the site at the time of proposed development.
J. All land use applications or legislative proposals to expand the Madras UGB must be accompanied by information that documents the following:

1. The proposed urban zoning or land use program for the subject properties that address an identified urban land need;
2. An annexation program for all subject properties;
3. Evidence that public facilities required by OAR 660-011-000 that are necessary to serve the expansion area can be served either by system improvements outlined in adopted public facility master plans or by supplemental improvements that augment adopted public facility master plans;
4. Evidence that the proposed zoning or land use plan complies with requirements of OAR 660-0012-0060 either by demonstrating that planned improvements in the Madras Transportation System Plan (TSP) have capacitv to meet transportation needs for the proposed expansion area or through supplemental transportation improvements that augment the adopted TSP to meet the need;
5. Evidence that providers of other crucial public facilities (e.g. schools, parks and recreation, emergency services and health care) are able to meet the projected demand for their services;
6. Evidence that financing for constructing needed public improvements is available so that the expansion area can be developed as planned within the planning horizon:
7. Evidence that development in areas subject to natural hazards are protected from these hazards;
8. Evidence that known or probable significant resources related to open space, scenic areas, historic places or structures, and fish and wildlife habitat will be protected from development impacts or have development impacts offset using appropriate mitigation measures.

## Response:

Zoning and Land Use Designations (Policy J1)

[^59]The east site is proposed to be re-zoned to a City R-2 designation. This meets some of the need for residentially zoned land outside the existing UGB that is projected for the next $15-$ 20 years. Residentially zoned land will provide for housing and public/semi-public uses. This land need is documented in the Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, August 2007). (See Table 5-2)

The west site is proposed to retain its existing County Range Land (RL) designation until the time when further land use action and development is proposed. Existing zoning will allow only limited development, and appropriate future designations for the site will be City residential designations given that City open space and residential zoning currently surround the site.

## Annexation Program (Policy J2)

The City is the applicant for this proposal, and annexation program pursuant to Article 7 of its Zoning Ordinance is described later in this report.

## Goal 11 Public Facilities (Policy J3) and Transportation Planning Rule (Policy J4)

Kittelson \& Associates has performed the transportation analysis needed to deem whether the proposed UGB amendment constitutes a significant effect on the transportation system. The scoping memo concluded that, of two development scenarios allowed under proposed $\mathrm{R}-2$ zoning, considered to be possible according to preliminary conversations about potential uses, and estimated for "worst-case" levels of potential traffic generation, the scenario that included both an elementary school and multi-family housing was found to generate more peak hour traffic than housing alone. Using this scenario in a Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) analysis for significant effect, it was found that the increase in traffic did not constitute a significant effect on the transportation system. Existing facilities and facilities identified in the Jefferson County and City of Madras Transportation System Plans (TSPs) that would likely be funded and built in the next 20 years are adequate to accommodate the projected growth in traffic without violating adopted performance standards.

Public facility analysis for establishing the Madras URA ranked drainage catchment areas around the existing UGB for sewer service costs and serviceability. Of the six study areas that comprised the preliminary and then final URA, Study Areas 3 and 4 on the east and southeast consistently ranked higher than other areas. This can, in part, be attributed to proximity to the new South Wastewater Treatment Plant (SWWTP) and being upslope of the plant. In particular, the proposed UGB amendment and annexation are is located in Catchment Area 180 and bordering on Catchment Area 179. These areas ranked $8^{\text {th }}$ and $12^{\text {th }}$ out of 60 catchment areas, making them among the more cost-effective and serviceable areas of the URA.

As was also determined during the URA public facility analysis, Deschutes Valley Water District (DVWD) found that there would be insignificant differences in providing water service to the different parts of the URA. Water supply in the region is adequate to ample.

Implementation of existing water and sewer master plans will be sufficient to provide service for the proposal area. Or are updates needed?

[^60]
## SERVICE PROVIDER LETTERS

Othet Public Facilities (Policy J5)
The Jefferson County School District 509-J 2009 Long Range Facility Plan includes enrollment projections for the next 20-25 years and compares the projected enrollment against the capacity and conditions of existing facilities. Even with shared uses or renovations, the plan recommends that a school be re-built on Warm Springs tribal land, that a new elementary school be built in Madras to replace substandard facilities, and that work be done to address flood hazards at Madras High School and the administration offices. It is projected in the plan that between 2025 and 2030, elementary school enrollment will exceed existing capacity by more than 400 students (Table 5-2, Appendix C).

As part of this proposal, it is requested that the adoption of the 2009 Long Range Facility Plan as an element of the County and City Comprehensive Plans be approved and acknowledged by DLCD.

The east site has access to substantial park and recreation resources. Juniper Hill Park (City/County) and Bean Park (City/County) are nearby, as well as Jefferson County Middle School and its fields. The Yarrow Master Plan that applies to the site and surrounding land also designates open space and parks throughout the plan area.

The City reports that Mountain View Hospital and City public safety and emergency services are sufficient to provide services for the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area.

## Financing for Improvements (Policy J6)

Financing?
For facility plan and other transportation, water, and sewer improvements

## Protection from Natural Hazards (Policy J7)

There are not steep slopes (slopes greater than $25 \%$ ), floodway, or floodplain in the proposed UGB expansion and annexation area. In fact, the proposed amendment and annexation are driven, in part, by the need to provide a school that is outside the floodway and floodplain of Willow Creek and its tributaries.

Fire protection service for the proposal area is currently provided by Jefferson County Fire Protection District \#1, and will continue to be provided by that district if the land is annexed to the city. The area is subject to a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) that Jefferson County completed in 2005 in collaboration with the fire district and federal agencies.

## Protection of Goal 5 Resources (Policy J8)

The Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan, Goal 5 inventory, or Jefferson County Geographic Information System (GIS) files do not identify floodways, floodplains, significant habitat, or cultural resources in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area. The only resources cited above that may apply to the site are open spaces. While open space will be a required part of public use or residential development that occurs in this area,

[^61]this proposal itself is not a development or entitlement proposal and, therefore, does not specify precisely where such open space will be designated.

## Findings:

- Amendments to zoning and land use designations are planned and proposed. The proposed City land use designation is residential and City zoning designation R-2 (Multiple Family Residential). A need for about 22 acres of land outside the existing UGB zoned R-2 was determined in the Madras Urbanization Study Addendum.
- Transportation analysis and results
- Implementation of existing water and sewer master plans will be sufficient to provide service for the proposal area, or are updates needed? Include/reference service provider letters.
- The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area has access to nearby parks and a middle school. Part of the proposal is to adopt the Jefferson County School District 509-J 2009 Long Range Facility Plan as an element of the Jefferson County and Madras Comprehensive Plans and annex the 20 -acre site in order to fulfill an agreement between JCSD and the City and provide land for an elementary school that will be needed in the next 15-20 years.
- Financing - facility plan and other transportation, water, and sewer improvements
- In terms of natural hazards, there are not slopes greater than $25 \%$, floodway, or floodplain in the proposed UGB expansion and annexation area. The proposed amendments and annexation are based, in part, on the need to provide a school that is outside the floodway and floodplain of Willow Creek and its tributaries. Fire protection service for the proposal area is and will be provided by Jefferson County Fire Protection District \#1.
- There are not floodways, floodplains, habitat, or cultural resources that are identified in the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan, Goal 5 inventory, or Jefferson County Geographic Information System (GIS) files in the proposal area. Open space will be provided as part of school and residential development pursuant to District school site and facility criteria and Madras zoning ordinance (MZO) in which $30 \%$ of a Master Planned Community must be open space (MZO Section 3.12(D)(4)).

Conclusion: The proposed comprehensive plan, comprehensive plan map, and zoning map amendments comply with the relevant policies of the Madras Comprehensive Plan.

## IX. Conformance with the City of Madras Community Development Code

City of Madras Zoning Ordinance

## ARTICLE 7: ANNEXATION

SECTION 7.1: PURPOSE - The purpose of this section is to:
A. Implement the policies of the City of Madras Comprehensive Plan;
B. Provide for City review of all annexation requests for a determination of the availability of facilities and services as related to the proposal;
C. Provide for dissemination of public information and for sufficient time for public review;
D. Provide for City and County coordination of a request for an annexation; and E. Provide for an expedited process by establishing procedures whereby the annexation and zoning, if applicable, may be considered concurrently.

SECTION 7.2: APPLICATION PROCEDURE. Annexation is a land use decision and is subject to applicable provisions of the City of Madras Comprehensive Plan, Oregon Revised Statutes, and Oregon Administrative Rules. In addition, the procedures below shall be followed:
A. The Planning Commission shall conduct a public hearing after notification of all property owners with two hundred fifty feet (250') outside of the boundary(ies) of the proposed annexation. The Planning Commission shall review the proposal for compliance with the annexation policies contained in this Ordinance and make a recommendation to the City Council, based on:

1. The annexation proposal which meets the application requirements; and
2. The Planning Commission shall conduct a public hearing to determine a recommendation to the City Council to approve, approve with conditions or modifications, or disapprove the feasibility of the annexation proposal based on the criteria set forth in Section 7.4 below; and
3. The Planning Commission shall state its recommendation and the reasons therefore in writing to the City Council.
B. Upon receipt of the Planning Commission recommendation, the City Council shall conduct a public hearing and consider an Ordinance declaring the requested lands to be annexed to the City of Madras.
4. The City Council shall review the record of the Planning Commission hearing their recommendation and shall determine whether to approve, approve with conditions or modifications, or disapprove the feasibility of the proposed annexation in accordance with the criteria set forth in Section 7.4 below.
5. The City Council may conduct additional public hearings to assist their making a determination.
6. The City Council shall state its determination and the reasons therefore in writing.

Response: The City of Madras sent public hearing notice to the surrounding property owners on DATE. The City and County Planning Commissions held their first public hearing on February 3, 2010. The City Planning Commission decided upon a
recommendation of [describe recommendation] at its hearing on DATE and forwarded it to the Madras City Council. The City Council is scheduled to hear the matter on DATE(S).

SECTION 7.3: ANNEXATION APPLICATION. The petitioner for annexation shall complete an application form provided by the Community Development Department. The application fee, established by Resolution of the City of Madras City Council, shall be submitted with the application. The application shall include:
A. A map demonstrating that the proposed annexation is contiguous to the City Limits;
B. Specific information on each parcel within the proposed annexation area:

1. Current assessed valuation shown on Jefferson County Assessor's tax rolls.
2. Acreage of both public and private property to be annexed.
3. Map and tax lot(s) number.
C. Names and ages of all residents and list of registered voters in the proposed annexation area.
D. Addresses of all parcels within the proposed annexation area.
E. Consent to Annexation forms, provided by the City of Madras, with notarized signatures of all property owners and electors within the proposed annexation area.
F. Written findings, which address the following:
4. Existing land uses within annexation area.
5. Existing zoning within the annexation area.
6. Existing improvements:
a. water system
b. streets
c. sanitary sewer
d. storm drainage
7. Special Districts within the area:
a. water districts
b. irrigation districts
c. fire district
d. school district
e. other
8. Urban services, the present availability of urban service systems to the proposed annexation area, their capacity and cost of extension and/or improvement to urban standards:
a. sanitary sewers - streets - parks
b. storm drainage - water
c. fire - power
d. schools - police
G. Compliance with all applicable policies of the City of Madras Comprehensive Plan.

Response: The City is initiating and applying for the proposed annexation. Maps of the west site and east site in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area are included in this report as Figure 4-1. Parcel size and other parcel information is presented in Section I, Proposal Summary. The City owns the taxlot where the east site is located. The 20 -acre parcel that is being created from the taxlot has been surveyed. Annexing the parcel to the UGB and city limits and re-zoning it to R-2 will allow the City to honor a land exchange agreement between the City and JCSD, which needs to occur by 2011 pursuant to the terms of the agreement (Appendix D). The west site is comprised of three taxlots, two taxlots that

[^62]are privately owned and one small taxlot ( 0.69 acres) that is County right-of-way. Re-zoning is not proposed for this site at this time as there are no immediate development plans. However, this site does better connect the east site to the existing UGB and will be suitable for residential uses and compatible public/semi-public uses, for which Madras urbanization studies have found a long-term need.

The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is currently vacant and not in active use. It is land under Jefferson County jurisdiction and zoned Range Land (RL). There are not water, sewer, or storm water facilities and services extended to the site yet, but they can be extended using existing City facility master plans [or with minor updates to the plans?]. The Deschutes Valley Water District (DVWD) provides water service to the area and can provide facilities and service to the site, to be financed primarily by development applicants. The same is true for sewer and storm water facilities and service, for which the City of Madras is the service provider. As part of its agreement with JCSD, the City will extend water and sewer to the edge of the east site. There is an irrigation district in the region - the Central Oregon Irrigation District - but the proposal area is not irrigated nor is it proposed to be.

There is a County collector road - Ashwood Road - along the northern border of the area that will/will not need improvements according to transportation analysis conducted for this proposal. Analysis results (Appendix F)

Jefferson County Fire Protection District \#1 currently provides service for the area and will continue to do so. Public safety responsibility for the area will be transferred from the County to the City. In terms of parks and recreation, there are two parks and a middle school close to the site, and the Yarrow Master Plan, which includes and surrounds the east site, includes the $30 \%$ of parks and open space required by local code (MZO Section 3.12(D)(4)).

The proposal area is in the Jefferson County School District 509-J. This application is driven, in part, by the need for a new elementary school in Madras in the next 10-20 years, as determined in the 2009 Long Range Facility Plan (Appendix C). The east site will be able to accommodate both school and residential uses once it is annexed and zoned R-2 as proposed. Pursuant to ORS 195.110, the facility plan needs to be approved as an element of the Jefferson County and Madras Comprehensive Plans now that it has been adopted by the District Board.

As addressed in the previous section of this report, the application complies with the applicable policies of the Madras Comprehensive Plan.

## SECTION 7.4: ANNEXATION CRITERIA. Lands may be annexed only if the City Council finds that the following criteria are met: <br> A. The property is contiguous to the City limits. <br> B. The property is located within the City's Urban Growth Boundary. <br> C. The annexation meets at least one of the following purposes:

1. To serve lands needing City water or sewer to alleviate a present or potential health hazard; or
2. To provide land to accommodate future urban development; or
3. To provide land for provision of needed transportation or utility facilities; or
4. To ensure that lands adjacent to the City are developed in a manner consistent with City standards.
D. The petitioner has adequately addressed infrastructure supply and demand issues. The annexation is considered timely in that an adequate level of urban services and infrastructure can be provided upon annexation or a plan is in place for the provision of such services or infrastructure in a reasonable period of time.
$E$. The proposed annexation complies with the City's Comprehensive Plan. If the Comprehensive Plan does not control the annexation, or substantial changes in conditions have occurred which render the Comprehensive Plan inapplicable to the annexation, the proposed annexation complies with current Statewide Planning Goals. F. The City is capable of extending City services to the area proposed for annexation without negatively impacting existing systems and the City's ability to adequately serve all areas within the existing City limits.
G. The proposed annexation is compatible with the existing topography, potential for future land division, natural hazards and other related considerations.

Response: The proposal area is adjacent to the Madras city limits and is simultaneously seeking to be annexed to the Madras UGB and to the city. The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area provides land for future urban development, specifically for a needed school and housing as demonstrated by the Jefferson County School District 509-J 2009 Long Range Facility Plan (Appendix C) and the Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, 2007). The east site of the proposal area is part of the Yarrow Master Plan area that the City has approved and found to be consistent with City development goals and standards.

The proposal area can be served by water and sewer using existing water and sewer master plans and being financed by the City and developers of the sites. Ashwood Road on the north side of the proposal area is a County collector road and does/does not need improvements in order to serve the area. Transportation analysis results (Appendix F ). Internal circulation and transportation facilities will need to be shown in future development applications.

## SECTION 8.2: ZONE/PLAN MAP AMENDMENTS

## A. Amendment to the Zone/Plan Map

1. Amendment to the Zone/Plan Map may be initiated by the Planning Commission, City Council, Community Development Director, Land Use Periodic Review, or by application of the property owner.
2. If the application is for a change of a quasi-judicial or legislative nature:
a. the Planning Commission shall conduct a public hearing on the proposed amendment at its earliest practical meeting date after the proposal is submitted and shall follow the adopted rules for quasijudicial hearings;
3. $\underline{b}$. the Planning Commission shall provide a recommendation to the City Councill based on findings-of-fact;
4. c. The City Council shall hold a public hearing and review the recommendation of the Planning Commission, along with any public testimony on the issue. The City Council must take final action on an amendment request and amendments shall be made by ordinance.
5. An application for a zone change for land annexed to the city that is subiect to an approved Master Planned Community Plan or an approved Area Master Plan mav be considered as an administrative action per Article 9.3.
B. Criteria for Amendments: The burden of proof is upon the applicant. The applicant shall show the proposed change is:
6. In conformity with all applicable state statutes.
7. In conformity with the applicable Statewide Planning Goals; and
8. In conformity with the Madras Comprehensive Plan, Zoning and Land Use Ordinance, and policies; and
9. In conformity with an approved Master Planned Community Plan or Area Master Plan, if applicable to the underlying properties; and
10. That there is a change of circumstances or further studies justifying the amendment or mistake in the original zoning.

Response: This application is being initiated by the City Community Development Department/Director. Also pursuant to the terms of the UGAMA between the County and the City, the City forwarded the UGB amendment application and appropriate fees to the Jefferson County Community Development Department within five working days of being initially filed.

This application is subject to legislative procedure and will receive full review by the public, the City Planning Commission, and the City Council. Hearings by the Madras Planning Commission and Jefferson County Planning Commission will be held first jointly on February 3, 2010 and then separately on DATE and DATE respectively. The Madras City Council will review the City Planning Commission's recommendation at a hearing on DATE, and will forward its decision to the County Board of Commissioners for a hearing on DATE.

As demonstrated by the previous findings, the proposed comprehensive plan, comprehensive plan map, and zoning map amendments comply with applicable Statewide Planning Goals, State statutes, and Madras Comprehensive Plan policies.

## Findings:

- The City has followed procedures for providing notice and holding public hearings for the proposal. Notice was mailed to number and type/distance from sites] property owners on DATE. A joint City and County Planning Commission hearing was held on February 3, 2010 and then separate hearings were held on DATE and DATE respectively. The City Council and County Board of Commissioners heard the proposal on DATES and approved the proposal on DATES respectively.
- The City of Madras has initiated this proposal. It owns the east site of the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area and has an agreement with Jefferson County School District 509-J to exchange this land for land downtown upon annexation and re-zoning.
- The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area provides land needed for residential and public/semi-public uses, specifically for a needed school and housing as demonstrated by the Jefferson County School District 509-J 2009 Long Range Facility Plan (Appendix C) and the Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, 2007).
- All service providers - the City of Madras, Jefferson County, Deschutes Valley Water District, Jefferson County Fire Protection District \#1, Jefferson County School District $509-\mathrm{J}$ - have capacity to serve the proposal area given: approval of the adoption of the Jefferson County School District 509-J 2009 Long Range Facility Plan as elements of the City and County Comprehensive Plans, implementation of existing water and sewer master plans, transportation improvements?, and financing from future proposed development.
- The east site of the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is part of the approved Yarrow Master Plan area, and the west site fulfills the requirements for an Area Master Plan. The set of proposed Comprehensive Plan, Comprehensive Plan Map, and Zoning Map amendments in this application comply with applicable Statewide Planning Goals, State statutes, and Madras Comprehensive Plan policies.

Conclusion: The proposed comprehensive plan, comprehensive plan map, and zoning map amendments comply with the relevant provisions of the Madras Zoning Ordinance.
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## I. Proposal Summary

| File No.: | 081-004 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Applicant: | Nick Snead, Community Development Director <br> City of Madras <br> 71 SE D Street <br> Madras, OR 97741 <br> (541) 475-3388 <br> (541) 475-7061 Fax <br> nsnead@ci.madras.or.us <br> Jon Skidmore, Community Development Director <br> Jefferson County <br> 85 SE D Street <br> Madras, OR 97741 <br> (541) 475-4462 <br> (541) 325-5004 Fax <br> jon.skidmore@co.jefferson.or.us |
| Applicant's Representative: | DJ Heffernan <br> Angelo Planning Group <br> 921 SW Washington, Suite 468 <br> Portland, Oregon 97205 <br> (503) 227-3664 <br> (503) 227-3679 Fax <br> dheffernan@angeloplanning.com |
| Request: | - To amend the Jefferson County and City of Madras Comprehensive Plans - to incorporate the Jefferson County School District 509-J 2009 Long Range Facility Plan as an element of the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan and the City of Madras Comprehensive Plan (Attachment A). <br> - To amend the Madras Comprehensive Plan - to add a table that presents the City zones and County zones that correspond and are allowed under City comprehensive plan designations. (Table 3-1) <br> - To amend the Jefferson County and City of Madras Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Maps - to expand the Madras Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) to include 36.91 acres from the Madras Urban Reserve Area (URA); to annex 20 acres of City-owned land ("east site," Figure 4-1) to the City of Madras and apply City R-2, Multiple Family Residential zoning; to annex 16.22 acres of privately owned land plus 0.69 acres of land for County right-of-way ("west site," Figure 4-1) and retain existing County RL, Range Land, zoning. |

[^65]| Location: | - West site: tax map of 16.91-acre west site (outlined), directly east of the existing Madras UGB, south of Ashwood Road (Appendix A) <br> - East site: survey map of 20 -acre east site, east of the existing Madras UGB, south of Ashwood Road (Appendix B) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Legal Description: | West site: 11S 14E 7 Lots 101 ( 12.28 acres), 102 ( 0.69 acres for right-of-way), and 200 ( 3.94 acres), entire lots <br> East site: 11S 14E 7 Lot 100 (20 acres), parcel of lot <br> Legal description of Lot 100 parcel (east site): <br> A portion of Parcel 2 of Partition Plat. No. 2002-12 as filed in the Jefferson County Clerk's Office, situated in the Northeast Quarter (NE 1/4) of Section 7, Township 11 South, Range 14 East of the Willamette Meridian, Jefferson County Oregon, more particularly described as follows: Commencing at the Nortbwest corner of said Nortbeast Quarter, monumented with a 2 inch diameter brass cap, from which the Nortbeast corner of said Section 7 bears <br>  East along the North line of said Section 7 a distance of 599.997 feet; thence South $0^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 40.00 feet to the Northwest corner of said Parcel 2 of Partition Plat No. 2002-12; thence continuing South $0^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ West along the West line of said Parcel 2 a distance of 40.00 feet to the South right-of-way line of East Ashwood Road and the True Point of Beginning of this Desctiption; thence South $0^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ Eastalong said West line a distance of 935.13 feet to the Soutbeast corner of Parcel 1 of said Partition Plat No. 2002-17; thence leaving said West line South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 931.70 feet; thence North $0^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 935.12 feet; to a point on the South right-of-way line of East Ashwood Road; thence North $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ West along said right-of-way line a distance of 931.70 feet to the True Point of Beginning. <br> Contains 20.00 acres more or less. <br> End of Description. (Appendix B) |

## II. Introduction

The Madras Urban Reserve Area (URA) was approved by DLCD in July 2009, and was sized to provide urbanizable land for the next 50 years. Land from the URA is the first priority for inclusion in the UGB pursuant to ORS 197.298. The City of Madras is not currently in periodic review or evaluating its existing UGB for a 20 -year land supply. The City, however, has initiated this UGB amendment and annexation process in order to abide by terms of an agreement it has with the Jefferson County School District 509-J ("JCSD" or the "District").

In September 2006, the City of Madras and JCSD signed a land exchange agreement. The District owns property - "Friendship Park" - on Highway 97 that is basically too small to site a new school and is poorly located along a state highway. The agreement specified an exchange of this land in the city for 20 acres of land that the City owns just outside the existing UGB (Appendix D). This land is proposed for annexation to the Madras UGB and city limits and for re-zoning as City Multi-Family Residential (R-2), a designation that will allow for a multi-fatnily and single-family housing as well as public/semi-public uses typically sited on residentially zoned land. The 20 -acre parcel is within the Yarrow Master Plan area. The plan conceptually identifies a school site along its northern border with Ashwood Road.

The terms of the land exchange agreement concerning this land is cited below.
...(T)he City bas agreed to the following conditions as part of the property's conveyance, all of which are to be completed within five (5) years:
(a) The City and its Planning Department will take such efforts as are reasonable and practicable to expand the Urban Growth Boundary for the City so that the parcel described in Exbibit. 'B' is within the Madras Urban Growth Boundary within five years of the signing of this Agreement, and that said property, when brought within the Urban Growth Boundary, shall be zoned to permit siting and construction of school facilities on said land; and
(b) At no cost to the School District, the City agrees to bave sewer lines and water service lines adequate to accommodate a 600 student public school extended to the lot line of the parcel described in Exbibit 'B"; and
(c) A Warranty Deed containing a legal description of the 20.0 acre parcel described in Exbibit " $B$ " shall be signed by the appropriate representative for the City and placed in escrov, with instructions that allow the School District to removed the Deed for recording in favor of the School District as soon as the parcel described in Exbibit "B" can be legally partitioned from the other property owned by the City in which said parcel is located; and
(d) The City will cooperate with the School District to process and complete any necessary partitioning and other legal procedures to segregate the School's parcel from the City's contiguous real property so that the Warranty Deed may be lawfully recorded in the records of the Jefferson County Clerk.

As part of the process of fulfilling its obligation under terms of this agreement, the City of Madras prepared an update to the Jefferson County School District 509-J Long Range Facility Plan. The facility plan, which the District has adopted, complies with ORS 195.110. The plan includes enrollment forecasts to 2025, an assessment of current conditions for

[^66]existing District facilities (Appendix C) and recommendations to address identified capacity problems. The plan recommends that Warm Springs Elementary School be re-built, that Metolius Elementary School undergo repairs, and that Westside Elementary School and Madras Elementary Schools either be renovated on site or replaced. The projections, assessments, and recommendations of the 2009 Long Range Facility Plan provide a basis for studying the efficacy of these alternative solutions to inform a potential bond measure campaign and possibly adopt an excise tax program.

In addition to the 20 -acres of school district land, herein referred to as the east site, there are an additional 16.91 acres of land in the proposed UGB annexation, herein referred to as the west site. The west site is comprised of three lots that provide County right-of-way, better connect the east site to the existing UGB, and contribute toward meeting the long-term need for residentially zoned land. The west site is privately owned and is not proposed for rezoning at this time; it will apply for re-zoning when the owners are prepared to file land development applications in the future. It is planned that the west-site land also will provide the same range of needed housing types and public/semi-public uses as the east site when re-zoning is approved.

In order to accommodate rutal zoning in the urban growth area, text amendments are proposed for Chapter 2 of the Madras Comprehensive Plan that identify county zones allowed on land that is designated for urban residential use on the comprehensive plan map.

## III. Jefferson County and City of Madras Comprehensive Plan Amendments

- Language adopting the Jefferson County School District 509-J 2009 Long Range Facility Plan (Appendix C)
- Language amending Madras Comprehensive Plan Section IV, Land Use Element that identifies the appropriate location for this table.

Table 3-1 Proposed Table for Corresponding City of Madras Comprehensive Plan Map Designations, City of Madras Zones, and Jefferson County Zones

| Plan <br> Map <br> Label | Designation | Description | City <br> Zones | County Zones |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R-1 | Single-Family Residential | Land primarily for single-family homes, including manufactured home subdivisions, and for duplexes | R-1 | EFU A-1, EFU A-2, RL, FM, RR-2, RR-5, RR-10, RR-20, ERD |
| R-2 | Multi-Family Residential | Land for multi-family housing to be close to businesses and services and to buffer single-family residential and commercial uses. Manufactured homes and neighborhood commercial uses are allowed. | R-2 | EFUA-1, EFU A-2, RL, FM, RR-2, RR-5, RR-10, RR-20, ERD |
| R-3 | Planned Residential Development | Land for primarily residential development that allows site design flexibility to promote creativity and protection of scenic and natural resources | R-3 | EFU A-1, EFU A-2, RL, RR-2, RR-5, RR-10, RR-20, ERD |
| C-1 | Corridor Commercial | Land for primarily motor vehicle-oriented uses located along major roadways | C-1 | CC, ERD |
| C-2 | Downtown Commercial | Land for a mixture of smaller scale businesses that supports redevelopment, higher density, public spaces, and other elements of pedestrian orientation | C-2 | CC, ERD |
| C-3 | Community Commercial | Land for primarily motor vehicle-oriented uses but on a smaller scale than Corridor Commercial | C-3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SC, CC, ERD, } \\ & \text { EFUA-1, EFU } \\ & \text { A-2, RL } \end{aligned}$ |
| NC | Neighborhood Commercial | Land for small-scale commercial uses in residential areas that includes public spaces and promotes transportation options | NC | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SC, ERD EFU } \\ & \text { A-1, EFU A-2, } \\ & \text { RL } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1 | Industrial | Land for industrial uses where industrial uses already exist in the city and in the Madras Industrial Park | I | EFU A-1, EFU <br> A-2, RL, FM, PM, CI, IR, ERD |
| O/S | Open Space | Land where parks, open space, or public uses already exist or is otherwise publicly owned | OS/PF | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EFU A-1, EFU } \\ & \text { A-2, RL, FM, } \\ & \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ |

Proposed Amendments to Jefferson County and Madras Comprehensive Plans and
Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Maps
January 2010

| Plan <br> Map <br> Label | Designation | Description | City <br> Zones | County Zones |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A/D | Airport Development | Land adjacent to airport facilities for <br> future commercial and industrial uses, <br> particularly those that rely on air <br> transportation | A/D | EFU A-1, EFU <br> A-2, AM, ERD |


| County Zones: | Airport Management |
| :--- | :--- |
| AM | County Commercial |
| CC | County Industrial |
| CI | Exclusive Farm Use Zones |
| EFU A-1, EFU A-2, RL | Existing Rural Development |
| ERD | Forest Management |
| FM | Industrial Reserve |
| IR | Park Management |
| PM | Rural Residential |
| RR-2, RR-5, RR-10, RR-20 | Service Community |
| SC |  |

IV. Jefferson County and City of Madras Comprehensive Plan Map and Zoning Map
Amendments

Proposed Amendments to Jefferson County and Madras Comprehensive Plans and Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Maps
January 2010

## V. Conformance with Statewide Land Use Goals

## Goal 1: Citizen Involvement

To develop a citizen involvement program that insures the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process.

Response: The proposed amendments have been reviewed during a series of public meetings and hearings in order to allow for consideration by public officials and public feedback.

The Jefferson County School District 509-J ("JCSD" or "District") Board ("Board") was briefed by the Superintendent about the 2009 Long Range Facility Plan in meetings [when, covered what]. The draft plan was brought to them first for formal review at a Board meeting on January 11, 2010. After [describe deliberations], they adopted the plan on DATE.

The proposed Madras Land Use Element Comprehensive Plan amendment and amendments to the Jefferson County and City of Madras Comprehensive Plan Maps and Zoning Maps were presented and reviewed in a series of meetings in early 2010.

ASK THE CITY FOR MEETING AND HEARING SCHEDULE AND INFO
Notice methods
Measure 56 notice
45-day notice to DLCD
December 14, 2009
Addendum
January _, 2010
Info available on City website?
The UGB expansion area is drawn from the Madras Urban Reserve Area (URA), which was developed through an intensive participatory process. A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Project Advisory Committee (PAC) were formed to provide guidance for the project. The TAC was comprised of staff from project team members, including Jefferson County, the City of Madras, ECONorthwest, Kittelson \& Associates, David Evans \& Associates, Ball Janik, LLP, and Angelo Planning Group. The PAC included representatives of the City of Madras, Jefferson County, Jefferson County School District 509-J, local farmers, housing advocates, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Region 4, and the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD).

A combination of bi-weekly TAC teleconferences, public forums, PAC meetings, and meetings of the Madras Planning Commission and City Council, and Jefferson County Planning Commission and Board of Commissioners informed the final URA recommendation. Public events included the following:

- PAC Meeting 1 - May 2, 2007

[^67]- Public Meeting 1 - May 15, 2007
- PAC Meeting 2 - May 24, 2007
- PAC Meeting 3 - October 22, 2007
- Public Meeting 2 - November 6, 2007
- Joint City Council/County Commission Work Session - November 20, 2007
- PAC Meeting 4 - December 3, 2007
- Joint City/County Planning Commission advisory hearing - April 3, 2008
- Joint City/County Planning Commission advisory hearing - May 8, 2008
- County Planning Commission hearing - May 22, 2008
- City Planning Commission hearing - June 11, 2008
- City Council/County Commission evidentiary hearing - August 13, 2008
- City Council hearing/deliberations - September 9, 2008
- City Council hearing/1 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ ordinance reading - September 23, 2008
- City Council hearing/final adoption - October 7, 2008
- County Commission hearing - September 24, 2008


## Findings:

- According to both their Comprehensive Plans and code, the City of Madras and Jefferson County Planning Commissions serve as their official citizen planning committees.
- Adoption of the Madras Urban Reserve Area (URA) complied with Goal 1.
- Members of the public have been able to participate in reviewing the proposed amendments. [DATES FOR MEETINGS, WORK SESSIONS AND HEARING]
- [WEBSITES AND OTHER PLACES MATERIALS ARE AVAILABLE]
- Measure 56 notice about upcoming County and City Planning Commissions and legislative hearings was mailed to [specify which property owners] on DATE.
- 45-day notice of proposed plan amendments was sent to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) on December 14, 2009 prior to the start of hearings held by County and City Planning Commissions and legislative bodies.
- Notices of the public meetings were published in the City's local newspaper, including contact information for the City and County. The paper also published articles [about what, if articles were published].
- ANY OTHER NOTICE AND PUBLIC ANNOUCEMENT INFORMATION FOR ADOPTION HEARINGS?

Conclusion: The City of Madras has complied with State requirements for citizen involvement per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 1.

## Goal 2: Land Use Planning

To establish a land use planning process and policy framework as a basis for all decisions and actions related to use of land and to assure an adequate factual base for such decisions and actions.

[^68]Response: The state statute governing long-term school district facility planning - ORS 195.110 - was revised in 2007 and expanded the definition of which districts were subject to the planning requirements. The statute is addressed in more detail later in this report. The Jefferson County School District 509-J 2009 Long Range Facility Plan (Appendix C) includes elements pursuant to ORS $195.100(5)$ (a) such as enrollment forecasts, an assessment of existing facility conditions, and an analysis of options to meet forecasted needs. Given projected future need, the plan recommends that the District proceed with implementation of re-building a school on the Warm Springs Reservation and providing a new elementary school to replace substandard existing facilities in Madras. The 2009 Long Range Facility Plan was adopted by the JCSD Board on DATE and is now proposed for inclusion as an element in the Jefferson County and City of Madras Comprehensive Plans pursuant to ORS 195.110(2)(a).

The proposed UGB amendment and annexation is based on the buildable lands inventory and needs analysis performed by ECONorthwest in 2007 and for the Madras Urban Reserve Area (URA) adopted in 2008 and acknowledged by the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) in 2009. The proposed table of corresponding City land use designations and City and County zones (Table 3-1) facilitates the annexation of land in the URA to the Madras UGB and city limits.

## Madtas Urban Reserve Area

The Madras City Council adopted the Madras Urban URA and related provisions in October 2008 and the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners in November 2008. DLCD acknowledged and approved the URA and related amendments in July 2009, with stipulations that some of the proposed amendments to the Jefferson County development code be modified. Pursuant to ORS 197.298, the first priority for land to be included in a UGB is land designated as an urban reserve. Therefore, the land in the Madras URA is the first priority for UGB expansion when there is a demonstrated need for land in the next 20 years, as was found by the Madras Urbanization Study and Addendum.

The URA and its related plan and code amendments were developed over the course of Spring 2007 to Summer 2008. They were developed using the guidance and input of a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and a Project Advisory Committee (PAC) as well as City and County Planning Commissioners, City Councilors, County Commissioners, and participating members of the public. These various elements of public involvement are described in more detail in the response and findings for Goal 1.

At the same time, amendments to the County and City's Comprehensive Plans and Development Codes were developed in order to implement the URA. Proposed amendments to the Madras Comprehensive Plan addressed Goal 14 (Urbanization) and recommended the following:

- Description of the Madras URA, its role in providing a 20 - to 50 -year land supply to the City, the cooperation between the City and the County in establishing a URA, its priority for inclusion in the City's UGB;
- Master planning provisions for areas added to the City's UGB, including cooperation with the County and new master planning requirements (Area Master Plans or AMPs); and
- UGB expansion proposal requirements including proposed zoning, an annexation program, adequate public facilities and transportation facilities, protection of cultural and natural resources, protection from natural hazard, and area property owner support.

Land in the URA is the first priority when designating land fora UGB expansion and the land in this proposed amendment to the UGB, Comprehensive Plan Maps, and Zoning Maps is drawn entirely from the adopted and acknowledged Madras URA. The selection of land from the URA is based on criteria that Madras adopted as a Goal 14 policy as part of adopting the URA.
J. All land use applications or legislative proposals to expand the Madras UGB must be accompanied by information that documents the following:

1. The proposed urban zoning or land use program for the subject properties that address an identified urban land need;
2. An annexation program for all subject properties;
3. Evidence that public facilities required by OAR 660-011-000 that are necessary to serve the expansion area can be served either by system improvements outlined in adopted public facility master plans or by supplemental improvements that augment adopted public facility master plans;
4. Evidence that the proposed zoning or land use plan complies with requirements of OAR 660-0012-0060 either by demonstrating that planned improvements in the Madras Transportation System Plan (TSP) have capacity to meet transportation needs for the proposed expansion area or through supplemental transportation improvements that augment the adopted TSP to meet the need;
5. Evidence that providers of other crucial public facilities (e.g. schools, parks and recreation, emergency services and health care) are able to meet the projected demand for their services;
6. Evidence that financing for constructing needed public improvements is available so that the expansion area can be developed as planned within the planning horizon;
7. Evidence that development in areas subject to natural hazards are protected from these hazards;
8. Evidence that known or probable significant resources related to open space, scenic areas, historic places or structures, and fish and wildlife habitat will be protected from development impacts or have development impacts offset using appropriate mitigation measures.

These criteria are addressed later in the report section on the Madras Comprehensive Plan, Goal 14.

## Madtas Utbanization Study - Residential Land

The Madras Urbanization Study (ECONorthwest, April 2007) and Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, August 2007) identify a shortage of residentially zoned land to meet single-family and multi-family housing needs and public/semi-public use needs in the next roughly 20 years The needed number of housing units and acreage for residential uses is summarized in Table 4-18 of the August 2007 Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (Table 51).

These needs are compared to the available land supply in the existing UGB in Table 6-4 in the study (Table 5-2) in order to determine whether there is a surplus or deficit of land for residential, public and semi-public, and employment uses. The table documents a shortage of land zoned R-2 (Multiple Family Residential) and land zoned R-1 (Single Family Residential) inside the existing UGB as well as a need for roughly 350 acres of public and semi-public uses over the course of the next 15-20 years. These public/semi-public uses tend to be related to residential uses and are usually allowed and sited on residentially zoned land.

Table 5-1: Housing Needs, Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, August 2007)

Table 4-18. Forecast of needed housing units and residential land, Madras, 2007-2027 and 2007-2057

| Housing Type | New DU | Percent | Density [DU/net res ac) | Net Res. Acres | Net to Gross Factor |  | Density (DU/grass res ac) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Needed Units, 2007-2027 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-family types |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-fanily detached | 1,791 | 61\% | 4.8 | 373.1 | 25\% | 497.5 | 3.6 |
| Manufactured | 206 | 7\% | 5.5 | 37.4 | 25\% | 49.8 | 4.1 |
| CondorTownhomes | 206 | 7\% | 9.0 | 22.8 | 15\% | 26.9 | 7.7 |
| Subtotal | 2,202 | 75\% | 5.4 | 410.5 |  | 574.2 | 3.8 |
| Multi-family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mutitiamily | 734 | 25\% | 14.0 | 52.4 | 15\% | 61.7 | 11.9 |
| Subtotal | 734 | 25\% | 14.0 | 52.4 |  | 61.7 | 11.9 |
| Total | 2,936 | 100\% | 6.3 | 462.9 |  | 635.8 | 4.6 |
| Needed Units, 2007-2057 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-family types |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-family detached | 5,516 | 61\% | 4.8 | 1.149.1 | 25\% | 1,532.1 | 3.6 |
| Manufactured | 633 | 7\% | 5.5 | 115.1 | 20\% | 143.8 | 4.4 |
| CondorTownhomes | 633 | 7\% | 9.0 | 70.3 | 15\% | 82.7 | 7.7 |
| Subtotar | 6781 | 75\% | 5.4 | 1,334.5 |  | 1.758 .7 | 3.9 |
| Multi-family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mutifamily | 2,260 | 25\% | 14.0 | 161.5 | 10\% | 179.4 | 12.6 |
| Sublotal | 2,260 | 25\% | 14.0 | 161.5 |  | 179.4 | 12.6 |
| Total | 9,042 | 100\% | 6.3 | 1,495.9 |  | 1,938.1 | 4.7 |

Source: ECONorthwest
Note- Gross acres calculaled by dividing net acres by ( 1 -nel to gross factor). For example, for single-femily
detached, $477.1 /(1-75)=636.1$. Conversely, $636.1 \times .75=477.1$

[^69]Table 5-2. Land Needs, Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, August 2007)

| Table 6-4. Comparison of land supply and demand, Madras UGB, |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2007-2027 and $2007-2057$ |

The proposed UGB amendment of about 37 acres addresses part of the residential and public use land need presented above. Annexing 20 acres that are owned by the City (the east site) and rezoning it R-2 allows the City to fulfill its agreement with JCSD, dated September 2006 (Appendix D). The proposed UGB amendment provides land to meet part of the need for residentially zoned land. The remainder of the land need will be addressed during the City's next cycle of periodic review.

## Findings:

- The 2009 Long Range Facility Plan was adopted by the Jefferson County School District Board on DATE and is now proposed for inclusion as an element in the Jefferson County and City of Madras Comprehensive Plans pursuant to ORS 195.110(2)(a).
- The JSCD 2009 Long Range Facility Plan includes an enrollment forecast and analysis of options for meeting projected needs, and recommends that a replacement school be built for the existing elementary school in Warm Springs and that Westside Elementary School and Madras Elementary School in Madras be renovated on site or re-built on new sites.
- The proposed UGB amendment and annexation is drawn from land in the adopted Madras URA and meets some of the need for residentially zoned land the next 20 years as established in the 2007 Madras Urbanization Study and addendum.

Conclusion: Jefferson County and the City of Madras have complied with State requirements for land use planning per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 2.

[^70]
## Goal 3: Agricultural Lands

To preserve and maintain agricultural lands.
Response: The entire Madras URA includes land zoned for rural residential, range land, and agricultural uses, as shown in Table X.

Table X: Exception and Resource Land in the Madras URA

| Land Type | Zones | Acres |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Exception Land | RR2, RR5, RR10 <br> (Rural Residential) | 1,709 |
| Non-prime Resource Land | RL <br> (Range Land) | 2,038 |
| Prime Resource Land | A1 <br> (Agricultural) | 68 |
|  | Total | 3,815 |

Prime agricultural land makes up less than $2 \%$ of the total URA. When prime agricultural land is included, it is only when it is adjacent to the existing UGB, surrounded by exception land or non-prime resource land, and/or will be more easily served with public facilities sewer service, in particular. The rest of the URA is comprised of rural residential and range land. Rangeland was included in the URA because of serviceability advantages it has over other land surrounding the Madras UGB and because all the exception (rural residential) land adjacent to the Madras UGB would not fulfill the city's estimated land needs for the next 50 years.

The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is currently zoned Range Land by the County. Upon annexation to the UGB and Madras city limits, City R-2, Multiple Family Residential, zoning is being requested for the east site. The west site is proposed to be annexed to the city and to retain its existing County zoning.

As explained above, land zoned Range Land has been included in the Madras URA to meet land needs and because of sewer service advantages over other areas around the existing UGB and because exception land alone would not meet land needs for the city over the next 50 years. Land in Study Areas 3 and 4 of the URA consistently ranked highest in sewer serviceability analysis, including land in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation.

Pursuant to ORS 197.298(a), the first priority of land to be included in the UGB is land in a URA. Beyond that, local criteria can be relied upon to prioritize land from the URA to be included in the UGB. Local criteria are found in Goal 14 (Urbanization) policies in the Madras Comprehensive Plan. The criteria require a Master Planned Community (MPC) plan or Area Master Plan (AMP), proposed urban zoning, an annexation program, sufficient public facilities, financing prospects, and protection for natural resources and natural hazard areas for the proposed UGB amendment area. These policies are addressed in more detail in the response and findings for Madras Comprehensive Plan Goal 14.

[^71]Land in the URA is subject to joint management under the terms of the City's and County's Urban Growth Area Management Agreement (UGAMA) once it is added to the City's UGB. Response and findings related to the UGAMA are provided later in this report.

## Findings:

- The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is land from the Madras URA, top priority land for inclusion in the UGB pursuant to ORS 197.298(a).
- The adopted Madras URA includes primarily land that is "exception land" (zoned Rural Residential) or non-prime resource land because exception land alone cannot meet land needs for the next 50 years.
- Some of the non-prime resource land (zoned Range Land) is easier to serve with sewer than other areas around the existing Madras UGB, based on public facility analysis done during the development of the URA. Land in Study Areas 3 and 4 of the URA consistently ranked highest in sewer serviceability analysis, including land in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation.

Conclusion: Jefferson County and the City of Madras have complied with State requirements for agricultural lands per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 3.

## Goal 5: Natural Resources, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Open Spaces To protect natural resources and conserve scenic and historic areas and open spaces.

