

MINUTES

JOINT WORK SESSION OF
SPRINGFIELD AND LANE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSIONS
City Council Chambers
230 Fourth Street—Springfield

April 20, 2010
6:00 p.m.

SPRINGFIELD PLANNING COMMISSION: Frank Cross, Chair; Johnny Kirschenmann, Vice Chair; Lee Beyer, Eric Smith, Sheri Moore, Steve Moe, Sean VanGordon, members; Linda Pauly, Greg Mott, Bill Grill, Steve Hopkins, staff; Mary Bridget Smith, Bill Van Vactor, City Attorney.

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, Matt Laird, Stephanie Schulz, staff.

Commissioner Cross convened the meeting.

1. BUSINESS FROM THE AUDIENCE

There was no business from the audience.

2. LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS—Continued meeting from March 16, 2010.

- Metro Plan Amendment, Springfield 2030 Refinement Plan LRP2009-00014;
- Springfield Development Code Amendments LRP2009-00015;
- Lane County PA 09-6018.

Co-Adopters: The City of Springfield and Lane County
Staff: Greg Mott and Linda Pauly, City of Springfield
Stephanie Schulz, Lane County

Commissioner Cross explained the purpose of tonight's meeting was to conduct the deliberation phase of the legislative public hearing continued from March 16, 2010. The public hearing testimony was closed on March 26, 2010, thus no new evidence would be presented tonight. The commissions would consider the evidence at hand to make recommendations to the elected officials.

Commissioner Cross opened deliberations for the Springfield Planning Commission.

Commissioner Noble opened deliberations for the Lane County Planning Commission.

Commissioner Moe arrived at 6:05 p.m.

Commissioner Cross stated the plan for this evening was to develop a consensus regarding Action Items detailed in Attachment 1, *Decision Matrix for April 20 Joint Planning Commission Meeting* included in the Planning Commission Transmittal Memorandum published for this meeting. Commissioners reviewed the process for this evening's deliberations.

Commissioner VanGordon arrived at 6:10 p.m.

Commissioner Beyer observed a number of individuals had requested that their properties, most of which were residential, be redesignated or rezoned. However, those requests did not fit this process although many of the requests made sense to Commissioner Beyer. He asked if there was a process that could follow the current one that would allow the City to address those issues.

Ms. Pauley Springfield Planning Supervisor said the City currently offered a process that would allow for property owners to request zone changes.

Mr. Mott Springfield Planning Manager added the Planning Commission could recommend that the elected officials consider making changes on a site specific basis to be included with the actions for the Metro Plan, Refinement Plan and Development Code recommendations. If the City Council decided to do that, staff would prepare findings. Staff could make no promises what it would do post 2030 Refinement Plan adoption that would capture those changes. The commission was aware the City needed to revisit all of the refinement plans and to look at the Main Street corridor related to plan zone conflicts, varying densities, in conjunction with existing requirements related to access management on that road.

Ms. Pauley offered a PowerPoint presentation on Attachment 1. She facilitated a discussion of:

- Issue 1, *Co-adopt Eugene-Springfield Metro Plan Amendment: Springfield 2030 Refinement Plan (LRP 2009-00014/PA 09-6018)*.

--Action Item 1: Residential Land and Housing Element

Commissioner Moore asked how many people have suggested that although the data indicated there was a sufficient supply of low and medium residential land, it may not be in the right place, or some property owners would like to see their property brought into the UGB. She asked if the plan as written was to be implemented and if in the future it was determined there was a need for more residential land, would it be possible to revisit the needs analysis.

Mr. Mott said the State of Oregon would require periodic review of the plans to evaluate their effectiveness seven to ten years after their adoption. The Metro Plan policy required an annual report to determine the inventory. The City of Springfield could initiate an amendment prior to periodic review if circumstances called for it. It was likely that periodic review would include a review of the residential land inventory.

Mr. Grile Springfield Development Services Director added it was customary in other jurisdictions for individual land owners to seek amendments to the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB).

Commissioner Cross asked commissioners whether they agreed or disagreed with the recommendation for Action Item 1.

Commissioner McCown believed the use of up zoning was appropriate and agreed with the recommended action.

Commissioner Smith thought the City had erred in being too conservative in estimating future growth and questioned whether there were sufficient buildable lands. Based on the available data, he begrudgingly agreed with the recommended action.

Commissioner Goldstein expressed a deep mistrust for consultants and was concerned about how the figures came about. The entire process was so complex that one could only set goals that would evolve over time.

