# Umatilla County 

## AGENDA

## Umatilla County Planning Commission Public Hearing Thursday, October 20, 2022, 6:30PM

To participate in the hearing please submit comments before 4PM, October 20th to planning@umatillacounty.gov or contact the Planning Department at 541-278-6252.

| Planning Commission |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Suni Danforth, Chair | Cindy Timmons |
| Don Wysocki, Vice-Chair | John Standley |
| Tammie Williams | Jodi Hinsley |
| Tami Green | Emery Gentry |
| Sam Tucker |  |

## Planning Staff

Bob Waldher, Director
Carol Johnson, Senior Planner
Megan Davchevski, Planner/Transit Coordinator
Tamara Ross, Planner II/ GIS
Gina Miller, Code Enforcement Coordinator
Tierney Cimmiyotti, Administrative Assistant

## 1. Call to Order

## 2. New Hearing

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT REQUEST \#C-1351-22: SILVER CREEK CONTRACTING, LLC - APPLICANT, WEST FLYING SERVICE - OWNER. Applicant, Silver Creek Contracting, LLC, seeks a conditional use permit for a "commercial activity in conjunction with farm use" in support of a construction firm. The subject property is zoned Exclusive Farm Use with a "Private Use Safety Airport" overlay. The property is located at 72837 Highway 207, Echo, OR, in Township 2N, Range 27E; Tax Lot 1202. The land use standards applicable to the applicant's request are found in Umatilla County Development Code Section 152.060, Section 152.061, Section 152.615 and Section 152.617 (I) (B).

## 3. New Hearing

TEXT AMENDMENT \#T-092-22, PLAN AMENDMENT \#P-135-22, and ZONE MAP AMENDMENT \#Z-322-22: GIRTH DOG LLC, APPLICANT / OWNER. The applicant requests to establish a new aggregate site, add the site to the Umatilla County Comprehensive Plan list of Goal 5 protected Large Significant Sites, and apply the Aggregate Resource (AR) Overlay Zone to the entire quarry site. The property site is comprised of several tax lots located south of the Interstate $82 / 84$ interchange. The site is identified on assessor's map as Township 4 North, Range 27 East, Section 36, Tax Lots 900, 1100, 1200, 1300, and 1800. The site is approximately 225 acres and is zoned Exclusive Farm Use (EFU).
4. Minutes Approval; August 25, 2022 Hearing

## 5. Other Business

## 6. Adjournment
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## MEMO

TO: Umatilla County Planning Commission<br>FROM: Robert Waldher, Planning Director<br>DATE: October 12, 2022

RE: October 20, 2022 Planning Commission Hearing Conditional Use Permit Request \#C-1351-22
Commercial Activity in Conjunction with Farm Use

## Background Information

Silver Creek Contracting, LLC, seeks a conditional use permit for a "commercial activity in conjunction with farm use" in support of a construction firm. The subject property is zoned Exclusive Farm Use with a "Private Use Safety Airport" overlay. The property is located at 72837 Highway 207, Echo, OR, in Township 2N, Range 27E; Tax Lot 1202.

In early 2022, Planning Department staff were contacted by representatives of Silver Creek Contracting inquiring about locating the construction business on the subject property which was listed for sale. Staff shared with the applicant that the activities described by the business owner were better suited for an industrial or commercial zone. Later, in May 2022, the Planning Department was contacted by the applicant's consultant, Carla McLane (see Exhibit A - Pre-application Communication). Staff reaffirmed their opinion that the contracting business would be best suited in a light industrial zone. However, staff acknowledged that any person is entitled to submit application for a proposed use.

The Planning Department received a Conditional Use Permit application for a "commercial activity in conjunction with farm use" on June 26, 2022. The consultant, in their email application (see Exhibit A - Pre-application Communication), noted that "available and affordable industrial land is hard to come by, and that this particular property, which has sat idle for a number of years, is well suited for the use and user." While it may be true that available and affordable industrial land may be hard to come by, and the business owner believes that the subject property is well suited for their use, those are not factors that are considered when evaluating a conditional use permit for commercial activity in conjunction with farm use.

The County Planning Director, rather than processing the application administratively, elected to forward the application to the Planning Commission for a decision since it was clear that the applicant does not meet all standards of approval (see Exhibit B - Preliminary Findings and Conclusions).

Included with the application materials was a landowner authorization (see Exhibit C Landowner Acknowledgement) from Gary West. The application also included the applicant's proposed site layout (see Exhibit D - Proposed Site Layout). Subsequent to receipt of the application, letters of support (see Exhibit E - Letters of Support) were

## Memo

Planning Commission Public Hearing - October 20, 2022
Conditional Use Permit Request \# C-1351-22
received from Tim Rust and John Myers (Myers Farm Company, Inc.)
Public Notice of the land use hearing was sent to adjacent landowners and affected agencies on September 30, 2022. A copy of the land use notification map (see Exhibit F - Notification Map) was included with the notice. Notice of the Planning Commission hearing was also published in the October 8, 2022 issue of the East Oregonian.

## Criteria of Approval

The land use standards applicable to the applicant's request are found in Umatilla County Development Code Section 152.060, Section 152.061, Section 152.615 and Section 152.617 (I) (B).

## Conclusion

Since the Planning Director has declined to review the conditional use request administratively, the process of approval by the County involves review and a decision by the County Planning Commission. Planning staff have prepared Preliminary Findings and Conclusions. The Planning Commission is tasked with determining if the application satisfies all ['emphasis added'] criteria of approval, based on the facts in the record. The decision of the Planning Commission is final unless timely appealed.

## PLANNING COMMISSION OPTIONS FOR MOTIONS

## Motion for Denial Based on Evidence in the Record

I, Commissioner $\qquad$ make a motion to deny the Silver Creek Contracting, LLC Conditional Use Permit \#C-1351-22, based on the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.

## Motion for Approval with Additional Findings

I, Commissioner $\qquad$ , make a motion to approve the Silver Creek Contracting, LLC Conditional Use Permit \#C-1351-22, with the following additional Findings of Fact:

1. $\qquad$ _.
2. $\qquad$ .
3. $\qquad$ .

## Attachments

- Exhibit A - Pre-application Communication
- Exhibit B - Preliminary Findings and Conclusions
- Exhibit C - Landowner Acknowledgement
- Exhibit D - Proposed Site Layout
- Exhibit E - Letters of Support
- Exhibit F - Notice Map


## Exhibit A - Pre-application Communication

## EFU Commercial Activities

## 3 messages

Carol Johnson [carol.johnson@umatillacounty.gov](mailto:carol.johnson@umatillacounty.gov)
Thu, May 5, 2022 at 1:20 PM

## To: mclane@eoni.com

Cc: Robert Waldher [robert.waldher@umatillacounty.gov](mailto:robert.waldher@umatillacounty.gov)

## Hi Carla,

Just want to take a moment to follow up on our earlier phone call today regarding a potential conditional use permit application for a "Commercial Activity in Conjunction with Farm Use" on EFU zoned land and make sure I understand the request.

The inquiry is for a construction company business to operate from some available EFU zoned land. This business would also involve some warehousing of materials and equipment at the location. Although not thoroughly discussed today the business could include office space, parking and/or dispatch of employees to job sites in the area. If this describes what is desired by your client, it appears the business would be a service oriented business, where workers would be employed to go on site to perform construction work including building, grading and preparing land for construction on rural lands, including farmland, as well as, land within urban areas such as the work the business is doing in a subdivision in Boardman. Thus, the construction business would appear to be a service oriented business. Service oriented businesses often are operated hand-in-hand with selling products for commercial retail; however, retail sales are not likely the focus of your client's construction company.

Let us know if this captures the inquiry accurately.
Thank you,
Carol
--
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To: Carol Johnson [carol.johnson@umatillacounty.gov](mailto:carol.johnson@umatillacounty.gov)
Cc: Robert Waldher [robert.waldher@umatillacounty.gov](mailto:robert.waldher@umatillacounty.gov)
Carol,
Good afternoon.
Your summary is adequate although not complete. You assume retail sales of which there would not be any. Employees that support the business, such as finance/accounting, management, and vehicle/equipment maintenance would be on site. Equipment, inputs, and supplies for a project may be stored and staged from the location. The past five-year average of work done on farms and ranches is over 50 percent of their averaged annual revenue. COVID had an interesting impact as some agricultural based jobs were put on hold and federal funding spurred municipal projects. More recent activity is pushing that average upwards.

When we were talking you indicated that the property has an overlay applied to it or some other protection or identification as an airstrip. Is that a Umatilla County designation? Or another agency? I have found references through the FAA and ODA to a West Buttercreek Airstrip as a private strip with activity; both are clearly out of date. Can you provide some better insight into any of that? It would be appreciated.

Should be in touch soon with more information as to our intended next steps.
Talk soon,
Carla
Quoted lext hidden]
[Quoted lext hidden]
[1]Carol Johnson, Senior Planner
Umatilla County Department of Land Use Planning
216 SE 4th ST, Pendleton, OR 97801
Phone: 541-278-6301 | Fax: 541-278-5480
http://www.umatillacounty.gov/planning
Visit the County's website for application forms, planning documents, and other helpful information.
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Carol Johnson [carol.johnson@umatillacounty.gov](mailto:carol.johnson@umatillacounty.gov)
To: mclane@eoni.com
Cc: Robert Waldher [robert.waldher@umatillacounty.gov](mailto:robert.waldher@umatillacounty.gov)

Hi Carla,
Thank you for your follow up. The Private Use Airport Overlay Zone was applied locally (2002) to protect the Buttercreek private airport/airstrip use and allow for airport expansion. The Private Use Airport Plan and Map amendment was completed as a result of ORS 836.608 and 836.610 . This statute also allows for the removal of the overlay protection by the airport operator or by non-operation of the airport over a period of time. Removal of the overlay zone would be through a zoning map amendment.

Umatilla County has designated Light Industrial zoning that would permit a contractor's equipment storage yard. Planning's opinion, in part, is that due to fluctuations in who the business serves reinforces that the contracting business would be best suited in a light industrial zone.

Thank you,

## Carol

[Quoted lexi hidden]

Yatalien


## Conditional Use Permit - Submittal

3 messages
mclane@eoni.com [mclane@eoni.com](mailto:mclane@eoni.com)
Sun, Jun 26, 2022 at 8:31 PM
To: Robert Waldher [robert.waldher@umatillacounty.net](mailto:robert.waldher@umatillacounty.net), Carol Johnson [carol.johnson@umatillacounty.net](mailto:carol.johnson@umatillacounty.net)
Cc: Mike Duncan [mike@silvercreekcontracting.com](mailto:mike@silvercreekcontracting.com), Matt Scrivner [matt@silvercreekcontracting.com](mailto:matt@silvercreekcontracting.com)
Bob and Carol,
Good evening. Or morning when you actually open this and review.
You will find attached an application packet for a Conditional Use Permit for a Commercial Use in Conjunction with Farm Use. I appreciate that Carol argued mightily for this not to be submitted; that the applicant should seek industrial land for this purpose. But available and affordable industrial land is hard to come by. And this particular property, which has sat idle for a number of years, is well suited to the proposed use and the user. It meets the requirements of a Commercial Use in Conjunction with Farm Use on land that does not have water rights and is ill suited for crop production based on past uses.

The primary intent is to use the property to support Silver Creek Contracting which does over fifty percent of its business in the farm sector. But the owner of Silver Creek Contracting also has an interest in the airport and intends to reclaim the deteriorating airstrip. Should an operator choose to utilize the airstrip Mr. Duncan would be open to such a proposition.

I appreciate your attention to this submittal. Please provide an invoice for payment of the required $\$ 750$ application fee. And while this can be considered through an administrative process should the Planning Director or staff feel it is better heard at the Planning Commission we would welcome that change of venue.

Additional submittals in support of this application will be added to the record over the next several weeks.
Please reach out if you have any questions.
Cordially,
Carla

## 8 attachments

2N27.pdf
77K
106951.pdf

- 5 K
(1)] CUP Commercial Use in Conjunction with Farm Use Narrative 06262022.docx

48 K
$\Rightarrow$ CUP Commercial Use in Conjunction with Farm Use Narrative 06262022.pdf

- 223 K
- Silver Creek Construction Land Use Application signed.pdf
- 6682 K
-\} Supplemental_Packet_-_Conditional_Use.pdf
- 319K
$\rightarrow$ West landowner authorization.pdf
1285K
-. West property layout drawing.pdf
147 K

Robert Waldher <robert,waldher@umatillacounty.gov>
Tue, Jul 5, 2022 at 8:46 AM
To: mclane@eoni.com
Cc: Carol Johnson [carol.johnson@umatillacounty.gov](mailto:carol.johnson@umatillacounty.gov)

Hi Carla - Please see the attached invoice. Once we receive the fee payment we will start our review/processing of the application and let you know if we need additional information. Thank you!

## Bob

[Quoted text hidden]
--
Robert Waldher, RLA
Director
Umatilla County Department of Land Use Planning
Tel: 541-278-6251 | Fax: 541-278-5480
216 SE 4th Street | Pendleton, OR 97801
nttp://www.umatillacounty gov/planning
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## C) CUP Invoice_07-05-22.pdf <br> 71K

mclane@eoni.com [mclane@eoni.com](mailto:mclane@eoni.com)
To: Robert Waldher [robert.waldher@umatillacounty.gov](mailto:robert.waldher@umatillacounty.gov)
Cc: Carol Johnson [carol.johnson@umatillacounty.gov](mailto:carol.johnson@umatillacounty.gov)

Thanks Bob.<br>Talk soon,<br>Carla<br>[Quoted text hidden]<br>[Quoted text hidden]<br>_Director_<br>Umatilla County Department of Land Use Planning<br>Tel: 541-278-6251 | Fax: 541-278-5480<br>216 SE 4th Street | Pendleton, OR 97801<br>hitp://www.umatillacounty.gov/planning [1]

_Please Be Aware_- Documents such as emails, letters, maps, reports, etc. sent from or received by the Umatilla County Department of Land Use Planning are subject to Oregon Public Records law and are NOT CONFIDENTIAL. All such documents are available to the public upon request; costs for copies may be collected. This includes materials that may contain sensitive data or other information, and Umatilla County will not be held liable for its distribution.

Links:
[1] http://www.umatillacounty.net/planning

## Exhibit B - Preliminary Findings and Conclusions

# UMATILLA COUNTY PRELIMINARY FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT REQUEST, \#C-1351-22 MAP \#2N 27, TAX LOT 1202, ACCOUNT \#106951 

\author{

1. APPLICANT: Silver Creek Contracting, LLC (c/o Mike Duncan), PO Box 994, Heppner, OR 97836
}
2. OWNER: West Flying Service, Inc. (Gary West, Owner), 1550 SW Riverhill Drive, Hermiston, OR 97838
3. REQUEST: The applicant, Silver Creek Contracting, LLC, seeks a conditional use permit for a proposed facility in support of their large construction firm. In their application, the applicant states that their firm has roots in the farm sector that does a significant amount of their business in the agricultural community. The applicant seeks a business warehousing and staging area of significant size to accommodate current business activities, and at a location that is reasonably connected to their customer base.

The applicant claims that light industrial properties are not available or are not of sufficient size to accommodate Silver Creek Construction. The applicant states that the subject property "has available the necessary space for staging, buildings for storage, and maintenance activities, and opportunities to redevelop the site into an appropriate facility for current business operations and support growth of the business enterprise."

The applicant notes, that as a pilot, he is also interested in bringing the airstrip back into useable condition for his own use as well as to attract aviation business(es) to the facility. This would include the addition of new hangers when the development dictates those improvements.
4. LOCATION:
5. ACREAGE: The subject property is 11.36 acres.
6. COMP PLAN: The subject property has a Comprehensive Plan designation of North/South Agriculture. In 2002, an amendment to Umatilla County's Comprehensive Plan was adopted to create a "Private use Airport" designation and apply this designation to the Buttercreek Airport.
7. ZONING:

The subject property is located on the east side of Highway 207, approximately 8.6 miles south of the Interstate-84 Interchange. The subject property is also approximately 3.4 miles south of the intersection with Oregon Trail Road or 4.1 miles north of the junction with Buttercreek Road.

The subject property is zoned Exclusive Farm Use (EFU).

While the underlying zoning of the property is EFU, a "Private Safety Airport" (PUSA-S) overlay zone also applies to the subject property. This overlay zone has been applied to the property to recognize the locations of certain privateuse and privately-owned airports and to provide for their continued operation and vitality consistent with state-law. The PUSA-S is designed to overlay the existing underlying zone, but does not change the underlying zone designation.

Therefore, the PUSA-S overlay zone does not preclude the uses allowed by the underlying EFU zone such as "Commercial Activities in Conjunction with Farm use." However, the expansion of existing uses as well as new uses, such as the addition of structures, are subject to the permitting requirements of the PUSA-S zone. In addition, the PUSA-S overlay zone may be removed by the Planning Commission upon request at any time pursuant to the requirements found in 152.771 (Hearings) of the Umatilla County Development Code.
8. LAND USE: The subject property was at one time to the West Buttercreek Airport, acknowledged by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and listed as an airport in the Oregon Department of Aviation's Airport Land Use Compatibility Guidebook, Appendix N Privately Owned Private Use Airports with Three or More Based Aircraft. While these listings are out of date with the airport having been idle for several years the applicant has a pilot's license and would support an agricultural aviation business joining the team at the site. He intends to bring the airstrip back up to operational condition and maintain it for aviation purposes. It should be noted that there has been significant degradation to the airstrip, paved areas that support the airstrip, and the associated outbuildings.

The use of an airstrip on the subject property pre-dates land use planning laws. A permit has never been issued for the airstrip. Therefore, it is considered a "pre-existing non-conforming use." When a nonconforming use of a structure or property is discontinued for a period in excess of one year, the structure or property shall not thereafter be used except in conformance with the zone in which the property is located. Therefore, future use of the airstrip would require land use approval.

A single family dwelling is also located on the subject property.
9. ACCESS: Access to the subject property is via Highway 207. Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) is the permitting authority for access to/from Highway 207.
10. ROAD TYPE: Highway 207 is a 2-lane, state-maintained public roadway.
11. EASEMENTS: There are no known easements on the subject property.
12. ADJACENT USE: Adjacent land use to the east of the subject property primarily includes dryland farming and land use to the west of the subject property primarily includes irrigated agriculture. Crops in the vicinity primarily include wheat and alfalfa.
13. IRRIGATION: There are no irrigation water rights associated with the subject property.
14. SOILS: The subject property is comprised entirely of non-high-value soils. High value soils are defined in UCDC 152.003 as Land Capability Class I and II.

| Soil Name, Unit Number, Description | Land Capability Class |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Dry | Irrigated |
| 89B-Shano Silt Loam, 2 to 7 percent slopes. | IV | II |
| Soil Survey of Umatilla County Area, 1989, NRCS. The suffix on the Land Capability Class designations are defined as " $e$ " - erosion prone, "c" - climate limitations, " $s$ " soil limitations and " $w$ " water (Survey, page. 172). |  |  |

15. BUILDINGS: The subject property contains a single family dwelling, hanger, accessory building (originally used as part of airport), and two well houses.
16. UTILITIES: Electrical service is provided by Umatilla Electric Cooperative. Telephone service is through Century Link. Sanitary Disposal provides trash service to the subject property.
17. WATER/

WASTEWATER: Domestic water to the subject property is provided by an exempt well. The applicant states that a commercial exempt well may be necessary to accommodate the proposed use.

The subject property is located within the Buttercreek Critical Groundwater Area identified and managed by the State of Oregon Water Resources Department.

An existing septic system serves the property.
18. FIRE SERVICE: The subject property is within the Echo Rural fire protection service area.
19. FLOODPLAIN: The subject property is not within a floodplain.
20. PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING:

October 20, 2022
21. NOTIFIED AGENCIES: Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development, Oregon Water Resources Department, Oregon Aviation Department, Umatilla County Assessor, Umatilla County Environmental Health, Umatilla County Public Works, Oregon Department of Transportation, Echo Rural Fire Department, Umatilla Electric Cooperative, Century Link, Sanitary Disposal Inc.
22. THE UMATILLA COUNTY DEVELOPMENT CODE Section 152.060 (A) allows establishment of A COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY IN CONJUNCTION with FARM USE as a CONDITIONAL USE in an Exclusive Farm Use Zone subject to the standards of the Umatilla County Development Code Section 152.061, Section 152.615 and Section 152.617 (I) (B).
In an EFU zone the following use may be permitted conditionally via administrative review (§ 152.769), subject to the requirements of this section, the applicable criteria in §§ 152.610 through 152.617 and $\S \S$ 152.545 through 152.562. A zoning permit is required following the approval of a conditional use pursuant to § 152.025 . Existing uses classified as conditional uses and listed in this section may be expanded subject to administrative review and subject to the requirements listed Oregon Administrative Rules, Chapter 660, Division 033.

## § 152.060 CONDITIONAL USES PERMITTED.

(A) Commercial activities in conjunction with farm uses but not including the processing of farm crops pursuant to ORS 215.283(1)(u) and provided in \$152.617(I)(B).

Applicant Response: The subject property is in an area committed to farm use that includes both irrigated, flood irrigated, and dryland operations, as well as grazing, in the general vicinity. There is no forest nor any rural residential uses near the subject property. The proposed uses include office functions, maintenance of equipment and vehicles, warehousing, and staging, all compatible with farm practices.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds the Umatilla County Development Code (UCDC) addresses the criteria for "commercial activities in conjunction with farm use" in UCDC Section 152.617(I)(B). Under state law, "commercial activities in conjunction with farm use" are conditionally allowed on land zoned for exclusive farm use. ORS 215.213(2)(a), ORS 215.283(2)(c). Although a county may regulate a conditional use more restrictively, the county may not be less restrictive, or allow uses that are not authorized under ORS chapter 215. The limitations placed on uses that may be permitted as "commercial uses in conjunction with farm use" are that the proposed use must (1) enhance the farming enterprises of the local agricultural community to which the EFU land hosting that commercial activity relates, and (2) satisfy ORS $215.296^{1}$. The applicant's proposal is evaluated against Umatilla County's adopted standards for "commercial activities in conjunction with farm use" below. In order for a conditional use permit to be approved, the applicant must meet or satisfy all ['emphasis added'] standards of approval.

## § 152.617 STANDARDS FOR REVIEW: CONDITIONAL USES AND LAND USE DECISIONS ON EFU ZONED LANDS. <br> (I) EFU CONDITIONAL USES

(B) Commercial Activities in Conjunction with Farm Use. Commercial activities that are in conjunction with farm use, including but not limited to, processing of farm crops into biofuel, public grain elevators, commercial use feedlots, livestock sale yards, commercial agricultural chemical storage tanks and agricultural products for sale commercially, provided that:
(1) The activity is compatible with adjacent farm, forest, rural residential or multiple use uses;

Applicant Response: The subject property is in an area committed to farm use that includes both irrigated, flood irrigated, and dryland operations, as well as grazing, in the general vicinity. There is no forest nor any rural residential uses near the subject property. The proposed uses include office functions, maintenance of equipment and vehicles, warehousing, and staging, all compatible with farm practices.

Additional information provided by applicant 10/10/22: Silver Creek Contracting employs 55-75 employees, depending on the season, with most employees at various job sites throughout Umatilla and Morrow Counties. At the proposed site along Highway 207 there will be at least two mechanics based at this location with one or more of them routinely on jobsites during work hours. There will be up to eight office staff initially that will use this as home base to conduct office work. Some of those staff will routinely be on jobsites during the work week.

Equipment is rarely stored on site. The following represents equipment owned and operated by Silver Creek Contracting: loaders, excavators, rollers, trucks, belly dump trailers, side dump trailers, haul trucks, concrete forming material, concrete screeds, concrete finishing machines, and job site trailers and offices.

[^0]Should this equipment be at this site it would be for general maintenance or repair. On the submitted Property Layout Drawing there is over 85,000 square feet of proposed outdoor storage for this equipment in an area that was previously used for chemical storage.

Construction materials could be stored at this site but doing so creates additional development costs to the client so that would only occur in unique or special circumstances and would not be a customary practice. The same area identified for equipment storage would also serve for material storage in those special circumstances. The intent is to construct appropriate buildings to protect these materials. The existing hangers will also be used for office space, maintenance and repair space, and storage space. Anticipated use of the airstrip will also require potential improvement or development of a hanger or tie down area(s).

No aggregate operations are anticipated to take place on the subject property as there is no known aggregate resource. For that reason, it is not anticipated that processing would take place either. Stockpiling could be a function of this site, but it is not anticipated at this time. Should that change, we realize that a land use approval would be required.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds that adjacent properties are used for farming. There are no forest, rural residential, or multiple use zoned areas in proximity to the subject property. The applicant's proposed business would include warehousing and storage of construction-related equipment as well as using an existing hanger for office functions and maintenance of equipment. Equipment associated with the business such as earthwork equipment and trucks is similar in nature to tractors, trucks and other equipment used for farming crops. Therefore, the activity is compatible with adjacent farm uses. This criterion is met.
(2) The activity is situated upon generally unsuitable land for production of farm crops considering, but not limited to, vegetation, location, terrain, adverse soil or land conditions, drainage and flooding, and size of the tract;

Applicant Response: The size of the subject property is just over 11 acres and is long and skinny to accommodate the airstrip. The largest consideration for the use of this property is the lack of available water as the Butter Creek Valley has seen its water resources over appropriated, meaning that new water is not available to add land for farming purposes. While work has been ongoing for many decades to increase water availability the first focus of that is to reestablish diminished water rights in the CGWA, not add new land to the inventory.

The second consideration is that the subject property has been the site of an airstrip, hanger, and associated warehouse for many years and has potential environmental issues that may require clean up. This is also limiting should a party attempt to integrate the subject property into a farming operation. The current airstrip will be maintained, and general maintenance will be performed as the applicant currently has a pilot's license and would allow a chemical applicator to use the airstrip if one presented itself in the future.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds that the subject property is 11.36 acres. While the applicant's statement about a lack of available water is true, water right transfers and groundwater recharge efforts in the region have made new water sources a viable option for some farms. In addition, dryland wheat, requiring no irrigation, is farmed adjacent to the subject property. Soils on the subject property have a land capability classification of Class 4 (non-irrigated) and Class 2 (irrigated) which are suitable for growing crops.

The chemical loading area identified by the applicant is approximately 2.4 acres. The applicant states that there are "potential environmental issues that may require clean-up" However, factual evidence
demonstrating that the area is contaminated to a level that would make it unsuitable for the production of farm crops has not been provided. Since the soils on the subject property are suitable for growing crops such as dryland wheat and it has not been demonstrated by factual evidence that the soils are contaminated to a level preventing the growing of crops, Umatilla County is unable to conclude that the activity is situated upon generally unsuitable land for production of farm crops. This criterion is NOT met.
(3) Does not materially alter the stability of the overall land use pattern of the area;

Applicant Response: The proposed warehousing and staging activities for a construction company would not be significantly different than the activity of the farming operations along this stretch of Highway 207. No proposed manufacturing or other activity that would produce smoke, odor, or other discharges is proposed.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds that the land use pattern in the area of the subject property primarily consists of large tracts of land (typically larger than 160 acres) that are zoned EFU and commercially farmed for irrigated and non-irrigated crops. Besides the existing dwelling located on the subject property, several farm dwellings with accessory structures are scattered along the Buttercreek Highway. It is common to see the storage of farm equipment located inside and adjacent to many of these structures in the vicinity. Much of the equipment associated with the applicant's proposed business such as earthwork equipment and trucks is similar in nature to tractors, trucks and other equipment used for farming crops. In addition to the construction equipment and vehicles that would be present on the subject property, the applicant intends to maintain and continue use of the private use airstrip. Adjacent farmland would continue to be farmed. Therefore, the proposed activity does not materially alter the stability of the overall land use pattern of the area. This criterion is met.
(4) The activity has access to a major state, county or public road which is improved to an acceptable county standard or has access to a rail line;

Applicant Response: The subject property fronts Highway 207, an ODOT highway connecting the greater Hermiston area to Lexington, Heppner, and places to the south. It is a state highway in good condition that is well maintained. There is also a fire station approximately 4.25 miles to the south at the Highway 207 junction with Butter Creek Road that is operated by the Boardman Rural Fire Protection District in cooperation with other districts in the vicinity to provide needed life and safety response.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds that the proposed activity is located immediately adjacent to Highway 207, which is a major public highway maintained by Oregon Department of Transportation.