Response: The land being proposed for inclusion in the Madras UGB is currently located within the Madras URA, jointly managed by Jefferson County and the City of Madras pursuant to the terms of the Urban Reserve Area Management Agreement (URAMA), adopted in January 2009 (Appendix E). Pursuant to the URAMA, the County processes land use decisions in the URA. In addition, conversion plans must be submitted to the City for land divisions in the URA.

Madras Comprehensive Plan policy language regarding protection of open space, scenic, wildlife, and cultural resources was adopted as part of amendments to Goal 14 (Urbanization) concurrent with the adoption of the Madras URA.
J. All land use applications or legislative proposals to expand the Madras UGB must be accompanied by information that documents the following:
> 8. Evidence that known or probable significant resources related to open space, scenic areas, historic places or structures, and fish and wildlife habitat will be protected from development impacts or have development impacts offset using appropriate mitigation measures.

The land in the proposal does not include floodways, floodplains, significant habitat, or cultural resources that are identified in the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan, Goal 5 inventory, or Jefferson County Geographic Information System (GIS) files. The only resources cited in Policy $14 J(8)$ that may apply to the site are open spaces. Open space will be a required part of school or multi-family residential development that occurs in the UGB

[^72]amendment area. However, this proposal itself is not a development or entitlement proposal and, therefore, is not required to specify precisely where such open space will be designated.

## Findings:

- Recently adopted amendments to Goal 14 of the City's Comprehensive Plan require identification of protective measures for significant open space, scenic, historic, cultural and natural resources in proposed UGB expansion areas. The Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan and Goal 5 inventory does not identify natural, scenic, or cultural resources in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area.
- Open space designations will be made as part of development entitlement for the proposed UGB amendment and annexation.

Conclusion: Jefferson County and the City of Madras have complied with State requirements for open space, scenic and historic areas, and natural resources per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 5.

Goal 6: Air, Water and Land Resource Quality To maintain and improve the quality of the air, water and land resources of the state.

Response: According to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ) there are no federally designated air quality management areas or federally designated hazardous waste sites in the Madras URA. Of Environmental Cleanup Sites reported on ODEQ's website, there are no sites identified in the URA. ${ }^{1}$ Further, R-2 zoning is proposed for the UGB amendment area to be brought in to the city, allowing residential uses and other compatible uses. These uses tend to produce less noise, air, land, and water pollution than commercial and industrial uses, which typically manufacture goods, produce by-products, and generate more vehicle traffic.

## Findings:

- There are not federal- or state-registered environmental quality sites within the URA boundary recommendation and proposed UGB amendment and annexation area.
- The amendment and annexation area is needed and planned for residential and related uses, which tend to have fewer adverse air, water, and land quality impacts than commercial or industrial uses.

Conclusion: Jefferson County and the City of Madras have complied with State requirements for air, water and land resources per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 6.

[^73]
## Goal 7: Areas Subject to Natural Hazards

 To protect people and property from natural hazards.Response: Primary potential natural hazards in Madras include steep slopes, floodway and floodplain, and wildfire. Statewide Goal 7 is reinforced in Madras Comprehensive Plan policies (Goal 14) by requiring protection from natural hazards be demonstrated for proposed UGB amendments.
J. All land use applications or legislative proposals to expand the Madras UGB must be accompanied by information that documents the following:

## 7. Evidence that development in areas subject to natural hazards are protected from these hazards;

There are not steep slopes (slopes greater than $25 \%$ ), floodway, or floodplain in the proposed UGB expansion area. In fact, the proposed amendment and annexation are driven, in part, by the need to provide a school that is outside the floodway and floodplain of Willow Creek and its tributaries.

Fire protection service for the proposal area is currently provided by Jefferson County Fire Protection District \#1, and will continue to be provided by that district if the land is annexed to the city. Area in the district is subject to a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) that Jefferson County completed in 2005 in collaboration with the fire district and federal agencies.

## Findings:

- There are not steep slopes (slopes greater than $25 \%$ ), floodway, or floodplain in the proposed UGB expansion and annexation area.
- Jefferson County Fire Protection District \#1 provides fire protection service to the proposed amendment and annexation area. The area is subject to the Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) developed and adopted by the County, the fire district, and federal agencies.

Conclusion: Jefferson County and the City of Madras have complied with State requirements for areas subject to natural hazards per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 7.

## Goal 10: Housing

To encourage the availability of adequate numbers of needed housing units at price ranges and rent levels which are commensurate with the financial capabilities of Oregon households and allow for flexibility of housing location, type and density.

Response: This proposal provides land for housing and compatible public and semi-public uses. The Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (August 2007) shows that there is a shortage of land zoned R-2 (Multi-Family Residential) and R-1 (Single Family Residential) inside the
existing UGB in the next 20 years, in addition to roughly 350 acres of residentially zoned land needed for public and semi-public uses (Table 5-2).

The proposed annexation to the Madras UGB and city limits addresses this need by including 36.91 acres of land from the URA for residential and public/semi-public uses. It is proposed that the east site be re-zoned from County RL (Range Land) zoning to City R-2 (Multi-Family Residential) zoning. It is anticipated that this land will be used for a combination of housing and a school. The need for a new elementary school in Madras is established in the Jefferson County School District 509-J 2009 Long Range Facility Plan (Appendix C).

These proposed amendments are not part of a periodic review work program and the next periodic review process will ensure that the UGB does include enough land to meet all the land needs that are projected for the next 20 years as shown in Table 5-2.

## Findings:

- The Madras Urbanization Study and Addendum found a need for about 22 acres of land zoned R-2 and 53 acres of land zoned R-1 outside the existing UGB in the next 20 years.
- The urbanization studies as well as the 2009 Long Range Facility Plan indicate the need for public uses on residentially zoned land, specifically one new elementary school in Madras. The proposed UGB amendment provides 36 acres for residential and public/semi-public uses. A majority of this land - 20 acres is being made more readily available for development of these uses by proposing its annexation to the Madras UGB and city limits.
- The remainder of land needs determined by the urbanization studies will be addressed during the next City of Madras periodic review.

Conclusion: Jefferson County and the City of Madras have complied with State requirements for housing per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 10.

## Goal 11 Public Facilities and Services

To plan and develop a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban and rural development.

## Goal Requirements

Urban Facilities and Services - Refers to key facilities and to appropriate types and levels of at least the following: police protection; sanitary facilities; storm drainage facilities; planning, zoning and subdivision control; health services; recreation facilities and services; energy and communication services; and community governmental services.

## A. Goal 11 Planning Guidelines

5. A public facility or service should not be provided in an urbanizable area unless there is provision for the coordinated development of all the other urban facilities and services appropriate to that area.

Response: According to terms of the UGAMA between Jefferson County and the City of Madras, the City will be the primary service provider for land within its UGB, in particular coordinating police, sewer, stormwater, land use, recreation, energy, and governmental services. City urbanization regulations amended with the adoption of the Madras URA require either a Master Planned Community (MPC) plan or Area Master Plan (AMP) for UGB amendments in Madras for areas over five acres (Madras Comprehensive Plan Policy 14I). Both MPC plans and AMPs must show "appropriate locations for transportation improvements, public facilities, protection for significant open space, scenic, historic, and natural resource areas" and how proposed land uses will integrate with existing development.

Transportation facilities are addressed in more detail in the response and findings for Statewide Goal 12 next in this report.

The adopted Yarrow Master Plan applies to the east site, land proposed for annexation both to the Madras UGB and city limits. It is also proposed that the east site be re-zoned to R-2 upon annexation so that it can provide land for uses such as a school and urban levels of housing. These uses are similar to and compatible with surrounding development. The east site is tangent to the existing UGB and is bordered by Ashwood Road, a County collector road, which lends itself to the extension of services from inside the existing UGB and city limits. SERVICE PROVIDER LETTERS
How do existing water and sewer plans fold in? Updates needed?
Pursuant to Madras Comprehensive Plan Urbanization Policy 14I: "An AMP shall demonstrate efficient use of land, zoning consistent with an identified urban land need, appropriate locations for transportation improvements, public facilities, protection for significant open space, scenic, historic, and natural resource areas." It is proposed to annex the west site to the Madras UGB and city limits. While it is also proposed that the site retain its existing County Range Land (RL) zoning until the owners are ready to propose development, the site is surrounded by land designated for residential and related uses, and its future designation must allow for residential and compatible public/semi-public uses in order to show that land uses on the west site can be: "integrated with the existing urban development pattern." (Madras Comprehensive Plan Urbanization Policy 14I(2)) Further, the proposed addition of a table showing Madras and County zones that correspond with Madras land use designations to the Madras Comprehensive Plan Section IV, Land Use Element (Table 3-1), will facilitate the transition of existing County zoning for the west site to appropriate City zoning.

The west site is comprised of three lots - Lots 101 and 200 that total 16.22 acres and are privately owned and Lot 102 that is 0.69 acres designated for County right-of-way. Lots 101 and 200 are both adjacent to Ashwood Road, a County collector, and will not require

[^74]additional public roads for sufficient internal or local circulation. At the time of proposed development, proposed land division or planned development plans must show an internal circulation system that satisfies City code requirements and street standards. The west site is adjacent to the existing Madras UGB and is bordered by Ashwood Road, which lends itself to the extension of services from inside the existing UGB and city limits.

## SERVICE PROVIDER LETTERS

How do existing water and sewer plans fold in? Updates needed?
The County has not identified historic, scenic, or natural resources on the west site. City open space requirements for subdivisions or planned developments will apply to the site at the time of proposed development.

This application also proposes to adopt the Jefferson County School District 509-J 2009 Long Range Facility Plan as an element of the Jefferson County and City of Madras Comprehensive Plans, pursuant to ORS 195.110 (2)(a). The Jefferson County School District 509-J Board adopted it on DATE. The plan (Appendix C) establishes school facility needs over the next 10-20 years and will facilitate coordination with financing opportunities and the provision of other public facilities and services. The 20 -acre east site is the subject of an agreement between the City of Madras and the District (Appendix D). Upon annexation, re-zoning, and transfer of the land to the District, the land will be available to meet projected school facility needs, such as the need for rebuilding Westside Elementary School and/or Madras Elementary School on a new site in Madras. With Jefferson County Middle School and Madras High School nearby, the east and west sites will be adequately provided with school services.

Finally both MPC plans and AMPs must have documented approval from a majority of landowners pursuant to Madras Comprehensive Plan Policy 14I(3).
Documented consent of landowners?

## B. Goal 11 Implementation Guidelines

5. Additional methods and devices for achieving desired types and levels of public facilities and services should include but not be limited to the following: (1) tax incentives and disincentives; (2) land use controls and ordinances; (3) multiple use and joint development practices; (4) fee and less-than-fee acquisition techniques; and (5) enforcement of local health and safety codes.

Response: The proposed land use designations and zoning for the annexation area - the east site and the west site - is appropriate for the type and level of public facilities and services that can be extended to the area. It is proposed to bring the west site into the Madras UGB and city limits but to retain its existing County Range Land (RL) zoning until landowners are ready to propose development. The site is surrounded by land planned for or developed as predominantly residential development. Given that the site will have little or no development for at least the short-term and its location adjacent to the existing Madras UGB and Ashwood Road, the site will not need many facilities or services for a while and is well situated for extension of facilities and services when they are needed. The proposed addition of a land use and zoning designation table to Section IV (Land Use Element) of the

[^75]Madras Comprehensive Plan (Table 3-1) establishes the City and County zoning designations that correspond to City land use designations, and will guide the transition from County zoning to appropriate City zoning once a land use action is proposed.

It is proposed that the east site be re-zoned to R-2 upon annexation so that it can provide land for uses such as a school and urban levels of housing. These uses are similar to and compatible with surrounding development. The east site is tangent to the existing UGB and is bordered by Ashwood Road, a County collector road, which lends itself to the extension of services from inside the existing UGB and city limits.
SERVICE PROVIDER LETTERS, any changes to master plans?
The site is part of the approved Yarrow Master Plan, a plan that overall features mostly a mixture of housing and then an internal circulation system, open space, public uses (including a school), and a small-scale commercial area to serve the residential uses.

Funding for public facility improvements?

## Findings:

- The text amendment adopting the Jefferson County School District 509-J Long Range Facility Plan as an implementing element of the Madras Comprehensive Plan addresses goal requirements for coordinating land use planning with school districts and other urban service providers.
- The Jefferson County School District 509-J 2009 Long Range Facility Plan meets statutory requirements (ORS 195.110) and provides an updated capital improvement and financing plan for school district facilities in Madras.
- Implementation of public facilities and services in Madras is primarily regulated by land use plans and ordinances and public facility master plans, which are elements of the City Comprehensive Plan.
- The City of Madras will be the primary provider of urban facilities and services in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area. The City will be able to coordinate service to the area with facilities and services already provided to adjacent land within the existing UGB.
- The approved Yarrow Master Plan applies to the proposal area and shows an internal transportation network and sites for housing and a school.
- Updates to water and sewer plans or service provider letters saying existing infrastructure and plans sufficient?
- Funding for public facility improvements?

Conclusion: The proposal complies with Goal 11 for public facilities and services subject to OAR 660, Division 11.

Goal 12 Transportation - OAR 660-015-0060(12)
To provide and encourage a safe, convenient and economic transportation system.
660-012-0060
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## Plan and Land Use Regulation Amendments

(1) Where an amendment to a functional plan, an acknowledged comprehensive plan, or a land use regulation would significantly affect an existing or planned transportation facility, the local government shall put in place measures as provided in section (2) of this rule to assure that allowed land uses are consistent with the identified function, capacity, and performance standards (e.g. level of service, volume to capacity ratio, etc.) of the facility. A plan or land use regulation amendment significantly affects a transportation facility if it would:
(a) Change the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility (exclusive of correction of map errors in an adopted plan);
(b) Change standards implementing a functional classification system; or
(c) As measured at the end of the planning period identified in the adopted transportation system plan:
(A) Allow land uses or levels of development that would result in types or levels of travel or access that are inconsistent with the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility;
(B) Reduce the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility below the minimum acceptable performance standard identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan; or
(C) Worsen the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility that is otherwise projected to perform below the minimum acceptable performance standard identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan.
(2) Where a local government determines that there would be a significant effect, compliance with section (1) shall be accomplished through one or a combination of the following:
(a) Adopting measures that demonstrate allowed land uses are consistent with the planned function, capacity, and performance standards of the transportation facility.
(b) Amending the TSP or comprehensive plan to provide transportation facilities, improvements or services adequate to support the proposed land uses consistent with the requirements of this division; such amendments shall include a funding plan or mechanism consistent with section (4) or include an amendment to the transportation finance plan so that the facility, improvement, or service will be provided by the end of the planning period.
(c) Altering land use designations, densities, or design requirements to reduce demand for automobile travel and meet travel needs through other modes.
(d) Amending the TSP to modify the planned function, capacity or performance standards of the transportation facility.
(e) Providing other measures as a condition of development or through a development agreement or similar funding method, including transportation system management measures, demand management or minor transportation improvements. Local governments shall as part of the amendment specify when measures or improvements provided pursuant to this subsection will be provided.

Response: Reflecting Statewide Goal 12 and the Transportation Planning Rule, UGB amendment applications must provide the following pursuant to Madras Goal 14 policies:
4. Evidence that the proposed zoning or land use plan complies with requirements of OAR 660-0012-0060 either by demonstrating that planned improvements in the Madras Transportation System Plan (TSP) have capacity to meet

Proposed Amendments to Jefferson County and Madras Comprehensive Plans and Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Maps
transportation needs for the proposed expansion area or through supplemental transportation improvements that augment the adopted TSP to meet the need; (Madras Comprehensive Plan Policy 14J)

City R-2 (Multi-Family Residential) zoning is proposed for the east site of the UGB amendment and annexation area. The zone allows multi-family and single-family housing outright and then allows associated uses such as schools, libraries, and community centers conditionally. The minimum lot size for single-family housing is 7,500 square feet and for multi-family 10,000 square feet for the first two units and 2,000 square feet per each additional unit.

The east site is adjacent to Ashwood Road, an existing road built to County standards as a collector road.
More description of the surrounding system, from the analysis (Appendix F)
The transportation analysis for the annexation and re-zoning of the east site was based on assumptions of a combination of multi-family housing and a school. A mixture of housing and a school is anticipated for the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area. Specifically, the analysis assumed [describe assumptions].
Findings of transportation analysis (Appendix F)

## Findings:

- Transportation analysis for the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area assumed that the area would be developed with amount of] housing and a [specify type or size] school.
- Transportation analysis showed that [analysis findings]. The proposal does not change functional classifications of any roadways and nor the standards that apply to them. It complies with mobility standards established in IDENTIFY DOCUMENTS for IDENTIFY ROADS. Therefore, the proposed UGB amendment and annexation was found to have no significant effect on the surrounding transportation system.

Conclusion: The proposed Comprehensive Plan and Map amendment complies with Goal 12 and OAR 660-015-0060(12).

## Goal 13 Energy Conservation

 To conserve energy.Response: The east site of the UGB amendment and annexation area is part of the Yarrow Master Plan area. The master plan includes a range of land uses so that residents can meet many daily needs within the neighborhood. The plan designates land predominantly for housing, but for parks and open space, a school, other community services, and commercial services as well. This mix of uses will provide for these daily needs and reduce the need to drive outside the neighborhood to access these uses. The subject of this application is part of that plan area-a 20 -acre site for housing and a school.

[^77]The Yarrow Community Master Plan also includes amount] miles of sidewalks and [amount] miles of multi-use paths. This supports the use of non-motorized transportation and the conservation of fuel resources. This proposed UGB amendment and annexation does not provide all of the land needed to implement the master plan but provides part of it.

The west site is not part of the Yarrow Master Plan but will be subject to internal circulation and multi-modal standards when a land division or planned unit development is proposed. Like the east site, the west site is adjacent to Ashwood Road.

The JCSD 509-J Facility Plan includes location policies that call for siting elementary school facilities in residentially zoned areas to promote walking to school within urban neighborhoods. This policy is included to reduce the need for bussing in urban areas.

While water service was projected to be of similar cost to provide to all the study areas that comprise the Madras URA, there were differences in relative cost for providing sewer service given the need for pumping in some of the study areas. The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is part of a study area and a drainage area where no pumping or limited pumping would be required for sewer service. This minimizes the amount of energy needed to provide that service.

Last, the City of Madras has adopted energy conservation standards for building. Or is it Yarrow? Describe.

## Findings:

- The approved Yarrow Master Plan that applies to the east site of the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area proposes a variety of uses that will allow residents to take care of day-to-day needs without always having to drive out of the neighborhood to do so. The plan also indicates multi-use paths and a continuous network of sidewalks to promote walking and bicycling. This supports fuel and energy conservation.
- Providing sewer service to the proposal area requires less pumping and, therefore, infrastructure, energy, and cost than other parts of the URA and other areas around the existing UGB.
- Local energy conservation (building) standards

Conclusion: The proposed UGB amendment and annexation complies with State requirements for energy conservation per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 13.

## Goal 14 Urbanization

To provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use, to accommodate urban population and urban employment inside urban growth boundaries, to ensure efficient use of land, and to provide for livable communities.
(2) Orderly and economic provision of public facilities and services;

Response: Transportation, water, and sewer services are among the critical public facilities that must be provided for the proposed UGB amendment area. Also discussed in the narrative and findings for Goals 11 and 12, these services can be provided to the UGB amendment area according to existing facility plans [no updates needed?] and [transportation improvements required of developers?].

Transportation - transportation analysis findings

Water - During the development of the Madras URA, Deschutes Valley Water District (DVWD) reported that there would be no supply constraint for urban development in the URA. Significant expansion of the District's distribution system would be necessary to serve urban demand in each part of the URA, and the water service study found that the marginal cost differences between the URA study areas were insignificant. Updated or existing plan can service the UGB amendment area?

Sewer - Public facility analysis conducted in developing the Madras URA showed that sewer service to the eastern study areas in the URA would be more cost-efficient because no pumping or limited pumping would be required as compared to areas to the north, south, and west. For the proposed UGB amendment and in particular, updates to the/the existing Madras Sanitary Sewer Service Master Plan have capacity to provide sewer service to the annexation area.

Schools are also another important public facility and service, and the Jefferson County School District 509-J 2009 Long Range Facility Plan determines the need for a new elementary school in Madras over the next $10-20$ years. The Yarrow Master Plan that applies to the east site of the proposal area identifies land for schools. The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area of 20 acres will provide land that can accommodate a school and housing.

## Findings:

- Water service can be provided to the proposal area using the existing and planned water facilities that are identified in the Deschutes Valley Irrigation District's water master plan. Providing water service was not found to be significantly different in cost between different parts of the URA in studies done in developing the Madras URA.
- Sewer service can be provided to the proposal area using the existing sewer master plan. Studies did find, however, that drainage areas in the eastern and southeastern parts of the URA were easier to serve in that they needed no pumping or minimal pumping of sewage when compared to other parts of the URA.
- General transportation analysis findings
- The proposal provides land for a school site, and need for potentially one or two new elementary school sites in Madras was found in the Jefferson County School 509-J 2009 Long Range Facility Plan (Appendix C). The City owns the land being proposed for UGB expansion and annexation, and has an agreement with the

[^78]District to exchange the land with the District once it is annexed into the UGB and city limits and re-zoned (Appendix D). The site can serve as a replacement site for Madras or Westside Elementary School.

Conclusion: The proposal complies with State requirements for urbanization and orderly and economic provision of public facilities and services per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 14.

## VI. Conformance with Oregon Revised Statutes (ORSs)

ORS 195
195.110 School facility plan for large school districts. (1) As used in this section, "large school district" means a school district that has an enrollment of over 2,500 students based on certified enrollment numbers submitted to the Department of Education during the first quarter of each new school year.
(2) A city or county containing a large school district shall:
(a) Include as an element of its comprehensive plan a school facility plan prepared by the district in consultation with the affected city or county.
(b) Initiate planning activities with a school district to accomplish planning as required under ORS 195.020.

Response: Jefferson County School District 509-J registered 2,985 students enrolled in the 2008-2009 school year and, thus, qualifies as a "large school district" pursuant to ORS 195.110. This application proposes that the Jefferson County School District 509-J 2009 Long Range Facility Plan (Appendix C) be adopted as an element in the Jefferson County and City of Madras Comprehensive Plans. The City of Madras has coordinated with the District in developing the plan.
(3) The provisions of subsection (2)(a) of this section do not apply to a city or a county that contains less than 10 percent of the total population of the large school district.
(4) The large school district shall select a representative to meet and confer with a representative of the city or county, as described in subsection (2)(b) of this section, to accomplish the planning required by ORS 195.020 and shall notify the city or county of the selected representative. The city or county shall provide the facilities and set the time for the planning activities. The representatives shall meet at least twice each year, unless all representatives agree in writing to another schedule, and make a written summary of issues discussed and proposed actions.

Response: Jefferson County and the City of Madras are the jurisdictions in which most of the students in Jefferson County School District 509-J live. The District has met with the City at least twice this year in developing the facility plan, and the District and City have both worked with a consultant firm - Angelo Planning Group - to prepare the plan. The firm has worked on other school district facility plans in the state.
(5)(a) The school facility plan must cover a period of at least 10 years and must include, but need not be limited to, the following elements:
(A) Population projections by school age group.
(B) Identification by the city or county and by the large school district of desirable school sites.
(C) Descriptions of physical improvements needed in existing schools to meet the minimum standards of the large school district.
(D) Financial plans to meet school facility needs, including an analysis of available tools to ensure facility needs are met.
(E) An analysis of:
(i) The alternatives to new school construction and major renovation; and
(ii) Measures to increase the efficient use of school sites including, but not limited to, multiple-story buildings and multipurpose use of sites.
(F) Ten-year capital improvement plans.
(G) Site acquisition schedules and programs.
(b) Based on the elements described in paragraph (a) of this subsection and applicable laws and rules, the school facility plan must also include an analysis of the land required for the 10-year period covered by the plan that is suitable, as a permitted or conditional use, for school facilities inside the urban growth boundary.

Response: The Jefferson County School District 509-J 2009 Long Range Facility Plan features forecasts that extend to 2040 and programs for financing, acquisition, and capital improvement that cover a 10 -year period. The plan (Appendix C) includes the required elements as follows:

- Chapter 3 - Enrollment forecasts
- Chapter 4 - Existing facility conditions and needed facility improvements
- Chapter 5 - Analysis of needed improvements, additional capacity, and potential school sites
- [REFERENCE when plan complete/updated] - 10-year financing, acquisition, and capital improvement programs.

The analysis of additional capacity considers the re-use and expansion of existing facilities. Ultimately, the plan does recommend re-building Warm Springs Elementary School on site and building a new elementary school in Madras (Chapter 6 - Recommendations). The locational analysis in Chapter 5 looks first at sites within the UGB, using the following criteria.

- Land use - unimproved land, except for parks and open space, or land with improvements valued $<\$ 50,000$.
- Size - at least 7 acres
- Environmental hazards/buildability - at least 5 acres flat (slopes $<5 \%$ ), at least 2.5 flat acres outside the floodplain.
- Zoning - not zoned for industrial use.
- Serviceability - not in areas with constrained sewers.
- Geographic distribution - not fully within a half mile of an existing elementary school.
- Traffic safety - not on a highway or arterial.
- Availability - not committed to another use, built or in the planning process.

Eight sites in the UGB were evaluated using these criteria and, while most of the sites performed well on some to most of the criteria, none of them met all of the criteria. In particular, the sites would not be easily served with sewer and transportation or, in the case of sites 7 and 8, they are not necessarily close to existing or planned residential neighborhoods and students.
(6) If a large school district determines that there is an inadequate supply of suitable land for school facilities for the 10-year period covered by the school facility plan, the city
or county, or both, and the large school district shall cooperate in identifying land for school facilities and take necessary actions, including, but not limited to, adopting appropriate zoning, aggregating existing lots or parcels in separate ownership, adding one or more sites designated for school facilities to an urban growth boundary, or petitioning a metropolitan service district to add one or more sites designated for school facilities to an urban growth boundary pursuant to applicable law.

Response: The eight sites in the UGB were evaluated using the criteria from the response above and none of them met all of the criteria, particularly serviceability criteria. Because issues such as zoning and parcel aggregation were not the reasons that the evaluation sites within the UGB failed to meet criteria, the District and City added the proposal area - a City-owned site outside and adjacent to the UGB - to the evaluation. It met the criteria.

The site is located within the Madras URA and complies with regulations for including land in the UGB, pursuant to ORS 197.298, which is addressed next in this report.
(9)(a) In the school facility plan, the district school board of a large school district may adopt objective criteria to be used by an affected city or county to determine whether adequate capacity exists to accommodate projected development. Before the adoption of the criteria, the large school district shall confer with the affected cities and counties and agree, to the extent possible, on the appropriate criteria. After a large school district formally adopts criteria for the capacity of school facilities, an affected city or county shall accept those criteria as its own for purposes of evaluating applications for a comprehensive plan amendment or for a residential land use regulation amendment.
(b) A city or county shall provide notice to an affected large school district when considering a plan or land use regulation amendment that significantly impacts school capacity. If the large school district requests, the city or county shall implement a coordinated process with the district to identify potential school sites and facilities to address the projected impacts.
(11) The capacity of a school facility is not the basis for a development moratorium under ORS 197.505 to 197.540.
(12) This section does not confer any power to a school district to declare a building moratorium.
(13) A city or county may deny an application for residential development based on a lack of school capacity if:
(a) The issue is raised by the school district;
(b) The lack of school capacity is based on a school facility plan formally adopted under this section; and
(c) The city or county has considered options to address school capacity. [1993 c. 550 §2; 1995 c. 508 §1; 2001 c. 876 §1; 2007 c. 579 §1]

Response: The facility plan establishes calculations for capacity in Chapter 4.

## INSERT/SUMMARIZE HERE IF DETERMINED

When the Board approved and adopted the facility plan in January 2010, this included these capacity formulas. The County and City understand that these formulas must be used in

[^79]evaluating future amendments to comprehensive plans and land use regulations, and may be used in denying a residential development application but not in instituting a development moratorium.

## Findings:

- Jefferson County School District 509-J is required to prepare a facility plan, and it has coordinated with the City of Madras in developing its 2009 Long Range Facility Plan (Appendix C). The plan was approved and adopted by the Jefferson County School District 509-J Board on DATE.
- Jefferson County and the City of Madras must adopt the facility plan as an element of their comprehensive plans and that has driven this proposal for an amendment to their comprehensive plans.
- The facility plan uses at least a 10 -year horizon in projecting enrollment, estimating future facility needs, evaluating ways of addressing these needs, and preparing financing, acquisition, and capital improvement programs.
- The 2009 Long Range Facility Plan evaluated eight sites in the UGB using land use, site size, zoning, buildability, serviceability, geographic distribution, and traffic safety criteria in order to address land needed beyond existing facility sites. The sites were either difficult to serve with sewer or roads, or were not located near existing or planned residential neighborhoods.
- The plan evaluated one site in the Madras URA, adjacent to the existing UGB, that the City owns. The site met the land use, site size, zoning, buildability, serviceability, geographic distribution, and traffic safety criteria.
- The adopted facility plan includes capacity criteria that the County and City must use in reviewing land use plan and regulation amendments.

Conclusion: The proposal complies with State school district facility planning requirements in ORS 195.110.

ORS 197
197.298 Priority of land to be included within urban growth boundary. (1) In addition to any requirements established by rule addressing urbanization, land may not be included within an urban growth boundary except under the following priorities:
(a) First priority is land that is designated urban reserve land under ORS 195.145, rule or metropolitan service district action plan.
(b) If land under paragraph (a) of this subsection is inadequate to accommodate the amount of land needed, second priority is land adjacent to an urban growth boundary that is identified in an acknowledged comprehensive plan as an exception area or nonresource land. Second priority may include resource land that is completely surrounded by exception areas unless such resource land is high-value farmland as described in ORS 215.710.
(c) If land under paragraphs (a) and (b) of this subsection is inadequate to accommodate the amount of land needed, third priority is land designated as marginal land pursuant to ORS 197.247 (1991 Edition).
(d) If land under paragraphs (a) to (c) of this subsection is inadequate to
accommodate the amount of land needed, fourth priority is land designated in an acknowledged comprehensive plan for agriculture or forestry, or both.
(2) Higher priority shall be given to land of lower capability as measured by the capability classification system or by cubic foot site class, whichever is appropriate for the current use.
(3) Land of lower priority under subsection (1) of this section may be included in an urban growth boundary if land of higher priority is found to be inadequate to accommodate the amount of land estimated in subsection (1) of this section for one or more of the following reasons:
(a) Specific types of identified land needs cannot be reasonably accommodated on higher priority lands;
(b) Future urban services could not reasonably be provided to the higher priority lands due to topographical or other physical constraints; or
(c) Maximum efficiency of land uses within a proposed urban growth boundary requires inclusion of lower priority lands in order to include or to provide services to higher priority lands. [1995 c. 547 §5; 1999 c. 59 §56]

Response: The proposed UGB amendment and annexation ärea is solely comprised of land from the Madras URA, which is the first priority of land to be included within the UGB pursuant to ORS 197.298(1)(a). There is sufficient land in the Madras URA to provide for the land needs estimated for the next 20 years in the Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, August 2007) and presented below.

The proposed UGB amendment and annexation provides land to meet a portion of the need for residentially zoned land over the next roughly 20 years (Table 6-1). The City's next periodic review process will ensure that the Madras UGB includes enough land to meet the remaining land needs projected to 2027.

Table 6-1: Housing Needs, Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, August 2007)

Table 6-4. Comparison of land supply and demand, Madras UGB, 2007-2027 and 2007-2057

| Plan Designation | Land Demand |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Supply } \\ 2007 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Surplus (deficit) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2007-2027 | 2007-2057 |  | 2007-2027 | 2007-2057 |
| Residential |  |  |  |  |  |
| R-1 | 451.9 | 1,355.7 | 398.1 | (53.8) | (957.6) |
| R-2 | 46.1 | 138.2 | 23.5 | (22.5) | (114.6) |
| R-3 | 148.0 | 444.0 | 242.8 | 94.8 | (201.2) |
| RR5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 32.7 | 32.7 | 32.7 |
| RR10 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 47.5 | 47.5 | 47.5 |
| RL | 0.0 | 0.0 | 38.7 | 38.7 | 38.7 |
| Public/Semi-public uses on res land | 358.3 | 770.7 | 0.0 | (358.3) | (770.7) |
| Subtotal (Residential) | 1,004.2 | 2,708,6 | 783.3 | (220.9) | $(1,925.3)$ |
| Commercial (Retail \& Services) |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}-1$ | 230.6 | 758.1 | 80.2 | (150.4) | (677.9) |
| NC | 28.6 | 90.4 | 4.9 | (23.7) | (85.4) |
| CC | 0 | 0 | 32.6 | 32.6 | 32.6 |
| Subtotal Commercial | 259.2 | 848.5 | 117.7 | (141.5) | (730.8) |
| Industrial |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 251.4 | 749.9 | 296.9 | 45.5 | (452.9) |

Notes: all public and semi-public and needs were allocated to residential zones

[^80]197.610 Local government notice of proposed amendment or new regulation; exceptions; report to commission. (1) A proposal to amend a local government acknowledged comprehensive plan or land use regulation or to adopt a new land use regulation shall be forwarded to the Director of the Department of Land Conservation and Development at least 45 days before the first evidentiary hearing on adoption. The proposal forwarded shall contain the text and any supplemental information that the local government believes is necessary to inform the director as to the effect of the proposal. The notice shall include the date set for the first evidentiary hearing. The director shall notify persons who have requested notice that the proposal is pending.
(2) When a local government determines that the goals do not apply to a particular proposed amendment or new regulation, notice under subsection (1) of this section is not required. In addition, a local government may submit an amendment or new regulation with less than 45 days' notice if the local government determines that there are emergency circumstances requiring expedited review. In both cases:
(a) The amendment or new regulation shall be submitted after adoption as provided in ORS 197.615 (1) and (2); and
(b) Notwithstanding the requirements of ORS 197.830 (2), the director or any other person may appeal the decision to the board under ORS 197.830 to 197.845.
(3) When the Department of Land Conservation and Development participates in a local government proceeding, at least 15 days before the final hearing on the proposed amendment to the comprehensive plan or land use regulation or the new land use regulation, the department shall notify the local government of:
(a) Any concerns the department has concerning the proposal; and
(b) Advisory recommendations on actions the department considers necessary to address the concerns, including, but not limited to, suggested corrections to achieve compliance with the goals.
(4) The director shall report to the Land Conservation and Development Commission on whether the director:
(a) Believes the local government's proposal violates the goals; and
(b) Is participating in the local government proceeding. [1981 c. 748 §4; 1983 c. 827 §7; 1985 c. 565 §27; 1989 c. 761 §20; 1999 c. 622 §1]

Response: Notice of the proposed amendments to the Jefferson County and City of Madras Comprehensive Plan, Comprehensive Plan Maps, and Zoning Maps was sent to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) at least 45 days before the first evidentiary hearing on the proposal. Notice was sent to DLCD on December 14, 2009 before the first advisory hearing before the Jefferson County and City of Madras Planning Commissions on February 3, 2010. Further hearing dates have yet to be determined but it is expected that DLCD will provide appropriate comment on the proposal at least 15 days prior to the final adoption hearing date.

## DLCD comments/application revisions, once received

197.626 Expanding urban growth boundary or designating urban or rural reserves subject to periodic review. A metropolitan service district that amends its urban growth boundary to include more than 100 acres, or that amends the district's regional framework plan or land use regulations implementing the plan to establish urban reserves designated under ORS 195.145 (1)(b), a city with a population of 2,500
or more within its urban growth boundary that amends the urban growth boundary to include more than 50 acres or that designates urban reserve under ORS 195.145, or a county that amends the county's comprehensive plan or land use regulations implementing the plan to establish rural reserves designated under ORS 195.141, shall submit the amendment or designation to the Land Conservation and Development Commission in the manner provided for periodic review under ORS 197.628 to 197.650. [1999 c. 622 §14; 2001 c. 672 §10; 2003 c. 793 §4; 2007 c. 723 §7]

Response: The City of Madras is coordinating with Jefferson County regarding the proposed amendments to their Comprehensive Plans, Comprehensive Plan Maps, and Zoning Maps. Adoption of the UGB amendment involves amendments to the City and County Comprehensive Plans that are post-acknowledgement plan amendments. However, the adoption process for the amendments will follow periodic review procedures pursuant to ORS 197. As part of periodic review procedures, the proposed amendments are subject to review by DLCD and approval by LCDC. DLCD and LCDC will conduct their review process upon adoption of the proposed amendments by the Madras City Council and Jefferson County Board of Commissioners.

## Findings:

- The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is entirely comprised of land from the Madras URA, the first priority of land to be included in the UGB pursuant to ORS 197.298(1)(a).
- There are 36.91 acres in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation. This meets some of the estimated need for residentially zoned land outside the existing UGB projected to 2027 by urbanization studies. The proposed R-2 zoning for the 20 -acre parcel (east site) allows housing and public/semi-public uses such as parks and schools. Other land needs for the next 20 years will be addressed during the next periodic review cycle.
- Notice of the first advisory hearing on Februaty 3, 2010 was sent to DLCD on December 14, 2009, more than 45 days before the advisory and evidentiary hearings.
- The City of Madras and Jefferson County are coordinating this proposed set of amendmènts.
- This proposal is a post-acknowledgement plan amendment (PAPA) but will follow procedures for periodic review. DLCD review and LCDC approval of the amendment will be necessary for the proposal if it is adopted by both the Madras City Council and Jefferson County Board of Commissioners.

Conclusion: The proposed amendments to the City and County Comprehensive Plans, Comprehensive Plan Maps, and Zoning Maps comply with applicable State requirements for urban reserve area planning, plan amendments, and UGB amendments pursuant to ORS 197.
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## VII. Conformance with the Urban Growth Area Management Agreement (UGAMA)

## 4. UGA ADMINISTRATION RESPONSIBILITIES

4.1. The City shall have responsibility for administration and decision making authority regarding all land use application within the UGB except applications for amendments to the UGB, as provided in Section 6.
4.2. The City shall have responsibility for annexation of land in the UGB. Lands outside the UGA shall not be annexed unless the UGB is also amended to include the territory to be annexed.

## 6. PROCESS FOR URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY AMENDMENTS

1.1 Amendments to the UGB, including amendments to the City's and County's comprehensive plan maps, may be initiated by the City, the County, or a property owner(s).
1.2 An application to amend the UGB shall be filed with the City Community Development Department along with the applicable City and County plan amendment fees. The City shall forward a copy of the application to the County Community Development Department, together with the County's plan amendment fee, within five working days of the date the application is filed.
1.3 The City and County Planning Commission shall each conduct a public hearing regarding the application. At their discretion, the Planning Commissions may hold a joint hearing rather than separate hearings.
1.4 The recommendation of the City and County Planning Commissions shall be forwarded to City Council, who shall hold a public hearing to consider the proposed amendment to the UGB. The decision of the City Council shall be forwarded to the County Board of Commissioners.
1.5 The Board of Commissioners shall conduct a public hearing and make a final decision on whether the UGB should be amended.
1.6 If the City and County disagree on the proposed amendments, a joint hearing of the City Council and Board of County Commissioners may be held to attempt to resolve the differences. Both jurisdictions may also request a dispute resolution process to resolve the differences.
1.7 If the governing bodies are not able to come to mutual agreement there shall be no change to the UGB.

Response: The Urban Growth Area Management Agreement (UGAMA) (Appendix G) was adopted by the City of Madras and Jefferson County on April 5, 2006. Pursuant to UGAMA terms for UGB amendments, the City is an eligible applicant for a UGB amendment application (Section 6.1). The UGB amendment application and appropriate fees were forwarded to the Jefferson County Community Development Department within five working days of being initially filed (Section 6.2).

Hearings by the Madras Planning Commission and Jefferson County Planning Commission were first held jointly on February 3, 2010 and then separately on DATE and DATE

[^82]respectively. OTHER PC HEARINGS? The Madras City Council will review the City Planning Commission's recommendation at a hearing on DATE, and will forward its decision to the County Board of Commissioners for a hearing on DATE (Sections 6.3-6.5). OTHER LEGISLATIVE HEARINGS?

It is proposed to annex both the east site and west site to the Madras UGB and city limits, and it is proposed to re-zone only the east site at this time. Regardless, if both sites are brought into the UGB and city limits, Madras will assume land use administration and decision making authority for the sites pursuant to Section 4.1 of the UGAMA.

Conclusion: The proposed amendments to the City and County Comprehensive Plans, Comprehensive Plan Maps, and Zoning Maps comply with applicable local requirements for UGB amendments per the UGAMA between Jefferson County and the City of Madras, adopted April 5, 2006.

## VIII. Conformance with the City of Madras Comprehensive Plan

Note: the highlighting in the policy text below indicates text that may not have been adopted by the City

GOAL 14 - To provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land and to provide for livable communities.
[Paragraph amended by Ordinance No. 781, Passed by Council on December 12, 2006]
POLICIES
A. The City, in cooperation with Jefferson County, shall establish an Urban Growth Boundary.
B. The City, in cooperation with Jefferson County, shall mutually agree to a management plan for the Urban Growth Boundary area.
C. The City, in cooperation with Jefferson County, shall establish an Urban Growth Boundary revision process to be utilized in a proposed change of the Urban Growth Boundary.
D. The City, in cooperation with Jefferson County, shall support adoption of an Urban Reserve Area boundary that, when taken together with land supplies in the Urban Growth Boundary, may contain up to a 50-vear supply of land for the City of Madras to support housing, economic development, public facility, recreation needs and other urban land needs.
E. The City, in cooperation with Jefferson County, shall give priority to land in designated urban reserve areas over other land when considering urban growth boundary amendments.

Response: The Madras City Council approved the Madras URA in October 2008 and the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners in November 2008. DLCD and LCDC received the URA proposal for review in January 2009, and approved the proposal - but remanded sections of proposed County Zoning Ordinance amendments having to do with use restrictions in the URA - in July 2009. The land in the proposed UGB amendment that is the subject of this application is land entirely drawn from the Madras URA, land estimated to be needed for urbanization over the next 50 years.
F. The City shall favor UGB amendments that involve land in locations that are suitable to address identified urban land needs in order to minimize buildable land supply shortages and address identified needs. Factors that will be considered when evaluating UGB additions include:

1. Existing and planned capacity of the transportation system
2. Existing and planned capacity of the city waste water treatment plant
3. Existing and planned capacity of the city sanitary sewer conveyance system
4. Existing and planned capacity of the Deschutes Valley Water District supply system
5. Impacts on schools, parks, and public safety service providers
6. Impacts on future operating costs for public facilities and services

## Response:

G. The City, in cooperation with Jefferson County, shall undertake an evaluation of the urban growth boundary land supply once every five years or more frequently if certified population growth rates exceed $3.2 \%$ in three consecutive years. In the event certified population growth rates fall below $3.2 \%$ for three consecutive years, the City and County may agree to postpone the evaluation of UGB land supply for up to three years.
H. During years when a comprehensive UGB land supply evaluation is not scheduled, individual applications for adding property to the UGB shall be limited to requests of less than 40 acres. UGB amendment applications must demonstrate consistency with applicable Oregon statutes and administrative rules and be accompanied by information that addresses Policy 14-J below. Applications that involve more than 5 acres also must comply with provisions of Policy 14-1.

D I. The City, in cooperation with Jefferson County, shall encourage the development of complete, livable communities that include characteristics such as: a variety of lot sizes, dwelling unit types and ownership types, open spaces and other recreational amenities, a mix of land uses, school and community facilifies, connected streets, proximity to downtown and other employment centers, and development that is scaled to the pedestrian and creates a sense of place. New growth areas of more than 5 acres that are added to the UGB shall should be planned and developed in accordance either with a master planned community development plan approved under the city Master Planned Community Overlay zone, or an Area Master Plan. The City encourages Master Planned Communities as a means to meet city housing needs as explained in other comprehensive plan documents. It may be appropriate, however, for the city to add new growth areas to the UGB that are planned and developed in accordance with an approved Area Master Plan. A majority of property owners subject to a Master Planned Community, or to an Area Master Plan, must consent to be included in the plan.

1. A Master Planned Community (MPC) Overlav mav apply to large multi-phased development projects where the master plan is intended to guide future development patterns and serves to regulate the site-development approval process. A MPC requires generous open space and amenities, and encourages efficient use of land and public facilities and services, a variety of housing types, innovative designs and complete pedestrian-friendly communities. A MPC shall demonstrate efficient use of land consistent with an identified urban land need, show appropriate locations for transportation improvements, public facilities, and the protection of significant open space, scenic, historic, and natural resource areas. A MPC must show how planned land uses will be integrated with the existing urban development pattern. Physical barriers, such as highways, tend to disrupt complete communities and livability because they disconnect areas from downtown and result in an auto-oriented environment of sprawl along highway corridors.

[^83]> 2. An Area Master Plan (AMP) is appropriate for land added to the UGB where the approval of future urban development is expected to relv on conventional urban zoning and the application of codified development standards and review procedures. An AMP may be prepared for contiguous properties added to the UGB that are greater than 5 acres and are not subject to a MPC overlay. An AMP shall demonstrate efficient use of land, zoning consistent with an identified urban land need, appropriate locations for transportation improvements, public facilities, protection for significant open space, scenic, historic, and natural resource areas. An AMP must show how planned land uses will be integrated with the existing urban development pattern.
> 3. An approved Master Planned Community Plan or an Area Master Plan must include documentation that a majority of property owners support the conversion of land to the planned urban uses and also consent to annexation by the city of Madras using a voluntary annexation process that is outlined in the plan.