Commissioner Moore thought time would show the figures too conservative. However, based on the information available, she agreed with the recommended action.

Commissioner Siekiel-Zdzienicki would go with the numbers, noting Springfield needed to be conservative due to land use constraints.

Commissioner Moe noted the data said 90 acres would support 6,000 units. He questioned where that number of units would be located.

Commissioner Dignam did not support Action Item 1. He had great confidence in the work of ECONorthwest and was sure they did an outstanding job on this project. Based on the evidence in the record, he thought there was insufficient residential land, which concerned him. While members of the development and builder community brought a bias to the process through their testimony, he said the development and builder community was closer to the issue than anyone else, and perhaps offered a greater level of expertise that had been overlooked. There were not sufficient residential lands and would respond “No” to Questions 1, 2 and 3.

Commissioner Beyer had been part of the process related to residential, commercial and industrial lands for three years. He asserted the details and methodology of the work of ECONorthwest was solid work. He said ECONorthwest used a conservative number that came from the Lane County study which underestimated the projections. He opined forecasts were always wrong. Commissioner Beyer would support Action 1 because the process needed to be completed. Success of the process depended on Springfield being able to achieve the needed densities. Most of the densities were intended to come from land management techniques. The task forces that worked on the project looked at approximately fourteen criteria established by the State, twelve of which Springfield had already met. The hope was that those techniques that had worked moderately well in the past would work better in the future. If the techniques did not work, the process could be reviewed and changed in the future. Although the City had enough land for the next five years, the land focused on was predominately in the hills and expensive to develop. It was difficult to develop affordable housing which was an issue for him.

Commissioner Arkin would support the Action Item as a fact based proposal. She recalled that the redevelopment proposal reviewed by the Lane County Planning Commission had been exciting, with an affordable housing component. She thought it smart to forecast in a conservative manner, which she preferred to pulling back at some point in the future. The proposed development along transportation corridors was smart.

Commissioner VanGordon echoed the sentiment that the proposal was too conservative, but the commissioners needed to accept the facts before them. He thought the proposal conservative due to the change in the housing market during the last few years which drove down the forecast data. Since forecasts were always wrong, the City could move forward and revisit as the housing market improved.

Commissioner Nichols would support Action Item 1 based on the information provided to commissioners.

Commissioner Sullivan would support Action Item 1, primarily to move it forward. It was a responsibility for the Lane County Planning Commissioners to work hard to provide a complete record for review by the elected officials.

Commissioner Kirschenmann, as a member of the commercial/industrial task team, echoed Commissioner Beyer’s comments. He stated ECONorthwest was a sound firm. Commissioner Kirschenmann was also concerned with the conservative estimates, and would have preferred the figure remain at 1.2 rather than .9. Builders were always concerned that they could not find lots to buy on flat land.

Commissioner Noble would support all three Questions in Action Item 1. He too was concerned about the amount of residential land available which would push the City of Springfield to be thoughtful about development processes. He was concerned about the ramifications of constrained UGBs for both the City of Springfield and the City of Eugene as well as for Lane County. He asked if would mean more rural development, or more development in Creswell, Cottage Grove, Veneta, Coburg, which would negatively impact the transportation systems. He agreed the City of Springfield was geographically constrained and thought needed to be given to where the City would push out and for what purposes. The proposal before the commissions was compliant with State law.

Commissioner Siekiel-Zdzienicki inquired about Question 3, *Do the proposed Implementation Actions address housing needs*, bullet 6. He asked if this was proposed because the land was difficult to develop due to the high number of property owners in the Glenwood Riverfront Plan District.

Ms. Pauley responded that the proposal under development by the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) and the consultant team would show that people wanted to see a residential neighborhood in Glenwood. There would be commercial uses as well.

--Action Item 2: Economic Element

Commissioner McCown was leaning towards “No” on Action Item 2. He was skeptical of the need for 640 acres for employment sites larger than 20 acres. He preferred to see rezoning or upzoning of existing sites to redevelop some properties to meet the need. He agreed that larger sites throughout the region were needed for industrial lands.

Commissioner Smith supported Action Item 2 to assemble larger manufacturing sites for examples discussed in the visioning process for 2030. It was not affordable to use a piecemeal process to assemble sites. It was prudent to allow for 20 acre sites for larger uses. He suggested 600 acres may not be enough land for a 20 year period, noting he saw this proposal as more accurate than the residential proposal.