As a precedent condition of approval, the applicant shall provide Umatilla County with verification of access approval from Oregon Department of Transportation for the existing access from Highway 207 serving the subject property. This criterion is pending.

> (5) Be located and of a size and design to help reduce noise, odor, or other detrimental effects when located adjacent to farm dwellings or rural [residential] or multiple use zones. A buffer or setback area from adjacent properties may be required to reduce possible detrimental effects. The establishment of a buffer shall consider such factors as prevailing winds, drainage, expansion potential of affected agricultural uses, open space and any other factors that may affect the livability of such proposed use of the agriculture of the area;

Applicant Response: The proposed activity of warehousing and construction staging would not produce odors or other detrimental effects to adjacent farm practices. There are no rural or other zones within the
vicinity of the subject property. Approved farm dwellings are in the area with the closest being approximately a quarter mile from the proposed use. There are upwards of seven homes within a two-mile radius of the subject property. While some noise and dust may be created those discharges would be comparable with the farming practices in the vicinity.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds, as provided by the applicant, there are no rural residential or multiple use zones adjacent to the subject property. Besides the existing dwelling on the subject property, the nearest farm dwelling on neighboring in the vicinity is located approximately $1 / 4$ mile away from the proposed use. Given the nature of the construction business, most activity is expected to occur off the subject property at construction job sites in the region. Environmental effects such as noise, vibration, air pollution, glare or odor are not expected to occur on the subject property at a frequency to impact neighboring properties. Therefore, no buffers or setbacks are required to reduce possible detrimental effects to farm dwellings. This criterion is met.

## (6) Ingress and egress are provided and designed not to create traffic hazards;

Applicant Response: An access onto Highway 207 is currently in place. Highway 207 is relatively flat with no obstructions for site distance at this access point. At full capacity of 20 employees a day at 4 trips per day the applicant is below the need for a traffic impact study and the current access is well developed and built to standard to handle trucks and trailers as it has been used in the past for similar purposes.

Additional information provided by applicant 10/10/22: Silver Creek has reached out to ODOT, specifically Tom Lapp. ODOT will be reviewing the access based on its current use (residential) and the proposed use with the result being a change in use determination. Various factors will be reviewed such as peak trip impacts which could result in requirements for the applicant, but nothing significant is anticipated given the average daily trips connected to the proposed use.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds that the applicant intends to utilize an existing ingress and egress for access to Highway 207. Highway 207 is a state-maintained roadway and permitting and design of the ingress and egress shall be approved by Oregon Department of Transportation.

Therefore, as a precedent condition of approval, the applicant shall provide Umatilla County with verification of access approval from Oregon Department of Transportation for the existing access from Highway 207 serving the subject property. This criterion is pending.
(7) Takes the least possible amount of agricultural land out of production;

Applicant Response: None of the proposed land is currently in production. No land is proposed to be taken out of production.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds that approximately 65 percent of the subject property is developed with structures or impervious surface. The airstrip on the subject property has been in operation since at least the 1970s and no crops have been grown on the parcel of land in recent years. Therefore, no land would be taken out of production. This criterion is met.
(8) The operation complies with all applicable air, noise and water quality and other applicable regulations of all county, state or federal jurisdictions and all applicable permits are obtained;

Applicant Response: For the proposed warehousing and staging activities no local, state, or federal permits would be required. Should any be identified, the applicant will obtain them. The applicant understands that they will be acquiring a previous agricultural chemical application facility that will need
some remediation.
County Finding: Umatilla County finds that domestic water to the subject property is provided by an exempt well. The applicant states in their application that a commercial exempt well may be necessary to accommodate the proposed use. The subject property is located within the Buttercreek Critical Groundwater Area identified and managed by the State of Oregon Water Resources Department. Therefore, as a subsequent condition of approval, the applicant shall comply with the applicable requirements of OWRD for securing water to accommodate the proposed business.

Umatilla County finds that the applicant does not propose any new buildings at this time, rather the business will utilize existing buildings. With the exception of the existing dwelling, these buildings are classified as agriculturally exempt structures and likely do not meet Oregon State Building Code requirements for industrial use or occupation of employees. Use of the existing structures for business and non-agricultural uses requires structural approval by Oregon State Building Codes as well as on-site septic approval from Umatilla County Environmental Health. Therefore, as a precedent condition of approval, the applicant shall obtain local and state permits, including structural approval from Oregon State Building Codes and on-site septic approval from Umatilla County Environmental Health, for business and non-agricultural use of existing structures.

Umatilla County finds that the applicant intends to maintain and continue use of the private use airstrip on the subject property. The use of an airstrip on the subject property pre-dates land use planning laws. A permit has never been issued for the airstrip. Therefore, it is considered a "pre-existing non-conforming use." When a nonconforming use of a structure or property is discontinued for a period in excess of one year, the structure or property shall not thereafter be used except in conformance with the zone in which the property is located. Therefore, as a subsequent condition of approval, the applicant shall obtain land use approval for future use of the airstrip.

Umatilla County finds that while the underlying zoning of the property is EFU, a PUSA-S overlay zone has been applied to the property to protect the continuing use of the airport. The PUSA-S overlay zone may only be removed by the Planning Commission upon request at any time pursuant to the requirements found in $\S 152.771$ of the Umatilla County Development Code. Therefore, as a subsequent condition of approval, any proposed future expansions or new uses are subject to the provisions of the PUSA-S overlay zone, unless it is removed by the Planning Commission.
(9) Explain how the proposed commercial activity complies with the following standards:
(a) The activity must enhance the farming activities of the local agricultural community,
(b) The agricultural and commercial activity must occur together in the local community, and
(c) The product or service must be essential to the practice of agriculture. Additional activity that is incidental to and supportive of the primary purpose does not disqualify the commercial activity.

Applicant Response: Silver Creek Contracting LLC (SCC) performs a substantial amount of its business in the agricultural community of Morrow and Umatilla counties. In 2017 agricultural activity was 68.1 percent of SCC's business by constructing digesters, piping projects, feed bunk construction and milk parlor construction. 2018 again saw a majority of agriculturally based construction with 62 percent of SCC's projects piping projects, grain hauling, chemical buildings, canal repairs, digester clean out, and corral construction. 2019 SCC was awarded a large municipal contract for a wastewater treatment plant and steel building foundation that throws off the percentage of agricultural revenue for 2019 as SCC continued multiple piping projects, corn dryer construction, feed slab pads and jet piping that was 37.6 percent of revenue. In 202022.5 percent of revenue was agriculturally based as SCC was awarded
multiple municipal contracts for a salt shed, road reconstruction project, flood emergency repairs, and a large waterline expansion. 2021 was back to normal and even more agriculturally based as 75.5 percent of SCC's revenue was from multiple large agriculturally based roller compacted concrete projects, pump stations, waterline projects, silo pads, wheat hauling, hay hauling, and more digester work. The last fiveyear average is 53.14 percent of agriculturally based revenue. Currently 2022 agriculturally based revenue is nearly $70 \%$ with compacted concrete work, pipeline projects, cattle facilities, a digester, agricultural waste infrastructure, and work on a processing plant.

These activities are critical to agricultural operations and occur on farm, along the farm-to-market progression, or in food processing. The construction activities occur in the local communities of Umatilla and Morrow Counties, and the service is essential to agricultural production and success.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds that the applicant provides, over the past five years agriculturally-related work completed by Silver Creek Contracting, LLC includes but is not limited to construction and clean-out of digesters, piping and pumping projects, construction of livestock facilities, grain and hay hauling, and construction of grain-related facilities. While the applicant doesn't provide specific details on which farms, or where they are located, this work has been completed on farms in Morrow and Umatilla Counties. Therefore, Umatilla County finds that the activity can be found to enhance the farming activities of the local community. Criterion (a) is met.

Umatilla County finds that it is less clear whether or not the applicant meets $\S 152.017(\mathrm{I})(\mathrm{B})(9)(\mathrm{b})$, requiring that the agricultural and commercial activity must occur together ['emphasis added'] in the local community. Planning staff identified several business addresses for Silver Creek Contracting, LLC; one address was located at 565 N Minor Street in Heppner, OR and a main business address at 505 Willamette Avenue in Umatilla, OR. In addition, construction equipment with the Silver Creek logo has been observed stored on industrially zoned property along Highway 395, north of Stanfield, OR. Therefore, the question must be asked; how is it, over the last five years, that Silver Creek Contracting has been able to perform these agriculturally-related activities without being located in the EFU zone?

Furthermore, as shown in revenue figures provided by the applicant, agriculturally-related construction work can fluctuate depending on a variety of economic factors and availability of contracts for municipalities and other construction related work. For example, in 2019 and 2020, Silver Creek's agriculturally-based revenue was 37.6 percent and 22.5 percent respectively. While the applicant states that 2021 revenue was "back to normal," there is no guarantee that their agriculturally-based work will continue at current levels. Therefore, Umatilla County finds that the agricultural and commercial activity do not necessarily occur together in the local community. Criterion (b) is NOT met.

Finally, the applicant must also meet the standard found in §152.017(I)(B)(9)(c), requiring that the product or service to be essential to the practice of agriculture. In order to make this determination, there is important case law in Oregon that must be considered:

City of Sandy v. Clackamas County and Parrott, LUBA No. 94-104, 1994 WL 1726767 (Or LUBA), Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) considered the question of whether a business consisting of large truck sales; truck, trailer, and other equipment rental; sale of portable storage buildings; mailbox UPS, and fax services; and construction of a 4,800 square-foot building to house operations was essential to the practice of agriculture. In making their decision, LUBA looked to case law construing "commercial activities that are in conjunction with farm use." Examples of commercial activities that are in conjunction with farm use include a winery that bought and processed grapes from agricultural enterprises in the area. Craven v. Jackson County, 308 Or 281, 779 P2d 1011 (1989). Similarly, a hop warehouse that stored hops grown by commercial hop growers and sold string and burlap used in hop production qualified as a commercial activity in conjunction with farm use. Earl v. McCarthy, 28 Or App 541, 560

P2d 665 (1977). Finally, a farm implement and irrigation equipment dealership qualified as a commercial activity in conjunction with farm use. Balin v. Klamath County, 3 LCDC 8, 19 (1979).

In City of Sandy, LUBA concluded that those cases "stand for the relatively straightforward proposition that a commercial activity in conjunction with farm use must be either exclusively or primarily a customer or supplier of farm uses." LUBA went on to explain the following:

28 Or LUBA at 321. "Even if a commercial activity primarily sells to farm uses, that may not be sufficient to allow the commercial activity to qualify as a commercial activity in conjunction with farm use. There is a second inquiry that must be satisfied. The products and services provided must be 'essential to the practice of agriculture.' While farmers must eat and farm equipment frequently operates on gasoline, that is not sufficient to make grocery stores or gas stations commercial activities in conjunction with farm use. The connection must be closer to the 'essential practice of agriculture."" Id. At 322.

LUBA concluded that the disputed uses in City of Sandy were not commercial activities in conjunction with farm use and further explained:
"There is no reason to believe the trucks, trailers, and equipment intervenor is authorized to sell and rent under the [CUP], will be purchased or rented exclusively or primarily by farms or farmers in the area. The same holds true for the mailbox, UPS and fax services. There is evidence that some of the intervenors expected sales and rentals will be to farm uses, but it is equally clear from the record that there is a potentially large number of customers for the items and services intervenor will offer that are not farm uses. The record in this case is inadequate to demonstrate sales and rentals will be primarily to farm uses in the area and, for that reason, is inadequate to demonstrate that the authorized use is a 'commercial activity in conjunction with farm use'" Id. (emphasis in original; footnote omitted) (citing Chauncey v. Multnomah County, 23 Or LUBA 599, 606-07 (1992)).

Umatilla County finds as provided by the applicant, approximately 53 percent of Silver Creek's revenue over the past five years has been what the applicant calls "agriculturally-based" revenue. Conversely, 47 percent of Silver Creek's revenue over the past five years has been from non-agricultural projects. Certainly, many of the services provided by the business such as construction and maintenance of grain and livestock related facilities are supportive of farm uses. However, there is no reason to believe that the construction work associated with the business will be exclusive to farm use or be conducted exclusively on land zoned for farm use. The business also performs a variety of municipal, non-agricultural construction projects. As indicated by their business website, Silver Creek Contracting, LLC also performs a variety of other construction related services including concrete pours, excavation, trucking, septic pumping and installation, aggregate sales, and other contracting services. During two, of the last five years, the majority of work completed and revenue generated by the business was not related to agriculture. Umatilla County Planning Department staff, on several occasions over the past year, have observed the business's construction equipment operating on a number of non-EFU zoned properties in the region. The proposal lacks the required connection to the "essential practice of agriculture." While the construction services offered by Silver Creek Contracting, LLC could be used by farm uses, they are also utilized by a significant number of non-agricultural customers. Therefore, Umatilla County finds that the products and services provided by the business are not essential to the practice of agriculture. Criterion (c) is NOT met.

## § 152.615 ADDITIONAL CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT RESTRICTIONS.

In addition to the requirements and criteria listed in this subchapter, the Hearings Officer, Planning Director or the appropriate planning authority may impose the following conditions upon a finding that circumstances warrant such additional restrictions:
(A) Limiting the manner in which the use is conducted, including restricting hours of operation and restraints to minimize such environmental effects as noise, vibration, air pollution, glare or odor;

Applicant Response: SCC typically operates with normal business hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday with some exceptions for emergency work or projects under a deadline. This would be the same as the farming operations adjacent to and in the vicinity of the subject property. No noise, vibration, air pollution, water pollution, glare, or odor is anticipated from the operations of SCC. Airstrip operations would reestablish the impacts previously encountered when the airstrip previously operated. Any impacts would be of a similar nature to the impacts from area farm practices.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds that the applicant intends to operate under set business hours of 7:00 am to 6:00 pm, Monday through Friday. These hours of operation are similar, or in some cases, less than the hours of operation of farming activities in the vicinity. In addition, given the nature of the construction business, most activity is expected to occur off the subject property at construction job sites in the region. Environmental effects such as noise, vibration, air pollution, glare or odor are not expected to occur on the subject property at a frequency to impact adjacent properties.

Umatilla County finds, as a subsequent condition of approval, regular hours of operation for the business shall be 7:00 am to 6:00 pm, Monday through Friday.
(B) Establishing a special yard, other open space or lot area or dimension;

Applicant Response: The property layout in support of the airstrip creates significant open space. No additional open space or special yards should be needed or required.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds that the subject property is over 11 acres, enough to accommodate the applicant's construction equipment. A preliminary site plan provided by the applicant shows that the existing airstrip will be maintained and no vehicles or traffic would be allowed on the runway. Therefore, no conditions establishing a special yard, other open space, lot area, or dimension are imposed.

## (C) Limiting the height, size or location of a building or other structure;

Applicant Response: No buildings taller than those on the property are proposed.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds that no additional buildings are proposed at this time. However, future proposed buildings would be subject to the permitting requirements of the PUSA-S overlay zone.

As a subsequent condition of approval, the height, size and location of future proposed buildings are subject to the permitting requirements of the PUSA-S overlay zone.
(D) Designating the size, number, location and nature of vehicle access points;

Applicant Response: The property has an improved access which is adequate to the request and serves both the home and the airstrip operations. It is adequate for the proposed Commercial Use in Conjunction with Farm use.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds that the proposed use will be served by an existing single point of access to and from Highway 207. No additional access points are proposed.

As a precedent condition of approval, the applicant shall provide Umatilla County with verification of
access approval from Oregon Department of Transportation for the existing access from Highway 207 serving the subject property.
(E) Increasing the required street dedication, roadway width or improvements within the street right of way;

Applicant Response: Highway 207 is an established highway. No additional width or improvements should be required based on this request.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds that Highway 207, an existing state roadway, abuts the west side of the subject property. None of the activities proposed as part of the proposed business necessitate the widening or improvements to the state highway. Therefore, no conditions increasing the required street dedication, roadway width or improvements within the road right-of-way are imposed.
(F) Designating the size, location, screening, drainage, surfacing or other improvement of a parking or loading area;

Applicant Response: Because of the previous airstrip activities a large portion of the subject property is already committed to impervious surface. No additional impervious surface is necessary or should be required. Parking spaces, including ADA compliance spaces, will be marked adjacent to the buildings used for office and maintenance activities.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds approximately 65 percent the subject property appears to consist of a paved or graveled surface, and should be adequate to accommodate the parking of constructionrelated equipment and vehicles.

As a precedent condition of approval, the applicant shall submit to Umatilla County a site plan that indicates proposed locations for construction equipment, vehicle parking, and vehicle circulation. The parking layout shall be designed to comply with the county's parking standards found in UCDC Sections 152.560 through 152.562 .
(G) Limiting or otherwise designating the number, size, location, height and lighting of signs;

Applicant Response: Signage identifying the location as being the operational headquarters for SCC will be installed in compliance with the signage standards of Umatilla County.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds that the applicant proposes to install signage identifying the proposed business.

As a precedent condition of approval, the applicant shall submit to Umatilla County a site plan that indicates proposed locations for signage, as well as drawings showing the signage design and dimensions. All signage shall be located and designed to comply with the county's signage standards found in UCDC Sections 152.545 through 152.548 .
(H) Limiting the location and intensity of outdoor lighting and requiring its shielding;

Applicant Response: Outdoor lighting for office and maintenance operations, including security lighting, will be installed. The intent would be to have it focused on the areas needing lighting for safety and security purposes and to include shielding to protect adjacent properties.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds that the applicant proposes to install lighting for safety and
security purposes.
As a precedent condition of approval, the applicant shall submit to Umatilla County a site plan that indicates proposed locations for safety and security lighting.

As a subsequent condition of approval, all lighting shall be shielded and maintained in a downward direction to avoid light pollution toward adjacent properties.
(I) Requiring diking, screening, landscaping or other methods to protect adjacent or nearby property and designating standards for installation and maintenance.

Applicant Response: No diking or screening is necessary and could be a hinderance for airstrip operations as well as impact security for the site. Landscaping will be accomplished as part of the renovation of the facility to support the operations of SCC.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds that a majority of the subject property is surrounded by farmland, with the exception of the west side of the property which abuts Highway 207. In addition, given the nature of the construction business, most activity is expected to occur off the subject property at construction job sites in the region. Therefore, no conditions requiring diking, screening, landscaping or other methods to protect adjacent or nearby property are imposed.
(J) Designating the size, height, location and materials for a fence;

Applicant Response: No fencing is anticipated beyond normal right-of-way or farm fencing. Access may be gated for security purposes.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds that the applicant proposes fencing that would be consistent with other types of fencing such as farm fencing that would be found in the vicinity. Besides the existing dwelling on the subject property, there are no neighboring residences within $1 / 4$ mile of the subject property where site-obscuring fencing would be necessary to limit visual impacts. Therefore, no conditions designating the size, height, location and materials for a fence are imposed.
(K) Protecting and preserving existing trees, vegetation, water resources, wildlife habitat, or other significant natural resources.

Applicant Response: The home that is on the sight has existing landscaping that will be retained and improved. Some landscaping may be done in support of the office and other buildings that will support the business operations of SCC. The balance of the property will be maintained to support the airstrip and will retain its natural features that support local flora and fauna.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds that the applicant intends to maintain or improve the existing landscaping. There are no known water resources, wildlife habitat areas, or other significant natural resources known to occur on the subject property. Therefore, no conditions to protect and preserve natural resources is imposed.

## (L) Parking area requirements as listed in $\$ \S 152.560$ through 152.562 of this chapter.

Applicant Response: Parking will be installed in support of the office and maintenance activities and will conform with the parking requirements of the Umatilla County Development Code including requirements for handicapped parking options.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds that the applicant proposes to install parking to accommodate the parking of construction-related equipment and employee vehicles.

As a precedent condition of approval, the applicant shall submit to Umatilla County a site plan that indicates proposed locations for construction equipment, vehicle parking, and vehicle circulation. The parking layout shall be designed to comply with the county's parking standards found in UCDC Sections 152.560 through 152.562 .
§152.061: STANDARDS FOR ALL CONDITIONAL USES. The following limitations shall apply to all conditional uses in an EFU zone. Uses may be approved only where such uses:
(A) Will not force a significant change in accepted farm or forest practices on surrounding lands devoted to farm or forest use;
(B) Will not significantly increase the cost of accepted farm or forest practices on lands devoted to farm or forest use.

Applicant Response: The subject property is currently idle having previously served as an airstrip and staging area for an agricultural aerial application service. The proposed use, while not utilizing the airstrip initially for construction operations, will use the warehouse and hanger space for office, maintenance, and storage purposes. The proposed activities will not change accepted farm practices on surrounding land that are devoted the growing of dryland wheat and alfalfa, or impact grazing activities in the vicinity.

Because the proposed uses will not change accepted farm practices, they would also not increase the cost of those same farm practices on lands adjacent to the subject property or in the vicinity.

Additional information provided by applicant 10/10/22: Accepted farming practices would consist of planting, irrigating (where appropriate and available), applying fertilizer or chemicals to control weeds or other unwanted pests, and harvesting. These practices are done on the surface or, in the case of chemicals or fertilizers, may be aerial applied. These activities happen predominately from the early spring through late fall. There is nothing in the activity of the proposed commercial use in conjunction with farm use that would disrupt or displace these activities. There are no chemicals or other noxious products used by Silver Creek Construction in their activities that would be an impact or require changes in agricultural activity.

While the access point for the proposed activity will see an increase in average daily trips (ADT), particularly in relation to the current residential use, it will not be of such volume to create a significant impact to other landowners and travelers of that portion of Highway 207. A residential use is generally accorded 10 ADT with the proposed use creating between 80 and 120 ADT , meaning no traffic impact study is triggered, and no significant impact is expected. The access point for the subject property is not located near or across from any other access points, thereby creating a separation from turning movements into the subject property and other farm activities in the vicinity.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds that the subject property is surrounded by farmed cropland on the north, south, and east sides. Highway 207 immediately abuts the west side of the subject property. A single parcel of land, owned by Myers Farm Company is located adjacent to the subject property on the south and east sides. Aerial imagery indicates that the property owned by Myers Farm Company appears to be farmed for both irrigated and non-irrigated crops such as wheat and alfalfa. Farmland immediately to the north of the subject property is owned by Hawkins Company, Inc and appears to be farmed for dryland wheat. Common farm activities associated with these types of crops includes but is not limited to cultivation, seeding, spraying (via aerial and ground application), harvesting (wheat), and swathing and
bailing hay (alfalfa). These activities occur at various times throughout the seasons and are performed with a variety of equipment types such as tractors, discs plows, cultivators, harrows, combines, swathers, balers, bale wagons, seeding equipment and trucks for hauling commodities. Farm practices in the area can generate occasional noise, dust and traffic at various times of year.

A letter of support was provided by John Myers, President of Myers Farm Company, Inc. Mr. Myers expressed that Silver Creek Contracting's business operations would be similar in nature to the farming activity occurring along Highway 207 from south of Interstate-84 to the Buttercreek junction.

Umatilla County finds that the applicant's proposed business would include warehousing and storage of construction related equipment. The business is not expected to generate excessive amounts of noise or dust because most construction equipment will be operated off the subject property at construction job sites. While the proposed use will generate additional traffic from employees traveling to/and from work and construction equipment coming and going between jobs, the types of equipment are not uncommon in an agricultural area and the number of ADT is not expected to trigger a traffic impact analysis ${ }^{2}$.
Therefore, equipment associated with the business is compatible with the types of agricultural equipment found in the vicinity.

Umatilla County finds that the applicant also proposes to utilize an existing hanger space for an office and maintenance of construction equipment. While these are uses that would be more typical of an industrial zone, they may not be much different than similar activities conducted in a building located on a commercial farm.

Umatilla County finds that the applicant has provided that their business does a significant amount of business in the agriculture sector. Agriculturally-related work completed by Silver Creek Contracting, LLC includes but is not limited to construction and clean-out of digesters, piping and pumping projects, construction of livestock facilities, grain and hay hauling, and construction of grain-related facilities. While the applicant doesn't provide specific details on which farms, or where they are located, this work has been completed on farms in Morrow and Umatilla Counties. It is not likely that these activities would interfere with accepted farm practices. Therefore, the proposed activity will not force a significant change in accepted farm or forest practices on surrounding lands devoted to farm or forest use, or increase the cost of those same farm practices on lands adjacent to the subject property or in the vicinity. These criteria are met.

[^1]
## 23. PLANNING COMMISSION OPTIONS

## DECISION: BASED ON THE FOREGOING FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, WHERE IT HAS NOT BEEN DEMONSTRATED THE REQUEST BY SILVER CREEK CONSTRUCTION, LLC COMPLIES WITH ALL CONDITONAL USE PERMIT REQUIREMENTS FOR A COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY IN CONJUNCTION WITH FARM USE, THE REQUEST IS DENIED.

## DECISION: BASED ON THE FOREGOING FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, WHERE IT HAS BEEN DEMONSTRATED THE REQUEST BY SILVER CREEK CONSTRUCTION, LLC COMPLIES WITH ALL CONDITONAL USE PERMIT REQUIREMENTS FOR A COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY IN CONJUNCTION WITH FARM USE, THE REQUEST IS APPROVED UPON COMPLETION OF THE CONDITIONS LISTED BELOW.

Precedent Conditions: The following precedent conditions must be fulfilled to finalize approval of this request.

1. Provide Umatilla County with verification of access approval from Oregon Department of Transportation for the existing access from Highway 207 serving the subject property.
2. Submit to Umatilla County a site plan that indicates proposed locations for construction equipment, vehicle parking, and vehicle circulation. The parking layout shall be designed to comply with the county's parking standards found in UCDC Sections 152.560 through 152.562 .
3. Submit to Umatilla County a site plan that indicates proposed locations for signage, as well as drawings showing the signage design and dimensions. All signage shall be located and designed to comply with the county's signage standards found in UCDC Sections 152.545 through 152.548.
4. Submit to Umatilla County a site plan that indicates proposed locations for safety and security lighting.
5. Obtain a Zoning Permit from the County Planning Department and all applicable Federal and State local permits; including structural approval from Oregon State Building Codes and onsite septic approval from Umatilla County Environmental Health, for business and nonagricultural use of existing structures.

Subsequent Conditions: The following subsequent conditions would continue to be applicable to the applicant's conditional use permit.

1. Hours of operation for the business shall be 7:00 am to $6: 00 \mathrm{pm}$, Monday through Friday.
2. All lighting shall be shielded and maintained in a downward direction to avoid light pollution toward adjacent properties.
3. Comply with the applicable requirements of OWRD for securing water to accommodate the proposed business.
4. Obtain land use approval for future use of the airstrip.
5. Any proposed future expansions or new uses are subject to the provisions of the PUSA-S overlay zone, unless the overlay zone is removed by the Planning Commission.
6. The height, size and location of future proposed buildings are subject to the permitting requirements of the PUSA-S overlay zone.
7. The approval for the construction business will be subject to an annual review and review fee for the first two years of operation. Reviews will be suspended after the second year; however, the county reserves the option to reinstate reviews.

## UMATILLA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Dated $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ , 20 $\qquad$

Suni Danforth, Chair

## Exhibit C - Landowner Acknowledgement

West Flying Service, Inc<br>Gary L. West, Estate Representative<br>1550 SW Riverhill Drive<br>Hermiston, OR 97838

June 21, 2022

Robert Waldher, Director
Umatilla County Planning Department
Umatilla County Courthouse
216 SE 4th Street
Pendleton, Oregon 97801

RE: Land Use Authorization/Conditional Use Permit
Dear Mr. Waldher:

Please accept this letter as notice that as representative of the estate for West Flying Service which owns the real property known as Tax Lot 1202 of Assessor's Map 2N 27 I support the application for the Conditional Use Permit for a Commercial Use in Conjunction with Farm Use. I am working with Mike Duncan of Silver Creek Construction on a potential purchase of this property which is part of the estate of my father.