Response: The total area under consideration is 36.4 acres, which is less than the 40 acre maximum established for interim UGB annexation requests. The east site of the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is part of the approved Yarrow Master Plan area. The plan designates land for predominantly residential land uses, which is compatible with adjacent development in the UGB, while also designating land for open space and park uses, community services including schools, and limited neighborhood commercial services. The conceptual plan also shows an internal transportation system that includes sidewalks and multi-use paths.

## For the east site:

Connections and improvements to the surrounding transportation network - transportation analysis results
Existing water and sewer master plans are adequate to address facilities and service in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area.
The designation for medium density Residential use is consistent with an un-met land need and identified housing need in the 2005 Urbanization Report.

Pursuant to Policy 14I: "An AMP shall demonstrate efficient use of land, zoning consistent with an identified urban land need, appropriate locations for transportation improvements, public facilities, protection for significant open space, scenic, historic, and natural resource areas." It is proposed to annex the west site to the Madras UGB and city limits but to retain its existing County Range Land ( RL ) zoning until the owners are ready to propose development. The site is surrounded by land designated for residential and related uses, and its future land use and zoning designation must allow for residential and compatible public/semi-public uses in order to show that land uses on the west site can be: "integrated with the existing urban development pattern." (Policy $14 \mathrm{I}(2)$ ) The proposed addition of a table showing Madras and County zones that correspond with Madras land use designations to the Madras Comprehensive Plan Section IV, Land Use Element (Table 3-1), will facilitate the transition of existing County zoning to appropriate City zoning.

The west site is comprised of three lots - Lots 101 and 200 that total 16.22 acres and are privately owned and Lot 102 that is 0.69 acres designated for County right-of-way. Lots 101
and 200 are both adjacent to Ashwood Road, a County collector, and will not require additional public roads for sufficient internal or local circulation. At the time of proposed development, proposed land division or planned development plans must show an internal circulation system that satisfies City code requirements and street standards. The west site is adjacent to the existing Madras UGB and is bordered by Ashwood Road, which eases extension of services from inside the existing UGB and city limits to the west site.

The plan map designation of medium density residential (R-2) is consistent with an un-met land need and identified housing need in the 2005 Urbanization Report.

For the west site:

## SERVICE PROVIDER LETTERS

How do existing water and sewer plans fold in? Updates needed?
The County has not identified historic, scenic, or natural resources on the west site. City open space requirements for subdivisions or planned developments will apply to the site at the time of proposed development.
J. All land use applications or legislative proposals to expand the Madras UGB must be accompanied by information that documents the following:

1. The proposed urban zoning or land use program for the subject properties that address an identified urban land need;
2. An annexation program for all subject properties;
3. Evidence that public facilities required by OAR 660-011-000 that are necessary to serve the expansion area can be served either by system improvements outlined in adopted public facility master plans or by supplemental improvements that augment adopted public facility master plans;
4. Evidence that the proposed zoning or land use plan complies with requirements of OAR 660-0012-0060 either by demonstrating that planned improvements in the Madras Transportation System Plan (TSP) have capacity to meet transportation needs for the proposed expansion area or through supplemental transportation improvements that augment the adopted TSP to meet the need;
5. Evidence that providers of other crucial public facilities (e.g. schools, parks and recreation, emergency services and health care) are able to meet the projected demand for their services:
6. Evidence that financing for constructing needed public improvements is available so that the expansion area can be developed as planned within the planning horizon:
7. Evidence that development in areas subiect to natural hazards are protected from these hazards;
8. Evidence that known or probable significant resources related to open space, scenic areas, historic places or structures, and fish and wildlife habitat will be protected from development impacts or have development impacts offset using appropriate mitigation measures.

## Response:

Zoning and Land Use Designations (Policy J1)

The east site is proposed to be re-zoned to a City R-2 designation. This meets some of the need for residentially zoned land outside the existing UGB that is projected for the next 1520 years. Residentially zoned land will provide for housing and public/semi-public uses. This land need is documented in the Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, August 2007). (See Table 5-2)

The west site is proposed to retain its existing County Range Land (RL) designation until the time when further land use action and development is proposed. Existing zoning will allow only limited development, and appropriate future designations for the site will be City residential designations given that City open space and residential zoning currently surround the site.

## Annexation Program (Policy J2)

The City is the applicant for this proposal, and annexation program pursuant to Article 7 of its Zoning Ordinance is described later in this report.

## Goal 11 Public Facilities (Policy J3) and Transportation Planning Rule (Policy J4)

Kittelson \& Associates has performed the transportation analysis needed to deem whether the proposed UGB amendment constitutes a significant effect on the transportation system. The scoping memo concluded that, of two development scenarios allowed under proposed R-2 zoning, considered to be possible according to preliminary conversations about potential uses, and estimated for "worst-case" levels of potential traffic generation, the scenario that included both an elementary school and multi-family housing was found to generate more peak hour traffic than housing alone. Using this scenario in a Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) analysis for significant effect, it was found that the increase in traffic did not constitute a significant effect on the transportation system. Existing facilities and facilities identified in the Jefferson County and City of Madras Transportation System Plans (TSPs) that would likely be funded and built in the next 20 years are adequate to accommodate the projected growth in traffic without violating adopted performance standards.

Public facility analysis for establishing the Madras URA ranked drainage catchment areas around the existing UGB for sewer service costs and serviceability. Of the six study areas that comprised the preliminary and then final URA, Study Areas 3 and 4 on the east and southeast consistently ranked higher than other areas. This can, in part, be attributed to proximity to the new South Wastewater Treatment Plant (SWWWTP) and being upslope of the plant. In particular, the proposed UGB amendment and annexation are is located in Catchment Area 180 and bordering on Catchment Area 179. These areas ranked $8^{\text {th }}$ and $12^{\text {th }}$ out of 60 catchment areas, making them among the more cost-effective and serviceable areas of the URA.

As was also determined during the URA public facility analysis, Deschutes Valley Water District (DVWD) found that there would be insignificant differences in providing water service to the different parts of the URA. Water supply in the region is adequate to ample.

Implementation of existing water and sewer master plans will be sufficient to provide service for the proposal area. Or are updates needed?
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## SERVICE PROVIDER LETTERS

Other Public Facilities (Policy J5)
The Jefferson County School District 509-J 2009 Long Range Facility Plan includes enrollment projections for the next 20-25 years and compares the projected enrollment against the capacity and conditions of existing facilities. Even with shared uses or renovations, the plan recommends that a school be re-built on Warm Springs tribal land, that a new elementary school be built in Madras to replace substandard facilities, and that work be done to address flood hazards at Madras High School and the administration offices. It is projected in the plan that between 2025 and 2030, elementary school enrollment will exceed existing capacity by more than 400 students (Table 5-2, Appendix C).

As part of this proposal, it is requested that the adoption of the 2009 Long Range Facility Plan as an element of the County and City Comprehensive Plans be approved and acknowledged by DLCD

The east site has access to substantial park and recreation resources. Juniper Hill Park (City/County) and Bean Park (City/County) are nearby, as well as Jefferson County Middle School and its fields. The Yarrow Master Plan that applies to the site and surrounding land also designates open space and parks throughout the plan area.

The City reports that Mountain View Hospital and City public safety and emergency services are sufficient to provide services for the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area.

## Financing for Improvements (Policy J6)

Financing?
For facility plan and other transportation, water, and sewer improvements

## Protection from Natural Hazards (Policy J7)

There are not steep slopes (slopes greater than $25 \%$ ), floodway, or floodplain in the proposed UGB expansion and annexation area. In fact, the proposed amendment and annexation are driven, in part, by the need to provide a school that is outside the floodway and floodplain of Willow Creek and its tributaries.

Fire protection service for the proposal area is currently provided by Jefferson County Fire Protection District \#1, and will continue to be provided by that district if the land is annexed to the city. The area is subject to a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) that Jefferson County completed in 2005 in collaboration with the fire district and federal agencies.

## Protection of Goal 5 Resources (Policy J8)

The Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan, Goal 5 inventory, or Jefferson County Geographic Information System (GIS) files do not identify floodways, floodplains, significant habitat, or cultural resources in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area. The only resources cited above that may apply to the site are open spaces. While open space will be a required part of public use or residential development that occurs in this area,
this proposal itself is not a development or entitlement proposal and, therefore, does not specify precisely where such open space will be designated.

## Findings:

- Amendments to zoning and land use designations are planned and proposed. The proposed City land use designation is residential and City zoning designation R-2 (Multiple Family Residential). A need for about 22 acres of land outside the existing UGB zoned R-2 was determined in the Madras Urbanization Study Addendum.
- Transportation analysis and results
- Implementation of existing water and sewer master plans will be sufficient to provide service for the proposal area, or are updates needed? Include/reference service provider letters.
- The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area has access to nearby parks and a middle school. Part of the proposal is to adopt the Jefferson County School District 509-J 2009 Long Range Facility Plan as an element of the Jefferson County and Madras Comprehensive Plans and annex the 20 -acre site in order to fulfill an agreement between JCSD and the City and provide land for an elementary school that will be needed in the next 15-20 years.
- Financing - facility plan and other transportation, water, and sewer improvements
- In terms of natural hazards, there are not slopes greater than $25 \%$, floodway, or floodplain in the proposed UGB expansion and annexation area. The proposed amendments and annexation are based, in part, on the need to provide a school that is outside the floodway and floodplain of Willow Creek and its tributaries. Fire protection service for the proposal area is and will be provided by Jefferson County Fire Protection District \#1.
- There are not floodways, floodplains, habitat, or cultural resources that are identified in the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan, Goal 5 inventory, or Jefferson County Geographic Information System (GIS) files in the proposal area. Open space will be provided as part of school and residential development pursuant to District school site and facility criteria and Madras zoning ordinance (MZO) in which $30 \%$ of a Master Planned Community must be open space (MZO Section 3.12(D)(4)).

Conclusion: The proposed comprehensive plan, comprehensive plan map, and zoning map amendments comply with the relevant policies of the Madras Comprehensive Plan.
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## IX. Conformance with the City of Madras Community Development Code

## City of Madras Zoning Ordinance

## ARTICLE 7: ANNEXATION

SECTION 7.1: PURPOSE - The purpose of this section is to:
A. Implement the policies of the City of Madras Comprehensive Plan;
B. Provide for City review of all annexation requests for a determination of the availability of facilities and services as related to the proposal;
C. Provide for dissemination of public information and for sufficient time for public review,
D. Provide for City and County coordination of a request for an annexation; and
E. Provide for an expedited process by establishing procedures whereby the annexation and zoning, if applicable, may be considered concurrently.

SECTION 7.2: APPLICATION PROCEDURE. Annexation is a land use decision and is subject to applicable provisions of the City of Madras Comprehensive Plan, Oregon Revised Statutes, and Oregon Administrative Rules. In addition, the procedures below shall be followed:
A. The Planning Commission shall conduct a public hearing after notification of all property owners with two hundred fifty feet (250') outside of the boundary(ies) of the proposed annexation. The Planning Commission shall review the proposal for compliance with the annexation policies contained in this Ordinance and make a recommendation to the City Council, based on:

1. The annexation proposal which meets the application requirements; and
2. The Planning Commission shall conduct a public hearing to determine a recommendation to the City Council to approve, approve with conditions or modifications, or disapprove the feasibility of the annexation proposal based on the criteria set forth in Section 7.4 below; and
3. The Planning Commission shall state its recommendation and the reasons therefore in writing to the City Council.
B. Upon receipt of the Planning Commission recommendation, the City Council shall conduct a public hearing and consider an Ordinance declaring the requested lands to be annexed to the City of Madras.
4. The City Council shall review the record of the Planning Commission hearing their recommendation and shall determine whether to approve, approve with conditions or modifications, or disapprove the feasibility of the proposed annexation in accordance with the criteria set forth in Section 7.4 below.
5. The City Council may conduct additional public hearings to assist their making a determination.
6. The City Council shall state its determination and the reasons therefore in writing.

Response: The City of Madras sent public hearing notice to the surrounding property owners on DATE. The City and County Planning Commissions held their first public hearing on February 3, 2010. The City Planning Commission decided upon a
recommendation of [describe recommendation] at its hearing on DATE and forwarded it to the Madras City Council. The City Council is scheduled to hear the matter on DATE(S).

SECTION 7.3: ANNEXATION APPLICATION. The petitioner for annexation shall complete an application form provided by the Community Development Department. The application fee, established by Resolution of the City of Madras City Council, shall be submitted with the application. The application shall include:
A. A map demonstrating that the proposed annexation is contiguous to the City Limits,
B. Specific information on each parcel within the proposed annexation area:

1. Current assessed valuation shown on Jefferson County Assessor's tax rolls.
2. Acreage of both public and private property to be annexed.
3. Map and tax lot(s) number.
C. Names and ages of all residents and list of registered voters in the proposed annexation area.
D. Addresses of all parcels within the proposed annexation area.
E. Consent to Annexation forms, provided by the City of Madras, with notarized signatures of all property owners and electors within the proposed annexation area.
F. Written findings, which address the following:
4. Existing land uses within annexation area.
5. Existing zoning within the annexation area.
6. Existing improvements:
a. water system
b. streets
c. sanitary sewer
d. storm drainage
7. Special Districts within the area:
a. water districts
b. irrigation districts
c. fire district
d. school district
e. other
8. Urban services, the present availability of urban service systems to the proposed annexation area, their capacity and cost of extension and/or improvement to urban standards:
a. sanitary sewers - streets - parks
b. storm drainage - water
c. fire - power
d. schools - police
G. Compliance with all applicable policies of the City of Madras Comprehensive Plan.

Response: The City is initiating and applying for the proposed annexation. Maps of the west site and east site in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area are included in this report as Figure 4-1. Parcel size and other parcel information is presented in Section I, Proposal Summary. The City owns the taxlot where the east site is located. The 20 -acre parcel that is being created from the taxlot has been surveyed. Annexing the parcel to the UGB and city limits and re-zoning it to R-2 will allow the City to honor a land exchange agreement between the City and JCSD, which needs to occur by 2011 pursuant to the terms of the agreement (Appendix D). The west site is comprised of three taxlots, two taxlots that

[^86]are privately owned and one small taxlot ( 0.69 acres) that is County right-of-way. Re-zoning is not proposed for this site at this time as there are no immediate development plans. However, this site does better connect the east site to the existing UGB and will be suitable for residential uses and compatible public/semi-public uses, for which Madras urbanization studies have found a long-term need.

The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is currently vacant and not in active use. It is land under Jefferson County jurisdiction and zoned Range Land (RL). There are not water, sewer, or storm water facilities and services extended to the site yet, but they can be extended using existing City facility master plans [or with minor updates to the plans?]. The Deschutes Valley Water District (DVWD) provides water service to the area and can provide facilities and service to the site, to be financed primarily by development applicants. The same is true for sewer and storm water facilities and service, for which the City of Madras is the service provider. As part of its agreement with JCSD, the City will extend water and sewer to the edge of the east site. There is an irrigation district in the region - the Central Oregon Irrigation District - but the proposal area is not irrigated nor is it proposed to be.

There is a County collector road - Ashwood Road - along the northern border of the area that will/will not need improvements according to transportation analysis conducted for this proposal. Analysis results (Appendix F)

Jefferson County Fire Protection District \#1 currently provides service for the area and will continue to do so. Public safety responsibility for the area vill be transferred from the County to the City. In terms of parks and recreation, there are two parks and a middle school close to the site, and the Yarrow Master Plan, which includes and surrounds the east site, includes the $30 \%$ of parks and open space required by local code (MZO Section $3.12(\mathrm{D})(4))$.

The proposal area is in the Jefferson County School District 509-J. This application is driven, in part, by the need for a new elementary school in Madras in the next 10-20 years, as determined in the 2009 Long Range Facility Plan (Appendix C). The east site will be able to accommodate both school and residential uses once it is annexed and zoned R-2 as proposed. Pursuant to ORS 195.110, the facility plan needs to be approved as an element of the Jefferson County and Madras Comprehensive Plans now that it has been adopted by the District Board.

As addressed in the previous section of this report, the application complies with the applicable policies of the Madras Comprehensive Plan.

## SECTION 7.4: ANNEXATION CRITERIA. Lands may be annexed only if the City Council finds that the following criteria are met: <br> A. The property is contiguous to the City limits. <br> B. The property is located within the City's Urban Growth Boundary. <br> C. The annexation meets at least one of the following purposes:

[^87]45

1. To serve lands needing City water or sewer to alleviate a present or potential health hazard; or
2. To provide land to accommodate future urban development; or
3. To provide land for provision of needed transportation or utility facilities; or
4. To ensure that lands adjacent to the City are developed in a manner consistent with City standards.
D. The petitioner has adequately addressed infrastructure supply and demand issues. The annexation is considered timely in that an adequate level of urban services and infrastructure can be provided upon annexation or a plan is in place for the provision of such services or infrastructure in a reasonable period of time.
$E$. The proposed annexation complies with the City's Comprehensive Plan. If the Comprehensive Plan does not control the annexation, or substantial changes in conditions have occurred which render the Comprehensive Plan inapplicable to the annexation, the proposed annexation complies with current Statewide Planning Goals. F. The City is capable of extending City services to the area proposed for annexation without negatively impacting existing systems and the City's ability to adequately serve all areas within the existing City limits.
G. The proposed annexation is compatible with the existing topography, potential for future land division, natural hazards and other related considerations.

Response: The proposal area is adjacent to the Madras city limits and is simultaneously seeking to be annexed to the Madras UGB and to the city. The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area provides land for future urban development, specifically for a needed school and housing as demonstrated by the Jefferson County School District 509-J 2009 Long Range Facility Plan (Appendix C) and the Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, 2007). The east site of the proposal area is part of the Yarrow Master Plan area that the City has approved and found to be consistent with City development goals and standards.

The proposal area can be served by water and sewer using existing water and sewer master plans and being financed by the City and developers of the sites. Ashwood Road on the north side of the proposal area is a County collector road and does/does not need improvements in order to serve the area. Transportation analysis results (Appendix F). Internal circulation and transportation facilities will need to be shown in future development applications.

## SECTION 8.2: ZONE/PLAN MAP AMENDMENTS

## A. Amendment to the Zone/Plan Map

1. Amendment to the Zone/Plan Map may be initiated by the Planning Commission, City Council, Community Development Director, Land Use Periodic Review, or by application of the property owner.
2. If the application is for a change of a quasi-judicial or legislative nature: a. the Planning Commission shall conduct a public hearing on the proposed amendment at its earliest practical meeting date after the proposal is submitted and shall follow the adopted rules for quasijudicial hearings;

[^88]3. b. the Planning Commission shall provide a recommendation to the City Council based on findings-of-fact;
4. c. The City Council shall hold a public hearing and review the recommendation of the Planning Commission, along with any public testimony on the issue. The City Council must take final action on an amendment request and amendments shall be made by ordinance.
3. An application for a zone change for land annexed to the city that is subject to an approved Master Planned Community Plan or an approved Area Master Plan may be considered as an administrative action per Article 9.3.
B. Criteria for Amendments: The burden of proof is upon the applicant. The applicant shall show the proposed change is:

1. In conformity with all applicable state statutes.
2. In conformity with the applicable Statewide Planning Goals; and
3. In conformity with the Madras Comprehensive Plan, Zoning and Land Use Ordinance, and policies; and
4. In conformity with an approved Master Planned Community Plan or Area Master Plan, if applicable to the underlving properties; and
5. That there is a change of circumstances or further studies justifying the amendment or mistake in the original zoning.

Response: This application is being initiated by the City Community Development Department/Director. Also pursuant to the terms of the UGAMA between the County and the City, the City forwarded the UGB amendment application and appropriate fees to the Jefferson County Community Development Department within five working days of being initially filed.

This application is subject to legislative procedure and will receive full review by the public, the City Planning Commission, and the City Council. Hearings by the Madras Planning Commission and Jefferson County Planning Commission will be held first jointly on February 3, 2010 and then separately on DATE and DATE respectively. The Madras City Council will review the City Planning Commission's recommendation at a hearing on DATE, and will forward its decision to the County Board of Commissioners for a hearing on DATE.

As demonstrated by the previous findings, the proposed comprehensive plan, comprehensive plan map, and zoning map amendments comply with applicable Statewide Planning Goals, State statutes, and Madras Comprehensive Plan policies.

## Findings:

- The City has followed procedures for providing notice and holding public hearings for the proposal. Notice was mailed to number and type/distance from sites] property owners on DATE. A joint City and County Planning Commission hearing was held on February 3, 2010 and then separate hearings were held on DATE and DATE respectively. The City Council and County Board of Commissioners heard the proposal on DATES and approved the proposal on DATES respectively.

[^89]- The City of Madras has initiated this proposal. It owns the east site of the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area and has an agreement with Jefferson County School District 509-J to exchange this land for land downtown upon annexation and re-zoning.
- The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area provides land needed for residential and public/semi-public uses, specifically for a needed school and housing as demonstrated by the Jefferson County School District 509-J 2009 Long Range Facility Plan (Appendix C) and the Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, 2007).
- All service providers - the City of Madras, Jefferson County, Deschutes Valley Water District, Jefferson County Fire Protection District \#1, Jefferson County School District 509-J - have capacity to serve the proposal area given: approval of the adoption of the Jefferson County School District 509-J 2009 Long Range Facility Plan as elements of the City and County Comprehensive Plans, implementation of existing water and sewer master plans, transportation improvements?, and financing from future proposed development.
- The east site of the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is part of the approved Yarrow Master Plan area, and the west site fulfills the requirements for an Area Master Plan. The set of proposed Comprehensive Plan, Comprehensive Plan Map, and Zoning Map amendments in this application comply with applicable Statewide Planning Goals, State statutes, and Madras Comprehensive Plan policies.

Conclusion: The proposed comprehensive plan, comprehensive plan map, and zoning map amendments comply with the relevant provisions of the Madras Zoning Ordinance.

| From: | Nick Snead |
| :---: | :---: |
| To: | "French, Larry"; "Mark Radabaugh"; "gloria.gardiner@state.or us"; "Ana Jovanovic"; |
| CC: | "Jon Skidmore"; "Tanya Cloutier"; "DJ Heffernan"; "Shayna Rehberg"; Mike Morgan; |
| Subject: | Supplemental Information to DLCD File \# Madras-002-09 |
| Date: | Wednesday, January 13, 2010 4:48:45 PM |
| Attachments: | DraftFacilityPlan_allchapters_Presented at 011110 School |
|  | Board mtg.doc |
|  | UGB amdmt Findings 011310 nick.doc |
|  | 10028Scoping.pdf |
|  | Site Map.JPG |
|  | UGB amdmt report v3.doc |
|  | 45 day notice of proposed amendment ADDENDUM memo |
|  | v3.doc |

To all,
I was contacted by Mark Radabaugh, DLCD, today where it was brought to my attention that information was missing from the 45-Day Notice of Proposed Plan Amendment submitted by DJ Heffernan of Angelo Planning Group on behalf of the City of Madras on December 14 th, 2009 . The intent of this email is to provide the missing information to make the Notice "complete" and also continue with the scheduled public hearings. There are a couple points I would like to make:

1. The documents attached to this email are in draft form and in most cases require approval from other organizations. That being said, we fully believe that any compliance issue identified by any participating organization can be resolved prior to the February $11^{\text {th }}$ Joint City of Madras/Jefferson County Planning Commission hearing.
2. Please note initial Notice submitted to DLCD on Dec. 14th, 2009 stated that the first evidentiary hearing would be in February 3 rd, 2010. That has been changed to allow the City and County Planning Commissions to meet jointly. They will meet on February 11th, 2010 at 7:00 PM at the Jefferson County Senior Center. Please be advised.

Additionally, the City of Madras has at great expense tried to follow all required local
and state procedural requirements. There has been a lot background work completed to date. As a result, I believe any issues can be resolved in a timely manner. Please note that I will be out of the office January $14^{\text {th }} \& 15^{\text {th }}$ and back in on January $19^{\text {th }}$. If have any urgent questions, comments, or concerns, please contact DJ Heffernan, Planning Consultant for the City of Madras at (503) 224-6974 or Jon Skidmore, Jefferson County Planning Director at 541-475-475-4462.

Thanks and have a good day!
"One may walk over the highest mountain one step at a time" -John Wanamaker-

Nicholas S. Snead
Director
Community Development Department
City of Madras
(541) 475-3388

Email: nsnead@ci.madras.or.us
Visit the City of Madras at http://ci.madras.or.us/
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## I. Proposal Summary

| File No.: | 081-004 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Legislative Sponsor: | Nick Snead, Community Development Director <br> City of Madras <br> 71 SE D Street <br> Madras, OR 97741 <br> (541) 475-3388 <br> (541) 475-7061 Fax <br> nsnead@).ci.madras.or.us |
| Planning Consultant: | DJ Heffernan <br> Angelo Planning Group <br> 921 SW Washington, Suite 468 <br> Portland, Oregon 97205 <br> (503) 227-3664 <br> (503) 227-3679 Fax <br> dheffernan@angeloplanning.com |
| Proposal: | - To amend the Madras Comprehensive Plan - to add a table that presents the City zones and County zones that correspond and are allowed under City comprehensive plan designations. (Table 3-1) <br> - To amend the Jefferson County and City of Madras Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Maps - to expand the Madras Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) to include 36.91 acres from the Madras Urban Reserve Area (URA); to annex 20 acres of City-owned land ("east site," Figure 4-1) to the City of Madras and apply City R-2, Multiple Family Residential zoning; to annex 16.22 acres of privately owned land plus 0.69 acres of land for County right-of-way ("west site," Figure 4-1) to the City and retain existing County RL, Range Land, zoning. |
| Location: | - West site: tax map of 16.91-acre west site (outlined), directly east of the existing Madras UGB, south of Ashwood Road (Appendix A) <br> - East site: survey map of 20-acre east site, east of the existing Madras UGB, south of Ashwood Road (Appendix B) |
| Legal Description: | West site: 11S 14E 7 Lots 101 (12.28 acres), 102 ( 0.69 acres for right-of-way), and 200 ( 3.94 acres), entire lots <br> East site: 11S 14E 7 Lot 100 ( 20 acres), parcel of lot <br> Legal description of Lot 100 parcel (east site): <br> A portion of Parcel 2 of Partition Plat No. 2002-12 as filed in the Jefferson County Clerk's Office, situated in the Northeast Quarter (NE 1/4) of Section |

Proposed Amendments to Madras Comprehensive Plan and
Madras and Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Maps

|  | 7, Tounship 11 Souttb, Range 14 East of the Willamette Meridian, Jefferson County Oregon, more particularly described as follows: Commencing at the Nortbwest corver of said Nortbeast Quarter, monumented with a 2 inch diameter brass cap, from which the Nortbeast corner of said Section 7 bears South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 2640.53 feet; thence South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ East along the North line of said Section 7 a distance of 599.997 feet; thence South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 40.00 feet to the Northwest corner of said Parcel 2 of Partition Plat No. 2002-12; thence continuing Soutb $0^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ West along the West line of said Parel 2 a distance of 40.00 feet to the South right-of-way line of East Ashwood Road and the True Point of Beginning of this Description; thence Soutb $0^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ East along said West line a distance of 935.13 feet to the Souttbeast corner of Parcel 1 of said Partition Plat No. 2002-17; thence leaving said West line South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 931.70 feet; thence North $0^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 935.12 feet; to a point on the Soutb right-of way line of East Ashwood Road; thence North $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ West along said right-of-way line a distance of 931.70 feet to the True Point of Beginning. Contains 20.00 acres more or less. <br> End of Desctiption. (Appendix B) |
| :---: | :---: |

## II. Introduction

## Proposed Map Amendments

The Madras Urban Reserve Area (URA) was approved by DLCD in July 2009, and was sized to provide urbanizable land for the next 50 years. Land from the URA is the first priority for inclusion in the UGB pursuant to ORS 197.298. The City of Madras is not currently in periodic review or evaluating its existing UGB for a 20 -year land supply. The City, however, has initiated this UGB amendment and annexation process in order to begin to meet the land need identified by the Madras Urbanization Study (April 2007) and the Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (August 2007), prepared by ECONorthwest. The studies found a need for residentially zoned land for housing and public/semi-public uses outside the existing UGB.

There are two parts to the proposed Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) annexation: the east site and the west site. The City of Madras owns the east site. This land is proposed for annexation to the Madras UGB and city limits and for re-zoning as City Multi-Family Residential (R-2), a designation that will allow for a multi-family and single-family housing as well as public/semi-public uses typically sited on residentially zoned land. The 20 -acre parcel is within the Yarrow Master Plan area.

In addition to the east site, there are another 16.91 acres of land in the proposed UGB and City annexation, referred to as the west site. The west site is comprised of three lots that provide County right-of-way, better connect the east site to the existing UGB, and contribute toward meeting the long-term need for residentially zoned land. The west site is privately owned and is not proposed for re-zoning at this time. Owners may apply for rezoning when they are prepared to file land development applications in the future. It is expected that the west-site land also will provide the same range of needed housing types and public/semi-public uses as the east site when re-zoning is approved. Both the east and west sites will be designated Residential on the Plan Maps if this proposal is approved.

## Proposed Text Amendments

In order to facilitate the transition of rural zoning to urban zoning in the urban growth area, text amendments are proposed for Section IV (Land Use Element) of the Madras Comprehensive Plan that identify county zones allowed on land that is designated for future urban use on the Comprehensive Plan map.

## III. Jefferson County and City of Madras Comprehensive Plan Amendments

Table 3-1 lists Madras Comprehensive Land Use Plan Designations and corresponding City and County zones that are deemed compatible. The table is needed because the Madras Comprehensive Land Use Plan map, which applies to incorporated and unincorporated properties, and the city's zoning map are one in the same. The table clarifies that unincorporated property may retain its county zoning when it is annexed into the UGB if the land is not immediately annexed into the city. Such properties may retain any of the listed County zones and be regulated under the County's land development ordinance consistent with adopted growth management policies and procedures that apply to all land inside the Madras UGB. When such land is ready for urban development, the owner may request city annexation and zoning that is consistent with the land use plan designation for their property. Practically speaking, the table simply allows rural zoning districts to be applied in the Madras urban growth area on an interim basis, even when the rural zone differs from the intended long range urban use for a subject property. The table does not alter anything in practice. County zoned properties that are inside the Madras UGB remain under county jurisdiction in all respects although they are subject to urban growth management policies and regulatory review procedures that have been jointly adopted by Jefferson County and the City of Madras. In this context, the conformity table serves as a zoning bridge between a property's planned urban future and its current unincorporated rural zoning.

Table 3-1 Proposed Table for Corresponding City of Madras Comprehensive Plan Map Designations, City of Madras Zones, and Jefferson County Zones

| Plan <br> Map <br> Label | Designation | Description | City <br> Zones | County Zones |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| R-1 | Single-Family <br> Residential | Land primarily for single-family homes, <br> including manufactured home <br> subdivisions, and for duplexes | R-1 | EFU A-1, EFU <br> A-2, RL, FM, <br> RR-2, RR-5, <br> RR-10, RR-20, <br> ERD |
| R-2 | Multi-Family <br> Residential | Land for multi-family housing to be close <br> to businesses and services and to buffer <br> single-family residential and commercial <br> uses. Manufactured homes and <br> neighborhood commercial uses are <br> allowed. | R-2 | EFU A-1, EFU <br> A-2, RL, FM, <br> RR-2, RR-5, <br> RRR-10, RR-20, <br> ERD |
| R-3 | Planned Residential <br> Development | Land for primarily residential <br> development that allows site design <br> flexibility to promote creativity and <br> protection of scenic and natural <br> resources | R-3 | EFU A-1, EFU <br> A-2, RL, RR-2, <br> RR-5, RR-10, <br> RR-20, ERD |
| C-1 | Corridor Commercial | Land for primarily motor vehicle-oriented <br> uses located along major roadways | C-1 | CC, ERD |
| C-2 | Downtown Commercial | Land for a mixture of smaller scale <br> businesses that supports redevelopment, <br> higher density, public spaces, and other <br> elements of pedestrian orientation | C-2 | CC, ERD |


| Plan Map Label | Designation | Description | City Zones | County Zones |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C-3 | Community Commercial | Land for primarily motor vehicle-oriented uses but on a smaller scale than Corridor Commercial | C-3 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { SC, CC, ERD, } \\ & \text { EFU A-1, EFU } \\ & \text { A-2, RL } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| NC | Neighborhood Commercial | Land for small-scale commercial uses in residential areas that includes public spaces and promotes transportation options | NC | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SC, ERD EFU } \\ & \text { A-1, EFU A-2, } \\ & \text { RL } \end{aligned}$ |
| I | Industrial | Land for industrial uses where industrial uses already exist in the city and in the Madras Industrial Park | I | EFU A-1, EFU <br> A-2, RL, FM, <br> PM, CI, IR, <br> ERD |
| O/S | Open Space | Land where parks, open space, or public uses already exist or is otherwise publicly owned | OS/PF | EFU A-1, EFU A-2, RL, FM, PM |
| A/D | Airport Development | Land adjacent to airport facilities for future commercial and industrial uses, particularly those that rely on air transportation | A/D | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EFU A-1, EFU } \\ & \text { A-2, AM, ERD } \end{aligned}$ |


| County Zones: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| AM | Airport Management |
| CC | County Commercial |
| CI | County Industrial |
| EFU A-1, EFU A-2, RL | Exclusive Farm Use Zones |
| ERD | Existing Rural Development |
| FM | Forest Management |
| IR | Industrial Reserve |
| PM | Park Management |
| RR-2, RR-5, RR-10, RR-20 | Rural Residential |
| SC | Service Community |

Figure 4-1: Proposed UGB Amendment and Annexation Area

| West Site: |
| :--- |
| - Taxlots 11S 14E 7101 |
| (12.28 acres), 102 (0.69 |
| acres, County right-of- |
| $\quad$ way), and 200 ( 3.94 acres) |
| - Privately owned |
| - Annex to Madras UGB |
| $\quad$ and city boundaries |
| - Proposed zoning: Retain |
| $\quad$ County RL (Range Land) |
| zoning |


| East Site: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | Parcel (20 acres) of |
|  | Taxlot 11S 14E 7100 |
| - | City owned |
| - | Annex to Madras UGB |
|  | and city boundaries |
| - | Proposed zoning: Re- |
| zone from County RL |  |
| (Range Land) to City R-2 |  |
| (Multi-Family Residential) |  |
| zoning |  |



## V. Conformance with Statewide Land Use Goals

## Goal 1: Citizen Involvement <br> To develop a citizen involvement program that insures the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process.

Response: The proposed amendments have been reviewed during a series of public meetings and hearings in order to allow for consideration by public officials and public feedback.

The Jefferson County School District 509-J ("JCSD" or "District") Board ("Board") was generally briefed by the Superintendent about the 2009 Long Range Facility Plan at the December 14, 2009 School Board meeting where the need for the updated plan was discussed. The draft plan was brought to them first for formal review at a Board meeting on January 11, 2010. After the School Board reviewed the enrollment forecast, location and conditions of existing schools, and future potential school locations, they adopted the plan on January 25, 2010.

The proposed Madras Land Use Element Comprehensive Plan amendment and amendments to the Jefferson County and City of Madras Comprehensive Plan Maps and Zoning Maps were presented and reviewed in a series of meetings in early 2010.

A public hearing was scheduled before the Madras and Jefferson County Planning Commissions (joint) on February 11, 2010. Notice of the hearing was published in the January 13, 2010 Madras Pioneer. The public notice published in the newspaper was also posted at the Madras City Hall, Jefferson County Annex, US Postal Service Office, and the Jefferson County Library 20 days prior to the February 11, 2010 Planning Commission meeting.

Additionally, property owners within 750 feet of the properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB were notified of the proposed land use action. Adjacent property owners were notified that the file was available for review at the Jefferson County Community Development Department at 85 SE "D" Street and that copies of any information would be provided at a cost of $.25 /$ page. The agenda for the Planning Commission was posted at Madras City Hall, Jefferson County Annex, US Postal Service Office, and the Jefferson County Library 7 days prior to the February 11, 2010 joint Planning Commission meeting.

As discussed above the City proposes to include four (4) properties that total 36.91 acres into the City of Madras Urban Growth Boundary. This constitutes a potential "land use change" that would typically require notice to affected property owners. ORS 227.186 (Measure 56 notice) requires property owners to be notified of legislative acts relating to comprehensive plan, land use planning or zoning proposed by the City. Additionally, the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment is limited to the four properties identified on page 1. As such, a city-wide notice is not needed rather notice to the individual properties is required.

The City owns property, has a signed Consent to Annex agreement or a letter from a property owner acknowledging the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment that verify that property owners are aware of the proposed land use action and a Measure 56 notice is not needed. Specifically, the City holds title and owns Tax Lot 100 and therefore is aware and consents to the proposed re-zone to a portion of the property it owns that represents a "land use change" that may limit use. Additionally, the City of Madras has signed consent forms from the property owners of tax lots 101 and 200. Jefferson County owns tax lot 102 and has provided a letter acknowledging and supporting the proposed land use action. As such, a formal notice as required by ORS 227.186 is not necessary as the affected property owners are aware of the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment. More over, the ensuing annexation and re-zoning of 20 acres of tax lot 100 is limited to City owned property.

45-day notice to DLCD was sent to DLCD staff on December 14, 2009. On January 13, 2010 DLCD Field Representative, Mark Radabaugh, notified the City of Madras that the contents of the 45 -day notice was incomplete. Later that day, City staff submitted the requested information to DLCD making the notice complete. The materials submitted on January 14, 2010 are noted as the Addendum to the notice.

The UGB expansion area is drawn from the Madras Urban Reserve Area (URA), which was developed through an intensive participatory process. A Technical Advisory Committee (IAC) and Project Advisory Committee (PAC) were formed to provide guidance for the project. The TAC was comprised of staff from project team members, including Jefferson County, the City of Madras, ECONorthwest, Kittelson \& Associates, David Evans \& Associates, Ball Janik, LLLP, and Angelo Planning Group. The PAC included representatives of the City of Madras, Jefferson County, Jefferson County School District 509-J, local farmers, housing advocates, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Region 4, and the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD).

## Findings:

- According to both their Comprehensive Plans and code, the City of Madras and Jefferson County Planning Commissions serve as their official citizen planning committees.
- Adoption of the Madras Urban Reserve Area (URA) complied with Goal 1.
- Materials were made available to the public at Madras City Hall and the Jefferson County Community Development Department.
- Measure 56 notice was not issued as the proposed post-acknowledgment plan amendments are property specific and do not propose additional regulations to the properties proposed to be annexed and, in the case of the east site, re-zoned to Multi-Family Residential (R-2).
- 45-day notice of proposed plan amendments was sent to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) on December 14, 2009 prior to the start of hearings held by County and City Planning Commissions and legislative bodies. On January 13, 2010 the City of Madras provided supplemental information to DLCD vial email.
- Notices of the public meetings were published in the City's local newspaper, including contact information for the City and County.

Conclusion: The proposed text and map amendments comply with State requirements for citizen involvement per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 1.

## Goal 2: Land Use Planning

To establish a land use planning process and policy framework as a basis for all decisions and actions related to use of land and to assure an adequate factual base for such decisions and actions.

## Response:

## Proposed Map Amendments

The Madras City Council adopted the Madras Urban URA and related provisions in October 2008 and the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners in November 2008. DLCD acknowledged and approved the URA and related amendments in July 2009, with stipulations that some of the proposed amendments to the Jefferson County development code be modified. Pursuant to ORS 197.298, the first priority for land to be included in a UGB is land designated as an urban reserve. Therefore, the land in the Madras URA is the first priority for UGB expansion when there is a demonstrated need for land in the next 20 years, as was found by the Madras Urbanization Study and Addendum.

The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is currently zoned Range Land by the County. Upon annexation to the UGB and Madras city limits, City R-2, Multiple Family Residential, zoning is being requested for the east site. The west site is proposed to be annexed to the city and to retain its existing County zoning, but the land is designated for multi-family residential use on the Plan Map.

Land zoned Range Land has been included in the Madras URA to meet long-term land needs and because of sewer service advantages over other areas around the existing UGB and because exception land alone would not meet land needs for the city over the next 50 years. Land in Study Areas 3 and 4 of the Madras URA - east and southeast of the city consistently ranked highest in sewer serviceability analysis, including land in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation. Land in the URA is subject to joint management under the terms of the City's and County's Urban Growth Area Management Agreement (UGAMA) once it is added to the City's UGB. Response and findings related to the UGAMA are provided later in this report.

Local criteria are relied upon to prioritize land from the URA to be included in the UGB. Local criteria are found in Goal 14 (Urbanization) policies in the Madras Comprehensive Plan. The criteria require a Master Planned Community (MPC) plan or Area Master Plan (AMP), proposed urban zoning, an annexation program, sufficient public facilities, financing prospects, and protection for natural resources and natural hazard areas for the proposed UGB amendment area. Policy14J requires the following.

[^92]J. All land use applications or legislative proposals to expand the Madras UGB must be accompanied by information that documents the following:

1. The proposed urban zoning or land use program for the subject properties that address an identified urban land need;
2. An annexation program for all subject properties;
3. Evidence that public facilities required by OAR 660-011-000 that are necessary to serve the expansion area can be served either by system improvements outlined in adopted public facility master plans or by supplemental improvements that augment adopted public facility master plans;
4. Evidence that the proposed zoning or land use plan complies with requirements of OAR 660-0012-0060 either by demonstrating that planned improvements in the Madras Transportation System Plan (TSP) have capacity to meet transportation needs for the proposed expansion area or through supplemental transportation improvements that augment the adopted TSP to meet the need;
5. Evidence that providers of other crucial public facilities (e.g. schools, parks and recreation, emergency services and health care) are able to meet the projected demand for their services;
6. Evidence that financing for constructing needed public improvements is available so that the expansion area can be developed as planned within the planning horizon;
7. Evidence that development in areas subject to natural hazards are protected from these hazards;
8. Evidence that known or probable significant resources related to open space, scenic areas, historic places or structures, and fish and wildlife habitat will be protected from development impacts or have development impacts offset using appropriate mitigation measures.

These criteria are addressed later in the report section on the Madras Comprehensive Plan, Goal 14.

The Madras Urbanization Study (ECONorthwest, April 2007) and Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, August 2007) identify a shortage of residentially zoned land to meet single-family and multi-family housing needs and public/semi-public use needs in the next roughly 20 years The needed number of housing units and acreage for residential uses is summarized in Table 4-18 of the August 2007 Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (Table 51).

These needs are compared to the available land supply in the existing UGB in Table 6-4 in the study (Table 5-2) in order to determine whether there is a surplus or deficit of land for residential, public and semi-public, and employment uses. The table documents a shortage of land zoned R-2 (Multiple Family Residential) and land zoned R-1 (Single Family Residential) inside the existing UGB as well as a need for roughly 350 acres of public and semi-public uses over the course of the next 15-20 years. These public/semi-public uses tend to be related to residential uses and are typically allowed and sited on residentially zoned land.

[^93]The proposed UGB amendment addresses part of the residential and public use land need presented above. Annexing 20 acres of the proposed amendment that are owned by the City (the east site) and rezoning it R-2 allows the City to fulfill its agreement with Jefferson County School District (JCSD) and provide land for a potential school site, which could address the need for a new school or replacement school as identified in the JCSD 2009 Long Range Facility Plan. The remainder of the land need identified in the urbanization studies will be addressed during the City's next cycle of periodic review.

Table 5-1: Housing Needs, Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, August 2007)

Table 4-18. Forecast of needed housing units and residential land, Madras, 2007-2027 and 2007-2057

| Housing Type | New DU | Percent | Density (DU/net res ac) | Net Res. Acres | Net to <br> Gross <br> Factor | Gross Res. Acres | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Density } \\ \text { (DU/gross } \\ \text { res ac) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Needed Units, 2007-2027 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-family types |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-family detached | 1,791 | 61\% | 4.8 | 373.1 | 25\% | 497.5 | 3.6 |
| Manumactured | 206 | 7\% | 5.5 | 37.4 | 25\% | 49.3 | 4.1 |
| Condortownhomes | 206 | 7\% | 9.0 | 22.8 | 15\% | 26.9 | 7.7 |
| Subiotal | 2,202 | 75\% | 5.4 | 410.5 |  | 574.2 | 3.8 |
| Multi-family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Muitifamily | 734 | 25\% | 14.0 | 52.4 | 15\% | 61.7 | 11.9 |
| Subtotal | 734 | 25\% | 14.0 | 52.4 |  | 61.7 | 11.9 |
| Total | 2.936 | 100\% | 6.3 | 462.9 |  | 635.8 | 4.6 |
| Needed Units, 2007-2057 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-family types |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-family detached | 5,516 | 61\% | 4.8 | 1,449,1 | 25\% | 1,532,1 | 3.5 |
| Manufactured | 633 | 7\% | 5.5 | 115.1 | 20\% | 143.8 | 4.4 |
| Condortownhomes | 633 | 7\% | 9.0 | 70.3 | 15\% | 82.7 | 7.7 |
| Sultotal | 6,781 | 75\% | 5.4 | 1,334.5 |  | 1,758.7 | 3.9 |
| Multi-family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Multifamily | 2,260 | 25\% | 14.0 | 151.5 | 1036 | 179.4 | 12.5 |
| Subiotal | 2,260 | 25\% | 14.0 | 161.5 |  | 179.4 | 12.6 |
| Total | 9,042 | 100\% | 6.3 | 1,495.9 |  | 1,938.1 | 4.7 |

Source: ECONorhwest
Hote: Gross acres calcu'ated by dividing net acres by (1-net to gross fector). For example, for singl--fanily dslached, $477.1(1-75)=636.1$. Comversely, $635.1 \times .75=477.1$.

