

MINUTES

Minutes approved by:
Springfield Planning Commission: 7/7/2010
Lane County Planning Commission:

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

May 4, 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, Dennis Sandow, Joseph Siekiel-Zdzienicki, John Sullivan, members; Kent Howe, Matt Laird, Stephanie Schulz, staff.

Mr. Cross convened the meeting and welcomed everyone to the joint meeting of the City of Springfield and Lane County Planning Commissions.

1. BUSINESS FROM THE AUDIENCE

There was no business from the audience.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES—March 16 and April 20, 2010

March 16, 2010

There were no corrections to the March 16, 2010 minutes.

April 20, 2010

Mr. Sullivan offered the following corrections:

Page 7, paragraph 4, sentence 3 should read: He opined Seavey Loop could not be considered if those exceptions were not considered.

Page 8, paragraph 9, sentence 2 should read: Action Item 2 would be tabled until the next meeting.

Ms. Arkin offered the following corrections:

Page 3, paragraph 5, sentence 2 should read: She recalled that the redevelopment proposal for Glenwood as reviewed by the Lane County Planning Commission had been exciting, with an affordable housing component.

Mr. Beyer, seconded by Ms. Moore, moved to approve the March 16 and April 20, 2010 Springfield Planning Commission minutes as amended. The motion passed unanimously, 6:0.

Mr. McCown, seconded by Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki, moved to approve the March 16 and April 20, 2010 Lane County Planning Commission minutes as amended. The motion passed unanimously, 9:0.

3. **LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS—Continued meeting from April 20, 2010.**
- **Metro Plan Amendment, Springfield 2030 Refinement Plan LRP2009-00014;**
 - **Lane County PA 09-6018;**
 - **Springfield Development Code Amendments LRP2009-00015.**

Co-Adopters: The City of Springfield and Lane County

**Staff: Greg Mott and Linda Pauly, City of Springfield
Stephanie Schulz, Lane County**

Mr. Cross stated tonight's meeting was a continuation of the deliberation phase for the proposed Eugene/Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan (Metro Plan) Amendment regarding the Springfield 2030 Refinement Plan LRP2009-00014, Lane County PA 09-6018, and Springfield Development Code Amendments LRP2009-00015. He explained the public testimony was closed on March 26, 2010 and no further information or evidence would be received this evening. The commissioners were tasked with considering the evidence before them and making the appropriate recommendations to the elected officials.

Mr. Cross opened the public hearing for the Springfield Planning Commission.

Mr. Noble opened the public hearing for the Lane County Planning Commission.

Mr. Cross reviewed the issues that the commissions would address this evening and the timeline for doing so.

Mr. Beyer remarked several e-mails had been sent to commissioners that raised interpretation questions of staff. He asked if staff could respond to those questions.

Mr. Mott said the City of Springfield prepared an analysis of the commercial and industrial buildable lands supply based on Goal 9 and the interpretative rule, which was applied to Goal 14 with respect to urban growth boundary (UGB) expansions. The City Council adopted a resolution that accepted the results of the commercial and industrial buildable lands analysis, which included an economic opportunities analysis and economic development strategies. A fundamental element was the conclusion that the City did not have enough opportunity sites for particular types of commercial and industrial activities, and it was necessary to go outside of the UGB to provide the needed lands. The action to adopt the resolution subject to public hearings and public comment as well as the State of Oregon's position. With few reservations regarding the State's comments which were primarily directed at nodal development, the State concluded the City had acted in compliance with Goal 9 and the interpretive rule, and the State had no substantive issues.