The property has been idle for some time. Redevelopment by Mike Duncan to support Silver Creek Construction and improvement to the airstrip and its related infrastructure is a positive improvement.

Should you have any questions about this Land Use Authorization please do not hesitate to give me a call at 503-779-7769 or email me at gary.west17@gmail.com.


Gary L. West

## Exhibit D - Proposed Site Layout



Exhibit E-Letters of Support

Tim Rust

77252 Maser Rust Ln.
Echo, OR 97826
July 27, 2022

Bob Waldher, Director
Department of Land Use Planning
216 SE $4^{\text {th }}$ Street, Room 104
Pendleton, Oregon 97801
Dear Mr. Waldher:

Please accept this letter in support of the application from Mike Duncan, owner of Silver Creek Construction, for a Conditional Use Permit to relocate his business operations, particularly office operations and staging of various construction projects, as a Commercial Use in Conjunction with Farm Use. The proposed location is known locally as the West Buttercreek Airport and is located at 72839 Highway 207, Echo, Oregon (and is otherwise identified as being tax lot 1202 of Assessor's Map 2N 27).

The airport operations have been idle for several years and the airport infrastructure is clearly degrading with the airstrip having weeds emerging through cracks in the hard surface. It is my understanding that Mr. Duncan has plans to improve the airstrip for both personal use and farm related uses should they emerge. Activity associated with his business operations would be similar in nature to the farming activity occurring along Highway 207 from south of Interstate 84 to the Buttercreek junction.

Please add me to the notice list for this request as I intend to support Mr. Duncan's application and would appreciate the opportunity to provide additional testimony and evidence to Planning staff or the Planning Commission should a public hearing be held. Mr. Duncan has a reputation in the farming community for good work done in a timely manner and for a reasonable price. Keeping his business local is good for the economies of both Umatilla and Morrow Counties. He employs local people and provides good wages.

Please approve Mr. Duncan's request for a Conditional Use Permit. It will allow a local business the opportunity to grow and keep a parcel of land from further degradation, creating an improvement along Highway 207.

Your consideration is appreciated.
Respectfully,



Tim Rust

Aug 2, 2022

Bob Waldher, Director
Department of Land Use Planning
216 SE 4 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street, Room 104
Pendleton, Oregon 97801
Dear Mr. Waldher:
Please accept this letter in support of the application from Mike Duncan, owner of Silver Creek Construction, for a Conditional Use Permit to relocate his business operations, particularly office operations and staging of various construction projects, as a Commercial Use in Conjunction with Farm Use. The proposed location is known locally as the West Buttercreek Airport and is located at 72839 Highway 207, Echo, Oregon (and is otherwise identified as being tax lot 1202 of Assessor's Map 2N 27).

The airport operations have been idle for several years and the airport infrastructure is clearly degrading with the airstrip having weeds emerging through cracks in the hard surface. It is my understanding that Mr. Duncan has plans to improve the airstrip for both personal use and farm related uses should they emerge. Activity associated with his business operations would be similar in nature to the farming activity occurring along Highway 207 from south of Interstate 84 to the Buttercreek junction.

Please add me to the notice list for this request as I intend to support Mr. Duncan's application and would appreciate the opportunity to provide additional testimony and evidence to Planning staff or the Planning Commission should a public hearing be held. Mr . Duncan has a reputation in the farming community for good work done in a timely manner and for a reasonable price. Keeping his business local is good for the economies of both Umatilla and Morrow Counties. He employs local people and provides good wages.

Approve Mr. Duncan's request for a Conditional Use Permit. It will allow a local business the opportunity to grow and keep a parcel of land from further degradation, creating an improvement along Highway 207.

Your consideration is appreciated.


## Exhibit F - Notice Map

APPLICANT: SILVER CREEK CONSTRUCTION OWNER: WEST FLYING SERVICE INC. MAP: 2N 27 TAX LOT: 1202

## \#C-1351-22

Notified property owners within 2,000 feet of the subject parcel.

## EFU

OWNER
Legend

| MAP | TAXLOT | OWNER | MAP | TAXLOT | OWNER |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 2N270000 | 400 | HALE BROTHERS INC |  |  | 2N270000 |
| 2N2700 | MCCARTY OREGON REAL |  |  |  |  |
| 2N270000 | 401 | HALE BROTHERS INC |  |  | PROPERTY LLC |
| 2N270000 | 403 | HALE BROTHERS INC | 2N270000 | 3000 | HAWKINS CO INC |
| 2N270000 | 404 | HALE BROTHERS INC | 2N270000 | $\mathbf{1 2 0 2}$ | WEST FLYING SERVICE INC |
| 2N270000 | 1500 | HANSON LARRY D | 2N270000 | 1200 | MYERS FARM CO |
| 2N270000 | 1501 | HANSON LARRY D |  |  |  |
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## MEMO

TO: Umatilla County Planning Commission
FROM: Megan Davchevski, Planner
DATE: October 12, 2022
RE: October 20, 2022 Planning Commission Hearing Text Amendment T-092-22, Zone Amendment Z-322-22 \& Plan Amendment P-135-22

CC: Robert Waldher, Planning Director

## Background Information

The applicant requests to establish a new aggregate site, add the site to the Umatilla County Comprehensive Plan list of Goal 5 protected Large Significant Sites, and apply the Aggregate Resource (AR) Overlay Zone to the entire quarry site. The property site is comprised of several tax lots located south of the Interstate $82 / 84$ interchange. The site is approximately 225 acres and is zoned Exclusive Farm Use (EFU). The subject property is south of the Interstates 82 and 84 Interchange, southwest of the Westland Road Interchange and south of Stafford Hansell Road.

The proposal, if approved, would add this site as a large significant site onto the County's Goal 5 inventory of significant sites. The applicant desires to excavate aggregate, batch that aggregate for various commercial and industrial projects, stockpile unused aggregate material for current and future use, and process the aggregate into both asphalt and concrete. Both sand and gravel materials are available on this site.

## Criteria of Approval

The criteria of approval are found in Oregon Administrative Rule 660-023-0040-0050, 660-023-0180 (3), (5) and (7), and Umatilla County Development Code (UCDC) Section 152.487-488.

## Conclusion

The process of approval by the County involves review by the County Planning Commission with a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC). The decision includes a set of Precedent and Subsequent Conditions of approval. The Planning Commission is tasked with determining if the application satisfies the criteria of approval, based on the facts in the record.

The BCC must also hold a public hearing(s) and make a decision whether or not to adopt the proposed amendments. A public hearing before the BCC is scheduled for November 30, 2022.

[^2]
## PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION OPTIONS

## Motion to Recommend Approval Based on Evidence in the Record

I, Commissioner $\qquad$ make a motion to recommend approval of the Girth Dog LLC Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment \#T-092-22, Zoning Map Amendment \# Z-322-22 and Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment P-135-22, to the Board of Commissioners based on the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.

## Motion to Recommend Approval with Additional Findings

I, Commissioner $\qquad$ make a motion to recommend approval of the Girth Dog LLC Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment \#T-092-22, Zoning Map Amendment \# Z-322-22 and Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment P-135-22, to the Board of Commissioners with the following additional Findings of Fact: $\qquad$ .

## Motion to Recommend Denial Based on Evidence in the Record

I, Commissioner $\qquad$ , make a motion to recommend denial of the Girth Dog LLC Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment \#T-092-22, Zoning Map Amendment \# Z-322-22 and Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment P-135-22, to the Board of Commissioners based on the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.

## UMATILLA COUNTY

PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING - OCTOBER 20, 2022
UMATILLA COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT, COMPREHENSIVE
PLAN TEXT AMENDMENT \& ZONING MAP AMENDMENT
GIRTH DOG LLC, APPLICANT \& OWNER
PACKET CONTENT LIST

1. Staff Memo to Planning Commission Pages 1-2
2. Notice and Vicinity Map

Page 4
3. 1500 foot Impact Area Map

Page 5
4. Soil Map

Page 6
5. Staff Report \& Preliminary Findings

Pages 7-36
6. Proposed Text Amendment

Pages 37-38
7. Proposed Zoning Map

Page 39
8. Lab Reports (Atlas 2022)

Pages 40-42
9. Site Sample Map

Page 43
10. Traffic Impact Analysis (Kittelson \& Associates)

Pages 45-120

## OWNER: GIRTH DOG LLC

Notified Property Owners within 750 feet of Subject Parcels


## GIRTH DOG LLC

## 1500 FT IMPACT AREA \& 500 FT DWELLING BUFFER <br> MAP 4N 27 36, TL 900, 1100, 1200, 1300 AND 1800




## Legend



# UMATILLA COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS PRELIMINARY FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAP AMENDMENT, \#P-135-22, COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TEXT AMMENDMENT T-092-22, ZONING MAP AMENDMENT \#Z-322-22 MAP 4N 27 36; TLs \#900, 1100, 1200, 1300, and 1800 

1. APPLICANT: Craig Coleman, Girth Dog LLC, 33896 E Walls Road, Hermiston, OR 97838
2. CONSULTANT: Carla McLane Consulting, LLC, 170 Van Buren Drive, Umatilla, OR 97882
3. OWNER: Girth Dog LLC, 33896 E Walls Road, Hermiston, OR 97838
4. REQUEST: The request is to add Tax Lots 900, 1100, 1200, 1300, and 1800 of Assessor's Map 4N 2736 to the Umatilla County list of Large Significant Sites, providing necessary protections under Goal 5 including limiting conflicting uses within the impact area, and applying the Aggregate Resource Overlay Zone to the subject property, with the objective to allow mining, processing, and stockpiling at the site. This action is designed to establish the entire site composed of all tax lots, as a Large Significant Site with protections under Goal 5 and to allow mining, processing, both concrete and asphalt batch plants, and stockpiling. For this application 'aggregate' means sand and gravel materials as both are available on this site.
5. LOCATION: The subject property is just south of the interchange for Interstates 84 and 82 , southwest of the Westland Road Interchange, just over a quarter of a mile west of Colonel Jordan Road, and south of Stafford Hansell Road. Agricultural operations under circle pivot irrigation and drip irrigation are currently occurring on the subject property.
6. SITUS: The proposed aggregate site does not currently have a situs address.
7. ACREAGE: The entire site is approximately 225 acres, spread across the various tax lots.
8. COMP PLAN: The subject property have a Comprehensive Plan designation of North/South Agriculture.
9. ZONING: The subject property is zoned Exclusive Farm Use (EFU).
10. ACCESS: The site can be accessed from Colonel Jordan Road, via Center Street, an unimproved public right of way.
11. ROAD TYPE: Center Street is an unimproved, 40 -foot wide, public right of way. Colonel Jordan Road, County Road \#1325, is a two-lane paved county roadway.
12. EASEMENTS: There are no access or utility easements on the subject property.
13. LAND USE: Currently there is an agricultural operation occurring with several circle pivots and drip irrigation. The applicant did not provide details on the crops grown on the subject property.
14. ADJACENT USE: An approved mining operation is directly to the east of the property with a truck stop and fueling station further to the east. The approved mining site hasn't yet been excavated, and is currently irrigated crop circles. Light industrial and commercial activities are further to the east across Colonel Jordan Road. To the north across Interstate 84 a FedEx Freight facility, a UPS Customer Center, several potato storages, and a food processing and shipping operation are west of Westland Road. Irrigated farmland is to the west, south, and east of the subject property, most under circle pivot irrigation systems. The zoning within the 1,500-foot impact area includes Exclusive Farm Use, Light Industrial, Limited Rural Light Industrial, and Light Industrial/Limited Use Overlay Zone.

## 15. LAND FORM: Columbia River Plateau

16. SOIL TYPES: The subject property contains predominately Non-High Value soil types. High Value Soils are defined in UCDC 152.003 as Land Capability Class I and II. The soils on the subject property are predominately Class IV.

| Soil Name, Unit Number, Description | Land Capability Class |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Dry | Irrigated |
| 3A: Adkins fine sandy loam, wet, 0 to 3 percent slopes | IIw | IIw |
| 75B: Quincy loamy fine sand, 0 to 5 percent slopes | VIIe | IVe |
| 76B: Quincy loamy fine sand gravelly substratum, 0 to 5 percent slopes | VIIe | IVe |
| 95B: Taunton fine sandy loam, 1 to 7 percent slopes | VIe | IVe |
| Soil Survey of Umatilla County Area, 1989, NRCS. The suffix on the Land Capability Class designations <br> are defined as "e" - erosion prone, "c" - climate limitations, "s" soil limitations and "w" - water (Survey, <br> page. 172). |  |  |

17. BUILDINGS: There are no buildings on the subject property.
18. UTILITIES: The site is not served by utilities.
19. WATER/SEWER: The applicant provides there are several water rights associated with the groundwater use for gravel washing. The groundwater rights are listed on certificates \#74109 (U-649), \#74185 (G-10505), \#79531 (G-1671), and \#79530 (G-3822). Oregon Water Resources has not confirmed that these groundwater rights may be used for gravel washing.
20. FIRE SERVICE: The site is located within Umatilla County Fire District \#1.
21. IRRIGATION: The site is located within Westland Irrigation District; however, the applicant has provided that the site is not served by the irrigation district.
22. FLOODPLAIN: This property is NOT in a floodplain.
23. WETLANDS: There are no known wetlands located on the subject property.
24. NOTICES SENT: Notice was sent to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) on September 9, 2022. Notice was mailed to neighboring land owners and affected agencies on September 30, 2022. Notice was printed in the October 8, 2022 publication of the East Oregonian.
25. HEARING DATE: A public hearing is scheduled before the Umatilla County Planning Commission in the Justice Center Media Room, 4700 NW Pioneer Place, Pendleton, OR 97838 on October 20, 2022 at 6:30 PM.

A subsequent hearing is scheduled before the Umatilla County Board of County Commissioners on November 30, 2022 at 9:00 AM. The hearing will be held in Room 130 at the County Courthouse, 216 SE $4^{\text {th }}$ St., Pendleton, OR 97801.
26. AGENCIES: Umatilla County Assessor, Umatilla County Public Works, Oregon Department of Transportation Region 5-Highways Division, Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development, Department of Environmental Quality, Department of Geology and Mineral Industries, Department of State Lands, Oregon Water Resources Department, Westland Irrigation District, CTUIR-Natural Resources, CTUIR-Cultural Resources
27. COMMENTS: Comments are pending.

NOTE: The Umatilla County Development Code has not been updated with the Division 23 Rules for Aggregate. The Oregon Administrative Rules 660-023-0180 to establish a Goal 5 Large Significant Site will be directly applied per OAR 660-023-180 (9).

## 28. GOAL 5 ISSUES: Scenic, Open Space, Historic, Wildlife, and other resources.

In order to mine aggregate in Umatilla County, a site must either be an active insignificant site, or be listed on the Goal 5 Inventory of the Umatilla County Comprehensive Plan as a significant site. The Umatilla County Comprehensive Plan requires that "[a]ny proposed modification to the text or areas of application (maps) of the AR, HAC, CWR or NA Overlay Zones shall be processed as an amendment to this plan." Therefore, this application constitutes a PostAcknowledgement Plan Amendment (PAPA), and is subject to the criteria listed in Oregon

Administrative Rules (OAR) 660-023-0030 through 660-023-0050, and OAR 660-023-0180. As a condition of approval for operation, the applicant must acquire a DOGAMI permit and obtain approval of a reclamation plan. Copies of both the DOGAMI permit and reclamation plan must be submitted to County Planning.

## 29. STANDARDS OF THE OREGON ADMINISTRATIVE RULES, DIVISION 23 FOR GOAL 5 LARGE SIGNIFICANT SITES are found in OAR 660-023-0180 (3), (5), \& (7), OAR 660-023-040, and OAR 660-023-050. The standards for approval are provided in underlined text and the responses are indicated in standard text.

## OAR 660-023-0180 Mineral and Aggregate Resources

(3) [Large Significant Sites] An aggregate resource site shall be considered significant if adequate information regarding the quantity, quality, and location of the resource demonstrates that the site meets any one of the criteria in subsections (a) through (c) of this section, except as provided in subsection (d) of this section:
(a) A representative set of samples of aggregate material in the deposit on the site meets Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) specifications for base rock for air degradation, abrasion, and sodium sulfate soundness, and the estimated amount of material is more than $2,000,000$ tons in the Willamette Valley, or 100,000 tons outside the Willamette Valley;
(b) The material meets local government standards establishing a lower threshold for significance than subsection (a) of this section; or
(c) The aggregate site is on an inventory of significant aggregate sites in an acknowledged plan on the applicable date of this rule.
(d) Notwithstanding subsections (a) through (c) of this section, except for an expansion area of an existing site if the operator of the existing site on March 1, 1996 had an enforceable property interest in the expansion area on that date, an aggregate site is not significant if the criteria in either paragraphs (A) or (B) of this subsection apply:
(A) More than 35 percent of the proposed mining area consists of soil classified as Class I on Natural Resource and Conservation Service (NRCS) maps on the date of this rule; or
(B) More than 35 percent of the proposed mining area consists of soil classified as Class II, or of a combination of Class II and Class I or Unique soil on NRCS maps available on the date of this rule, unless the average width of the aggregate layer within the mining area exceeds:
(i) 60 feet in Washington, Multnomah, Marion, Columbia, and Lane counties;
(ii) 25 feet in Polk, Yamhill, and Clackamas counties; or
(iii) 17 feet in Linn and Benton counties.

The proposed quarry is in eastern Oregon and has an inventory of over 13 million cubic yards of available sand and gravel aggregate material. The United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service Soil Survey of Umatilla County identify the soils on the northern portion of the subject property as Quincy loamy fine sand, with gravelly substratum, with slopes of 0 to 5 percent. The balance of the subject property is Quincy loamy find sand also with a slope of 0 to 5 percent with very small amounts in the southeast corner of the subject property of Adkins fine
sandy loam and Taunton fine sandy loam. Except for the very small number of acres of Adkins fine sandy loam and Taunton fine sandy loam, the soil is classified as VII when not irrigated or IV when irrigated. The Taunton fine sandy loam is classified as VI when not irrigated; the Adkins fine sandy loam is classified as II. The portion of the proposed quarry site that is has a soil classification of II is between two and three acres or about .01 percent of the site, significantly less than 35 percent of the proposed mining area.

In 2022 samples of material were tested by Atlas Technical Consultants from the proposed quarry and were determined to meet current ODOT specifications. Three laboratory reports for two samples indicate that tests were completed for abrasion, soundness, and specific gravity stating that the material tested satisfied the Oregon Standard Specifications for Construction.

Umatilla County finds the proposed quarry consisting of approximately 225 acres meet, and is estimated to exceed, both the quantity and quality criteria for a significant aggregate site in accordance with OAR 660-023-0180(3)(a).
(5) [Large Significant Sites] For significant mineral and aggregate sites, local governments shall decide whether mining is permitted. For a PAPA application involving an aggregate site determined to be significant under section (3) of this rule, the process for this decision is set out in subsections (a) through (g) of this section. A local government must complete the process within 180 days after receipt of a complete application that is consistent with section (8) of this rule, or by the earliest date after 180 days allowed by local charter.
(a) Impact Area] The local government shall determine an impact area for the purpose of identifying conflicts with proposed mining and processing activities. The impact area shall be large enough to include uses listed in subsection (b) of this section and shall be limited to 1,500 feet from the boundaries of the mining area, except where factual information indicates significant potential conflicts beyond this distance. For a proposed expansion of an existing aggregate site, the impact area shall be measured from the perimeter of the proposed expansion area rather than the boundaries of the existing aggregate site and shall not include the existing aggregate site.

Applicant Response: The interchange for Interstates 84 and 82 is immediately to the north of the proposed quarry with a variety of light industrial uses to the northeast of the property, all of which are north of Interstate 84 which diminishes the impacts of the mining operation on those activities. There is a mining operation immediately to the east with commercial and light industrial uses further to the east of the mining operation. Another mining operation is to the west, also along Interstate 84 . The area to the west, south, and southeast of the mining area are farmed, predominantly under circle pivot irrigation. There are two homes in the impact area of the subject property.

Umatilla County finds that factual information is not present to indicate that there would be significant conflicts beyond the 1,500 foot impact area from the boundaries of the proposed expansion. Therefore, the 1,500 foot impact area is sufficient to include uses listed in (b) below.
(b) [Conflicts created by the site] The local government shall determine existing or approved land uses within the impact area that will be adversely affected by proposed mining operations and shall specify the predicted conflicts. For purposes of this section, "approved land uses" are dwellings allowed by a residential zone on existing platted lots and other uses for which conditional or final approvals have been granted by the local government. For determination of conflicts from proposed mining of a significant aggregate site, the local government shall limit its consideration to the following:
(A) Conflicts due to noise, dust, or other discharges with regard to those existing and approved uses and associated activities (e. g. , houses and schools) that are sensitive to such discharges;

Applicant Response: There are two homes within the 1,500-foot impact area all sited on land zoned for Exclusive Farm Use. They were approved as farm dwellings in the Exclusive Farm Use zone. There are no residentially zoned lands within the impact area. There is a mining operation and a truck stop to the east of the mining operation. Another mining operation is to the west of the subject property. To the north of Interstate 84 there is a FedEx freight facility, Triple M Truck and Equipment, and other commercial or light industrial uses.

There are uses that may be impacted by noise, dust, or other discharges from the proposed mining operation including the truck stop to the east and the homes, all within the 1,500 -foot impact area. The applicant or contractors will manage impacts by employing best management practices that include the installation of a berm and controlling dust during extraction and processing activities.

The applicant does acknowledge that the mining and processing operation can create noise, dust, and other discharges and will employ normal and customary practices to manage those impacts. Both noise and dust are regulated by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, imposing standards that the applicant or contractors on this site would be compelled to meet, including obtaining a General Air Contaminant Discharge Permit (ACDP) for processing and batching activities. Dust will be managed on site through the application of water or other dust abatement mechanisms.

Another concern related to discharges would be stormwater which the applicant or contractors will collect and hold onsite. There does not appear to be a need at this point for the applicant to obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) stormwater permit with 225acres available to collect and hold stormwater. If conditions should change one can be obtained.

Blasting will NOT be conducted as part of the mining process as no basalt rock is proposed for extraction, just sand and gravel. As like the earlier requirements the applicant will comply with requirements of DOGAMI.

With application of the management practices described above all potential conflicts due to noise, dust, or other discharges will be minimized or eliminated within the 1,500 -foot impact area.

Umatilla County finds that the applicant has identified potential conflicts due to noise, dust, or other discharges with regard to those existing and approved uses and associated activities (e.g., houses and commercial uses) that are sensitive to such discharges exist within the 1,500 foot impact area. Umatilla County finds with application of the management practices (including obtaining State permits) described above all potential conflicts due to noise, dust, or other discharges will be minimized within the 1,500 -foot impact area.
(B) Potential conflicts to local roads used for access and egress to the mining site within one mile of the entrance to the mining site unless a greater distance is necessary in order to include the intersection with the nearest arterial identified in the local transportation plan. Conflicts shall be determined based on clear and objective standards regarding sight distances, road capacity, cross section elements, horizontal and vertical alignment, and similar items in the transportation plan and implementing ordinances. Such standards for trucks associated with the mining operation shall be equivalent to standards for other trucks of equivalent size, weight, and capacity that haul other materials;

Applicant Response: Developed roads adjacent to or proposed to be used are Stafford Hansell Road to the north and Colonel Jordan Road to the east. Material leaving this site can travel Stafford Hansell Road to the east, then most likely onto Interstate 84 or north along Westland Road to the delivery point. Access can also occur along Center Street, a platted but undeveloped road, that bisects the subject property and creates an opportunity to access Colonel Jordan Road creating an alignment with Noble Road. The applicant has determined that the best alternative for access is to develop Center Street, to be renamed Noble Road, from the project site to the intersection with Colonel Jordan Road creating a crossroad intersection. The farm operations on the subject property will continue to use Stafford Hansell as their normal and customary access.

Traffic is dependent upon activity within the mining area and will vary based on the time of year. At peak usage Average Daily Trips will be under the 250 trips identified within the Umatilla County Development Code as the trigger for a Traffic Impact Study. Employees at the anticipated scale and office site would generate less than 10 trips per day with employees working within the mining area generating fewer than 30 trips. Material trucks moving raw material, concrete, or asphalt could contribute up to 160 trips per day. The original submittal of this application is modified by the Traffic Impact Study completed and stamped by Kittelson \& Associates dated August 5, 2022. The original narrative concerning trips is slightly different, but the assumptions remain the same. The year 2042 intersection operations both with and without the additional aggregate site trips does not change the Level of Service of the interchange ramps. In all instances the ramps and the intersection of Colonel Jordan and Center Street/Noble Road operate within operational standards. There is no change of note with the addition of the anticipated trips from the aggregate operation. The Traffic Impact Study also analyzed the proposal under the Transportation Planning Rule and found no significant impact on operations of the subject intersections.

The subject property has historical access onto Stafford Hansell Road which is paved for a portion and then becomes gravel, which is generally in good condition. The road is flat with no impairments to sight distance at the current access point. There are no posted speed limits. The
subject property is bisected by Center Street which could be developed providing access to Colonel Jordan Road at the current intersection point with Noble Road. Colonel Jordan Road is paved and in good condition. There are no posted speed limits. As stated earlier the applicant intends to continue to use Stafford Hansell Road for continuing farming operations. Aggregate operations will utilize Center Street/Noble Road with access to Colonel Jordan Road. Traffic would not trigger a traffic impact analysis as it would be less than the 250 average daily trips as outlined at UCDC $152.019(\mathrm{~B})(2)(\mathrm{a})$, however a Traffic Impact Study was completed and submitted.

Staff findings: Umatilla County finds that traffic generated by the quarry operations will be consistent with current levels. Umatilla County finds that the site will contribute less than 250 daily trips, as supported by the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) submitted by the applicant. The provided TIA concluded that the proposed Aggregate Resource overlay zone and mining operation would not result in a significant effect on the surrounding transportation network, or require offsite mitigation. It was recommended that a new site access be constructed to extend Noble Road, forming the fourth leg to the existing Colonel Jordan Road/Noble Road intersection.

Umatilla County finds the applicant is required to obtain a County Road Approach Permit to Colonel Jordan Road. The access shall be constructed to comply with the County Public Works requirements. This will be captured as a subsequent condition of approval.
(C) Safety conflicts with existing public airports due to bird attractants, i.e., open water impoundments as specified under OAR chapter 660, division 013;

Umatilla County finds that there are no public airports within the Impact Area. The closest public airport is east of Hermiston and more than five miles away from the site.
(D) Conflicts with other Goal 5 resource sites within the impact area that are shown on an acknowledged list of significant resources and for which the requirements of Goal 5 have been completed at the time the PAPA is initiated;

Applicant Response: There are no known other Goal 5 resource sites within the impact area for the aggregate site. There is a recently approved aggregate site that was approved under these same standards and criteria. The approval rendered by Umatilla County earlier this year has added the Rock It \#2 aggregate site and operation to the list of Goal 5 Aggregate Sites in Umatilla County and provided it protections under the Goal 5 program not dissimilar to what is being requested in this application.

This standard seeks to identify if there would be a conflict with this or other Goal 5 resource sites. The applicant asserts that there would not be a conflict. Both aggregate sites have similar impacts related to noise, dust, or other discharges that are evaluated and regulated as customary. We would anticipate conditions aligned with those applied to the Rock It \#2 operation.

First Street, as shown on Assessor's Map 4n 2736 and as platted on the 1910 Meadow Valley Addition plat, provides a barrier between the two operations on the north/south boundary line. That road, dedicated at 60 feet, when considered in addition to the required setback provides over a 100-foot separation between the two operations.

As the operations would be mining similar material in a similar manner with a barrier provided by a road right-of-way no conflicts are anticipated.

Staff findings: Umatilla County finds there is an existing Goal 5 resource site directly to the east of the subject property. This Goal 5 site is a large significant aggregate site, which was recently approved under the same criteria that this application is reviewing. Since this is an existing aggregate site, and is a similar operation to the applicant's request, there are no known Goal 5 conflicts.
(E) Conflicts with agricultural practices; and

Applicant Response: Agricultural practices within the 1,500-foot impact area of the proposed quarry are to the west, south, southeast, and east and consist of irrigated agriculture with circle pivot irrigation. The crops would be predominately potatoes, corn, wheat, and other row crops. There are no planted vineyards in the impact area or within 2 miles of the proposed site. Mining activity is not expected to conflict with these agricultural activities or practices. Prevailing winds are from the southwest moving any dust or emissions from the aggregate site away from agricultural lands towards an area that is used predominately for various commercial and industrial uses.

