

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF
THE SPRINGFIELD PLANNING COMMISSION
Tuesday, December 15, 2009

The City of Springfield Planning Commission met in regular session in the Council Meeting Room, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon on Tuesday, December 15, 2009, at 7:00 p.m., with Frank Cross as Springfield Planning Commission Chair.

ATTENDANCE

Present were Chair Frank Cross, Vice Chair Johnny Kirschenmann and Planning Commissioners Lee Beyer, Sheri Moore, and Steve Moe. Also present were Development Service Director Bill Grile, Planning Supervisor Linda Pauly, Administrative Specialist Brenda Jones, Assistant City Attorney Mary Bridgette Smith.

ABSENT

- None

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

- The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chair Frank Cross.

LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARING

- **Springfield Commercial and Industrial Buildable Lands Study – LRP2007-00031**

The City of Springfield proposed to adopt the draft Springfield Commercial and Industrial Buildable Lands Inventory, Economic Opportunities Analysis and the Economic Development Objectives and Implementation Strategies as part of Springfield 2030 Refinement Plan pursuant to LCDC's Economic Development goal and rule in order to carry out mandate of 2007 Oregon Laws Chapter 650 requiring Springfield to separately establish its own urban growth boundary pursuant to statewide land use goals. Applicable criteria include 2007 Oregon Laws Chapter 650, State Economic Development Planning Goals and Rules OAR 660-0015, OAR 660-009-0020, OAR 660-009-0025 as amended by LCDC in 2007, and applicable comprehensive plan policies.

The CIBL project has three components: (1) a buildable lands inventory; (2) an economic opportunities analysis; and (3) an economic development strategy. All of these elements are required to comply with statewide planning Goal 9 and the Goal 9 rule (OAR 660-009). The Economic Development Objectives and Implementation Strategies updates and builds from previous economic development planning work by the City and will be used to guide development of land use policies to implement the City's economic development vision. Previous land studies were conducted jointly with Springfield's Metro Plan partners. Adoption of Springfield-specific economic development policies and implementation actions – through adoption of the Springfield 2030 Refinement Plan – will allow the City to clearly articulate its desired economic future and its preferred land use strategies to attain that vision.

The Springfield Commercial and Industrial Buildable Lands Inventory, Economic Opportunities Analysis provides 1) an employment forecast for Springfield; 2) identification of target industries; 3) a comparison of land capacity and demand; and 4) characteristics of needed sites to determine the sufficiency of sites available for economic land uses. OAR 660-009 requires cities to maintain an inventory of land to provide for at least a 20-year supply of commercial and industrial sites consistent with local community development objectives. The analysis seeks to answer the questions:

- Which industries are most likely to be attracted to the Eugene-Springfield area?
- Which industries best meet Springfield's economic objectives?
- Which types of sites will be required by these industries?
- Does the City's inventory provide land for needed sites?

Demand for commercial and industrial land will be driven by the expansion and relocation of existing businesses and new businesses locating in Springfield. Employment is forecast to grow by 13,440 employees (a 32% increase) by 2030. The CIBL study provides technical analysis to determine the types of sites and the amount of land that would be required to provide for this future employment growth, based on the inventory of land available under existing Metro Plan designations and policies. OAR 660-009-0015(2) requires the City to identify the number and types of sites reasonably expected to be needed over the planning period. Types of needed sites are based on the site characteristics typical of expected uses.

The key conclusions in the analysis of land availability and capacity for employment uses in Springfield are:

