



MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Sambo Kirkman, Senior Planner

DATE: September 9, 2020

SUBJECT: Appeal of the Director's Decision to Approve the Public Transportation Facility Application for the Walker Murray Road Improvements Project (APP2020-005)

At the September 16, 2020 meeting the Planning Commission will hear an appeal of the Director's decision to approve PTF2019-004, the Public Transportation Facility (PTF) application for the Walker Murray Road Improvements Project.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

On April 19, 2019, the applicant, Washington County, submitted Public Transportation Facility (PTF2019-0004), Sidewalk Design Modification (SDM2019-0009) and Tree Plan Two (TP2019-0006) land use applications to improve the intersection of SW Walker Road and SW Murray Boulevard. The project would to add additional left turn lanes, dedicated right turn lanes, an additional southbound lane on Murray to SW Bowerman Drive, bike lane and sidewalk improvements, replace existing bridges, and other associated improvements. On July 17, 2020, the Director approved the applications (PTF2019-0004/ SDM2019-0009/ TP2019-0006). An appeal from Marc San Soucie and Mark Fagin was received on July 22, 2020 (Exhibit APP1.1) for the PTF application. Supplemental testimony was provided by the appellants on August 28, 2020 (Exhibit APP1.2) and has been incorporated into this memorandum.

The arguments raised by the appellants include concern about the addition of "slip lanes" within the intersection. The applicant's proposal describes the proposed right turn lane at the northwest and southeast corner of the intersection as "channelized right-turn lanes." While the terminology has been used interchangeably, staff would like to clarify that slip lanes generally are separated turn lanes that allow a vehicle to avoid an intersection controls, allowing free-flow traffic movement and are not generally controlled by any traffic signals. The applicant's proposed channelized right-turn lane includes the addition of a signal and other measures to control the turning movement. To simplify the review of this proposal for Commission, staff's analysis addresses the applicant's design as a channelized turn lane and not a slip lane as it is the most appropriate term for the proposed design.

APPEAL OF A TYPE 3 DECISION REQUIREMENTS: (50.65 of the Beaverton Development Code):

50.65.2 Within Seven (7) calendar days after an appeal has been filed, the Director shall determine whether an appeal contains at least the following information:

A. The case file number designated by the City.

Staff Finding:

The appellant identified PTF2019-0004 in their appeal packet received July 22, 2020: application.

Staff finds this requirement has been met

B. The name and signature of each appellant.

Staff Finding:

The appellants, Marc San Soucie and Mark Fagin (jointly referred to as “appellant”) signed the appeal form.

Staff finds this requirement has been met

C. Reference to the oral or written evidence provided to the decision-making authority by the appellant that is contrary to the decision.

Staff Finding:

The appellant references their testimony provided in response to the applicant’s submittal which was included as Exhibits 2.1, 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 in the Director’s Decision dated July 17, 2020 (Exhibit APP5.1). These exhibits provide testimony that is contrary to the Director’s Decision.

Staff finds this requirement has been met.

D. If multiple people sign and file a single appeal, the appeal shall include verifiable evidence that each appellant provided written testimony to the decision-making authority and that the decision being appealed was contrary to such testimony. The appeal shall designate one person as the contact representative for all pre-appeal hearing contact with the City. All contact with the City regarding the appeal, including notice, shall be through this contact representative.

Staff Finding:

The appeal packet was submitted by two parties of record, Mark Fagin and Marc San Soucie. Both have provided testimony and have designated Mr. San Soucie as the primary contact.

Staff finds this requirement has been met

E. The specific approval criteria, condition, or both being appealed, the reasons why a finding, condition, or both is in error as a matter of fact, law or both, and the evidence relied on to allege the error.

The appellant in their initial submittal identified the following approval criteria being appealed: BDC Sections 40.03.2.A, 40.03.2.B, 40.03.2.C, 40.03.2.E, and 40.57.15.1.C.4. In their supplemental testimony dated August 28, the appellant makes multiple assertions in their appeal identified in the record as Exhibits APP1.2. The applicant's project team provides written responses to the appellant's assertions which are identified in the record as Exhibits APP2.1, APP2.2, and APP2.3 in this memorandum. Information provided by the applicant applicable to the assertions of the appellant are summarized in the findings below.