Mr. Mott said the premise of the Springfield 2030 Refinement Plan (refinement plan) was that the City would adopt a separate UGB for the City of Springfield. The evidence in the record that would direct the commissioners to take specific action related to the UGB included public testimony, documents provided primarily by the City's consultants, ECONorthwest and stakeholders. The conclusion was there was adequate residential land but there was not enough commercial and industrial land. He stated staff and commissioners could not predict what actions the elected officials would take on the proposals. It was important for the Planning Commissions to prepare an opinion about the suitability of the four proposed sites for expansion for commercial and industrial activities, based on the priorities iterated in the Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS). Each of the sites represented compliance with the evaluation process, and each had a variety of tax lot configurations and strengths. The sites were adjacent to the existing UGB. It was important that the commissioners feel comfortable with any action they took. Staff had put forth their best efforts to provide the commissioners with information to help with the decision making process.

Mr. Cross asked if the City Council had already decided on the elements, if there was any need for the commissions to further discuss Action Item 2, Economic Element.

Mr. Mott replied the council approved the element for use in this process, which was required for evaluation of potential UGB expansion areas. He noted the Planning Commissions were not policy makers and there were poli-

cies embedded in the studies that were recommended by citizen stakeholders during a 3 year period that were accepted by the City Council as an acknowledgement of compliance with the law.

Mr. Mott concurred with Mr. Beyer that the commissioners' task was solely to opine on the recommendations for expansion on the four identified sites. Mr. Mott added the normal process for a Planning Commission in an advisory role was to forward supportable recommendations to elected officials.

Mr. Dignam agreed with Mr. Mott with the exception of the statement that the Planning Commissions were not policy makers. Mr. Dignam agreed the commissions were not decision makers, but he believed part of the Planning Commissions' task was to help advise the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) on policy matters.

Mr. Mott asserted the commissions could forward recommendations to the elected officials regarding policies. However, those recommendations had no material affect on the effort to also tell elected officials if they expanded the UGB, the identified sites complied with the law. However, the commissions did not have the authority to remove a policy and replace it with another.

Mr. VanGordon arrived at 6:28 p.m.

Ms. Arkin agreed with Mr. Dignam. She believed the commissioners' job was to consider the whole record and all of the evidence it contained. Where a policy was not clear, or did not support certain conclusions, it was the commissioners' job to consider inadequacies in proposed policies and make advisory recommendations to the decision makers.

Mr. Mott iterated the distinction between the assumptions and policies embedded in the Metro Plan and Refinement Plan was what was moving the process forward. Commissioners were entitled to disagree with the policy, but it was not their role to replace a policy with a policy of their own.

Mr. Cross asked if there was any point in going back to Action Item 2. He noted all but four commissioners were satisfied that the proposed economic objectives and strategies referred to in Goal 9 in the Metro Plan.

Mr. McCown thought Mr. Beyer had addressed the issue when he raised the e-mails to which staff had responded. He acknowledged there were only four objections, but those four were Lane County Planning Commissioners, which could change the recommendation to the BCC, while the recommendation from the Springfield Planning Commission may be to support the recommendation.

Mr. Mott was not in complete agreement with the content of either of the e-mails. He did not agree with any of the assertions that suggested the information he provided was inaccurate. The City's consultant would have to provide information regarding the tables in the CIBL document that provided different information.

Mr. Sullivan said he did not read the e-mails he received after the record was closed. He respected both authors because he found their comments insightful in previous testimony and they were an important part of the record. He thought it inappropriate for commissioners to discuss the e-mails in question because the record was closed.

Ms. Smith said a couple of e-mails had been sent to all commissioners after the record was closed. She conducted a poll of commissioners to determine who had received and read the e-mails, which indicated several commissioners had read the e-mails. Upon a review by the City Attorney's office, it was determined the record was closed. However, another procedure with the joint elected officials would allow the record to be reopened. People were welcome to put information in the record at that time. The City Attorney's office concluded this was a legislative rather than a quasi-judicial hearing. In the context of the bigger picture, it would be prudent to have a response to the e-mails in the event any commissioners had read or wanted to read and discuss them. Since many of the commissioners had not read the e-mails, Ms. Smith suggested that the commissioners should not consider the e-mails, but consider the record before the commissions as a whole, and move forward with the process.

