



**Development Advisory Committee (DAC) Meeting  
November 29, 2012 @ 12:00 - 2:00 p.m.  
Emergency Operations Center 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Springfield Justice Center**

**Attendees:** *Renee Clough (Chair), Ed McMahon (Vice-Chair), Rick Satre, Eric Hall, Shaun Hyland, Carole Knapel, Joshua Burstein, Philip Farrington, Mike Koivula, Greg James (PC), Sean VanGordon (CC), Matt Stouder, Jim Donovan, Karen LaFleur*

**Call to Order:**

The agenda was reviewed and adopted.

Minutes were approved with one correction.

Mike Koivula requested that item #6 under criterion discussion be changed. Jim Donovan recommended item #6 should read, Discussion on the criteria ensued.

**Motion:**

Motion was made to make correction to the minutes for item #6 under criterion discussion to read, Item #6. Discussion on the criteria ensued.

Motion carried unanimously.

**Public Comment:** *none*

**Criteria Matrix - Tentative:**

***Group consensus on draft status***

- Renee explained the differences between the two draft matrixes.
  - One copy was information that had been taken directly as it was listed off the chalk board from the 11-8-12 meeting exercise.
  - From that matrix Renee created a new draft matrix that looked at what the red lines had attempted to create.
  - Renee asked for the committees ok of her revisions on formatting, what was included and excluded in the matrix, and if they felt she had carried forward everything correctly. This did not pertain to the scoring aspects.
- The committee reviewed the draft matrix and discussion occurred.
  - Eric Hall felt the matrix should be re-ordered.
  - Priority of items will hopefully be determined by this group by the end of the December 13<sup>th</sup> meeting.

- Rick Satre asked Renee for clarification on her recent e-mail that dealt with scoring, priorities, action plan, and descriptions. Renee explained that she had taken comments from the November 8<sup>th</sup> meeting and tried to address those in her e-mail dated 11-20-12. Renee is hopeful to have clarity as a group on how to proceed after the next two meeting discussions. Rick would like to see a goal/objective, choices of action column added. Renee plans to list those out in paragraph form, on page two rather than a separate column.
- Rick Satre asked Renee for the definition of the criteria again. Renee will add definitions to the bottom of the table.
- Commissioner James would like future items, like the matrix, to be labeled as versions with dates. There was also concern by Commissioner James that after the breakout sessions that all the information will be brought back from the sessions to the larger group as a whole. It will be important to look back to see if any impacts have come out of these breakout sessions to the numbers. This is a consensus based decision group that will need to be sure the final decisions are made as a whole group.
- Staff Matt Stouder reminded the group that the Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for January 15<sup>th</sup>, which means the staff report will have to be ready prior to January 10<sup>th</sup>. We will need to have a pretty good idea of what the priorities will be and what we want to present by the end of the December 13<sup>th</sup> meeting.
- Shaun Hyland asked "What is the committee's ultimate goal?" Shaun feels the goal is to make development easier and less expensive. Staff Jim Donovan stated he felt the mission statement approved by City Council is the ultimate goal. It is a refinement process by group consensus as to what will make economic development more attractive in Springfield. Efficiency, economic development, and doing things that are good for the entire city will include cost savings as a function of that process.
- Commissioner James would like the council goals - mission statement to be posted each meeting on the agenda to help us stay focused and on track.

### **Breakout Sessions (Concurrent)**

The committee broke out into two concurrent breakout sessions, with the committee members attending both group sessions.

- Group A - was given by Staff Jim Donovan, (Ed McMahon took notes/comments from each group) - this was an overview of Site Plan Review -State & Local Planning requirements; Site Plan Ladder of Review Procedures; and Site Plan Process (Springfield Development Code) 5.17-100 (see Group A Summary Outline below)
- Group B - was given by Staff Matt Stouder, (Renee Clough took notes/comments from each group) - this was an overview of (SDC) System Development Charges Methodology/Public Involvement, and SDC Assessment. (see Group B Outline below)

## Group A Summary Outline:

Jim Donovan  
Group A

### Site Plan Overview Notes

#### 1) Site Plan Review Relationship of Site Plan Review to Oregon Land Use Rules

- SB 100- Oregon Land Use is Born 1973
- 19 Statewide Planning Goals – OAR 660 Division 015
- DLCD/LUBA – Acknowledgement, Rule Making and Appeals
- Comprehensive Plans - ORS197
- Limited Land Use Decision Statute- ORS 197.195
- Planning Commissions- PI, Appeals and Discretion- ORS 227
- Springfield-Eugene Metro Plan Acknowledgement- 1982
- Springfield Refinement Plans- 6 Acknowledged by DLCD
- Site Plan Review- SDC 5.17-100

Ref: [www.oregon.gov/lcd/docs/goals/compilation\\_of\\_statewide\\_planning\\_goals.pdf](http://www.oregon.gov/lcd/docs/goals/compilation_of_statewide_planning_goals.pdf)

[www.leg.state.or.us/ors/home.html](http://www.leg.state.or.us/ors/home.html)

#### 2) Site Plan Ladder of Review Procedures

- Counter Information
- LUCS
- Minor MDS
- Major MDS
- Site Plan Review / Modifications I & II
- Discretionary Use & Site Plan
- Master Plan
- Refinement Plans

#### 3) Site Plan Process SDC 5.17-100

- Limited Land Use Decision
- 120 Day Process
- Public Notice
- Diagram Review

## Group B Summary Outline:

Matt Stauber  
Group B

### State Statute

- Guiding Policy on how jurisdictions can collect SDC's
- Defines which systems SDC can be collected for
- Defines Reimbursement & Improvement SDC
- Defines how revenues may be used
- Defines how methodologies may be established
- Defines how amounts may be determined
- Defines how expenditures may be made
- Requires Capital Improvements Plan

### Municipal Code

- Establishes Purpose (3.404) – charge levied to impose an equitable share of public cost of capital improvements upon development that creates the need for or increases the demands on capital improvements.
- Describes process for Methodology (3.408)
- Defines how City collects SDC's
- Establishes basis for credits
- Appeal procedures

### Citizens Advisory Committee/Public Involvement Process

- Springfield has an established process for public involvement and updating/reviewing SDC methodologies
- Recent committee convened in 2008-2009 – 10 members
  - Wastewater (2009)
  - Stormwater (2009)
  - Transportation (2000)

### Policy Setting

- Master Plans updated periodically
- Adopted by Council
- SDC Project Lists & Methodology adopted by Council

### SDC Components (fact sheet)

- Local Wastewater
- Local Stormwater
- Local Transportation
- MWMC
- Willamalane (Residential only)

### Other

- Collection rates currently reduced (50% & 100%) – local only
- SEDA pays Local in the downtown (possibly Glenwood Phase 1 after 12/3)
- Payable at time of issuance of BP or development approval
- Council considering deferring payment collection to occupancy on 12/3
- Springfield collects SDC's for other Jurisdictions (MWMC & Willamalane)

**Next Meeting Agenda Overview:**

- Both Renee Clough and Ed McMahon felt there was a lot of really good conversation that came out of each of the group sessions.
- Next Step - Renee and Ed will compile their notes together from the two sessions, and write up descriptions in draft form. The draft version will be e-mailed out to the committee for their review/comments. Ed asked if any committee member had additional comments they would like to be added, to e-mail them to Renee and Ed by Monday, December 3<sup>rd</sup>.

**Adjourn:**

Meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.