Staff findings: Umatilla County finds that the proposed Goal 5 expansion is not expected to conflict with nearby agricultural activities or practices. Nearby existing aggregate sites have been operating without conflicts to nearby agricultural practices for many years.
(F) Other conflicts for which consideration is necessary in order to carry out ordinances that supersede Oregon DOGAMI regulations pursuant to ORS 517.780;

Umatilla County finds that there are no other conflicts for which consideration is necessary in order to carry out ordinances that supersede Oregon DOGAMI regulations. Therefore, this criterion is not applicable.
(c) [If conflicts exist, measures to minimize] The local government shall determine reasonable and practicable measures that would minimize the conflicts identified under subsection (b) of this section. To determine whether proposed measures would minimize conflicts to agricultural practices, the requirements of ORS 215.296 shall be followed rather than the requirements of this section. If reasonable and practicable measures are identified to minimize all identified conflicts, mining shall be allowed at the site and subsection (d) of this section is not applicable. If identified conflicts cannot be minimized, subsection (d) of this section applies.

Applicant Response: The applicant has identified limited impacts from dust and stormwater that can be managed or mitigated through various voluntary measures and best management practices. During mining and processing, if approved on site, the applicant and its contractors will implement best management practices and, as necessary or required, obtain necessary permits in the management of dust, stormwater, or other identified discharges.

Staff findings: Umatilla County finds that no conflicts were identified within the 1,500 foot impact area. Although no conflicts have been identified within the impact area, the applicant has identified limited impacts from dust and stormwater that can be managed or mitigated through various voluntary measures and best management practices. During mining and processing, if approved on site, the applicant or its contractors will implement best management practices and, as necessary or required, obtain necessary permits in the management of dust, stormwater, or other identified discharges.
(d) If conflict can't be minimized then conduct an Economic, Social, Environmental, and Energy (ESEE) analysis] The local government shall determine any significant conflicts identified under the requirements of subsection (c) of this section that cannot be minimized. Based on these conflicts only, local government shall determine the ESEE consequences of either allowing, limiting, or not allowing mining at the site. Local governments shall reach this decision by weighing these ESEE consequences, with consideration of the following:
(A) The degree of adverse effect on existing land uses within the impact area;
(B) Reasonable and practicable measures that could be taken to reduce the identified adverse effects; and
(C) The probable duration of the mining operation and the proposed post-mining use of the site.

Applicant Response: The applicant's experience is that all identified potential conflicts from the mining operation can be minimized as described above. This criterion is not applicable.

Umatilla County finds that all identified potential conflict will be minimized as described above. This criterion is not applicable.
(e) [Amend Plan] Where mining is allowed, the plan and implementing ordinances shall be amended to allow such mining. Any required measures to minimize conflicts, including special conditions and procedures regulating mining, shall be clear and objective. Additional land use review (e. g., site plan review), if required by the local government, shall not exceed the minimum review necessary to assure compliance with these requirements and shall not provide opportunities to deny mining for reasons unrelated to these requirements, or to attach additional approval requirements, except with regard to mining or processing activities:
(A) For which the PAPA application does not provide information sufficient to determine clear and objective measures to resolve identified conflicts;
(B) Not requested in the PAPA application; or
(C) For which a significant change to the type, location, or duration of the activity shown on the PAPA application is proposed by the operator.

Applicant Response: The applicant will implement best management practices and obtain permits as necessary to ensure management of dust and stormwater discharges and anticipates Conditions to do so. It is also acknowledged that the applicant may be required to obtain an Access Permit for the proposed aggregate site for access to Center Street and Colonel Jordan Road from the Umatilla County Roadmaster.

Staff findings: Umatilla County finds that no conflicts were identified. Therefore, this criterion is not applicable.
(f) [Post mining uses] Where mining is allowed, the local government shall determine the post-mining use and provide for this use in the comprehensive plan and land use regulations. For significant aggregate sites on Class I, II and Unique farmland, local governments shall adopt plan and land use regulations to limit post-mining use to farm uses under ORS 215.203, uses listed under ORS 215.213(1) or 215.283(1), and fish and wildlife habitat uses, including wetland mitigation banking. Local governments shall coordinate with DOGAMI regarding the regulation and reclamation of mineral and aggregate sites, except where exempt under ORS 517.780.

Applicant Response: The applicant is currently considering the installation of a photovoltaic solar energy generation facility as a post-mining use. The subject property is predominately not composed of Class I, II, Prime, or Unique farmland and would therefore allow a use allowed under ORS 215.283(2). Other post-mining uses, if allowed under ORS 215.283 and the Umatilla County Development Code, could also be considered.

Staff findings: Umatilla County finds the applicant has identified a possible post-mining use that is allowed under ORS 215.283. Umatilla County finds this criterion is satisfied.
(g) [Issuing a zoning permit] Local governments shall allow a currently approved aggregate processing operation at an existing site to process material from a new or expansion site without requiring a reauthorization of the existing processing operation unless limits on such processing were established at the time it was approved by the local government.

Applicant Response: This is not applicable as this is being proposed as a new site.
Staff findings: Umatilla County finds this criterion is not applicable.
(7) [Protecting the site from other uses/conflicts】 Except for aggregate resource sites determined to be significant under section (4) of this rule, local governments shall follow the standard ESEE process in OAR 660-023-0040 and 660-023-0050 to determine whether to allow, limit, or prevent new conflicting uses within the impact area of a significant mineral and aggregate site. (This requirement does not apply if, under section (5) of this rule, the local government decides that mining will not be authorized at the site.)

The applicant has provided an ESEE analysis. The analysis supports a decision to limit new conflicting uses within the impact area to assure protection of the aggregate site.

## 660-023-0040 ESEE Decision Process

(1) Local governments shall develop a program to achieve Goal 5 for all significant resource sites based on an analysis of the economic, social, environmental, and energy (ESEE) consequences that could result from a decision to allow, limit, or prohibit a conflicting use. This rule describes four steps to be followed in conducting an ESEE analysis, as set out in detail in sections (2) through (5) of this rule. Local governments are not required to follow these steps sequentially, and some steps anticipate a return to a previous step. However, findings shall demonstrate that requirements under each of the steps have been met, regardless of the sequence followed by the local government. The ESEE analysis need not be lengthy or complex, but should enable reviewers to gain a clear understanding of the conflicts and the consequences to be expected. The steps in the standard ESEE process are as follows:
(a) Identify conflicting uses;

The subject property and property within 1500 feet to the west, south, southeast, and east is zoned Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) which allows a variety of farm related uses including dwellings if certain criteria are met. There are also additional uses that are allowed with standards or conditionally. Some of these uses could create conflicts with an aggregate operation. Conflicts are most likely to arise when a new use would place people, living or working, within the impact area. Those uses include homes, churches, parks or certain recreation facilities, farm stands, and other similar uses that allow or create areas where people congregate.

Properties to the north of Interstate 84 are zoned for Light Industrial, Limited Rural Light Industrial, and Light Industrial with a limited use overlay zone. These lands, while within 1,500 -feet of the mining operation and within the impact area, are buffered from the noise and other impacts by the Interstate. Noise and vibration from the mining operation would be overshadowed by the noise from Interstate traffic.
(b) Determine the impact area;

The impact area is a 1,500 -foot buffer extending from the aggregate site boundary.
(c) Analyze the ESEE consequences; and
(d) Develop a program to achieve Goal 5.

Items (c) through (d) are addressed below.
(2) Identify conflicting uses. Local governments shall identify conflicting uses that exist, or could occur, with regard to significant Goal 5 resource sites. To identify these uses, local governments shall examine land uses allowed outright or conditionally within the zones applied to the resource site and in its impact area. Local governments are not required to consider allowed uses that would be unlikely to occur in the impact area because existing permanent uses occupy the site. The following shall also apply in the identification of conflicting uses:

Applicant Response: Umatilla County Planning staff, under this provision, will need to identify conflicting uses that could occur, relative to this site. To assist them with this a table follows with some of the potential uses that could create conflicts within the required 1500foot distance of the proposed expansion area. The Exclusive Farm Use zone is applied to the subject property and properties to the west and south which allows a variety of farm and farm related uses. As previously stated, the applicant is concerned with activities that might be negatively impacted by mining activities including processing and stockpiling as well as impacts from those activities to the mining operation. Uses to the east and north of the freeway are governed by Rural Tourist Commercial, Light Industrial, and Agri-Business use zones which also allow potential conflicting uses.

The local government has identified conflicting uses that exist, or could occur, with regard to significant Goal 5 resource sites. Potential conflicting uses found in the Umatilla County Development Code are outlined in the Table 1, below. This criterion is satisfied.

Table 1 - Potential Conflicting Uses

| Zoning |  | Potential Conflicting Uses |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Code Sections | Potential Conflicting Uses |  |  |
| EFU | 152.056 Uses Permitted <br> 152.058 Zoning Permit | No conflicting uses identified. <br> Replacement Dwellings, Winery, Farm <br> Stand, Home Occupations. <br> Churches, Dwellings, Schools, Parks, <br> Playgrounds, Community Centers, <br> Hardship Dwellings, Boarding and <br> Lodging Facilities, Various Commercial <br> Uses Related to Agriculture. |  |
| 152-059 Land Use Decisions or |  |  |  |
| 152.060 Conditional Uses |  |  |  |$\quad$| Light Industrial |
| :--- |

(a) If no uses conflict with a significant resource site, acknowledged policies and land use regulations may be considered sufficient to protect the resource site. The determination that there are no conflicting uses must be based on the applicable zoning rather than ownership of the site. (Therefore, public ownership of a site does not by itself support a conclusion that there are no conflicting uses.)

Potential conflicting uses taken from the Umatilla County Development Code that could be adversely affected by mining on the proposed Goal 5 expansion area are identified above. Therefore, this criterion is not applicable.
(b) A local government may determine that one or more significant Goal 5 resource sites are conflicting uses with another significant resource site. The local government shall determine the level of protection for each significant site using the ESEE process and/or the requirements in OAR 660-023-0090 through 660-023-0230 (see OAR 660-0230020(1)).

There is an existing Goal 5 resource site directly to the east of the subject property. This Goal 5 site is a large significant aggregate site, which was recently approved under the same criteria that this application is reviewing. Since this is an existing aggregate site, and is a similar operation to the applicant's request, there are no known conflicts.

Umatilla County finds the only significant Goal 5 site within the impact area is an existing aggregate operation, which is not identified as a conflicting use since the proposed use being evaluated is also aggregate mining. The ESEE analysis is evaluated below.
(3) Determine the impact area. Local governments shall determine an impact area for each significant resource site. The impact area shall be drawn to include only the area in which allowed uses could adversely affect the identified resource. The impact area defines the geographic limits within which to conduct an ESEE analysis for the identified significant resource site.

The impact area for an aggregate site is 1,500 feet, as specified by OAR 660-023-0180(5)(a). Based on the list of potential conflicting uses identified in Table 1, above, Umatilla County has determined that the 1,500 foot impact area is sufficient for conducting the ESEE analysis.
(4) Analyze the ESEE consequences. Local governments shall analyze the ESEE consequences that could result from decisions to allow, limit, or prohibit a conflicting use. The analysis may address each of the identified conflicting uses, or it may address a group of similar conflicting uses. A local government may conduct a single analysis for two or more resource sites that are within the same area or that are similarly situated and subject to the same zoning. The local government may establish a matrix of commonly occurring conflicting uses and apply the matrix to particular resource sites in order to facilitate the analysis. A local government may conduct a single analysis for a site containing more than one significant Goal 5 resource. The ESEE analysis must consider any applicable statewide goal or acknowledged plan requirements, including the requirements of Goal 5. The analyses of the ESEE consequences shall be adopted either as part of the plan or as a land use regulation.

Applicant Response: The applicant is requesting that Umatilla County determine that future dwelling or residential use and other uses that would place people within the impact area, such as gathering spaces, be limited to protect the mining area from encroachment and
provide protections to residents and landowners in the vicinity of the proposed quarry. The requested limits are the requirement for a covenant not to sue or object/waiver of conflicts along the lines of similar covenants for farm and forest uses. The types of uses that have potential to pose a conflict with the quarry include wineries, farm stands, mass gatherings, agri-tourism activities, churches, commercial activities in conjunction with farm use that could encourage gathering, private and public parks, golf courses, community centers, destination resorts, living history museums, residential homes, room and board operations, and schools. Mining has operated in this area without any significant conflicts for many years. It is adequate that the county imposes a condition of approval on discretionary approvals of assembly or residential uses in the 1500 -foot impact area waiving any rights to object to mining and mining related activity at the significant site.

While this site is not listed within the Umatilla County Technical Report to the Comprehensive Plan there are several aggregate sites within the vicinity that are listed, most as a 1 A but some with a 3 C designation. A 3C designation provides that Umatilla County should specifically limit conflicting uses. It is interesting to note that all the sites in the vicinity have the same soil configuration of Quincy loamy fine sand, with gravelly substratum. The exception is those that were already in production at the time the Soil Survey was being drafted and were assigned with a soil classification acknowledging the aggregate resource called Pits, Gravel. The two aggregate sites with the 3C designation are west of the subject property.

Staff findings: As shown in Table 1, above, the local government has determined several outright and permitted uses that are allowed by the different zones within the 1,500 foot impact area. For purposes of the ESEE analysis, these potential conflicting uses can be grouped into two types of similar uses:

- Dwellings (typically includes farm dwellings, non-farm dwellings, lot of record dwellings, replacement dwellings, hardship dwellings, home occupations, room and board operations
- Public/Private Gathering Spaces (typically includes wineries, churches, community centers, private and public parks and playgrounds, living history museums, golf courses, public or private schools, various commercial uses related to agriculture)

The ESSE Analysis follows:

| ESEE consequences related to review criteria for dwellings and gathering spaces in the 1,500-foot impact area surrounding the proposed quarry |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Prohibit dwellings and gathering spaces | Condition the placement of new dwellings and gathering spaces | No change to review standards for dwellings and gathering spaces |
| Economic Consequences | Consequences related to new use on neighboring properties. <br> There may be some negative economic impact to neighboring property owners if | Consequences related to new use on neighboring properties. <br> The economic impact to neighboring property owners would be neutral. A | Consequences related to new use on neighboring properties. <br> The economic consequence for property owners would be |
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|  | new dwellings or gathering places were not allowed within 1500 feet of the quarry boundary. Since only a portion of properties in the impact area are zoned for Exclusive Farm Use, all with a 160-acre minimum lot size, about half of the properties would be affected and some existing limits on dwellings are already in code, the negative impact would be small. Dwellings are not allowed as outright uses in the other use zones within the impact area. Some uses that allow gathering spaces are also allowed either outright or conditionally. <br> Consequences related to loss or interruption of quarry access. <br> The economic benefit of preserving the applicant's ability to access material from this site does have an economic impact through direct employment and employment impacts on the various developments that rock is delivered to. The proposed quarry will provide material for a variety of projects throughout Umatilla and Morrow Counties and possibly beyond. | requirement for a waiver of remonstrance would not restrict the use of the property allowed in the underlying zone. <br> Similar wavers are required by counties around the state as a condition of approval for a new residential structure in a farm or forest zone. These wavers, required by ORS 215.213 and 215.283, restrict a landowner's ability to pursue a claim for relief or cause of action alleging injury from farming or forest practices. <br> Without evidence that the widespread use of such waivers has negatively impacted property values or development rights, it is reasonable to conclude that the proposed limit on new conflicting uses in the impact area of the proposed quarry will have no negative economic consequence. <br> Consequences related to loss or interruption of quarry access. <br> The economic benefit would be the same as that for a decision to prohibit uses since the proposed "limit" is to require that new uses would be permitted on the condition that the applicant except mining activity on this significant aggregate site. | neutral. This decision would maintain the current approval criteria for new residences and gathering places in the impact area. <br> Consequences related to loss or interruption of quarry access. <br> The economic impact would be negative. Interruptions in use of a quarry, due to complaints and nuisance lawsuits, have cause delays and increased costs for projects across the state. Development of this quarry supports economically efficient development and construction projects in the region. New noise sensitive uses locating within 1500 feet of the quarry will bring the possibility that limitations on quarry activity will be sought by people who are bothered by mining activity. The potential negative economic impact ranges from small to exceptionally large. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Prohibit dwellings and gathering spaces | Condition the placement of new dwellings and gathering spaces | No change to review standards for dwellings and gathering spaces |
| Social Consequences | Consequences related to new use on neighboring properties. Removing the option to place a dwelling, which otherwise meets all existing review criteria, within 1500 feet of the quarry boundary, would have a negative social consequence. This would be similar if | Consequences related to new use on neighboring properties. The social impact to neighboring property owners would be neutral if acceptance of the mining activity were added as a condition of approval for new dwellings and uses related to social | Consequences related to new use on neighboring properties. <br> The social impact to neighboring property owners would be neutral if new dwellings and social gathering spaces within 1500 feet of the quarry boundary were |
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|  | gathering spaces were also prohibited. The social consequences stem from a landowner's desire to have reasonable options and flexibility when making choices about what they can and cannot do on their land. <br> Consequences related to loss of quarry access. Various development and construction projects in the region that would utilize the aggregate material in the proposed quarry may have to forgo their development which could impact social activities including those that would benefit recreation and tourism. | gatherings within 1500 feet of the quarry boundary. Options available to property-owners would not be reduced. <br> Dwellings and gathering spaces that meet existing review criteria would be allowed, provided the applicant agreed to accept the mining activity approved by the county. <br> Consequences related to loss of quarry access. <br> Various development and construction projects in the region that would utilize the aggregate material in the proposed quarry may have to forgo their development which could impact social activities including those that would benefit recreation and tourism. | allowed under the existing review criteria. <br> Consequences related to loss of quarry access. Various development and construction projects in the region that would utilize the aggregate material in the proposed quarry may have to forgo their development which could impact social activities including those that would benefit recreation and tourism. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Prohibit dwellings and gathering spaces | Condition the placement of new dwellings and gathering spaces | No change to review standards for dwellings and gathering spaces |
| Environmental Consequences | Consequences related to new use on neighboring properties. There are no environmental consequences identified that stem from prohibiting new dwellings or social gathering spaces in the impact area. <br> Consequences related to loss of quarry access. <br> Efficient development practices include obtaining aggregate material from a quarry close to the project site. There will be some environmental benefit from fewer vehicle emissions when truck travel is minimized. | Consequences related to new use on neighboring properties. There could be a negative environmental consequence from noise if new dwellings or social gathering spaces were limited in the impact area. New dwellings and social gathering spaces in the impact area could be authorized on the condition that the applicant accept the mining activity approved by this decision. This approach assures that a property owner will make an informed decision when locating a new use. If they decide to locate within the impact area, they will be exposed to noise impacts when mining activities are conducted on the site. <br> Consequences related to loss of quarry access. <br> Efficient development practices include obtaining aggregate material from a quarry close to the project site. There will be | Consequences related to new use on neighboring properties. There could be a negative environmental consequence from noise if new dwellings and social gathering spaces were allowed in the impact area. Different than the option to limit a decision, there would be no mechanism in the county's approval process to inform property owners of the authorized mining activity. This would result in a higher possibility for a residence or social gathering space to be in the impact area and a higher potential for a negative consequence. <br> Consequences related to loss of quarry access. <br> There may be some negative environmental consequence if new uses in the impact area oppose mining activity and pose an obstacle to the use of |
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|  |  | some environmental benefit from fewer vehicle emissions when truck travel is minimized. | this site. Efficient development practices include obtaining aggregate material from a quarry close to the project site. Vehicle emissions will increase if trucks must travel further to access material. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Prohibit dwellings and gathering spaces | Condition the placement of new dwellings and gathering spaces | No change to review standards for dwellings and gathering spaces |
| Energy Consequences | Consequences related to new use on neighboring properties. There are no energy consequences identified that stem from prohibiting new dwellings or social gathering spaces in the impact area. <br> Consequences related to loss of quarry access. <br> Efficient development practices include obtaining aggregate material from a quarry close to the project site. There will be some negative energy consequences from additional fuel use if truck travel is increased due to loss of access to this quarry. | Consequences related to new use on neighboring properties. There are no energy consequences identified that stem from limiting new dwellings or social gathering spaces in the impact area. <br> Consequences related to loss of quarry access. <br> Efficient development practices include obtaining aggregate material from a quarry close to the project site. There will be some negative energy consequences from additional fuel use if truck travel is increased due to loss of access to this quarry. | Consequences related to new use on neighboring properties. There are no energy consequences identified that stem from allowing new dwellings or social gathering spaces in the impact area. <br> Consequences related to loss of quarry access. <br> Efficient development practices include obtaining aggregate material from a quarry close to the project site. There will be some negative energy consequences from additional fuel use if truck travel is increased due to loss of access to this quarry. |

(5) Develop a program to achieve Goal 5. Local governments shall determine whether to allow, limit, or prohibit identified conflicting uses for significant resource sites. This decision shall be based upon and supported by the ESEE analysis. A decision to prohibit or limit conflicting uses protects a resource site. A decision to allow some or all conflicting uses for a particular site may also be consistent with Goal 5, provided it is supported by the ESEE analysis. One of the following determinations shall be reached with regard to conflicting uses for a significant resource site:
(a) A local government may decide that a significant resource site is of such importance compared to the conflicting uses, and the ESEE consequences of allowing the conflicting uses are so detrimental to the resource, that the conflicting uses should be prohibited.
(b) A local government may decide that both the resource site and the conflicting uses are important compared to each other, and, based on the ESEE analysis, the conflicting uses should be allowed in a limited way that protects the resource site to a desired extent. (c) A local government may decide that the conflicting use should be allowed fully, notwithstanding the possible impacts on the resource site. The ESEE analysis must demonstrate that the conflicting use is of sufficient importance relative to the resource site, and must indicate why measures to protect the resource to some extent should not be
provided, as per subsection (b) of this section.
Umatilla County has determined, through the applicant's ESEE analysis, that the resource site and the conflicting uses (dwellings and public/private gathering spaces) are important compared to each other. Therefore, Umatilla County finds that proposed conflicting uses should be limited within the 1,500-foot impact area for the life of the Girth Dog Quarry in order to achieve Goal 5.

A condition of approval is imposed that any land use application for a proposed conflicting use within the 1,500 -foot impact area requires a waiver of remonstrance prior to final approval. The waiver shall include language stating that the applicant accepts normal mining activity at this significant aggregate site and restricts a landowner's ability to pursue a claim for relief or cause of action alleging injury from the aggregate operation.

Umatilla County finds that the waiver of remonstrance requirement for proposed conflicting uses along with the mitigation measures proposed by the applicant are adequate to minimize conflicts for future uses that potentially locate within the mining impact area.

## 660-023-0050 Programs to Achieve Goal 5

(1) For each resource site, local governments shall adopt comprehensive plan provisions and land use regulations to implement the decisions made pursuant to OAR 660-023-0040(5). The plan shall describe the degree of protection intended for each significant resource site. The plan and implementing ordinances shall clearly identify those conflicting uses that are allowed and the specific standards or limitations that apply to the allowed uses. A program to achieve Goal 5 may include zoning measures that partially or fully allow conflicting uses (see OAR 660-023-0040(5) (b) and (c)).

Umatilla County finds that the Policy 41 of the Umatilla County Comprehensive Plan shall be amended to list the Girth Dog Quarry as a significant aggregate resource site.

The Umatilla County Zoning Map will be amended to apply the Aggregate Resource (AR) Overlay Zone to the subject property. In addition, a 1,500 -foot buffer around the AR Overlay Zone will be shown on the Zoning Map to acknowledge that conflicting uses (dwellings and public/private gathering spaces) are limited.

As noted previously, a condition of approval is imposed that any land use application for a proposed conflicting use within the 1,500 -foot impact area requires a waiver of remonstrance prior to final approval. The purpose of this condition is not to disallow these activities, but to ensure that applicants for these types of uses be made aware of the mining operation and waive their rights to remonstrate against aggregate mining activities allowed by this decision. This would be consistent with current Umatilla County Development Code provisions found at 152.063(D) that are applicable to permitted mining activities. This criterion is met.
(2) When a local government has decided to protect a resource site under OAR 660-0230040(5)(b), implementing measures applied to conflicting uses on the resource site and within its impact area shall contain clear and objective standards. For purposes of this division, a standard shall be considered clear and objective if it meets any one of the following criteria:
(a) It is a fixed numerical standard, such as a height limitation of 35 feet or a setback of 50 feet;
(b) It is a nondiscretionary requirement, such as a requirement that grading not occur beneath the dripline of a protected tree; or
(c) It is a performance standard that describes the outcome to be achieved by the design, siting, construction, or operation of the conflicting use, and specifies the objective criteria to be used in evaluating outcome or performance. Different performance standards may be needed for different resource sites. If performance standards are adopted, the local government shall at the same time adopt a process for their application (such as a conditional use, or design review ordinance provision).

Umatilla County finds that proposed conflicting uses should be limited within the 1,500-foot impact area for the life of the Girth Dog Quarry in order to achieve Goal 5. The Umatilla County Zoning Map will be amended to apply the Aggregate Resource (AR) Overlay Zone to the subject property. In addition, a 1,500-foot buffer around the AR Overlay Zone will be shown on the Zoning Map to acknowledge that conflicting uses (dwellings and public/private gathering spaces) are limited. A condition of approval is imposed that any land use application for a proposed conflicting use within the 1,500 -foot impact area requires a waiver of remonstrance prior to final approval.
(3) In addition to the clear and objective regulations required by section (2) of this rule, except for aggregate resources, local governments may adopt an alternative approval process that includes land use regulations that are not clear and objective (such as a planned unit development ordinance with discretionary performance standards), provided such regulations:
(a) Specify that landowners have the choice of proceeding under either the clear and objective approval process or the alternative regulations; and
(b) Require a level of protection for the resource that meets or exceeds the intended level determined under OAR 660-023-0040(5) and 660-023-0050(1).

Umatilla County finds that this request is related to aggregate resources. Therefore, this criterion is not applicable.

## 30. STANDARDS OF THE UMATILLA COUNTY DEVELOPMENT CODE FOR

 ESTALISHING AN AR OVERLAY ZONE are found in Sections 152.487 and 152.488. The following standards of approval are underlined and the findings are in normal text.152.487 CRITERIA FOR ESTABLISHING AN AR OVERLAY ZONE: Section 152.487 of the Umatilla County Development Code lists required criteria the Planning Commission must consider for establishing an AR Overlay Zone. Criteria are listed and underlined. Evaluation responses are
provided in normal text.
(A) At the public hearing the Planning Commission shall determine if the following criteria can be met:

## (1) The proposed overlay would be compatible with the Comprehensive Plan;

The Umatilla County Comprehensive Plan and Technical Report both have input into this decision even though this site is not listed. There are two mining operations to the west with the same soil type and classification that have been afforded a 3C designation indicating that the site is significant and warrants protection. It should also be noted that there are several aggregate resource sites along the Interstate 84 corridor. This action seeks to protect the proposed aggregate site under Goal 5 as a significant site, to apply the Aggregate Resource Overlay Zone to the mining site, and to allow mining and processing on the site.

Comprehensive Plan Findings and Policies are also applicable. Finding 38 states, "Extraction of non-renewable aggregate and mineral resources requires ongoing exploration, reclamation, separation from adjacent incompatible land uses and access." The accompanying policy would also be applicable:

Policy 38. (a) The County shall encourage mapping of future agencies sites, ensure their protection from conflicting adjacent land uses, and required reclamation plans.
(b) Aggregate and mineral exploration, extraction, and reclamation shall be conducted in conformance with the regulations of the Department of Geology and Mineral Industries.
(c) The County Development Ordinance shall include conditional use standards and other provisions to limit or mitigate conflicting uses between aggregate sites and surrounding land uses.

The applicant is seeking protection of the aggregate site by the application of the Aggregate Resource Overlay Zone and protection from encroaching and conflicting uses by mapping of the buffer area to best achieve both this Finding and Policy.