Mr. McCown said the questions in the March 14, 2010 letter and subsequent responses by staff mirrored the questions in the e-mail. He thought it may be appropriate for those questions to be forwarded to the consultants for a response after which they should be forwarded to the elected officials.

Mr. Sullivan concurred the commissioners should not consider information received, including the e-mails, after the record was closed.

Mr. Noble said it appeared not all issues had been resolved to the satisfaction of all of the County commissioners and suggested revisiting those issues since all nine commissioners were present this evening.

Mr. Cross suggested revisiting Action Item 2, Economic Elements, questions 5, 6, 8, 9 and 10, after which the commissioners could concentrate on reviewing maps and concepts.

Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki said having a discussion of the maps would help to make a decision on Action Item 2.

Mr. Noble polled Lane County Planning Commissioners on those favoring moving to discussion of the areas and evaluating the maps. Commissioners Arkin, Dignam, Nichols, Noble, Sandow and Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki responded affirmatively.

Mr. Cross noted consensus on the part of the Springfield Planning Commission to review the maps.

Commissioners reviewed the maps and asked questions of staff from 6:45 p.m. to 7:20 p.m.

Mr. Noble called for a show of hands of Lane County Planning Commissioners of those who wished to move on to Action Item 3, Urbanization Element and Springfield Urban Growth Boundary. There was unanimous consent, 9:0, to move on to Action Item 3.

Mr. Cross asked Springfield Planning Commissioners if there were objections to moving on to Action Item 3, Urbanization Element and Springfield Urban Growth Boundary. There was unanimous consent, 6:0, to move on to Action Item 3.

Mr. Cross clarified the commissions had ended the April 20, 2010 discussion at Action Item 3, Question 17, selection of a concept area. At the April 20 meeting, 50 percent of those polled agreed with Concept 1, and 50 percent looked at another concept that was a hybrid of several areas. He suggested polling commissioners on each of the concepts to eliminate the unwanted concepts and selecting or designing one that suited commissioners.

Ms. Pauley reviewed Concept 1, which consisted of Area 1, North Gateway; Area 8, South of Millrace; Area 9, Seavey Loop.

Mr. Noble said while he could not support Concept 1 completely, he could consider supporting the concept if protections were provided for Areas 1 and 9.

Mr. Mott explained the prioritization requirements of Goal 14 could not be dismissed. Unsuitable land could be a higher priority for inclusion in the UGB than suitable land elsewhere because of circumstances related to Goal 14. There were some uses of unsuitable land that supported an urban use in the area that could not be accomplished if the unsuitable land was outside of the UGB. Bringing unsuitable land into the UGB did not mean it would be used for typical urban development such as buildings, but it could be used for a required open space component for adjoining development such as riparian restoration or stormwater management. He opined there was not a perfect solution available.

Mr. Noble called for a show of hands of those who supported each concept totally.

Concept 1 support:

Lane County Planning Commission: Arkins, Dignam, Sullivan.

Springfield Planning Commission: Kirschenmann, VanGordon.

Ms. Pauley reviewed Concept 2, which consisted of Area 3, north of 52nd Avenue; Area 8, South of Millrace; Area 9, Seavey Loop.

Concept 2 support:

Lane County Planning Commission: no support

Springfield Planning Commission: no support

Ms. Pauley reviewed Concept 3, which consisted of Area 1, North Gateway; Area 3, North of 52nd Avenue; Area 9, Seavey Loop.

Concept 3 support:

Lane County Planning Commission: Dignam, Goldstein.

Springfield Planning Commission: no support

Mr. Cross noted Concept 2 had no support and was definitely out of consideration.

Mr. Cross called for a show of hands for those who supported combining Concepts 1 and 3 to create a desired outcome.

Combined Concept 1 and 3 support:

Lane County Planning Commission: Dignam, Goldstein, McCown, Nichols, Sullivan.