Commissioner Goldstein was concerned with the broad brush approach being used for the differing uses of retail, manufacturing and industrial, especially for infrastructure needs. He was not uncomfortable with the amount of land, but was uncomfortable with the lack of goals for the land use. He could not say yes to Action Item 2 until he saw a better focus on the infrastructure needs.

Commissioner Moore was concerned about the regional aspect of the economic element, noting employment did not need to be in Springfield for Springfield’s residents. She did understand that it would be beneficial for the City to have a better tax base offered by commercial and industrial land. She was torn because she did not want to have an industrial complex along the river, but she saw a need to move forward.

Commissioner Siekiel-Zdzienicki would not support Action Item 2. He iterated his concern about the amount of constrained land. The current proposal would use 600 of the 2,000 available acres through this process. Staff had said that density of employment per acre was not a requirement, but because the City was limited he thought employment density needed to be used as a factor for sites over 20 acres. He said he would not support any action until he had seen Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) maps that showed the location of the flood plain related to development along the river.

Commissioner Cross noted that the economic element was not whether the City would expand the UGB or where that expansion would occur, but rather whether or not there was a need in Springfield for additional commercial/industrial land. The location of any expansion would be covered under Action Item 3.

Commissioner Moe said FEMA maps were always changing. He supported Action Item 2 because the City hoped to attract larger employers in the future, but larger sites were needed to accommodate their needs.

Commissioner Dignam would support Action Item 2. There was a need for additional commercial/industrial land. While upzoning or enforcement of higher density employment requirements may be desirable on the City’s part, if the private sector did not like that or could not make use of it, nothing would happen. If the commissions wanted to ensure that the plan would meet Goal 9 for development, the commissions needed to be willing to be flexible to accommodate employment needs. The record justified an increase in commercial/industrial land.

Commissioner Beyer stated the proposal was reasonable proposal. ECONorthwest put as much attention into the commercial/industrial side as it did the residential side of the proposal. Most of the small commercial needs were being met through redevelopment of Glenwood. Most of the larger sites consisting of 250 to 300 acres identified in the original Metro Plan for the Gateway area, including Sony, PeaceHealth, and others, had been developed. A major strength in the Springfield area was it was one day’s truck drive from California and Seattle. Distribution was a good business for Springfield. Warehouse work provided good wages and provided good opportunities around the freeway. The City had asked the Metro Partnership and the State Economic Development Authority for their input, and both agencies reported they had many clients who were interested in locating in Oregon, and in the Eugene/Springfield metropolitan area in

particular, but there was not enough land available that met their needs. This moderate proposal would support jobs for our children in the future.

Commissioner Arkin would not support Action Item 2 based on assumptions that could not be supported. The predictions for economic growth were overstated and did not consider the availability of vacant, large industrial sites along I-5 and in Junction City, for which there was not a demand. There was currently a push from the State and federal government to reduce the transportation needed to move goods over longer distances and to site things closer to centers. She added the study did not adequately account for a majority of employment in the small business sector and for the growth of small farms. The study assigned too few jobs per acre and was not a good use of highly constrained land. The cost of developing large parcels of land, and extending City services to them was a questionable use of funds. A number of people who submitted comments pushed for creation of an urban renewal district, and this option had not been adequately explored.

Commissioner VanGordon supported Action Item 2. It would help meet the realistic economic needs of the City and the region. Springfield and Eugene were the economic power horse of Lane County. Having pro-growth policies and accepting the ECONorthwest needs forecast provided industry a chance to have access to sites that would make them competitive. The advantage of Eugene and Springfield was the proximity to the transportation corridor and the existing opportunities. If Springfield and Eugene did not have the needed 20 acre sites available, businesses would site in the smaller communities, and the region as a whole would pay the price through an additional demand on the transportation plan.

Commissioner Nichols did not see a need for 640 acres, but the addition of some larger sites was justified. The policy should encourage redevelopment.

Commissioner Sullivan would support Action Item 2. Although 640 acres initially sounded like a big number, it sounded more realistic when put in the context of 20 years and the context of the cost to support the development in terms of water, sewer, fire protection and other services. The Attorney General said the decision needed to be site based and not employee based.

Commissioner Kirschenmann would support Action Item 2, adding if you build it, they will come. He strongly supported redevelopment of existing sites, and thought the City was doing a good job to encourage redevelopment. The facts supported Action Item 2.

