

City of Springfield
Work Session Meeting

MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION MEETING OF
THE SPRINGFIELD CITY COUNCIL HELD
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2004.

The City of Springfield council met in a work session in the Jesse Maine Room, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon, on Monday, February 9, 2004 at 6:00 p.m., with Mayor Leiken presiding.

ATTENDANCE

Present were Mayor Leiken and Councilors Ballew, Woodrow, Lundberg, Ralston, and Malloy. Also present were City Manager Mike Kelly, City Attorney Joe Leahy, City Recorder Amy Sowa and members of the staff.

Councilor Fitch was absent (excused).

1. 2004-2009 Capital Improvement Program.

City Engineer Al Peroutka presented the staff report on this item. Mr. Peroutka said tonight's work session was to review and provide consensus for the recommended five-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The CIP, as modified by any council input, will be brought back to the council for public comment and adoption at their February 17, 2004 regular meeting.

The Springfield 2004-2009 CIP has been drafted by staff, reviewed by the Planning Commission, and is now being forwarded to the City Council for their review and comments prior to a scheduled public hearing on the plan. The Springfield 2004-2009 CIP was reviewed at the Planning Commission's January 21, 2004 meeting. The Commission recommended council approval of the plan with an additional recommendation that council should direct more resources to maintenance of existing infrastructure assets, even at the expense of projects that expand the infrastructure. There was no specific recommendation to remove any projects from the CIP. A review of the CIP reveals that there is not a great deal of new infrastructure proposed in the next five years of programmed funding, however, there is a great deal of infrastructure development in the "pipeline", i.e. already budgeted and awaiting staff design, bidding and construction. These projects, which have already been committed to, would cause a burden of ongoing maintenance and thus increase maintenance costs in the future. Additionally, new development, such as the Riverbend development, that is facilitated by our capital infrastructure expansion will also result in maintenance impacts as more privately developed infrastructure is built. The larger projects in the pipeline, along with their projected annual maintenance impacts, are listed in the Council Briefing Memorandum included in the agenda packet.

Mr. Peroutka referred to a map on the wall outlining the carry-over projects (Previous/Budgeted or Programmed) and the 2004-2009 New Projects. The majority of projects are carry-over projects. There are about \$15M worth of projects that are existing funded projects, excluding those that are county projects. He discussed the ongoing maintenance related to these projects.

Mr. Peroutka said for the 2004-2009 five-year outlook, one of the most significant aspects of this CIP is the return of the Street Fund as a viable funding source for preservation projects on the street system. There is approximately \$500,000 in this fund due to new revenue sources such as the fuel tax, the added Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding and the city's share of the Oregon Transportation Investment Act (OTIA) III funding. About a half a million dollars of this money can be used for capital maintenance projects. Ideally, one million dollars would be in this account.

Councilor Ballew asked how much we were collecting from the recent gas tax.

Technical Services Manager Len Goodwin said year-to-date we have collected approximately \$430,000. If that were to be annualized without any additional refunds, it could be as high as \$750,000-\$800,000. This is based on the amount collected over the past four months from gas stations in Springfield city limits only. We could also receive about \$500,000 from the county.

Mr. Peroutka said the city planned to add an additional half a million dollars in System Development Charge (SDC) funds for planning around Franklin Boulevard. Studies done to date show the redevelopment of the Glenwood area contingent on a revitalized, functioning, and attractive Franklin Boulevard. He said to be ready for the development, the city could take advantage of some Federal Funding and State Funding for that project. The city can't rely on the state to do that planning, although it is a state road. There are possibilities around the interchange that could potentially be used as some kind of a match. He discussed some of the transportation projects.

Traffic Manager Brian Barnett discussed the Intelligent Transportation System included on the map as a new project. This project is a follow-up to the Department of Transportation (DOT) sponsored planning effort that created an Intelligent Transportation System plan. He discussed the different projects that have come out of that plan. He discussed Transportation Demand Management which the city has been involved with for the last several years along with Lane Transit District (LTD). He described some of the requests from low-vision users and options available to assist these citizens. This Intelligent Transportation System is complete and all of the agencies in the metropolitan area were involved in creating that plan. It has been approved by DOT and will go forward to Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC).

Mr. Peroutka discussed the Beltline/Gateway project and the obligation of PeaceHealth to participate in that project with seven million dollars. Staff would like to add something in the CIP to indicate this project. The annexation agreement states this project would occur in 2009, but PeaceHealth would prefer it was started sooner.

Mayor Leiken asked why PeaceHealth asked for this project to be accelerated.

