

Documentation of the CMP Impact Committee's Matrix

Mission Statement

The mission of the CMP Impact Committee was to evaluate all proposed secondary access routes and rate each one as to how closely each proposed route adheres to the Comprehensive Master Plan (CMP).

Methodology

To accomplish this task the committee read through the section of the CMP that applies to Perry Park Ranch and picked out five items that the committee felt applied to a permanent second access road. A vote was then taken on each of these items to pick the matrix weight. The committee then discussed how well each proposed route adhered to that section of the CMP and then voted on a score for each item.

Committee Members

Tony Lucas
Jim Matchett
Bev Carson

Item one, Discourage SUA Expansion, was taken from page 4-24 of the Douglas County 2020 Comprehensive Master Plan (see below).

Expansion of these areas is generally not supported; however, in some cases limited expansion may be supported based on a compelling public benefit, such as supporting the fiscal health of metropolitan or special districts and lowering overall indebtedness and tax rates for residents. In addition, limited expansion may be supported when a transfer of development credits offers a benefit to the County, including enhancement of community-separation buffers or elimination of inappropriate zoning.

The committee has been told by County Planning that in general the more impact that a road has on agricultural land the more likely that land can be brought into the SUA and be zoned for higher density development. The scoring for this item is based on how much impact each route has on the surrounding land that is not currently in the SUA. Route 4 was given the highest score because of the fact that it does not go through any land that can be developed. Route 5 was given the next highest score because it follows property lines for most of its length. Routes 2 and 7 were given the same lower score because they do to some degree follow property lines, but less so than route 5.

Routes 3 and 6 were given the lowest score because both routes go right through the middle of parcels that are used as agricultural land.

Item two, Support Fiscal Health of Special Districts, was taken from page 4-34 of the CMP Document (see below)

Policy 4-10B.3

Support efforts to ensure the fiscal health of special districts.

The Perry Park Water and Sanitary District is the special district that is primarily affected by growth and we felt that routes 6 and 7 would add the most water taps because they would create small islands of agricultural land that would be difficult to use for anything except residential lots. Routes 2, 3, 5 would likely produce larger lots that may or may not be served by the Water District so they were given a lower score. Route 4 scored the lowest because it would not add any lots. The Metro District is currently financially stable and would remain so regardless which route is chosen.

Item three, Support Public Safety and Establish Second Access, was taken from page 4-33 of the CMP Document (see below).

There are three important public safety issues in Perry Park. The first is the need to establish one or more secondary emergency access routes for Perry Park.

Route 2, which has the highest score for our third criteria, was chosen because we felt that it had the ability to handle the most traffic flow and it was located in the middle of Perry Park Ranch. Route 3 was given a lower score because it runs southeast and exits on 105 closer to Red Rock Dr. Route 5 was given the same score as route 3 because its advantage of exiting onto 105 at Tomah is offset by its start at the far north of the park. Both 3 and 5 are further away from Red Rock Dr and would likely be less affected by smoke if the fire was near the front of the park. Route 7 is closer to Red Rock Dr so it was given a lower score than 3 or 5. Routes 4 and 6 were given the lowest scores because of their proximity to Red Rock Dr.

Item four, Preservation of Large Ranches, was taken from page 5-6 of the CMP Document (see below)

Rural land uses, such as large ranches and farms, are supported in the Nonurban area for the value they bring in conserving the County's rural character. The County, through the Plan, supports residents' desire to stay on the land (see Goal 5-1 for more information). Some large landholdings have been divided into 35- or 40-acre residential tracts. Such land parceling is exempt from County subdivision review by State law. The occurrence of such practices increased dramatically in the 1990's, and led to the adoption and enforcement by

the County of the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 299 standards, as amended by the Board of County Commissioners. These standards apply in rural areas for the purpose of establishing water supply requirements for fire fighting, driveway standards for emergency vehicle accessibility, defensible space standards round structures to minimize the threat of wildfire, as well as access and emergency evacuation.

Route 4 had the highest score for our fourth matrix item because it would not affect any ranch land. Route 6 was given the next highest score because it only affects one large ranch and is close to the south property line. Route 7 was given the same score because it is also close to the property line of one large ranch. Route 5 was given a lower score because while it does follow property lines for much of its length it does cut into a large ranch near its intersection with 105. Routes 2 and 3 were given the lowest score because they both go through the middle of large ranches.

Item five, Minimize Environmental Impact, was taken from page 4-4 of the CMP Document (see below).

OBJECTIVE 4-4A

Minimize the impact of development on the natural terrain.

Policy 4-4A.1

Locate development away from environmentally and visually sensitive lands, including primary ridges, bluffs, and horizon lines.

Route 4 had the highest score for our last matrix item because it requires the least road construction and has no major road cuts. Route 4 also has the least impact on view shed, vegetation and continuous habitat. Route 6 was given the next highest score because it requires more pavement than 4 but less than the other routes. Routes 3 and 7 were given a lower score because both would add about the same amount of pavement and have one bridge. Routes 2 and 5 got the lowest score because route 5 requires two bridges and the longest segment of road to be built and route 2 requires large road cuts with a long road segment.

Conclusion

The final scores for the routes were as follows:

1. Route 4 with 178
2. Route 7 with 174
3. Route 6 with 160
4. Route 2 with 138
5. Route 5 with 136
6. Route 3 with 124