



Gold Line BRTOD: Helmo Station Oakdale City Council Feedback on Phase 3 Refinements

23 January 2018, in-person meeting at Oakdale City Hall

Participants

- Oakdale City Council members and staff
- WCRRA team members Jan Lucke and Sara Allen
- Crandall Arambula project team members Don Arambula, Jason Graf, and Anne Carroll
- Audience members included additional staff and a Washington County commissioner

Materials

- [Presentation](#) on BRTOD refinements

Feedback, Discussion

- **Notes:**
 - Phase 1 input from City and community stakeholders shaped station area objectives; based on those, the project team developed Phase 2 draft BRTOD alternatives and received feedback from the Council and community; this Phase 3 draft refines those alternatives for further feedback
 - Review the presentation in advance to understand the feedback and specific references
 - The feedback below is from Council members unless otherwise indicated; *CA* indicates information provided by Jason Graf or Don Arambula from the Crandall Arambula consulting team; *Staff* indicates the same from Oakdale community development director Bob Streetar
 - While the discussion was wide ranging, the feedback below is organized by topic for clarity
 - This feedback session with Council was to have followed a community feedback session scheduled for 1/22 that was cancelled due to the massive snowstorm on that day; there are currently no plans to reschedule that community session; people are encouraged to provide feedback on the station area BRTOD plans via the Gateway Corridor [website](#)
- **Traffic:**
 - *CA*: Sufficient traffic will be necessary to support retail (8-12 thousand trips/day)
 - Request for staff to provide Council with information about roadway sections with average daily traffic volumes (ADTs) comparable to the various project projections
 - *CA*: Important to consider “level of service” (LOS), which is graded A-F; in a station area it may be acceptable to have lower levels of service in a station area because you want it to be a destination vs. just passing through – plus, the typical solutions to improve level of service (such

as adding lanes, dedicated turn lanes, etc.) may negatively affect ped and bike user access or safety

- Important that the next round of solutions to level of service issues reasonably address needs of the full range of users, i.e., meet ped and bike needs without causing extreme car backups
 - For the traffic analysis, questions about the direction from which projected traffic is coming into the station area; CA noted the notion of induced demand and ways to reduce the likelihood that people choose certain routes for efficient pass-through (vs. as a destination); want to make sure that people from the neighborhood to the north will be able to access this new development
 - Discussion that *any* development in this area will have an impact on traffic to, through, and around
 - Request for staff to work with Council on implications of this increased traffic on the roadway infrastructure – maintenance/replacement costs and timelines, speed limits, etc. CA: would welcome some recommendations from city engineer, including options to deal with level-of-service issues in a wider variety of ways
 - Think about the impact on nearby residents of increased bus noise as they accelerate to go up the hill onto the bridge
- **Circulation:** *Staff:* Remember that many of the lines on the neighborhood drawing are ped/bike paths, not streets for cars
 - **Infrastructure/utilities:** Agree on importance of designing utilities to accommodate the larger/built-out project from the beginning; more efficient and cost-effective
 - **Parking:**
 - CA: Design includes and accommodates parking for each subarea; the park-and-ride is sized for an efficient and easy-to-navigate ramp per the capacity in the Environmental Assessment; there is a much larger parking facility at the end of the line in Woodbury, where the demand will be higher
 - **Open space:**
 - Concern that shift to the larger parcels on the south end along the freeway to increase development flexibility results in reduced open space; CA: there are ways to make larger parcels without reducing as much of the open space – just perhaps not as proposed in the earlier version with open space slicing through the middle of the parcels
 - Concerned about losing open space
 - CA: Open space should be an intentional element of the overall plan and system vs. just to meet requirements or targets; could also think creatively such as looking at balcony spaces and similar; expectations and options could be written into the design requirements for this site
 - *Staff:* Open space is an amenity *and also* for stormwater retention
 - *Staff and CA:* The PUD process will address these design issues. A PUD code should regulate what matters, and provide flexibility on other issues – and address the details as part of the specific plan review. There are lots of simple options available that have great positive results. Oakdale has been/is doing that in other developments, so there is experience with this approach.

- **Density (housing):**
 - Small strip of medium-density housing along 4th may be awkward
 - Not sure medium-density in triangle at 4th make sense relative to the notion of density increasing from north to south
 - CA: to address density concern in triangle, you could, for example, establish height restrictions (3-story) while still maintaining sufficient yield for the developer; for the multi-family parcel to the east of the triangle, it might be better to use a stepped-back approach (a building starting at 3 stories then “stepping back” and becoming 4 stories)
 - Think the lower heights along 4th along with the stepping back idea for housing to the east will work well
 - CA: For housing on the south side along the freeway, it would be reasonable to have a few rows of parking that serve as a buffer
 - Concern that big parcels with dense housing will result in lots of tall apartment buildings that block the sun
 - Supported higher density to the south, so concerned about the higher-density housing “creeping” farther north
 - Concerned about there being a sufficient mix of uses; don’t want a lot of big-box retail and housing that’s too high especially along 4th
 - More high density than we original discussed, though understand why it’s important to make this work; don’t see why we need MF in the triangle
 - CA: About 1/3 of the housing throughout the project is assumed to be medium-density townhomes; most of the development along 4th is employment (2-story); the multi-family proposed for the triangle is so it is proximate to the green space as an important amenity
 - CA: Key issue is to identify a blend of uses that reflects actual market demand, which is more medium and high density than flex/office use; it’s also essential to have sufficient density for increased ridership
 - Look at height restrictions for residential on NE edge; CA: absolutely need design standards to support high-quality and attractive design and construction that is compatible with community standards and expectations, etc. – not big blocks of prefab apartments
 - At north end of triangle, could increase setbacks, add landscaping, and make all medium density; CA: that would work

- **Overall**
 - Heard from some neighbors with concerns about the overall costs of this development and whether this is the best place for such investments
 - Think this is going in a good direction
 - Not sure what developers will think about these plans
 - Want to make sure the consulting team and staff find a good balance between specific Council member ideas, technical issues, options and alternatives, etc. *Staff* noted this being a highly iterative process
 - This has been expedited, but grateful for the consulting team’s positive work with the City and County staff and the Council, and putting together some great ideas to move this forward on our schedule
 - *CA and Staff*: Going forward, we will make the information easier for people to understand on their own (if they’re not attending an in-person session); we will also engage people more in March when this comes back for further discussion