

MINUTES

JOINT PUBLIC HEARING OF
SPRINGFIELD AND LANE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSIONS
Springfield Library Meeting Room
225 Fifth Street—Springfield

February 2, 2010
6:00 p.m.

SPRINGFIELD PLANNING COMMISSION: Frank Cross, Chair; Johnny Kirschenmann, Vice Chair; Lee Beyer, Steve Moe, Sean VanGordon, Sheri Moore, members; Linda Pauly, Greg Mott, Bill Grill, staff.

LANE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION: Robert Noble, Chair; Tony McCown, Vice Chair; Lisa Arkin, Steve Dignam, George Goldstein, Nancy Nichols, Joseph Siekiel-Zdzienicki, John Sullivan, members; Kent Howe, Stephanie Schulz, staff.

Mr. Noble convened the meeting.

Mr. Cross called the Springfield Planning Commission to order.

Mr. Noble called the Lane County Planning Commission to order.

Planning Commissioners introduced themselves.

1. BUSINESS FROM THE AUDIENCE

2. WORK SESSION

A. EUGENE-SPRINGFIELD METROPOLITAN AREA PLAN (METRO PLAN AMENDMENT):

- SPRINGFIELD 2030 REFINEMENT PLAN LRP2009-00014 AND
- SPRINGFIELD DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS LRP2009-00015

Linda Pauly provided the staff report. She distributed a DVD containing the public record assembled to date for the Metro Plan Amendment, adding that all materials would be available on the City's website. She offered a PowerPoint presentation entitled *Springfield and Lane County Planning Commissions Joint Work Session February 17, 2010* and distributed copies of the presentation to commissioners. She presented an overview of the Springfield 2030 Refinement Plan and related Springfield Development Code Amendments and facilitated a discussion of:

- The relationship of the SRP to the Metro Plan.
- The relationship of the SRP to Eugene's concurrent planning process.
- The relationship of the SRP Diagram to the Metro Plan diagram and Springfield's existing neighborhood refinement plans.
- How proposed SRP policies would supplement and refine Metro Plan policies and how SRP policies would be applied.

- How proposed development Code Amendments would implement Land Use Efficiency Measures.
- The status of Springfield's land inventories and UGB Alternatives Analysis and their relationship to the SRP and upcoming proceedings to adopt the SRP.

Mr. Mott explained the SRP work began in 2004 when the Lane Metro Partnership presented information to elected officials that the inventory of commercial and industrial sites was not sufficient to accommodate the level of interest seen by the partnership. In 2005, the Lane County Home Builders Association (HBA) raised the same issue related to residential land with the City Council. The City and the HBA subsequently undertook a joint evaluation of residential lands east of I-5. In 2007, the Oregon State Legislature enacted H.B. 3337 requiring Eugene and Springfield to conduct a buildable lands determination by January 1, 2010, and to adopt separate urban growth boundaries (UGBs). The City Council determined that an analysis of the residential land was insufficient and directed staff to inventory commercial, industrial, public, park, open space, and schools. The City of Eugene was going through a similar process, the Eugene Comprehensive Lands Assessment (ECLA). Although one option was to totally amend the Metro Plan to reflect new circumstances that existed for the City of Springfield, the City chose to create a refinement of the Metro Plan. He emphasized the City was not turning its back on the Metro Plan and its policies.

Mr. Mott said the proposed refinement plan would go out to the UGB because the rest of the community deserved a level of specificity not previously available. GIS had advanced beyond what it was in 1982 and record keeping for land use activities, developments and permits was current to 2008 because two stakeholder groups evaluated what lands the City had and what it would need for the next 20,000 people who lived and worked in the City of Springfield for the next 20 years. Additionally, there was a requirement by the State that the City of Springfield create its own UGB. When all of these pieces were evaluated, the Metro Plan amendments and refinement plan offered the best way to achieve the desired goals.

Mr. Beyer understood if there was a conflict between the Metro Plan and a refinement plan the Metro Plan governed. He asked how the new refinement plan fit into that procedure.

Mr. Mott understood the neighborhood refinement plans needed to be revisited but the integrity of those plan diagrams combined with the proposals for the Metro Plan were still consistent. Stakeholders would be contacted and engaged in discussions about the future of the neighborhood refinement plans. He added several possible amendments to the Metro Plan had been drafted regarding why the cities were undertaking the work and what it would mean to the Metro Plan.

In response to Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki, Mr. Mott said Springfield's objective was not to exclude Eugene from its process. The statute stated Eugene could not participate in the establishment of the UGB but it would participate in any amendment to the Metro Plan that explained what Eugene and Springfield were doing.

Mr. Dignam urged commissioners to make sure that conflicting rules that were difficult to interpret and created barriers for the public were not created through this planning process.

Mr. Kirschenmann asked if the SRP would supersede Springfield's other nine refinement plans.

Mr. Mott said the SRP diagram would apply in all of the refinement plan areas while the refinement plan policies would remain in place.

Mr. Mott said the joint elected officials directed staff to update five areas of the Metro Plan. That work would be incorporated into the work underway in Eugene and Springfield on the H.B. 3337 requirements and land inventories work. He added both Eugene and Springfield were building their own transportation system plans to replace TransPlan. They would be amendments to the Metro Plan and nested in the federal transportation system plan document.

Ms. Pauly said the Metro Plan amendments would go to the Joint Elected Officials in July, and reviewed the schedule to move the proposals forward.

In response to Mr. Noble, Mr. Mott said commissioners could submit questions to staff via e-mail on the materials for the February 16 and 17, 2010 meetings.

Mr. Cross adjourned the Springfield Planning Commission at 7:20 p.m.

Mr. Noble adjourned the Lane County Planning Commission at 7:20 p.m.

(Recorded by Linda Henry)