In the findings below staff only responds to the appellant's assertions of error and does not provide a re-analysis of the original decision (PTF2019-0004) in full. Staff incorporates by reference the findings in the Director's Decision dated July 17, 2020 (Exhibit APP5.1) in their entirety. Staff has provided references to the PTF analysis in the July 17 document where applicable.

Assertion 1: The standards of the City's Engineering Design Manual (EDM) do not specify the design and configuration of the intersection proposed by the applicant, therefore the design should be based on other established City plans and policies.

The appellant contends that the City's adopted plans and policies, such as the Active Transportation Plan, Context Sensitive Design Policy, the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element, ADA requirements and the EDM, are intended to increase the city's focus on the rights, safety and concerns of pedestrians in transportation and development projects. These policies should be taken into consideration in the design of the intersection, specifically the channelized turn lanes.

Applicant's Response:

In a letter dated September 4, 2020 from Daniel Kearns (Exhibit APP2.3), the applicant's project team concurs with the appellant that Beaverton does not "dictate" design standards for intersection; however Mr. Kearns points out that the Code provides only basic approval criteria leaving the specific intersection designing to the design professionals and engineers. As part of the Facilities Review Committee the City Transportation Engineer has the discretion to determine if the proposal meets the technical requirements as identified in the Facilities Review Approval Criteria.

Staff Findings:

The City's Active Transportation Plan (Resolution No. 4487, February 4, 2018) and Context Sensitive Design Policy (Resolution No. 4559, February 12, 2019) are intended to further inform multi-modal amenities in the City's transportation network in both its own capital projects and through future development. However, the policies, which were adopted by resolution, have not yet been incorporated into the Transportation System Plan (TSP).

The TSP was last updated in September 2010 (Ordinance No. 4551). The policies adopted in the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan implement the TSP, and guide development towards the goals of increasing variety in transportation options, enhancing livability, and creating a balanced multimodal system. However, staff find that the policies within the Active Transportation Plan, Context Sensitive Design Policy, and the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element are not directly applicable to the review of the PTF application.

The policies established as part of the TSP are the Comprehensive Plan Policies that must be addressed under Facilities Review Approval Criterion 40.03.2.a, which reads:

The transportation facility, as proposed or modified, conforms to the Transportation System Plan.

Staff determined in the Director's Decision dated July 17, 2020 that "Based on the information provided by the applicant, the City Transportation Engineer concurs with the applicant's project team that the proposed project design is consistent with the goals of the transportation system plan for this intersection." Further, staff found that the design does not preclude compliance with ADA standards and have included conditions of approval to ensure the project's compliance with these Federal regulations.

Assertion 2: Transportation projects require land use approval; thereby placing the authority with the City for the design of the transportation facility.

The appellant states that Senate Bill 100 and case law has affirmed that transportation facilities require land use approval. Further, the appellant asserts the land use process provides gives discretion to the City Transportation Engineer and the City to determine the design of the roadway.

Staff Finding:

The PTF application is identified as a Type 2 land use application in Section 40.57 of the Beaverton Development Code (BDC) with the intent to, "Establish a process for review of new construction or significant expansion of major transportation facilities." Staff concur with the appellant that the proposal is subject to land use approval as it meets the thresholds established in BDC Section 40.57.15.1.A

However, staff do not concur with the appellant that having land use authority to review certain transportation projects affords City staff the authority to determine the final design of a County transportation facility. Pursuant to BDC Section 50.40.11 and as required by state law, the decision-making authority for this PTF application may only make a decision based on the facts and findings related to the approval criteria laid out in BDC Section 40.57.10.1.C.

There are seven (7) approval criteria for the PTF application. Of the seven approval criteria, two are related to the design of the transportation facility with limited design parameters. These two criteria are:

BDC 40.57.10.C.4: *“The proposal meets all applicable design standards for the classification of the subject road as specified by the Engineering Design Manual and Standard Drawings unless the applicable provisions have been modified by the City Engineer by a separate process;*

BDC 40.57.10.C.5: *“The alignment of the new or extended transportation facility is consistent with the general location shown in the Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element.”*

The Director’s decision dated July 17, 2020 determined that the proposed facility meets the applicable design standards for the classification of the subject roads (both of which are Arterials), and that the alignment for the proposed improvement is consistent with the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive plan.