Springfield Planning Commission: Beyer, Kirschenmann, Moe, Moore, Smith, VanGordon.

Mr. Cross asked who preferred only a modification to Concept 1.

Modified Concept 1 support:

Lane County Planning Commission: Noble, Nichols.

Springfield Planning Commission: Beyer.

Mr. Sullivan called a point of order. He stated the commissioners could make recommendations to the BCC related to the benefits of a concept, or benefits of combining concepts, but they were not qualified to determine what properties should or should not be included.

Mr. Noble disagreed with Mr. Sullivan. He said modifying or taking parts of Concept 1, Area 1 and Area 9, would be suitable to him.

Mr. Sullivan agreed to see where Mr. Noble's suggestion led the group.

Ms. Moore asked if a number lower than 640 acres could be achieved if Concept 1 was modified to include Area 1 and Area 9, and Area 8 was removed.

Mr. Grile said the factual base indicated a shortfall of 640 acres. In order to support a conclusion of less than 640 acres, the analysis would need to be modified to conclude that a smaller number was needed. Another option would be to agree there was an established need of 640 acres that would be phased in over time.

Mr. Beyer asked if such an action would be consistent with the statutory requirement.

Mr. Van Vactor stated it would be necessary to provide an explanation of what steps the City would take to address the statutory requirement.

Mr. Beyer said the acreage requirements were not based strictly on raw acreage, but the need to have a number of sites that were 20 acres or larger.

Ms. Pauley directed commissioners to page 5 of the May 4, 2010 memorandum from Bob Parker, ECONorthwest to Greg Mott, regarding Table 4, which summarized the suitability evaluation of the four study areas, Areas 1, 3, 8 and 9.

Ms. Arkin said when addressing the issue of obtaining large sites, it appeared the high end of the range was used in developing the need and she had not seen a range of acreages identified.

Mr. Grile replied the analysis described the needed acreage for 20 years, with the need for several 50 acre sites identified, and acknowledgement that a significant portion of the total need identified 5 acre sites for redevelopment inside the existing UGB.

Mr. Sullivan said it appeared Option 1 and Option 3 had eleven commissioners who were in consensus that there were good aspects to both options. If this was the case it was not necessary to develop a specific recommendation to the elected officials. It was the responsibility of the commissioners to identify strengths and weaknesses within a common ground. He said wetlands most likely were present in some of the identified areas, and he thought the BCC might be pleased to have the wetlands within the City's UGB because they may assume there would be better stewardship. Conversely, he also thought the BCC may not want to have the wetlands within the City's UGB because the BCC may feel that the County could be more diligent on the stewardship, since development could not occur on wetlands outside of the UGB. This was a decision for the elected officials to make because there were political ramifications involved.

Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki had concerns with large sites and employment density. ECONorthwest had identified large sites for industrial parks that were subdividable, and owned by multiple developers, thus destroying the concept of one large site. He stated use of large, 50 acres sites for warehouses was not good use of the land due to the geographic constraints the City faced.

Mr. VanGordon suggested the commissioners had reached consensus on some version of Areas 1 and 9. He added 315 of the needed 640 acres had been identified, and the discussion should be directed to how much of Seavey Loop or other areas should be included. He opined there was agreement that North Gateway should be included in whatever concept the commissioners decided upon.

Mr. Cross called for a show of hands of those who supported moving forward to develop a recommendation based on the opinions of commissioners and agreements that could be identified.

Lane County Planning Commission: Arkin, Dignam, Goldstein, McCown, Nichols, Noble, Sandow, Sullivan.

Springfield Planning Commission: Beyer, Cross, Kirschenmann, Moore, Smith, VanGordon.