Finding 41 would also be applicable and states, "Several aggregate sites were determined to be significant enough to warrant protection from surrounding land uses in order to preserve the resource." Based on this application, the applicant requests that the accompanying Policy be updated to list the Girth Dog Quarry.

Umatilla County finds that the applicant's request for limitations of conflicting residential and social gathering space uses is reasonable under the Goal 5 protection program and appears to be compatible with the Umatilla County Comprehensive Plan. This criterion is met.
(2) There is sufficient information supplied by the applicant to show that there exists quantities of aggregate material that would warrant the overlay;

Umatilla County finds that the applicant's PAPA application and laboratory reports demonstrate that the inventory of aggregate material at the Girth Dog Quarry is over 13.5 million cubic yards which exceeds ODOT specifications and warrants the overlay. This
criterion is met.
(3) The proposed overlay is located at least 1,000 feet from properties zoned for residential use or designated on the Comprehensive Plan for residential;

Umatilla County finds that there are no residences or properties zoned for residential use within 1,000 feet of the proposed overlay. This criterion is met.
(4) Adequate screening, either natural or man-made, is available for protecting the site from surrounding land uses.

The location of the proposed quarry along Interstate 84 and south and west of industrial uses would make screening unnecessary. This type of aggregate activity regularly takes place along highways and roads to provide easy and cost-effective access to aggregate material for use in development projects. The applicant would state that screening beyond the use of berms of this site would be cost prohibitive and would not provide benefit.
(5)The site complies with Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660-023-0180.

Umatilla County finds that the standards found in (OAR) 660-023-0180 were found to be met by the proposed mining operation. This criterion is met.
152.488 MINING REQUIREMENTS: Section 152.488 of the Umatilla County Development Code lists mining requirements for aggregate sites under the AR Overlay Zone. Criteria are listed and underlined. Evaluation responses are provided in standard text.
(A) All work done in an AR Overlay Zone shall conform to the requirements of DOGAMI or its successor, or the applicable state statutes.

Umatilla County finds that the applicant shall provide to the Umatilla County Planning Department a copy of the DOGAMI operating permit and, as a condition of approval, will be required to obtain all necessary State Permits.
(B) In addition to those requirements, an aggregate operation shall comply with the following standards:
(1) For each operation conducted in an AR Overlay Zone the applicant shall provide the Planning Department with a copy of the reclamation plan that is to be submitted under the county's reclamation ordinance;

Umatilla County finds that the reclamation plan requirements must meet the standards of DOGAMI and that a copy of the reclamation plan is to be submitted to the Planning Department.
(2) Extraction and sedimentation ponds shall not be allowed within 25 feet of a public road or within 100 feet from a dwelling, unless the extraction is into an area that is above the grade of the road, then extraction may occur to the property line;

Applicant Response: The applicant will mine the aggregate resource leaving a 25 -foot buffer area around the perimeter of the subject property. There are two homes on property adjacent to the proposed mining area, one to the northwest and the other to the northeast. Based on the location of the homes on their subject properties mining will not be done within 100 feet of the homes. There are no other homes within the 1,500 -foot impact area and the requested remonstrance process would work to ensure that any new homes sited in the 1500 -foot impact area do not conflict with the proposed large significant site. Future sedimentation ponds that may be installed will be more than 25 feet from any county roads.

Staff findings: Umatilla County finds that as a condition of approval, the applicant shall provide a site plan to the Planning Department showing extraction and sedimentation ponds that are not located within 25 feet of a public road or within 100 feet from a dwelling.
(3) Processing equipment shall not be operated within 500 feet of an existing dwelling at the time of the application of the Overlay Zone. Dwellings built after an AR Overlay Zone is applied shall not be used when computing this setback.

Applicant Response: There is the two dwellings identified above that are located within 500feet of the boundary of the subject property. Processing equipment will be sited in such a way as to retain this 500 -foot setback requirement. The applicant is requesting that future dwellings or social gathering spaces be limited and require a remonstrance agreement within the impact area to assure this standard can be maintained.

Staff findings: Umatilla County finds as a condition of approval, the applicant shall provide a site plan demonstrating that processing equipment will be sited to retain the 500 -foot setback to the existing dwellings.
(4) All access roads shall be arranged in such a manner as to minimize traffic danger and nuisance to surrounding properties and eliminate dust.

Applicant Response: The propesed quarry subject property has access to Stafford Hansell Road with the farming operations continuing to use this access. A new access point is proposed to be constructed to Colonel Jordan Road along Center Street to support the mining activity. The applicant is requesting that future dwellings or social gathering spaces approved in a discretionary land use process to be limited by a requirement to sign a waiver of remonstrance within the impact area to assure this standard can be maintained.

Staff findings: Umatilla County finds that the proposed Girth Dog Quarry site fronts both Stafford Hansell and Colonel Jordan Roads with an existing historical farm access on Stafford Hansell Road. A new access point will need to be approved and constructed to Colonel Jordan Road to support the mining activity. A subsequent condition of approval is imposed that the applicant obtain access permit approval from Umatilla County Public Works to Colonel Jordan Road at the time the new access is needed by the mining operation, this access point must meet the 1,320 foot spacing requirements from the interchange ramps.

## 31. ANALYSIS OF STATEWIDE PLANNING GOALS 1 THROUGH 14.

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.

Applicant Response: Umatilla County's Comprehensive Plan and development codes outline the County's citizen involvement program that includes the activities of the Planning Commission and provides for the public hearing process with its required notice provisions. These notice provisions provide for adjoining and affected property owner notice; notice to interested local, state, and federal agencies; and allows for public comment to the process. More specifically this request will be publicly noticed and discussed at a public hearing and will be subject to input from citizens.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds that the applicant's request will go through the public hearing process and complies with Statewide Planning Goal 1 (Citizen Involvement).

Goal 2 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.

Applicant Response: Goal 2 establishes the underlining process that a county or a city needs to utilize when considering changes to their Comprehensive Plans and development codes. This application meets those requirements for this request.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds that through this amendment process, the applicant's request complies with the County's Comprehensive Plan and Development Code and therefore complies with Statewide Planning Goal 2 (Planning).

Goal 3 Agricultural Lands: To preserve and maintain agricultural lands.
Applicant Response: Goal 3 requires counties to preserve and maintain agricultural lands for farm uses. Counties must inventory agricultural lands and protect them by adopting exclusive farm use zones consistent with Oregon Revised Statute 215.203 et. seq.

Goal 3 is relevant to this application as the proposal is on land currently zoned Exclusive Farm Use. While the primary purpose of this zone is to allow and protect farm operations there are many other uses that are allowed on farmland that are outlined in Oregon Revised Statute and codified in the Umatilla County Development Code. There are at six other aggregate sites within a four-mile radius of this site, most to the west, with several of them operating adjacent to lands producing crops.

In this instance there is an intersection of Goal 3 and Goal 5 because an aggregate source has been identified, can be determined to be significant, and the applicant is requesting protection for the site and for mining to be allowed. Here, approval of the proposal allows both the objectives of Goal 3 and Goal 5 to be realized.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds that the applicant's request appears to be consistent with Statewide Planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands) as demonstrated throughout this document.

Goal 4 Forest Lands: To conserve forest lands by maintaining the forest land base and to protect the state's forest economy by making possible economically efficient forest practices that assure the continuous growing and harvesting of forest tree species as the leading use on forest land consistent with sound management of soil, air, water, and fish and wildlife resources and to provide for recreational opportunities and agriculture.

Applicant Response: There are no forest lands impacted by this request. The Umatilla National Forest is significantly south of the subject property.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds that Statewide Planning Goal 4 (Forest Lands) does not directly apply to the applicant's request.

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

Applicant Response: The process undertaken within this application is to protect the subject property under Goal 5 as a significant aggregate site. The subject property does not have any overlays or other known cultural or historical sites. There is a portion of a 1.67-acre freshwater pond found on the National Wetlands Inventory map based on aerial photography from 1981. Using google earth imagery today the area is under circle-pivot irrigation with no pond visible or any impacts to farming operations. No floodplain has been mapped on the subject property.

This application for a Comprehensive Plan amendment to protect an aggregate resource has been reviewed under Oregon Administrative Rule 660-023-0180, the process required under Goal 5.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds that the applicant's request is to apply Goal 5 protection to the site, the request has been reviewed under the necessary Goal 5 process and appears to be consistent with Statewide Planning Goal 5 (Open Spaces, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Natural Resources).

Goal 6 Air, Water and Land Resources Quality: To maintain and improve the quality of the air, water and land resources of the state.

Applicant Response: Goal 6 addresses the quality of air, water, and land resources. In the context of comprehensive plan amendments, a local government complies with Goal 6 by explaining why it is reasonable to expect that the proposed uses authorized by the plan amendment will be able to satisfy applicable federal and state environmental standards, including air and water quality standards.

The request to protect the subject property under Goal 5 and to allow mining, based on the analysis above, can and will be compliant with Goal 6 . The objective of this process is to protect
an aggregate resource. Required measures protecting water are required under Oregon law and will be implemented during mining, processing, and stockpiling of aggregate material. Any mining or processing of aggregate material will be required to meet Oregon Department of Environmental Quality requirements for air quality through the imposition of air quality standards with some activities having to obtain an Air Contaminate Discharge Permit. The use of mining and processing techniques that include temporary and permanent Best Management Practices for erosion and sediment control and spill control and prevention can achieve compliance with both clean air and water standards.

Noise is defined as unwanted sound. The location of this site adjacent to Interstate 84 would provide significant mitigation based on the noise generated by the Interstate.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds that the applicant's request addresses air, water and land resource quality and will obtain necessary permits and implement best practices to be consistent with Statewide Planning Goal 6 (Air, Water and Land Resource Quality).

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

Applicant Response: Goal 7 works to address natural hazards and disasters and through a comprehensive plan amendment process would seek to determine if there are known natural hazards and seek to mitigate any concerns. There are no known natural hazards on the subject property.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds that Statewide Planning Goal 7 (Areas Subject to Natural Hazards and Disasters) does not directly apply to this request.

Goal 8 Recreation Needs: To satisfy the recreational needs of the citizens of the state and visitors and, where appropriate, to provide for the siting of necessary recreational facilities including destination resorts.

Applicant Response: No recreation components are included in this application or affected by it.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds that the applicant's request appears to be consistent with Statewide Planning Goal 8 (Recreation Needs) and Goal 8 does not directly apply to this request.

Goal 9 Economy: To provide adequate opportunities throughout the state for a variety of economic activities vital to the health, welfare, and prosperity of Oregon's citizens.

Applicant Response: Goal 9 requires local governments to adopt comprehensive plans and policies that contribute to a stable and healthy economy. Umatilla County has a comprehensive plan and technical report that has been acknowledged to comply with Goal 9. While the approval of an aggregate site does not, in and of itself, provide significant economic benefit, the aggregate
industry can provide an economic benefit to a region. Having said that this site will create at least 10 new jobs serving various development needs throughout Umatilla and Morrow Counties. Aggregate is a necessary component that is essential for residents, businesses, and recreation and tourism activities in this region.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds that the applicant's request appears to be consistent with Statewide Planning Goal 9 (Economy).

Goal 10 Housing: To provide for the housing needs of citizens of the state.
Applicant Response: Housing is not a consideration of this application. However, the approval of this site would allow for aggregate to be available for use in the housing and commercial construction economies.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds housing is not a direct consideration of this request, however, the requested activities will allow for aggregate to be available for use in the housing and commercial construction business.

Goal 11 Public 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.

Applicant Response: Goal 11 requires local governments to plan and develop a timely, orderly, and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services. The goal provides that urban and rural development be guided and supported by types and levels of services appropriate for, but limited to, the needs and requirements of the area to be served. The approval of this request would support the local economy that provides for the employment of residents, delivery of goods, and allows for recreation and tourism in the region.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds that the applicant's request appears to support Statewide Planning Goal 11 (Public Services).

Goal 12 Transportation: To provide and encourage a safe, convenient and economic transportation system.

Applicant Response: Goal 12 requires local governments to provide and encourage a safe, convenient, and economic transportation system, implemented through the Transportation Planning Rule. In 2006 Umatilla County adopted an Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP) for the Westland Interchange which does discuss the intersection of Stafford Hansell Road to Westland Road, identifying concerns with the spacing of Stafford Hansell Road from the interstate eastbound on- and off-ramps. This request is for a use that is allowed conditionally and improvements to the Stafford Hansell Road intersection, while needed, are not appropriately required of this application. Connection for the proposed aggregate site is proposed to be from Center Street at the current intersection of Noble Road and Westland Colonel Jordan Road, which is nearly 1,000 -feet more than the 1320 -feet required by the IAMP.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds as part of this application approval process, the applicant will be required to construct a new access point that complies with the adopted Umatilla County / ODOT Westland Road / I-84 / I-82 Interchange Area Transportation Plan, this access point will serve the proposed mining operation. The existing and continued farm operations occurring on the property will continue to have legal access from Stafford Hansell Road. The applicant submitted a Traffic Impact Analysis which found that the proposed mining operations will add less than 250 daily trips on local roads and is not anticipated to have a significant effect on the local transportation network. Umatilla County finds that the applicant's request appears to support Statewide Planning Goal 12 (Transportation).

Goal 13 Energy: To conserve energy.
Applicant Response: Goal 13 directs local jurisdictions to manage and control land and uses developed on the land to maximize the conservation of all forms of energy, based on sound economic principles. Approval of this request provides opportunities for energy efficiency and convenience for residents, the movement of farm goods, and for access to recreation and tourism opportunities by providing improved and safe highways. It also recognizes the energy savings of having aggregate sites throughout a region in support of residential, commercial, and industrial development.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds that the applicant's request appears to be consistent with Statewide Planning Goal 13 (Energy).

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.

Applicant Response: Goal 14 prohibits urban uses on rural lands. Goal 14 is not specifically applicable to this action.

County Finding: Umatilla County finds that Statewide Planning Goal 14 (Urbanization) is not specifically applicable to this request.

## 32. DECISION:

BASED UPON THE ABOVE STATED FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS, THE GIRTH DOG LLC REQUEST TO AMEND THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TO ADD THIS SIGNIFICANT SITE TO THE COUNTY'S INVENTORY OF SIGNIFICANT SITES AND ESTABLISH AN AGGREGATE RESOURCE OVERLAY TO THE GIRTH DOG SITE IS APPROVED, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS.

Precedent Conditions: The following precedent conditions must be fulfilled prior to final approval of this request:

1. Pay notice costs as invoiced by the County Planning Department.
2. Obtain a County Road approach permit to Colonel Jordan Road. The access approach shall comply with Road Department standards and satisfy the 1,320 spacing standard to the I-84/Westland Road interchange ramps.

Subsequent Conditions: The following subsequent conditions must be fulfilled following final approval of this request:

1. Obtain all other federal and state permits necessary for development. Provide copies of these permit approvals to the County Planning Department.
a. Obtain all applicable permits for the mining operations from DOGAMI before these activities begin. Applicant will obtain approval from DOGAMI for the reclamation plan and submit a copy of the reclamation plan to the Planning Department.
b. Obtain all applicable permits for the mining operation from DEQ (air, noise, and water quality issues) before these activities begin.
2. Obtain a Zoning Permit from the Umatilla County Planning Department to finalize the approval of the aggregate site. The site plan shall demonstrate that the extraction and sedimentation ponds are not located within 25 feet of a public road or within 100 feet from a dwelling. Access to the mining operation shall be restricted from Stafford Hansell Road.
3. If the site were to lay inactive for a period of greater than one year, a new zoning permit must be obtained.
4. Adhere to DEQ Noise Standard as found in OAR 340-035-0035, Noise Control Regulations for Industry and Commerce.
5. If cultural artifacts are observed during ground-disturbing work, that work must cease in the development area until the find is assessed by qualified cultural resource personnel from the State Historic Preservation Office and the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR). Once qualified cultural resource personnel from SHPO and CTUIR are satisfied, the ground-disturbing work may continue.
6. Contour and revegetate the quarry for agricultural or wildlife habitat purposes during post-mining activities according to the requirements of the DOGAMI application.
7. Any land use application for a proposed conflicting use within the 1,500 -foot impact area requires a waiver of remonstrance prior to final approval. The waiver shall include language stating that the applicant accepts normal mining activity at this significant aggregate site and restricts a landowner's ability to pursue a claim for relief or cause of action alleging injury from the aggregate operation.

Girth Dog LLC, Plan Amendment, \#P-135-22, Text Amendment T-092-22, Zoning Map Amendment. \#Z-322-22 Page 30 of 30

## UMATILLA COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Dated $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ , 2022

George M. Murdock, Commissioner

John M. Shafer, Commissioner

Daniel L. Dorran, Commissioner

# Proposed Umatilla County Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment 

GIRTH DOG LLC QUARRY
Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment \#P-135-22
Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment T-092-22
Zoning Map Amendment \#Z-322-22
Township 4N, Range 27E, Section 36, Tax Lots: 900, 1100, 1200, 1300 and 1800

This proposed amendment to the Umatilla County Comprehensive Plan is to add to the Girth Dog, LLC Quarry Site to the list of Goal 5 protected, significant resource aggregate sites. The following proposed changes will be made in Chapter 8, Open Space, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Natural Resources:

Note: Proposed changes are in underlined text.
41. Several aggregate sites were determined to be significant enough to warrant protection from surrounding land uses in order to preserve the resource (see Technical Report).
41. In order to protect the aggregate resource, the County shall apply an aggregate resource overlay zone to the following existing sites:
(1) ODOT quarry, T5N, R35E, Section 35, TL 6200, 5900.
(2) ODOT quarry, T5N, R29E, Section 22, TL 800 ("Sharp's Corner")
(3) Private, commercial pit, T4N, R38E, Section 27, TL 1100.
(4) Upper Pit, T4N, R28E, Sections 28, 29, TL 4000.
(5) ODOT quarry, T3N, R33E, Section 23, TL 100, 600, 700
(6) Several quarries, T2N, R31E, Section

15, 16, 17, TL 400, 800, 3100. (See
Technical report for specific site information).
(7) ODOT quarry, T3S, R30 1/2, Section 12, 13, TL 503.
(8) ODOT quarry, T4N, R35, TL 7303.
(9) Private, commercial pit, T4N, R28E, Sections 30, 31, TL 300, 2200, 2202, 2203.
(10) ODOT quarry, T1N, R35, Section 34, TL 800, 900, 1000, and T1S, R35, Section 03, TL 100.
(11) ODOT quarry, T1S, R30, TL 1901.
(12) ODOT quarry, T2N, R27, TL 2700.
(13) Private, commercial pit, T4N, R27E,

Section 25, TL 900, Section 36, TL 400, 500, 600, 700, 800, 1400, 1500.
(14) Private, commercial pit,

T2N, R32, Section 04, TL 400.
(15) Private, commercial pit, T4N, R27E, Section 36, TL 900, 1100, 1200, 1300, 1800.

## GIRTH DOG, LLC <br> PROPOSED ZONING MAP



- Zoning Boundary $\square$ Property Boundary

Jeff Hines
HNS, INC.
63830 Industrial Lane
La Grande, OR 97850

RECEIVED

## MAY 232022

UMATHLLA OOUNTTY PLANNING DEPARTMEENT

Phone: 541-786-0540
Fax:
Other: E-REPORTS ONLY

Project: 2022 Laboratory Services
Permit \#:
Project Manager: Jason Plunkett
Lab Technician: Ryan Hart
Test Date: 3/25/22
As requested Atlas has performed specific gravity testing on the sample referenced below. The testing was performed in accordance with current standards indicated below. The results obtained in our laboratory were as follows:

| Source: | Girth Dog - 29730 Stafford Hansel Rd. Hermiston OR. |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date Obtained: | 3/7/22 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample ID: | 22-5038 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sampling and Preparation: | ASTM D75: | X | AASHTO T2: | ASTM D421: | X | AASHTO T87: |
| Test Standard: | ASTM C127: | X | AASHTO T85: |  |  |  |


| Sample | 1 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Bulk Specific Gravity | 2.741 |
| Bulk SSD Specific Gravity | 2.768 |
| Apparent Specific Gravity | 2.817 |
| Absorption (\%) | 0.98 |

If there are questions concerning this report (Document1), please contact the project manager at (541) 8893602.

Respectfully submitted,

## ATLAS TECHNICAL CONSULTANTS



Reviewed By: Charles D. Walker
Regional Manager

Note: The recording of false, fictitious or fraudulent statements or entries on this document may be punishable as a felony under Federal Statute. cc:


## RECEIVED

| Jeff Hines |  | Phone: |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| HNS, INC. | Fax: |  |
| 63830 Industrial Lane | MAY 232022 | Other: |
| La Grande, OR 97850 | UMATILLA COUNTY |  |
|  | PLANNING DEPARTMENT Project: | 2022 Laboratory Services |
|  | Permit \#: |  |

As requested Atlas has performed an LA Abrasion testing on the sample referenced below. The testing was performed in accordance with current standards indicated below. The results obtained in our laboratory were as follows:

| Source: | Girth Dog - 29730 Stafford Hansel Rd. Hermiston OR. |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date Obtained: | 3/7/22 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample ID: | 22-5038 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sampling and Preparation: | ASTM D75: | AASHTO T2: | X | ASTM D421: | AASHTO T87: | X |
| Test Standard: | ASTM C131: | AASHTO T96: | X |  |  |  |


| Nominal Maximum Size of Aggregate | $1.5^{\prime \prime}$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Grading Designation | C |
| Loss by Abrasion (\%) | $14.0 \%$ |

If there are questions concerning this report (LA 22-5038), please contact the project manager at (541) 8893602.

Respectfully submitted,
ATLAS TECHNICAL CONSULTANTS


Reviewed By: Charles D. Walker
Regional Manager

Note: The recording of false, fictitious or fraudulent statements or entries on this document may be punishable as a felony under Federal Statute. CC:

## RECEIVED

Jeff Hines
HNS, INC.
63830 Industrial Lane
La Grande, OR 97850

## MAY 232022

UMATILLA UUNNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENTProject: 2022 Laboratory Services Permit \#:
Project Manager: Jason Plunkett
Lab Technician: Ryan Hart
Test Date: March 28 ${ }^{\text {th }} 2022$

As requested Atlas has performed sulfate soundness testing on the sample referenced below. The testing was performed in accordance with current standards indicated below. The results obtained in our laboratory were as follows:

| Source: | Girth Dog - 29730 Stafford Hansel Rd. Hermiston OR. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date Obtained: | 3/7/22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample ID: | 22-5045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sampling and Preparation: | ASTM D75: | X | AASHTO T2: | ASTM D421: | X | AASHTO T87: |  |
| Test Standard: | ASTM C88: | X | AASHTO T104: |  |  |  |  |
| Solution: | Sodium: | X | Magnesium: | Fresh Prepared: | X | Previously Used: |  |

Coarse Aggregate

| Sieve Size |  | Weight of Test Fraction Before Test | \% Passing Designated Sieve After Test | Weighted \% Loss |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Passing | Retained |  |  |  |
| 2.0" | 1.5" | 1868.4 | 0.56 | 0.23 |
| 1.5 " | 1.0 " | 954.8 |  |  |
| 1.0 " | 3/4" | 498.2 | 0.89 | 0.28 |
| 3/4" | 1/2" | 669.9 |  |  |
| 1/2" | 3/8" | 331.0 | 2.83 | 0.61 |
| 3/8" | \#4 | 300.2 | 4.53 | 0.29 |
|  |  |  | Total | 1.41 |

Coarse Aggregate Examination

| Sieve Size |  | Splitting |  | Crumbling |  | Cracking |  | Flaking |  | \# of Particles |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Before Test |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

If there are questions concerning this report (SS22-5038), please contact the project manager at (541) 8893602.

Respectfully submitted,

## ATLAS TECHNICAL CONSULTANTS



Reviewed By: Charles D. Walker
Regional Manager

Note: The recording of false, fictitious or fraudulent statements or entries on this document may be punishable as a felony under Federal Statute. CC:


## CE VED

0.2 mi
-119.387 45.787 Degrees

## Robert Waldher and Megan Davchevski

Umatilla County Department of Land Use Planning
216 SE 4th Street
Pendleton, OR 97801

# RECEIVED 

RE: Aggregate Overlay Zone/Girth Dog Pit Transportation Assessment
AUG 082022
UMATILLA COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
Dear Robert and Megan:
This letter presents a Traffic Impact Analysis supporting a proposed plan map amendment that would overlay the Umatilla County Aggregate Resource Overlay zone on approximately 225 acres of existing Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) zoned property in Umatilla County.

Based on the results of the transportation analysis outlined in this report, the proposed Aggregate Resource Overlay zone and the development of the proposed Girth Dog Pit (herein referred to as an aggregate mining operation) is not anticipated to result in a significant effect on the surrounding transportation network or require offsite transportation improvements. Additional details of our analyses are summarized herein.

## PROJECT BACKGROUND

The 225-acre property consists of Tax Lots 900, 1100, 1200, 1300, and 1800 of Map 4 N 2736 (see Figure 1) and is used for farming purposes consistent with the current Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) zoning. In order to support proposed mining, processing, concrete/asphalt batch plants, and aggregate stockpiling operations, the owner is proposing to apply the County's Aggregate Resource Overlay zone to the subject property.

Modifications to existing zoning designations such as the Aggregate Resource Overlay zone must be shown to meet the applicable criteria in Oregon Administrative Rule 660-012-0060, also known as the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). Per the TPR, an analysis of whether the zoning overlay has the potential to create a significant effect to a transportation facility must be reviewed. The following report addresses the TPR requirements and the specific transportation-related impacts of a proposed aggregate mining operation.

Figure 1 - Site Vicinity Map and Study Intersections


## STUDY SCOPE \& ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

The proposed land use action is a unique case in that the existing use of the property (wheat, potatoes, corn, and blueberry farming) already represents a reasonable maximum development scenario under the existing EFU zoning. As such, the focus of this analysis is on incremental impacts of the allowed uses under the proposed Aggregate Resource Overlay zone.

## STUDY SCOPE

This analysis identifies the transportation-related impacts associated with the application of the Aggregate Resource Overlay zone. The study was prepared in accordance scope direction from Umatilla County staff. The study scope and overall study area for this project were selected based on an analysis of current and future traffic volumes at study intersections and discussions with County staff. The analysis was prepared to address the following transportation issues:

- Existing land use and transportation system conditions within the site vicinity;
- Review of regional traffic growth and seasonal traffic patterns, in-process developments, and planned transportation improvements;
- Site trip generation and distribution estimates for reasonable worst-case development scenarios for the proposed Aggregate Resource Overlay zone;
- Planning horizon year 2042 traffic operations under existing EFU zoning and proposed Aggregate Resource Overlay zone scenarios;
- Transportation system adequacy to accommodate the proposed reasonable worst case development scenarios for the proposed Aggregate Resource Overlay zone;
- Assessment of overlay zone change compliance with the TPR (OAR Section 660-12-060); and,
- Conclusions and recommendations.


## STUDY INTERSECTIONS

The study intersections were identified in collaboration with County staff. Figure 1 illustrates the location of the study intersections that are listed below. For ease of review, each intersection is referenced within this report using a numerical ID.

1. I-84 WB Ramp Terminal / Westland Road
2. I-84 EB Ramp Terminal / Colonel Jordan Road
3. Colonel Jordan Road / Noble Road

## TRAFFIC ANALYSIS TIME PERIODS

Study intersection operations were analyzed during the weekday morning (intersection peak hour between 7:00-9:00 AM) and evening peak hour (intersection peak hour between 4:00-6:00 PM).

## ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

The unsignalized and signalized intersection operational analyses presented in this report were prepared following Highway Capacity Manual $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition (Reference 1) analysis procedures using Synchro software.

## APPLICABLE MOBILITY STANDARDS

Intersection operating targets adopted by the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and Umatilla County are summarized below.

## ODOT MOBILITY TARGETS

ODOT uses volume-to-capacity ( $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ) ratios to assess intersection operations. Table 6 of the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) provides maximum volume-to-capacity ratio mobility targets for all signalized/roundabout and unsignalized intersections located outside the major metropolitan areas. Table 1 summarizes the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio that will be used to identify the existing and potential future operational issues at the ODOT owned/maintained l-84 ramp terminal intersections.