- The majority of employment growth in Springfield will not require vacant land. Springfield will be able to meet employment land needs on sites five acres and smaller within the existing UGB, through redevelopment, infill development, and employment uses on non-employment land (e.g., home occupations). The City assumes that 52% of new employment would not require vacant land. One of the City's economic development strategies is to encourage redevelopment, especially in Downtown and Glenwood. Springfield concludes that 187 industrial sites and 340 commercial and mixed-use sites would redevelop to address land needs over the 20-year period. In addition to this assumption about redevelopment, Springfield assumes that all land needs on sites smaller than five acres would be accommodated through redevelopment. This portion of employment addresses the OAR 660-024-0050 requirements that the City consider "land use efficiency measures" prior to expanding the UGB. Policies in the Springfield 2030 Refinement Plan will articulate the City's strategies to achieve this level of infill and redevelopment.
- Springfield will need employment land with characteristics that cannot be found within the existing UGB. The employment land needs that may not be met within the UGB are for sites five acres and larger. The Economic Opportunities Analysis identifies six needed industrial sites on 450 acres and eleven needed commercial and mixed-use sites on about 190 acres to meet the city's economic development objectives over the plan period - a total of 17 sites with approximately 640 acres of industrial and other employment land on sites five acres and larger that cannot be accommodated within the existing UGB. Springfield's inventory lacks employment sites of sufficient size, location and configuration to provide an adequate competitive supply of suitable land to respond to economic development opportunities as they arise. Sites suitable for commercial and industrial land uses (flat sites, frontage on arterials, access to rail and freeways, separation from residential uses, etc.) are already developed and/or designated for these uses. The City currently has only one buildable site 20 acres or larger. Availability of sites 20 acres and larger is important for attracting or growing large businesses, which are often traded-sector businesses. If the City does not have these large sites, there is little chance that the City will attract these types of businesses. There are relatively few large sites (20 acres or larger) available near I-5 available for development in the Southern Willamette Valley and in fact no sites with these characteristics in the Eugene-Springfield area.

The City has no basis for assuming that redesignation of non-employment lands will provide the needed larger sites. Lands designated to accommodate the city's other land use categories are needed for those planned uses. The City has no basis for assuming that all of the projected 13,000 new jobs can be located via redevelopment or that the need for large employment sites can be accommodated through assembly of small land parcels. Such assumptions would not take into account existing life cycle value of buildings, on-site compatibility of new uses with existing uses or the ability of all affected parties to be able to satisfy site needs at these locations. Springfield will need to add land to its Urban Growth Boundary to accommodate forecast employment growth and provide larger sites for target industry employers if the City is to meet local community development objectives.

Adoption of the study will establish a clear economic development direction that identifies the city's strengths and opportunities, and its position in the broader Southern Willamette Valley region. Adoption of the study will facilitate employment opportunities and job creation in Springfield by identifying industrial/employment land needs and developing an economic development strategy aimed at selected target industries.

Planning Supervisor Linda Pauly provided the staff report. She reported the purpose of the hearing was to accept testimony on the draft work products of the Commercial and Industrial and Buildable Lands (CIBL) Study. They included the Springfield Commercial and Industrial Buildable Lands Inventory, Economic Opportunities Analysis and the Economic Development Objectives and Implementation Strategies. The products were prepared by the City's consultant ECONorthwest and staff in collaboration with the CIBL Stakeholder Advisory Committee and

the CIBL Technical Advisory Committee. The Planning Commission and City Council had reviewed and refined the work in progress. The study was informed by the results of an online Community Development Survey, two community visioning workshops, and interviews with stakeholders and staff representing affected agencies such as Oregon Department of Transportation and Department of Land Conservation and Development. The survey results and draft work products of the study were available for viewing at public open houses. Drafts of all interim work products and documentation of the CIBL Stakeholder Committee process were posted on the Planning Division web page throughout the project. A summary of the stakeholder process was included in the packet as Attachment 3. The public record was available at the hearing.

Ms. Pauly reviewed the scope of the notice for the hearing.

Ms. Pauly noted the applicable criteria. She emphasized that Springfield's response to the deficiencies identified in the study were not the subject of the hearing, nor were possible amendments to the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). She stated that the Springfield Commercial and Industrial Buildable Lands Inventory, Economic Opportunities Analysis and the Economic Development Objectives and Implementation Strategies would eventually be incorporated into a future action to amend the Metro Plan – the Springfield 2030 Refinement Plan. The joint planning commissions of Springfield and Lane County would conduct public hearings on the UGB alternatives analysis and Springfield 2030 Refinement Plan in early 2010.

Ms. Pauly entered into the record a Letter sent to Springfield via email from Sid Friedman, 1000 Friends of Oregon dated December 15, 2009, and noted that copies were provided to the commission.