Table 5-2. Land Needs, Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, August 2007)

Table 6-4. Comparison of land supply and demand, Madras UGB, 2007-2027 and 2007-2057

| Plan Designation | Land Demand |  | Supply 2007 | Surplus (deficit) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2007-2027 | 2007-2057 |  | 2007-2027 | 2007-2057 |
| Residential |  |  |  |  |  |
| R-1 | 451.9 | 1,355.7 | 398.1 | (53.8) | (957.6) |
| $\mathrm{R}-2$ | 46.1 | 136.2 | 23.5 | (22.5) | (114.6) |
| $\mathrm{R}-3$ | 148.0 | 444.0 | 242.8 | 94.8 | (201.2) |
| RRE | 0.0 | 0.0 | 32.7 | 32.7 | 32.7 |
| RR10 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 47.5 | 47.5 | 47.5 |
| RL | 0.0 | 0.0 | 38.7 | 38.7 | 38.7 |
| Public/Semi-pullic uses on res land | 358.3 | 770.7 | 0.0 | (358.3) | (770.7) |
| Sulbtotal (Residential) | 1,004,2 | 2,708.6 | 783.3 | (220.9) | (1,925,3) |
| Commercial (Retail \& Services) |  |  |  |  |  |
| C-1 | 230.6 | 758.1 | 80.2 | (150.4) | (677.9) |
| NC | 23.6 | 90.4 | 4.9 | (23.7) | (85.4) |
| CC | 0 | 0 | 32.6 | 32.6 | 32.6 |
| Subtotal Commercial | 259.2 | 848.5 | 117.7 | (141.5) | (730.8) |
| Inclustrial |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 251.4 | 749.9 | 296.9 | 45.5 | (452.9) |

Notes: a'l public and semi-pubic and needs were allocated to residential zones

## Proposed Text Amendments

As discussed above, the proposed UGB amendment and annexation is based on the buildable lands inventory and needs analysis performed by ECONorthwest in 2007 and for the Madras URA. The proposed table of corresponding City land use designations and City and County zones (Table 3-1) is proposed to facilitate the transition of land from rural to urban and the annexation of land in the URA to the Madras UGB and city limits.

## Findings:

- The proposed UGB amendment and annexation is drawn from land in the adopted Madras URA, which is the first priority land to be included in the UGB pursuant to state statute.
- The east site and west site are currently zoned Range Land by the County. Range land was included in the Madras URA because of sewer service advantages it had over other land surrounding the UGB and because including only exception land in the URA would not have provided enough land for the projected growth needs of the next approximately 50 years.
- The proposed annexation area meets some of the need for residentially zoned land outside the existing UGB over the next 20 years, as established in the 2007 Madras Urbanization Study and addendum. The studies found the need for more than 200 acres of land for housing and related public/semi-public uses.

Conclusion: The proposed map and text amendments comply with State requirements for land use planning per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 2.
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## Goal 3: Agricultural Lands

To preserve and maintain agricultural lands.
Response: The entire Madras URA includes land zoned for rural residential, range land, and agricultural uses, as shown in Table 5-3.

Table 5-3: Exception and Resource Land in the Madras URA

| Land Type | Zones | Acres |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Exception Land | RR2, RR5, RR10 <br> (Rural Residential) | 1,709 |
| Non-prime Resource Land | RL <br> (Range Land) | 2,038 |
| Prime Resource Land | A1 <br> (Agricultural) | 68 |
|  | Total | 3,815 |

Prime agricultural land makes up less than $2 \%$ of the total URA. When prime agricultural land is included, it is only when it is adjacent to the existing UGB, surrounded by exception land or non-prime resource land, and/or will be more easily served with public facilities sewer service, in particular. The rest of the URA is comprised of rural residential and range land. Rangeland was included in the URA because of serviceability advantages it has over other land surrounding the Madras UGB and because all the exception (rural residential) land adjacent to the Madras UGB would not fulfill the city's estimated land needs for the next 50 years.

The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is currently zoned Range Land by the County. Upon annexation to the UGB and Madras city limits, City R-2, Multiple Family Residential, zoning is being requested for the east site. The west site is proposed to be annexed to the city and to retain its existing County zoning, but the land is designated for multi-family residential use on the Plan Map.

As explained above, land zoned Range Land has been included in the Madras URA to meet land needs and because of sewer service advantages over other areas around the existing UGB and because exception land alone would not meet land needs for the city over the next 50 years. Land in Study Areas 3 and 4 of the URA consistently ranked highest in sewer serviceability analysis, including land in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation.

Pursuant to ORS 197.298(a), the first priority of land to be included in the UGB is land in a URA. Beyond that, local criteria can be relied upon to prioritize land from the URA to be included in the UGB. Local criteria are found in Goal 14 (Urbanization) policies in the Madras Comprehensive Plan. The criteria require a Master Planned Community (MPC) plan or Area Master Plan (AMP), proposed urban zoning, an annexation program, sufficient public facilities, financing prospects, and protection for natural resources and natural hazard areas for the proposed UGB amendment area. These policies are addressed in more detail in the response and findings for Madras Comprehensive Plan Goal 14.

Land in the URA is subject to joint management under the terms of the City's and County's Urban Growth Area Management Agreement (UGAMA) once it is added to the City's UGB. Response and findings related to the UGAMA are provided later in this report.

## Findings:

- The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is land from the Madras URA, top priority land for inclusion in the UGB pursuant to ORS 197.298(a).
- Some of the non-prime resource land (zoned Range Land) is easier to serve with sewer than other areas around the existing Madras UGB, based on public facility analysis done during the development of the URA. Land in Study Areas 3 and 4 of the URA consistently ranked highest in sewer serviceability analysis, including land in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation.

Conclusion: The proposed map amendments comply with State requirements for agricultural lands per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 3.

## Goal 5: Natural Resources, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Open Spaces

To protect natural resources and conserve scenic and historic areas and open spaces.
Response: The land being proposed for inclusion in the Madras UGB is currently located within the Madras URA, jointly managed by Jefferson County and the City of Madras pursuant to the terms of the Urban Reserve Area Management Agreement (URAMA), adopted in January 2009 (Appendix C). Pursuant to the URAMA, the County processes land use decisions in the URA. In addition, conversion plans must be submitted to the City for land divisions in the URA.

Madras Comprehensive Plan policy language regarding protection of open space, scenic, wildlife, and cultural resources was adopted as part of amendments to Goal 14 (Urbanization) concurrent with the adoption of the Madras URA.

> J. All land use applications or legislative proposals to expand the Madras UGB must be accompanied by information that documents the following:
> 8. Evidence that known or probable significant resources related to open space, scenic areas, historic places or structures, and fish and wildlife habitat will be protected from development impacts or have development impacts offset using appropriate mitigation measures.

The land in the proposal does not include floodways, floodplains, significant habitat, or cultural resources that are identified in the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan, Goal 5 inventory, or Jefferson County Geographic Information System (GIS) files. The only resources cited in Policy 14 J ( 8 ) that may apply to the site are open spaces. Open space will be a required part of school or multi-family residential development that occurs in the UGB amendment area. However, this proposal itself is not a development or entitlement proposal and, therefore, is not required to specify precisely where such open space will be designated.

## Findings:

- Recently adopted amendments to Goal 14 of the City's Comprehensive Plan require identification of protective measures for significant open space, scenic, historic, cultural and natural resources in proposed UGB expansion areas. The Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan and Goal 5 inventory does not identify natural, scenic, or cultural resources in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area.
- Open space designations will be made as part of development entitlement for the proposed UGB amendment and annexation.

Conclusion: The proposed map amendments comply with State requirements for open space, scenic and historic areas, and natural resources per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 5.

## Goal 6: Air, Water and Land Resource Quality <br> To maintain and improve the quality of the air, water and land resources of the state.

Response: According to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ) there are no federally designated air quality management areas or federally designated hazardous waste sites in the Madras URA. Of Environmental Cleanup Sites reported on ODEQ's website, there are no sites identified in the URA. ${ }^{1}$ Further, R-2 zoning is proposed for the UGB amendment area to be brought in to the city, allowing residential uses and other compatible uses. These uses tend to produce less noise, air, land, and water pollution than commercial and industrial uses, which typically manufacture goods, produce by-products, and generate more vehicle traffic.

## Findings:

- There are not federal- or state-registered environmental quality sites within the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area.
- The amendment and annexation area is needed and planned for residential and related uses, which tend to have fewer adverse air, water, and land quality impacts than commercial or industrial uses.

Conclusion: The proposed map amendments comply with State requirements for air, water and land resources per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 6.

## Goal 7: Areas Subject to Natural Hazards

To protect people and property from natural hazards.
Response: Primary potential natural hazards in Madras include steep slopes, floodway and floodplain, and wildfire. Statewide Goal 7 is reinforced in Madras Comprehensive Plan

[^95]policies (Goal 14) by requiring protection from natural hazards be demonstrated for proposed UGB amendments.
J. All land use applications or legislative proposals to expand the Madras UGB must be accompanied by information that documents the following:
7. Evidence that development in areas subject to natural hazards are protected from these hazards;

There are not steep slopes (slopes greater than $25 \%$ ), floodway, or floodplain land in the proposed annexation area. Fire protection service for the proposal area is currently provided by Jefferson County Fire Protection District \#1, and will continue to be provided by that district if the land is annexed to the city. Area in the district is subject to a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) that Jefferson County completed in 2005 in collaboration with the fire district and federal agencies.

## Findings:

- There are not steep slopes (slopes greater than $25 \%$ ), floodway, or floodplain land in the proposed UGB expansion and annexation area.
- Jefferson County Fire Protection District \#1 provides fire protection service to the proposed amendment and annexation area. The area is subject to the Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) developed and adopted by the County, the fire district, and federal agencies.

Conclusion: The proposed map amendments comply with State requirements for areas subject to natural hazards per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 7.

## Goal 10: Housing

To encourage the availability of adequate numbers of needed housing units at price ranges and rent levels which are commensurate with the financial capabilities of Oregon households and allow for flexibility of housing location, type and density.

Response: This proposal provides land for housing and related public and semi-public uses. The Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (August 2007) shows that there is a shortage of residentially zoned land inside the existing UGB for growth over the next 20 years (Table 5-2).

The proposed annexation to the Madras UGB and city limits addresses this need by including 36.91 acres of land from the URA for residential and public/semi-public uses. It is proposed that the east site be re-zoned from County RL (Range Land) zoning to City R-2 (Multi-Family Residential) zoning.

These proposed amendments are not part of a periodic review work program and the next periodic review process will ensure that the UGB does include enough land to meet all the land needs that are projected for the next 20 years as shown in Table 5-2.

Proposed Amendments to Madras Comprehensive Plan and
Madras and Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Maps

## Findings:

- The Madras Urbanization Study and Addendum found a need for residentially zoned land for housing and public/semi-public uses outside the existing UGB for growth expected over the next 20 years.
- The remainder of land needs determined by the urbanization studies will be addressed during the next City of Madras periodic review.

Conclusion: The proposed map amendments comply with State requirements for housing per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 10.

## Goal 11 Public Facilities and Services

To plan and develop a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban and rural development.

## Goal Requirements

Urban Facilities and Services - Refers to key facilities and to appropriate types and levels of at least the following: police protection; sanitary facilities; storm drainage facilities; planning, zoning and subdivision control; health services; recreation facilities and services; energy and communication services; and community governmental services.

## A. Goal 11 Planning Guidelines

5. A public facility or service should not be provided in an urbanizable area unless there is provision for the coordinated development of all the other urban facilities and services appropriate to that area.

Response: According to terms of the UGAMA between Jefferson County and the City of Madras, the City will be the primary service provider for land within its UGB, in particular coordinating police, sewer, stormwater, land use, recreation, energy, and governmental services. City urbanization regulations amended with the adoption of the Madras URA require either a Master Planned Community (MPC) plan or Area Master Plan (AMP) for UGB amendments in Madras for areas over five acres (Madras Comprehensive Plan Policy $14 \mathrm{I})$. Both MPC plans and AMPs must show "appropriate locations for transportation improvements, public facilities, protection for significant open space, scenic, historic, and natural resource areas" and how proposed land uses will integrate with existing development.

Transportation facilities are addressed in more detail in the response and findings for Statewide Goal 12 next in this report.

The adopted Yarrow Master Plan applies to the east site. This land is proposed for annexation both to the Madras UGB and city limits. It is also proposed that the east site be re-zoned to R-2 upon annexation so that it can provide land for uses such as urban levels of housing and related public/semi-public uses. These uses are similar to and compatible with surrounding development of residential and public uses. The east site is tangent to the existing UGB and is bordered by Ashwood Road, a County collector road, which lends itself to the extension of services from inside the existing UGB and city limits. Sufficient water
and sewer service can be provided to the east site given existing and planned systems, and this is documented in the service provider letters from Deschutes Valley Water District and the City of Madras Public Works (Appendix D).

Pursuant to Madras Comprehensive Plan Urbanization Policy 14 I: "An AMP shall demonstrate efficient use of land, zoning consistent with an identified urban land need, appropriate locations for transportation improvements, public facilities, protection for significant open space, scenic, historic, and natural resource areas." It is proposed to annex the west site to the Madras UGB and city limits. While it is also proposed that the site retain its existing County Range Land (RL) zoning until the owners are ready to propose development, the site is surrounded by land designated for residential and public/semipublic uses, and its future designation as residential allows housing and compatible public/semi-public uses that can be: "integrated with the existing urban development pattern." (Madras Comprehensive Plan Urbanization Policy 14 I (2)) Further, the proposed addition of a table showing Madras and County zones that correspond with Madras land use designations to the Madras Comprehensive Plan Section IV, Land Use Element (Table 3-1), will facilitate the transition of existing County zoning for the west site to appropriate City zoning.

The west site is comprised of three lots - Lots 101 and 200 that total 16.22 acres and are privately owned and Lot 102 that is 0.69 acres designated for County right-of-way. Lots 101 and 200 are both adjacent to Ashwood Road, a County collector, and will not require additional public roads for sufficient internal or local circulation. At the time of proposed development, proposed land division or planned development plans must show an internal circulation system that satisfies City code requirements and street standards. The west site is adjacent to the existing Madtas UGB and is bordered by Ashwood Road, which lends itself to the extension of services from inside the existing UGB and city limits. As with the east site, sufficient water and sewer service can be provided to the west site given existing and planned systems, as stated in service provider letters (Appendix D).

The County has not identified historic, scenic, or natural resources on the west site. City open space requirements for subdivisions or planned developments will apply to the site at the time of proposed development.

Finally both MPC plans and AMPs must have documented approval from a majority of landowners pursuant to Madras Comprehensive Plan Policy 14 I (3). Specifically, the City of Madras owns Tax Lot 100 and as the applicant, consents to the proposed UGB expansion to include 20 acres of 'Tax Lot 100 and the re-zoning of the property from Range Land ( RL ) to Multi-Family Residential (R-2). Tax Lot 102 is dedicated to Jefferson County for Ashwood right-of-way and consent for UGB expansion and re-zoning is not needed as inclusion in the UGB and re-zoning will not change how the right-of-way can be used. Consent from other landowners is provided in Appendix E.

## B. Goal 11 Implementation Guidelines

5. Additional methods and devices for achieving desired types and levels of public facilities and services should include but not be limited to the following: (1) tax incentives and disincentives; (2) land use controls and ordinances; (3) multiple use and joint
development practices; (4) fee and less-than-fee acquisition techniques; and (5) enforcement of local health and safety codes.

Response: The proposed land use designations and zoning for the annexation area - the east site and the west site - is appropriate for the type and level of public facilities and services that can be extended to the area. It is proposed to bring the west site into the Madras UGB and city limits but to retain its existing County Range Land (RL) zoning until landowners are ready to propose development. The site is surrounded by land planned for or developed as predominantly residential development. It is well situated for extension of urban facilities and services when they are needed. The proposed addition of a land use and zoning designation table to Section IV (Land Use Element) of the Madras Comprehensive Plan (Table 3-1) establishes the City and County zoning designations that correspond to City land use designations, and will guide the transition from County zoning to appropriate City zoning once a land use action is proposed.

It is proposed that the east site be re-zoned to R-2 upon annexation so that it can provide land for uses such as urban levels of housing and related public/semi-public uses. These uses are similar to and compatible with surrounding development. The east site is tangent to the existing UGB and is bordered by Ashwood Road, a County collector road, which lends itself to the extension of services from inside the existing UGB and city limits. In that vein, service providers have determined that sufficient water and sewer service can be provided to the east and west sites given existing and planned systems (Appendix D).

The east site is part of the approved Yarrow Master Plan, a plan that envisions a variety of housing and then an internal circulation system, open space, public uses (including a school), and a small-scale commercial area to serve the primary residential uses.

Once the properties are annexed into the city limits and developed, wastewater and domestic water services will need to be extended to each developed property. The property owner will fund the extension of wastewater and domestic water services to their properties. Extension of these facilities will be completed as required in the City of Madras Wastewater Master Plan and the Deschutes Valley Water District Master Plan.

As previously discussed, this proposal is not a development proposal that offers entitlements for construction. Subsequent to this land use action, the property owner will be required to obtain development approvals (e.g. Site Plan Review, Conditional Use, or Subdivision). Any development approval will require public facilities to be extended to the subject property at the expense of the applicant.

OAR 660-011-0010 The Public Facility Plan<br>(1) The public facility plan shall contain the following items:<br>(a) An inventory and general assessment of the condition of all the significant public facility systems which support the land uses designated in the acknowledged comprehensive plan;

(b) A list of the significant public facility projects which are to support the land uses designated in the acknowledged comprehensive plan. Public facility project descriptions or specifications of these projects as necessary;
(c) Rough cost estimates of each public facility project;
(d) A map or written description of each public facility project's general location or service area;
(e) Policy statement(s) or urban growth management agreement identifying the provider of each public facility system. If there is more than one provider with the authority to provide the system within the area covered by the public facility plan, then the provider. of each project shall be designated;
(f) An estimate of when each facility project will be needed; and
(g) A discussion of the provider's existing funding mechanisms and the ability of these and possible new mechanisms to fund the development of each public facility project or system.
(2) Those public facilities to be addressed in the plan shall include, but need not be limited to those specified in OAR 660-011-0005(5). Facilities included in the public facility plan other than those included in OAR 660-011-0005(5) will not be reviewed for compliance with this rule.
(3) It is not the purpose of this division to cause duplication of or to supplant existing applicable facility plans and programs. Where all or part of an acknowledged comprehensive plan, facility master plan either of the local jurisdiction or appropriate special district, capital improvement program, regional functional plan, similar plan or any combination of such plans meets all or some of the requirements of this division, those plans, or programs may be incorporated by reference into the public facility plan required by this division. Only those referenced portions of such documents shall be considered to be a part of the public facility plan and shall be subject to the administrative procedures of this division and ORS Chapter 197.

## OAR 660-011-0015

## Responsibility for Public Facility Plan Preparation

(1) Responsibility for the preparation, adoption and amendment of the public facility plan shall be specified within the urban growth management agreement. If the urban growth management agreement does not make provision for this responsibility, the agreement shall be amended to do so prior to the preparation of the public facility plan.
(2) The jurisdiction responsible for the preparation of the public facility plan shall provide for the coordination of such preparation with the city, county, special districts and, as necessary, state and federal agencies and private providers of public facilities.

Response: The Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) that implements Goal 11 is OAR 660011. The rule establishes requirements for the planning and provision of public facilities in Oregon. Pursuant to OAR 660-011-0005(5), a public facility "includes water, sewer, and transportation facilities, but does not include buildings, structures or equipment incidental to the direct operation of those facilities." Transportation facilities are addressed in detail in the response and findings for Goal 12 in this report.

The City of Madras is responsible for the planning and provision of sewer service in the proposed annexation area, and Deschutes Valley Water District (DVWD) for the planning and provision of sewer service in the area. The City and DVWD master plans for sewer and water provide an inventory and assessment of existing facilities, a list and map of planned projects, a timeline for their implementation, and a discussion of costs and financing mechanisms.

The City Public Works Director has submitted a letter that is included with this report (Appendix D) that affirms there is sufficient capacity in existing and planned sewer infrastructure to serve the east and west sites in the proposed annexation area. Similarly, the DVWD General Manager has prepared a statement that there is sufficient capacity in existing and planned water infrastructure to serve the proposed annexation area (Appendix D).

## Findings:

- Implementation of public facilities and services in Madras is primarily regulated by land use plans and ordinances and public facility master plans, which are elements of the City Comprehensive Plan.
- The City of Madras will be the primary provider of urban facilities and services in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area. The City will be able to coordinate service to the area with facilities and services already provided to adjacent land within the existing UGB.
- The approved Yarrow Master Plan applies to the east site and shows an internal transportation network and sites for housing and a school.
- The City of Madras Public Works Director and DVWD General Manager have provided letters that verify that there is sufficient capacity in existing and planned sewer and water infrastructure to serve the proposed annexation area.
- When development occurs on the properties to be included in the Madras UGB, the property owner will be responsible for cost to extend sewer and domestic water facilities to development.

Conclusion: The proposed map and text amendments comply with Goal 11 for public facilities and services subject to OAR 660, Division 11.

## Goal 12 Transportation

To provide and encourage a safe, convenient and economic transportation system.

## 660-012-0060

## Plan and Land Use Regulation Amendments

(1) Where an amendment to a functional plan, an acknowledged comprehensive plan, or a land use regulation would significantly affect an existing or planned transportation facility, the local government shall put in place measures as provided in section (2) of this rule to assure that allowed land uses are consistent with the identified function, capacity, and performance standards (e.g. level of service, volume to capacity ratio, etc.) of the facility. A plan or land use regulation amendment significantly affects a transportation facility if it would:

[^96](a) Change the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility (exclusive of correction of map errors in an adopted plan);
(b) Change standards implementing a functional classification system; or
(c) As measured at the end of the planning period identified in the adopted transportation system plan:
(A) Allow land uses or levels of development that would result in types or levels of travel or access that are inconsistent with the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility;
(B) Reduce the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility below the minimum acceptable performance standard identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan; or
(C) Worsen the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility that is otherwise projected to perform below the minimum acceptable performance standard identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan.
(2) Where a local government determines that there would be a significant effect, compliance with section (1) shall be accomplished through one or a combination of the following:
(a) Adopting measures that demonstrate allowed land uses are consistent with the planned function, capacity, and performance standards of the transportation facility.
(b) Amending the TSP or comprehensive plan to provide transportation facilities, improvements or services adequate to support the proposed land uses consistent with the requirements of this division; such amendments shall include a funding plan or mechanism consistent with section (4) or include an amendment to the transportation finance plan so that the facility, improvement, or service will be provided by the end of the planning period.
(c) Altering land use designations, densities, or design requirements to reduce demand for automobile travel and meet travel needs through other modes.
(d) Amending the TSP to modify the planned function, capacity or performance standards of the transportation facility.
(e) Providing other measures as a condition of development or through a development agreement or similar funding method, including transportation system management measures, demand management or minor transportation improvements. Local governments shall as part of the amendment specify when measures or improvements provided pursuant to this subsection will be provided.

Response: Reflecting Statewide Goal 12 and the Transportation Planning Rule, UGB amendment applications must provide the following pursuant to Madras Goal 14 policies:

> 4. Evidence that the proposed zoning or land use plan complies with requirements of OAR 660-0012-0060 either bv demonstrating that planned improvements in the Madras Transportation Svstem Plan (TSP) have capacity to meet transportation needs for the proposed expansion area or through supplemental transportation improvements that augment the adopted TSP to meet the need; (Madras Comprehensive Plan Policy J-4)

City R-2 (Multi-Family Residential) zoning is proposed for the east site of the UGB amendment and annexation area. The zone allows multi-family and single-family housing outright and then allows associated uses such as schools, libraries, and community centers conditionally. The minimum lot size for single-family housing is 7,500 square feet and for
multi-family 10,000 square feet for the first two units and 2,000 square feet per each additional unit.

The east site is adjacent to Ashwood Road, an existing road built to County standards as a collector road. Ashwood Road borders the site to the north and provides primary access and connectivity to the proposed lands. Ashwood Road serves the Deer Creek Correctional Institute and other rural uses to the east of the site. To the immediate west Ashwood Road serves Juniper Hills Park and the Jefferson County Middle School, and further west transitions into B Street and connects to US 97 and the City's downtown core. A recently constructed extension of City View to J Street connects the parcel to the southern City limits, and Bean Drive connects toward the northern portion of the City. Table 1 summarizes key characteristics of the existing roadway facilities (Appendix F).

The transportation analysis for annexing and re-zoning the east site to R-2 was based on the assumptions below. Given that schools generate more peak hour traffic than housing alone, two scenarios were developed for Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) analysis that involved both housing and a school. The difference in the scenarios represents the typical range of an elementary school site, 5-10 acres. ${ }^{2}$ The enrollment assumption roughly approximates the average elementary school enrollment in Jefferson County School District 509-J. A maximum housing density of 11.6 units/acre was derived from standards for lot and building size, parking, setbacks, and infrastructure for multi-family residential uses in the R-2 zone.

1. 5-acre school site - 174 multi-family units on 15 acres and a 350 -student elementary school.
2. 10-acre school site - 116 multi-family units on 10 acres and a 350 -student elementary school.

The analysis found that all the study intersections operate acceptably in the planning horizon ${ }^{3}$ with and without the proposed annexation and re-zoning of the east site, except the intersections of US 97 and J Street. These intersections exceed volume-to-capacity ( $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ) standards in 2025 with or without the proposed annexation and re-zoning. Because the proposal increases traffic at these intersections, even if minimally, the proposal is deemed to have a "significant effect"; it would further degrade the performance of the failing intersections.

Improvements for the US 97/J Street intersection have been included in an amendment to the Madras TSP and in the ODOT 2010-2013 Draft STIP. The improvements involve realignment of northbound US 97 onto Adams Drive and two new traffic signals at the new J Street intersections, and would allow the US 97/J Street intersections to operate within adopted $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ standards. ODOT has deemed these improvements to be "reasonably likely" in the planning horizon and, thus, no significant would occur with the proposed annexation and re-zoning (Appendix G).

## Findings:

- Transportation analysis for the east site of the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area assumed that the area would be developed with a combination of housing and a school. This was because there is the potential for a school to be located on the site and schools generate more traffic, thus creating a "worse case" set of scenarios for the analysis.
- Transportation analysis showed that all the study intersections would perform within adopted operational standards at the end of the planning horizon with or without the proposed annexation and re-zoning of the east site, except the intersections of US 97 and J Street. These intersections exceed adopted standards and the proposed annexation and re-zoning produce a "significant effect" on the intersections.

[^97]However, improvements for the intersections that are included in the Madras TSP and the 2010-2013 Draft STIP have been deemed "reasonably likely" to occur in the planning horizon, thus mitigating the proposal's significant effect.

Conclusion: The proposed map amendments comply with Goal 12 and OAR 660-0150060.

## Goal 13 Energy Conservation

 To conserve energy.Response: The east site of the UGB amendment and annexation area is part of the Yarrow Master Plan area. The master plan includes a range of land uses so that residents can meet many daily needs within the neighborhood. The plan designates land predominantly for housing, but for parks and open space, a school, other community services, and commercial services as well. This mix of uses will provide for these daily needs and reduce the need to drive outside the neighborhood to access these uses.

All public improvements within the Yarrow Master Plan area are required to be constructed to City of Madras standards, which includes the provision of sidewalks. The Master Plan also includes planned open space which will be accessed by a multi-use trail system that will connect to existing multi-use trails in the City of Madras. This supports the use of nonmotorized transportation and the conservation of fuel resources. This proposed UGB amendment and annexation does not provide all of the land needed to implement the master plan but provides part of it.

The west site is not part of the Yarrow Master Plan but will be subject to internal circulation and multi-modal standards when a land division or planned unit development is proposed. Like the east site, the west site is adjacent to Ashwood Road.

While water service was projected to be of similar cost to provide to all the study areas that comprise the Madras URA, there were differences in relative cost for providing sewer service given the need for pumping in some of the study areas. The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is part of a study area and a drainage area where no pumping or limited pumping would be required for sewer service. This minimizes the amount of energy needed to provide that service.

All residential development within the Yarrow Master Plan area are required be built to Earth Advantage/Energy Star standards and receive certification as stated in the Codes, Covenants, and Restrictions (CC\&R's) recorded for the development. Such requirement reduces energy consumption of each dwelling constructed in the Master Plan area and thereby conserves energy consumption which in part satisfies the Goal 13 requirements.

## Findings:

- The approved Yarrow Master Plan that applies to the east site of the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area proposes a variety of uses that will allow residents to take care of day-to-day needs without always having to drive out of the

[^98]neighborhood to do so. The plan also indicates multi-use paths and a continuous network of sidewalks to promote walking and bicycling. This supports fuel and energy conservation.

- Providing sewer service to the proposal area requires less pumping and, therefore, infrastructure, energy, and cost than other parts of the URA and other areas around the existing UGB.
- The CC\&R's recorded for the Yarrow Master Plan area require energy conservation by requiring future development to meet or exceed Earth Advantage/Energy Star standards.

Conclusion: The proposed map amendments comply with State requirements for energy conservation per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 13.

## Goal 14 Urbanization

To provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use, to accommodate urban population and urban employment inside urban growth boundaries, to ensure efficient use of land, and to provide for livable communities.

## (2) Orderly and economic provision of public facilities and services;

Response: The proposed map amendments respond to the need for more residentially zoned land as determined in the adopted Madras Urbanization Study and Addendum. The studies analyzed the potential for development inside the existing UGB and found that in addition to development that the existing UGB can accommodate, approximately 220 acres of land is needed outside the UGB for residential and related public/semi-public uses over the years until 2027. These studies provided the basis for the Madras URA and URAs are enabled by statewide rules that address orderly and efficient land use as well as an orderly and efficient process for amending UGBs when needed.

This proposed map amendment draws strictly from land in the URA, which is the first priority land to be included in the UGB pursuant to ORS 197.298 and Madras plan policies.

The proposed text amendments (Section III) contribute to orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use by clearly establishing the ways that Jefferson County and City of Madras zones correspond to Madras Comprehensive Plan designations.

Transportation, water, and sewer services are among the critical public facilities that must be provided for the proposed UGB amendment area. As discussed in the narrative and findings for Goals 11 and 12 above, these services can be provided to the UGB amendment area relying on planned capital improvements.

Transportation - Transportation analysis shows that all study intersections perform within adopted operational standards at the end of the planning horizon, with or without the proposed annexation and re-zoning of the east site, except for the intersections at US 97 and J Street. An analysis shows the performance of those intersections, as they are currently designed, exceed mobility standards with and without the proposed annexation and re-

[^99]zoning. Unless the intersections can be improved, the proposed annexation and re-zoning produce a "significant effect" on them by making worse an already failing condition.

Proposed improvements to the "J" Street and US 97 intersections are included in the Madras TSP. Those improvements also are listed in the 2010-2013 Draft STIP, in effect programming the necessary state resources for them. On that basis, ODOT has determined the "J" Street/US 97 intersection improvements are "reasonably likely" to occur in the planning horizon (Appendix G). With those planned improvements in place, the affect of the proposed annexation is mitigated and the proposal will not have a significant effect.

Water - During the development of the Madras URA, Deschutes Valley Water District (DVWD) reported that there would be no supply constraint for urban development in the URA. Significant expansion of the District's distribution system would be necessary to serve urban demand in each part of the URA, and the water service study found that the marginal cost differences between the URA study areas were insignificant. Existing and planned facilities will provide sufficient water service to the area, as confirmed by Deschutes Valley Water District in a service provided letter (Appendix D).

Sewer - Public facility analysis conducted in developing the Madras URA showed that sewer service to the eastern study areas in the URA would be more cost-efficient because no pumping or limited pumping would be required as compared to areas to the north, south, and west. For the proposed UGB amendment area, existing and planned sewer facilities will provide sufficient service to the area according to City of Madras Public Works (Appendix D).

## Findings:

- The proposed map amendments address the residential land need established in the Madras urbanization studies. It draws from the Madras URA, which is the first priority land to be included in the UGB when land need is demonstrated.
- The text amendments facilitate the transition between County zoning and City land use designations and zoning.
- Water service can be provided to the proposal area using the existing and planned water facilities that are identified in the Deschutes Valley Water District's water master plan. Providing water service was not found to be significantly different in cost between different parts of the URA in studies done in developing the Madras URA.
- Studies conducted for the URA found that drainage areas in the eastern and southeastern parts of the LIRA were easier to serve in that they needed no pumping or minimal pumping of sewage when compared to other parts of the URA. Sewer service can be provided to the proposal area using the existing City of Madras sewer master plan.
- Sufficient transportation facilities and service can be provided to the proposed UGB amendment area given "reasonably likely" construction of improvements to the intersections of US 97/J Street before 2025.

Conclusion: The proposed map and text amendments comply with State requirements for orderly and economic urbanization and provision of public facilities and services per Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 14.

## VI. Conformance with Oregon Revised Statutes (ORSs)

## ORS 197

197.298 Priority of land to be included within urban growth boundary. (1) In addition to any requirements established by rule addressing urbanization, land may not be included within an urban growth boundary except under the following priorities:
(a) First priority is land that is designated urban reserve land under ORS 195.145, rule or metropolitan service district action plan.
(b) If land under paragraph (a) of this subsection is inadequate to accommodate the amount of land needed, second priority is land adjacent to an urban growth boundary that is identified in an acknowledged comprehensive plan as an exception area or nonresource land. Second priority may include resource land that is completely surrounded by exception areas unless such resource land is high-value farmland as described in ORS 215.710.
(c) If land under paragraphs (a) and (b) of this subsection is inadequate to accommodate the amount of land needed, third priority is land designated as marginal land pursuant to ORS 197.247 (1991 Edition).
(d) If land under paragraphs (a) to (c) of this subsection is inadequate to accommodate the amount of land needed, fourth priority is land designated in an acknowledged comprehensive plan for agriculture or forestry, or both.
(2) Higher priority shall be given to land of lower capability as measured by the capability classification system or by cubic foot site class, whichever is appropriate for the current use.
(3) Land of lower priority under subsection (1) of this section may be included in an urban growth boundary if land of higher priority is found to be inadequate to accommodate the amount of land estimated in subsection (1) of this section for one or more of the following reasons.
(a) Specific types of identified land needs cannot be reasonably accommodated on higher priority lands;
(b) Future urban services could not reasonably be provided to the higher priority lands due to topographical or other physical constraints; or
(c) Maximum efficiency of land uses within a proposed urban growth boundary requires inclusion of lower priority lands in order to include or to provide services to higher priority lands. [1995 c. 547 §5; 1999 c. 59 §56]

Response: The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is solely comprised of land from the Madras URA, which is the first priority of land to be included within the UGB pursuant to ORS 197.298(1)(a). There is sufficient land in the Madras URA to provide for the land needs estimated for the next 20 years in the Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, August 2007) and presented below.

The proposed UGB amendment and annexation provides land to meet a portion of the need for residentially zoned land over the next roughly 20 years (Table 6-1). The City's next periodic review process will ensure that the Madras UGB includes enough land to meet the remaining land needs projected to 2027.

Table 6-1: Housing Needs, Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, August 2007)

Table 6-4. Comparison of land supply and demand, Madras UGB, 2007-2027 and 2007-2057

| Plan Designation | Land Clemand |  | Supply 2007 | Surplus (deficit) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2007.2027 | 2007-2057 |  | 2007-2027 | 2007-2057 |
| Residential |  |  |  |  |  |
| R-1 | 451.9 | 1,355.7 | 398.1 | (53.3) | (957.6) |
| R-2 | 46.1 | 138.2 | 23.5 | (22.5) | (1146) |
| R-3 | 143.0 | 444.0 | 242.8 | 94.3 | (201.2) |
| RR5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 32.7 | 32.7 | 32.7 |
| RR10 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 47.5 | 47.5 | 47.5 |
| RL | 00 | 0.0 | 36.7 | 38.7 | 32.7 |
| Public/Seni-public uses on res land | 358.3 | 770.7 | 0.0 | (358.3) | (770.7) |
| Subtotal (Residential) | 1,004.2 | 2,708.6 | 783.3 | (220.9) | (1,925.3) |
| Commercial (Retail \& Services) |  |  |  |  |  |
| C-1 | 230.6 | 758.1 | 80.2 | (150.4) | (677.9) |
| NC | 28.6 | 90.4 | 4.9 | (23.7) | (85.4) |
| CC | 0 | 0 | 32.6 | 32.6 | 32.6 |
| Subtotal Commercial | 259.2 | 848.5 | 117.7 | (141.5) | (730.8) |
| Industrial |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 251.4 | 749.9 | 296.9 | 45.5 | (452.9) |

197.610 Local government notice of proposed amendment or new regulation; exceptions; report to commission. (1) A proposal to amend a local government acknowledged comprehensive plan or land use regulation or to adopt a new land use regulation shall be forwarded to the Director of the Department of Land Conservation and Development at least 45 days before the first evidentiary hearing on adoption. The proposal forwarded shall contain the text and any supplemental information that the local government believes is necessary to inform the director as to the effect of the proposal. The notice shall include the date set for the first evidentiary hearing. The director shall notify persons who have requested notice that the proposal is pending.
(2) When a local government determines that the goals do not apply to a particular proposed amendment or new. regulation, notice under subsection (1) of this section is not required. In addition, a local government may submit an amendment or new. regulation with less than 45 days' notice if the local government determines that there are emergency circumstances requiring expedited review. In both cases:
(a) The amendment or new regulation shall be submitted after adoption as provided in ORS 197.615 (1) and (2); and
(b) Notwithstanding the requirements of ORS 197.830 (2), the director or any other person may appeal the decision to the board under ORS 197.830 to 197.845.
(3) When the Department of Land Conservation and Development participates in a local government proceeding, at least 15 days before the final hearing on the proposed amendment to the comprehensive plan or land use regulation or the new land use regulation, the department shall notify the local government of:
(a) Any concerns the department has concerning the proposal; and
(b) Advisory recommendations on actions the department considers necessary to address the concerns, including, but not limited to, suggested corrections to achieve compliance with the goals.
(4) The director shall report to the Land Conservation and Development Commission on whether the director:
(a) Believes the local government's proposal violates the goals; and
(b) Is participating in the local government proceeding. [1981 c. 748 §4; 1983 c. 827

[^100]Response: Notice of the proposed map and text amendments was sent to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) at least 45 days before the first evidentiary hearing on the proposal. Notice was sent to DLCD on December 14, 2009, which was more than 45 days before the first advisory hearing before the Jefferson County and City of Madras Planning Commissions on February 11, 2010. A notice addendum was submitted to DLCD on January 14, 2010. Further hearing dates have yet to be determined but DLCD provided comments on the proposal on January 29, 2010, more than 15 days prior to the final adoption hearing date.

DLCD comments address the map amendments. They call for a boundary locational analysis pursuant to OAR 660-024-0060 and a "reasonably likely" determination from OODT for the proposed 20 -acre rezoning. The locational analysis is not necessarily applicable because the proposed map amendment draws from an adopted and acknowledged URA. Part of the idea behind URAs is to create a 20 - to 50 -year reserve of land for urbanization all at once so that the process for subsequent UGB amendments can be streamlined. For cities or regions that do not have URAs, it is understood that the locational analysis established in -0060 would definitely be applicable and needed.

As to the "reasonably likely" determination, ODOT rendered an affirmative determination on February 2, 1010. DLCD comments acknowledge that the set of needed improvements at the intersections of US 97/J Street is in the current draft STIP. Including them in the final STIP signifies a financial commitment to the improvements and thus makes a clear finding for "reasonably likely."
197.626 Expanding urban growth boundary or designating urban or rural reserves subject to periodic review. A metropolitan service district that amends its urban growth boundary to include more than 100 acres, or that amends the district's regional framework plan or land use regulations implementing the plan to establish urban reserves designated under ORS 195.145 (1)(b), a city with a population of 2,500 or more within its urban growth boundary that amends the urban growth boundary to include more than 50 acres or that designates urban reserve under ORS 195.145, or a county that amends the county's comprehensive plan or land use regulations implementing the plan to establish rural reserves designated under ORS 195.141, shall submit the amendment or designation to the Land Conservation and Development Commission in the manner provided for periodic review under ORS 197.628 to 197.650. [1999 c. 622 §14; 2001 c. 672 §10; 2003 c. 793 §4; 2007 c. 723 §7]

Response: The City of Madras has coordinated with Jefferson County regarding the proposed map and text amendments. The amendments to the City and County Comprehensive Plans are post-acknowledgement plan amendments. However, the adoption process for the amendments will follow periodic review procedures pursuant to ORS 197. As part of periodic review procedures, the proposed amendments are subject to review by DLCD and approval by LCDC. DLCD and LCDC will conduct their review process upon adoption of the proposed amendments by the Madras City Council and Jefferson County Board of Commissioners.

## Findings:

- The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is entirely comprised of land from the Madras URA, the first priority of land to be included in the UGB pursuant to ORS 197.298(1)(a).
- There are 36.91 acres in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation. This meets some of the estimated need for residentially zoned land outside the existing UGB projected to 2027 by urbanization studies. The proposed R-2 zoning for the 20 -acre parcel (east site) allows housing and public/semi-public uses such as parks and schools. Other land needs for the next 20 years will be addressed during the next periodic review cycle.
- Notice of the first advisory hearing on February 11, 2010 was sent to DLCD on December 14,2009 , more than 45 days before the advisory and evidentiary hearings. A notice addendum was filed on January 13, 2010.
- The City of Madras and Jefferson County have coordinated this proposed set of amendments.
- This proposal is a post-acknowledgement plan amendment (PAPA) but will follow procedures for periodic review. DLCD review and LCDC approval of the amendment will be necessary for the proposal if it is adopted by both the Madras City Council and Jefferson County Board of Commissioners.

Conclusion: The proposed map and text amendments comply with applicable State requirements for urban reserve area planning, plan amendments, and UGB amendments pursuant to ORS 197.

[^101]
## VII. Conformance with the Urban Growth Area Management Agreement (UGAMA)

## 4. UGA ADMINISTRATION RESPONSIBILITIES

4.1. The City shall have responsibility for administration and decision making authority regarding all land use application within the UGB except applications for amendments to the UGB, as provided in Section 6.
4.2. The City shall have responsibility for annexation of land in the UGB. Lands outside the UGA shall not be annexed unless the UGB is also amended to include the territory to be annexed.

## 6. PROCESS FOR URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY AMENDMENTS

1.1 Amendments to the UGB, including amendments to the City's and County's comprehensive plan maps, may be initiated by the City, the County, or a property owner(s).
1.2 An application to amend the UGB shall be filed with the City Community Development Department along with the applicable City and County plan amendment fees. The City shall forward a copy of the application to the County Community Development Department, together with the County's plan amendment fee, within five working days of the date the application is filed.
1.3 The City and County Planning Commission shall each conduct a public hearing regarding the application. At their discretion, the Planning Commissions may hold a joint hearing rather than separate hearings.
1.4 The recommendation of the City and County Planning Commissions shall be forwarded to City Council, who shall hold a public hearing to consider the proposed amendment to the UGB. The decision of the City Council shall be forwarded to the County Board of Commissioners.
1.5 The Board of Commissioners shall conduct a public hearing and make a final decision on whether the UGB should be amended.
1.6 If the City and County disagree on the proposed amendments, a joint hearing of the City Council and Board of County Commissioners may be held to attempt to resolve the differences. Both jurisdictions may also request a dispute resolution process to resolve the differences.
1.7 If the governing bodies are not able to come to mutual agreement there shall be no change to the UGB.

Response: The Urban Growth Area Management Agreement (UGAMA) (Appendix H) was adopted by the City of Madras and Jefferson County on April 5, 2006. Pursuant to UGAMA terms for UGB amendments, the City is an eligible applicant for a UGB amendment application (Section 6.1). The UGB amendment application and appropriate fees were forwarded to the Jefferson County Community Development Department within five working days of being initially filed (Section 6.2).

Hearings by the Madras Planning Commission and Jefferson County Planning Commission were first held jointly on February 11, 2010. The Madras City Council and Jefferson County

Board of Commissioners held a joint public hearing on March 29, 2010 to review their recommendations from their respective Planning Commissions. On March 29, 2010, the Madras City Council approved the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments and forwarded it's recommendation that evening to the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners who then approved the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment. All of the public hearings before the Planning Commissions, Madras City Council, and Jefferson County Board of Commissioners were conducted in a manner consistent with the provisions of the UGAMA.

It is proposed to annex both the east site and west site to the Madras UGB and city limits, and it is proposed to re-zone only the east site at this time. Regardless, if both sites are brought into the UGB and city limits, Madras will assume land use administration and decision making authority for the sites pursuant to Section 4.1 of the UGAMA.

## Findings:

- The City is an eligible applicant for a UGB amendment application.
- Appropriate UGB amendment application materials and fees were forwarded to the Jefferson County Community Development Department in the prescribed amount of time.
- The proposal will be heard jointly by the County and City Planning Commissions and then separately by the County Board of Commissioners and City Council.
- Madras assumes administrative responsibility for any land annexed to its UGB and city limits.

Conclusion: The proposed map amendments comply with applicable local requirements for UGB amendments per the UGAMA between Jefferson County and the City of Madras, adopted April 5, 2006.

## VIII. Conformance with the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan

## Goal 14: Urbanization

Policy 1: Changes to urban growth boundaries, the establishment of new urban growth boundaries or urban reserve areas, incorporation of a new city, or annexation of land into a city which is not in an established urban growth boundary requires an amendment to this Plan and the Zoning Map. The following factors should be used in considering such proposals:
A. Demonstrated need to accommodate long-range urban population consistent with a 20- to 50-year population forecast coordinated with the cities;
B. Demonstrated need for housing, employment opportunities, livability or uses such as public facilities, streets and roads, schools, parks or open space;
C. Orderly and economic provision of public facilities and services;
D. Maximum efficiency of land uses within and on the fringe of the existing urban area.
E. Comparative environmental, energy, economic and social consequences;
F. Compatibility of the proposed urban uses with nearby agricultural activities on land outside the UGB; and
G. Priority of land as required by ORS 197.298. Non-irrigated parcels may be added to the UGB before irrigated parcels that are in the same statutory priority.