Table 1 - ODOT Mobility Targets

| Infersection | OHP Mobility Targeł |
| :---: | :---: |
| I-84 WB Ramp Terminal / Westland Road | 0.70 off ramp approach |
| I-84 EB Ramp Terminal / Colonel Jordan Road | 0.70 off ramp approach |

## UMATILLA COUNTY OPERATING STANDARDS

Umatilla County's standards specify that LOS "E" or better is considered acceptable at unsignalized intersections, including the Colonel Jordan Road/Noble Road intersection.

## EXISTING CONDITIONS TRAFFIC ANALYSIS

The existing conditions analysis identifies field conditions and the current operational, traffic control, and geometric characteristics of the roadways and other transportation facilities within the study vicinity. These conditions will be compared with future year conditions later in this report. Kittelson staff visited the study area and inventoried the existing transportation system to identify lane configurations, traffic control devices, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, transit stops, and geometric features at the study intersections during the summer of 2022.

## SITE CONDITIONS AND ADJACENT LAND USES

The overall site is located south of I-84 and approximately $1 / 4$ mile west of the Colonel Jordan Road corridor. The majority of the land is currently used for agricultural purposes. A separate aggregate mining operation is located directly to the east of the property with a truck stop and fueling station further to the east. Light industrial and commercial activities are further to the east across Colonel Jordan Road. Irrigated farmland is to the west, south, and east of the subject property, most under circle pivot irrigation systems.

## Transportation Facilities

Table 2 summarizes the attributes of key roadways in the site vicinity. Figure 2 illustrates the existing lane configurations and traffic control devices at the study intersections.

Table 2 - Existing Transportation Facilities

| Roadway | Jurisdictional Authority | Functional Classification ${ }^{1}$ | Number of Auto Lanes | Posed <br> Speed <br> (mph) | Sidewalks Present? | Bike <br> Lanes Present? | On-Street Parking Allowed? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I-84 | ODOT | Interstate Highway | 4 | 70 | No | No | No |
| Westland Road | Umatilla County | Major Collector | 2 | Not Posted | No | No | No |
| Colonel Jordan Road | Umatilla County | Local Road | 2 | Not Posted | No | No | No |
| Noble Road | Umatilla County | Local Road | 2 | Not Posted | No | No | No |

ISource: Oregon Highway Plan and Umatilla County Transportation System Plan

## INTERSECTION CRASH HISTORY

Study intersection crash histories were obtained and reviewed in an effort to identify potential safety issues. ODOT provided crash records for the study intersections for the five-year period from January 1, 2016 through December 31, 2020. Table 3 summarizes the ODOT crash data. As shown in the table, there were no crashes at two of the study intersections and only one crash at the I-84 WB ramp terminal. Appendix A contains the crash data summary sheets.

Table 3 - Reported Crash History (January 1, 2016 - December 31, 2020)

|  | Crash Type |  |  |  |  | Severity |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Study Intersection | Rear End | Turning | Angle | fixed Object | Other | PDO | Injury | Fatal | Total |
| I-84 WB Ramp Terminal/ Westland Road | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| I-84 EB Ramp Terminal/ Colonel Jordan Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Colonel Jordan Road/ Noble Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
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Figure 2

## EXISTING CONDITIONS

Turning movement counts at the study intersections were conducted on a mid-week day in late June 2022. Appendix B contains the intersection turning movement count sheets.

## SEASONAL ADJUSTMENT

To determine an appropriate seasonal factor, three methodologies were investigated as outlined in ODOT's Analysis Procedures Manual (APM): On-Site ATR Method, ATR Characteristic Table Method, ATR Seasonal Trend Method.

## On-Site ATR Method

The On-Site ATR Method is used when an Automatic Traffic Recorder (ATR) is within or near the project area. There are three ATRs within relative close proximity of the site. Each of these ATRs are located along the I-84 corridor and are recording volumes along the interstate highway. A seasonal factor for each ATR was calculated for comparison purposes to the other methodologies described herein. As shown in Table 4, the seasonal factors ranged from $1.04 \%$ to $1.09 \%$ with an average seasonal factor of $1.07 \%$.

Table 4 - Seasonal Adjustment Calculations for ATRs

|  | 2019 | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ATR 11-009 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Count Month (June) | 120 | 121 | 123 | 118 | 120 | 120.3 |
| Peak Month | 132 | 130 | 136 | 130 | 131 | 131 |
| ATR 25-008 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Count Month (June) | $H$ | 112 | 114 | 112 | 111 | 111.7 |
| Peak Month | 119 | 118 | 121 | 118 | 121 | 119.3 |
| ATR 20-027 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Count Month (June) | 114 | 111 | 113 | 113 | 111 | 112.3 |
| Peak Month | 117 | 115 | 123 | 116 | 118 | 117 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

- ATR 11-009 Season Adjustment Factor $=131 \% / 120.3 \%=1.09 \%$
- ATR 25-008 Seasonal Adjustment Factor $=119.3 \% / 111.7 \%=1.07 \%$
- ATR 20-027 Seasonal Adjustment Factor $=117 \% / 112.3 \%=1.04 \%$


## ATR Characteristics Table

The ATR Characteristic Table provides general characteristics for each ATR in Oregon and is typically used when there is not a nearby ATR within the immediate study area. Since two of the study intersections are interchange ramp terminals, a review of the Characteristic Table did not find an ATR that closely matches the unique study area conditions. As such, the ATR Seasonal Trend Method was evaluated as described in the following section.

## ATR Seasonal Trend Method

The seasonal trend table is used when there is not an ATR nearby or in a representative area. This method averages seasonal trend groupings from the ATR Characteristics Table. For movements at the study interchange (which has significant industrial and employment generators with limited freeway oriented retail uses), an average of the "commuter" and "summer" trends was deemed appropriate and consistent with other recent development-driven traffic studies in the area. As shown in Table 5, the average of the seasonal adjustment factor calculations for the Commuter and Summer trends would be a factor of 1.02.

Table 5 - ATR Seasonal Trend Method for Commuter and Summer Trends

|  | June/July Count Month | Seasonal Trend Peak Period <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Commuter | Avg of $0.9355 \& 0.9470=0.94125$ | 0.9335 |
| Summer | Avg of $0.8615 \& 0.8457=0.8536$ | 0.8299 |

- The peak period seasonal factor is 0.9355 for the Commuter trend and 0.8299 for the Summer Trend.
- The average June/July count date seasonal factor is 0.94125 for the Commuter trend and 0.8536 for the Summer trend.
- The Commuter seasonal adjustment is $0.94125 / 0.9355=1.01$ and the Summer seasonal adjustment is 0.8536/0.8299 = 1.03 .
- An average of the Commuter and Summer season adjustments is 1.02

As described in the previous sections, a comparison on the On-Site ATR Method and the ATR Seasonal Trend Method revealed a higher seasonal factor derived from the On-Site ATR Method. However, since the ATRs used in this method primarily reflect freeway traffic volumes and the interchange ramps do not serve a large number of freeway-oriented uses, the ATR Seasonal Trend Method was deemed to be a more representative method. For the purposes of this analysis, a seasonal factor of 1.02 has been applied to existing traffic volumes.

## EXISTING INTERSECTION OPERATIONS

Figure 3 illustrates the resulting 2022 existing traffic volumes at the study intersections while Table 6 summarizes the corresponding traffic operations during the weekday AM and PM peak hours (7:55-8:55 AM and 4:15-5:15 PM). As shown in Table 6 and detailed in Appendix $C$ (which includes the existing conditions operations analysis worksheets), the study intersection operations satisfy applicable ODOT performance targets and County standards during the AM and PM peak hours.

Table 6 - Existing Traffic Conditions

|  | Weekday AM Peak Hour |  |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | V/C | Approach Delay (sec) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Approach } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | V/C | Approach Delay (sec) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Approach } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ |
| I-84 WB Ramp Terminal/ <br> Westland Road | 0.06 | 9.5 | A | 0.08 | 9.7 | A |
| I-84 EB Ramp Terminal/ Colonel Jordan Road | 0.05 | 9.4 | A | 0.06 | 9.8 | A |
| Colonel Jordan Road/ Noble Road | 0.01 | 8.7 | A | 0.02 | 9.0 | A |
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## YEAR 2042 TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

This section of the report contains a detailed assessment of the long-term traffic impacts associated with and without the proposed plan map amendment. More specifically, it evaluates the impacts of an aggregate mining operation which would be allowed under the Aggregate Resource Overlay zone. The analysis of long-term traffic conditions is mandated by the State's Transportation Planning Rule (TPR, OAR Section 660-12-0060), given that the proposed plan map amendment would require an amendment to an acknowledged land use regulation and may have the potential to significantly affect a transportation facility.

To test for significant effect and development-related impacts, an analysis of traffic conditions was conducted under the existing EFU land use designation (assuming continued farming use of the site) and the proposed Aggregate Resource Overlay zone (assuming the development of an aggregate mining operation).

Based on the required analysis, the impacts of traffic generated by the potential Aggregate Resource Overlay zone (using the proposed aggregate mining operation as a reasonable worst-case proxy) were examined in the following manner:

- Anticipated future traffic growth patterns were identified for the weekday AM and PM peak hour under the 2042 planning horizon year. This horizon year assumes no overlay zone and is indicative of future conditions with no land use modifications beyond those allowed under the Exclusive Farm Use designation.
- A reasonable worst-case land development scenario (aggregate mining operation) was developed under the proposed Aggregate Resource Overlay zone. Estimates of average daily, weekday AM, and weekday PM peak hour site trips were prepared for the potential Aggregate Resource Overlay zone using the proposed aggregate mining operation.
- A site trip distribution pattern was derived through a review of existing traffic volumes and knowledge of the regional transportation network.
- Weekday AM and PM peak hour site-generated trips from the proposed aggregate mining operations were assigned to the surrounding street/study intersections network.
- Planning horizon year 2042 traffic volumes and operations were analyzed for the weekday AM and PM peak hour under existing background conditions and for the proposed Aggregate Resource Overlay zone designation.


## YEAR 2042 EXISTING ZONING SCENARIO TRAFFIC FORECAST

To achieve a reasonable estimate of existing zoning scenario traffic levels during the 2042 planning horizon year, a $2 \%$ per year growth rate was applied to the study intersection traffic volumes. This growth rate is consistent with other recent traffic studies performed in the area. In addition, trips from other in-process developments were identified, including the following:

- VADATA, Inc. Data Center: a data center located north of I-84 and east of Westland Road. This data center is approximately $75 \%$ built out. As such, $25 \%$ of the overall site-generated trips from the approved 2017 traffic study were assigned to the study intersections.

The resulting Year 2042 existing zoning scenario traffic volumes forecast for the weekday AM and PM peak hour are illustrated in Figure 4 for all study intersections. These figures reflect background traffic levels without any changes to the underlying zoning on the subject site.


## YEAR 2042 EXISTING ZONING INTERSECTION OPERATIONS

Operations of the study intersections under 2042 Existing Zoning Scenario were assessed to understand the base future year operations assuming no changes are made to the site zoning and the land continued to be used for farming purposes. Table 7 summarizes the operational analyses for the weekday AM and PM peak hours reflective of anticipated regional and local traffic volume growth. As shown, all study intersections are forecast to continue to operate acceptably during both the weekday AM and PM peak hours. Appendix D includes the 2042 existing zoning intersection operations analysis worksheets.

Table 7-2042 Existing Zoning Traffic Conditions

|  | Weekday AM Peak Hour |  |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | V/C | Approach Delay (sec) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Approach } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | V/C | Approach Delay (sec) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Approach } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ |
| I-84 WB Ramp Terminal/ Westland Road | 0.08 | 9.8 | A | 0.11 | 10.1 | B |
| I-84 EB Ramp Terminal/ Colonel Jordan Road | 0.07 | 9.7 | A | 0.08 | 10.3 | B |
| Colonel Jordan Road/ Noble Road | 0.01 | 8.8 | A | 0.02 | 9.0 | A |

## PROPOSED AGGREGATE RESOURCE OVERLAY ZONE

Under the proposed Aggregate Resource Overlay zone, an aggregate mining operation is proposed to be constructed. This use represents a worst-case development scenario for the site. Based on discussions with the applicant/owner, anticipated operational features of the proposed aggregate mining facility include:

- A rock crushing operation that is expected to generate up to 40 truck loads of aggregate per day.
- An onsite concrete batch plant that is designed to generate up to 15 truckloads of concrete mixture per day.
- An onsite asphalt batch plant that is designed to generate up to 15 truckloads of asphalt mixture per day.
- Up to 15 total staff working at the site with operational hours ranging between 4:00 AM and 5:00 PM.

In recognition of these unique characteristics and the fact that there are no comparable land uses in the standard reference Trip Generation Manual, detailed discussions were had with the applicant and operators of other aggregate operations in the region to identify the trip making potential of such an operation. Appendix E contains a detailed breakdown of the operations and the associated trip making characteristics and Table 8 summarizes the resulting number of net new trips that can be expected on a typical weekday.

Table 8 - Aggregate Mining Trip Generation Estimates

| Land Use | Daily Trips | Weekday AM Peak Hour |  |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total | In | Out | Total | In | Out |
| Aggregate Mining Operation | 170 | 15 | 9 | 6 | 17 | 6 | 11 |

## SITE TRIP DISTRIBUTION AND ASSIGNMENT

The site-generated trips from the proposed aggregate mining operation were distributed onto the study area roadway system via an assumed future driveway connection that forms the fourth leg of the existing Colonel Jordan Road/Noble Road intersection. This access road connection was assumed to be a twolane roadway that would be stop-controlled at Colonel Jordan Road. No other modifications to the intersection were assumed. From there, the regional distribution was determined via a combination of existing traffic patterns and destinations afforded by the regional transportation facilities within the site vicinity. Figure 5 illustrates the resulting trip distribution pattern and site-generated trip assignment at the study intersections.

## YEAR 2042 OVERLAY ZONE INTERSECTION OPERATIONS

To reflect conditions anticipated under the proposed Aggregate Resource Overlay zone, the weekday AM and PM peak hour site generated traffic volumes shown in Figure 5 were added to the existing zoning traffic volumes shown in Figure 4 to arrive at the cumulative 2042 traffic volumes shown in Figure 6.

Operations of the study intersections under 2042 conditions (with the site converted to an aggregate mining operation) are summarized in Table 9 for the weekday AM and PM peak hours. As shown, all of the study intersections are forecast to continue to operate acceptably during both the weekday AM and PM peak hours. Appendix Fincludes the 2042 total traffic conditions intersection operations analysis worksheets.

Table 9 - 2042 Aggregate Overlay Zoning Traffic Conditions

|  | Weekday AM Peak Hour |  |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | V/C | Approach Delay (sec) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Approach } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | V/C | Approach Delay (sec) | Approach LOS |
| I-84 WB Ramp Terminal/ Westland Road | 0.09 | 9.9 | A | 0.11 | 10.2 | B |
| \|-84 EB Ramp Terminal/ Colonel Jordan Road | 0.07 | 9.7 | A | 0.09 | 10.4 | B |
| Colonel Jordan Road/ Noble Road | 0.01 | 9.1 | A | 0.02 | 9.3 | A |




## TRANSPORTATION PLANNING RULE COMPLIANCE

This section addresses the Oregon Administrative Rule Section 660-12-0060 of the Oregon Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) requirements for the proposed zone change.

## TRANSPORTATION PLAN RULE

OAR Section 660-12-0060 Plan and Land Use Regulation Amendments of the TPR sets forth the criteria for evaluating plan and land use regulation amendments. The criteria establish the determination of significant effect on a transportation system resulting from a land use action; where a significant effect is identified, the criteria establish the means for achieving compliance. The relevant portion of this section of the TPR is reproduced below in italics followed by the response for this project in standard text.

## 660-12-0060 Plan and Land Use Regulation Amendments

(1) If an amendment to a functional plan, an acknowledged comprehensive plan, or a land use regulation (including a zoning map) would significantly affect an existing or planned transportation facility, then the local government must put in place measures as provided in section (2) of this rule, unless the amendment is allowed under section (3), (9) or (10) of this rule. 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);

Response: The proposed Aggregate Resource Overlay zone will not require or result in any changes to the functional classification of any transportation facility in the vicinity of the site.
(b) Change standards implementing a functional classification system; or

## Response: The proposed Aggregate Resource Overlay zone will not require changes to the standards that implement the functional classification system.

(c) Result in any of the effects listed in paragraphs (A) through (C) of this subsection based on projected conditions measured at the end of the planning period identified in the adopted TSP. As part of evaluating projected conditions, the amount of traffic projected to be generated within the area of the amendment may be reduced if the amendment includes an enforceable, ongoing requirement that would demonstrably limit traffic generation, including, but not limited to, transportation demand management. This reduction may diminish or completely eliminate the significant effect of the amendment.
(A) Types or levels of travel or access that are inconsistent with the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility;

Response: The proposed Aggregate Resource Overlay zone would result in future traffic volumes that remain consistent with the functional classifications of the roadways in the study area.
(B) Degrade the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility such that it would not meet the performance standards identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan; or

## Response: The proposed Aggregate Resource Overlay zone would not degrade operations of the study intersections below adopted performance targets.

## GIRTH DOG PIT ACCESS

As noted herein, the transportation system/study intersections can accommodate the peak-hour transportation-related impacts of the aggregate mining operation and its assumed access road forming the fourth leg of the Colonel Jordan Road/Noble Road intersection. To support a follow up land use application for the aggregate mining operation, the following section includes an assessment of preliminary sight distance at the site access road off Colonel Jordan Road.

## PRELIMINARY INTERSECTION SIGHT DISTANCE

Intersection sight distance (ISD) was evaluated at the proposed site access roadway connection at the Colonel Jordan Road/Noble Road intersection. For this assessment, preliminary intersection sight distance measurements were evaluated using the recommended observation reference points ${ }^{1}$ outlined in A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets. While there is no posted speed along Colonel Jordan Road, 55 mph was conservatively used based on observed travel speeds during the June 2022 site visit. As noted in A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets, the minimum passenger car intersection sight distance requirement for a $55-\mathrm{mph}$ design speed is 610 feet (left-turn from stop) and 530 feet (right-turn from stop). For combination trucks, the minimum intersection sight distance requirement for a $55-\mathrm{mph}$ design speed is 930 (left-turn from stop) and 850 feet (right-turn from stop).

From the approximate location of the proposed site access driveway approach to Colonel Jordan Road, there is adequate sight distance (>850 feet) looking to the north and adequate sight distance (>930 feet) looking to the south.

To provide and maintain adequate intersection sight distance post development, it is recommended that any proposed signage or landscaping be appropriately located such that the minimum intersection sight distance can be maintained. To confirm adequate sight lines, it is further recommended that a final sight distance evaluation be performed post access road construction and prior to site beginning formal operations.

[^3]
## SITE ACCESS TRAFFIC CONTROL

To accommodate future traffic movements on the site access road, a STOP (R1-1) sign should be installed on the eastbound access road approach to Colonel Jordan Road in accordance with County standards and the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) in conjunction with site development.

## CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results of the transportation analysis outlined in this report, the proposed Aggregate Resource Overlay zone and the assumed aggregate mining operation is not anticipated to result in a significant effect on the surrounding transportation network or require offsite mitigation. To support the land use application for an aggregate mining operation, the following is recommended:

- Construct a new site access roadway forming the fourth (west) leg to the existing Colonel Jordan Road/Noble Road intersection. A STOP (R1-1) sign should be installed on the eastbound approach to Colonel Jordan Road in accordance with County standards and the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) in conjunction with site development.
- To provide and maintain adequate intersection sight distance at the site access road connection to Colonel Jordan Road, locate any proposed signage or landscaping appropriately such that the minimum intersection sight distance can be maintained. To confirm adequate sight lines, it is further recommended that a final sight distance evaluation be performed post access road construction and prior to site occupancy.

We trust this traffic impact analysis adequately addresses impacts associated with the proposed Aggregate Resource Overlay Zone and proposed aggregate mining operation. Please contact us if you have any questions or comments regarding the contents of this report or the analyses performed.

Sincerely,
KITTELSON \& ASSOCIATES, INC.


Matt Hughart, AICP
Principal Planner


Ste Gudimella Analyst


Chris Brehmer, P.E. Senior Principal Engineer


Appendix A Crash Data

Intersectional Crashes on Colonel Jordan Rd \& Noble Rd (CR 1336) in Umatilla County, OR.
January 1, 2016 through December 31, 2020

| COLLISION TYPE | FATAL CRASHES | $\begin{array}{r} \text { NON- } \\ \text { FATAL } \\ \text { CRASHES } \end{array}$ | PROPERTY DAMAGE ONLY | TOTAL CRASHES | PEOPLE <br> KILLED | PEOPLE INJURED | TRUCKS | $\begin{gathered} \text { DRY } \\ \text { SURF } \end{gathered}$ | WET SURF | DAY | DARK | INTERSECTION | INTERSECTION RELATED | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OFF- } \\ & \text { ROAD } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

YEAR:

TOTAL
FINAL TOTAL

Disclaimers: Effective 2016, collection of "Property Damage Only" (PDO) crash data elements was reduced for vehicles and participants. Age, Gender, License, Error and other elements are no longer available for PDO crash reporting. Please keep this in mind when comparing 2016 PDO crash data to prior years.

A higher number of crashes may be reported as of 2011 compared to prior years. This does not necessarily reflect an increase in annual crashes. The higher numbers may result from a change to an internal departmental process that allows the Crash Analysis and Reporting Unit to add previously unavailable, non-fatal crash reports to the annual data file. Please be aware of this change when comparing pre-2011 crash statistics. For all disclaimers,
see https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Data/documents/Crash_Data_Disclaimers.pdf.

## CRASH SUMMARIES BY YEAR BY COLLISION TYPE

Intersectional Crashes on Westland Rd \& Interstate 84, Old Oregon Trail Hwy (\#006), EB Off-Ramps in Umatilla County, OR.
January 1, 2016 through December 31, 2020

| COLLISION TYPE | FATAL CRASHES | $\begin{array}{r} \text { NON- } \\ \text { FATAL } \\ \text { CRASHES } \end{array}$ | PROPERTY DAMAGE ONLY | TOTAL CRASHES | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PEOPLE } \\ & \text { KILLED } \end{aligned}$ | PEOPLE <br> INJURED | TRUCKS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DRY } \\ & \text { SURF } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WET } \\ & \text { SURF } \end{aligned}$ | DAY | DARK | INTERSECTION | INTERSECTION RELATED | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OFF- } \\ & \text { ROAD } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

YEAR:
TOTAL
FINAL TOTAL

Disclaimers: Effective 2016, collection of "Property Damage Only" (PDO) crash data elements was reduced for vehicles and participants. Age, Gender, License, Error and other elements are no longer available for PDO crash reporting. Please keep this in mind when comparing 2016 PDO crash data to prior years.

A higher number of crashes may be reported as of 2011 compared to prior years. This does not necessarily reflect an increase in annual crashes. The higher numbers may result from a change to an internal departmental process that allows the Crash Analysis and Reporting Unit to add previously unavailable, non-fatal crash reports to the annual data file. Please be aware of this change when comparing pre-2011 crash statistics. For all disclaimers,
see https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Data/documents/Crash_Data_Disclaimers.pdf.

## CRASH SUMMARIES BY YEAR BY COLLISION TYPE

Intersectional Crashes on Westland Rd \& Interstate 84, Old Oregon Trail Hwy (\#006), WB Off-Ramps in Umatilla County, OR.
January 1, 2016 through December 31, 2020

| COLLISION TYPE | FATAL CRASHES | $\begin{array}{r} \text { NON- } \\ \text { FATAL } \\ \text { CRASHES } \end{array}$ | PROPERTY DAMAGE ONLY | TOTAL CRASHES | PEOPLE KILLED | PEOPLE <br> INJURED | TRUCKS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DRY } \\ & \text { SURF } \end{aligned}$ | WET <br> SURF | DAY | DARK | INTERSECTION | INTERSECTION RELATED | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OFF- } \\ & \text { ROAD } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR: 2019 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TURNING MOVEMENTS | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 2019 TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| FINAL TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

Disclaimers: Effective 2016, collection of "Property Damage Only" (PDO) crash data elements was reduced for vehicles and participants. Age, Gender, License, Error and other elements are no longer available for PDO crash reporting. Please keep this in mind when comparing 2016 PDO crash data to prior years.

A higher number of crashes may be reported as of 2011 compared to prior years. This does not necessarily reflect an increase in annual crashes. The higher numbers may result from a change to an internal departmental process that allows the Crash Analysis and Reporting Unit to add previously unavailable, non-fatal crash reports to the annual data file. Please be aware of this change when comparing pre-2011 crash statistics. For all disclaimers,
see https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Data/documents/Crash_Data_Disclaimers.pdf.