Commissioner Noble said if redevelopment was too expensive, there were no incentives, or there were barriers such as encroachment, noise or transportation, developers would not develop sites. He understood the City of Springfield initiated the current process because there was a lack of sufficient land to attract employers. It was important for any development to be thoughtful. I-5 would be a transportation corridor for many years beyond the 20 year period being examined. Although 640 acres seemed like a large number, Commissioner Noble would support Action Item 2.

Commissioner Beyer stated if there was no demand for the sites, they would remain undeveloped as open space.

Commissioner Moore appreciated everyone's comments and would support Action Item 2.

Commissioner Cross summarized the commissions' votes on Action Item 2. The Springfield Planning Commission supported Action Item 2 with a 7:0 vote, and the Lane County Planning Commission was split 3:5, with Commissioners Dignam, Noble and Sullivan supporting the item, and Commissioners Arkin, Goldstein, McCown, Nichols, and Siekiel-Zdzienicki opposing the item.

The Planning Commissions took a break from 7:15 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.

--Action Item 3: Urbanization Element and Springfield Urban Growth Boundary

Ms. Pauly directed commissioners to Questions 11 and 12.

In response to a question from Commissioner Arkin, Ms. Pauly explained the term “newly urbanizable” referred to new lands brought into the UGB. “Urban holding area” was a concept the City proposed so that newly urbanizable land brought into the UGB would be designated urban holding area. If the owner wished to urbanize, annex and develop that property, the owner would be required to go through a plan amendment process to amend the Metro Plan and the Springfield Refinement Plan.

Commissioner Arkin understood there was a staff proposal to designate an urban holding area that would prohibit parcels smaller than 10 acres.

In response to a question from Commissioner Beyer, Mr. Grile added the plan amendment process would not be a complete Goal 12 analysis but would satisfy Goal 14 criteria.

Commissioner Cross called for commissioners’ to state their support or opposition to Questions 11 and 12.

Commissioner Noble was unsure.

Commissioner Kirschenmann supported Questions 11 and 12 based on the information available information.

Commissioner Sullivan stated the findings in the record were clear and supported Questions 11 and 12.

Commissioner Nichols likely would support Questions 11 and 12.

Commissioner VanGordon supported Questions 11 and 12.

Commissioner Arkin was unsure whether she supported Questions 11 and 12.

Commissioner Beyer supported Questions 11 and 12.

Commissioner Dignam supported Questions 11 and 12.

Commissioner Moe supported Questions 11 and 12.

Commissioner Siekiel-Zdzienicki did not support Questions 11 and 12 based on issues he raised previously. He said although the Attorney General, DLCDC, and other legal people said it was not the commissions’ role to address employment density, he felt it did need to be addressed when dealing with constrained areas.

Commissioner Moore supported Questions 11 and 12 since the efficiency issues had been addressed.

Commissioner Goldstein supported Questions 11 and 12.

Commissioner Smith supported Questions 11 and 12.

Commissioner McCown supported Questions 11 and 12. He added the issue of employment density was an issue of whether or not it was legal, since it was clearly legal, but it was a policy issue.

Commissioner Beyer stated there was no legal way to deal with the employment density issue, noting businesses were either a permitted use or they were not. There were no government restrictions on the minimum number of employees.

Commissioner Cross asked those who were unsure of their support if there was a piece of information missing.

Commissioner Nichols said the documentation provided by the City seemed reasonable but she was not absolutely sure it was totally correct. She thought this was more of a City of Springfield issue than a Lane County issue.

Commissioner Noble recalled that the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCDC) representative provided a lengthy response to the Springfield code revisions and efficiency measures. Although the City Planning

Director's response had clarified most of the issues identified, there were a few unresolved issues. He felt the City would adequately address those unresolved issues.

Ms. Pauly directed commissioners to the concept maps, Map 6 (Priority 1 Lands for UGB Expansion), Map 7 (Springfield Land Use Concept 1), Map 9 (Springfield Land Use Concept 2) and Map 11 (Springfield Land Use Concept 3) distributed at this meeting. She stated ECONorthwest said Concept Maps 1, 2 and 3 met the intent of the law. Commissioners were asked to select a preferred concept.

Commissioner Sullivan stated Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 197 referred frequently in the documentation provided to commissioners to prioritization. He said Seavey Loop appeared to be the only option with exceptions of approximately 70 acres. He opined Seavey Loop could not be considered if those exceptions were not identified.