Pursuant to BDC Section 40.03.2, the City’s Facilities Review Committee is required to make findings as to whether the proposal meets desired technical outcomes identified in the approval criteria, such as safety, efficiency and connectivity. The criteria are written to achieve specific desired outcomes and not to prescribe specific design treatments. The Committee reviewed the proposed intersection design as well as supporting documentation furnished by the applicant, Washington County, including traffic analyses and engineering manual references to find that the proposal does in fact meet the technical criteria within BDC Section 40.03.2 as demonstrated in the Director’s Decision dated July 17, 2020.

Assertion 3: The discretion of the City Engineer is not consistent with the clear direction of Criteria 40.03.2.B and E regarding safe, efficient and direct pedestrian circulation.

The appellant reasons that the City Engineer has some discretion in addressing the design of the intersection. However, the discretion should not impact the clear direction provided in these two Facilities Review criteria – specifically, the safe, efficient, and direct design of the intersection, which the appellant believes are not provided with the channelized right turn lanes.

Applicant’s Response:

In the memorandum from Tony Roos, P.E. dated September 4, 2020 (Exhibit APP2.1), the applicant’s project team outlined the rationale for the proposed design of this intersection and explained how the project team determined that their proposed channelized right-turn design would improve pedestrian safety when crossing the turn lanes. The purpose of the channelized right-turn lanes was to enhance pedestrian visibility and to address the skewed angle of the intersection. The proposed design included features to improve the pedestrian experience. In a memorandum from Mr. Roos, a table was provided listing the pedestrian features included in the design, the benefits of the feature and why the features are distinct from design of other channelized turn lanes.

Staff Finding:

Pursuant to Section 10.95.3 of the BDC, the Facilities Review Committee provides the decision maker with a recommendation on an application related to the technical requirements of a project. The membership of the Facilities Review Committee consists of, "... persons with the technical expertise in and responsibility for technical issues including, but not limited to, land use, transportation, utilities, police, and fire." (BDC 10.59.3.A). This includes the City Transportation Engineer. As the subject matter experts, the Committee reviewed the PTF proposal under the Facilities Review approval criteria in BDC Section 40.03.2. Further, the applicant has provided a technical memorandum outlining the safety measures associated with the proposed channelized right-turn lanes (Exhibit APP2.1). Staff find it appropriate that the City Engineer used his professional and technical discretion, based on the information provided by the applicant, to assess whether the proposal to improve the Walker/Murray intersection meets the Facilities Review approval criteria. Based on the facts and findings in the Director's Decision dated July 17, 2020 (Exhibit APP5.1), the memorandum from the City Transportation Engineer dated September 8 (Exhibit APP5.2), and the memorandum from the applicant dated September 4 (Exhibit APP2.1), staff support the Facilities Review Committee determination that Criteria 40.03.2.B and E were met.

Assertion 4: The proposed design goes beyond the design intentions for this intersection outlined in the City's Transportation System Plan (TSP).

The appellant states that while the TSP identified certain improvements for this intersection (TSP project 10570/ Intersection #17), it did not include the addition of channelized right turn lanes. Further the city has not included this design element in other intersection designs, while other agencies, like ODOT, have removed them at certain locations.

Staff Finding:

The City's TSP, which was last updated in September 2010 (Ordinance No. 4551), complies with the Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) chapter 660-012, also known as the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR), which is a highly prescriptive set of rules outlining local government's responsibilities for land use and transportation planning across the state. Specifically, OAR 660-012-0020 describes the elements of the TSP. Subsection (3) of this rule describes the requirement for local jurisdictions to adopt a system of "planned transportation facilities, services and major improvements." The TPR only requires: "A description of the location of planned facilities, services and major improvements, establishing the general corridor within which the facilities, services or improvements may be sited. This shall include a map showing the general location of proposed transportation improvements, a description of facility parameters such as minimum and maximum road right of way width and the number and size of lanes, and any other additional description that is appropriate." (OAR 660-012-0020 (3)(c)). Staff finds that the broad project description within the TSP, that the appellant cites, in their submittal, is an acceptable planning-level description for the purposes of complying with the state-required TSP, and that this broad description does not preclude the County from making additional design refinements using its own design standards, as well as common engineering standards, if they are not specifically called out in the brief TSP project description.