Public Works Director Dan Brown said PeaceHealth asked staff to accelerate the Beltline/Gateway interchange project because the hospital is scheduled to open in 2007. They would like the intersection improvements completed by that time. He discussed the process to get the environmental assessment approved for this project. There is a lot of advance work to be

done prior to starting up on this project. There are a lot of issues that need to be considered before agreeing to move up the timeline on this project.

Mayor Leiken said this is a credibility issue because of the work done with the businesses and citizens in that area. It would negate that work to accelerate the process. Mr. Brown said these same issues were discussed with PeaceHealth.

Mr. Peroutka said he would add the project regarding the Grandview Estates and a pump station to the 2004-2009 CIP list.

Councilor Ballew asked about the wood stave line removal.

Mr. Peroutka said it was the last active section of an old wooden storm sewer line. It is located in an easement off of South A.

Mayor Leiken noted the Planning Commission's comments regarding more maintenance focused projects. He asked if they had specific projects they were referring to regarding maintenance.

Discussion was held regarding new projects and maintenance of those new projects.

Mr. Brown said the Planning Commission was talking primarily about the Street Fund. Mr. Brown would have assured them that the Street Fund is only used for capital projects for maintenance and preservation. Those funds are being used how the Planning Commission wants them to be used.

Councilor Ballew said we need to be prepared for repairs and opportunities. She said the Capital Improvement Budget does not and never will mesh with the General Budget.

Finance Director Bob Duey and Mr. Kelly discussed the process of the CIP and the Capital Budget. The first year of the CIP goes into the next year's Capital Budget. The city has had to dilute their maintenance as they have not always received enough revenue at the time of the project to provide maintenance.

2. Discussion of Metro Plan Policies and Provisions Not Currently Subject to Periodic Review.

Planning Manager Greg Mott presented the staff report on this item. The Metro Plan's fundamental principles and most of its policies have not undergone a comprehensive or timely review since their 1982 adoption. Two recent decisions by council (demonstrating *compliance* with these Metro Plan principles and policies) have been challenged by several of our agency partners for *non-compliance*. Staff believes that such divergent interpretations are symptomatic more of dated language than political dissimilarities.

Many land use decisions made by city staff, the Planning Commission and the City Council must demonstrate compliance or consistency with applicable policies of the Metro Plan. While such an obligation *theoretically* may result in better findings for the decision, in practice this standard merely contributes to the confusion and rancor that characterize much of the public debate on

controversial land use proposals. If the same policies alternately support and oppose the same application, how can these policies retain their credibility? The short answer is they cannot until an appellate body affirms or remands a decision *based* on Plan consistency.

This is an awkward way to process applications and presents an obstacle to inter-agency cooperation (PeaceHealth, Fire District Annexation, etc.). We do not fault past elected bodies that created this language; it was relevant to the issues and times at hand. However, times have changed and the policies have not. This area is about to complete its second Periodic Review of the Plan, and this is the second time an update was not included in this work. Staff has prepared a preliminary list of issues, provisions and omissions to discuss with our partners in the interests of creating a better comprehensive plan. If the council agrees that there is a need to re-visit some of these policies, staff can initiate a discussion with our peers at Eugene and Lane County through SEL and Planning Directors. We understand that some discussion to this effect may occur during the joint public hearing on February 10th when the three jurisdictions will consider "housekeeping" amendments as part of Periodic Review.

Mr. Mott referred to the attachment included in the agenda packet which listed possible Metro Plan Amendments. He discussed recent situations that brought attention to the way the planning text content was interpreted, such as the PeaceHealth Plan Amendment and the request to annex to Willakenzie Fire District. He described the precautions the city had taken in some of these situations to identify who participated as decision makers and who did not.

Mayor Leiken said the PeaceHealth Amendment was not a policy decision.

City Attorney Joe Leahy said that was identified to him by a commissioner as a testing of some language they needed to know the policy. The language needs to be clarified if it continues to be confusing.

Mr. Mott said it is becoming increasingly extensive to pursue some of these things even when achieving these things benefits the community at large, not just Springfield. He explained why they have decided to make the changes in the plan. The list on the attachment in the agenda packet outlines some of the items that continue to reoccur both in public hearings and in preliminary discussions. Opinions can change over time based on exposure to a particular issue. The staff suggests a short-term approach to an evaluation of some of these issues outside the periodic review process.

Council will be asked to initiate the Public Facilities and Service Plan Text Amendment presented on behalf of the Metropolitan Wastewater Management Commission (MWMC) during the February 17, 2004 council meeting. This warrants proposed language that gives City of Springfield, City of Eugene and Lane County Public Works some latitude and clarity in what they need to do to make these amendments. He discussed the five items staff feels are necessary when the TransPlan is updated. The updated TransPlan has to occur starting this year. The TransPlan has no amendment process and has to be referred back to the Metro Plan Amendment Process. Mr. Mott said the goal of this process is to simplify. He noted the items that need to be amended in the TransPlan. He discussed the Joint Elected Officials (JEO) meeting scheduled for Tuesday, February 10 in Eugene and the topics that may be discussed at that meeting. He

discussed deregulation and how that affects cities. This plan needs to be updated and now could be the time to work with the other jurisdictions to make these updates.

