



CITY OF BAKER CITY, OREGON

P.O. Box 650 ☒ Baker City, OR 97814-0650

541-523-6541 Voice/TDD ☒ 541-524-2049 Fax

AGENDA

Leo Adler Memorial Parkway/Central Park Advisory Committee

Monday October 15, 2007

5:30 p.m.

Baker County Library

-
1. **Call to Order/Roll Call**
 2. **Approval of Minutes:** **September 17, 2007**
 October 1, 2007
 October 8, 2007
 3. **Public Comments (3 minutes per speaker)**
 4. **Review of Draft Parking Statement**
 5. **Deliberation on preferred pathway route**
 6. **Meeting Schedule**
 Further discussion of meeting times.
 7. **Other Business**
 8. **Adjourn**
-

MINUTES
LEO ADLER MEMORIAL PARKWAY/CENTRAL PARK ADVISORY
COMMITTEE
MONDAY, OCTOBER 8, 2007

Call to Order/Roll Call. The meeting was called to order at 6:34 pm by Chair Brian Cole.

Roll Call			
X	Brian Cole		Dallas Defrees
	Randy Dodson	X	Alyson Ogan
	Susan Dowling		Logan Ermovick
	Chris Folkman		Rachael Livingston
X	Blake Marlia		Monica Boyer
X	Ann Mehaffy		Jackson Clarke
X	Wayne Sieg	X	Robin Harris Anderson-Perry (Engineers)
	Jennifer Watkins (staff)	X	Doug Wright ODOT
X	Tabor Clarke (LAMP)		

Also present were Peggi Timm, John Harmer, and Steve Bogart.

Approval of Minutes. Since a quorum was not present, this agenda item was cancelled until the next meeting. At the next meeting the minutes from September 17, October 1 and October 8 meeting will be considered.

Public Comments. Steve Bogart inquired as to what type of fencing/access control would be implemented associated with this phase of the project.

Robin Harris replied that these considerations would be looked at. Tabor Clarke noted that in previous phases of the project, the City and the Parkway Committee worked with neighboring property owners to find a favorable fencing/access control solution.

All agreed that satisfactory fencing/access control is highly desired.

Review of Draft Parking Statement. Brian Cole distributed a copy of a draft parking statement. The draft parking statement and version 2.0 of the draft parking statement are attached to the minutes.

Deliberation of Preferred Pathway Route. Robin Harris led a discussion of geographic segments of the pathway from south-to-north from Washington to Broadway.

The Committee reviewed their previous discussions and findings, and then conducted a Fist-to-Five on the statement: “we support the development of the pathway along the east side of the river from Washington to Broadway.” All five of the

Committee members responded with a “4” or “5”. As such, there was consensus to move forward on the east side of the river between Washington and Broadway.

Robin Harris noted that the pathway alignment decision was more complicated between Broadway and Madison.

He then continued the conversation by reviewing the next geographic segments: Broadway to King’s Store. Harris noted that because of the apartment complex on the east side of the river which is built extremely close to the river, prior discussions favored building the pathway on the west side of the river between Broadway and King’s.

After further discussion and reflection on prior conversations, the Committee conducted a Fist-to-Five on the statements: “the pathway should be constructed on the west side of the river between Broadway and King’s Store.” In its deliberations, the Committee noted that the specific alignment of the property on the west side was subject to further refinement. In particular, there would be further discussion about the alignment of the pathway either through property owned by the Flanagan family or the adjacent property to the west.

The Committee conducted the Fist-to-Five with everyone indicating either “4” or “5”.

Next, Robin Harris outlined the option to extend the pathway north from King’s Store to Madison along the west side of the river.

Harris described this development including platforms that would extend out over the river, an archway both for aesthetic and structural purposes, the need to anchor the structure into the Dollar Tree building, the need for a narrower (probably ten foot) pathway, and the need for consent by the property owner (who has been unable to be reached over the past two months).

Harris indicated that the *pros* of this option would be to allow for a continuous pathway along the west side, good connectivity, and improved aesthetics on the back side of the Dollar Tree building.

Harris continued that the *cons* of this option would be the uncertainty with the property owner and the need to anchor the structure to the building. Harris noted that it was possible to construct a ten foot path (although narrower than many other portions of the pathway).

At this juncture, there was not a Fist-to-Five action taken.

Harris then continued to discuss a second option north of King’s to Madison.

The initial part of this option would entail a walkway bridge over the river to the east to the property owned by the Alex Sackos family. Harris and Clarke noted that the

Sackos family has been very willing and patient with our process, and has a desire that the project spur the purchase of either none or all of their property. One option would be for their property to be purchased by a co-developer that would integrate the pathway design and construction into the development.

The *pros* would be that this portion of the project is very open, has easy accessibility, and would align directly with the Geiser-Pollman Park main south entrance.

The *cons* of this option would be that the route would then need to find a solution between the Sackos property and Madison Street.