Mr. Noble was frustrated because he was unable to visit the sites, noting there was something to be learned if all commissioners could visit the sites together. He thought it ridiculous that the commissioners did not put their feet on the ground in areas for which recommendations and decisions were being made. He supported the North Gateway area with the exception of the floodway adjacent to the river. The BCC could determine whether or not it should be included in the UGB. He did not support use of the floodway for other types of development since it was in relatively primitive condition. He said the North Gateway area had been identified as having suitable properties for most of the building types in the UGB, based upon the alternatives analysis requirements. In some areas, the resource agriculture land was of mixed condition. The North Gateway area was adjacent to the I-5 transportation corridor.

Mr. Noble could support parts of Area 9, as somewhat suitable for most of the development types identified. A problem with the area was a number of the lots were small. It would be important to protect the large sites for commercial or industrial development, and not divide them into small parcels. He said use of Areas 3 or 8 were problematic because Area 3 was prone to floods, and Area 8 was the source of drinking water.

Mr. Moe supported Areas 1 and 9, but he thought what the commissioners decided tonight would be irrelevant before the elected officials.

Ms. Arkin said use of exception areas first was required by ORS, and there were sections in Areas 1 and 9 that met that requirement. There were portions in Area 9 that were under power lines and along the I-5 corridor that could provide smart land uses. In Concept 1, Area 1, 350 acres had been identified of which 250 acres, or 78 percent, were able to be developed. In Area 9, 500 acres had been identified, of which 350 acres, or 47 percent, were able to be developed, which offered a less efficient use of the land than Area 1. Under Concept 3, North Gateway

had 78 percent of usable land, while it dropped to 35 percent in Seavey Loop. Use of only 35 percent indicated that too much land was being brought into the urban holding area. There was no guarantee that the land would be protected although much of it consisted of riparian and floodplain areas. The land outside of the UGB was Lane County land with a current use of natural resources, which was as valid a use of the land as designating it for industrial uses. There was a lack of consistency by City staff regarding what could and could not be developed in the flood plain. She observed Area 8, was close to the Springfield well fields and she was concerned uses would be introduced that would contaminate the well fields. She stated identifying large lots of 50 acres was arbitrary. She expressed concern that the large lots could be subdivided, and questioned whether 640 acres was a valid number. She was impressed with the quality of the soil, noting most of it was class 2. She was pained to think of parking lots and warehouses on class 2 soil. Future generations would need the land to grow food.

Mr. Beyer averred there were no good options. Area 3 was under water regularly and Area 8 was near the well field. The City Council was trying to get trucks off of Main Street, making Area 8 challenging for industrial uses. Areas 1 and 9 offered major advantages that they were close to I-5 and would provide better access for commercial vehicles. The biggest issue for the City Council would be to determine how to protect large sites from being subdivided into small parcels. He was skeptical about bringing in all of the non-usable land. He suggested if the large sites and Goal 5 areas were protected, regardless of whether they were inside or outside of the City, they would look the same in 20 years. The City of Springfield and City of Eugene policies were more protective of the lands than were Lane County's due to available resources.

Mr. Sandow saw some value in Areas 1 and 9, but had a concern related to employment density. He could find no discussion around the assumption of what would happen to per capita wages. Wages in Oregon wages had been dropping for over 15 years and were at a 16 year low in 2009. There was a relationship between per capita wage and the amount of land needed. Although there was no legal requirement for the Planning Commission to make decisions based on wage levels, he saw this as an efficiency issue. It was difficult to make a decision on lands that could be used for agricultural purposes, although they may be class 2 soils, without being careful with assumptions. This represented a fundamental flaw.

Mr. Kirschenmann concurred with Mr. Beyer that there was not one good concept. He hoped the elected officials would look at Areas 1, 3, 8 and 9. He opined the City could look at sites within the four areas, while protecting farm lands in Area 9; using some of Area 8, being cognizant of the water fields; and, Area 3 could be used to avoid wetlands. Portions of all four areas could be used to fill the City's needs.