# ACTION CODE TRANSLATION LIST 

## ACTION SHORT

CODE DESCRIPTION LONG DESCRIPTION

| 000 | NONE | NO ACTION OR NON-WARRANTED |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 001 | SKIDDED | SkIDDED |
| 002 | on/off V | GEtting on or off stopped or parked vehicle |
| 003 | LOAD OVR | OVERHANGING LOAD Struck Another vehicle, etc. |
| 006 | SLOW DN | SLOWED DOWN |
| 007 | Avoiding | AVOIDING MANEUVER |
| 008 | PAR PARK | PARALLEL PARKIng |
| 009 | Ang Park | Angle Parking |
| 010 | Interfere | PASSENGER INTERFERING WITH DRIVER |
| 011 | Stopped | Stopped in traffic not waiting to make a left turn |
| 012 | STP/L TRN | Stopped because of left turn signal or waiting, etc. |
| 013 | STP TURN | Stopped while executing a turn |
| 014 | EMR V PKD | Emergency vehicle legally parked in the roadway |
| 015 | GO A/STOP | PROCEED AFTER STOPPING FOR A STOP SIGN/FLASHING RED. |
| 016 | TRN A/RED | TURNED ON RED AFter stopping |
| 017 | LOSTCTRL | LOST CONTROL OF VEhicle |
| 018 | EXIT DWY | Entering Street or highway from aliey or driveway |
| 019 | Entr DWY | ENTERING ALLEY OR DRIVEWAY FROM STREET OR HIGHWAY |
| 020 | STR ENTR | BEFORE ENTERING ROADWAY, STRUCK PEdestrian, Etc. On SIDEWALK OR SHOULDER |
| 021 | NO DRVR | CAR RAN AWAY - NO DRIVER |
| 022 | PREV COL | Struck, OR WAS Struck by, vehicle or pedestrian in prior collision before acc. Stabilized |
| 023 | Stalled | VEHICLE STALLED OR DISABLED |
| 024 | DRVR DEAD | DEAD BY UNASSOCIATED CAUSE |
| 025 | FATIGUE | FAtIGUED, SLEepy, ASLEEP |
| 026 | SuN | DRIVER BLINDED BY SUN |
| 027 | HDLGHTS | DRIVER BLINDED BY Headilghts |
| 028 | ILLNESS | PHYSICALLY ILL |
| 029 | thru med | VEHICLE CROSSED, PLUNGED OVER, OR THROUGH MEDIAN BARRIER |
| 030 | PURSUIT | PURSUING OR ATTEMPTING TO STOP A VEhICLE |
| 031 | PASSING | PASSING SITUATION |
| 032 | PRKOFFRD | VEHICLE PARKED BEYOND CURB OR SHOULDER |
| 033 | CROS MED | VEHICLE CROSSED EARTH OR GRASS MEDIAN |
| 034 | X N/SGNL | CROSSING AT Intersection - No TRAFFIC SIGNAL PRESENT |
| 035 | X w/ SGNL | CROSSING AT Intersection - TRAFFIC SIGNAL PRESENT |
| 036 | DIAGONAL | Crossing at intersection - diagonally |
| 037 | BTWN INT | CRossing between intersections |
| 038 | DISTRACT | DRIVER'S Attention distracted |
| 039 | W/TRAF-S | WALkING, RUNNING, RIDING, ETC., ON SHOULDER WIth traffic |
| 040 | A/TRAF-S | WALking, RUNNING, RIding, Etc., On Shoulder facing traffic |
| 041 | W/TRAF-P | WALkIng, Running, RIding, Etc., On PAVEMENT WIth traffic |
| 042 | A/TRAF-P | WALking, Running, RIding, etc., on Pavement facing traffic |
| 043 | PLAYINRD | PLAYING In Street or road |
| 044 | puSh mV | PUSHING OR WORKING ON VEHICLE IN ROAD OR ON SHOULDER |
| 045 | WORK ON | WORKING IN ROADWAY OR ALONG SHOULDER |
| 046 | W/ TRAFIC | NON-MOTORIST WALKING, RUNNING, RIDING, ETC. WIth traffic |
| 047 | A/ TRAFIC | NON-MOTORIST WALKING, RUNNING, RIDING, ETC. FACING TRAFFIC |
| 050 | LAY ON RD | Standing or lying in roadway |
| 051 | ENT OFFRD | Entering / Starting in traffic lane from off road |
| 052 | MERGING | MERGIng |

## ACTION CODE TRANSLATION LIST

055 SPRAY BLINDED BY WATER SPRAY
088 OTH
BLINDED BY
UNKNOWN ACTION

| 00 | NO CODE | NO CAUSE ASSOCIATED AT THIS LEVEL |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 01 | TOO-FAST | TOO FAST FOR CONDITIONS (NOT EXCEED POSTED SPEED. |
| 02 | NO-YIELD | DID NOT YIELD RIGHT-OF-WAY |
| 03 | PAS-STOP | PASSED STOP SIGN OR RED FLASHER |
| 04 | DIS SIG | DISREGARDED TRAFFIC SIGNAL |
| 05 | LEFT-CTR | DROVE LEFT OF CENTER ON TWO-WAY ROAD; STRADDLING |
| 06 | IMP-OVER | IMPROPER OVERTAKING |
| 07 | TOO-CLOS | FOLLOWED TOO CLOSELY |
| 08 | IMP-TURN | MADE IMPROPER TURN |
| 09 | DRINKING | ALCOHOL OR DRUG INVOLVED |
| 10 | OTHR-IMP | OTHER IMPROPER DRIVING |
| 11 | MECH-DEF | MECHANICAL DEFECT |
| 12 | OTHER | OTHER (NOT IMPROPER DRIVING) |
| 13 | IMP LNC | IMPROPER CHANGE OF TRAFFIC LANES |
| 14 | DIS TCD | DISREGARDED OTHER TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICE |
| 15 | WRNG WAY | WRONG WAY ON ONE-WAY ROAD; WRONG SIDE DIVIDED ROi |
| 16 | FATIGUE | DRIVER DROWSY/FATIGUED/SLEEPY |
| 17 | ILLNESS | PHYSICAL ILLNESS |
| 18 | IN RDWY | NON-MOTORIST ILLEGALLY IN ROADWAY |
| 19 | NT VISBL | NON-MOTORIST NOT VISIBLE; NON-REFLECTIVE CLOTHIN |
| 20 | IMP PKNG | VEHICLE IMPROPERLY PARKED |
| 21 | DEF STER | DEFECTIVE STEERING MECHANISM |
| 22 | DEF BRKE | INADEQUATE OR NO BRAKES |
| 24 | LOADSHFT | VEHICLE LOST LOAD OR LOAD SHIFTED |
| 25 | TIREFAIL | TIRE FAILURE |
| 26 | PHANTOM | PHANTOM / NON-CONTACT VEHICLE |
| 27 | INATTENT | INATTENTION |
| 28 | NM INATT | NON-MOTORIST INATTENTION |
| 29 | FAVOID | FAILED TO AVOID VEHICLE AHEAD |
| 30 | SPEED | DRIVING IN EXCESS OF POSTED SPEED |
| 31 | RACING | SPEED RACING (PER PAR) |
| 32 | CARELESS | CARELESS DRIVING (PER PAR) |
| 33 | RECKLESS | RECKLESS DRIVING (PER PAR) |
| 34 | AGGRESV | AGGRESSIVE DRIVING (PER PAR) |
| 35 | RDRAGE | ROAD RAGE (PER PAR) |
| 40 | VIEW OBS | VIEW OBSCURED |
| 50 | USED MDN | IMPROPER USE OF MEDIAN OR SHOULDER |
| 51 | FAIL LN | FAILED TO MAINTAIN LANE |
| 52 | OFF RD | RAN OFF ROAD |

OFF RD

RAN OFF ROAD

## COLIISION TYPE CODE TRANSLATTON LIST

COLL SHORT
CODE DESCRIPTION LONG DESCRIPTION
MISCELLANEOUS
\& OTH $\quad$ MISCELLANEOUS
BACK BACKING
P PED PEDESTRIAN

| 1 | ANGL |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 | HEAD |


| 2 | HEAD | HEAD-ON |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3 | REAR | REAR-END |

4 SS-M SIDESWIPE - MEETING
5 SS-O SIDESWIPE - OVERTAKING

TURN TURNING MOVEMENT
PARKING MANEUVER
NON-COLLISION
NCOL FIX FIXED OBJECT OR OTHER OBJECT

## CRASH TYPE CODE TRANSLATION LIST

CRASH SHORT
TYPE DESCRIPTION LONG DESCRIPTION

| $\&$ | OVERTURN | OVERTURNED |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | NON-COLL | OTHER NON-COLLISION |


| 0 | NON-COLL | OTHER NON-COLLISION |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | OTH RDWY | MOTOR VEHICLE ON OTHER ROADWAY |

$\begin{array}{lll}1 & \text { OTH RDWY } & \text { MOTOR VEHICLE ON OTHER } \\ 2 & \text { PRKD MV } & \text { PARKED MOTOR VEHICLE }\end{array}$
3 PRKD MV PARKED MOTOR VEHICLE

ANIMAL
FIXED OBJECT
entertng at angle - ONE VEhicle Stopped
ENTERING AT ANGLE - ALL OTHERS
FROM SAME DIRECTION - BOTH GOING STRAIGHT
FROM SAME DIRECTION - ONE TURN, ONE STRAIGHT
FROM SAME DIRECTION - ONE STOPDED
FROM SAME DIRECTION-ALL OTHERS, INCLUDING PARKING FROM OPPOSITE DIRECTION - BOTH GOING STRAIGHT FROM OPPOSITE DIRECTION-ONE LEFT TURN, ONE STRAIGHT fROM OPPOSITE DIRECTION - ONE STOPPED FROM OPPOSITE DIRECTION-ALL OTHERS INCL. PARKING

| LIC | SHORT |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| CODE | DESC | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| 0 | NONE | NOT LICENSED (HAD NEVER BEEN LICENSED) |
| 1 | OR-Y | VALID OREGON LICENSE |
| 2 | OTH-Y | VALID LICENSE, OTHER STATE OR COUNTRY |
| 3 | SUSP | SUSPENDED/REVOKED |
| 4 | EXP | EXPIRED |
| 8 | N-VAL | OTHER NON-VALID LICENSE |
| 9 | UNK | UNKNOWN IF DRIVER WAS LICENSED AT TIME OF CRASH |


| RES <br> CODE | SHORT <br> DESC | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |

## ERROR CODE TRANSLATION LIST

| ERROR CODE | SHORT <br> DESCRIPTION | FULL DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 000 | NONE | No ERROR |
| 001 | WIDE TRN | WIDE TURN |
| 002 | CUT CORN | CUT CORNER ON TURN |
| 003 | FAIL TRN | FAILED TO OBEY MANDATORY TRAFFIC TURN SIGNAL, SIGN OR LANE MARKINGS |
| 004 | L In tre | LEFT TURN IN FRONT OF ONCOMING TRAFFIC |
| 005 | L PROHIB | LEFT TURN WHERE PROHIBITED |
| 006 | FRM WRNG | TURNED FROM WRONG LANE |
| 007 | TO WRONG | turned into wrong lane |
| 008 | ILLEG U | U-TURNED ILLEGALLY |
| 009 | IMP STOP | IMPROPERLY STOPPED IN TRAFFIC LANE |
| 010 | IMP SIG | IMPROPER SIGNAL OR FAILURE TO SIGNAL |
| 011 | IMP BACK | BACKING IMPROPERLY (NOT PARKING) |
| 012 | IMP PARK | IMPROPERLY PARKED |
| 013 | UNPARK | Improper Start leaving Parked position |
| 014 | IMP STRT | IMPROPER START FROM STOPPED POSITION |
| 015 | IMP LGHT | IMPROPER OR NO LIGHTS (VEHICLE IN TRAFFIC) |
| 016 | InAtTENT | INATTENTION (FAILURE TO DIM LIGHTS PRIOR TO 4/1/97) |
| 017 | UNSF VEH | DRIVING UNSAFE VEHICLE (NO OTHER ERROR APPARENT) |
| 018 | OTH PARK | Entering/Exiting Parked position w/ insufficient clearance; other improper parking maneuver |
| 019 | DIS DRIV | disregarded other driver's Signal |
| 020 | DIS SGNL | DISREGARDED TRAFFIC SIGNAL |
| 021 | RAN STOP | DISREGARDED STOP SIGN OR FLASHING RED |
| 022 | DIS SIGN | DISREGARDED WARNING SIGN, FLARES OR FLASHING AMBER |
| 023 | DIS OFCR | DISREGARDED POLICE OFFICER OR FLAGMAN |
| 024 | DIS EMER | DISREGARDED SIREN OR WARNING OF EMERGENCY Vehicle |
| 025 | DIS RR | DISREGARDED RR SIGNAL, RR SIGN, OR RR FLAGMAN |
| 026 | REAR-END | FAiled to avoid stopped or parked vehicle ahead other than school bus |
| 027 | BIKE ROW | DID NOT HAVE RIGHT-OF-WAY OVER PEDALCYCLIST |
| 028 | No Row | DID NOT HAVE RIGHT-OF-WAY |
| 029 | PED ROW | FAILED to yield Right-of-way to pedestrian |
| 030 | PAS CURV | PASSING ON A CURVE |
| 031 | PAS WRNG | PASSING ON THE WRONG SIDE |
| 032 | PAS TANG | PASSING ON STRAIGHT ROAD UNDER UNSAFE CONDITIONS |
| 033 | PAS X -WK | PASSED VEHICLE Stopped at crosswalk for pedestrian |
| 034 | PAS INTR | PASSING AT INTERSECTION |
| 035 | PAS HILL | PASSING ON CREST OF HILL |
| 036 | N/PAS ZN | PASSING In "NO PASSING" ZONE |
| 037 | PAS TRAF | PASSING IN FRONT OF ONCOMING TRAFFIC |
| 038 | CUT-IN | CUTTING IN (TWO LANES - TWO WAY ONLY) |
| 039 | WRNGSIDE | DRIVING ON WRONG SIDE OF THE ROAD (2-WAY UNDIVIDED ROADWAYS) |
|  |  | 71 |


| ERROR | SHORT DESCRIPTION | FULL DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 040 | THRU MED | DRIVING THROUGH SAFETY ZONE OR OVER ISLAND |
| 041 | F/ST BUS | FAILED TO STOP FOR SCHOOL BUS |
| 042 | F/SLO MV | FAILED TO DECREASE SPEED FOR SLOWER MOVING VEHICLE |
| 43 | too Close | FOLLOWING TOO CLOSELY (MUST BE ON OFFICER'S REPORT) |
| 044 | STRDL LN | STRADDLING OR DRIVING ON WRONG LANES |
| 045 | IMP CHG | ImPROPER CHANGE OF TRAFFIC LANES |
| 046 | WRNG WAY | WRONG WAY ON ONE-WAY ROADWAY; WRONG SIDE DIVIDED ROAD |
| 047 | BASCRULE | DRIVING TOO FAST FOR CONDITIONS (NOT EXCEEDING POSTED SPEED) |
| 048 | OPN DOOR | OPENED DOOR INTO ADJACENT TRAFFIC LANE |
| 049 | Impeding | IMPEDING TRAFFIC |
| 050 | SPEED | DRIVING In EXCESS OF POSTED SPEED |
| 051 | RECKLESS | RECKLESS DRIVING (PER PAR) |
| 052 | CARELESS | CARELESS DRIVING (PER PAR) |
| 053 | RACING | SPEED RACING (PER PAR) |
| 054 | X N/SGNL | CROSSING AT Intersection, NO TRAFFIC SIGNAL PRESENT |
| 055 | X W/SGNL | CROSSING AT INTERSECTION, TRAFFIC SIGNAL PRESENT |
| 056 | DIAGONAL | CROSSING AT INTERSECTION - DIAGONALLY |
| 057 | BTWN INT | CROSSING BETWEEN INTERSECTIONS |
| 059 | W/TRAF-S | WALKING, RUNNING, RIDING, ETC., ON SHOULDER WITH TRAFFIC |
| 060 | A/TRAF-S | WALKING, RUNNING, RIDING, ETC., ON SHOULDER FACING TRAFFIC |
| 061 | W/TRAF-P | WALKING, RUNNING, RIDING, ETC., ON PAVEMENT WITH TRAFFIC |
| 062 | A/TRAF-P | WALKING, RUNNING, RIDING, ETC., ON PAVEMENT FACING TRAFFIC |
| 063 | PLAYINRD | PLAYING IN STREET OR ROAD |
| 064 | PUSH MV | PUSHING OR WORKING ON VEHICLE IN ROAD OR ON SHOULDER |
| 065 | WORK IN RD | WORKING IN ROADWAY OR ALONG SHOULDER |
| 070 | LAY ON RD | Standing Or Lying in roadway |
| 071 | NM IMP USE | IMPROPER USE OF TRAFFIC LANE BY NON-MOTORIST |
| 073 | ELUDING | ELUding / Attempt to elude |
| 079 | F NEG CURV | FAILED TO NeGotiate a curve |
| 080 | FAIL LN | FAILED TO MAINTAIN LANE |
| 081 | OFF RD | RAN OFF ROAD |
| 082 | No CLEAR | DRIVER MISJUDGED CLEARANCE |
| 083 | OVRSTEER | OVER-CORRECTING |
| 084 | NOT USED | CODE NOT IN USE |
| 085 | OVRLOAD | OVERLOADING OR IMPROPER LOADING OF VEHICLE WITH CARGO OR PASSENGERS |
| 97 | UNA DIS TC | UNABLE TO DETERMINE WHICH DRIVER DISREGARDED TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICE |

## LONG DESCRIPTION

| 001 | FEL/JUMP | OCCUPANT FELL, JUMPED OR WAS EJECTED FROM MOVIng VEhicle |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 002 | INTERFER | PASSENGER INTERFERED WITH DRIVER |
| 003 | Bug inte | ANIMAL OR INSECT IN VEHICLE INTERFERED WIth driver |
| 004 | INDRCT PED | PEDESTRIAN INDIRECTLY INVOLVED (NOT STRUCK) |
| 005 | SUB-PED | "SUB-PED": PEDESTRIAN INJURED SUBSEQUENT TO COLLISION, ETC. |
| 006 | INDRCT BIK | PEDALCYCLIST INDIRECTLY INVOLVED (NOT STRUCK) |
| 007 | HITCHIKR | HITCHHIKER (SOLICITING A RIDE) |
| 008 | PSNGR TOW | PASSENGER OR NON-MOTORIST BEING TOWED OR PUSHED ON CONVEYANCE |
| 009 | ON/OFF V | GEtTING ON/OFF StOPPEd/PARKED VEHICLE (OCCUPANTS ONLY; MUST HAVE PHYSICAL CONTACT W/ vehic |
| 010 | SUB OTRN | OVERTURNED AFTER FIRST HARMFUL EVENT |
| 011 | MV PUSHD | VEHICLE BEING PUSHED |
| 012 | MV TOWED | VEHICLE TOWED OR HAD BEEN TOWING ANOTHER VEHICLE |
| 013 | FORCED | VEHICLE FORCED BY IMPACT INTO ANOTHER VEHICLE, PEDALCYCLIST OR PEDESTRIAN |
| 014 | SET MOTN | VEHICLE SET IN MOTION BY NON-DRIVER (CHILD RELEASED BRAKES, ETC.) |
| 015 | RR ROW | AT OR ON RAILROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY (NOT LIGHT RAIL) |
| 016 | LT RL Row | AT OR ON LIGHT-RAIL RIGHT-OF-WAY |
| 017 | RR HIT V | train Struck vehicle |
| 018 | V HIT RR | VEHICLE STRUCK TRAIN |
| 019 | HIT RR CAR | VEHICLE STRUCK RAILROAD CAR ON ROADWA |
| 020 | JACKNIFE | JACKKNIFE; TRAILER OR TOWED VEHICLE STRUCK TOWING VEHICLE |
| 021 | TRL OTRN | TRAILER OR TOWED VEHICLE OVERTURNED |
| 022 | CN BROKE | TRAILER CONNECTION BROKE |
| 023 | DETACH TRL | DETACHED TRAILING OBJECT STRUCK OTHER VEHICLE, NON-MOTORIST, OR OBJECT |
| 024 | V DOOR OPN | VEHICLE DOOR OPENED INTO ADJACENT TRAFFIC LANE |
| 025 | WHEELOFF | WHEEL CAME OFF |
| 026 | HOOD UP | HOOD FLEW UP |
| 028 | LOAD SHIFT | LOST LOAD, LOAD MOVED OR SHIFTED |
| 029 | TIREFAIL | TIRE FAILURE |
| 030 | PET | PET: CAT, DOG AND SIMILAR |
| 031 | LVSTOCK | STOCK: COW, CALF, BULL, STEER, SHEEP, ETC. |
| 032 | HORSE | HORSE, MULE, OR DONKEY |
| 033 | HRSE\&RID | HORSE AND RIDER |
| 034 | GAME | WILD ANIMAL, GAME (INCLUDES BIRDS; NOT DEER OR ELK) |
| 035 | DEER ELK | DEER OR ELK, WAPITI |
| 036 | ANML VEH | ANIMAL-DRAWN VEHICLE |
| 037 | CULVERT | CULVERT, OPEN LOW OR HIGH MANHOLE |
| 038 | ATENUATN | IMPACT ATTENUATOR |
| 039 | PK METER | PARKING METER |
| 040 | CURB | CURB (ALSO NARROW SIDEWALKS ON BRIDGES) |
| 041 | JIGGLE | JIGGLE BAR OR TRAFFIC SNAKE FOR CHANNELIZATION |
| 042 | GDRL END | LEADING EDGE OF GUARDRAIL |
| 043 | GARDRAIL | GUARD RAIL (NOT METAL MEDIAN BARRIER) |
| 044 | BARRIER | MEDIAN BARRIER (RAISED OR METAL) |
| 045 | WALL | RETAINING WALL OR TUNNEL WALL |
| 046 | BR RAIL | BRIDGE RAILING OR PARAPET (ON BRIDGE OR APPROACH) |
| 047 | BR ABUTMNT | BRIDGE ABUTMENT (INCLUDED "APPROACH END" THRU 2013) |
| 048 | BR COLMN | BRIDGE PILLAR OR COLUMN |
| 049 | BR GIRDR | BRIDGE GIRDER (HORIZONTAL BRIDGE STRUCTURE OVERHEAD) |
| 050 | ISLAND | TRAFFIC RAISED ISLAND |
| 051 | GORE | GORE |
| 052 | POLE UNK | POLE - TYPE UNKNOWN |
| 053 | POLE UTL | POLE - POWER OR TELEPHONE |
| 054 | ST LIGHT | POLE - Street light Only |
| 055 | TRF SGNL | POLE - TRAFFIC SIGNAL AND PED SIGNAL ONLY |
| 056 | SGN BRDG | POLE - SIGN BRIDGE |
| 057 | STOPSIGN | STOP OR YIELD SIGN |

## EVENT CODE TRANSLATION LIST

| CODE | DESCRIPTION | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 058 | OTH SIGN | OTHER SIGN, INCLUDING STREET SIGNS |
| 059 | HYDRANT | HYDRANT |
| 060 | MARKER | DELINEATOR OR MARKER (REFLECTOR POSTS) |
| 061 | MAILBOX | MAILBOX |
| 062 | TREE | TREE, STUMP OR SHRUBS |
| 063 | VEG OHED | TREE BRANCH OR OTHER VEGETATION OVERHEAD, ETC. |
| 064 | WIRE/CBL | WIRE OR CABLE ACROSS OR OVER THE ROAD |
| 065 | TEMP SGN | TEMPORARY SIGN OR BARICADE IN ROAD, ETC. |
| 066 | PERM SGN | PERMANENT SIGN OR BARRICADE IN/OFF ROAD |
| 067 | SLIDE | SLIDES, FALLEN OR FALLING ROCKS |
| 068 | FRGN OBJ | FOREIGN OBSTRUCTION/DERIS IN ROAD (NOT GRAVEL) |
| 069 | EQP WORK | EQUIPMENT WORKING IN/OFF ROAD |
| 070 | OTH EQP | OTHER EQUIPMENT IN OR OFF ROAD (INCLUDES PARKED TRAILER, BOAT) |

## event code translation list

SHORT
CODE DESCRIPTION LONG DESCRIPTION

| 114 | RR EQUIP | VEHICLE STRUCK RAILROAD EQUIPMENT (NOT TRAIN) ON TRACKS |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 115 | DSTRCT GPS | DISTRACTED BY NAVIGATION SYSTEM OR GPS DEVICE |
| 116 | DSTRCT OTH | DISTRACTED BY OTHER ELECTRNIC DEVICE |



| CLASS | DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :--- |
| 01 | RURAL PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - INTERSTATE |
| 02 | RURAL PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER |
| 06 | RURAL MINOR ARTERIAL |
| 07 | RURAL MAJOR COLLECTOR |
| 08 | RURAL MINOR COLLECTOR |
| 09 | RURAL LOCAL |
| 11 | URBAN PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - INTERSTATE |
| 12 | URBAN PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER FREEWAYS AND EXP |
| 14 | URBAN PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER |
| 16 | URBAN MINOR ARTERIAL |
| 17 | URAN MAJOR COLLETOR |
| 18 | URBAN MINOR COLLETTOR |
| 19 | URBAN LOCAL |
| 78 | UNKNOWN RURAL SYSTEM |
| 79 | UNKNOWN RURAL NON-SYSTEM |
| 98 | UNKNOWN URBAN SYSTEM |
| 99 | UNKNOWN URBAN NON-SYSTEM |

## INJURY SEVERITY CODE TRANSLATION LIST

## SHORT

| CODE | DESC | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | KILL | FATAL INJURY (K) |
| 2 | INJA | SUSPECTED SERIOUS INJURY (A) |
| 3 | INJB | SUSPECTED MINOR INJURY (B) |
| 4 | INJC | POSSIBLE INJURY (C) |
| 5 | PRI | DIED PRIOR TO CRASH |
| 7 | NO<5 | NO INJURY- O TO 4 YEARS OF AGE |
| 9 | NONE | NO APPARENT INJURY (0) |

## MEDIAN TYPE CODE TRANSLATION LIST

|  | SHORT |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| CODE | DESC | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| 0 | NONE | NO MEDIAN |
| 1 | RSDMD | SOLID MEDIAN BARRIER |
| 2 | DIVMD | EARTH, GRASS OR PAVED MEDIAN |

## LIGHT CONDITION CODE TRANSLATION LIST

## SHORT

| CODE | DESC | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | UNK | UNKNOWN |
| 1 | DAY | DAYLIGHT |
| 2 | DLIT | DARKNESS - WITH STREET LIGHTS |
| 3 | DARK | DARKNESS - NO STREET LIGHTS |
| 4 | DAWN | DAWN (TWILIGHT) |

5 DUSK DUSK (TWILIGHT)

MILEAGE TYPE CODE TRANSLATION LIST

| CODE | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :--- |
| 0 | REGULAR MILEAGE |
| T | TEMPORARY |
| Y | SPUR |
| $Z$ | OVERLAPPING |

MOVEMENT TYPE CODE TRANSLATION LIST

| CODE | DESC | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | UNK | UNKNOWN |
| 1 | STRGHT | STRAIGHT AHEAD |
| 2 | TURN-R | TURNING RIGHT |
| 3 | TURN-L | TUANING LEFT |
| 4 | U-TURN | MARING A U-TURN |
| 5 | BACK | BACKING |
| 6 | STOP | STOPPED IN TRAFFIC |
| 7 | PRKD-P | PARKED - PROPERLY |
| 8 | PRKD-I | PARKED - IMPROPRLY |
| 9 | PARKNG | PARKING MANEUVER |

PARTICTPANT TYPE CODE TRANSLATION LIST

| CODE | SHORT <br> DESC | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | OCC | UNKNOWN OCCUPANT TYPE |
| 1 | DRVR | DRIVER |
| 2 | PSNG | PASSENGER |
| 3 | PED | PEDESTRIAN |
| 4 | CONV | PEDESTRIAN USING A PEDESTRIAN CONVEYA: |
| 5 | PTOW | PEDESTRIAN TOWING OR TRAILERING AN OB |
| 6 | BIKE | PEDALCYCLIST |
| 7 | BTOW | PEDALCYCLIST TOWING OR TRAILERING AN |
| 8 | PRKD | OCCUPANT OF A PARKED MOTOR VEHICLE |
| 9 | OTHR | OTHER TYPE OF NON-MOTORIST |

## tRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICE CODE TRANSLATION LIS

| Code | SHORT DESC | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 000 | NONE | NO CONTROL |
| 001 | TRF SIGNAL | TRAFFIC SIGNALS |
| 002 | FLASHBCN-R | FLASHING BEACON - RED (STOP) |
| 003 | FLASHBCN-A | FLASHING BEACON - AMBER (SLOW) |
| 004 | STOP SIGN | STOP SIGN |
| 005 | SLOW SIGN | SLOW SIGN |
| 006 | REG-SIGN | REGULATORY SIGN |
| 007 | YIELD | Yield Sign |
| 008 | WARNING | WARNING SIGN |
| 009 | CURVE | CURVE SIGN |
| 010 | SCHL X-ING | SCHOOL CROSSING SIGN OR SPECIAL SIGNAL |
| 011 | OFCR/FLAG | POLICE OfFICER, FLAGMAN - SChOol Patrol |
| 012 | BRDG-GATE | BRIDGE GATE - BARRIER |
| 013 | TEMP-BARR | TEMPORARY BARRIER |
| 014 | NO-PASS-ZN | NO PASSING ZONE |
| 015 | ONE-WAY | ONE-WAY STREET |
| 016 | CHANNEL | CHANNELIZATION |
| 017 | MEDIAN BAR | MEDIAN BARRIER |
| 018 | PILOT CAR | PILOT CAR |
| 019 | SP PED SIG | SPECIAL PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL |
| 020 | x-BUCK | CROSSBUCK |
| 021 | THR-GN-SIG | through green Arrow or Signal |
| 022 | L-GRN-SIG | Left turn green Arrow, Lane markings, or Signal |
| 023 | R-GRN-SIG | RIGHT TURN GREEN ARROW, LANE MARKINGS, OR SIGNAL |
| 024 | WIGWAG | WIGWAG OR FLASHING LIGHTS W/O DROP-ARM GATE |
| 025 | x-BUCK WRN | CROSSBUCK And ADVANCE WARning |
| 026 | WW W/ GATE | flashing lights with drop-ARM gates |
| 027 | OVRHD SGNL | SUPPLEMENTAL OVERHEAD SIGNAL (RR XING ONLY) |
| 028 | SP RR STOP | SPECIAL RR STOP SIGN |
| 029 | ILUM GRD X | ILLUMINATED GRADE CROSSING |
| 037 | RAMP METER | METERED RAMPS |
| 038 | RUMBLE STR | RUMBLE STRIP |
| 040 | AUTO. FLAG | AUTOMATED FLAGGER ASSISTANCE DEVICE |
| 090 | L-TURN REF | LeFt turn refuge (When Refuge is involved) |
| 091 | R-TURN ALL | RIGHT tURN AT ALL times Sign, etc. |
| 092 | EMR SGN/FL | EMERGENCY SIGNS OR FLARES |
| 093 | ACCEL LANE | ACCELERATION OR DECELERATION LANES |
| 094 | R-TURN PRO | RIGHT TURN PROHIBITED ON RED AFTER Stopping |
| 095 | BUS STPSGN | BuS Stop Sign and red Lights |