Furthermore, the TPR makes a distinction between “Transportation Project Development,” which is the planning process to determine specific design elements, alignments, and other final engineering details for a transportation improvement project. The TPR defines “Transportation Project Development” as “implementing the transportation system plan (TSP) by determining the precise location, alignment, and preliminary design of improvements included in the TSP, based on site-specific engineering and environmental studies.” 660-012-0020. Staff concludes that the planning process by which the County began designing the Walker/Murray intersection improvements is considered a transportation project development, and that it is entirely appropriate for the County to refine the intersection’s design at this time.

Staff cite the findings in the Director’s Decision as applicable to the removal or installation of other channelized right-turn lanes. Factors for the removal and the installation of this design feature are on a case-by case basis. The applicant’s proposal to include the channelized turn-lanes for this project was based on improvements to the roadway which balanced the needs of vehicles and pedestrians outlined by the applicant’s materials. As stated in the Director’s Decision:

“When specific engineering design standards or requirements are not available or are silent on a design feature, the City reviews the methodology and the engineering judgement that the applicant’s traffic engineer uses to determine the appropriateness of the design and asks if it meets the adopted intersection performance standards, as well as the intent of the TSP and EDM.”

In reviewing the materials provided by the applicant, staff concurs that the proposed design of the roadway is consistent with the City’s transportation goals.

Assertion 5: The County’s design is not consistent with City policies and regulations.

The appellant asserts the proposed design does not provide pedestrian safety and convenience and therefore does not meet the following City policies and regulations: BDC Section 60.55.20.4.E.2 and Section 60.55.25 and Comprehensive Plan Policies 3.1.1.a and c, Policy 6.2.1.g, and Policy 6.2.2.d.

Staff Finding:

Staff cite the findings in the Director’s Decision for the PTF application (Exhibit APP5.1) as applicable to the appellant’s assertion. Staff in their findings concurred that the comprehensive plan policies help to guide development towards the goal of an improved multi-modal transportation system, but they do not provide specific implementing standards. While there are no specific City standards that address the use of channelized right-turn lanes, the final design of the intersection was reviewed by the Facilities Review Committee to determine if the design addressed the applicable BDC standards and applicable Comprehensive Plan policies. The appellant contends that pedestrian comfort and convenience were not prioritized in staff’s review. In fact, staff considered the safety provided by the pedestrian island and determined that while additional distance may be added with the channelized turn lane design, the benefits of reducing the exposure time

of pedestrians in the “through movement traffic”, and the amenities such as raised crosswalks and signalized turn lane would improve the comfort and convenience of pedestrians. The City Transportation Engineer reviewed the proposal and concurred with the applicant’s project team that, as designed, the proposal is consistent with the goals of the City’s TSP to improve this intersection not only for vehicles, transit, and bicycles, but for pedestrian use as well.

Assertion 6: The use of the channelized right turn lanes is not necessary since this design is intended for improving turning movements for trucks. The turning movements at this intersection utilizing the channelized turn lanes are less likely to be used by trucks.

The appellant reasons that with the restriction on trucks using SW Walker Road eastbound from this intersection and the lack of industrial uses west of SW Murray Boulevard, there is not a need to improve truck turning movements at this intersection, and therefore no need for channelized right turn lanes.

Applicant’s Response:

In the memorandum dated September 4 (Exhibit APP2.1), the applicant’s project team stated the design would improve the turning motion for trucks, but emphasized that the proposed intersection improvements, with the channelized right-turn lanes, are designed to improve pedestrian visibility and to break up the long crossing for pedestrians based on the geometry of the intersection.

Staff Finding:

The appellant asserts that channelized turn lanes are intended for improved truck movement and are not needed based on the submitted traffic data. However, the applicant’s narrative discusses that the intent of the project is to bring the arterial roadways of Walker Rd and Murray Blvd up to current standards (BDC Section 40.57.15.1.5) for all modes of transportation and not just for trucks. The noted benefits to freight within the applicant’s narrative are the addition of the new through travel lanes, which allow additional lanes for other vehicles to move around the slower moving trucks (see applicant’s response to freight-related Comprehensive Plan policies in BDC 40.03.2.A). Both the channelized and non-channelized turn lanes at this intersection have been designed to improve the turning movements of trucks so they are not required to drive into oncoming vehicle lanes or onto sidewalks, as described in the applicant’s supplemental information dated September 4 (Exhibit APP2.1). The design of the channelized turn lane includes pedestrian focused features such as signalization of the turn lane, raised crossings, and narrower radii for a maximum design speed of 18 mph. This shows the overall proposal will improve the functionality of the intersection not only for large vehicles like trucks, but for pedestrians as well.