TESTIMONY FROM THE AUDIENCE:

- **Rick Satre** – 1326 Wimbledon Place, Springfield, a planning consultant and resident, commended the good work that had been done. He was neutral in respect to the materials before the commission, but wanted the commission to consider market place and choice as it proceeded. If the City was attempting to predict employment demand, which was then translated into land need, Mr. Satre believed it needed to be careful not to be overly specific about the demand projection. He said a healthy economy needed choice and too much specification might drive a potential business to locate elsewhere in the metropolitan area. He recommended the City avoid having a minimum amount or too tight of a number for land need. Mr. Satre believed it was acceptable for Springfield to consider a range of employment objections and suggested that staff communicate with Portland Metro, which was considering a range approach.
- **Dan Egan** – 850 North 6th Street, Springfield, Director of the Springfield Chamber of Commerce, noted he was also a member of the CIBL stakeholders committee. He emphasized the importance of the project to the future of Springfield. He asked the commission to adopt the findings and forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council. He was concerned that the 20-year population projection was too low and noted his advocacy for larger parcels of land to be made available. He said that currently, Springfield was not able to respond to companies that needed large sites. Mr. Egan noted the growth that occurred in the Gateway Center and suggested that the growth that occurred in the next 20 years should somewhat resemble the growth of the last 20 years. He thought that Springfield was a better city for having PeaceHealth, Symantec, Pacific Source, and Royal Caribbean, and said none would be here without the availability of land. He did not think that such future growth would be accommodated somewhere along Main Street. Mr. Egan agreed that the market would dictate how the community looked in the next 20 years. He said if Springfield provided the market with a place to act, it would do what it did best, which was to maximize the acreage that it had for jobs.
- **Teresa Bishow** – 2911 Tennyson Avenue, Suite 400, Eugene, represented Arlie and Company. She noted Arlie's focus on sustainable business and green business projects. She noted the company's ownership of a parcel on the east side of Bob Straub Parkway immediately south of the city limits. That investment decision was based on the 1999 Jasper-Natron Plan and the support of City staff, who believed it was suitable for a mixed use project. The site was within the UGB and was currently planned for low-density residential use; however, it was zoned industrial. She was unsure the City had examined lots that were designated for commercial and industrial use but constrained by zoning regulations. The buildable lands inventory examined physical constraints but she did not believe it was sufficiently thorough in regard to plan-zone conflicts. As an example, she cited the Child Center on Marcola Road, which was designated heavy industrial but zoned public land and open space. The inventory included the vacant portion of the campus as available to meet future growth, but industrial uses were not permitted under the zoning, and industrial uses would be incompatible with a child care center. Ms. Bishow

asked the City to examine the scope of the problem as it moved forward and to design a strategy that corrected the plan-zone conflicts. She also asked the commission to examine the Jasper-Natron Plan and determine how the project could help implement the vision for the area, which was a significant future growth area for Springfield. She asked the commission to focus on the vision rather than the numbers and concurred with Mr. Satre the State law allowed the City to look beyond specific numbers and to develop strategies designed to foster particular outcomes. She provided some information about her company's property to the commission.

Ms. Pauly reported that staff had done extensive work to reconcile existing plan-zone conflicts and to determine which plan-zone conflicts could be resolved through this planning process. She acknowledged that not all were included but staff would be addressing all of them in the future.

- **Michael Farthing** – PO Box 10126, Eugene, also commended the planning effort. He agreed with Mr. Egan that the population projections were too low and recommended that issue be reexamined. He also supported the remarks of Mr. Egan, Mr. Satre, and Ms. Bishow. He represented Gordon Webb, owner of 500-600 acres in the Jasper-Natron area, and about half was included in the UGB and half was outside the UGB. He asked how the Jasper-Natron Plan was being incorporated into the planning project.

In response, Ms. Pauly indicated the Jasper-Natron Plan had been put on hold while the inventory was being conducted. The City did not want to redesignate land in Jasper-Natron based on the ten-year old draft plan until the inventory was completed to determine what the City's needs were today. Since the inventory was completed, she anticipated the City would examine that plan for potential changes. Mr. Webb's property included land inside and outside the UGB, while the Arlie property was immediately adjacent to the city limits and inside the UGB.