Response: The proposed change to the UGB fulfills some of the need for residentially zoned land outside the existing UGB as identified in the Madras Urbanization Study and Addendum. The urbanization studies found the need for approximately 220 actes of residentially zoned land - for residential and public/semi-public uses - over the next 15-20 years. This is land that was found to be needed outside the existing UGB once all residential land inside the existing UGB is built out. Although the stadies found a land need primarily for residential uses, employment and public/semi-public uses also were also determined to need land inside and outside the existing UGB in the next 20-50 years.

The studies were the basis for adopting the Madras URA, which the County adopted in November 2008 and DLCD acknowledged in July 2009. The proposed UGB and map amendments draw strictly from land designated as URA, which is the first priority land to include in the UGB pursuant to ORS 197.298. The proposed residential zoning and expected primarily residential uses are compatible with residential development on the edges within the existing UGB, and provide a similar buffer to resource land outside the UGB.

The URA is comprised of land that is classified as "exception" land as well as land zoned by the County as Range Land (RL). Range land was included in the URA because: exception land could not meet all the land needs of the next $20-50$ years on its own; range land is lower value resource land; and range land surrounding the existing UGB - particularly to the east and southeast - would be more easily served with sewer than other land surrounding the existing UGB

The ability to serve land on the east and southeast of the existing UGB and to urbanize land that is not parcelized like the exception land in the URA, as well as the lower resource value of the land, offer more land use efficiency and cost-effectiveness and fewer impacts on prime resource land than initially bringing other land in the URA into the UGB. This gives land on the east comparative advantages in economic, energy, environmental, and social terms.

Policy 2: The County shall cooperate with each city to determine where and when an urban growth boundary should be expanded.
2.1 Expansion of an existing urban growth boundary shall be in accordance with state requirements, including the priority of land to be included within the urban growth boundary. Non-irrigated land should have a higher priority for inclusion in the boundary than irrigated land.

Response: Jefferson County and City of Madras staff have closely coordinated the proposed map amendments, and the first evidentiary hearing for the proposal will be a joint meeting of the County and City Planning Commissions. The two jurisdictions also worked closely together to adopt the Madras URA in 2008.

The proposed map amendments comply with applicable Statewide Planning Goals, statutes, and administrative rules as demonstrated in previous sections of this report. The proposed UGB amendment is comprised of land from the Madras URA, which is the first priority for inclusion in the UGB pursuant to ORS 197.298. The land is not irrigated.

## Findings:

- The proposed UGB and map amendments provide some of the residentially zoned land that is needed outside the existing UGB in the next 15-20 years as found in Madras urbanization studies.
- The amendments draw only from non-irrigated land in the Madras URA, which is the first priority land to include in the UGB pursuant to state statute.
- Residential and related public/non-public uses will be compatible with residential development adjacent and inside the existing UGB, as it will with resource land outside the UGB that already borders residential uses just inside the UGB.
- The ability of the land in the proposed amendment area to be more easily served with sewer than other land in the URA or other land surrounding the existing UGB and to build more densely than developed exception land provides land use, energy, and investment efficiencies. Developing more efficiently and on low resource land instead of
high resource land also present social and environmental benefits when compared to other land surrounding the existing UGB.
- Jefferson County and City of Madras have collaborated on the proposed map amendments.
- The proposed map amendments comply with applicable Statewide Planning Goals, statutes, and administrative rules.

Conclusion: The proposed map amendments comply with applicable policies from the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan.

## IX. Conformance with the City of Madras Comprehensive Plan

GOAL 14 - To provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land ${ }_{\llcorner }$and to provide for livable communities.
[Paragraph amended by Ordinance No. 781, Passed by Council on December 12, 2006]

## POLICIES

A. The City, in cooperation with Jefferson County, shall establish an Urban Growth Boundary.
B. The City, in cooperation with Jefferson County, shall mutually agree to a management plan for the Urban Growth Boundary area.
C. The City, in cooperation with Jefferson County, shall establish an Urban Growth Boundary revision process to be utilized in a proposed change of the Urban Growth Boundary.
D. The City, in cooperation with Jefferson County, shall support adoption of an Urban Reserve Area boundary that, when taken together with land supplies in the Urban Growth Boundarv, mav contain up to a 50 -year supply of land for the City of Madras to support housing, economic development, public facility, recreation needs and other urban land needs.
E. The City, in cooperation with Jefferson County, shall give priority to land in designated urban reserve areas over other land when considering urban growth boundary amendments.

Response: The Madras City Council approved the Madras URA in October 2008 and the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners in November 2008. DLCD and LCDC received the URA proposal for review in January 2009, and approved the proposal - but remanded sections of proposed County Zoning Ordinance amendments having to do with use restrictions in the URA - in July 2009. The land in the proposed UGB amendment that is the subject of this application is land entirely drawn from the Madras URA, land estimated to be needed for urbanization over the next 50 years.

```
F. The City shall favor UGB amendments that involve land in locations that are suitable to address identified urban land needs in order to minimize buildable land supply shortages and address identified needs. Factors that will be considered when evaluating UGB additions include:
1. Existing and planned capacity of the transportation system
2. Existing and planned capacity of the city waste water treatment plant
3. Existing and planned capacity of the city sanitary sewer conveyance system
4. Existing and planned capacity of the Deschutes Valley Water District supply system
5. Impacts on schools, parks, and public safetv service providers
6. Impacts on future operating costs for public facilities and services
```

G. The City, in cooperation with Jefferson County, shall undertake an evaluation of the urban growth boundary land supply once every five vears or more frequently if certified population growth rates exceed $3.2 \%$ in three consecutive years. In the event certified population growth rates fall below $3.2 \%$ for three consecutive years, the City and County may agree to postpone the evaluation of UGB land supply for up to three years.
H. During years when a comprehensive UGB land supply evaluation is not scheduled, individual applications for adding property to the UGB shall be limited to requests of less than 40 acres. UGB amendment applications must demonstrate consistency with applicable Oregon statutes and administrative rules and be accompanied by information that addresses Policy 14-J below. Applications that involve more than 5 acres also must comply with provisions of Policy 14-I.

Q I. The City, in cooperation with Jefferson County, shall encourage the development of complete, livable communities that include characteristics such as: a variety of lot sizes, dwelling unit types and ownership types, open spaces and other recreational amenities, a mix of land uses, school and community facilities, connected streets, proximity to downtown and other employment centers, and development that is scaled to the pedestrian and creates a sense of place. New growth areas of more than 5 acres that are added to the UGB shall should be planned and developed in accordance either with a master planned community development plan approved under the city Master Planned Community Overlay zone, or an Area Master Plan. The City encourages Master Planned Communities as a means to meet city housing needs as explained in other comprehensive plan documents. It may be appropriate, however, for the city to add new growth areas to the UGB that are planned and developed in accordance with an approved Area Master Plan. A majority of property owners subject to a Master Planned Community, or to an Area Master Plan, must consent to be included in the plan.

1. A Master Planned Community (MPC) Overlay may apply to large multi-phased development projects where the master plan is intended to guide future development patterns and serves to regulate the site-development approval process. A MPC requires generous open space and amenities, and encourages efficient use of land and public facilities and services, a variety of housing types, innovative designs and complete pedestrian-friendly communities. A MPC shall demonstrate efficient use of land consistent with an identified urban land need, show appropriate locations for transportation improvements, public facilities, and the protection of significant open space, scenic, historic, and natural resource areas. A MPC must show how planned land uses will be integrated with the existing urban development pattern. Physical barriers, such as highways, tend to disrupt complete communities and livability because they disconnect areas from downtown and result in an auto-oriented environment of sprawl along highway corridors.
2. An Area Master Plan (AMP) is appropriate for land added to the UGB where the approval of future urban development is expected to rely on conventional urban zoning and the application of codified development standards and review procedures. An AMP mav be prepared for contiquous properties added to the UGB that are greater than 5 acres and are not subject to a MPC overlay. An AMP shall demonstrate efficient use of land, zoning consistent with an identified urban land need, appropriate locations for transportation improvements, public facilities, protection for significant open space, scenic, historic, and natural
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# resource areas. An AMP must show how planned land uses will be integrated with the existing urban development pattern. <br> 3. An approved Master Planned Community Plan or an Area Master Plan must include documentation that a majority of property owners support the conversion of land to the planned urban uses and also consent to annexation by the city of Madras using a voluntary annexation process that is outlined in the plan. 

Response: The total area under consideration is 36.4 acres, which is less than the 40 acre maximum established for interim UGB annexation requests. The east site of the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is part of the approved Yarrow Master Plan area. The plan designates land for predominantly residential land uses, which is compatible with adjacent development in the UGB, while also designating land for open space and park uses, community services including schools, and limited neighborhood commercial services. The conceptual plan also shows an internal transportation system that includes sidewalks and multi-use paths.

The east site is being proposed for both annexation to the UGB and Madras city boundaries. The site can be adequately served with water and sewer facilities given existing and planned facilities, according to the service providers (Appendix D). The site is not projected to have a significant adverse effect on surrounding transportation facilities given planned improvements for the intersections of US 97/J Street (Appendices F and G). Its proposed designation as Multi-family Residential is consistent with land needs identified in the 2007 urbanization studies and with residential zoning in the area.

Pursuant to Policy I-1: "An AMP shall demonstrate efficient use of land, zoning consistent with an identified urban land need, appropriate locations for transportation improvements, public facilities, protection for significant open space, scenic, historic, and natural resource areas." It is proposed to annex the west site to the Madras UGB and city limits but to retain its existing County Range Land (RL) zoning until the owners are ready to propose development. The site is surrounded by land designated for residential and related uses, and its future land use and zoning designation must allow for residential and compatible public/semi-public uses in order to show that land uses on the west site can be: "integrated with the existing urban development pattern." (Policy I-2) The proposed addition of a table showing Madras and County zones that correspond with Madras land use designations to the Madras Comprehensive Plan Section IV, Land Use Element (Table 3-1), will facilitate the transition of existing County zoning to appropriate City zoning.

The west site is comprised of three lots - Lots 101 and 200 that total 16.22 acres and are privately owned and Lot 102 that is 0.69 acres designated for County right-of-way. Lots 101 and 200 are both adjacent to Ashwood Road, a County collector, and will not require additional public roads for sufficient internal or local circulation. At the time of proposed development, proposed land division or planned development plans must show an internal circulation system that satisfies City code requirements and street standards. The west site is adjacent to the existing Madras UGB and is bordered by Ashwood Road, which eases extension of services from inside the existing UGB and city limits to the west site. Water and sewer service providers have attested that existing and planned facilities will be sufficient to serve the west site ( $\Lambda$ ppendix D).

The County has not identified historic, scenic, or natural resources on the west site. City open space requirements for subdivisions or planned developments will apply to the site at the time of proposed development.
J. All land use applications or legislative proposals to expand the Madras UGB must be accompanied by information that documents the following:

1. The proposed urban zoning or land use program for the subject properties that address an identified urban land need;
2. An annexation program for all subject properties;
3. Evidence that public facilities required by OAR 660-011-000 that are necessary to serve the expansion area can be served either by system improvements outlined in adopted public facility master plans or by supplemental improvements that augment adopted public facility master plans;
4. Evidence that the proposed zoning or land use plan complies with requirements of OAR 660-0012-0060 either by demonstrating that planned improvements in the Madras Transportation System Plan (TSP) have capacity to meet transportation needs for the proposed expansion area or through supplemental transportation improvements that augment the adopted TSP to meet the need;
5. Evidence that providers of other crucial public facilities (e.g. schools, parks and recreation, emergency services and health care) are able to meet the projected demand for their services;
6. Evidence that financing for constructing needed public improvements is available so that the expansion area can be developed as planned within the planning horizon;
7. Evidence that development in areas subject to natural hazards are protected from these hazards;
8. Evidence that known or probable significant resources related to open space, scenic areas, historic places or structures, and fish and wildlife habitat will be protected from development impacts or have development impacts offset using appropriate mitigation measures.

## Response:

Zoning and Land Use Designations (Policy J1)
The east site is proposed to be re-zoned to a City R-2 designation. This meets some of the need for residentially zoned land outside the existing UGB that is projected for the next 1520 years. Residentially zoned land will provide for housing and public/semi-public uses. This land need is documented in the Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, August 2007). (See Table 5-2)

The west site is proposed to retain its existing County Range Land (RL) designation until the time when further land use action and development is proposed. Existing zoning will allow only limited development, and appropriate future designations for the site will be City residential designations given that City open space and residential zoning currently surround the site.

When rezoning is proposed for the west site and for other land being converted from rural to urban, the proposed text amendments (Table 3-1) will assist and regulate the rezoning that will occur when changing County zoning to City land use designations and zoning.

## Annexation Program (Policy J2)

The City is the applicant for this proposal, and annexation program pursuant to Article 7 of its Zoning Ordinance is described later in this report.

Goal 11 Public Facilities (Policy J3) and Transportation Planning Rule (Policy J4)
Kittelson \& Associates has performed the transportation analysis needed to deem whether the proposed UGB amendment constitutes a significant effect on the transportation system. Given that schools generate more peak hour traffic than housing alone, two scenarios were developed for Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) analysis that involved both housing and a school. Using these scenarios in a TPR analysis, it was found that the increase in traffic did constitute a significant effect on the US 97/J Street intersections. However, given improvements included in the City's amended TSP and Draft 2010-2013 STIP, the effect can be mitigated and removed.

Public facility analysis for establishing the Madras URA ranked drainage catchment areas around the existing UGB for sewer service costs and serviceability. Of the six study areas that comprised the preliminary and then final URA, Study Areas 3 and 4 on the east and southeast consistently ranked higher than other areas. This can, in part, be attributed to proximity to the new South Wastewater Treatment Plant (SWW'TP) and being upslope of the plant. In particular, the proposed UGB amendment and annexation are is located in Catchment Area 180 and bordering on Catchment Area 179. These areas ranked $8^{\text {th }}$ and $12^{\text {th }}$ out of 60 catchment areas, making them among the more cost-effective and serviceable areas of the URA.

As was also determined during the URA public facility analysis, Deschutes Valley Water District (DVWD) found that there would be insignificant differences in providing water service to the different parts of the URA. Water supply in the region is adequate to ample. Similarly, existing and planned sewer facilities provided by the City will be sufficient to serve the proposal area. (See service provider letters in Appendix D)

## Other Public Facilities (Policy J5)

The east site has access to substantial park and recreation resources. Juniper Hills Park (County) and Bean Park (City) are nearby, as well as Jefferson County Middle School and its fields. The Yarrow Master Plan that applies to the site and surrounding land also designates open space and parks throughout the plan area.

The City reports that Mountain View Hospital and City public safety and emergency services are sufficient to provide services for the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area. The sites are served by the Jefferson County School District 509-J.

Financing for Improvements (Policy J6)
Financing for constructing the needed public improvements will be placed upon property owners. As demonstrated by the letters submitted by the City of Madras Public Works

Director and Deschutes Valley Water District General Manager, each respective utility has capacity to service the properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB To extend wastewater and domestic water services to the properties to be included in the UGB, each property owner will be responsible for extending services lines to their property, not with standing the requirements for annexing their property into the Madras city limits.

Similarly, the Oregon Department of Transportation has determined the proposed UGB expansion will significantly affect the US 97/J Street intersection but that the design concept is established, the City has implemented System Development Charges to partially fund the improvements for this particular intersection and in the Draft State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP) is funding for the intersection. With the design concept established and both funding sources identified, ODOT has determined that the US 97/ J Street intersection improvements are Reasonably Likely to Occur and therefore, impacts of the proposed UGB expansion are mitigated.

## Protection from Natural Hazards (Policy J7)

There are not steep slopes (slopes greater than $25 \%$ ), floodway, or floodplain in the proposed UGB expansion and annexation area. In fact, the proposed amendment and annexation are driven, in part, by the need to provide a school that is outside the floodway and floodplain of Willow Creek and its tributaries.

Fire protection service for the proposal area is currently provided by Jefferson County Fire Protection District \#1, and will continue to be provided by that district if the land is annexed to the city. The area is subject to a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) that Jefferson County completed in 2005 in collaboration with the fire district and federal agencies.

## Protection of Goal 5 Resources (Policy J8)

The Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan, Goal 5 inventory, or Jefferson County Geographic Information System (GIS) files do not identify floodways, floodplains, significant habitat, or cultural resources in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area. The only resources cited above that may apply to the site are open spaces. While open space will be a required part of public use or residential development that occurs in this area, this proposal itself is not a development or entitlement proposal and, therefore, does not specify precisely where such open space will be designated.

## Findings:

- Amendments to zoning and land use designations are planned and proposed. The proposed City land use designation is residential and City zoning designation R-2 (Multiple Family Residential). A need for about 22 acres of land outside the existing UGB zoned R-2 was determined in the Madras Urbanization Study Addendum.
- Proposed text amendments facilitate the transition from urban to rural zoning, from County zoning to City land use designations and zoning.
- Existing and planned transportation facilities - including improvements for the US 97/J Street intersections in the Madras TSP and the 2010-2013 Draft STIP, which ODOT has deemed reasonably likely - will allow the study intersections to operate
within adopted standards both in the case of the proposal area being annexed and rezoned and not.
- Existing and planned water and sewer facilities will be sufficient to serve the proposal area.
- The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area has access to nearby parks, a middle school, and a high school. Rezoning the 20 -acre east site to R-2 will allow for residential and public/semi-public uses there.
- Financing of wastewater and domestic water services will be placed upon property owners once the properties are annexed and developed in a manner that is consistent with the service providers facility plans.
- In terms of natural hazards, there are not slopes greater than $25 \%$, floodway, or floodplain in the proposed UGB expansion and annexation area. The proposed amendments and annexation are based, in part, on the need to provide a school that is outside the floodway and floodplain of Willow Creek and its tributaries. Fire protection service for the proposal area is and will be provided by Jefferson County Fire Protection District \#1.
- There are not floodways, floodplains, habitat, or cultural resources that are identified in the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan, Goal 5 inventory, or Jefferson County Geographic Information System (GIS) files in the proposal area. Open space will be provided pursuant to Madras zoning ordinance (MZO) in which $30 \%$ of a Master Planned Community must be open space (MZO Section 3.12(D)(4)).

Conclusion: The proposed map and text amendments comply with the relevant policies of the Madras Comprehensive Plan.

## X. Conformance with the City of Madras Community Development Code

City of Madras Zoning Ordinance

## ARTICLE 7: ANNEXATION

SECTION 7.1: PURPOSE - The purpose of this section is to:
A. Implement the policies of the City of Madras Comprehensive Plan;
B. Provide for City review of all annexation requests for a determination of the availability of facilities and services as related to the proposal;
C. Provide for dissemination of public information and for sufficient time for public review;
D. Provide for City and County coordination of a request for an annexation; and E. Provide for an expedited process by establishing procedures whereby the annexation and zoning, if applicable, may be considered concurrently.

SECTION 7.2: APPLICATION PROCEDURE. Annexation is a land use decision and is subject to applicable provisions of the City of Madras Comprehensive Plan, Oregon Revised Statutes, and Oregon Administrative Rules. In addition, the procedures below shall be followed:
A. The Planning Commission shall conduct a public hearing after notification of all property owners with two hundred fifty feet (250') outside of the boundary(ies) of the proposed annexation. The Planning Commission shall review the proposal for compliance with the annexation policies contained in this Ordinance and make a recommendation to the City Council, based on:

1. The annexation proposal which meets the application requirements; and 2. The Planning Commission shall conduct a public hearing to determine a recommendation to the City Council to approve, approve with conditions or modifications, or disapprove the feasibility of the annexation proposal based on the criteria set forth in Section 7.4 below; and
2. The Planning Commission shall state its recommendation and the reasons therefore in writing to the City Council.
B. Upon receipt of the Planning Commission recommendation, the City Council shall conduct a public hearing and consider an Ordinance declaring the requested lands to be annexed to the City of Madras.
3. The City Council shall review the record of the Planning Commission hearing their recommendation and shall determine whether to approve, approve with conditions or modifications, or disapprove the feasibility of the proposed annexation in accordance with the criteria set forth in Section 7.4 below.
4. The City Council may conduct additional public hearings to assist their making a determination.
5. The City Council shall state its determination and the reasons therefore in writing.

Response: The City of Madras sent public hearing notice to the surrounding property owners on February 1, 2010. The City and County Planning Commissions held their first public hearing on February 11, 2010 . The City Planning Commission decided upon a recommendation to approve the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment (10-PA-01) at its hearing on February 11, 2010 and forwarded it to the Madras City Council. The City

Council is held a public hearing jointly with the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners on March 29, 2010. The City of Madras has not provided notice to affected property and adjacent property owners, or noticed the public hearings for the annexation of 20 acres of the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment to expand the Madras UGB by approximately 36.91 acres.

SECTION 7.3: ANNEXATION APPLICATION. The petitioner for annexation shall complete an application form provided by the Community Development Department. The application fee, established by Resolution of the City of Madras City Council, shall be submitted with the application. The application shall include:
A. A map demonstrating that the proposed annexation is contiguous to the City Limits;
B. Specific information on each parcel within the proposed annexation area:

1. Current assessed valuation shown on Jefferson County Assessor's tax rolls.
2. Acreage of both public and private property to be annexed.
3. Map and tax lot(s) number.
C. Names and ages of all residents and list of registered voters in the proposed annexation area.
D. Addresses of all parcels within the proposed annexation area.
E. Consent to Annexation forms, provided by the City of Madras, with notarized signatures of all property owners and electors within the proposed annexation area. F. Written findings, which address the following:
4. Existing land uses within annexation area.
5. Existing zoning within the annexation area.
6. Existing improvements:
a. water system
b. streets
c. sanitary sewer
d. storm drainage
7. Special Districts within the area:
a. water districts
b. irrigation districts
c. fire district
d. school district
e. other
8. Urban services, the present availability of urban service systems to the proposed annexation area, their capacity and cost of extension and/or improvement to urban standards:
a. sanitary sewers - streets - parks
b. storm drainage - water
c. fire - power
d. schools - police
G. Compliance with all applicable policies of the City of Madras Comprehensive Plan.

Response: The City is initiating and applying for the proposed annexation. Maps of the west site and east site in the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area are included in this report as Figure 4-1. Parcel size and other parcel information is presented in Section I, Proposal Summary. The City owns the taxlot where the east site is located. The 20 -acre parcel that is being created from the taxlot has been surveyed. The west site is comprised of three taxlots, two taxlots that are privately owned and one small taxlot ( 0.69 acres) that is

County right-of-way. Re-zoning is not proposed for this site at this time as there are no immediate development plans. However, this site does better connect the east site to the existing UGB and will be suitable for residential uses and compatible public/semi-public uses, for which Madras urbanization studies have found a long-term need.

The property proposed to be included in the UGB amendment and annexed currently is vacant and not in active use. It is land under Jefferson County jurisdiction and zoned Range Land (RL). There are not water, sewer, or storm water facilities and services extended to the site yet, but they can be extended using existing City facility master plans. The Deschutes Valley Water District (DVWD) provides water service to the area and can provide facilities and service to the site, to be financed primarily by development applicants. The same is true for sewer and storm water facilities and service, for which the City of Madras is the service provider. As part of its agreement with JCSD, the City will extend water and sewer to the edge of the east site. There is an irrigation district in the region - the Central Oregon Irrigation District - but the proposal area is not irrigated nor is it proposed to be.

There is a County collector road - Ashwood Road - along the northern border of the area that will not need improvements according to transportation analysis conducted for this proposal. (See Appendix F)

Jefferson County Fire Protection District \#1 currently provides service for the area and will continue to do so. Public safety responsibility for the area will be transferred from the County to the City. In terms of parks and recreation, there are two parks and a middle school close to the site, and the Yarrow Master Plan, which includes and surrounds the east site, includes the $30 \%$ of parks and open space required by local code (MZO Section $3.12(\mathrm{D})(4)$ ).

As addressed in the previous section of this report, the application complies with the applicable policies of the Madras Comprehensive Plan.

SECTION 7.4: ANNEXATION CRITERIA. Lands may be annexed only if the City Council finds that the following criteria are met:
A. The property is contiguous to the City limits.
B. The property is located within the City's Urban Growth Boundary.
C. The annexation meets at least one of the following purposes:

1. To serve lands needing City water or sewer to alleviate a present or potential health hazard; or
2. To provide land to accommodate future urban development; or
3. To provide land for provision of needed transportation or utility facilities; or
4. To ensure that lands adjacent to the City are developed in a manner consistent with City standards.
D. The petitioner has adequately addressed infrastructure supply and demand issues. The annexation is considered timely in that an adequate level of urban services and infrastructure can be provided upon annexation or a plan is in place for the provision of such services or infrastructure in a reasonable period of time.
$E$. The proposed annexation complies with the City's Comprehensive Plan. If the Comprehensive Plan does not control the annexation, or substantial changes in
conditions have occurred which render the Comprehensive Plan inapplicable to the annexation, the proposed annexation complies with current Statewide Planning Goals. $F$. The City is capable of extending City services to the area proposed for annexation without negatively impacting existing systems and the City's ability to adequately serve all areas within the existing City limits.
G. The proposed annexation is compatible with the existing topography, potential for future land division, natural hazards and other related considerations.

Response: The proposal area is adjacent to the Madras city limits and is simultaneously seeking to be annexed to the Madras UGB and to the city. The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area provides land for future urban development, specifically for a needed school and housing as demonstrated by the Madras Urbanization Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, 2007). The east site of the proposal area is part of the Yarrow Master Plan area that the City has approved and found to be consistent with City development goals and standards.

The proposal area can be served by water and sewer using existing water and sewer master plans and being financed by the City and developers of the sites. Ashwood Road on the north side of the proposal area is a County collector road and does not need improvements in order to serve the area. Planned improvements for US 97/J Street are the only improvements needed in the vicinity in order to mitigate any potential significant effects associated with this proposal (Appendix F). Internal circulation and transportation facilities will need to be shown in future development applications.

## SECTION 8.2: ZONE/PLAN MAP AMENDMENTS

## A. Amendment to the Zone/Plan Map

1. Amendment to the Zone/Plan Map may be initiated by the Planning Commission, City Council, Community Development Director, Land Use Periodic Review, or by application of the property owner.
2. If the application is for a change of a quasi-judicial or legislative nature:
a. the Planning Commission shall conduct a public hearing on the proposed amendment at its earliest practical meeting date after the proposal is submitted and shall follow the adopted rules for quasijudicial hearings;
3. b. the Planning Commission shall provide a recommendation to the City Council based on findings-of-fact;
4. c. The City Council shall hold a public hearing and review the recommendation of the Planning Commission, along with any public testimony on the issue. The City Council must take final action on an amendment request and amendments shall be made by ordinance.
5. An application for a zone change for land annexed to the city that is subject to an approved Master Planned Community Plan or an approved Area Master Plan may be considered as an administrative action per Article 9.3.
B. Criteria for Amendments: The burden of proof is upon the applicant. The applicant shall show the proposed change is:
6. In conformity with all applicable state statutes.
7. In conformity with the applicable Statewide Planning Goals; and
8. In conformity with the Madras Comprehensive Plan, Zoning and Land Use Ordinance, and policies; and
9. In conformity with an approved Master Planned Community Plan or Area Master Plan, if applicable to the underlving properties; and
10. That there is a change of circumstances or further studies justifying the amendment or mistake in the original zoning.

Response: This application is being initiated by the City Community Development Department/Director. Also pursuant to the terms of the UGAMA between the County and the City, the City forwarded the UGB amendment application and appropriate fees to the Jefferson County Community Development Department within five working days of being initially filed.

This application is being processed pursuant to legislative procedures and will receive full review by the public, the City Planning Commission, and the City Council. Hearings by the Madras Planning Commission and Jefferson County Planning Commission will be held first jointly on February 11, 2010. The Madras City Council will review the City Planning Commission's recommendation at a hearing on February 11, 2010, and will forward its decision to the County Board of Commissioners for a hearing on March 29, 2010.

As demonstrated by the previous findings, the proposed comprehensive plan, comprehensive plan map, and zoning map amendments comply with applicable Statewide Planning Goals, State statutes, and Madras Comprehensive Plan policies.

## Findings:

- The City has followed procedures for providing notice and holding public hearings for the proposal. Notice to adjacent property owners was mailed On Februaty 1, 2010 to all properties within 750 feet of the properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB. A joint City and County Planning Commission hearing was held on February 11, 2010 and then a joint hearing before the Madras City Council and Jefferson County Board of Commissioners was held on March 29, 2010. The City Council and County Board of Commissioners heard the proposal on March 29, 2010 and approved the proposal on March 29, 2010.
- The City of Madras has initiated this proposal. It owns the east site of the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area and has an agreement with Jefferson County School District 509-J to exchange this land for land downtown upon annexation and re-zoning.
- The proposed UGB amendment and annexation area provides land needed for residential and public/semi-public uses, specifically for a needed school and housing as demonstrated by the Madras Urbaniqation Study Addendum (ECONorthwest, 2007).
- All service providers - the City of Madras, Jefferson County, Deschutes Valley Water District, Jefferson County Fire Protection District \#1, Jefferson County School District 509-J - have capacity to serve the proposal area given implementation of existing water and sewer master plans, planned improvements to US 97/J Street intersections, and financing from future proposed development.
- The east site of the proposed UGB amendment and annexation area is part of the approved Yarrow Master Plan area, and the west site fulfills the requirements for an Area Master Plan. The set of proposed map and text amendments in this application comply with applicable Statewide Planning Goals, State statutes, and Madras Comprehensive Plan policies.

Conclusion: The proposed map and text amendments comply with the relevant provisions of the Madras Zoning Ordinance.

Appendix A: West Site Tax Map (3 lots, 16.91 acres)

## Appendix B: East Site Legal Description and Survey Map (20-acre parcel)

Appendix C: Urban Reserve Area Management Agreement (URAMA) (January 2009)

## Appendix D: Water and Sewer Service Provider Letters

## Appendix E: Property Owner Consent Letters

Appendix F: Transportation Planning Rule Analysis (Kittelson \& Associates, January 2010)

Appendix G: ODOT Letter Regarding Reasonably Likely Determination for US 97/J Street Improvements

## Appendix H: Urban Growth Area Management Agreement (UGAMA) (April 2006)

Appendix A: West Site Tax Map (3 lots, 16.91 acres)


## Appendix B: East Site Legal Description and Survey Map (20-acre parcel)



63885 N. Hwy. 97 - Bend, OR 97701 ( 541 ) $382-4192$
December 16, 2009
City of Madras
Job\# 09077

## PROPERTY DESCRIPTION FOR A 20.00 ACRE TRACT OF LAND FOR SCHOOL DISTRICT 509-J

A portion of Parcel 2 of Partition Plat No. 2002-12 as filed in the Jefferson County Clerk's Office, situated in the Northeast Quarter (NË1/4) of Section 7, Township 11 South, Range 14 East of the Willamette Meridian, Jefferson County, Oregon, more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the Northwest corner of said Northeast Quarter, monumented with a 2 inch diameter brass cap, from which the Northeast corner of said Section 7 bears South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 2640.53 feet; thence South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ East along the North line of said Section 7 a distance of 599.97 feet; thence South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 40.00 feet to the Northwest corner of said Parcel 2 of Partition Plat No. 2002-12; thence continuing South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ West along the West line of said Parcel 2 a distance of 40.00 feet to the South right-of-way line of East Ashwood Road and the True Point of Beginning of this Description; thence South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ East along said West line a distance of 935.13 feet to the Southeast corner of Parcel 1 of said Partition Plat No. 200217 ; thence leaving said West line South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 931.70 feet; thence North $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 935.12 feet to a point on the South right-of-way line of East Ashwood Road; thence North $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ West along said right-of-way line a distance of 931.70 feet to the True Point of Beginning.

Containing 20.00 acres more or less.
End of Description.


Renews: 12/31/2009



Appendix C: Urban Reserve Area Management Agreement (URAMA) (January 2009)

## M-014-09

## Urban Reserve Area Management Agreement

This agreement is entered into by the City of Madras, an incorporated municipality of the State of Oregon, hereby referred to as the "City" and Jefferson County, a political subdivision of the State of Oregon, hereby referred as "County".

## A. RECITALS

WHEREAS, the City of Madras and Jefferson County are authorized pursuant to Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) Chapter 190 to enter into an Intergovernmental Management $\Lambda$ greement for the performance of functions which either governmental entity has the authority to perform; and

WHEREAS the City and County have previously entered into an intergovernmental agreement on April 5, 2006 setting forth their respective rights and responsibilities with respect to the Urban Growth Bounardy (UGB); and

WHEREAS, the Management Agreement also constitutes a cooperative agreement under ORS Chapter 195; and

- WIEEREAS the City and County consider it mutually advantageous to establish this Urban Reserve Area Management Agreement (URAMA) for the purpose of facilitating the future conversion of lands in the Urban Reserve Area (URA) from rural to urban land uses.


## B. INTENT OF AGREEMENT

1. To establish standards and procedures for review and action on proposed land use actions and related matlers noted within this agreement pertaining to implementation of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan and Zoning Regulations as adopted by the City and County for the Urban Reserve Area (URA); and
2. To affirm Jefferson County's jurisdictional authority for current planning activities, land use decisions, building permilting, public improvements, and code enforcement within the URA; and
3. To provide assistance to property owners in the URA by laying out a clear and cooperative process designed to make decisions on land use applications in a timely and consistent manner; and
4. To clarify plaming and zoning intents and to satisfy the requirements of OAR Chapter 660, Division 21 relating to Urban Reserve Areas.
C. DEFINITIONS
5. City: City of Madras.
6. Board: the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners.
7. Council: the Madras City Council.
8. County: Jefferson County.
9. Land Use Decision: A Land Use Decision is defined by ORS 197.015
10. Urban Reserve Area: has the same meaning as set forth in OAR 660-021$0010(1)$, and means land outside of an Urban Growth Boundary identified as highest priority of inclusion in the Urban Growth Boundary when urbanizable land is needed in accordance with the requirements of Statewide Planning Goal 14.
11. Urban Growth Boundary: The boundary line which separates lands to be urbani\%ed and eventually incorporated into the City of Madras from the surrounding rural lands under the County's jurisdiction.
12. Conversion Plan: has the same meaning as set forth in JCZO Section 105.

## D. AGREEMENT

Compliance with OAR Chapter 660, Division 21. In accordance with the applicable requirements of Chapter 660, Division 21, City and County agree as follows:

1. As required by OAR 660-021-0040(2)(e):
(a) The County shall ensure that conversion plans are required and processed as part of tentative land division decisions in the URA as outlined in the Jefferson County Zoning Ordinance (JCZO) Section 703.2(O).
(b) The County shall prohibit certain uses in the URA, including plan or zoning map amendments that allow a mimimum lot size less than ten acres as outlined in JCZO Section 323.3.
2. As required by OAR 660-021-0050(1):
(a.) Jefferson County shall have authority and jurisdictional responsibility for current planning activities, land use decisions, building permitting, and code enforcement within the URA.
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(b.) Upon inclusion of property from the URA within the Urban Growth Boundary, the property shall be subject to the Urban Growth Management Area Agreement.
3. Designation of service responsibility, as required by OAR 660-021-0050(2) is as follows:

| Service | Existing Service Provider | Future Urban Service <br> Provider |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sanitary Trash Disposal | No Public Service Provider | No Public Service Provider |
| Sanitary Sewer | No Public Service Provider | City of Madras |
| Water | Deschutes Valley Water <br> District | Deschutes Valley Water <br> District |
| Fire Protection | Jefferson County Fire District <br> $\# 1$ | Jefferson County Fire <br> District \#1 |
| Parks | Jefferson County | City of Madras <br> RecreationMadras Aquatic Center <br> District |
| Transportation | Jefferson County | District Aquatic Center |
| Storm Water | Jefferson County | City of Madras |

(a.) The local government or special district responsible for services (including sanitary trash disposal, sanitary sewer, water, fire protection, parks, transportation, storm water) for areas within the URA are designated and shown on the map(s) attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit " 1 A ".
4. As required by OAR 660-0210-0050(3), the terms and conditions under which service responsibility will be transferred or expanded, for areas where the provider of service is expected to change over time, is described in Exhibit " 1 B " attached hereto and incorporated herein.
5. As required by OAR 660-0210-0050(4), procedures for notification and review of land use actions to ensure involvement by all affected local governments and special districts:
(a) Within the URA, the County shall process all land use applications for comprehensive plan amendments, zone changes, and other applications affecting land use (including conditional uses, Planned Unit Developments (PUDs), subdivisions and partitions) in a manner that is consistent with the procedures set forth in the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance for the respective land use actions.
(b) Prior to acceptance of a land division application within the URA, the County shall require the applicant to submit a conversion plan to the City of Madras as outlined in JCZO Section 703.2(O).

$$
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The intent of the conversion plan is that it:

1. Is not an engineered plan.
2. May be amended fionn time to time by property owners submitting a new conversion plan to the City and County.
3. Does not constitute a separate land use decision, as it is part of a land division decision.
4. Must be recorded with the County Clerk so that future buyers of newly-created parcels in the URA will become aware, prior to purchase, that roads and utility easements will be required when the property is further developed after annexation.
5. Serves a guide to placement of structures in the building permitting process.

The City shall review the conversion plan and work with the property owner to ensure that the locations of planned roads and rights-of-way; and the locations of future easements for water, sewer, and storm water facilities that will adequately serve the site when developed at an urban density; are protected. The City may recommend that the conversion plan be approved, denied, or be approved with conditions.

Within 15 days of receiving a conversion plan for revicw, the City will forward its comments to both the applicant and the County, and the applicant is required to include the conversion plan and City comments with their tentative land division application to the County.

The County shall review the conversion plan as part of the tentative land division application, and approve, deny, or approve with conditions. A condition of approval for the land division decision shall be that the property owner record the conversion plan with the final plat at the County Clerk's Office.

The County agrees to consult conversion plans prior to building permit approval of structures in the URA, where applicable.

The City or County may charge a separate fee for review of conversion plans.
(c) Notice of all land use applications within the URA shall be sent to the City of Madras Community Dcvelopment Department and to any other affected City agencies and other applicable special service districts for review and comment prior to a decision by the County. Such agencies shall be given ten business days in which to provide comments on the land use application.

$$
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(d) In making its decision, the County shall consider all comments received under Section (c) above.
(e) The City, and agency, or any other special service district that provides comments on land use applications shall be mailed written notice of the land use decision and shall have standing to appeal the County's decision.

## E. AMENDMENT AND TERMINATION

1. This agreement may be amended at any time by mutual agreement of both parties, after public hearing and adoption by both the City Council and the Board of Commissioners.
2. Any modifications to this agreement shall be consistent with the City and County Comprehensive Plans, the Urban Growth Area Management Agreement for the City of Madras and the statewide planning goals.
3. This agreement may be terminated by either party under the following procedure:
a. Written notice of intent to terminate this Agreement shall be sent to the other party at least forty-five (45) days prior to taking any action, including the publication of public hearing notices in order to provide ample time for resolution of differences, or amendment to comprehensive plans.
b. A public heaxing shall be held by the party considering termination. The party considering termination shall give the other party at least 20 days prior notice of the scheduled hearing date. The 20 day period shall be used by both parties to seek resolution of differences. Both parties shall also request a collaborative conflict resolution process to resolve differences that remain.
c. Public notice of hearings shall be in accordance with applicable statutes and local ordinances.
d. This agreement is necessary for compliance with, at minimum, statewide planning Goals 2 and 14. Unless the Urban Reserve Area is no longer an overlay zone in the County, this agreement may not be termined without adoption of a new agreement.

## F. TIME OF EFFECTIVENESS

$$
M=014-09
$$

This agreement shall not become effective until properly executed by both the City and the County. Upon execution, this agreement shall supersede all previous Urban Reserve Area Management Agreements.

## G. SEVERABILITY

The Provisions within this agreement are serverable. If any section, sentence, clause or phrase of this agreement is adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, said invalidity shall not impair or affect the validity of the remaining portions of the agreement.

ADOPTED this $28 \frac{\text { Th }}{}$ of January, 2009.

CITY OF MADRAS, OREGON
$\frac{\text { Myefanci }}{\text { Mellanic Widmer, Mayor }}$

Date: $\qquad$

ATTEST:

Sores Alunenon-

JEFFERSON COUNTY, OREGON


Wayne Fording, Commissioner
Date: furman 28,2009



## 阶 $-014-09$

## EXHIBIT 1B

## URBAN SERVICE TRANSITION POLICIES

Tems and Conditions under which Service Responsibility will be transferred or expanded,
A. Special Districts. The City shall agree to the formation of any special district within the Urban Reserve Area prior to the approval of the formation of the district by Jefferson County. This provision shall not apply to County-wide service districts formed under ORS Chapter 451.
B. Service Expansion Plans. Service expansion plans shall be consistent with the Madras Comprehensive Plan. As the future provider of, sanitary sewer, storm water and potable water services, the City shall prepare, and from time to time, update utility expansion plans. These plans shall provide a basis for the extension of services within the Urban Growth Boundary, and as such shall be referred to Jefferson County for information and comment.
C. Transition Policies Relating to Service Responsibility

1. Sanitary Sewer Service. There will be no public provider of sanitary sewer seryice until City services are available, except in the case of a state mandate due to a health hazard. At the time of annexation, the City will require hook-up to City sanitary sewor services. There shall be no special sanitary sewer districts created in the Urban Reserve Area. Nothing in this provision shall limit the ability of individuals to provide septic services (i.e. septic sewer systems) on their own private property within the Urban Reserve Area.
2. Potable Water Service. The City of Madras and Deschutcs Valley Water District shall be the public providers of water in this area, unless new districts are expanded or created through mutual agreement by the City and the County. Nothing in this provision shall limit the ability of individuals to provide services on their own private property within the Urban Reserve Area.
3. Fire Protection. The Jefferson County Fire District \#1 provides fire protection services to property within the Urban Reserve Area, the Urban Growth Boundary, and the City limits.
4. Parks. Jefferson County provides parks services within the Urban Reserve Area. The City of Madras provides parks services within the city limits and the Urban Growth Boundary. The City of Madras will provide these services as park properties as they are included within the city's limits unless agreed otherwise.
5. Recreation. The Madras Aquatic Center is separate recreation district that serves Jefferson County.. The Madras Aquatic Center District will continue to provide aquatic recreational services when property is included in the City of Madras Urban Growth Boundary and city limits.
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6. Transportation and Strect Improvements. Jefferson County provides transportation services on county roads within the Urban Reserve Area. Upon annexation from the UGA, the City of Madras will accept all paved Jefferson County roads that have a pavement condition index ( PCI ) of 70 or above. If the PCI is below 70 , the county may structurally overlay the road to raise the PCl above 70 at which time the City shall be obligated to accept jurisdiction of such road. Jefferson County policies for road design and construction standards to be used in the Urban Growth Boundary and Urban Reserve Area are outlined in the Jefferson County Code, Sections 12,18.070 and 12.18.080. Per Jefferson County ordinances, the Jefferson County Public Works Director may require roads to be constructed to City of Madras standards.

The Oregon Department of Transportation provides transportation services on state highways within the Urban Reserve area. The Oregon Depariment of Transportation retains jurisdiction and maintenance responsibilities on all state highways after incorporation into the UGB and annexation except in special cases where jurisdiction is transferred to the City or County by a specific agreement.
7. Storm Water Management. Jefferson County provides public storm water management services to property where required within the Urban Reserve Area. The City will provide stom water management services to property within the city limits. Transition of public storm water management services will follow transition of road maintenance responsibilities.

## Jefferson County Code Section 12.18.070:

12.18.070 Roads within an urban growth boundary.

Roads within an urban growth boundary (UJGB) or urban reserve shall, at the discretion of the Jefferson County director of public works, conform to the design and construction specifications of the city contained within the UGB boundary and shall be subject to review and approval of that city's director of public works and the Jefferson County director of public works. (Ord. O-59-07 § 1 Exh. A (part), 2007: Ord. O-110-02 § 2 Exh. B (part), 2002)
12.18.080 Roads within one mile of an urban growth boundary.

At the discretion of the Jefferson County director of public works, design and construction standards and specifications for roads within one mile of a UGB may be modified to accommodate future reconstruction to city standards. Roads in zones contiguous to the UGB of Madras, Culver or Metolius may be required to be constructed in accordance with Section 12.18.070 of this chapter if, in the opinion of the director of public works, such roads would become connected to the city road system. (Ord. O-69-07 § 1 Exh. A (part), 2007: Ord. O-110$02 \S 2$ Exh. B (part), 2002)

## Appendix D: Water and Sewer Service Provider Letters


S.E. D Street, Madras, OR, 97741-541-475-3388

## MEMORANDUM

| Date: | January 26, 2010 |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Jefferson County Planning Commission <br> Madras Planning Commission <br> Jon Skidmore, Jefferson County Community Development Director |
| Cc: | Nick Snead, City of Madras Community Development Director |
| From: | Gus Burril, City of Madras Public Works Director |

## Overview:

The City of Madras (City) has filed a post-acknowledgement plan amendment application with Jefferson County to expand the current Madras Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) by approximately 37 acres and re-zone 20 of the 37 acres from Range Land (RL) to Multi-Family Residential (R-2) as shown in the attached map. To complete this land use action the City is required demonstrate that public facilities (i.e. wastewater, domestic water, stormwater, and transportation) can be extended to serve the area proposed to be included in the Madras UGB. The City provides wastewater and stormwater service and the properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB are located within the planning boundaries of the City of Madras Wastewater and Stormwater Master Plans.