Assertion 7: The design is based on pedestrian data related to pedestrian counts during commuting hours and does not consider the “nature of pedestrian traffic in this area.”

The appellant explains that based on context-sensitive design, staff should have considered how the intersection functions for pedestrians, taking into consideration that the peak use of the intersection for pedestrian is outside the peak vehicle commute times.

Staff Finding:

Staff concurs with the appellant that pedestrian count data within the submitted traffic analysis is limited. However, the methodology for traffic impact analysis in the BDC does not require that pedestrian count data be collected. It is common practice (and acceptable to the BDC standards regarding traffic analysis) to require traffic counts for the peak travel times only. The applicant's analysis is consistent with the information typically provided with a PTF application. The context-sensitive design approach is moot, as the policies related in this document focus on how the City evaluates upcoming capital improvement projects and does not implement standards for developments such as the Walker/Murray project.

Assertion 8: *The current design already compromises pedestrian comfort with narrower sidewalks.*

The appellant reasons that the approval of the Sidewalk Design Modification already shows the design compromises on pedestrian comfort over vehicle design.

Staff Finding:

The Sidewalk Design Modification application requested a modification to the City standards for the entire project area, not the specific area associated with the channelized right-turn lane. The reasons associated with the modification of these standards include the following:

- Minimize impacts on adjoining properties where additional right-of-way acquisitions would be needed.
- Avoid existing parking structure and sound wall.
- Minimize slope impacts to properties adjacent to the proposed improvements and minimize significant grading and retaining wall impacts on adjoining property owner.
- Minimize impact to the natural resources with improved bridge crossing to minimize impact on sensitive areas or preserve existing trees.

These reasons were not specific to the design of the channelized right-turn lanes. Further, the appeal submitted by the appellant is in response to the PTF application. The appellants did not submit a second appeal for the Sidewalk Design Modification application that was stated approved in the Director's Decision dated July 17, 2020 and therefore the Sidewalk Design Modification approval cannot be revisited by this appeal.

Assertion 9: *The proposed channelized turn lane design may be less safe than if the channelized turn lane were removed.*

The appellant acknowledges that safety is a complex issue but states the use of the channelized right turn lane can be less safe for pedestrians based on the information provided by agencies such as the Oregon Department of Transportation.

Applicant's Response:

The applicant's project team in their memorandum dated September 4 (Exhibit APP2.1) states the design is supported by studies of channelized right-turn lanes and that there is the potential for fewer pedestrian safety problems as compared to right-turn lane approaches. Further, the proposed design, which includes the signalized right-turn lanes "...maximizes the accessibility of the crossing for people with vision disabilities." The applicant's memo outlines design features used in the development of the proposal that are improvements to older right-turn lane designs that included:

- Narrowing the right-turn lane width;
- Edge hatching to narrow the appearance of the curb-to-curb width;
- Crosswalk is perpendicular to the right turn lane at the crossing;
- The right turn lane is fully signalized and signed with No-Turn -on Red;
- Stop bar is prior to the cross walk; and
- The angle of the right turn lane is 110-degrees, lowering vehicle speeds (maximum speed design is 18 mph).

Staff Finding:

The appellant references a chapter from a document titled, "Signalized Intersections: Informational Guide" published by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), which states that channelized right turn lanes often have intersections with large turning radii, thus allowing for faster vehicle speeds as they travel through intersections. Staff does not disagree with this statement. However, the proposed design for Walker/Murray does not have large turning radii. In the supplemental memo provided by the applicant, dated September 4, 2020, the applicant states the maximum design speed of the right turn lanes are 18 mph. Additional safety features included dedicated signals and a raised crosswalk that functions like a speed hump that effectively reduces fast turning movements. In the applicant's supplemental memo, the project team provided additional reasoning for the proposed design that factored in pedestrian needs such as those of visually impaired persons. As discussed in the Director's Decision, there is a significant amount of information generated by various agencies on the advantages and disadvantages of utilizing channelized right turn lanes with no specific standards established. However, in most cases, the focus on the benefits or detriment in using the channelized turn lanes stem from how the turn lanes are designed. The applicant in the materials provided for the Director's Decision, as well as in their September 4, 2020 supplemental memorandum, have outlined a design that staff finds addresses concerns related to pedestrian-vehicle conflicts.