Ms. Nichols said the most logical sites included sections of Areas 1 and 9. She was concerned with including floodways since they could be developed under certain circumstances. She preferred that the floodways remain in the County and be restricted except as needed for utilities. She thought counting small parcels as constrained artificially lowered the suitable acres. She thought that northeast corner of Seavey Loop Area 9 was in the floodway and should not be considered. She was concerned with finding a way to preserve large parcels.

Mr. VanGordon noted there was quite a bit of agreement among the commissioners. He supported using Area 1, but was concerned with flooding issues related to Area 3, and urged caution. Additionally, he supported taking a larger piece of Area 9, noting the law required taking 93 acres of the site. It would be more cost effective to use available infrastructure. He commented floodway issues would be raised by the elected officials. He wanted to ensure Springfield had a continuous set of land and UGB that would make sense. It made sense to have everything in North Gateway. He believed the City of Springfield could be a good steward of the land. Conversely, Area 9 needed to be examined for floodway issues.

Mr. Smith supported the Area 1 in its entirety; a reduced section of Area 9 being aware of soil issues in the area; and a portion of Area 3. He encouraged elected officials to consider the east side of Seavey Loop. He said elected officials could look at the suitable versus unsuitable lands Question It was important to be efficient with the land.

Mr. Sullivan directed his comments to the BCC rather than the Springfield City Council. Lands suitable for employment must be part of the expansion decision. He supported expansion as close as reasonable to I-5 to reduce surface street transit and the potential to have to move rail. Option 1 made the most sense although North Gateway and Seavey Loop would be a challenge to service. He noted there was testimony in the record which needed

further exploration that there was available in the Seavey Loop area. He questioned the concerns about the fire district capability to the Seavey Loop area, noting Lane Community College contracted with a local fire protection district. The elected officials needed to determine what lands the BCC must protect as stewards. He asked if they could they do a better job of stewardship than the City of Springfield. He encouraged the BCC to read the dialogue from the public and to responses to the issues. He found the written testimony intriguing and insightful. He noted the process had been lengthy but had gone a long way to reinforce the applicants' desires to bring the issues forward and reinforce the focus on those who have opposition on the process.

Ms. Moore agreed with Mr. Noble that feet on the ground would be beneficial and recommended that the elected officials visit the various sites. She understood there were water resources in Area 8, but also understood there were wells throughout the City that were protected. She noted of the 140 acres identified in Area 8, 130 acres were deemed to be suitable. She supported Concept 1 in its entirety, although she agreed that Area 3 perhaps offered better accessibility to I-5 and should be considered.

Mr. Dignam said Areas 3 and 8 were bad alternatives, and Areas 1 and 9 were better alternatives. Areas 1 and 9 were better because they included exception areas and freeway frontage, which was ideal for commercial and industrial development. He thought it would be possible to find pieces from Areas 3 and 8. He did not understand why bringing in excess acres was a bad thing. Staff provided detail on the rationale and benefits of doing so. He asserted no one would build on lands with undesirable features such steep slopes. He disputed the assumption that lands would be built on as soon as they were brought into the UGB. He concurred that it was desirable to protect valuable farm land, noting class 2 soil was important. It was also important to find a place for humans, and that was what this exercise was all about.

Mr. Goldstein mourned the loss of farmland but it seemed there was no way to get around it. He was concerned with access to the highway. It would have been helpful if the proposals had been split into heavy and light industrial use, which would make taking land near the highway more amenable to commissioners. He had not seen that the construction of the roads had been studied, and it would be the City of Springfield's burden to pay for roads for large vehicles. He encouraged keeping development close to I-5.

Mr. McCown noted there was general consensus that Areas 1 and 9 were the best suited sites and the elected officials would need to look at Areas 3 and 8 to reach 640 acres if that was the decided upon acreage. He hoped the staff and consultants could develop satisfactory responses to the questions raised through this process.

Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki said constrained lands could always be brought into the UGB and he saw no reason to bring them in at the present time. He saw only 200 available unconstrained acres in Area 1, along with some land along Franklin Boulevard, Seavey Loop, and Highway 58, but he did not think there was sufficient land available to reach a target of 640 acres.

Mr. Cross agreed that the City should focus on the Area 1 and much of Area 9, with the balance brought in from Area 3, primarily due to accessibility. Area 8 should not be considered due to accessibility issues. He saw no issue with bringing in unsuitable land, opining the City could be a good steward of the land. Bringing in unsuitable land would provide consistency in the development of the UGB and provide open space when other parcels were developed.

Mr. Cross noted consensus to use Area 1, and Area 9. There was some interest in parceling Area 9 and parts of Area 3.

Mr. Beyer said a cornerstone of local planning was that smaller developments would occur on existing lots of which there were many. There were no easily accessible large parcels in Oregon that appealed to larger businesses.

Mr. Noble did a time check. There was consensus to try to finish the review this evening. There were no objections if Mr. Goldstein had to leave early.

The Planning Commissions took a short break at 8:45 p.m.

Mr. Goldstein left at 8:45 p.m.

Ms. Pauley reviewed and facilitated a discussion of Question 18, *is the City's proposal to designate "newly urbanizable" area added to the UGB as Urban Holding Areas that require a post acknowledge plan amendment (PAPA) process required to remove UHA and allow designation for urban development supportable?*

Mr. Beyer supported protecting large parcels. However, the language in Question 18 suggested it would be impossible to develop large parcels because it would take developers months if not years to work through a plan amendment.

Ms. Pauley stated the City could undertake the plan amendment process rather than require it of potential developers.

Mr. Grile said Goal 14 required a comparative analysis of the public facilities and transportation system, although there was some question about that based on a recent Goal 12 decision out of Eugene. However, the City was not addressing Goal 12 at the level of detail required for a transportation system plan. The significant goal that needed to be addressed for annexing and developing the land would be Goal 12.

In response to a question from Mr. Dignam, Mr. Grile said if the commissioners said no to Questions 18 and 20 the Springfield Planning Commission would have to plan and zone each parcel. He concurred with Ms. Moore that by proceeding with the holding plan, planning and zoning would be deferred to the applicant or to the City, in a manner similar to the commission's work with a citizen advisory committee that was preparing a detailed plan for Glenwood.

Mr. Cross called for a show of hands on Question 18.

Lane County Planning Commission: Commissioners Dignam, McCown, Nichols, Noble, and Sullivan voted in favor, and Commissioners Arkin, Sandow, and Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki voted against.

Springfield Planning Commission: Unanimously supported Question 18, 7:0

Mr. Moe left at 8:57 p.m.

Ms. Pauley reviewed and facilitated a discussion of Question 19, *Shall all master plans for urban development on "newly urbanizable" lands require that development of such lands is consistent with the Urban Holding Area designations for such lands and with the site needs criteria for their inclusion in the UGB as expressed in the applicable Economic Opportunities Analysis, Residential Lands Analysis, UGB Alternatives Analysis, and related findings adopted in support of their inclusion?*

There was consensus that this was strictly a City of Springfield issue on which the Lane County Planning Commission would not vote.

Following a brief discussion related to lot sizes, commissioners agreed with Mr. Grile's suggestion that the commission defer addressing that issue until staff could provide more information to the City of Springfield Planning Commission.

Mr. Cross called for a show of hands on Question 19.

Springfield Planning Commission: Unanimously supported Question 19, 6:0.

Ms. Pauley reviewed and facilitated a discussion of Question 20, *is the City's proposal to preserve large "newly urbanizable" sites supportable?"*

Mr. Noble said there was no need for the Lane County Planning Commission to vote on Question 20.

Mr. Cross called for a show of hands on Question 20.

Springfield Planning Commission: Unanimously supported Question 20, 6:0.