## Wastewater:

The properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB are located within the study area of the City of Madras' Wastewater Master Plan. Figure 5-2B (attached) identifies a planned 8 inch wastewater service line to be constructed in the Ashwood right-of-way that would service the properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB. Additionally, the City constructed a 10 inch wastewater service line to Oregon Department of Corrections Deer Ridge Correctional facility in Ashwood Road adjacent to the properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB (see attached drawing).

When the proposed properties are developed, the City will require the property owner to extend wastewater service in accordance with City standards. Based on the planned improvements in the Madras Wastewater Master Plan, the existing wastewater facilities in Ashwood Road, the City of Madras has capacity to provide wastewater service to the properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB at the time of development.

## Stormwater:

The properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB are located within the study area of the City of Madras' Stormwater Master Plan. Figure IV-5 (attached) identifies a planned 12 inch
stormwater service line to be constructed in Ashwood Road adjacent to the properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB. Furthermore, Design Criteria (1) in the City of Madras Stormwater Master Plan in Section IV, requires"
"Any property development or redevelopment shall include stormwater facilities designed to handle runoff from all tributary areas for the 24-hour, 25-uear design storm event. The facilities shall limit the peak discharge from the development in a 24-hour, 25-year design storm to the estimated pre-development peak flow rate in a 24 -hour, 10 -year design storm."

Considering the planned stormwater facilities identified in the City of Madras Stormwater Master Plan and the existing stormwater design standards for development, the City has capacity to provide stormwater service to the properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB.

## Conclusion:

The City of Madras has capacity to serve the properties proposed to be included in the Madras UGB with wastewater and stormwater service. Should there by any questions, please contact me at 541-475-2622.

Sincerely,

Gus Burril, P.E
City of Madras
Public Works Director
71 SE "D" Street
Madras, OR, 9774
541-475-2622

## Attachments: Figure 5-2B Wastewater Collection System Phase 1B Segment 2 Wastewater Improvements Figure IV-5 Stormwater System Improvements





## Nick Snead

From: Edson at DVWD [edson@dvwd.org]
Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2010 11:15 AM
To: Nick Snead
Subject: RE: Domestic water service availability

Hi Nick-

DVWD should be able to serve that property. Naturally, the mainline upgrades and/or extensions would have to be paid for by the developer. When there is an engineered plan for the required infrastructure, I will be happy to do an estimate for the waterworks portion to be installed by DWWD.

Feel free to call if you need more information.

Edson Pugh, P.E.
General Manager
Deschutes Valley Water District
881 SW Culver Hwy.
Madras, OR 97741
Ph. \# (541) 475-3849

From: Nick Snead [mailto:nsnead@ci.madras.or.us]
Sent: Monday, January 25, 2010 8:45 AM
To: Ed Pugh
Subject: Domestic water service availability
Importance: High

Ed,

Good morning! You may have heard the City is proposing to expand the Urban Growth Boundary by approximately 37 acres and annex 20 acres into the City for the Jefferson County School District. The property proposed to be annexed is south of Ashwood Road. I have attached a map to quickly orient your to the property. I am wondering if DWWD domestic water service is available or if not, what facility improvements would future development be responsible for constructing? This email is a formal request and I would like to put your response in the record to demonstrate (hopefully) that water service is available and/or the facility improvements needed to serve the area proposed to be in the Madras UGB.

Let me know if you have any questions. Call me at 541-323-2916 if needed.

Take care,
"One may walk over the highest mountain one step at a time" -John Wanamaker-

Nicholas S. Snead
Director
Community Development Department
City of Madras
(541) 475-3388

Email: nsnead@ci.madras.or.us

Visit the City of Madras at http://ci.madras.or.us/

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 8.5.432 / Virus Database: 271.1.1/2644 - Release Date: 01/25/10 07:36:00

# Appendix E: Property Owner Consent Letters 

# CITY OF MADRAS <br> PROPERTY OWNER <br> CONSENT TO ANNEXATION 

The undersigned property owner(s) hereby consents to the annexation of the toltingrdessibedan property to the City of Madras, Jefferson County, Oregon.

> (Legal description of property):


The undersigned property owner hereby gives express, continuing, written consent to annexation of the property described herein to the City of Madras; and does hereby agree to execute such separate, further or additional application, petition, and consent as may be hereafter required by the City, or the laws of the State, as now or hereafter enacted for such annexation. This consent is given in consideration of City services that either have been or will be applied to the described property. The undersigned intends this consent to comply with all requirements of law for annexation of the property described. The undersigned and City intend that this consent shall constitute a covenant running with the land, binding on the undersigned and the undersigned's heirs, successors, or assigns.

The undersigned represents that the undersigned is the owner of this property and has the right to consent to its annexation.

DATED this 9th day of $\qquad$ Signature:
Typed Name:

Signature: Typed Name:


STATE OF OREGON )
()

County of Jefferson
)
Personally appeared before me this $10^{\text {th }}$ day of 9 ctoluen 2003 the above named
Albert L. Zemke
(List name of individual(s) having signature notarized)
and acknowledged the foregoing instrument to be a voluntary act.


Jefferson County Offlcial Records
Kathleen B. Marston, County Clerk
2003-005431
After Recording Return to:
City of Madras
71 S.E. "D" Street
Madras, Oregon 97741

## CONSENT TO ANNEXATION ONE-YEAR WAIVER

(I/We), the undersigned, do hereby waive the one-year requirement on the attached "Consent to Annexation" for the following described property and acknowledge that the consent shall remain in effect indefinitely.
, (Metes and Bounds Description and Map to be Attached to the Consent to Annexation)

## "See Attached Exhibit "B"


STATE OF OREGON ,
County of Jefferson

Personally appeared before me this $10^{\text {th }}$ day of Octoblt, 2003 the above named

Albert L. Zemke
(List name of individual(s) having signature notarized)
and acknowledged the foregoing instrument to be a voluntary act.
Frarem, Q. Coleman
Notary Public for Oregon
My Commission Expires:
$9.14-2004$

After Recording Return to:


71 S.E. "D" Street
Madras, Oregon 97741

## EXHIBIT "B"

## MAP \#11-14-7, TAX LOT \#101 <br> ALBERT L. ZEMKE

PARCEL I: Northeast quarter, Northeast quarter of the Southeast quarter, North half of the Northwest quarter of the Southeast quarter, Southeast quarter of the Northwest quarter of the Southeast quarter of Section 7, Township 11 South, Range 14 East of the Willamette Meridian Jefferson County Oregon, and the Southwest quarter of the Northwest quarter of the Southeast quarter.

# RECORDED DOCUMENT STATE OF OREGON COUNTY OF JEFFERSON 

## DO NOT REMOVE THIS CERTIFICATE

(This certificate constitutes a part of the original instrument in accordance with ORS 205.180(2). Removal of this certificate may invalidate this certificate and affect the admissibility of the original instrument into evidence in any legal proceeding.)

## KATHLEEN B. MARSTON <br> JEFFERSON COUNTY CLERK

## CITY OF MADRAS <br> PROPERTY OWNER CONSENT TO ANNEXATION

The undersigned property owners) hereby consents to the annexation of the following described property to the City of Madras, Jefferson County, Oregon.
(Legal description of property):
MAP \#11-14-7, TAX LOT \#200, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED
ON ATTACHED EXHIBIT "A"
The undersigned property owner hereby gives express, continuing, written consent to annexation of the property described herein to the City of Madras; and does hereby agree to execute such separate, further or additional application, petition, and consent as may be hereafter required by the City, or the laws of the State, as now or hereafter enacted for such annexation. This consent is given in consideration of City services that either have been or will be applied to the described property. The undersigned intends this consent to comply with all requirements of law for annexation of the property described. The undersigned and City intend that this consent shall constitute a covenant running with the land, binding on the undersigned and the undersigned's heirs, successors, or assigns.

The undersigned represents that the undersigned is the owner of this property and has the right to consent to its annexation.


## STATE OF OREGON ) )ss. <br> County of Jefferson )

Personally appeared before me this 28 day of_ MAY 2008 the above named Dorothy Thomas o Dorothy. Thomas Attomey-in and acknowledged the foregoing (List name of individuals) having signature notarized) , for RB
instrument to be a voluntary act.

After Recording Retum to:


City of Madras
71 S.E. "D" Street
Madras, Oregon 97741



City of Madras
May 13, 2008
Job \# 08029B
Tax lot: 11-14-7-200

## CITY OF MADRAS ANNEXATION \#2008-02

A Tract of land located in the Northeast One-Quarter of the Northwest One-Quarter (NE 1/4NW 1/4) and the Northwest One-Quarter of the Northeast One-Quarter (NW 1/4-NE 1/4) of Section 7, Township 11 South, Range 14 East of the Willamette Meridian, Jefferson County, Oregon, more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the North-South centerline of said Section 7 which bears South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 80.01 feet from the North One-Quarter corner of said Section 7; thence leaving said North-South Section centerline and along the South right-of-way line of Ashwood Road as described in Warranty Deed recorded in Book 2005, Page 005605 of Jefferson County official records South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 39^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 61.23 feet; thence leaving said right-of-way line South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 424.32 feet; thence South $89^{\circ} 42^{\prime} 25^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 61.22 feet to a point on the North-South centerline of said Section 7 which bears South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 505.00 feet from the North One-Quarter corner of said Section 7, being a point on the boundary of Parcel 1 of Partition Plat No. 2004-15 (recorded as MF\# 2004-4735); thence along the boundary of said Parcel 1 South $89^{\circ} 42^{\prime} 25^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 354.87 feet; thence leaving said boundary 117.68 feet along a non-tangent curve to the right with a radius of 455.00 feet, the chord of which bears North $07^{\circ} 42^{\prime} 08^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 117.35 feet; thence North $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 18.24 feet; thence 123.03 feet along the arc of a tangent curve to the right with a radius of 240.00 feet, the chord of which bears North $14^{\circ} 23^{\prime} 32^{\prime \prime}$ East for a distance of 121.68 feet; thence 186.84 feet along the arc of a reverse curve to the left with a radius of 360.00 feet, the chord of which bears North $14^{\circ} 12^{\prime} 33^{\prime \prime}$ East for a distance of 184.75 feet to a point on said South right-of-way line; thence along said South right-of-way line the following two (2) courses and one (1) curve:

South $88^{\circ} 42^{\prime} 59^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 170.57 feet;
18.12 feet along the arc of a tangent curve to the left with a radius of 1099.00 feet, the chord of which bears South $89^{\circ} 11^{\prime} 19^{\prime \prime}$ East for a distance of 18.12 feet; South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 39^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 104.28 feet to the point of beginning, the terminus of this description.


Renews: 12/31/2009
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## CONSENT TO ANNEXATION ONE-YEAR WAIVER

(INes), the undersigned, do hereby waive the one-year requirement on the attached "Consent to Annexation" for the following described property and acknowledge that the consent shall remain in effect indefinitely.

## (Metes and Bounds Description and Map to be Attached to the Consent to Annexation)

Map \# 11-14-7 Tax Lot \#_ 200


Address: $\quad 2465$ E. ASHWOOD ROAD
MADRAS, OREGON 97741

## STATE OF OREGON ) <br> County of Jefferson )

Personally appeared before me this 28 day of MAy 2008 the above
Evan $W$ Thomas, by Dorothy Thomas his athornjuin. fact named Dorothy E. Thomas AKA Dorothy Thomas, and acknowledged the foregoing
(Listhame of individuals) having signature notarized)' Dorothy Thomas, AHornoy-in fact for EVAN W' Thomas instrument to be a voluntary act.


After Recording Return to:
City of Madras
71 S.E. "D" Street Madras, Oregon 97741


## PETITION FOR ANNEXATION BY CONSENT PURSUANT TO ORE 222.170

IN, Evan W. Thomas \& Dorothy Thomas Council of the City of Madras to annex contiguous property to the City pursuant to OPS 222.170 (1)(a).
(Metes and Bounds Legal Description and Map Required)
(These can be attached to the Consent to Annexation Form)


Attached hereto is the consent of the owners) of the property, and is incorporated herein as Exhibit "A". Petitioner hereby certifies that they are the owners) of said property as ownership is described in ORS 222.120(7). Petitioner further certifies to the City that they are the legal owners) of record and are the sole owners of the property.


Signature:
Typed or Printed Name: DoRothy thomas
ed Name: DOROTHY THOMAS by Ceveehg Shan cen then

Signature: atromog $z$-an - foch.
Typed or Printed Name: EVAN N. ThomAS

Petition for Annexation by Consent

# JEFFERSON County Assessor's Summary Report <br> Real Property Assessment Report <br> FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2009 
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# JEFFERSON County Assessor's Summary Report <br> Real Property Assessment Report <br> <br> FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2009 

 <br> <br> FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2009}

| Account \# | 2602 | Tax Status | ASSESSABLE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Map \# | 111407-00-00200 | Acct Status | ACTIVE |
| Code - Tax \# | 0110-2602 | Subtype | NORMAL |
| Legal Descr | Metes \& Bounds - See legal report for full description. |  |  |
| Mailing Name | THOMAS, EVAN W \& DOROTHY E | Deed Reference \# | See Record |
| Agent |  | Sales Date/Price | See Record |
| In Care Of |  | Appralser | COX, DON |
| Mailing Address |  |  |  |
|  | 665 E ASHWOOD R |  |  |
|  | ADRAS, OR 97741 |  |  |





Parcel 1 of Partition Plat No. 2004-06, recorded April 15, 2004, as Instrument No. 2004-1610, Jefferson County, Oregon.

## SUBJECT TO:

1. 2004-2005 taxes, a lien in an amount to be determined, but not yet payable.
2. As disclosed by tax roll the premises herein described have been zoned or classified for farm use. At any time that said land is disqualified for such use, the property may be subject to additional taxes or penalties and interest.
3. The property lies within the boundaries of Deschutes Valley Water District and is subject to any charges or assessments levied by said District, and pipeline easements in connection therewith.
4. Rights of the public in and to that portion of the herein described premises lying within the boundaries of roads or highways.
5. Right of way, if any, of Public Usage Road No. 3053 as shown on tax assessor map but which the Grantor declares may be closed or vacated by prior Federal or County governmental action.
6. Mineral reservation by the United States of America as disclosed in Deed recorded April 28, 1983, Fee No. 147453.
7. Reservation by the United States of America for power line as disclosed in Deed, recorded April 28, 1983, Fee No. 147453.

The true consideration for this conveyance is an exchange of real property between the Grantee and Grantor.
-1- WARRANTY DEEDMServeriKahylMorrowLMorrow Properies - Warranty Deed.wpd


GLENN, SITES \& REEDER, LLP ATTORNEYSAT LAW
8. Reservation by the United States of America for power line as disclosed in Deed, recorded April 28, 1983, Fee No. 147453.
9. Easement, including the terms and provisions thereof, for electrical transmission lines granted to Central Electric Cooperative, Inc., recorded April 28, 1983, Fee No. 147456.
10. Easement, including the terms and provisions thereof, for communication lines, granted to Pacific Northwest Bell Telephone Company, recorded April 28, 1983, Fee No. 147458.
11. Easements as shown on Partition Plat 2004-06, for utility and access.

THIS INSTRUMENT WILL NOT ALLOW USE OF THE PROPERTY DESCRIBED IN THIS INSTRUMENT IN VIOLATION OF APPLICABLE LAND USE LAWS AND REGULATIONS. BEFORE SIGNING OR ACCEPTING THIS INSTRUMENT, THE PERSON ACQUIRING FEE TITLE TO THE PROPERTY SHOULD CHECK WITH THE APPROPRIATE CITY OR COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT TO VERIFY APPROVED USES AND TO DETERMINE ANY LIMITS ON LAWSUITS AGAINST FARMING OR FOREST PRACTICES AS DEFINED IN ORS 30.930.
$\qquad$
Dated this day of


2005
MORROW PROPERTIES, INC:


ANDREW J. MORROW, President

| STATE OF OREGON | ) ss. |
| :--- | :--- |
| County of Jefferson | ) |

Personally appeared ANDREW J. MORROW, who being duly sworn, did say that he is the President of MORROW PROPERTIES, NNC., an Oregon corporation, and that the seal affixed to the foregoing instrument is the corporate seal of said corporation by authority of its Board of Directors, and heacknowledged said instrument to be its voluntary act and deed, before me this




## JEFFERSON COUNTY ASSESSOR'S NAME LEDGER

$\begin{array}{ccccccc}\text { TOWNSHIP } & \text { RANGE } & \text { SECTION } & 14 & 1 / 4 & 1 / 16 & \text { TAXLOT } \\ 07 & 0 & 0 & 00100\end{array} \quad$ SPECIAL INTEREST Transaction ID 110303

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SEQ | VOUCHER ID | TAX | YEAR | DOCUMENT SOURCE | TYPE | ID\# |
| 1 | 108982 | 2001 | HISTORICAL - BOR | U | 1900 |  |


| 1 | 108982 | 2001 | HISTORICAL - BOR | $U$ | 1900 | 8880 | 1 | 20011814 | CONVERSION |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Name Type Ownership Type Ownership \%
Name Type
OWNER
Entry Date 22-Jan-2000
000Z-uer-ZZ əృe口 əles
TO/FROM MAP

$\begin{array}{cc}\text { Name Changes } & \text { Status } \begin{array}{c}\text { Name } \\ D\end{array} \text { SPRINGVIEW FARMS, LLC }\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { Size Totals } & \text { Code } & \text { Acres } & \text { SqFt } \\ & 0110 & 213.70 & 0.00\end{array}$
Effective Date 23-Oct-2007 11:59 AM Transaction ID 386939 Entry Date 22-Oct-2007 Recorded Date 22-Oct-2007 Sale Date
SEQ VOUCHERID TAX YEAR DOCUMENT SOURCE TYPE ID\#1 ID\#2 PID SOurceID PT OPERATION TOIFROMMAP
Page 1


[^104]Commencing at the Northwest corner of said Northeast Quarter, monumented with a 2inch diameter brass
cap, from which the Northeast comer of said Section 7 bears South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 2640.53 feet; thence South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ East long the Northline of said Section 7 a distance of 599.97 feet; thence South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ West a distanceof 40.00 feet to the Northwest corner of said Parcel 2 of Partition Plat No.
2002-12 andthe True Point of Beginning of this Description; thence continuing South $00017^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ West
along the West line of said Parcel 2 a distance of 40.00 feet; thence South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 39^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of
1690.17 feet; thence 374.44 feet along the arc of a 600.00 foot radius curve to the right, with a central angle
of 3 So4S\#24\#\# the long chord bearsSouth $71046 \#$ S7\#\# East a distance of 368.40 feet to the East line of
Page 2
TOWNSHIP

11 RANGE | SECTION |
| :--- |
| 14 |

Containing 2.15 acres more or less.

Effective Date 04-May-2009 12:43 PM Transaction ID 432733 Entry Date 04-May-2009 Recorded Date 04-May-2009 Sale Date
Effective Date 04-May-2009 12:43 PM Transaction ID 432733 Entry Date 04-May-2009 Recorded Date 04-May-2009
COMBINING SPLIT CODES INTO ONE REAL ACCOUNT NUMBER \#2833. REAL ACCOUNT NUMBERS \#2836, \#13275, \&
Sale Date
Sale Price \#13276 CANCELLED.

| SEQ | VOUCHER ID TAX YEAR | DOCUMENT SOURCE | TYPE | ID\#1 | ID \#2 | PID | Source ID | PT OPERATION | TOIFROM MAP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | 565927 | 2009 | ASSESSOR | AF | 2009 | 130 | 1 |  | COMBINATION-TO |  |

1114070000100
1114070000100
1114070000100
Move to Acct


## JEFFERSON COUNTY ASSESSOR'S NAME LEDGER


Page 1
$\begin{array}{ccccccc}\text { TOWNSHIP } & \text { RANGE } & \text { SECTION } & 1 / 4 & 1 / 14 & \text { TAXLOT } & \text { SPECIAL INTEREST }\end{array}$



$\begin{array}{llll}\text { Size Changes Code } & +/- \text { Size } & 0110 & \text { Alternate Size } \\ 0.00 & \text { Code Area Deleted } & \end{array}$

| Size Totals | Code | Acres | SqFt |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| 0110 | 8.88 | 0.00 |  |

$3409855 \quad 2007 \quad$ CLERK. BOR PLA $2007 \quad 3081$
MINUS 0.60 A.CRES FROM 11-14-07 101 TO 11-14-07 200, ACCOUNT \#13134 TO \#2602.
Size Changes Code

| Size Totals | Code | Acres | SqFt |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0.28 | 0.00 |  |  |

LINCICOME MADRAS DEVELOPMENT LLC, CONVEY TO EVAN W THOMAS \& DOROTHY THOMAS, 0.60 ACRES,
Page 2
TOWNSHIP RANGE SECTION $1 / 4 \quad 1 / 16$ TAXLOT SPECIALINTEREST
 2007-3810
Size Totals Code Acres $\quad$ SqFt

EASEMENT: $11-14-07200$ TO 11-14-07 101, EVAN W THOMAS \& DOROTHY THOMAS TO LINCICOME MADRAS
DEVELOPMENT LLC., DOC. \#2007-3813.

| Size Totals | Code | Acres | SqFt |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0110 | 8.28 | 0.00 |  |



Effective Date 10-Mar-2009 9:01 AM Transaction ID 430942 Entry Date 05-Mar-2009 Recorded Date 04-Mar-2009 Sale Date 02-Mar-2009 Sale Price 350,000

| SEQ | VOUCHER ID TAX YEAR | DOCUMENT SOURCE | TYPE | ID \#1 | ID \#2 | PID | Source ID | PT OPERATION | TOIFROM MAP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 557756 | 2009 | CLERK - BOR | WD | 2009 | 741 | 1 |  | NAME CHANGE |  |

Page 3
Ownership \%
${ }_{\square}^{a}$



09/04/2009 03:26:23 PM

After recording return to: FIRST OREGON TITLE COMPANY 116 SE D Street, Ste MADRAS, OR 97741

Until a change is requested all tax statements shall be sent to the following address:
Heinz A. John
3879 Ladera Vista Road
Fallbrook, CA 92028
Escrow No. 0011105 TD
Title No. 11105

## WARRANTY DEED

Lincicome Madras Development, LLC,
Grantor(s) hereby grant, bargain, sell, warrant and convey to:
Grantee (s) John grantee's heirs, successors and assigns the following described real property, free of encumbrances except as specifically set forth herein in
the county of JGPYRRSON and State of Oregon, to Wit: Acct 13134/13274
SUBJECT TO: all those items of record and those apparent upon the land, if any, as of the date of this deed and those shown below, if any:
and the grantor will warrant and forever defend the said premises and every part and parcel thereof against the lawful claims and demands of all persons whomsoever, except those claiming under the above described encumbrances.

The true and actual consideration for this conveyance is $\$ 350,000.00$.

BEFORE SIGNING OR ACCEPTING THIS INSTRUMENT, THE PERSON TRANSFERRING FEE TITLE SHOULD INQUIRE ABOUT THE PERSON'S RIGHTS, IF ANY UNDER SECTIONS 2 , 3 AND 5 TO 22 OF CHAPTER 424 , OREGON LAWS 2007 (MEASURE 49 (2007)), THIS INSTRUMENT DOES NOT ALLOW USE OF THE PROPERTY DESCRIED IN THIS INSTRUMENT IN VIOLATION OP APPLICABLE LAND USE LAWS AND REGULATIONS, BEFORE SIGNING OR ACCEPTING THIS INSTRUMENT, THE PERSON ACQUIRING FEE TITLE TO THE PROPERTY SHOULD CHECK WITH THE APPROPRIATE BEING TRANSFERRED IS A LAWFULLY ESTABLISHED LOT OR PARCEL, AS DEFINED IN RS 92.010 OR 215.010, TO VERIFY THE APPROVED USES OF THE IOT OR PARCEL, TO DETERMINE ANY LIMITS ON LAWSUITS AGAINST FARMING OR FOREST PRACTICES AS DEFINED IN IRS 30.930 AND TO INQUIRE ABOUT THE RIGHTS OF NEIGHBORING PROPERTY OWNERS, IF ANY, UNDER SECTIONS 2, 3 AND 5 TO 22 OF CHAETER 424, OREGON LAWS $200^{\circ}$ (MEASURE 49 (2007)).
Dated this $2^{\text {no }}$
day of March, 2009.

State of oregon
County of Seschntes
County of feprengen Deschntes


My commission expires (o11917010

## EXHIBIT "A"

## Legal Desoription:

A parcel of land containing 12.28 acres, more or less, being a portion of Parcel 1 of Partition Plat No. 2002.12 located in the Northeast One-quarter of Section 7, Township 11 South, Range 14 East of the Willamette Meridian, Jefferson County, Oregon, being more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at a point on the north-south centerline of said Section 7 which bears South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 80.01 feet from the North One-quarter corner of said Section 7, thence leaving said north-south section centerline and along the south right-of-way line of Ashwood road as described in Warranty Deed recorded as instrument No. 2005-005605 of Jefferson County official records South 89"39'39" East a distance of 61.23 feet to the true Point of Beginning of this description; thence continuing along said right-of-way line South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 39^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 538.68 feet to a point on the east boundary of said Parcel 1 ; thence along said east boundary South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 935.15 feet to the Southeast corner of said Parcel 1; thence along the south boundary of said Parcel 1 North $89^{\circ} 40^{\prime} 13^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 599.90 feet to the southwest cormer of said Parcel 1, being a point on said north-south section centerline; thenoe along said northsouth section centerline North $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 510.26 feet to a point which bears South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 505.00 feet from the North One-quarter corner of said Section 7; thence leaving said north-south section centerline North $89^{\circ} 42^{\prime} 25^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 61.22 feet thence North $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 424.32 feet to the point of beginning.

# JEfFERSON COUNTY ASSESSOR <br> REAL PROPERTY ASSESSMENT REPORT <br> FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2009 

Jan 13, 2010


## JEFFERSON COUNTY ASSESSOR'S NAME LEDGER




| Space above this line for Recording Office Use |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| After recording, return to: | Send Tax statements to: |
| Oregon Department of Corrections | (same) |
| Attn: Community Development Manager |  |
| $179313^{\text {th }}$ Street SE |  |
| Salem, OR 97302-2595 |  |

## WARRANTY DEED

(ORS 93.850)
Lincicome Madras Development, LLC, an Oregon limited liability company Grantor, conveys and warrants to STATE OF OREGON, by and through its DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, Grantee, its successors and assigns, the real property described in Exhibit A (the "Property") free of encumbrances, except for easements, conditions, and restrictions contained in the public record, and except as specifically set forth herein (none).

BEFORE SIGNING OR ACCEPTING THIS INSTRUMENT, THE PERSON TRANSFERRING FEE TITLE SHOULD INQUIRE ABOUT THE PERSON'S RIGHTS, IF ANY, UNDER ORS 197.352. THIS INSTRUMENT DOES NOT ALLOW USE OF THE PROPERTY DESCRIBED IN THIS INSTRUMENT IN VIOLATION OF APPLICABLE LAND USE LAWS AND REGULATIONS. BEFORE SIGNING OR ACCEPTING THIS INSTRUMENT, THE PERSON ACQUIRING FEE TITLE TO THE PROPERTY SHOULD CHECK WITH THE APPROPRIATE CITY OR COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT TO VERIFY APPROVED USES, TO DETERMINE ANY LIMITS ON LAWSUITS AGAINST FARMING OR FOREST PRACTICES AS DEFINED IN ORS 30.930 AND TO INQUIRE ABOUT THE RIGHTS OF NEIGHBORING PROPERTY OWNERS, IF ANY, UNDER ORS 197.352.

The true consideration for this conveyance is $\$ 39,021.00$.

Dated this $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ Tune 2006.

by James Myth Cole, Managing Member of Lincicome Madras Development, LLC

## STATE OF OREGON )

County of


This instrument was acknowledged and executed before me on this
 2006, by James Mitch Cole, Managing Member of Lincicome Madras Development, LLC.


## ACCEPTED BY:

The State of Oregon, acting by and through its Department of Corrections


As: Dept. of Corrections, Community Manager


This instrument was acknowledged before me on this $30^{\text {th }}$ day of /urn $\qquad$ , 2006, by BOBBI BURTON as the Community Manager authorized representative of the Oregon Department of Corrections, acting under authority granted to him/her by the State of Oregon.


## EXHIBIT A

Legal Description for Warranty Deed ASHWOOD ROAD

Section 7 (East Property)

A 60.00 -foot wide strip of land, lying 60.00 on the south side of the following described centerline, over land located in the northwest $1 / 4$ of the northeast $1 / 4$ of Section 7 of Township 11 South and Range 14 East of the Willamette Meridian, Jefferson County, Oregon, described in the Watranty Deed recorded at 2005-002823 of the Jefferson County Official Records:

Beginning at Engineer's Centerline Station 5+00, on the section line between Sections 6 and 7 of Township 11 South and Range 14.East of the Willamette Meridian, Jefferson County, Oregon, which bears North $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 17^{\prime \prime}$ West 1481.20 feet from the $1 / 4$ comer between said Sections 6 and 7 ; thence South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 17^{\prime \prime}$ East 138.33 feet, along the section line between said Sections 6 and 7; thence leaving said section line, 17.02 feet along the arc of a 1039.00 foot radius curve right (the long chord of which bears South $89^{\circ} 11^{\prime} 08^{\prime \prime}$ East 17.01 feet); thence South $88^{\circ} 43^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$ East 1205.50 feet; thence 17.13 feet along the arc of a 1039.00 foot radius curve left (the long chord of which bears South $89^{\circ} 11^{\prime} 20^{\prime \prime}$ East 17.13 feet); thence South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ East 2394.42 feet; thence 633.14 feet along the arc of a 660.00 foot radius curve right (the long chord of which bears South $62^{\circ} 10^{\prime} 44^{\prime \prime}$ East 609.14 feet); thence South $34^{\circ} 41^{\prime} 49^{\prime \prime}$ East 774.75 feet; thence 1709.82 feet along the arc of a 1000.00 foot radius curve left (the long chord of which bears South $83^{\circ} 40^{\prime} 47^{\prime \prime}$ East 1509.02 feet); thence North $47^{\circ} 20^{\prime} 15^{\prime \prime}$ East 542.88 feet; thence 2560.21 feet along the arc of a 1400.00 foot radius curve right (the long chord of which bears South $80^{\circ} 16^{\prime} 24^{\prime \prime}$ East 2218.09 feet); thence South $27^{\circ} 53^{\prime} 03^{\prime \prime}$ East 943.15 feet; thence 1158.98 feet along the arc of an 850.00 foot radius curve left (the long chord of which bears South $66^{\circ} 56^{\prime} 44^{\prime \prime}$ East 1071.26 feet); thence North $73^{\circ} 59^{\prime} 34^{\prime \prime}$ East 585.08 feet; thence 368.57 feet along the are of a 340.00 foot radius curve right (the long chord of which bears South $74^{\circ} 57^{\prime} 06^{\prime \prime}$ East 350.79 feet); thence South $43^{\circ} 53^{\prime} 47^{\prime \prime}$ East 305.17 feet; thence 254.87 feet along the arc of a 340.00 foot radius curve left (the long chord of which bears South $65^{\circ} 22^{\prime} 17^{\prime \prime}$ East 248.94 feet); thence South $86^{\circ} 50^{\prime} 46^{\prime \prime}$ East 596.74 feet; thence 122.81 feet along the arc of a 660.00 foot radius curve right (the long chord of which bears South $81^{\circ} 30^{\prime} 56^{\prime \prime}$ East 122.63 feet); thence South $76^{\circ} 11^{\prime} 06^{\prime \prime}$ East 271.44 feet to engineer's centerline station $151+00$, the terminus for this description, from which the $1 / 4$ corner between Sections 9 and 10 bears North 89우'59" East 2049.79 feet.

The parcel of land to which this description applies contains 30,016 square feet, more or less.
This description may include areas that are preexisting public right-of-way or easements, which are retained, and included herein to provide a clearer record of title in the future.

Page 1 of 1


## JEFFERSON COUNTY ASSESSOR'S NAME LEDGER

$\begin{array}{ll}\text { RANGE } & \text { SECTON } \\ 07\end{array}$
TOWNSHIP


[^105]| Size Totals Code | Acres | SqFt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0110 | 0.36 | 0.00 |


1114070000201
> $\begin{array}{ccccc}\text { Size Changes Code } & +/- \text { Size } & \text { Alternate Size Code Area Deleted } & 0.00 & \text { Move to Acct Move to Code }\end{array}$ $0110-0.44$ Acres
> $\begin{array}{llrl}\text { Size Totals } & \text { Code } & \text { Acres } & \text { SqFt } \\ & 0110 & 3.92 & 0.00\end{array}$

## SPECIAL INTEREST <br> TAXLOT 00200 <br> $\stackrel{\infty}{ }$ <br> \$o <br> SECTION <br> RANGE <br> TOWNSHIP <br> | TOW | 11 | 14 | 07 | 0 | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


Page 2
$\begin{array}{ccccccc}\text { TOWNSHIP } & \text { RANGE } & \text { SECTION } & 1 / 4 & 1 / 16 & \text { TAXLOT } & \text { SPECIAL INTEREST } \\ & 14 & 07 & 0 & 0 & 00200 & \\ & & & & & \\ \text { Size Changes } & \text { Code } & & & \\ & 0110 & & 0.60 & \text { Acres } & \text { Alternate Size } & 0.00\end{array}$

\section*{| Size Totals Code | Acres | SqFt |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 3.94 | 0.00 |}

Add:
A parcel of land containing 3.94 acres, more or less, located in a portion of the Northwest One-quarter (NW 1/4) and a portion of the Northeast One-Quarter (NE 1/4) of Section 07, Township 11 South, Range

14 East, Willamette Meridian, City of Madras, Jefferson County, Oregon, being more particularly South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 80.01 feet from the North One-quarter corner of said Section 07 ; thence leaving said north-south section centerline and along the south right-of-way line of Ashwood Road as described in Warranty Deed recorded in Book 2005, Page 005605 of Jefferson County official records South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 39^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 61.23 feet; thence leaving said right-of-way line South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ Eastt a distance of 424.32 feet; thence South $89^{\circ} 42^{\prime 2} 25^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 61.22 feet to a point on the
north-south centerline of said Section 07 which bears South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ Eastt a distance of 505.00 feet from the North One-quarter comer of said Section 07, being a point on the boundary of Parcel 1 of Partition Plat

No. 2004-15 (recorded as MF\#2OO4-4735); thence along the boundary of said Parcel 1 South $89^{\circ} 42^{\prime 2} 25^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 354.87 feet; thence leaving said boundary 117.68 feet along a non-tangent curve to the
right with a radius of 455.00 feet, the chord of which bears North $07^{\circ} 42^{\prime} 08^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 117.35 feet; thence North $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 18.24 feet; thence 123.03 feet along the arc of a tangent curve to the right with a radius of 240.00 feet, the chord of which bears North $14^{\circ} 23^{\prime} 32^{\prime \prime}$ East for a distance
of 121.68 feet; thence 186.84 feet along the arc of a reverse curve to the left with a radius of 360.00
the chord of which bears North $14^{\circ} 23^{\prime} 32^{\prime \prime}$ East for a distance of 184.75 feet to a point on said south
right-of-way line; thence along said south right-of-way line the following two (2) courses and one (1) curve:

South $88^{\circ} 42^{\prime} 59^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 170.57 feet
18.12 feet along the arc of a tangent curve to the left with a radius of 1099.00 feet, the chord of which bears South $89^{\circ} 11^{\prime} 19^{\prime \prime}$ East for a distance of 18.12 feet; South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 39^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 104.28 feet to
the point of beginning, the terminus of this description. description.
410313
PERFECTION DEED, EVAN W THOMAS \& DOROTHY THOMAS TO EVAN W THOMAS \& DOROTHY THOMAS, DOC. \#2007-3807

## $\begin{array}{llrl}\text { Size Totals } & \text { Code } & \text { Acres } & \text { SqFt } \\ & 0110 & 0.94 & 0.00\end{array}$

$\begin{array}{ccccccc}\text { TOWNSHIP } & \text { RANGE } & \text { SECTION } & 1 / 4 & 1 / 16 & \text { TAXLOT } & \text { SPECIAL INTEREST } \\ 11 & 14 & 07 & 0 & 0 & 00200 & \end{array}$


\section*{| Size Totals Code | Acres | SqFt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0110 | 0.00 |}



## $\begin{array}{llcc}\text { Size Totals } & \text { Code } & \text { Acres } & \text { SqFt } \\ & 0110 & 3.94 & 0.00\end{array}$

Jefferson County Official Records $\quad$ _ O07-003807

## -Space below for Recorder's use only-

## BARGAIN AND SALE DEED

KNOW ALL. MEN BY THESE PRESENTS THAT, Evan W Thomas and Dorothy Thomas, as husband and wife, Grantor(s), for and in consideration of the sum of ZERO and 00/100 Dollars to it paid by the grantee herein, do hereby grant, bargain, sell and convey unto Evan W Thomas and Dorothy Thomas, as husband and wife, Grantees), the described tract of land in County of Jefferson and State of Oregon, more particularly described as follows:

See Attached Legal Description as Tract ' $B$ '

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD the granted premises unto the said Grantee, its heirs and assigns forever.


Dated: $\qquad$ $4 / 20107$

Until a change is requested all tax statements Should be sent to the following address:

Evan W Thomas and Dorothy Thomas


After Recording Please Return to:
Same as above

## TRACT B

A parcel of land containing 3.94 acres, more or less, located in a portion of the
Northwest One-quarter (NW1/4) and a portion of the Northeast One-Quarter (NE1/4) of Section 07, Township 11 Sồuth, Range 14 East, Willamette Meridian, City of Madras, Deschutes County, Oregon, being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the north-south centerline of said Section 07 which bears South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 80.01 feet from the North One-quarter corner of said Section 07; thence leaving said north-south section centerline and along the south right-of-way line of Ashwood Road as described in Warranty Deed recorded in Book 2005, Page 005605 of Jefferson County official records South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 39^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 61.23 feet; thence leaving said right-of-way line South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 424.32 feet; thence South $89^{\circ} 42^{\prime} 25^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 61.22 feet a point on the north-south centerline of said Section 07 which bears South $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 505.00 feet from the North Onequarter corner of said Section 07, being a point on the boundary of Parcel 1 of Partition Plat No. 2004-15 (recorded as MF\#2004-4735); thence along the boundary of said Parcel 1 South $89^{\circ} 42^{\prime 2} 25^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 354.87 feet; thence leaving said boundary 117.68 feet along a non-tangent curve to the right with a radius of 455.00 feet, the chord of which bears North $07^{\circ} 42^{\prime} 08^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 117.35 feet; thence North $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 18.24 feet; thence 123.03 feet along the arc of a tangent curve to the right with a radius of 240.00 feet, the chord of which bears North $14^{\circ} 23^{\prime} 32^{\prime \prime}$ East for a distance of 121.68 feet; thence 186.84 feet along the arc of a reverse curve to the left with a radius of 360.00 feet, the chord of which bears North $14^{\circ} 12^{\prime} 33^{\prime \prime}$ East for a distance of 184.75 feet to a point on said south right-of-way line; thence along said south right-of-way line the following two (2) courses and one (1) curve:

South $88^{\circ} 42^{\prime} 59^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 170.57 feet
18.12 feet along the arc of a tangent curve to the left with a radius of 1099.00 feet, the chord of which bears South $89^{\circ} 11^{\prime} 19^{\prime \prime}$ East for a distance of 18.12 feet; South $89^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 39^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 104.28 feet to the point of beginning, the terminus of this description.

Subject to: All easements, restrictions and right-of-ways of record and those common and apparent on the land.


April 11, 2007
S:ILand Projects1051213-Cole subd in MadrasldocsITRACT B(2).doc
Thomas to Thomas

Appendix F: Transportation Planning Rule Analysis
(Kittelson \& Associates, January 2010)

KITTELSON \& ASSOCIATES, INC. TRANSPORTATIONENGINEERING/PLANNING 354 SW Upper Terrace Drive. Suite 101, Bend. Oregon $97702 \quad 5413128300 \quad 541312.4585$

## MEMORANDUM

| Date: | January 22, 2010 |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Nick Snead, City of Madras |

From: Chris Brehmer, P.E. \& Joe Bessman, P.E. \& Matt Bel
Project: Madras Elementary School UGB Amendment
Subject: Transportation Planning Rule Analysis


The purpose of this memorandum is to document compliance with the Transportation Planning Rule for the proposed rezone of 20 acres of land located in Jefferson County from Range Land (RL) zoning to Multiple Family Residential (R-2) zoning. This memorandum was prepared to address the requirements identified within Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 660-12-0060 (Transportation Planning Rule, TPR), which contains the applicable criteria for a zone change analysis. The intent of the TPR is to ensure the transportation system can accommodate the change of uses to the adopted system plan and that any resultant significant affects are mitigated.

The land included in the proposed rezone is generally located south of Ashwood Road, east of Jefferson County Middle School, and south of the existing Juniper Hills County Park near Bean Drive. The property is within the Yarrow development and its rezone to accommodate a school was identified as part of the original Yarrow Concept Plan. The location of the property is generally shown in Figure 1, and the identification of the 20-acre future school property on the Yarrow Concept Plan is illustrated in Figure 2. No specific development plans or entitlements are being pursued as part of this zone change.

This study determined that, with the exception of the US 97/J Street intersections, all of the study area intersections operate acceptably with the existing and proposed zoning in the horizon analysis period. The US 97/J Street intersections exceed ODOT mobility standards with or without the proposed rezone. The additional trips associated with the rezone create an incremental impact on the intersection, creating a Significant Effect. The City's Transportation System Plan (TSP) Amendment previously identified a mitigation plan for this intersection and, with the planned improvements in place, the transportation system will operate acceptably with the existing zoning and will continue to operate acceptably with the proposed rezone. Assuming that the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) is able to make a Reasonably Likely determination for the J Street improvements in the TSP, no unmitigated significant effects will occur with the proposed rezone. The study methodology, findings, and recommendations are detailed herein.
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## BACKGROUND

The City of Madras, in partnership with the Jefferson County School District is proposing the UGB amendment and rezone to accommodate a potential future elementary school site. Jefferson County School District currently operates two elementary schools within the Madras City limits that served approximately 1,060 kindergarten through fifth grade students during the 2008 school year. The recent closure of the Westside Elementary School due to budget shortfalls has split Madras kindergarten through fifth grade students between Madras Elementary School (kindergarten through $2^{\text {nd }}$ grade) and Buff Elementary School ( $3^{\text {rd }}$ through $5^{\text {th }}$ grades).

Future building needs and the current location of Buff Elementary School within a 100 -year floodplain has created a need for the School District to look at alternative future sites. The location of the proposed land within the Yarrow neighborhood is expected to help accommodate future growth along Madras' east side, and the adjacent Jefferson County Middle School and Juniper Hills Park ball fields are expected to be complementary uses. A new school is not proposed for construction or entitlements at this time; the purpose of the zone change is to accommodate the long-term educational infrastructure needs in the City.

## EXISTING TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE

The existing transportation infrastructure assessment is provided herein to assist the City of Madras with the planning and prioritization of maintenance and infrastructure improvements within the study area. The existing conditions analysis is intended to identify operational and geometric conditions surrounding the site to ensure the necessary right-of-way will be available to accommodate needed system interconnectivity and accessibility, and to ensure existing transportation safety needs are addressed.

## Roadway Facilities

As illustrated in Figure 2, Ashwood Road borders the site to the north and provides primary access and connectivity to the proposed lands. Ashwood Road serves the Deer Creek Correctional Institute and other rural uses to the east of the site. To the immediate west Ashwood Road erves Juniper Hills Park and the Jefferson County Middle School, and further west transitions into B Street and connects to US 97 and the City's downtown core. A recently constructed extension of City View to J Street connects the parcel to the southern City limits, and Bean Drive connects toward the northern portion of the City. Table 1 summarizes key characteristics of the existing roadway facilities.

Table 1
Existing Transportation Facilities and Roadway Designations

| Roadway | Functional Classification | Number of Lanes | Posted Speed | Sidewalks | Bicycle Lanes | On-Street Parking |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ashwood - B Street | Major Collector | 2-Lanes | 25-45 mph | Partial ${ }^{2}$ | Yes | Partial ${ }^{1}$ |
| City View | Major Collector | 2-Lanes | 25 mph | Yes | Yes | No |
| Bean Drive | Minor Collector | 2-Lanes | 25 mph | No | No | No |
| Kinkade | Minor Collector | 2-Lanes | 25 mph | Partial ${ }^{2}$ | No | No |
| Ashwood - C Street | Major Collector | 2-Lanes | 25 mph | Partial ${ }^{2}$ | No | No |
| $10^{\text {th }}$ Street | Major Collector | 2-Lanes | 25 mph | Yes | No | Yes |
| $J$ Street | Major Collector | 2-Lanes | 25 mph | Yes | Yes | No |

${ }^{1}$ On-street parking is provided along sections of roadway within the City limits.
${ }^{2}$. Sidewalks are located on one side of the street only.

## Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities

Sidewalks are currently provided along the south side of Ashwood Road primarily where frontage improvements have been completed. As shown in Table 1, sidewalks are generally provided along a majority of the roadways within the site vicinity, with the exception of Bean Drive, where pedestrians may rely on the multi-use path within Juniper Hills Park.

Bicycle lanes are provided on both sides of Ashwood Road and extend west to the City center. Bicycle lanes are also provided on both sides of City View Road, which connect to J Street and the City center to the south.

Review of the project vicinity identified that pedestrian and bicycle connectivity and roadway crossing treatments should be considered to connect the existing Jefferson County Middle School with the Juniper Hills Park. Additional connections to the Yarrow neighborhood should also be provided concurrent with development, including appropriate pedestrian crossing treatments along Ashwood Road. These connections could help encourage non-vehicular trips between the complementary uses and increase pedestrian and bicyclist safety.

