

February 3, 2020

City of McMinnville Planning Department
Attn: Charles Darnell
231 NE Fifth Street
McMinnville, Oregon 97128

RE: Stafford – CPA 1-19; ZC 1-19; PDA 2-19; PD 1-19; s 1-19; L 2-19

Dear Mr. Darnell,

I am responding to the Charbonneau Engineering replies to my written testimony.

The first issue: why wasn't the Hill Road and Baker Creek roundabout included in the study? Charbonneau responded that the "design and construction was expected to sufficiently handle the future traffic flow." The actual response should have been because the City did not include it in the list of intersections Charbonneau needed to study. At the public hearing on January 28, 2020, the City Engineer stated that the intersection wasn't included because it was functioning as planned. In less than a year, there has been at least one accident that was reported on YamCo Watch concerning that intersection. I think there have been two other accidents there as well. Additionally, there has been one significant motorcycle accident at the Wallace and Hill roundabout and I can't remember if the oil spill at the Wallace roundabout was due to a truck dumping its load or the motorcycle accident. I think the oil was truck-related. I'm including the Wallace roundabout information because it is only 0.7 miles from Baker Creek roundabout and both were engineered at the same time.

Since I prefer to deal with facts rather than rely on my memory, I contacted a traffic consultant to gather information about the Baker/Hill intersection pre- and post-roundabout. The Oregon Department of Transportation and the McMinnville Police Department quoted a turnaround time of 10 days, and that didn't meet the required 7-day time limit. In an effort to be thorough, the consultant contacted the McMinnville Public Works Engineering Department and was told that "they don't have records like that." So I'm not sure how the city can recommend that the nearest intersection to the proposed high traffic commercial area not be included in the traffic study because it is "functioning as planned." One to three accidents in less than a year, assuming my memory is correct, makes the Baker Creek/Hill intersection equal or greater (worse?) than any of the included intersections despite it being the most recently designed intersection.

The second issue: the July time frame isn't an issue because there are no schools within the immediate neighborhood of Baker Creek North. There might be some confusion, depending on whether Charbonneau was using Stafford's lot width foot measurement (which is minor and doesn't impact the livability of the area) or Stafford's driveway foot measure (in which case the entire project will fail to sell). I have decided

to use miles based on Google Maps so I don't have to choose between driveway feet and lot width feet. That was too confusing.

1. Bethel School 0.8 miles (virtually all students are delivered by car)
2. McMinnville Adventist Christian School 1.3 miles
3. Memorial School 1.4 miles
4. McMinnville High School 1.5 miles (Baker Creek Road is the primary access from west of the high school for those of you not from the area)
5. Duniway School 1.6 miles
6. Newby School 1.7 miles
7. Elementary School site 0.4 miles
8. High School site 0.7 miles

I included the last two sites because they figured strongly in Stafford's bid for Baker Creek South, so I was sure they wouldn't want them to be ignored for Baker Creek North. Additionally, if a hay field can be counted as a commercial center, I felt there could be no issue in counting a hay field as a school. Comparing the hard count traffic study commissioned by private citizens to the extrapolated (estimated?) count performed by Charbonneau, there is a significant increase in traffic during the school year.

Continuing on, the Public Hearing was quite informative for me. Stafford gave several builders the opportunity to speak on their behalf, and yet only one, when prompted by Mayor Hill, actually said he was in favor of Baker Creek North. The rest simply took issue with Condition 20, especially the driveway foot measurement – that *is* a pesky unit of measure. I also looked at the written testimony and only one letter stated that they supported Baker Creek North, before launching into Condition 20 issues. One letter actually thought that Condition 20 was fine, as long as it only applied to Baker Creek North. I thought that was quite supportive.

Condition 20 could be doing a huge favor to Stafford. Stafford said that they knew what people wanted, and yet I think Mr. Root said Stafford still had 6 houses not sold in Baker Creek East. A couple of other builders also mentioned they had unsold houses. I know of other contractors who built houses in Baker Creek East and sold 100% of what they built. Of course, they were local builders who worked with their clients to build what the client wanted. Since all the builders were working under the some "restrictions" in Baker Creek East, I have to wonder if the issue is that the "spec" house designs need refreshing for McMinnville tastes. It's either that or the demand is not as high as people seem to believe.

One design was particularly called out, a single story with a three car garage. We were told that the third car bay wasn't really for a car but was for storage. If that is the case, it should be a simple fix to eliminate the garage door on the third bay. The space would be available for storage accessed through the double garage door. And the façade should satisfy the City requirement of less than 50% of the front façade can be garage.

With only two bays for cars actually needed, the city-required driveway width should be more than adequate to park two cars side by side with room to spare.

I do agree with Councilmember Drabkin's confusion about the need to park three cars side by side in a driveway when there are three bays in a garage. A simple fix could be a decorative paver walkway that would give occupants room to step out of their cars. Then again, if the high density development that requires such hard driveway decisions was actually built along transit routes as specified, possibly the driveway issue wouldn't be an issue at all.

I am at a loss to figure out what is so threatening about Stafford's demand to "modify Condition 20 or we'll build individual subdivisions." I'd be willing to bet that Compton Crest, Oak Ridge, Mahon Farm and all the other subdivisions along Baker Creek Road haven't generated as many complaints to the Planning Department as Baker Creek West has just by itself. Stafford plans to break the build into sections anyway. The community would get the individuality it has requested. The BPA powerline has a 60-foot easement that can't be built on and the land that Stafford wants to remove from its tax rolls – you know, the unbuildable flood plain AKA a park – will still be open space. We may be missing out on some stumps buried in the ground, but overall, I can't see that as much of problem.

Several hours and a couple of days into it, neither Google nor I could find a copy of Ordinance 4633. Charles Darnell of the Planning Department was very helpful as always and emailed me a copy. I was curious about how everything related to each other. For example, 4626 was repealed completely for the Baker Creek South decision. I assumed that 4633 was done to fulfill the requirements of 4626, and if so, was 4633 even applicable anymore? Then since PDA 2-19/Ordinance 5086 would completely repeal 4633 if it is passed, I was wondering why CPA 1-19/Ordinance 5084 was required. I assume that there's a reason for all the various paperwork repealing and superseding each other. I'm just looking forward to the arborvitae hedge being planted around the Baker Creek South apartments. While I didn't recommend 4506, and I certainly didn't vote for it, I did read it. Happy planting.

Patty O'Leary