Action Item 4: Land Use and Urban Design Element

Ms. Pauley reviewed and facilitated a discussion of Question 23, *Establish parcel-specific diagram?*

In response to a Question from Mr. Noble, Mr. Howe said the County would always be supportive of a site specific plan designation, which was already the County's practice. There was no need for the Lane County Planning Commission to vote on Question 23.

Mr. Cross called for a show of hands on Question 23.

Springfield Planning Commission: Unanimously supported Question 23, 6:0.

Ms. Pauley reviewed and facilitated a discussion of Question 24, *Prepare findings to support and incorporate re-designations to resolve plan-zone conflict where feasible?*

Mr. Cross called for a show of hands on Question 24.

Springfield Planning Commission: Unanimously supported Question 24, 6:0.

Ms. Pauley directed commissioners to Attachment 1-17, Issue 2, Adopt amendments to the Springfield Development Code to Implement Land Use Efficiency Measures—Phase one (LRP 2009-00015/PA 09-6018), that would:

- Create a Small Lot Residential District;
- Establish a minimum density of six dwelling units per net acre in the LDR District;
- Require a mix of housing types in the SLR developments.

Action Item 1: Adopt Springfield Development Code Amendments.

Mr. Beyer, seconded by Mr. Smith, moved that the Springfield Planning Commission recommend adoption of the Springfield Development Code Amendments Land Use Efficiency Measures-Phase 1. The motion passed unanimously, 6:0.

Mr. Noble said there was no need for the Lane County Planning Commission to vote on this motion.

Mr. Beyer, seconded by Mr. Kirschenmann, moved to recommend the elected officials adopt a parcel specific plan diagram. The motion passed unanimously, 6:0.

Mr. Noble said there was no need for the Lane County Planning Commission to vote on this motion.

Mr. Beyer, seconded by Mr. Kirschenmann, moved to recommend the elected officials consider resolving plan zone conflicts. The motion passed unanimously, 6:0.

Mr. Noble said there was no need for the Lane County Planning Commission to vote on this motion.

Mr. Beyer, seconded by Mr. Kirschenmann, moved to recommend the elected officials adopt the Springfield 2030 Refinement Plan including establishing a separate Urban Growth Boundary for the City of Springfield. The motion passed unanimously, 6:0.

Ms. Arkin, seconded by Mr. McCown, moved to recommend the elected officials adopt the Springfield 2030 Refinement Plan including establishing a separate Urban Growth Boundary for the City of Springfield. The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Mr. McCown, seconded by Ms. Nichols, moved to advance the Springfield 2030 Refinement Plan forward to the BCC without a recommendation for specific areas for the UGB expansion and for the Board to review the Planning Commission deliberations to understand the Planning Commission concerns.

Mr. McCown explained he had concerns about issues that had been raised by the commissioners. He stated if staff and the consultants could clarify the issues of alleged inconsistencies and assumptions, the BCC could possibly agree to those issues. It was difficult for him to agree to expand the UGB while there were still big issues related to the total acreage.

Mr. Dignam could support the motion since there was a divergence of opinion.

Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki supported the motion because staff would now be able to present new evidence when the record reopened and the issues raised by the commissioners could be discussed by the BCC.

Ms. Arkin supported the motion because the commissioners were not policy makers but advisory to the BCC. The BCC would be able to make a decision based on the evidence in the record and the comments offered by the Planning Commissions.

The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Mr. Sullivan, seconded by Mr. Dignam, moved that Lane County Planning Commission recommend that prior to initiation of the process by the BCC, comments made by individuals regarding options and larger maps, be presented at the beginning of the process; and that a workshop be conducted to streamline the process.

Ms. Arkin would support the motion. She asked if chair or vice chair would ask if the BCC would like to have a joint meeting with the Lane County Planning Commission.

Mr. Dignam had no interest in discussing the issue further.

The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

The meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

(Recorded by Linda Henry)