## Transit Facilities

Limited transit service is available throughout the site vicinity through services provided by the Cascades East Transit (Reference 1). Cascades East provides community connections from Madras to Redmond, Culver, and the Metolius City Hall on two trips in the morning and two trips during the afternoon period. Fares on the intercommunity connections are $\$ 5.00$ per day. Curb to curb on-call transit service is also available through Cascades East Transit Mondays through Friday with reservations. These services are available within a five-mile radius of the town center, and the fare for on-demand service is currently $\$ 1.25$ per trip. In addition, the Central Oregon Intergovernmental Council (COIC) also provides bus rides to Medicaid eligible clients within a nine-county area throughout Central Oregon.

## Existing Traffic Counts

Historical traffic counts were obtained at City of Madras intersections from May 2007. Review of the manual turning movement counts showed that during the critical evening peak hour B Street near its intersection with $10^{\text {th }}$ Street carries approximately 145 vehicles in the eastbound direction and approximately 275 vehicles in the westbound direction during the evening peak hour. It was also noted that of the westbound vehicles approximately 20 percent were expected to travel south on City View with the remainder continuing westbound along Ashwood Road - B Street.

Figure 3 provides a summary of the historical year 2007 existing weekday p.m. peak hour turning-movement counts, which are rounded to the nearest five vehicles per hour. No historical traffic count data was available for the Ashwood Road/Bean Drive intersection, so new counts were conducted in January of 2010. The new traffic count showed similar but slightly lower through volumes along Ashwood Road as compared to the historical 2007 counts. Accordingly, it is expected that the 2006/2007 counts continue to reflect the existing roadway conditions. A summary of the existing traffic volumes throughout the study area is shown in Figure 3. Attachment " 1 " contains the traffic count worksheets used in this study as provided by City staff.

## Current Levels of Service and Performance Standards

Intersection performance thresholds vary throughout the study area based on the roadway jurisdiction. Jefferson County traffic study requirements included within the County's TSP (Reference 2) identify that a Level of Service "C" or higher should be maintained at all County intersections. The City of Madras TSP (Reference 3) identifies a target Level of Service (LOS) "D" for signalized intersections, LOS " E " for unsignalized intersections (or LOS F with a volume-tocapacity ratio below 0.95). ODOT mobility standards included within the Oregon Highway Plan (add subsequent updates, Reference 4) require a volume-to-capacity ratio of less than 0.90 on the stop-controlled minor street approaches at the J Street intersections and a volume-to-capacity ratio of 0.80 at the signalized B Street intersections and future signalized J Street intersections. ${ }^{1}$

Intersection operations were reviewed to identify current capacity and safety constraints on the roadway network. Field review of the study area identified that all of the intersections are uncontrolled in the east-west direction along B Street - Ashwood Road and are stop-sign controlled along the north-south minor-street approaches. Relevant intersection performance standards for the study area intersections are summarized below in Table 2.
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Table 2 Summary of Intersection Performance Standards

| Intersection | Jurisdiction | Traffic Control ${ }^{1}$ | Performance Standard | Horizon Period |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ashwood Road/ Bean Drive | Jefferson County | TWSC | LOS C | Year 2027 |
| Ashwood Road/ City View | City of Madras | TWSC | $\begin{gathered} \text { LOS E/ } \\ v / c<0.95 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Year 2020 |
| B Street/ <br> Kinkade Road | City of Madras | TWSC | $\begin{gathered} \text { LOS E/ } \\ \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}<0.95 \end{gathered}$ | Year 2020 |
| B Street/ Ashwood Road | City of Madras | TWSC | $\begin{gathered} \text { LOS E/ } \\ v / c<0.95 \end{gathered}$ | Year 2020 |
| B Street/ $10^{\text {th }}$ Street | City of Madras | TWSC | $\begin{gathered} \text { LOS E/ } \\ v / c<0.95 \end{gathered}$ | Year 2020 |
| B Street/ US 97 Northbound | ODOT | Signalized | $v / \mathrm{c}<0.80$ | Year 2025 |
| B Street/ US 97 Southbound | ODOT | Signalized | $v / \mathrm{c}<0.80$ | Year 2025 |
| ] Street/ US 97 Northbound | ODOT | TWSC | $v / \mathrm{c}<0.90$ | Year 2025 |
| ] Street/ US 97 Southbound | ODOT | TWSC | $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}<0.90$ | Year 2025 |

Results of the existing conditions intersection operations during the weekday p.m. peak hour are illustrated in Figure 3. As shown in the figure, all of the study area intersections currently operate acceptably. It was noted that the J Street intersection with Southbound US 97 (4 $4^{\text {th }}$ Street) meets mobility standards but operates with high delays (Level of Service " E ") along the stop-controlled east-west approaches. Existing conditions level-of-service worksheets are included in Attachment " 2 ".

## Existing Conditions Summary

The following transportation system improvement needs were identified based on review of the existing system conditions. Since mitigation of these existing deficiencies is not applicable to or caused by the proposed zone change, it is recommended that these safety and performance improvements be provided by the City of Madras as part of the City's regular maintenance or incorporated into the City's Capital Improvement Plans.

- Pedestrian and bicycle connectivity and roadway crossing treatments should be considered as part of future planning efforts to connect the existing Jefferson County Middle School with the Juniper Hills Park. Additional connections to the Yarrow neighborhood should also be provided concurrent with development, including appropriate pedestrian crossing treatments along Ashwood Road. These connections could help encourage non-vehicular trips between the complementary uses and increase pedestrian and bicyclist safety.
- All of the study area intersections operate acceptably, although the Southbound US 97 (4 $4^{\text {th }}$ Street)/J Street intersection operates with high minor-street delay at a Level of Service "E".


## TRANSPORTATION PLANNING RULE COMPLIANCE

The applicable criteria for zone change analyses are found within Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 660-12-0060, also known as the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR, Reference 5). The TPR is intended to require that any changes to the adopted and recognized Transportation System Plan show consistency and compliance with the stated goals of the plan, the development and regular updates of which are a mandated requirement for cities. The overall purpose of a city's TSP is to 1) provide a safe, convenient, and economic transportation system that encourages and supports the availability, safety, convenience, and efficiency of a variety of transportation choices for moving people that balance vehicular use with other transportation modes, including walking, bicycling, and transit in order to avoid principal reliance upon any one mode of transportation; and 2) to protect existing and planned facilities for their identified functions.

The City's applicable Transportation System Plan was completed in 2001, with updates completed for the J Street connection with the US 97 in 2005 (Reference 6). The initial plan provides an assessment of roadway classifications throughout the City and potential intersection treatments at a sampling of collector and arterial intersections along with associated planning level improvement costs, and is the applicable planning document related to the City's Ashwood - B Street intersections. The J Street amendment reviewed improvement options specific to the US 97 intersections and is considered the relevant planning document for the J Street intersections.

The City's adopted TSP does not include a specific assessment of the long-term intersection needs at any of the City intersections along B Street-Ashwood, as the TSP focused on the more critical intersections along the US 97/US 26 corridor through downtown Madras. The intent of this zone change analysis is to provide an assessment of the long-term system needs that should be considered for inclusion within the City's TSP (as summarized within the Existing Zoning section). In addition, to support the proposed zone change this report also includes an assessment of additional impacts that could occur with future development resulting from this zone change (as included within the Proposed Zoning section).

All analyses assess year 2020 conditions on City facilities and year 2027 conditions on County facilities for consistency with the adopted TSP horizon years. ODOT's US 97 intersections with J Street are assessed under year 2025 conditions, consistent with the TSP Update and meeting the minimum 15-year planning horizon required for consistency with the Oregon Highway Plan (Section 1F.2). ODOT's intersections with B Street are also assessed under year 2025 conditions for consistency with the 15 -year minimum planning horizon identified in the State's TSP, the Oregon Highway Plan (the City TSP assesses only 2020 conditions at B Street).

## Reasonably Likely Transportation Improvements

Transportation Planning Rule analyses allow the inclusion of planned improvements in the horizon analysis period for which a funding mechanism has been identified. The funding mechanism could be an established local Capital Improvement Project, local projects contained within a City's Systems Development Charge (SDC) list, or funded ODOT Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) projects. No funded improvements affect the study area intersections.

The US 97/J Street improvements are identified in the City's TSP Amendment as a needed facility improvement and included within the ODOT 2010-2013 Draft STIP list. Improvement plans include realignment of northbound US 97 onto Adams Drive and two new traffic signals at the new J Street intersections. A request for a "Reasonably Likely" determination for the planned improvements has been sent to ODOT and is pending approval. Attachment " 3 " includes an illustration of the planned J Street Improvements.

## Existing Zoning Conditions (Future Horizon Period)

An analysis was conducted for the horizon years as identified in the applicable City, County, and State TSPs. The existing zoning assessment was prepared to identify how the study area's transportation system operates in the horizon year with build-out of the subject parcel as currently zoned (without the impact of the proposed rezone). This analysis will supplement the City's TSP efforts along this segment of Ashwood Road and will provide a basis for comparison to potential future conditions with the proposed zone change.

Review of the City's TSP (TSP Technical Memorandum \#3, Reference 7) shows that future horizon volumes were developed through the application of an annual three percent growth rate for all turning and through movements to and from City facilities. ODOT facilities were assessed using a two percent annual growth rate for through movements along US 97/US 26. County facilities were assessed with a 3.2 percent growth rate through 2011 and 2.5 percent annual growth from 2012 through 2027.

To identify the existing trip generation potential of the subject property, review of the County zoning, allowable land uses, and site constraints was conducted. The existing Range Land zoning is one of three designations for Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) lands within Jefferson County. The RL zoning is intended to preserve predominantly non-irrigated agricultural lands for livestock grazing, and the $R L$ zoning requires that non-farm residences contain a minimum of 40 acres. A variety of non-residential uses are permitted within the $R L$ zoning, though these uses require more acreage than the 20 -acres proposed for the rezone and all are considered low intensity uses. Accordingly, under the existing zoning the trip generation potential is severely limited, and for analysis purposes it was conservatively assumed to be none.

## Intersection Level-of-Service Analysis

Figure 4 illustrates the weekday p.m. peak hour traffic volumes inclusive of regional growth and potential site build-out with the existing zoning. These volumes were used to conduct an operational analysis at each of the study intersections to determine the horizon year levels of service. As shown, all of the study intersections are forecast to operate at acceptable levels of service with exception of the US 97/J Street intersections, which exceed ODOT mobility standards. With the planned J Street improvements in place both the US 97 Northbound and Southbound intersections with J Street are forecast to operate acceptably. Attachment " 4 " contains the horizon period existing zoning level-of-service worksheets.


## Proposed Zoning Conditions (Future Horizon Period)

Future horizon year conditions were developed based on the same methodology used to assess the existing zoning conditions. The proposed zoning conditions also include the incremental increase in trips that could be generated with the Multiple Family Residential (R-2) zoning, as described below.

The Multiple Family Residential (R-2) zoning category provides for higher-density single-family uses and attached residential uses, including apartments and townhomes. The R-2 zoning also allows parks and community centers as outright uses. Schools, churches, libraries, and other government buildings are allowed as conditional uses.

The City of Madras zoning provisions, as contained within Ordinance 723 (Reference 8), were reviewed to identify density ranges and allowable uses within the R-2 zoning. Conditional uses are typically not considered as part of a zone change analysis. However, as the intent of the rezone is to ultimately allow for a new school this specific conditional use was reviewed to ensure that a reasonable development scenario considers the potential impact of a school.

Review of the City zoning provisions identified the following outright allowable uses in the R-2 zoning:

- Single family residential
- Multi-family residential
- Public park, recreation areas, community centers

Based on the uses shown above, multi-family residential was identified as the most intense outright land use category from a trip generation perspective. Review of the required building space, parking allocations, lawn space, and typical road and infrastructure allocations identified a resultant reasonable maximum density of 11.6 attached residential units per acre, or approximately 232 total attached residential units on 20-acres. Additional details on the development of residential densities are included in Attachment "5".

Conversations with the project team identified that a future school would likely comprise ten acres of the overall land, with a minimum of five acres dedicated to the elementary school. Any additional lands would be retained for residential uses. The most likely school type would be an elementary school given the regional needs and recent closure of the Westside Elementary site. A new elementary school could be expected to serve an enrollment of approximately 350 students (historical records from the closed Westside Elementary School showed an enrollment of 325 students).

Accordingly, in addition to consideration of build-out of the 20 -acres with residential uses, this provides two additional R-2 development scenarios to consider:

1. 116 attached residential units on ten acres ( 11.6 units/acre * 10 acres $=116$ units) and a 350student elementary school
2. 174 attached residential units on fifteen acres ( 11.6 units/acre * 15 acres $=174$ units) and a 350 -student elementary school on the remaining five acres.

While a ten acre school site is more typical, the minimum five-acre site provides a reasonable worst-case development scenario resulting in a more conservative analysis. The two scenarios forwarded for consideration include build-out of the parcel with residential and build-out of 15acres with residential and 5 -acres with a new school.

## R-2 Zoning Trip Generation Potential

Trip generation estimates were prepared for both $R-2$ zoning scenarios to determine which land use combination resulted in a higher overall trip generation potential during the critical weekday evening commute period (one hour between 4:00 and 6:00 p.m.). Trip generation estimates for each of the scenarios were prepared based on surveys of similar sites. Residential trip generation estimates were prepared based on data contained within ITE's standard reference Trip Generation, $8^{\text {th }}$ Edition, using the Apartment land use category (Land Use Code 220, Reference 9).

Trip generation estimates for the elementary school were prepared using surveys of schools within the City of Bend to better approximate local elementary school trends. The surveys of the Bend locations contain slightly lower trip generation rates than national surveys of elementary schools ( $0.13 \mathrm{trips} /$ student versus 0.15 trips/student), but are expected to better reflect local characteristics of Central Oregon schools than the national data due to similarities in weather characteristics, mode splits, and after school activities.

All of the elementary school surveys were conducted in early fall at each of the five school sites and include an account of after school activities and public use of the adjacent ballfields. Because the evening commute period analysis of the school primarily reflects faculty trips (student trips typically occur in the afternoon), the increased student walking ratios during fair weather conditions are not expected to impact the results. The study found that the increased public use of the ballfields due to the fair weather likely results in a higher than typical trip rate. While the Bend Elementary School surveys were conducted at locations within developed residential neighborhoods, it is assumed that the City of Madras Urban Growth Boundary area will be fully developed by the horizon year providing similar characteristics at the proposed location. It was also noted that the surrounding neighborhoods have already been master planned, with portions of the roadway infrastructure for the first development phases already in place. Attachment " 6 " contains the Bend-La Pine Elementary School Trip Generation study.

While the location of the elementary school is expected to support the surrounding Yarrow neighborhood, complement with the adjacent middle school, recreational facility, and benefit from the adjacent Juniper Hills Park ballfields, additional trip discounts were not applied to the trip rates obtained from the Bend-La Pine School District facilities. Mixed-use incentives provided in Section 6 of the TPR were also omitted from the analysis, though the densities and integrated uses planned within the Yarrow development are expected to comply with the applicable definitions of a mixed-use pedestrian friendly neighborhood. Table 3 summarizes the trip generation potential of the two potential land use scenarios.

| Table 3 R-2 Scenarios Trip Generation Potential |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use | ITE Code | Size | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |  |
|  |  |  | Total | In | Out |
| Proposed R-2 Zoning: Residential Only Scenario |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apartments (20 acres) | 220 | 232 Units | 145 | 94 | 51 |
| Proposed R-2 Zoning: Residential Plus Elementary School Scenario |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apartments (15 acres) | 220 | 174 Units | 113 | 74 | 39 |
| Elementary School (5 acres) | N/A | 350 Students | 46 | 25 | 21 |
| Total Trips |  |  | 159 | 99 | 60 |

As shown in Table 3, future development of the 20 -acres with an elementary school (comprising five acres) and residential uses (comprising 15 acres) provides a reasonable worst-case development scenario. This scenario was found to generate 14 more weekday p.m. peak hour trips than build-out of residential uses alone and was used to assess the incremental system impacts associated with the proposed rezone.

## Trip Distribution and Trip Assignment

The estimated trip distribution pattern of primary site-generated trips associated with the UGB amendment was determined through review of existing traffic patterns, likely school faculty/employee housing, and residential destinations. The trip distribution patterns were separated by residential and school trips, with the resultant trip distribution pattern illustrated in Figure 5. As shown, the pattern highlights that the majority of trips would be headed west toward the City center and US 97 corridor. Trips destined toward US 97 are expected to distribute onto the available parallel routes (Loucks, City View, or B Street) based on their ultimate travel destination.

The difference between the Range Land zoning trip generation potential (assumed to be none) and the proposed Multiple Family Residential (R-2) zoning trips (shown in Table 4) during the critical weekday p.m. peak hour was assigned to the roadway network based on the trip distribution patterns and routing. These incremental trips were added to the existing zoning traffic volumes, with the resultant volumes illustrated in Figure 7.

## Study Area Intersections

Based on a review of the potential increase in trips with the proposed zoning, the following intersections of collector and arterial roadways were identified as study intersections due to their potential for being significantly affected by the proposed zone change. Scoping materials and conversations with the affected jurisdiction staff provided concurrence on the study area. The City of Madras roadway classification map is included in Attachment " 7 " and the scoping letter is included as Attachment " 8 ".
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- Ashwood Road/Bean Drive (could be impacted by up to 137 additional weekday p.m. peak hour trips, a 46 percent increase from existing volume)
- Ashwood/City View (could be impacted by up to 119 additional weekday p.m. peak hour trips, a 34 percent increase from existing volume)
- B Street/Kinkade Road (could be impacted by up to 76 additional weekday p.m. peak hour trips, a 22 percent increase from existing volume)
- B Street/Ashwood (could be impacted by up to 66 additional weekday p.m. peak hour trips, an 18 percent increase from existing volume)
- B Street/ $10^{\text {th }}$ Street (could be impacted by up to 55 additional weekday p.m. peak hour trips, a 12 percent increase from existing volume)
- US 97 Northbound/B Street (exceeds ODOT's 300 daily trip threshold)
- US 97 Southbound/B Street (exceeds ODOT's 300 daily trip threshold)
- US 97 Northbound (Fifth Street)/J Street (exceeds ODOT's 300 daily trip threshold)
- US 97 Southbound (Fourth Street)/J Street (exceeds ODOT's 300 daily trip threshold)

It should be noted that additional assessment of localized queuing and operations during the school peak periods may be required in the future as part of the entitlements process when a specific site plan is available. However, as the purpose of the Transportation Planning Rule is to provide consistency with the adopted Transportation System Plan only the weekday p.m. peak hour operations (design hour) are summarized herein for TPR purposes.

## Intersection Level of Service Analysis

The weekday p.m. peak hour turning-movement volumes shown in Figure 5 were used to conduct an operational analysis at each study intersection to determine the horizon year levels of service. As shown, with the application of regional growth and the incremental trip generation potential of the proposed R-2 zoning all of the study intersections are forecast to operate at acceptable levels of service during the weekday p.m. peak hour with exception of the US 97/J Street intersections. With the planned J Street improvements in place, both the US 97 northbound and southbound intersections with J Street are shown to operate acceptably. Attachment "9" contains the horizon year level-of-service worksheets.

## TRANSPORTATION PLANNING RULE COMPLIANCE

OAR Section 660-12-0060 sets forth the relative criteria for evaluating plan and land use regulation amendments. Table 4 summarizes the TPR criteria and their applicability to the proposed rezone application.

Table 4 Summary of Criteria in OAR 660-012-0060

| Section | Criteria | Applicable? |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 1 | Describes how to determine if a proposed land use action results <br> in a significantly affects transportation facilities. | Yes <br> See response below |
| 2 | Describes measures for complying with Criteria \#1 where a <br> significant effect is identified. | Yes <br> See response below |
| 3 | Describes measures for complying with Criteria \#1 and \#2 <br> without assuring that the allowed land uses are consistent with <br> the function, capacity and performance standards of the facility | No |
| 4 | Determinations under Criteria \#1, \#2, and \#3 are coordinated <br> with other local agencies. | Yes <br> See response below |
| 5 | Indicates that the presence of a transportation facility shall not be <br> the basis for an exception to allow development on rural lands. | No <br> (Lands are part of a <br> master plan area) |
| 7 | Indicates that local agencies should credit developments that <br> provide a reduction in trips. | No <br> (No concurrent site <br> plan) |
| 7 | No <br> Outlines requirements for a local street plan, access management <br> plan, or future street plan for commercial areas. | Nommercial lands are <br> not proposed) |
| 8 | Defines a mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly neighborhood | No <br> (No concurrent site <br> plan) |

As shown, there are eight criteria that apply to Plan and Land Use Regulation Amendments. Of these, Criteria \#1, \#2, and \#4 are applicable to the proposed land use action. Applicable sections of these criteria are provided below in italics with a corresponding response shown in standard font.

OAR 660-12-0060 (1) Where an amendment to a functional plan, an acknowledged comprehensive plan, or a land use regulation would significantly affect an existing or planned transportation facility, the local government shall put in place measures as provided in section (2) of this rule to assure that allowed land uses are consistent with the identified function, capacity, and performance standards (e.g. level of service, volume to capacity ratio, etc.) of the facility. A plan or land use regulation amendment significantly affects a transportation facility if it would:
(a) Change the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility (exclusive of correction of map errors in an adopted plan);
(b) Change standards implementing a functional classification system; or
(c) As measured at the end of the planning period identified in the adopted transportation system plan:
(A) Allow land uses or levels of development that would result in types or levels of travel or access that are inconsistent with the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility;

Response: Based on the incremental traffic increase from $R L$ to $R-2$ zoning, the functional classification of all the adjacent roadways will not be affected with the proposed zone change.
(B) Reduce the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility below the minimum acceptable performance standard identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan; or

Response: The intersections of US 97/J Street performs below the minimum acceptable performance standard in the City of Madras TSP and the OHP with the existing zoning.
(C) Worsen the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility that is otherwise projected to perform below the minimum acceptable performance standard identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan.

Response: The performance of the US 97/J Street intersections are degraded with the incremental trips from the proposed rezone, and therefore a Significant Effect occurring with the proposed rezone.

OAR 660-12-0060 (2) Where a local government determines that there would be a significant effect, compliance with section (1) shall be accomplished through one or a combination of the following:
(a) Adopting measures that demonstrate allowed land uses are consistent with the planned function, capacity, and performance standards of the transportation facility.
(b) Amending the TSP or comprehensive plan to provide transportation facilities, improvements or services adequate to support the proposed land uses consistent with the requirements of this division; such amendments shall include a funding plan or mechanism consistent with section (4) or include an amendment to the transportation finance plan so that the facility, improvement, or service will be provided by the end of the planning period.
(c) Altering land use designations, densities, or design requirements to reduce demand for automobile travel and meet travel needs through other modes.
(d) Amending the TSP to modify the planned function, capacity or performance standards of the transportation facility.
(e) Providing other measures as a condition of development or through a development agreement or similar funding method, including transportation system management measures, demand management or minor transportation improvements. Local governments shall as part of the amendment specify when measures or improvements provided pursuant to this subsection will be provided.

Response: The J Street intersections are significantly affected. An amendment to the City's Transportation System Plan identifies the long-term needs at these intersections, but at the time the TSP amendment was approved a funding mechanism was not simultaneously adopted. However, because the J Street improvements are located on US 97 and under the
jurisdiction of ODOT additional steps are required to provide a Reasonably Likely determination.

OAR 660-12-0060 (4) Determinations under sections (1)-(3) of this rule shall be coordinated with affected transportation facility and service providers and other affected local governments.
(a) In determining whether an amendment has a significant effect on an existing or planned transportation facility under subsection (1)(c) of this rule, local governments shall rely on existing transportation facilities and services and on the planned transportation facilities, improvements and services set forth in subsections (b) and (c) below.
(b) Outside of interstate interchange areas, the following are considered planned facilities, improvements and services:
(D) Improvements to state highways that are included as planned improvements in a regional or local transportation system plan or comprehensive plan when ODOT provides a written statement that the improvements are reasonably likely to be provided by the end of the planning period.
(e) For purposes of this section, a written statement provided pursuant to paragraphs (b)(D), (b)(E) or (c)(A) provided by ODOT, a local government or transportation facility provider, as appropriate, shall be conclusive in determining whether a transportation facility, improvement or service is a planned transportation facility, improvement or service. In the absence of a written statement, a local government can only rely upon planned transportation facilities, improvements and services identified in paragraphs (b)(A)-(C) to determine whether there is a significant effect that requires application of the remedies in section (2).

Response: A formal request has been provided to ODOT for a Reasonably Likely determination for the J Street improvements. The J Street improvements are included in the City of Madras TSP Amendment, conceptual design and cost estimates have been completed, and the project is included on the Draft 2010-2013 STIP, expected for approval in October 2010. Pending the anticipated receipt of the Reasonably Likely letter from the ODOT Region Manager the ability to assume completion of the J Street improvements as part of the horizon year transportation system will be conclusive.

## PROJECT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## Existing Transportation System Findings and Recommendations

Findings of the existing transportation system review and analysis are summarized below,

- All of the study area intersections currently operate acceptably. The Southbound US 97 (4 $4^{\mathrm{th}}$ Street)// Street intersection meets City and ODOT operational standards but operates with high peak hour delays on the stop-controlled east-west approaches.
- No marked pedestrian crossings or continuous sidewalks are provided between the Jefferson County Middle School/Yarrow and Juniper Hills Park.

Recommendations from the existing conditions assessment are provided below. The City of Madras should incorporate these recommendations into their scheduled maintenance plans or assess the priority of the improvements based on the potential system safety and performance benefit. The identified improvements are currently needed regardless of the proposed zone change.

- Pedestrian and bicycle connectivity and roadway crossing treatments should be considered as part of future planning efforts to connect the existing Jefferson County Middle School with the Juniper Hills Park. Additional connections to the Yarrow neighborhood should also be provided concurrent with development, including appropriate pedestrian crossing treatments along Ashwood Road. These connections could help encourage non-vehicular trips between the complementary uses and increase pedestrian and bicyclist safety.


## Transportation Planning Rule Findings and Recommendations

Key findings from the Transportation Planning Rule Analysis are summarized below.

- The proposed 20-acre rezone from the County's Rangeland zoning to the City's Multiple Family Residential zoning could generate an additional 159 weekday p.m. peak hour trips.
- With exception of the US 97/J Street intersections, all of the study area intersections operate acceptably with the existing and proposed zoning in the horizon analysis period.
- With or without the proposed rezone the US 97/J Street intersections exceed ODOT mobility standards. The additional trips associated with the rezone create an incremental impact on the intersection, creating a Significant Effect.
- The City's Transportation System Plan Amendment was prepared to identify the system improvement needs to address the J Street needs. Identified improvements include a realignment of Northbound US 97 ( $5^{\text {th }}$ Street) east onto Adams Drive and two new signalized intersections along J Street for both northbound and southbound highway traffic. With the planned improvements in place the transportation system will operate acceptably with the existing zoning and will continue to operate acceptably with the proposed rezone.
- A request for a Reasonably Likely determination has been provided to ODOT. With a Reasonably Likely determination for the J Street improvements, no unmitigated significant effects will occur with the proposed rezone.
- Interconnectivity should be reviewed with subsequent Yarrow development (including within the subject parcel) to provide direct and convenient multimodal access to the potential school site. Additionally, pedestrian treatments should be considered between Yarrow, Juniper Hills Park, the adjacent recreational facility, and Jefferson County Middle School.

Please let us know if you have any questions regarding this zone change analysis at (541) 3128300.

## ATTACHMENTS:

1. Historical Turning Movement Count Data
2. Existing Conditions Level of Service Worksheets
3. J Street Concept Map
4. Horizon Year (Existing RL Zoning) Level of Service Worksheets
5. R-2 Residential Density Development
6. Bend-La Pine Elementary School Trip Generation Study
7. City of Madras Roadway Classification Map
8. Project Scoping Letter
9. Horizon Year (Proposed R-2 Zoning) Level of Service Worksheets
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Attachment "1"
Manual Turning
Movement Counts

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Existing PMM Peak HourTraffic (As Counted) $\substack{40026 \\ \text { Mart } 7,2007}$$\quad$ Yarrow Subdivision Phase 3 and Phase 4 - Madras, Oregon | Figure 4 <br>  |

TRAFFIC COUNT SUMMARY FORM

| Project Title: | Madras |
| :--- | :--- |
| Project No. | ODOT0000.0408 |
| Location: | OR |
| NS Street: | Hwy 97/5th Street |
| EW Street: | B Stree: |


| Condtion: | 2003 Exlsting |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Count Date: | $1 / 28 / 2003$ |  |
| Count Period: | $4: 00-6: 00$ | PM |
| Growth Rate: | NA |  |
| \# Compounding Years: | NA |  |

APPROACH VOLUMES


Counted by: Traffic Smithy

15-MIN HOURLY

| TIME |  | EBL | EBT | EBA | W8L | W8T | WBR | NBL. | NBT | N8R | SBL | SBT | SBR | 15-MIN Total | HOURLY <br> Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16:00 | 16:15 | 2 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 20 | 5 | 141 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 256 | 984 | 0:00 |
| 16:15 | 16:30 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 6 | 12 | 133 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 236 | 1014 | 0.00 |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 10 | 12 | 164 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 258 | 1035 | 16:30 |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 12 | 11 | 143 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 234 | 1013 | 0:00 |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 12 | 12 | 161 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 285 | 964 | 0:00 |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 4 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 8 | 7 | 151 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 257 | 678 | 0:00 |
| 17:30 | 17:45 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 12 | 5 | 142 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 236 | 421 | 0:00 |
| 17:45 | 18:00 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 11 | 6 | 133 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 185 | 185 | 0:00 |

Actual PM peak hour perlog is from: | $16: 30$ | to |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |

ACTUAL PEAK HOUR VOLUME

| TIME |  | ACTUAL PEAK HOUR VOLUME |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15-Min <br> Total | Hourly Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | E8L. | E8T | EBR | WBL | Wat | WBR | NBL | NBT | N8R | S8L | SBT | SBR |  |  |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 10 | 12 | 164 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 258 |  |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 12 | 11 | 143 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 234 |  |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 12 | 12 | 161 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 286 |  |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 4 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 8 | 7 | 151 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 257 |  |
|  | total | 18 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 170 | 42 | 42 | 618 | 108 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1035 |
| Mvmni | PHF | 0.64 | 0.75 | \#DIV/0 | \#DIV/0! | 0.70 | 088 | 0.88 | 0.94 | 061 | \#DIV/0. | \#DIV/0! | \#DIVIO! | Int |  |
| Approach | PHF |  | 0.79 |  |  | 0.73 |  |  | 0.95 |  |  | \#DIV/0! |  | PHF-> | 0.90 |

The PM peak hour used is from: 16:30 to 17:30
VOLUME FOR PEAK HOUR USED

| TIME |  | E8L. | EBT | E8R | W8L | W8T | WBA | NBL | NBT | N88 | SBL | S8T | S8R | 15-Min Total | Hourly Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 10 | 12 | 164 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 258 |  |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 12 | 11 | 143 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 234 |  |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 12 | 12 | 161 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 286 |  |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 4 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 8 | 7 | 151 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 257 |  |
|  | TOTAL | 18 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 170 | 42 | 42 | 619 | 108 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1035 |
| Mvmnt | PHF | 064 | 075 | \#DIV/O | \#DIViol | 070 | 088 | 0.88 | 0.94 | 061 | 20IV/0 | MDiv/ol | \#DIVIO | Int |  |
| Approach | PHF |  | 0.79 |  |  | 0.73 |  |  | 095 |  |  | \#DIVIOI |  | PHF-> | 0.90 |

ACTUAL PEAK HOUR LINK VOLUMES

| TIME |  | ACTUAL PEAK HOUR LNK VOLUME16:30 to 17:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | NORTH OF INT. |  | SOUTH OFINT. |  | WEST OF INT. |  | EAST OF INT. |  |
|  |  | NB | SB | NB | SB | W8 | EB | WB | EB |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 179 | 0 | 194 | 0 | 53 | 13 | 51 | 26 |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 157 | 0 | 177 | 0 | 48 | 8 | 49 | 29 |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 180 | 0 | 196 | 0 | 73 | 17 | 73 | 33 |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 163 | 0 | 202 | 0 | 38 | 16 | 39 | 56 |
|  | TOTAL | 679 | 0 | 768 | 0 | 212 | 54 | 212 | 144 |

LINK VOLUMES FOR PEAK HOUR USED

|  |  |  |  | 16: | to | 17:30 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| time |  | NORT | F INT | SOUT | INT. | WES | F IN | EAS | INT. |
|  |  | NB | SB | NB | SB | WB | EB | WB | EB |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 179 | 0 | 194 | 0 | 53 | 13 | 51 | 26 |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 157 | 0 | 177 | 0 | 48 | 8 | 49 | 29 |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 180 | 0 | 196 | 0 | 73 | 17 | 73 | 33 |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 163 | 0 | 202 | 0 | 38 | 16 | 39 | 56 |
|  | TOTAL | 679 | 0 | 769 | 0 | 212 | 54 | 212 | 144 |

COMMENTS:

TRAFFIC COUNT SUMMARY FORM

| Project TItle: | Madras |
| :--- | :--- |
| Prolect No. | ODOT0000-0408 |
| Locatlon: | OR |
| NS Street: | Hwy 97/4th Street |
| EW Street: | B Street |


| Conditlon: | 2003 Existling |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Count Date: | $1 / 28 / 2003$ |  |
| Count Perlod: | $4: 00-6: 00$ | PM |
| Growth Rate: | NA |  |
| \# Compounding Years: | NA |  |
|  |  |  |
| APPROACH VOLUMES |  |  |



15-MIN HOURLY

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TIME |  | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL. | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR | 15-MIN <br> Total | HOURLY <br> Total | 0:00 |
| 16:00 | 16:15 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 50 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 170 | 5 | 251 | 953 |  |
| 16:15 | 16:30 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 49 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 141 | 6 | 225 | 966 | 0:00 |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 46 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 166 | 4 | 238 | 974 | 16:30 |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 43 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 167 | 9 | 239 | 930 | 0:00 |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 54 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 181 | 3 | 264 | 869 | 0.00 |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 42 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 164 | 5 | 233 | 605 | 0:00 |
| 17:30 | 17:45 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 40 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 130 | 4 | 194 | 372 | 0:00 |
| 17:45 | 18:00 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 21 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 141 | 2 | 178 | 178 | 0:00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1822 |  |  |

Actual PM peak hour perlod is from: $16: 30 \quad 10 \quad$ 17:30

| TIME |  | ACTUAL PEAK HOUR VOLUME |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 15-Min } \\ \text { Total } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Hourly <br> Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | S8L | SBT | SBR |  |  |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 46 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 166 | 4 | 238 |  |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 43 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 167 | 9 | 239 |  |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 54 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 181 | 3 | 264 |  |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 42 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 164 | 5 | 233 |  |
|  | TOTAL | 0 | 24 | 13 | 185 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 678 | 21 |  | 974 |
| Mvimit | PHF | \#OIVio | 0.67 | 0.65 | 0.86 | 0.63 | \#DIV/01 | Holv/01 | \#DIV/0! | HDIV/01 | 0.78 | 0.94 | 0.58 | Int |  |
| Approach | PHF |  | 0.71 |  |  | 0.85 |  |  | \#DIV/0) |  |  | 0.94 |  | PHF.> | 0.92 |

The PM peak hour used is from: $\qquad$
VOLUME FOA PEAK HOUR USED

| TIME |  | EBL | EBT | EBR | W8L | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBA | 15-Min Total | Housty Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 46 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 166 | 4 | 238 |  |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 43 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 167 | 9 | 239 |  |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 54 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 181 | 3 | 264 |  |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 42 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 164 | 5 | 233 |  |
|  | total | 0 | 24 | 13 | 185 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 678 | 21 |  | 974 |
| Mvmnt | PHF | \#DIVio | 0.67 | 0.65 | 086 | 063 | \#DIV/0, | HDIVo! | ADIVIO! | \#DIV/0! | 0.78 | 0.94 | 0.58 | Int. |  |
| Approach | PHF |  | 0.71 |  |  | 0.85 |  |  | \#DIVIO! |  |  | 0.94 |  | PHF-> | 0.92 |

ACTUAL PEAK HOUR UNK VOLUMES



COMMENTS:




## YEAR 2020 TRAFFIC CONDITIONS - WEEKDAY PM PEAK "WITH IMPROVEMENT" SCENARIO

|  |  | CITY OF MADRAS COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN UPDATE | S.ugassmasras.,1F | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { FIGURE } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | MAY 2001 |  |  |



Attachment " 2 "
Existing Conditions Level of Service Worksheets

| Fri．Jan 22，2010 11：47：19 |  |  |  |  | Page，－1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kitcelsori s Associates，Inc．－Froject 120028 Madras Elementary Schoci UGE Amendment．Macras，Creyor Existing Traffic Conditions，Weekday m leak Hous |  |  |  |  |  |
| Impact Analysis Repert Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection |  | Ease |  | Purure | Change |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { Dely } \\ \text { ven } \\ \text { ven } \end{array}$ | i： |
| \＃2＂B＂Street／4th Street |  | 17．E0．567 |  | 27.80 .567 | ＋ 0.000 Div |
| \＃2＂E＂Street／5th Street | B | 15.50 .472 | E 1 | 15．5．0．472 | ＋ 7.000 DN |
| 43 ＂B＂Street／10th Street | B | 10.40 .020 | E | 10.40 .020 | － 0.000 da |
| \＃4＂E＂Streer／Ashwoct | B | 10.70 .049 | B | 10.70 .5149 | － 0.000 yy |
| 有 5 ＂®＂Screet／Kinkade Road |  | 11.20 .008 |  | 12.20 .004 | ＋ 2.0008 |
| ＊6＂ミn Street／City View |  | 10.50 .050 |  | 10.50 .050 | － 0.0003 Dr |
| ＊？＂E＂Street／Rean Drive |  | 9.70 .080 |  | 9.70 .083 | － 2.000 mm |
| \＃\％＂J＂Sareet／4th Street |  | 46.60 .550 |  | 45.60 .550 | 10．000 1／4 |
| ＊9＂山＂sureet／5th street |  | 17.60 .350 |  | 14．63．350 | － 3.000 DE |


| Ex Exi Jan 22， 2010 11：47：17 |  | Page 1－1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kitteison a Associares，Inc．－Project $\# 10023$ <br> Madras Eiementary School UGB Amendment－Madras，Oregon Existing Traffic Contitions，Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |  |
|  | Scenario Report |  |
| Scenario： | PM |  |
| Command： | PM |  |
| volume： | PM |  |
| Geometry： | PM |  |
| Impart Fee： | Default Impact Fee |  |
| Trip Generation： | PM |  |
| Trip Distribution： | Default Trio Distribution |  |
| Paths： | Default Path |  |
| Routes： Configuration： | Default Route EM |  |





| PM | Fri Jan 22, 2010 11:47:19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Fage ${ }^{\text {n- }}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kittelson © Associates, Inc. - Project 1120028 <br> Madras Elementary School UGE Ansmdment - Madras, Cireqon Existirg Traffic Conditions, Weekday EM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service Detazled Computaition Repore ; HC:2000 Dueut methors; <br> 2000 HCM Operations Method Base Volume Alternative |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Iatersection \#1 "3" Srreet/4th Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach: | North Hound |  | South Bourid |  | East Eound |  |  | West mound |  |  |
| Moverrent: | T | - R | T | - R | L - | T |  | L- | T |  |
| Green/Cycle: | 0.000 .00 | 0.0 | . 55 | 0.52 | 0.00 | 0.37 |  |  |  |  |
| Arrivaltype: |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Progeactor: | 1.001 .00 | 1.00 | 1.001 .00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 500 |
| $01:$ | $0.0 \quad 0.0$ | 0.0 | 3.98 .9 | 6.9 |  | 1.1 |  | 3.8 | $4 . \%$ | $\square$ |
| UpstreamVC: | 0.000 .00 | 0.50 | 0.000 .00 | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.47 | 2.17 | 0.00 |
| UpstreamAdj: | 0.000 .00 | 0.00 | 0.000 .00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.70 | 0.45 | 0.45 | 2.00 |
| EarlyArrAdj: | 0.000 .00 | 0.00 | 1.001 .00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.40 | 34: | 0.00 |
| Q2: | $0.0 \quad 0.0$ | 0.0 | 1.31 .3 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 2.5 | 4.5 | 0.0 |
| Hcmamoueue: | $0.0 \quad 1.0$ | 0.0 | 10.110 .1 | 10.1 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 5.3 | 5 | 0.0 |
|  | 1.201 .20 | 1.20 | 1.181 .18 | 1.18 | 1.20 | 1.20 | 1.20 | 1.15 |  | . 20 |
| Hemariothe: | $0.0 \quad 0.0$ | 0.0 | 11.911 .9 | 11.5 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 0.0 |
| asthatactor: | 1.501 .50 | 1.60 | 1.511 .51 | 1.51 | 1.50 | 1.59 | 1.59 | 2.54 | 1.54 | . 60 |
| HCM2ksjurne: | $0.0 \quad 0.0$ | 0.0 | 15.315 .3 | 15.3 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 9.7 | 9.3 | 9.1) |
| 90-nafactor: | 1.801 .80 | 1.80 | 1.641 .64 | 2.64 | 1.80 | 1.18 | 1.78 | 1.69 | 1.35 | . 90 |
| HCM2k90thQ: | $0.0 \quad 0.0$ | 0. | 16.616 .6 | 16.5 | 0.0 | 2. | 2.1 | 10.6 | 10.6 | , |
| 95 thifactor: | 2.102 .10 | 2.10 | 1.841 .54 | 1.84 | 2.10 |  | 2.36 |  |  | 2.10 |
| HCM2k95tho: | $0.0 \quad 0.0$ | 0.0 | 18.718 .7 | 18.7 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 12.1 | 12.: | 0.6 |
| 98 th Factor: | 2.702 .70 | 2.70 | 2.162 .16 | 2.16 | 2.70 | 2.61 | 2.51 |  | 2.32 | 2.70 |
| HCM2kgetho: | 0.00 .0 | 0.0 | 21.321 .9 | 21.9 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 3. | 14.6 | 11.6 |  |
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## Attachment "3"

J Street Conceptual Improvement Illustration

US97@J Street (Madras) Project
Alternative Concepts of US97 Realignment Shown



US97@ J Street (Madras) Project
Conceptual Drawing of Signalized Intersections @ J Street US97 Option B Realignment Shown

(7)

## Attachment "4"

Existing RL Zoning LOS
Worksheets
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| Saturation | OiN MO | dule: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sat/Lane: | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 2750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 0 | 50 |
| Adjustinent: | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.64 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 1.00 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 1.00 |
| Lanes: | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 1.67 | 0.22 | 0.00 | 0.66 | 0.34 | 0.79 | 0.21 | 0.00 |
| Final Sat | 0 | 0 | 0 | 162 | 2443 | 319 |  | 1109 | 562 | 965 | 25.3 | 0 |
| Capacity Analysis Module: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Crit Moves: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Green/Cycle: | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.00 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.00 |
| Volume/Cap: | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.20 | 0.64 | 0.64 | 0.64 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.64 | 0.64 | 0.00 |
| Delay/Veh: | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 28.0 | 28.0 | 28.0 | 0.0 | 10.3 | 10.3 | 16.9 | 16.9 | 0.0 |
| User Deladj: | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| AdjDel/Veh: | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 28.0 |  | 28.0 | 0.0 |  | 10.3 | 16.9 |  | 0.0 |
| Los by Move: |  |  | A | c |  |  | A | B | B | B | B |  |
| HCM2 2 AvgQ: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 2 |  | 9 | 0 |










| ri Jan 22, 20101 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kittelson 5 Associates, Inc. - Project \#10028 Madras Elementary School UGB Amendment - Madras, Oregon Background Traffic Conditions, Weekriay PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |
| evel Of Service Detailed Computation Report (Fermitted Left Turn Sat AdI: 2000 HCM Operations Method Future Volume Alternative |  |  |  |  |
| rsection \#2 "B" st |  |  |  |  |
| Approach: <br> Cycle Length, C |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Actual Green Time Pex Lane Group, G: |  |  |  |  |
| Opposing Effective Green Time, go: Number OE Opposing Lanes, No: |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Lenes In Lane Group, N: |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion of Left Turns in Lane Group, plt: Froportion of Left Turns in Opp Flow, elto Leff Turns per Cycle, LTC: |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Adjusted Opposing frow kate, vo: |  | ${ }^{2}$ | 57 |  |
| Opposing Flow Per Lane Per Cycle, Vole: Opposing platoon Ratio, Rpo: |  | xx*x |  |  |
|  |  | yxxx | 1.00 |  |
| opposing platoon Ratio, Rpo: <br> Lost Time Per Phase, tl <br> Bff grn untic leftoturn oar sf |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Eff grn until arrival of left-turn car, gf: Opposing Queue Ratio, qro: |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Max opposing cars arriving during ga-gt, $n$ : |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| proportion of Left Turns in shared Lane, pi: Through-car Equivalents, ell: |  | xxxxx* |  |  |
| Single Lane Through-car Equivalents, ell:Minimum Left Turn Adjustment Factor, Emin single Lane Left Turn Adjustment Factor, fr: Left Turn Adjustment Factor, flt: |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\xrightarrow{\text { Adjustment }}$ Factor, fitit. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |


Traffis 8.0.0715 (c) 2008 Dowling Assoc. Licensed te KITTELSON, WAPTMAN









 Shrd ConDel:
Shared Los:
ApproachDel:


Traffix 8.0.0715 (e) 2008 Dowling Assoc. Licensed to KITTELSON, PORTLAND


ratife 8.0.0715 (L) 2008 Dowling Assoc. Licenser to :TYTELSON, PORTLAB!