## VEhicle type code translation lis

WEATHER CONDItION CODE TRANSLATION LIST

| CODE | SHORT DESC | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 00 | PDO | NOT COLLECTED FOR PDO CRASHES |
| 01 | PSNGR CAR | PASSENGER CAR, PICKUP, LIGHT DELIVERY, ETC. |
| 02 | BOBTAIL | TRUCK TRACTOR WITH NO TRAILERS (BOBTAIL) |
| 03 | FARM TRCTR | FARM TRACTOR OR SELF-PROPELLED FARM EQUIPMENT |
| 04 | SEMI TOW | TRUCK TRACTOR WITH TRAILER/MOBILE HOME IN TOW |
| 05 | TRUCK | TRUCK WITH NON-DETACHABLE BED, PANEL, ETC. |
| 06 | MOPED | MOPED, MINIBIKE, SEATED MOTOR SCOOTER, MOTOR BIKE |
| 07 | SCHL BUS | SCHOOL BUS (INCLUDES VAN) |
| 08 | OTH BUS | OTHER BUS |
| 09 | MTRCYCLE | MOTORCYCLE, DIRT BIKE |
| 10 | OTHER | OTHER: FORKLIFT, BACKHOE, ETC. |
| 11 | MOTRHOME | MOTORHOME |
| 12 | TROLLEY | MOTORIZED STREET CAR/TROLLEY (NO RAILS/WIRES) |
| 13 | ATV | ATV |
| 14 | MTRSCTR | MOTORIZED SCOOTER (STANDING) |
| 15 | SNOWMOBILE | SNOWMOBILE |
| 99 | UNKNOWN | UNKNOWN VEHICLE TYPE |

## Appendix B Traffic Count Summary Worksheets






Comments:


Comments:


## Appendix C Existing Traffic Operations Worksheets





|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  |  |  | 4 |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |  | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 13 | 1 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 25 | 22 | 32 | 0 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 13 | 1 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 25 | 22 | 32 | 0 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.916 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.945 |  |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.982 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.980 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1160 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1326 | 0 | 0 | 1283 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.982 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.980 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1160 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1326 | 0 | 0 | 1283 | 0 |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 88 |  |  | 138 |  |  | 380 |  |  | 281 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 2.0 |  |  | 3.1 |  |  | 5.8 |  |  | 4.3 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 62\% | 100\% | 18\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 28\% | 20\% | 55\% | 19\% | 0\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 15 | 1 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 30 | 26 | 38 | 0 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(ft) |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Link Offset(ft) |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(ft) |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |

## Intersection Summary

```
Area Type: Other
```

Control Type: Unsignalized
Intersection Capacity Utilization 19.8\% ICU Level of Service A
Analysis Period (min) 15

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 13 | 1 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 25 | 22 | 32 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 13 | 1 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 25 | 22 | 32 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - |  | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 62 | 100 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 20 | 55 | 19 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 15 | 1 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 30 | 26 | 38 | 0 |



|  |  | $4$ |  |  |  | $\frac{1}{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | * |  | 个 |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 0 | 6 | 11 | 2 | 4 | 10 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 0 | 6 | 11 | 2 | 4 | 10 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt | 0.865 |  | 0.979 |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  |  |  | 0.985 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1138 | 0 | 1593 | 0 | 0 | 1419 |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  |  |  | 0.985 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1138 | 0 | 1593 | 0 | 0 | 1419 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 30 |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 841 |  | 369 |  |  | 1508 |
| Travel Time (s) | 19.1 |  | 8.4 |  |  | 34.3 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.69 | 0.69 | 0.69 | 0.69 | 0.69 | 0.69 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 33\% | 9\% | 0\% | 25\% | 20\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 9 | 16 | 3 | 6 | 14 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 9 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Left |
| Median Width(ft) | 12 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Link Offset(ft) | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Crosswalk Width(ft) | 16 |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 | 9 |  | 9 | 15 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 14.4\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service A |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | - |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 6 | 11 | 2 | 4 | 10 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 6 | 11 | 2 | 4 | 10 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 33 | 9 | 0 | 25 | 20 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 9 | 16 | 3 | 6 | 14 |


| Major/Minor M | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 44 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 18 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 26 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.4 | 6.53 | - | - | 4.35 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.5 | 3.597 | - | - | 2.425 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 972 | 977 | - | - | 1460 | - |
| Stage 1 | 1010 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 1002 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 968 | 977 | - | - | 1460 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 968 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 1010 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 998 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 8.7 |  | 0 |  | 2.1 |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 977 | 1460 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.009 | 0.004 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 8.7 | 7.5 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{4}$ |  |  | $-\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 3 | 42 | 20 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 27 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 3 | 42 | 20 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 27 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 1 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 33 | 54 | 30 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 23 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 3 | 46 | 22 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 29 |



|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  |  |  | 4 |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |  | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 18 | 1 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 21 | 47 | 42 | 0 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 18 | 1 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 21 | 47 | 42 | 0 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.931 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.964 |  |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.977 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.974 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1349 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1354 | 0 | 0 | 1439 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.977 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.974 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1349 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1354 | 0 | 0 | 1439 | 0 |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 88 |  |  | 138 |  |  | 380 |  |  | 281 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 2.0 |  |  | 3.1 |  |  | 5.8 |  |  | 4.3 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 33\% | 0\% | 5\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 23\% | 29\% | 17\% | 20\% | 0\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 21 | 1 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 25 | 56 | 50 | 0 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 0 | 0 | 106 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(ft) |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Link Offset(ft) |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(ft) |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |

## Intersection Summary

```
Area Type: Other
```

Control Type: Unsignalized
Intersection Capacity Utilization 21.9\% ICU Level of Service A
Analysis Period (min) 15

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |  | 个 |  |  | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 18 | 1 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 21 | 47 | 42 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 18 | 1 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 21 | 47 | 42 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 33 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 29 | 17 | 20 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 21 | 1 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 25 | 56 | 50 | 0 |



|  | 7 | 4 |  |  |  | $\frac{1}{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | * |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 1 | 13 | 17 | 1 | 14 | 7 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 1 | 13 | 17 | 1 | 14 | 7 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt | 0.873 |  | 0.994 |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.997 |  |  |  |  | 0.967 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1010 | 0 | 1363 | 0 | 0 | 1481 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.997 |  |  |  |  | 0.967 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1010 | 0 | 1363 | 0 | 0 | 1481 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 30 |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 841 |  | 369 |  |  | 1508 |
| Travel Time (s) | 19.1 |  | 8.4 |  |  | 34.3 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 54\% | 29\% | 0\% | 21\% | 0\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 1 | 16 | 20 | 1 | 17 | 8 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 17 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Left |
| Median Width(ft) | 12 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Link Offset(ft) | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Crosswalk Width(ft) | 16 |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 | 9 |  | 9 | 15 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 17.9\% |  |  |  |  | Level | Service A |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 4.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Yr |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 1 | 13 | 17 | 1 | 14 | 7 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 1 | 13 | 17 | 1 | 14 | 7 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 54 | 29 | 0 | 21 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 1 | 16 | 20 | 1 | 17 | 8 |


| Major/Minor M | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 63 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 21 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.4 | 6.74 | - | - | 4.31 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.5 | 3.786 | - | - | 2.389 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 948 | 924 | - | - | 1480 | - |
| Stage 1 | 1007 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 986 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 937 | 924 | - | - | 1480 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 937 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 1007 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 974 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 9 |  | 0 |  | 5 |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 925 | 1480 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.018 | 0.011 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 9 | 7.5 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.1 | 0 | - |

## Appendix D Trip Generation Estimates

## FUTURE SITE TRIP GENERATION ASSUMPTIONS

Based on discussions with the applicant and other aggregate mining operators, the following four sources will comprise the daily trips.

## ROCK CRUSING OPERATION

- Approximate Hours of Operation
- $\quad$ Shift 1-5:00 AM to 1:00 PM (4 staff)
- $\quad$ Shift 2 - 1:00 PM to 10:00 PM (4 staff)
- Delivery of aggregate to offsite locations from 7:00 AM to 5:00 PM
- Approximately 40 truck deliveries per day.


## CONCRETE BATCH PLAN

- Approximate hours of operation - 4:00 AM to 1:00 PM
- Generates approximately 12-15 mixture loads for misc. delivery per day. Performed by 4-5 mixture trucks which are based at the site.
- 2 staff


## ASPHALT BATCH PLANT:

- Approximate hours of operation - 10:00 AM to 5:00 PM
- 2 staff
- Generates approximately 10-15 truck loads for misc. delivery per day. Performed by 4-5 mixture trucks which are based at the site.


## STAFF

- 1 scale operator and 2 clerks
- 7:00 AM to 5:00 PM staff hours.

Based on these details, the following table estimates the total number of net new trips that can be expected on a typical weekday.

|  | Land Use | Daily Trips | Weekday AM Peak Hour (7:55-8:55 AM) |  |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour (4:15-5:15 PM) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Total | In | Out | Total | In | Out |
| Rock Crushing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - | Staff ${ }^{1}$ | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| - | Rock Deliveries ${ }^{2}$ | 80 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 4 |
| Concrete Batch Plant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - | Staff ${ }^{1}$ | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Load Deliveries ${ }^{2}$ | 30 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Asphalt Batch Plant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Staff ${ }^{1}$ | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |



[^4]
## Appendix E 2042 Aggregate Resource Overlay Zone Operations Worksheets





|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  |  |  | 4 |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |  | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 17 | 1 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 33 | 31 | 42 | 0 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 17 | 1 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 33 | 31 | 42 | 0 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.916 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.945 |  |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.982 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.979 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1164 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1326 | 0 | 0 | 1276 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.982 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.979 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1164 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1326 | 0 | 0 | 1276 | 0 |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 88 |  |  | 138 |  |  | 380 |  |  | 281 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 2.0 |  |  | 3.1 |  |  | 5.8 |  |  | 4.3 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 62\% | 100\% | 18\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 28\% | 20\% | 55\% | 19\% | 0\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 20 | 1 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 39 | 37 | 50 | 0 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 87 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(ft) |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Link Offset(ft) |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(ft) |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |

## Intersection Summary

```
Area Type: Other
```

Control Type: Unsignalized
Intersection Capacity Utilization 20.9\% ICU Level of Service A
Analysis Period (min) 15

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \& |  |  |  |  |  | 个 |  |  | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 17 | 1 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 33 | 31 | 42 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 17 | 1 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 33 | 31 | 42 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 62 | 100 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 20 | 55 | 19 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 20 | 1 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 39 | 37 | 50 | 0 |



|  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 0 | 8 | 15 | 3 | 5 | 13 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 0 | 8 | 15 | 3 | 5 | 13 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt | 0.865 |  | 0.979 |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  |  |  | 0.987 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1138 | 0 | 1592 | 0 | 0 | 1423 |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  |  |  | 0.987 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1138 | 0 | 1592 | 0 | 0 | 1423 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 30 |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 841 |  | 369 |  |  | 1508 |
| Travel Time (s) | 19.1 |  | 8.4 |  |  | 34.3 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.69 | 0.69 | 0.69 | 0.69 | 0.69 | 0.69 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 33\% | 9\% | 0\% | 25\% | 20\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 12 | 22 | 4 | 7 | 19 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 12 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Left |
| Median Width(ft) | 12 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Link Offset(ft) | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Crosswalk Width(ft) | 16 |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 | 9 |  | 9 | 15 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 15.5\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | - |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 8 | 15 | 3 | 5 | 13 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 8 | 15 | 3 | 5 | 13 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 33 | 9 | 0 | 25 | 20 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 12 | 22 | 4 | 7 | 19 |


| Major/Minor M | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 57 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 24 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 33 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.4 | 6.53 | - | - | 4.35 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.5 | 3.597 | - | - | 2.425 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 955 | 970 | - | - | 1451 | - |
| Stage 1 | 1004 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 995 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 950 | 970 | - | - | 1451 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 950 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 1004 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 990 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 8.8 |  | 0 |  | 2.1 |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 970 | 1451 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.012 | 0.005 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 8.8 | 7.5 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |


|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  |  |  | 4 |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  | * |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\hat{F}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 4 | 55 | 27 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 101 | 35 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 4 | 55 | 27 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 101 | 35 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 |
| Lane Utill. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  |  |  |  | 0.905 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.965 |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  |  | 0.988 |  |  | 0.987 |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1066 | 0 | 0 | 1367 | 0 | 0 | 1443 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  |  | 0.988 |  |  | 0.987 |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1066 | 0 | 0 | 1367 | 0 | 0 | 1443 | 0 |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 114 |  |  | 94 |  |  | 318 |  |  | 378 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 2.6 |  |  | 2.1 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  | 5.7 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 29\% | 33\% | 54\% | 30\% | 25\% | 0\% | 0\% | 15\% | 23\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 4 | 60 | 29 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 110 | 38 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 107 | 0 | 0 | 148 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(tt) |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Link Offset(ft) |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(tt) |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 28.9\%Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




|  | $\rangle$ |  |  | 1 |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  |  |  |  | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 24 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 28 | 65 | 54 | 0 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 24 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 28 | 65 | 54 | 0 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 |
| Lane Utill. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.932 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.963 |  |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.976 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.973 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1344 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1352 | 0 | 0 | 1439 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.976 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.973 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1344 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1352 | 0 | 0 | 1439 | 0 |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 88 |  |  | 138 |  |  | 380 |  |  | 281 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 2.0 |  |  | 3.1 |  |  | 5.8 |  |  | 4.3 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 33\% | 0\% | 5\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 23\% | 29\% | 17\% | 20\% | 0\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 29 | 1 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 | 33 | 77 | 64 | 0 |
| Shared Lane Trafic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 | 0 | 0 | 141 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(t) |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Link Offset(ft) |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(tt) |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |

## Intersection Summary

```
Area Type: Other
```

Control Type: Unsignalized
Intersection Capacity Utilization 23.7\% ICU Level of Service A
Analysis Period (min) 15

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 24 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 28 | 65 | 54 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 24 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 28 | 65 | 54 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 33 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 29 | 17 | 20 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 29 | 1 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 | 33 | 77 | 64 | 0 |



HCM LOS B

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT | NBR EBLn1 | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | - | 734 | 1379 |


|  |  | $4$ |  |  |  | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | 个 |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 1 | 17 | 23 | 1 | 19 | 9 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 1 | 17 | 23 | 1 | 19 | 9 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt | 0.871 |  | 0.995 |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.998 |  |  |  |  | 0.967 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1005 | 0 | 1360 | 0 | 0 | 1482 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.998 |  |  |  |  | 0.967 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1005 | 0 | 1360 | 0 | 0 | 1482 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 30 |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 841 |  | 369 |  |  | 1508 |
| Travel Time (s) | 19.1 |  | 8.4 |  |  | 34.3 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 54\% | 29\% | 0\% | 21\% | 0\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 1 | 20 | 28 | 1 | 23 | 11 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 21 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 34 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Left |
| Median Width(ft) | 12 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Link Offset(ft) | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Crosswalk Width(ft) | 16 |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 | 9 |  | 9 | 15 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 18.3\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 4.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | - |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 1 | 17 | 23 | 1 | 19 | 9 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 1 | 17 | 23 | 1 | 19 | 9 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 54 | 29 | 0 | 21 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 1 | 20 | 28 | 1 | 23 | 11 |


| Major/Minor M | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 86 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 29 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 57 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.4 | 6.74 | - | - | 4.31 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.5 | 3.786 | - | - | 2.389 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 920 | 914 | - | - | 1470 | - |
| Stage 1 | 999 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 971 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 905 | 914 | - | - | 1470 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 905 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 999 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 955 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 9 |  | 0 |  | 5.1 |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 913 | 1470 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.024 | 0.016 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 9 | 7.5 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.1 | 0 | - |




| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \& |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 17 | 1 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 35 | 31 | 47 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 17 | 1 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 35 | 31 | 47 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 62 | 100 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 20 | 55 | 19 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 20 | 1 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 42 | 37 | 56 | 0 |







| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 24 | 1 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 32 | 65 | 58 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 24 | 1 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 32 | 65 | 58 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 33 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 29 | 17 | 20 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 29 | 1 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 | 38 | 77 | 69 | 0 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 4.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  | * |  |  | \& |  |  | 4 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 23 | 1 | 19 | 9 | 6 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 23 | 1 | 19 | 9 | 6 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 50 |
| Mvmt Flow | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 28 | 1 | 23 | 11 | 7 |



## DRAFT MINUTES

# TEXT AMENDMENT \#T-091-22 <br> PLAN AMENDMENT \#P-134-22 ZONE MAP AMENDMENT \#Z-321-22 

JIM HATLEY, APPLICANT ROSEMARY SCHEUNING ESTATE, OWNER

The applicant requests to expand a previously approved aggregate quarry (Scheuning Quarry) to include 25.8 acres of a 151.4 -acre site to the Umatilla County Comprehensive Plan list of Goal 5 protected Significant Sites and apply the Aggregate Resource Overlay Zone.

## UMATILLA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING AUGUST 25, 2022

DRAFT MINUTES<br>UMATILLA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION<br>Meeting of Thursday, August 25, 2022<br>$* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *$

COMMISSIONERS
PRESENT: Tammie Williams, Tami Green, John Standley \& Jodi Hinsley
COMMISSIONERS
VIRTUAL (ZOOM): Suni Danforth, Chair \& Cindy Timmons
COMMISSIONERS
ABSENT: Don Wysocki, Vice Chair, Sam Tucker \& Emery Gentry
PLANNING STAFF: Bob Waldher, Planning Director; Tamara Ross, Planner; Tierney Cimmiyotti, Administrative Assistant
$* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *$
NOTE: THE FOLLOWING IS A SUMMARY OF THE MEETING. RECORDING IS AVAILABLE AT THE PLANNING OFFICE

## CALL TO ORDER

Chair Danforth called the meeting to order at $6: 32 \mathrm{pm}$ and read the Opening Statement.

## NEW HEARING

TEXT AMENDMENT \#T-091-22, PLAN AMENDMENT \#P-134-22 \& ZONE MAP AMENDMENT \#Z-321-22; JIM HATLEY, APPLICANT/ ROSEMARY SCHEUNING ESTATE, OWNER. The applicant requests to expand a previously approved aggregate quarry (Scheuning Quarry) to include 25.8 acres of a 151.4-acre site to the Umatilla County Comprehensive Plan list of Goal 5 protected Significant Sites and apply the Aggregate Resource (AR) Overlay Zone. The subject property is on the north side of the Oregon Trail Highway, approximately 500 ft . east of the intersection of Old Airport Road and the Oregon Trail highway, just outside the City of Pendleton Urban Growth Boundary. The subject property is zoned Exclusive Farm Use. The criteria of approval are found in Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 660-023-0040 - 0050, 660-023-0180(3), (5) \& (7), and Umatilla County Development Code Section (UCDC) 152.487-488.

Chair Danforth called for any abstentions, bias, conflicts of interest, declarations of ex parte contact or objections to jurisdiction. Commissioner Standley disclosed that he will abstain from voting because he does business with Mr. Hatley. Chair Danforth called for the Staff Report.

## STAFF REPORT

Tamara Ross, Planner, presented the Staff Report. Mrs. Ross stated that in 2004, the subject property was approved to include approximately 8.8 acres under Goal 5 Inventory and has been active since that time. She added that there have been no complaints filed with Umatilla County concerning the activity onsite. The quarry provides crushed rock and aggregate to private businesses and the City of Pendleton resulting in a local source which meets Oregon

Department of Transportation (ODOT) aggregate specifications. The landowner and operator are seeking approval of a larger mining area to ensure the resource is available for years into the future.

Mrs. Ross explained that the applicant requests to expand a previously approved aggregate quarry (Westgate Quarry) to include 25.8 acres of a 151.4-acre site to the Umatilla County Comprehensive Plan list of Goal 5 protected Significant Sites and apply the AR Overlay Zone. The subject property is on the north side of the Oregon Trail Highway, approximately 500 ft . east of the intersection of Old Airport Road and the Oregon Trail Highway, just outside the City of Pendleton's Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and zoned Exclusive Farm Use (EFU).

Mrs. Ross concluded that the process of approval by the County involves review by the County Planning Commission with a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC). The decision includes a set of Precedent and Subsequent Conditions of approval. The Planning Commission is tasked with determining if the application satisfies the criteria of approval, based on the facts in the record. The BCC will also hold a public hearing and decide whether to adopt the proposed amendments. A public hearing before the BCC is scheduled for September 21, 2022 at the Umatilla County Courthouse in Pendleton.

Commissioner Timmons asked if the situation with this property being used the way it is, in the location that it is, is a result of the town growing around the established mining site. Mr. Waldher, Planning Director, stated that he does not know the history of the UGB in this specific area. He added that the applicant may be able to provide insight during his testimony.

Chair Danforth asked if the Oregon Trail goes through the subject property. Mr. Waldher stated that staff has not found any maps indicating the Oregon Trail crosses through the subject property.

Applicant Testimony: Jim Hatley, Hatley Construction, 64880 E Birch Creek Road, Pilot Rock, Oregon \& Tamra Mabbott, T.M. Consulting, LLC, 80379 Zimmer Lane, Hermiston, Oregon. Mrs. Mabbott stated that she is in attendance to assist Mr. Hatley as a favor to an old family friend. She thanked Planning Staff for their hard work preparing the Findings and stated that she doesn't have much to add. In terms of rock quarries, she states that this request is quite simple.

Mrs. Mabbott responded to Commissioner Timmons' earlier question regarding the location and whether the town grew around the established quarry, she believes this is the case. She stated that she also thought it was an odd place for a quarry but after further thought, she believes it actually works well. Mr. Hatley stated that the mining site was permitted in 2004, but rock was being extracted prior to that. Mrs. Mabbott pointed out that Mr. Hatley has
received letters of support for this request from both the City and neighboring property owners and added that there has been no concern expressed by surrounding land owners.

Mrs. Mabbott referred to a map of the property and explained that the existing quarry is 8.8 acres and has not yet been exhausted. She explained that the primary reason for this request to expand is to ensure the availability of quality, locally sourced aggregate in the area for years to come. She added that they are a primary provider of aggregate for the City of Pendleton and having the source of the material close to worksites allows for additional convenience and reduced cost of transport. She explained that Mr. Hatley would continue to use the existing ingress and egress sites for access along the highway while expanding the quarry to the north.

Mrs. Mabbott stated that there are some dwellings within the 1500 -foot buffer area, however the owner of those homes has no complaints and provided a letter of support. Mrs. Mabbott believes the activity to be compatible with the residential use on adjacent properties. She explained that Mr. Hatley owns 3 tracts of land and only has 2 CDL (commercial driver license) drivers so the daily traffic at the site is minimal. She didn't believe a traffic impact study was warranted because traffic will not be increased.

Mrs. Mabbott stated that Mr. Hatley has all required permits including his Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) air quality permit which regulates equipment used at the site. She made clear that there is no batch plant at this site and a batch plant is not being proposed as part of this request. She and Mr. Hatley have reviewed the proposed Conditions of Approval provided by Planning Staff and agree with the terms. She concluded by displaying a photo of Scheuning Quarry taken from Westgate, also known as Highway 30.

Commissioner Green asked if any farming activities are taking place on the property at this time. Mrs. Mabbott replied, no. Commissioner Green asked for more details about how the rock is being mined. Mr. Hatley stated that they use drilling and blasting to extract rock at the quarry. Mrs. Mabbott clarified that the material is not typically used to produce asphalt, it's mainly used for graveling roadways, rock face stabilization and construction purposes. Therefore, a batch plant and rock crusher are not necessary.

Chair Danforth called for any requests for the hearing to be continued or the record to remain open, there were none. The photo of Scheuning Quarry provided by Mrs. Mabbott was added to the record as Exhibit A. Chair Danforth closed the hearing for deliberation.

## DELIBERATION \& DECISION

Commissioner Williams made a motion to recommend approval of the Schuening Quarry Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment \#T-091-22, Zoning Map Amendment \#Z-321-22 \& Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment \#P-134-22 to the Board of County Commissioners
based on the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. Commissioner Hinsley seconded the motion. Motion passed with a vote of 5:0.

## MINUTES

Chair Danforth called for any corrections or additions to the minutes from the June 23, 2022 meeting. There were none. Commissioner Standley moved to approve the minutes as presented. Commissioner Williams seconded the motion. Motion carried by consensus.

## OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Waldher provided information about the proposed Nolin Hills Wind Power Project. He explained that the project plans involve development of a new wind and solar energy generation facility located on approximately 48,196 acres of private land, primarily zoned EFU. The facility is proposed to be located in Umatilla County, south of I-84, and approximately 4 miles south of Echo and 10 miles west of Pendleton.

Mr. Waldher reminded the Planning Commissioners that he attended the Oregon Department of Energy's (ODOE) public hearing to provide comments pertaining to the Draft Proposed Order for the Nolin Hills Wind Power Project back in May 2022. He provided comments to ODOE to call attention to the fact that 8 turbines fail to meet the County's land use standard which requires a 2 -mile setback from a wind turbine to a rural residence. The applicant and ODOE found in their Draft Proposed Order that they did not need to comply with the County's setback standard to residences because it is not included as part of Oregon's Statewide Planning Goals.

Mr. Waldher stated that the project is now before the Energy Facility Siting Council which is the agency responsible for overseeing the development of large electric generating facilities in the State of Oregon. Umatilla County has chosen to file a request for Petition Party Status in the Contested Case Hearing for an Application for Site Certificate. The County has retained outside legal counsel though the services of attorney Wendie Kellington, of Kellington Law Group in Lake Oswego.

Mr. Waldher read from the ODOE, Energy Facility Siting Council, OAR 345-022-0030(3) which states, "As used in this rule, the "applicable substantive criteria" are criteria from the affected local government's acknowledged comprehensive plan and land use ordinances that are required by the statewide planning goals and that are in effect on the date the applicant submits the application. If the special advisory group (in this case, Umatilla County) recommends applicable substantive criteria, as described under OAR 345-021-0050, the Council shall apply them. If the special advisory group does not recommend applicable substantive criteria, the Council shall decide either to make its own determination of the applicable substantive criteria and apply them or to evaluate the proposed facility against the statewide planning goals." Mr. Waldher explained that the County interprets this language
as a requirement for the applicant to follow Umatilla County standards. He agreed to keep the Planning Commission informed as the project progresses.

Mr. Waldher notified the group that there is no Planning Commission hearing scheduled for the month of September 2022. The October hearing has been moved up one week due to scheduling conflicts and is now scheduled for Thursday, October 20, 2022 at 6:30pm.

The October 2022 hearing will include two items for consideration; a proposal for a new aggregate quarry in west county and a request for Conditional Use approval for commercial activity in conjunction with farm use to operate a construction/ contracting business on an 11-acre EFU zoned parcel. The applicant contends they meet the standard because the work they do often serves farming operations. However, Mr. Waldher is not sure this request demonstrates a clear relationship to the essential practice of agriculture, so he is bringing it before the Planning Commission to make a final decision on the matter.

## ADJOURNMENT

Chair Danforth adjourned the meeting at 7:09pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Tierney Cimmiyotti, Administrative Assistant


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ ORS 215.296 includes approval standards. Those standards require that the proposed use will not force a significant change in accepted farm practices on surrounding lands or will not significantly increase the cost of accepted farming practices on surrounding lands. See $\S 152.061$

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Umatilla County Development Code requires a traffic impact analysis for proposals that may result in an increase in site traffic volume generation by 250 Average Daily Trips (ADT) or more (or as required by the County Engineer). The latest edition of the Trip Generation manual, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) shall be used as standards by which to gauge average daily vehicle trips.

[^2]:    216 S.E. 4 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street - Pendleton, OR 97801 - Ph: 541-278-6252 - Fax: 541-278-5480 Website: www.umatillacounty.gov/planning • Email: planning@umatillacounty.gov

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ For passenger cars, an eye height of 3.5 feet, an object height of 3.5 feet, and an observation point located 14.5 feet from the edge of the cross-street travel lane. For combination trucks, an eye height of 7.6 feet, an object height of 3.5 feet, and an observation point located 14.5 feet from the edge of the crossstreet travel lane.

[^4]:    ' Each employee was assumed to generate 2 daily trips (1 in, 1 out)
    ${ }^{2}$ Each delivery was assumed to generate 2 daily trips ( 1 exit for delivery, 1 return from delivery)