Assertion 10: The proposed design trades pedestrian convenience for truck convenience.

The appellant states the following:

- The proposed design requires dual separate signal or combined signal cycle that results in a longer travel time for pedestrians.
- While the pedestrian refuge added to the channelized turn lanes will reduce the distance a pedestrian is exposed to traffic, the overall crossing distance is increased and require pedestrians to cross the "slip lane."

- The channelized turn lane does not prevent vehicles from moving in excess speeds through the turn, creating a potential conflict with pedestrians crossing the lane.
- The design prioritizes vehicle directness and convenience over pedestrians.
- The channelized turn lane is designed for a larger truck profile than is common in this area.
- The design is meant for some other type of location and not this location. Murray/Farmington is a more consistent design for this type of intersection.

Applicant's Response:

In the memorandum dated September 4, 2020 the applicant's project team addressed the appellant's assertion with the following points:

- While the pedestrian refuge adds additional crossing distance and may require additional time to cross with two pedestrian signals, the pedestrian island provides a better-defined space for the pedestrian, with less exposure time for crossing pedestrians in the through movement traffic, and allows pedestrians, including those who are visually impaired, to not be exposed to vehicle conflicts at a right-on green (pedestrians aren't allowed to cross) or right-on red (vehicles aren't allowed to turn).
- The propose design includes amenities that are less convenient for vehicles than pedestrians, such as elevated crosswalks in the channelized turn lanes to reduce vehicular speed and signalized right-turn lanes with "no-turn on red" signs restricting right turn movements at these channelized turn lanes.
- The proposed design does accommodate truck turning movement but has been designed with narrower lane width (13 feet) and a maximum design speed of 18 mph, which is not qualified as a "high-speed turning movement."
- In the supplemental figure provided (Exhibit APP2.3) the Murray/Farmington and Murray/Walker intersections were overlaid, showing the intersections are not the same scale and that based on the size of the intersection would require an additional 12 feet of crossing for a pedestrian at the Murray/ Walker intersection as compared to the Murray Farmington intersection if the pedestrian island, as part of the channelized turn lane, were not used.

Staff Finding:

Based on the materials provided by the applicant in their original PTF application and the supplemental memo dated September 4, staff's supports the findings made in the Director's Decision that the channelized right turn lanes for this project are appropriate and finds the design incorporates features that improve pedestrian crossing for a busy intersection. While the design may add some additional distance to the overall crossing, the additional distance is minimal when weighed against the safety provided.

Staff finds that the Director did not err in fact or law in findings that the approval criteria for the public transportation facility had been met.

F. The appeal fee, as established by resolution of the City Council.

Staff Finding:

Staff finds that the applicant has paid the required fee of \$250 for one appeal. The appeal fee was set by the City Council as part of the Planning Division fee schedule consistent with the requirements of ORS 227.175.10.b.

Staff finds this requirement has been met.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission **DENY** the **Appeal of the Director's Decision to Approve the Public Transportation Facility Application for the Walker Murray Road Improvements Project (APP2020-005)**, thereby affirming the Director's Decision approving the Public Transportation Facility Application for the Walker Murray Road Improvements Project (PTF2019-0004).

EXHIBITS

Exhibit APP1 – Appellant Materials:

- APP1.1 Appeal Submittal by Marc San Soucie and Mark Fagin received July 22, 2020
- APP1.2 Supplemental Written Testimony by Marc San Soucie received August 28, 2020

Exhibit APP2 – Applicant Materials:

- APP2.1 Appeal Response on behalf of Washington County by Tony Roos, Kittelson & Associates, received September 4, 2020
- APP2.2 Appeal Response on behalf of Washington County by Daniel Kearns, Reeve Kearns Attorneys at Law, received September 4, 2020
- APP2.3 Murray/Farmington and Murray/Walker Overlay Plans, received September 4, 2020
- APP2.4 Application Packet for PTF2019-0004

Exhibit APP3 – Public Comment:

No additional public comment received to date.

Exhibit APP4 – Agency Comment:

No additional agency comment received to date.

Exhibit APP5 – Supplemental Staff Materials

- APP5.1 Director's Notice of Decision date July 17, 2020
- APP5.2 Memorandum from Jabra Kasho dated September 8, 2020.