Harris then focused the Committee on the stretch of the property between the Sackos property and Madison Street. Harris noted that two families owned property fronting Madison Street: the Harmers and the Nalleys.

John Harmer spoke on behalf of his household indicating that they did not want to be an “obstructionist” to the project, and were very supportive of the City. Harmer continued that they would prefer the pathway be developed on the west side of the river, but was open to further discussion along his property as a “last ditch” option.

Harmer emphasized the benefits to everyone of having the aesthetics approved along the river bank should the pathway be behind the Dollar Tree store.

Harmer also noted that the property behind the Dollar Tree has no *function*, whereas the property on the east side of the river does have function for both the Harmers and the Nalleys.

Harmer closed by thanking the Committee for listening to him, and conducting the process so openly and positively.

Brian Cole responded that he was extremely grateful for the positive civic tone of the Harmers, and their willingness to find solutions.

At this time, it was agreed by the Committee that further information was needed on two or three properties before a recommendation could be formulated. These properties would be property owned by the Flanagan’s, the property immediately west of the Flanagan’s, and perhaps the Nalley property.

Tabor Clarke indicated that he would be working over the following week to get more information. Cole replied that he would be available Tuesday and Wednesday of this week to assist if needed.

Harris and Doug Wright of ODOT both emphasized the need to keep the process moving.

Wright noted that from the “federal prospective”, the money is still with the federal government and not with the State of Oregon. The federal government will not release the money to the state if they do not find sufficient progress being made in terms of defining the path route and completing the environmental studies. The environmental analysis will take six months.

It was agreed by everyone that a final recommendation should take place at the October 15th meeting.

Wright noted that the Committee and the City should have “good logic” with respect to the specific route recommended. Such logic would include constructive arguments related to costs, meeting the needs of adjacent property owners, and overall pathway design.

Aly Ogan stated that she favored the pathway remaining along the western side of the river for the entire stretch between Broadway and Madison. Blake Marlia, Wayne Sieg, and Brian Cole concurred. Ann Mehaffy indicated that she would prefer to have more information before making such a statement.

Steve Bogart suggested that a “pros and cons list” of each option be developed. Cole responded that the minutes of this meeting (*these minutes*) would be a starting point for such a “pros and cons list”.

Next Meeting. The Committee agreed that the next meeting should be October 15th. It was noted that the 6:30 pm time slot was not working to generate a consensus. Cole indicated that he would ask Becky Fitzpatrick to poll the board to identify a time on October 15th that could generate a quorum. Cole noted that he would be out of state for that meeting.

Other Business. There was no other business.

Adjourn. The Committee adjourned at 8:08 pm.

DRAFT

Version 1.0

Leo Adler Memorial Parkway/Central Park Committee

Position Statement Related to Parking

The members of the Leo Adler Memorial Parkway/Central Park Committee recognize that the creation of additional parking at or near the project site is desired by several interests. The committee members also desire to see the project contribute to benefiting existing business and building owners by providing sufficient parking.

The Baker City Council did not specifically task our committee with the responsibility for developing a parking plan. Additionally, the funding acquired by the City to date is not earmarked (or eligible?) for parking improvements.

Nonetheless, the Committee has discussed the need and desirability of parking, and has identified an option that would not only create additional parking, but also provide direct access to the proposed performance area associated with the park.

The conceptual plan for parking would entail the construction of a ____-foot wide road that would connect to Resort Street at ____, proceed approximately ____ feet to the east, and then turn 90 degrees to the north and travel ____ feet before it would meet Washington Street.

The committee also sees an opportunity for a land exchange between the non-profit corporation Leo Adler Memorial Parkway, Inc. and the Baker Garage which would be beneficial to the project, a private business, and the community at-large.

DRAFT

Version 2.0

Leo Adler Memorial Parkway/Central Park Committee

Position Statement Related to Parking

The members of the Leo Adler Memorial Parkway/Central Park Committee recognize that the creation of parking at or near the project site is desired by several interests. The committee members also desire to see the project contribute to benefiting existing business and building owners by providing sufficient parking.

The Baker City Council did not specifically task our committee with the responsibility for developing a parking plan. Additionally, the funding acquired by the City to date is not eligible for parking improvements.

Nonetheless, the Committee has discussed the need and desirability of parking, and has identified an option that would not only create parking, but also provide direct access to the proposed performance area associated with the park.

The conceptual plan for parking would entail the construction of a ____-foot wide road that would connect to Resort Street at ____, proceed approximately ____ feet to the east, and then turn 90 degrees to the north and travel ____ feet before it would meet Washington Street. **Such a road should have benefits in terms of emergency vehicle access to the park. If the road accommodated parking on one side, it would create ____ parking spaces. If the road accommodated parking on both sides, it would accommodate ____ parking spaces. (new)**

The committee also sees an opportunity for a land exchange between two or more property owners which would be beneficial to the project, businesses, and the community at-large. *(subject to further edits by Tabor)*

Finally, the Committee recommends to the City Council that further consideration of the need for parking improvements be made. (new)