Ms. Bishow expressed concern that the Arlie property would not be examined during the alternatives growth analysis because the property was outside the city limits. She urged the commission to consider uses inside the UGB as well as the city limits as the industrial designation on her company's property precluded the mixed use development it hoped to construct.

CLOSE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Chair Cross closed the public hearing and acknowledged the receipt of the communications from 1000 Friends and Ms. Bishow.

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION

Commissioner Beyer noted the many hours he and Commissioner Kirschenmann put into the project before the Commission. He reminded the commission that the project must be adopted by both Springfield and Lane County and acknowledged by the State, and for that reason it contained many compromises. He agreed that the population projections were inadequate and reminded the commission that under State law, once the City finished the process, it had the ability to update the plan. He spoke to the concerns expressed by 1000 Friends and suggested that in reality, when large companies who provided lots of jobs sought sites they did not have a choice between a site in Glenwood or downtown Springfield versus a site outside the UGB; their sites were not limited to Eugene-Springfield but included other communities in the northwest, and they were happy to go where they could find land to meet their needs. He did not think the City wanted to be in the position of denying its citizens those employment opportunities. Mr. Beyer recalled the development of the initial Metro Plan, which resulted in the identification of eight special light industrial sites that eventually developed in spite of the fact some had environmental constraints. At that time, those sites were beyond what the trend analysis showed what the community needed to have, but the community had argued it was choosing to pursue different types of development, which justified the sites. Although the planners had been wrong about some of the assumptions, overall those sites had served the community well and provided thousands of jobs.

Commissioner Beyer recalled his work on economic development in the community and the fact that there were few large 20-acre sites to show companies, and consequently those businesses chose to go elsewhere. He believed that some large parcels needed to be added to the inventory to take advantage of such opportunities.

Speaking to small business expansion, Commissioner Beyer questioned the projection that 52 percent of jobs would be filled in existing businesses on existing land. He suggested that the number was too small. However,

he thought that by and large, the numbers were fair, and would give the community room to grow. He pointed out that if the City designated more acres than it needed, they would simply not be developed.

Commissioner Kirschenmann said that being on the CIBL committee was a big eye opener for him and he had learned a great deal. He agreed with Commissioner Beyer and said he was a proponent of more, larger parcels. He was also concerned about the population projections. He believed that the City was doing a good job with redevelopment and acknowledged it took more time. He thanked staff for its support.

MOTION

Commissioner Kirschenmann, seconded by Commissioner Beyer, moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve the determination set forth in the Commercial and Industrial Buildable Lands Inventory, Economic Opportunities Analysis as presented herein, Case LRP2007-00031 The motion passed, 7:0:0

Responding to a question from Commissioner Cross regarding the status of the Jasper-Natron Plan, Mr. Grile indicated the draft plan had never proceeded to adoption and implementation. He said the 2030 Refinement Plan would be the controlling document that would guide the implementation of other plans, such as the Jasper-Natron Plan and the existing plan-zone conflicts. Ms. Pauly indicated that staff had looked at the impact of plan implementation on the buildable lands inventory and determined it would not have much of an impact on how much land was available for anticipated needs. What would be different was the location of various uses. Mr. Grile indicated that if a property owner wished to submit a land use application to redesignate and rezone property, the City would process it like any other application and bring it to the commission; however, he could not recommend that the commission move that property or any other property legislatively.

BUSINESS FROM THE AUDIENCE

- None

BUSINESS FROM THE DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTOR

- None

REPORT OF COUNCIL ACTION

- None.

BUSINESS FROM THE COMMISSION

- Responding to a question from Commissioner Moe about the land development charges assessed to Hyland questions, Mr. Grile acknowledged that the City's fees were very high and were designed to recover 80 percent of costs. Many factors went into the fees, including the amount of impervious surface, and that pushed Hyland's fees to six figures. The council had a work session on the item and directed staff to hire a consultant to review the fees and return with some recommendations. Staff was in the process of developing a Request for Proposals. He indicated staff would provide the Agenda Item Summary for the work session to the commission.

ADJOURNMENT

- The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Minutes recorded by Brenda Jones