

SE GRAND AVE:

On the SE Grand Ave vacation, has anyone found out if Multnomah County has any concerns about the vacation given its Sellwood Bridge work/investment in the area?

We spoke with Mike Magee, PBOT's Liaison to the County's Sellwood Bridge Project, and based on his comments, we required that the Petitioner reduce the vacation area to exclude the new bike / pedestrian ramps that were constructed as a connection from the Tacoma to Grand Ave. (which leads to the Springwater Corridor).

The additional right-of-way the County acquired along Tacoma is not affected by the vacation, and my understanding is at least some of the new Tacoma sidewalk will be transferred to the City.

Is there any concern with keeping the width of SE Grand consistent? Looking across SE Spokane on the map it looks like the right of way will be narrower on one side than the other.

PBOT's reviewers did not express any concerns about the width of Grand. In this block, Grand's use by vehicles is minimal, so traffic lanes, etc. were not a concern.

Does existing sidewalk run the length of Grand in this area and will the sidewalk be in right of way or on private property after the vacation?

The existing sidewalk on the west side of Grand is currently in the public right-of-way. On the east side of Grand, there is no sidewalk, nor was there any plan for a sidewalk, due to the steep geography and to a BES storm water facility (which is remaining as a public facility).

Re-development of the property on the east side of Grand, owned by the petitioner, could involve reconfiguring the slope and geography, including the retaining wall. So, at the time of a development proposal, the City would be able to review the plans and decide if something different was needed based on what development was being proposed.

SE HARRISON:

What is the rush on the second vacation proposal? Why not give the neighborhood time for input? The staff report concludes no neighborhood plan considerations but the letters suggest better notice could have been provided.

Several members of the City Council have asked us to expedite this vacation process. I believe it's due to R2DToo having to move from where they are at now since that property is being sold.

The original comment deadline for groups who received notice (including the neighborhood association) was November 16, but when they commented on their inability to send a response, we offered that they could send written comments as late as November 30 and still have them included in the report to the PSC. (We often provide extensions on the comment deadline, both to City staff and to external groups.)

Does East Side Plating use the street for access required by Plating's land use permit(s)? Where will ESP get its second egress if the street is not a public street

One of ESP's egresses (required by a 2011 Permit) exits out on to OMF's property. (The triangular lot labeled as Lot 3 and Lot 4 on the attached aerial photo map.) ODOT condemned on this parcel for the Mt. Hood Freeway, which was eventually cancelled. The parcel was used for staging for the reconstruction of the MLK Viaduct, and when the parcel was no longer needed, ODOT sold it to OMF.

Assuming OMF develops the property as planned, they were planning to provide ESP a 10 foot wide buffer corridor from their emergency exit to SE 3rd Avenue. A representative of BDS informed me that this would likely be sufficient from their viewpoint. I do not think there is currently an adequate alternate egress.

ESP has also used Harrison St. and the triangular lot for parking and chemical deliveries by tanker truck. ESP has limited options for on-street parking on SE 3rd and surrounding streets, and although more costly and less desirable, ESP can receive chemical deliveries on the opposite end of its building on SE Stephens St.