Councilor Ralston asked about attachment 1, item 3, included in the agenda packet. He asked what the difference was between the TransPlan Amendment process and the Metro Plan Amendment process.

Mr. Mott said there is no TransPlan Amendment process at this time. The Metro Plan Amendment process is used for any changes to the TransPlan. It is not responsive to what may want to be done in the TransPlan. The new Metro Plan text that is in the transportation element comes directly from TransPlan. It would be useful if there was also an amendment process for TransPlan rather than having to refer to the Metro Plan.

Councilor Ralston does agree with item 10 and 23 on the attachment included in the agenda packet, but does not agree with other items, especially those relating to the fire district. Cities should provide all city services.

Mayor Leiken asked if mental health was listed in services the city should provide.

Mr. Mott said health services are listed as services the city should provide, not including hospitals.

Councilor Lundberg said this is a long list. She discussed the process. Staff will talk with the City of Eugene and Lane County and find the items that all can agree to, but there are some items that would create more controversy. She said some of these would take much longer to come to agreement on and she asked what kind of process the City of Springfield, City of Eugene and Lane County have to go through to discuss these issues. She asked if the process would start with staff or elected officials.

Mr. Mott explained the process for the Public Facilities Plan (PFP) of the Metro Plan and the process for the TransPlan. The City of Eugene staff has similar issues as the City of Springfield. This has been difficult in the past and costly, but it can be done collectively and with purpose.

Mr. Kelly said this list is primarily for discussion tonight and tomorrow at the JEO. He discussed other issues that have arisen regarding misunderstandings in the Metro Plan and the county's role in decisions made based on this document. He discussed the reason clarification needs to be made to the Metro Plan for future decisions.

Mr. Mott said there would be discussion regarding the Periodic Review housekeeping items at the JEO meeting. There could also be discussion regarding the amendments to the Metro Plan regarding districts. If all three governing bodies say this is something worth pursuing, it would be a good opportunity to introduce these other items. This plan needs updated.

Councilor Ballew said the Metro Plan was created to share the costs, but it no longer seems effective. She asked about a cost benefit in staying in the Metro Plan.

Mr. Mott said for the metropolitan area, there would only be two plans: one for Eugene and one for Springfield. He said there has not been a cost benefit analysis on staying in the Metro Plan.

Councilor Malloy said many of these items listed appear to be the result of the Fire District and hospital. He asked if the county was aware of the issues the city has with the Metro Plan.

Mr. Mott said these items are listed as an opportunity in case the discussion at the JEO meeting got to a point where it was suggested the other elements outside of the periodic review should be reviewed and subject to revisions. The housekeeping items the county would be discussing would include all of the other chapters included in the periodic review, leaving everything else on this list the same. That could cause apprehension.

Councilor Malloy said he agrees many of these items have caused confusion over the last few years, but he is concerned our partners would not be willing to look at these items for discussion.

Councilor Woodrow asked if it would be inappropriate for City of Springfield staff to contact the City of Eugene staff to see if they have similar issues regarding this plan.

Mr. Mott said it would be appropriate for City of Springfield staff to make contact with City of Eugene staff. He believes the elected officials are aware of the differences of opinion regarding plan policy because of many issues that have come up in the past. There has been recent acknowledgement that each city does business differently when Eugene adopted a separate Eugene only policy in the TransPlan. There is always the opportunity to clarify, with different outcomes. It could be managed in a shorter time frame than some of the other issues.

Councilor Lundberg said she is most supportive of putting an amendment process in place. She also agrees that Coburg should be recognized and accounted for in the transportation scenario. Deference to local interpretation should also be recognized, such as Eugene's own implementation policy in the TransPlan. She agrees there should be only one project list.

Mayor Leiken referred to the Senate Bill (SB)100 and land use systems that were established in 1973. It was a good system at the time, but does need to be updated. It would be difficult to get rid of the entire Metro Plan at one time, but it does need to be updated. We need to look to protect the city's best interests. He discussed situations where one jurisdiction has been able to impede another jurisdiction's project. There could be a healthy debate and tomorrow's JEO meeting could be the beginning of that discussion. He discussed the services citizens want within the metropolitan area.

Councilor Ballew said regionalism would need to be separated so it does not undermine individual entities.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:08 pm.

Minutes Recorder – Amy Sowa

Sidney W. Leiken
Mayor

Attest:

Amy Sowa
City Recorder