Mr. Grile explained how the exception lands were identified on the maps. Those were the only areas the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) agreed were exception areas when the Comprehensive Plan was adopted. He averred the only way to bring 640 acres into the UGB was to actually bring in approximately 900 and 1150 acres of employment land due to the patchwork availability of land.

Commissioner Cross called for commissioners to state their support or opposition to Question 17, Concepts 1, 2 and 3.

Commissioner Noble stated based on the available information, the most logical choice was along the I-5 corridor that would be the North Gateway and Seavey Loop areas.

Commissioner Kirschenmann preferred Concept 1 based on transportation and geographic access purposes.

Commissioner Sullivan preferred Concept 3 because the land that would provide the best conditions to improve services were available in the north Springfield and Northgate while Seavey Loop was not a good candidate. However, it was important to work Seavey Loop into the process.

Commissioner Nichols preferred "Other". She liked the larger layout of Seavey Loop on Concept 1 less the northeast corner that was in the flood plain. She liked Concept 2 with the removal of the flood plain area.

Commissioner VanGordon preferred Concept 1 because it took advantage of the existing transportation system.

Commissioner Arkin preferred Other. She could not support bringing in almost double the acreage needed, stating there was lack of a rationale for that theory and there was not a fact based need for double the acreage. She could support Concept 1, the North Gateway area, noting the farmland in the area was of a lesser quality than other potential sites. Area 3 north of 52nd Avenue was in the flood plain but she thought there could be a way to bring in some acreage that was close to the City limits. Area 9, Seavey Loop, contained the highest quality farmland, and did not supporting taking this area in

Commissioner Beyer opined there were not many choices. Area 3 north of 52nd Avenue had been under two to four feet of water two times during the last fifteen years. He had similar concerns with Area 8, south of the Millrace in Concept 1, noting part of it was on the hillside, part on an existing mining operation, part of it was within the Springfield Utility Board's (SUB) well fields and close to a school. He thought the only options were Area 1, North Gateway, and Area 9, Seavey Loop, since they were close to the freeway. Neither of them would be easy to serve.

Commissioner Moe preferred Concept 1 since it appeared to contain the most usable acreage.

Commissioner Moore preferred Concept 1, Area 1, North Gateway, as the most reasonable option, although it was located by the river. She added Area 8 south of the Millrace could be suitable for office employment.

Commissioner Goldstein preferred Concept 1 because it had the best balance and it provided good access.

Commissioner Smith preferred "Other". He liked Concept 1, but was concerned with encroaching on high quality farm land in Seavey Loop and providing services would be difficult. He did like the North Gateway use, using the limited

version, and taking in exceptions lands. He liked portions of Concept 3, and cutting back part of North 52nd Avenue due to flooding concerns.

Commissioner McCown was leaning towards Concept 1 because he was initially opposed to using the North 52nd Avenue. He liked the protection of farm lands and scaling back in Seavey Loop. There was already some manufacturing that was not clearly visible in the North 52nd Avenue area and there was good freeway access. He preferred to see the area north and west of North 52nd Avenue used.

Commissioner Dignam said Area 1, North Gateway, should be a top priority because it was close to the freeway and there was public testimony in the record that the farm land in that area was of poor quality. He saw Area 9, Seavey Loop, had freeway access, but poor access to services, and contained high value farm land. Area 3, North 52nd Avenue, had better access to services but had flood plain issues. He preferred Concept 1 since it included Areas 1 and 9. He stated the commissioners needed to accept the staff recommendation that the most efficient way to bring in 640 usable acres was to bring in 1,100 acres. He opined staff did their best to find the most efficient way to identify 640 acres.

Commissioner Siekiel-Zdzienicki would not choose any of the concepts since he disagreed with taking 640 acres.

Commissioner Nichols asked if there was a map available that identified suitable acres as well as explained why some acreage was unsuitable.

Commissioner Sullivan said he was comfortable moving from Concept 3 to Concept 1. The 640 acres was a reasonable number and he was not uncomfortable bringing in 1,000 acres to achieve that goal. It was important to move forward.

Commissioner Cross summarized the meeting, noting that the commissioners would finalize Option 3 at the next meeting with additional information from staff. Action on Option 2 would be tabled until the next meeting.

Commissioner Noble commended Planning Commissioners for this evening's progress. He suggested Lane County Planning Commissioners review the questions they had concerning Action 2 and bring those concerns to the next meeting.

Commissioner Cross suggested commissioners could forward their questions to staff via e-mail so they could be researched before the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

(Recorded by Linda Henry)