Fri $\operatorname{Jan} 22,2010$ 11:48:58








 Note: Queue reported is the number fry cors por

## Attachment "5"

R-2 Residential Density Development

Derivation of Potential Residential Density (based on provisions within City Ordinance 723)
5 acres * $43,560 \mathrm{SF} /$ acre $=217,800 \mathrm{SF}$
$217,800 \mathrm{SF}-25 \%$ roads, offsets, easements $=163,350$ SF Usable

- Assuming 18 units per typical apartment structure


## First two units

$=10,000 \mathrm{SF}$ (first two units) $+(2$ units * 200 SF lawn/unit) + ( 2 units * 300 SF parking/unit)
$=11,000 \mathrm{SF}$

## 16 Additional units

$=16$ units * 200 lawn +16 units * 300 parking +16 units * 2,000 SF/unit
$=40,000 \mathrm{SF}$
18 Unit Apartment Building
$=11,000 \mathrm{SF}+40,000 \mathrm{SF}$
$=51,000 \mathrm{SF}$

## Total Buildings

$=163,350 / 51,000=3$ Buildings

- Assuming final building has more than 18 units to utilize remaining land
$=163,350$ SF $-51,000$ SF/Building * 3 Buildings
$10,350 \mathrm{SF}=$ ( $x$ units * 200 SF lawn/unit $+x$ * 300 parking/unit $+x$ * 2,000 SF/unit)
$x=4$ units


## Total Residential Units

$=3$ Buildings $* 18$ units per building +4 units
$=58$ units multifamily units, or 11.6 units per acre per five acres
$=232$ apartment units on 20 acres or 174 units on 15 acres

Attachment "6"
Bend-La Pine Trip Generation Study

KITTELSON \& ASSOCIATES, INC. TRANSPORTATIONENGINEERING/PLANNING 354 SW Upper Terrace Drive. Suite 101, Bend Oregon 9770254131283005413124585

MEMORANDUM

| Date: | October 14, 2008 | Project \#: 9140 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| To: | John M. Rexford |  |
|  | Bend-La Pine Schools |  |
|  | 520 NW Wall Street |  |
|  | Bend, Oregon 97701-2699 |  |
| From: | Joe Bessman, P.E. |  |
| Subject: | Elementary School Trip Generation Study |  |

## PURPOSE

The purpose of this memorandum is to summarize measured trip generation rates for elementary schools in Bend during the weekday p.m. peak hour of adjacent street traffic. Standard reference manuals contain trip generation data for elementary schools during the weekday a.m. peak hour (7:00 to 9:00 a.m.) and during the afternoon school peak hour (2:00 to 4:00 p.m.), but no data is available for the evening commute period. This time period is commonly used to assess off-site impacts of schools to the transportation system.

This study identifies elementary school trip generation data during the weekday p.m. peak hour of adjacent street traffic, and was prepared based on surveys of four elementary schools located within Bend. The study methodology and resultant trip generation rates are summarized herein.

## AVAILABLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DATA

As defined within Trip Generation, $7^{\text {th }}$ Edition, elementary schools serve grades kindergarten through fifth or sixth grade, are typically centrally located within residential communities to facilitate access, and provide bus service to students within specific geographic boundaries. The ITE land use category for elementary schools includes both public and private elementary schools within the dataset, although data for this study was collected exclusively at public schools.

As identified within the Trip Generation manual, school bus utilization may vary significantly between elementary schools, and may result in varying trip rates between school sites. Potential factors for school bus utilization could include the proximity of bus service, service boundaries, transportation infrastructure, crime, income, or other factors. School bus utilization data was not collected as the purpose of this trip generation study is to identify characteristics specific to the Bend-La Pine School District, and specifically to elementary schools within the City of Bend.

Available data contained within the standard reference materials includes elementary school surveys during the weekday p.m. peak hour of the generator only. This coincides with the end of
the school day, which typically occurs between 2:00 p.m. and 4:00 p.m. However, the critical offsite transportation analysis period typically coincides with the evening commute period (4:00 to 6:00 p.m.), which does not occur simultaneously with elementary school peak trip generation. No standard data is available within the ITE manual related to elementary school trip characteristics during the weekday evening commute period, when limited after-school activities or staff trips represent the primary uses.

As part of new elementary school projects for the City of Hillsboro School District, trip generation studies were conducted at several locations during the critical weekday p.m. commute period (4:00 to 6:00 p.m.). These studies showed that the schools' trip generation rates during the evening commute period were approximately 30 percent of the peak school trip rates that occurred in the afternoon. Given the unique characteristics of Bend (population, service boundaries, and bus ridership), a trip generation study was conducted to assess trip generation rates applicable to local conditions.

## TRIP GENERATION STUDY

Four school sites were selected for analysis throughout the City of Bend. School sites selected were those that were in operation for at least two years, were centrally located within residential communities, include typical school hours and amenities, contain defined attendance boundaries, and include configurations that would allow the separation of trips from those associated with surrounding uses. The school sites selected for the survey, data collection dates, street address, and year 2008/2009 enrollment data are identified in Table 1. The attachments include the school attendance boundary map illustrating the location of the elementary schools and the areas served.

Table 1
Elementary School Characteristics

| School Name | Data Collection Dates | School <br> Enrollment | Street Address |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |$|$| Pine Ridge Elementary | Tuesday September 16, <br> 2008 | 540 | 19840 SW Hollygrape St <br> Bend, Oregon 97702 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| R E Jewell Elementary | Tuesday September 16, <br> 2008 | 557 | 20550 Murphy Rd <br> Bend, Oregon 97702 |
| Juniper Elementary | Tuesday September 16, <br> 2008 | 509 | 1300 NE Noton Ave <br> Bend, Oregon 97701 |
| Elk Meadow Elementary | Tuesday September 16, <br> 2008 | 568 | 60880 Brookswood Blvd <br> Bend, Oregon 97702 |

Each of the ingress/egress points at the school sites were videotaped on September 16, 2008, two weeks after the start of school to ensure that school attendance patterns had normalized. It should be noted that many of the schools are situated adjacent to public parks, and trips associated with the ball fields or adjacent parks could not be entirely separated. During the surveys, the weather was sunny with a high temperature of 90 degrees. Accordingly, it is expected that the trip generation studies are conservatively high given the higher usage of the adjacent ball fields than during the majority of the school year. As trips during the evening commute period likely reflect
low levels of student trips to and from the school, the potential impact of weather on student mode choice is not expected to have a significant impact on the measured trip generation rates.

Intersection traffic counts were simultaneously conducted at nearby collector and arterial intersections to identify the time period with peak traffic volumes on the adjacent roadway system. Given the relatively low school volumes, this hour represents the time period when the combination of site-generated traffic and roadway volumes are expected to peak. The peak hour of adjacent street traffic identified in the study typically occurred just prior to the 5:00 to 6:00 p.m. period, with exception of counts collected near Juniper Elementary which identified an earlier peak hour between 4:25 and 5:25 p.m

## TRIP GENERATION RESULTS

Videotapes collected at the school ingress/egress points were manually reviewed in five-minute increments coinciding with the peak hour of adjacent street traffic. Trip rates on a per-student basis were calculated at each of the four school sites, and a weighted average was applied to generate a local elementary school trip generation rate on a per-student basis. A summary of the trip generation data for each school is provided in Table 2 and Figure 1, and worksheets from the data collection efforts are included in the attachments.

Table 2
Measured Trip Generation Rates (Weekday PM Peak Hour)

| School Name | Student <br> Enrollment | Weekday PM Peak Hour of <br> Adjacent Street Traffic | Trips Per <br> Student | \% <br> Trips In | \% <br> Trips Out |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pine Ridge Elementary | 540 | $4: 50$ to 5:50 p.m. | 0.16 | 40 | 60 |
| RE Jewell Elementary | 557 | $4: 25$ to $5: 25$ p.m. | 0.09 | 68 | 32 |
| Juniper Elementary | 509 | $4: 25$ to $5: 25$ p.m. | 0.15 | 52 | 48 |
| Elk Meadow Elementary | 568 | $4: 55$ to $5: 55$ p.m. | 0.12 | 58 | 42 |
| Weighted Average Trip Generation Rate |  | $0.13^{1}$ | $55 \%$ | $45 \%$ |  |

${ }^{1}$ The weighted average is calculated by dividing the sum of all trips or trip ends by the sum of all independent variable units (total school trips / total student enrollment).

Based on the resultant trip generation rates, trip generation rates for elementary schools within the Bend La Pine School District were identified as 0.13 trips per student during the weekday p.m. peak hour of adjacent street traffic, with 55 percent of the trips inbound and 45 percent of the trips outbound. This local trip rate is approximately half of the national trip rate of 0.28 trips per student during the weekday peak hour of generator (2:00 to 4:00 p.m. time period).

We trust that the information contain herein adequately summarizes the trip generation characteristics of elementary schools within the City of Bend. Please let us know if you have any questions or need any additional information to review the analysis findings.

```
Attachments: Traffic count worksheets
School Attendance Area Map
```


## Elementary School

## Average Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Students On a: Weekday, <br> Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.

Number of Studies: 4
Average Number of Students: 544
Directional Distribution: 55\% entering, $45 \%$ exiting
Trip Generation per Student

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.13 | $0.09-0.16$ | 0.03 |

Data Plot and Equation
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Attachment "7"
City of Madras Roadway
Classification Map


Attachment " 8 "
Project Scoping Letter

KITTELSON \& ASSOCIATES, INC.
TRANSPORTATIONENGINEERING/PLANNING
354 SW Upper Terrace Orive, Suite 101. Bend, Oregon $97702541312.8300 \quad 5413124585$
MEMORANDUM

| Date: | December 10, 2009 | Project \#: 10028.0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| To: | Nick Snead, City of Madras |  |
|  | Jon Skidmore, Jefferson County <br> Ana Jovanovic, ODOT Region 4 |  |
| From: | Joe Bessman, Kittelson \& Associates, Inc. |  |
| Cc: | DJ Heffernan, Angelo Planning Group |  |
| Project: | Madras Elementary School UGB Amendment <br> Subject: |  |
|  |  |  |

The purpose of this memorandum is to document transportation analysis scoping to rezone 20 acres of land located in Jefferson County from Range Land (RL) to include this land within the City's Urban Growth Boundary as Multiple Family Residential (R-2) zoning. This scoping was prepared for consistency with the requirements identified within Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 660-12-0060 (Transportation Planning Rule, TPR), which contains the applicable criteria for a zone change analysis. The purpose of the TPR analysis is to ensure the transportation system can accommodate the allowable land uses and that any significant affects are mitigated.

The land included in the rezone is generally located south of Ashwood Road, east of the Jefferson County Middle School, and south of the existing ballfields near Bean Drive. The property is within the Yarrow Master Planned Community and its rezone to accommodate a school is consistent with the approved Yarrow Concept Plan. The location of the property is generally shown in Figure 1, and the identification of the approximately 20 -acre future school property on the Yarrow Concept Plan is illustrated in Figure 2. No specific development or entitlements are being pursued as part of this zone change.

Note that while specific parcel boundaries have not yet been identified, the general location of the property south of Ashwood and east of Bean Drive within the future school boundary location shown on the Yarrow Concept Plan provides adequate information to accurately assess the transportation system impacts. Specific definition of the property will be provided as part of the zone change application pending further area refinement with City and County staff.

## LAND DEVELOPMENT ASSUMPTIONS

Two reasonable development scenarios were identified to assess the potential transportation impact of rezoning 20 -acres from Range Land to Multiple Family Residential Zoning. The two scenarios reflect County and City zoning provisions and are presented below.



## Range Land (RL) Development Potential

The Range Land zoning is one of three designations for Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) lands within Jefferson County. The RL zoning is intended to preserve predominantly non-irrigated agricultural lands for livestock grazing. The RL zoning requires that non-farm residences contain a minimum of 40 acres. A variety of non-residential uses are permitted within the RL zoning, though these uses require more acreage than the 20 -acres proposed for the rezone and all are considered low intensity uses. Accordingly, under the existing zoning the trip generation potential is severely limited, and for analysis purposes it was conservatively assumed to be none.

## Multiple Family Residential (R-2) Development Potential

The Multiple Family Residential (R-2) zoning category provides for higher-density single-family uses and attached residential uses, to include apartments and townhomes. The R-2 zoning also allows parks and community centers as outright uses. Schools, churches, libraries, and other government buildings are allowed as conditional uses.

The City of Madras zoning provisions, as contained within Ordinance 723, were reviewed to identify density ranges and allowable uses within the R-2 zoning. Conditional uses are typically not considered as part of a zone change analysis. However, as the intent of the rezone is to ultimately allow for a new elementary school, this specific conditional use was reviewed to ensure that a reasonable development scenario considers the impacts of this intended future use.

Review of the City zoning provisions identified the following outright allowable uses:

- Single family residential
- Multi-family residential
- Public park, recreation areas, community centers

Based on the uses shown above, multi-family residential was identified as the most intense outright land use from a trip generation perspective. Review of the required building space, parking allocations, lawn space, and typical road and infrastructure allocations identified a resultant reasonable maximum density of 11.6 attached residential units per acre, or approximately 232 total attached residential units on 20 -acres. Additional details on the development of residential densities are included as an attachment.

Conversations with the project team identified that a future school would likely comprise five acres of the overall land, with the remainder retained for residential uses. The most likely school type would be an elementary school given the regional needs. A new elementary school could be expected to serve an enrollment of approximately 350 students. This would result in a second potential development scenario that would include 174 attached residential units ( 11.6 units/acre * 15 acres $=174$ units) and a 350-student elementary school (remaining five acres)..

## TPR ANALYSIS SCOPING

## Trip Generation

Trip generation estimates were prepared for both R-2 zoning scenarios to determine which land use combination resulted in a higher overall trip generation potential during the critical weekday evening commute period (one hour between 4:00 and 6:00 p.m.). Trip generation estimates for each of the scenarios were prepared based on surveys of similar sites. Residential trip generation estimates were prepared based on data contained within the Institute of Transportation Engineer's (ITE's) standard reference Trip Generation, $8^{\text {th }}$ Edition, using the Apartment land use category (Land Use Code 220). Trip generation estimates for the elementary school were prepared using surveys of schools within the City of Bend, which contain slightly lower trip generation rates than national surveys of elementary schools ( 0.13 trips per student versus 0.15 trips per student) but are expected to better represent local characteristics. The attachments contain the BendLa Pine Elementary School Trip Generation study.

While the location of the elementary school is expected to support the surrounding Yarrow neighborhood, complement the adjacent middle school, and benefit from the adjacent ballfields, additional trip discounts were not applied to the trip rates obtained from the Bend-LaPine school district facilities. Table 1 summarizes the trip generation potential of the two scenarios.

Table $1 \quad$ R-2 Development Scenarios Trip Generation Potential

| Land Use | ITE Code | Size | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Total | In | Out |
| Proposed R-2 Zoning: Residential Only Scenario |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apartments | 220 | 232 Units | 145 | 94 | 51 |
| Proposed R-2 Zoning: Residential Plus Elementary School Scenario |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apartments | 220 | 174 Units | 113 | 74 | 39 |
| Elementary School | N/A | 350 Students | 46 | 25 | 21 |
| Total Trips |  |  | 159 | 99 | 60 |

*Trip rate reflects data collected at elementary schools in central Oregon
As shown in Table 1, future development of the 20 -acres with an elementary school (comprising five acres) and residential uses (comprising 15 acres) provides a reasonable worst-case development scenario. This scenario was found to generate 14 more weekday p.m. peak hour trips than build-out with residential uses alone.

## Trip Distribution and Trip Assignment

The estimated trip distribution pattern of primary site-generated trips associated with the proposed UGB amendment and rezone was determined through review of existing traffic patterns, the locations of other elementary schools, residential destinations, and review of existing
school attendance boundary maps. The resultant trip distribution patterns were separated by residential and school trips, and are illustrated in Figures 3 and 4. As shown, the pattern highlights that the majority of trips would be headed west toward the City center and US 97 corridor. Trips destined toward US 97 are expected to distribute onto the parallel routes (Loucks, City View, or B Street) based on their ultimate travel destination. Both trip distribution patterns reflect a regional draw as the school trips are primarily associated with faculty and staff during the evening commute period.

The difference between the Range Land zoning trip generation potential (assumed to be none) and the proposed Multiple Family Residential (R-2) zoning trips (shown in Table 1) during the critical weekday p.m. peak hour were assigned to the roadway network based on the trip distribution patterns and routing, as illustrated in Figure 5. Figure 5 includes a sum of the total additional vehicles that could occur at nearby collector and arterial intersections.

## Study Intersections

Based on a review of the potential increase in trips with the proposed zoning (as shown in Figure 5), the following five intersections of collector and arterial roadways are proposed for inclusion in the traffic study.

1. Ashwood/Bean Drive (could be impacted by 137 additional weekday p.m. peak hour trips)
2. Ashwood/City View (could be impacted by 119 additional weekday p.m. peak hour trips)
3. B Street/Kinkade Road (could be impacted by 76 additional weekday p.m. peak hour trips)
4. B Street/Ashwood (could be impacted by 66 additional weekday p.m. peak hour trips)
5. B Street $/ 10^{\text {th }}$ Street (could be impacted by 55 additional weekday p.m. peak hour trips)

These intersections are those that could experience more than 50 additional weekday p.m. peak hour trips with the rezone/UGB amendment, or those that could experience a significant increase in total volume with the amendment ${ }^{1}$. The City of Madras roadway classification map is included in the attachments.

It should be noted that additional assessment of localized queuing and operations during the school peak periods may be required at the time of site plan application/land use entitlements. However, as the purpose of the Transportation Planning Rule is to provide consistency with the adopted Transportation System Plan (TSP), only the weekday p.m. peak hour operations are applicable to the TPR analysis.
${ }^{1}$ The City of Madras Technical Memorandum \#2B contains traffic study guidelines that identify study area intersections as those that experience a 10 percent volume increase as a result of a proposed land use action.




Jefferson County traffic study requirements identify that a Level of Service "C" or higher should be maintained at all County intersections. The City of Madras TSP identifies a target Level of Service (LOS) "D" for signalized intersections, LOS "E" for unsignalized intersections (or LOS F with a volume-to-capacity ratio below 0.95 ).

## Study Periods

The purpose of the Transportation Planning Rule is to ensure that the proposed zone change will continue to be consistent with the system planning required under OAR 660-12. To assess consistency, the horizon analysis period is selected based on the horizon period of the adopted Transportation System Plan. The Jefferson County TSP considers a horizon year of 2027 and the City's TSP assesses year 2020 conditions. Accordingly, the applicable horizon period will vary throughout the study area based on roadway jurisdiction. All traffic volume forecasts will be obtained from the applicable TSP or based on continued application of the approved growth rates where otherwise unavailable. Table 2 summarizes the study intersections, roadway jurisdiction, applicable performance standards, and horizon analysis year required for compliance with the TPR. ${ }^{2}$

Table 2 Summary of Intersection Performance Standards

| Intersection | Jurisdiction | Traffic <br> Control $^{1}$ | Performance <br> Standard | Horizon <br> Period |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ashwood Road/ <br> Bean Drive | Jefferson County | TWSC | LOS C | Year 2027 |
| Ashwood Road/ <br> Clty View | City of Madras | TWSC | LOS E/ <br> $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}<0.95$ | Year 2020 |
| B Street/ <br> Kinkade Road | City of Madras | TWSC | LOS E/ <br> $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}<0.95$ | Year 2020 |
| B Street/ <br> Ashwood Road | City of Madras | TWSC | LOS E/ <br> $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}<0.95$ | Year 2020 |
| B Street/ <br> $10^{\text {th }}$ Street | City of Madras | TWSC | LOS E/ <br> $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}<0.95$ | Year 2020 |

${ }^{1}$ TWSC: Two-way stop-controlled (unsignalized)

## Recent or Upcoming Roadway Improvements

There are three identified public improvement projects within the vicinity of the property.

- The J Street improvements will include traffic signal upgrades at the US 97 northbound and southbound couplet, realignment of the southern couplet terminus, and roadway widening. The J Street project is identified on the Draft 2010-2013 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and is likely to be funded by the horizon period (note that

[^109]| Madras Elementary School UGB Amendment | Project \#: 10028.0 |
| :--- | :--- |
| December 10,2009 |  |

while the improvement is likely to occur, a reasonably likely determination has not been provided by ODOT).

- The Fairground Road extension is identified as a new east-west route within the City of Madras on the Transportation System Plan. Similarly, the roadway extension is likely to be provided within the planning horizon.
- The City View to J Street connection has been recently completed. This new connection provides convenient and direct access from the proposed lands to US 97.

The recent construction of the City View connection will provide convenient access to the south. The future funding and reasonably likely determinations for the J Street realignment/improvements and the Fairgrounds extension are not critical to the proposed UGB amendment as it will not affect the selection of study intersections, assumed intersection configurations, or result in modifications to the demand-based regional trip distribution patterns included herein. As a result, to be conservative, neither the J Street realignment/improvements nor the Fairgrounds extension will be assumed in the traffic analysis.

## NEXT STEPS

Please provide written comments or concurrence on the proposed analysis scope at your earliest convenience. If you have any questions on these materials please call us at (541) 312-8300.

## Attachments

1. Residential Density Development
2. Bend - La Pine School District Elementary School Trip Generation Study
3. City of Madras Roadway Classification Map

Attachment "9" Proposed R-2 Zoning LOS Worksheets

| $20!6$ |  |  | \%ex |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ittelson vadras Eiemencar Total Trafic | es. Inc. - Pro UGE Amendment ions, Heekday | ent 1110025 Mauras, oregon Feuk ituas |  |
| Impact Analysis Report Level of Service |  |  |  |
| 1nsersection | Ease | Fusure | crance |
|  |  | 10\% Dent ${ }^{\text {V/ }}$ | 2 l |
| 2 "B" Screet/4th street | c 22.40 .636 | c 22.260 .65 | + a.262 0\% |
| 2 "8" Street/5th Strees | c 20.30 .581 | c 219.60 .5045 | - 11.261 mv |
| \# 3"B" Street/10th street | E 17.8 0.13 .188 | B 12.6, 0.048 | - 4.843 D |
| \# 4 "B" street/Ashwood | R 19.200084 | B 0.80 .093 | $-0.62 \% \mathrm{mov}$ |
| 5 "E" Street/Kinkade Ruad | в 21.80 .016 | B 24.00 .024 | + 2006 da |
| 6 "B" Street/city view | 8 11.90 .088 | 8 12.50.109 | * 0.9.94 $\mathrm{L} / \mathrm{l}$ |
| 7 "E" Street/Eean Drive | 11.30 .143 | 13.40 .151 | +2.97 0\% |
| \# 8 " ${ }^{\text {U" Street/4th Street }}$ | F OVREL 4.790 | Foveri 4.8.s | -2.061029 |
| 9 "J" street/Eth street | F 287.21 .476 | F 531.72 .010 | $4 \mathrm{4.57}$ |
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| Kittelson a Associates, Inc. - Project \#1002B Madres Elementary School UGB Amendment - Madras, Oregon total Traffic Conditions, Weekday PM Peak Hour |
| :---: |
| Level of Service Detailed Computation Report 2000 HCM Operations Method Future Volume Alternative |

Intersection n1 "B" Street/sth street













| satice | 27501750 | 1750 | 1750 |  | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | :75: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arsuemper | 0.840 .84 | 0.34 | 1.00 | . 00 | 1.00 | 0.75 | 0.75 | $1.0 n$ | (10) |  | 0 |
| Ler | 0.181 .33 | 0.49 | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.39 | 0.61 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | 3 |
| Fin | 2531946 | 718 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 517 | 802 | 0 |  | 1245 | 99 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | * |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |
|  | $0 \cdot 90$ | 0.0 | Tortrot | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | $\stackrel{1}{ }$ |  |  |  |
| $00:$ | 00\% 00 | $00^{\circ} \mathrm{t}$ | 20'100't | 00.1 |  | $00^{\circ}$ | 00. |  |  |  |
|  | $0 \cdot 5$ | \% | Cotrot | $0 \cdot$ |  |  | - 52 |  |  |  |
| 09.0 | c19.0 $00^{\circ}$ | $00 \%$ | acomo | 00.0 |  |  | 09.0 |  |  | , |
| (cio | $\because 9000$ | c.0.0 | cs.0 cs'o | $00 \cdot 0$ |  |  | $5 \varepsilon^{\circ}$ |  |  | - 2 \%uaze |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



|  | Jan 22, 2010 11:50:20 |  |  |  |  |  | ge :- |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kittelson a Associates, Inc. - Project 110028 <br> Madras E.lementary School Utib Amendment - Madras, oregon Total Traffic Conditions, Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service Detailed Computation Report (HCM2000 Queue Method) <br> 2000 HCM Operations Method <br> Future Volume Alcernative |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection \#1 "B" Street/4th street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Noxth Boun |  | South Boun |  | st Bou |  | West Bound <br> - T - |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Green/Cycle: | 0.000 .00 | . 00 | 35 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.600 .57 | 0.57 | . 57 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ogFactor: | 1.001 .00 | 1.00 | 1.001 .00 | 1.00 | 1.001 .00 | 1.00 | 1.001 .00 | 0 |
|  | 0.00 .0 | 0.0 | ${ }^{8.2} 81.2$ | 8.2 | 0.01 .4 |  | ${ }^{8.50}{ }^{8.5}$ |  |
| Upstrea | 0.000 .00 | 0.00 | 0.000 .00 | 0.00 | 0.000 .00 | 0.00 | 0.600 .60 | \% |
| UpstreamAd | 0.000 .00 | 0.00 | 0.000 .00 | 0.00 | , | , | 0.770 .77 |  |
|  |  | . | . 01.00 | . |  |  |  |  |
| M2K0 | 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 | 0.0 0.0 | $\begin{array}{ll}1.7 & 1.7 \\ 9.9 & 9.9\end{array}$ | 1.7 | $\begin{array}{ll}0.0 & 0.1 \\ 0.0 & 1.5\end{array}$ | 0. | 0.8 9.3 9.3 9.3 | 0.0 0.0 |
|  | 1.201 .20 | 1.20 | 1.181.18 | 1.18 | 1.201 .20 | 1.20 | 1.181 .18 |  |
| HCM2k | 0.00 .0 | 0.0 | 11.711 | 11 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 10.910 |  |
| 85thsfactor | 1.601 .60 | 1.60 | 1.521 .52 | 1.52 | 1.601 .58 | 1.58 | 1.521 .52 |  |
| нсм2k85 | $0.0 \quad 0.0$ | 0.0 | 15.015 | 15.0 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 14.1 |  |
| 90 -h\%factor | 1.201 .80 | 1.80 | 1.541 .64 | 1.64 | 1.801 .77 | . 77 | 1.651 .65 |  |
| HCM2k90the: | 0.0 | 0.0 | 16.316 .3 | 16 | $0.0 \quad 2.7$ | 2.7 | 15.315 .3 |  |
| ths | 10 | 2.10 | 1.851 .85 | 1.85 | 2.102 .05 | 2.05 | 1.861 .86 |  |
| HCM2k95the | 0.00 .0 | 0.0 | 18.318 .3 | 18.3 | $0.0 \quad 3.2$ | 3.2 | 17.217 .2 |  |
| 98tht Factor: | $2.70 \geq .70$ | 2.70 | 2.172 .17 | 2.17 | 2.702 .59 | 2.59 | 2.192 .19 |  |
| Q: | $0.0 \quad 0.0$ | 0.0 | 21.521 .5 | 21.5 | 0.04 .0 |  | 20.320 .3 |  |

Fri Jan 22, 2010 11:50:20

Tnteasection \#2 "B" Street, Sth Street


| Lanes: | 1 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 \% | , | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\therefore$ - | 0 |  | 0 |
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| Critical Gap | Moduie: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical 6 p | $4.2 \times x \times x \times \times \times x \times$ | xxixx xxxx sxxax | 7.1 | 0.5 | x:xx: | xxx> |  |  |  |
| FollowUpTim: | 2.3 xxxx xxxxx | xxxxs xxxx mxaxx | 3.5 | 4.0 | yxxxx | xxxxx | 4.0 |  |  |
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| PM Fri Jan 22， 2010 11：51：10 |  |  | faye 4－ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kitrelson \＆Associates，Ins．－Project $\mathrm{i}_{10028}$ <br> Madras Elementary School UGZ Amendment－Madras，Oregon Total Trafíic Conditions－Mitigated，weekday pM peak Hour |  |  |  |  |
| d Computation Report（Permitted Left Turn Sat Adi： 2000 HCM Operations Method Future Valume Alternarive |  |  |  |  |
| Interssction 48 ＂J＂street／4th Street－Mitigated |  |  |  |  |
| proash： | Nor | South |  |  |
| Cycle Length， |  |  |  |  |
| Actual Green Time Per Larie Group | кххк心采 | x\％ | \％ |  |
| Effective Green Time Per Lane Group，g： | xxxxxx | ххиумх |  |  |
| Opposing Effective Green Time，go |  |  |  |  |
| Rumber of Opposing Lanes，No： |  |  |  |  |
| Number OE Lanes In Lane Group， | xzxask | x：xxxxx |  |  |
| Adjusted Lett－Turn Flow Rate， | x：xxxx | \％xxysx | xxxxsx |  |
| Proportion of Left Turns in Lane Group，Plt |  |  |  |  |
| Pxoportion of Left Turns in Opp Flow， |  |  |  |  |
| Left Turns Per Cycle，LTC： |  | xuxx： | x＞＞x | 91 |
| Aijusted Opposing Flow Rate， | xxxxxx | xxxx：x |  |  |
| Opposing Flow per Lane per Cycle，Volo |  |  | \％xx |  |
| Opposing platron Ratio，R |  |  |  | 2.00 |
| Lost Time Per Phase |  |  | ， |  |
| Eff grn until arrival of left－turn car， | x＜x＞x： |  | \％x＜z |  |
| Opposing queue Ratio，gro： | x××xx¢ | x＜xxxx | kxxx | 0.76 |
| Eff grn blocked by opposing queu |  |  | x $\times \times \times \times \mathrm{x}$ | 7 |
| Eff grn while left turns filter | － | x×з\％ | xxxx\％ | 21.27 |
| Max opposing cars arriving during | xxxxx | xxxxx | kxx： |  |
| propertion of opposing Thru a RT | x×xxx | x：xx：x | \％＜ | －$\times 1 \times 2 \times 8$ |
| Left－turn Saturation Factor，fs： | kx＜x：$\times$ x | x＜xx $\times \times \times$ | $x \times \times x=\%$ |  |
| Proportion of Left Turns in Shared Lane，pl | кх\％\％\％\％ | \％xx | xxx\％$\times$ \％ | 1.00 |
| Through－car Eqpivalents，ell： |  |  |  | 1.59 |
| ngle Lane Through－car Equiva |  |  |  |  |
| umm Left Turn Adjustment Factor，emin |  |  |  |  |
| Factor，fm： | ＊x | ＜x＜x | xxyxxx |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
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Appendix G: ODOT Letter Regarding Reasonably Likely Determination for US 97/J Street Improvements

Department of Transportation
Robert W. Bryant Region 4 Manager 63055 N. Hwy 97 Bend, OR 97701
(541) 388-6180

FAX: (541) 388-6231
FILE CODE:
February 2, 2010

Nick Snead
Community Development Director
71 SE "D"St
Madras, OR 97740

Subject: Madras UGB Expansion TPR Analysis; Reasonably Likely Determination
Dear Mr. Snead,
The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on the transportation study prepared for Madras UGB Expansion and related TPR Analysis. We received this study from Kittelson and Associates on January 22, 2010. Our planning staff also reviewed the City's plan amendment application and DLCD's recent response.

As part of the UGB expansion, the City of Madras is considering a 20-acre rezone of Range Land to R-2 Residential uses, including a new elementary school. The proposed amendment is located at the outskirts of town, near the intersection of Ashwood Road and Bean Drive. Neither roads are state facilities; however, the traffic study concluded that the proposed rezone has a significant effect on the US97/" ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ " Street intersections (degraded operation with incremental trips within the plaming horizon). This is an important state facility where ODOT and the City are plaming significant improvements in the near future.

On January 21, 2010, pursuant to OAR 660-012-0060(4)(b), the City has written ODOT requesting a determination as to whether planned state highway improvements at US97/ "J" Street are not only included in the City's TSP, but also:

- Funded for construction in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP);
- Part of a regional transportation system plan; or
- If neither of the above, the planned improvements are reasonably likely to be provided by the end of the TSP planning period.

ODOT offers the following comments in response:

1. US97 is a Statewide level highway facility and a freight route.
2. The City of Madras completed a TSP Amendment in 2005 to address the anticipated failure of the US 97/'J" Street intersections.
3. A preferred concept was identified by the City and ODOT as shown on the project website http://ci.madras.or.us/public works/pw hwy97southY. shtml. The concept includes cost estimates, right-of-way needs, and a double-line sketch of the preferred roadway alignment.
4. Funding for the construction of the US97/'J'Street improvements is included in the Draft 2010-2013 STIP, which is expected to be approved in October 2010. The "J" Street improvements are not on the current 2008-11 STIP list. At this time, there is a gap between funding identified in the Draft STIP and cost estimates submitted by the project team. However, the City has been collecting transportation System Development Charges slated specifically for US97/'J" Street improvements.

Based on ODOT's review of the circumstances associated with future improvements to US97 $/$ 'J" Street intersections, it is our opinion that the necessary improvements are reasonably likely to occur by the end of the planning period. ODOT has reached this conclusion based on the following factors:

1. The planned improvements are listed on the Draft 2010-2013 STIP and will likely be approved.
2. The planned improvements are located on a statewide freight route, an important facility that will likely receive future funding.
3. The City of Madras has land use regulations that allow the City to impose conditions on future development if such conditions are needed to avoid or remedy a significant effect. These include ordinances enabling transportation System Development Charges for US97/'J" Sireet improvements and City approval of the proposed intersection redesign.
4. ODOT has a positive working relationship with the City of Madras and collaboratively funded other projects in the area. We are confident that the City, ODOT and other partners will be able to fund the needed US97/"J" Street improvements.

This reasonably likely determination does not constitute a commitment on the part of ODOT to fund the planned improvements at US97/'J" Street. Further, this written statement applies only to the subject property and only to this specific proposed amendment. It does not apply to any future amendments that may rely upon the same project. Instead, future proposed amendments will require a new written statement from ODOT. (see
http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/[D/TP/docs/TPR/tprGuidelines.pdf, Section 3.2.09)
ODOT appreciates the opportunity to provide you with this written statement. If you have any questions, or need more information, please contact Ana Jovanovic, ODOT Region 4 Planning office, at (541) 388-6046 or email ana.jovanovic@odot.state.or.us.

cc via e-mail: Mark_Redabaugh, DLCD; Joe Bessman, Kittelson \& Assoc, Inc.; DJ Heffernan, Angelo Planning Group; Jon Skidmore, Jefferson County Planning Director; Matt Garrett, ODOT Director; Jerri Bohard, ODOT TDD Manager; Pat Creedican, ODOT District 10 Manager

## Nick Snead

From: JOVANOVIC Ana [Ana.JOVANOVIC@odot.state.or.us]
Sent: Thursday, February 04, 2010 4:34 PM
To: Nick Snead
Cc: RADABAUGH Mark; Joe Bessman; DJ Heffernan; Jon Skidmore
Subject: RE: Madras UBG expansion \& TRP Analysis

Nick,
Here is ODOT's Reasonably Likely Determination letter for Madras UGB Expansion and TPR Analysis. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Ana

Ana Jovanovic
ODOT Region 4 Program and Planning
541388.6046
ana.jovanovic@odot.state.or us

From: Nick Snead [mailto:nsnead@ci.madras.or.us]
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2010 8:49 AM
To: JOVANOVIC Ana
Subject: Madras UBG expansion \& TRP Analysis

Ana,

Good morning! I hope you had a good weekend as well. I am writing to determine the status of ODOT's review of our TPR study submitted by Kittleson \& Associates related to the 37 acre UGB expansion proposal. Can you give me an update?
"There are no short cuts to any place worth going"
-Beverly Sills-

Nicholas S. Snead

2/5/2010

Community Development Director
City of Madras
(541) 475-3388

Email: nsnead@ci.madras.or.us

Visit the City of Madras at http://ci.madras.or.us/

Appendix H: Urban Growth Area Management Agreement (UGAMA) (April 2006)

# Urban Growth Area Management Agreement For the City of Madras 

This agreement is entered into by the City of Madras, an incorporated municipality in the State of Oregon, hereby referred to as the "City" and Jefferson County, a political subdivision of the State of Oregon, hereby referred to as the "County".

## RECITALS

WHEREAS, the City of Madras and Jefferson County are authorized pursuant to Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) Chapter 190 to enter into an Intergovernmental Management Agreement for performance of functions which either governmental unit has the authority to perform; and

WHEREAS, this Management Agreement also constitutes a cooperative agreement under ORS Chapter 195; and

WHEREAS, Goal 14 [Urbanization] requires that the City and the County establish an urban growth boundary to identify and separate urbanizable land from rural and that the establishment and change of urban growth boundaries shall be through a cooperative process between the City and County; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to provisions in Goal 2 [Land Use Planning], the City and County are required to have coordinated and consistent comprehensive plans which establish an Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and a plan for the Urban Growth Area (UGA) within the boundary; and,

WHEREAS, the City and County share a common concern regarding the accommodation of population growth and utilization of lands within the UGB; and

WHEREAS, the City and County consider it mutually advantageous to establish this Urban Growth Area Management Agreement (UGAMA) for the purpose of facilitating the orderly transition from rural to urban land uses and to enable the City to plan for and provide urban services such as sewer, water and street facilities in a timely, orderly and cost effective manner consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan;

NOW, THEREFORE THE CITY OF MADRAS AND JEFFERSON COUNTY MUTUALLY AGREE AS FOLLOWS:

## 1. INTENT OF AGREEMENT

1.1. To establish standards and procedures for review and action on proposed land use actions and related matters noted within this agreement pertaining to lands within the UGA;
1.2. To transfer authority and jurisdiction over current planning activities, land use decisions, provision of urban services and code enforcement within the UGA from the County to the City;
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### 1.3. To benefit the public through reduction of governmental processes; and,

1.4. To establish procedures for City and County consideration of expansions to the UGA.

## 2. DEFINITIONS

For the purpose of this agreement, the following definitions shall apply:
2.1. Board: the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners.
2.2. City: the City of Madras.
2.3. Council: the Madras City Council.
2.4 County: Jefferson County.
2.5. Land Use Decision: A final decision or determination concerning the adoption, amendment or application of statewide planning goals, a comprehensive plan provision or a land use regulation.
2.6. Public Facilities Plan: A document or documents describing the water, sewer and transportation facilities which are to support the land uses designated in the appropriate acknowledged comprehensive plans.
2.7. Urban Growth Area (UGA): The area between the Madras City Limits and the Madras Urban Growth Boundary, as designated on the City's and the County's Comprehensive Plan Maps.
2.8. Urban Growth Boundary (UGB): The boundary line which separates lands to be urbanized and eventually incorporated into the City of Madras from the surrounding rural lands under the County's jurisdiction.
2.9. Urban Growth Area Management Agreement (UGAMA): This Intergovernmental Agreement between the City and County that coordinates the management of land use and development within the City of Madras UGA.
2.10. Urbanizable Lands: Lands inside the Urban Growth Area that are designated for future urban development when public facilities and services can be provided by the City.

## 3. URBANIZATION PROCESS

3.1 The UGA shall be managed to maintain the potential for future urban development until such time as the land is annexed into the City and is converted to urban land.
3.2. Conversion of urbanizable land to urban development can occur when public facilities and services are available and adequate to serve urban levels of development, or the land
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is annexed into the City and zoned for urban development.
3.3. Rural levels of development within the UGA shall be sited in such a way as to not interfere with urban levels of development and services when conversion from urbanizable land to urban lands occurs.
3.4. Extension of City services within the UGA may be permitted when approved by the City. Establishment or extension of sewer systems outside the UGB is prohibited except to mitigate a public health hazard in accordance with the provisions of OAR 660-011-0060.
4. UGA ADMINISTRATION RESPONSIBILITIES
4.1. The City shall have responsibility for administration and decision making authority regarding all land use applications within the UGA except applications for amendments to the UGB, as provided in Section 6.
4.2. The City shall have responsibility for annexation of lands in the UGA. Lands outside the UGA shall not be annexed unless the UGB is also amended to include the territory to be annexed.

## 5. PROCESS FOR LAND USE APPLICATIONS WITHIN THE UGA

5.1. Land Use applications shall be processed through the City Community Development Department.
5.2. Notice of all land use applications within the UGA shall be sent to the County Community Development Department and to any other affected County agencies and other applicable special service districts for review and comment prior to any decision by the City. Such agencies or districts shall be given ten business days in which to provide comments on the application.
5.3. In making its decision, the City shall consider all comments received under § 5.2.
5.4. The County, any agency or special service district that provides comments on the application shall be mailed a copy of the land use decision and shall have standing to appeal the City's decision.

## 6. PROCESS FOR URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY AMENDMENTS

6.1. Amendments to the UGB, including amendments to the City's and County's comprehensive plan maps, may be initiated by the City, the County, or a property owner(s).
6.2. An application to amend the UGB shall be filed with the City Community Development Department along with the applicable City and County plan amendment fees. The City shall forward a copy of the application to the County Community Development Department, together with the County's plan amendment fee, within five working days of
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the date the application is filed.
6.3. The City and County Planning Commissions shall each conduct a public hearing regarding the application. At their discretion, the Planning Commissions may hold a joint hearing rather than separate hearings.
6.4. The recommendation of the City and County Planning Commissions shall be forwarded to the City Council, who shall hold a public hearing to consider the proposed amendment to the UGB. The decision of the City Council shall be forwarded to the County Board of Commissioners.
6.5. The Board of Commissioners shall conduct a public hearing and make a final decision on whether the UGB should be amended.
6.6. If the City and County disagree on the proposed amendments, a joint meeting of the City Council and Board of County Commissioners may be held to attempt to resolve the differences. Both jurisdictions may also request a dispute resolution process to resolve the differences.
6.7 If the governing bodies are not able to come to mutual agreement there shall be no change to the UGB.

## 7. OTHER LAND USE ACTIVITIES

7.1. The City and County agree to mutually review any proposed action on public improvement projects and similar programs, projects or proposals that apply to the UGA.
7.2. The City shall be responsible for public facilities planning within the UGA. The City shall coordinate with any affected County agency in the development of a public facilities plan for the UGA.
7.3. The County shall be responsible for administering the state Building Code and issuing building permits for all construction within the UGA, until such time as the City has its own state-approved building code program.

## 8. ROADS

8.1. Public rights-of-way within the UGA shall be accepted by the City upon annexation of adjacent lands.
8.2. The City shall accept jurisdiction over County roads within the UGA that have a pavement condition index (PCI) of 70 or above. If the PCI is below 70, the County may structurally overlay the road to raise the PCI above 70 , at which time the City shall accept jurisdiction over the road. Nothing contained in this subsection shall restrict the City from accepting jurisdiction over a road or public right-of-way within the UGA that does not meet such minimum standards.
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8.3 When a parcel in the UGA is initially partitioned or subdivided and creation of a street is required, development shall proceed initially with streets to City road standards
8.4 Streets in subdivisions and PUDs shall be developed to the City's improvement standards
8.5. All unpaved county roads, excluding public usage roads, within the UGA shall be graded biannually by the County until the City has accepted jurisdiction over the road.

## 9. FEES

9.1. Applications for land use permits, including all land use appeals within the UGA, shall be accompanied by a fee set by the City.
9.2. Applications for UGB Amendments shall be accompanied by fees set by the County in addition to any City fees.
9.3. System Development Charges for lands within the UGA will be collected by the County, prior to the issuance of building permits.

## 10. ENFORCEMENT

The City shall be responsible for enforcement of land use regulations within the UGA.

## 11. AMENDMENT AND TERMINATION

11.1. This agreement may be amended at any time by mutual agreement of both parties, after public hearing and adoption by both the City Council and the Board of Commissioners.
11.2 Any modifications to this agreement shall be consistent with the City and County Comprehensive Plans and the statewide planning goals.
11.3. This agreement may be terminated by either party under the following procedure:
a. Written notice of intent to terminate this Agreement shall be sent to the other party at least forty-five (45) days prior to taking any action, including the publication of public hearing notices in order to provide ample time for resolution of differences, or amendment to comprehensive plans.
b. A public hearing shall be held by the party considering termination. That party shall give the other party at least 20 days prior notice of the scheduled hearing date. The 20 day period shall be used by both parties to seek resolution of differences. Both parties shall also request a collaborative conflict resolution process to resolve differences that remain.
c. Public notice of hearings shall be in accordance with applicable statutes and local ordinances.
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e. This agreement is necessary for compliance with, at minimum, statewide planning Goals 2 and 14. If this agreement is terminated without adoption of a new agreement, jurisdiction and authority over all planning activities and land use decisions within the UGA shall revert to the County. Therefore, this agreement may not be terminated without adoption of a new agreement.

## 12. TIME OF EFFECTIVENESS

This agreement shall not become effective until properly executed by both the City and the County. Upon execution, this agreement shall supersede all previous Urban Growth Area Management Agreements.

## 13. SEVERABILITY

The Provisions within this agreement are severable. If any section, sentence, clause or phrase of this agreement is adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, said invalidity shall not impair or affect the validity of the remaining portions of the agreement.

ADOPTED this $5^{\text {Th }}$ day of Apse 2006.


ATTEST:


JEFFERSON COUNTY, OREGON


Date: April 5,2006
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