

## MINUTES

Springfield Planning Commission  
Work Session  
Springfield City Hall  
Jesse Main Room  
225 Fifth Street, Springfield

March 4, 2003  
6 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Marilyn Phillips, Chair; Steve Moe, Vice Chair; Tim Malloy, William Carpenter, jr., Jim Burford, Greg Shaver, members; Mel Oberst, Mark Metzger, City of Springfield staff; Joe Leahy, City Attorney.

**ABSENT:** Lee Beyer, member.

Commissioner Phillips called the Springfield Planning Commission Work Session to order at 6 p.m.

1. **Natural Resources Inventory Update**

***The Planning Commission last considered the Natural Resources Study (NR Study) on October 2, 2001. At that meeting, "significant criteria" to be used in identifying important natural resource sites was considered and various changes were recommended to Council. The City Council received the Commission's recommendations and after a very thorough discussion, approved a revised set of significance criteria that addressed the Commission's issues while maintaining the support of the other jurisdictions.***

Mr. Metzger, Senior Planner, referred to a staff memorandum entitled *Natural Resources Inventory Update* and gave a brief overview of the history of the Natural Resources Study and the Natural Resources Inventory, the current status, and upcoming issues during the public involvement process. He also distributed a document entitled *Springfield Natural Resources Study*. He described the steps the City would follow to comply with the statewide planning Goal 5 requirement to inventory natural resources within its area. Mr. Metzger explained the City was currently at Step 1 and once sites were selected using the significance criteria and the inventory was adopted, it would set in motion a follow-up analysis, community input in determining the value of sites, and assist in future development decisions.

Mr. Metzger stated that an inventory of significant sites had been adopted as part of the Metro Plan and distributed excerpts from the plan listing those sites.

According to Mr. Metzger, the revised significance criteria recommended by the Commission and approved, with some changes, by the City Council were rejected by the City of Eugene. Lane County had adopted an entirely difference approach. Therefore, he said, staff concluded that each jurisdiction would act independently on the technical parts of the natural resource inventory and coordinate at the Metro Plan level on policies that transcended any one jurisdiction. He noted that the Commission's first public hearing on significance criteria would be on April 15.

Commissioner Moe arrived at 6:08 p.m.

Mr. Metzger said technical guidance had been received from the Department of Land Conservation and Development and the Department of Geology and Mineral Industries addressing what should be on the inventory and how to handle certain types of sites such as quarries. He said that protection measures and development standards for sites included in an approved and still viable master plan would be honored for the life of the plan. Those sites would be identified in the inventory. He also said Lane County had decided to treat all natural resource sites that were outside of the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) under the "safe harbor" provisions of state law. Mr. Metzger said staff recommended retaining sites adjacent to, but outside of, the UGB on the City's inventory.

Commissioner Moe observed the UGB should be extended to the river to allow the City to control and protect those lands, but those areas were not included when the UGB was established because of fear they would be developed.

Mr. Metzger said because the inventory would include sites within the city limits and outside city limits, but inside the UGB, staff recommended adoption of an inventory and eventually a natural resources plan using separate sets of ordinances for sites inside the city limits and sites outside the city limits. The sites outside the city limits would need to be approved by the County. In response to a question from Commissioner Burford, Mr. Metzger explained that by agreement with the County, the City had jurisdiction over land outside the city limits and inside the UGB for planning purposes, but if zoning or development code standards were changed, the County must be involved and approve the changes.

Mr. Leahy clarified the County had ceded to the City, through an intergovernmental agreed, jurisdiction over land outside city limits and inside the UGB and that agreement specified which of the City's code provisions could be applied. He said in some instances code application was based on the jurisdiction of the municipal court, which extended only to the city limits.

In response to a question from Mr. Shaver, Mr. Metzger explained the County would make decisions regarding lands outside of the UGB and had granted the City planning decision authority for lands inside the UGB, but outside the city limits. He reiterated that the County Commission would have approval over those planning decisions.

Mr. Metzger reported that in compliance with Measure 56, a written notice would be sent to all property owners and residents whose land is proposed for inclusion on the inventory, as well as property owners and residents within 300 feet of the proposed sites. He said the adoption of a natural resources inventory would in effect amend the Metro Plan.

Mr. Metzger said the Commission would address many of the same issues raised during a City of Eugene public hearing in December, including:

- Is the inventory too old - much of the work was started in the 1980s and some areas may have subsequently been developed
- Is the wildlife habitat assessment scoring system set at an appropriate level
- What should or should not be on the inventory – quarries or master plan areas
- Should manmade waterways be included – distinguish between natural features that had been modified, using historic vegetation map, and waterways that were wholly manmade

Mr. Metzger cited the portion of the Millrace west of the pond and sections of the Q Street Ditch as examples of manmade waterways that should be retained in the inventory.

Mr. Metzger concluded his presentation by stating that parallel with the adoption of the inventory, staff proposed forming an advisory committee to assist with the rest of the project. He said that part of the process involved considering the environmental, social, economic and energy consequences of allowing development to occur on the inventoried sites and would be further explained in the proposed Citizen Involvement Plan.

Commissioner Carpenter noted that the header text of Item 4 on page 2-2 of the staff memorandum referred to areas larger than two acres, while the rationale stated a one-acre size. Mr. Metzger said the two-acre reference was correct and the rationale text would be changed to reflect that.

Commissioner Phillips adjourned the Work Session at 6:40 p.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)

\\CESRV900\MINUTES\2003\CITY OF SPRINGFIELD\PLANNING COMMISSION\CSPCWS030304.DOC