
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Meeting Date: 9/12/2016
Meeting Type: Work Session/Reg. Mtg
Staff Contact/Dept.: Linda Pauly DPW
Staff Phone No: (541)726-4608
Estimated Time: 90 minutes
Council Goals: Mandate

**SPRINGFIELD CITY COUNCIL AND LANE
COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**

ITEM TITLE: SPRINGFIELD 2030 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: ADOPTION OF AMENDMENTS TO THE SPRINGFIELD URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY (UGB) AND *EUGENE-SPRINGFIELD METROPOLITAN AREA GENERAL PLAN*, DESIGNATING LAND TO MEET EMPLOYMENT LAND NEEDS FOR 2010-2030 PLANNING PERIOD AND DESIGNATING LAND FOR NATURAL RESOURCES; PUBLIC FACILITIES; PARKS AND OPEN SPACE. (METRO PLAN AMENDMENT FILE NO. LRP 2009-00014)

ACTION REQUESTED: Conduct a joint public hearing with the Lane County Board of Commissioners and first reading of the following Ordinance: **AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE SPRINGFIELD URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY; THE *EUGENE-SPRINGFIELD METROPOLITAN AREA GENERAL PLAN (METRO PLAN)* TEXT AND DIAGRAM TO AMEND THE *METRO PLAN* BOUNDARY, ADOPT THE SPRINGFIELD 2030 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (2030 PLAN) ECONOMIC AND URBANIZATION POLICY ELEMENTS AND ASSIGN PLAN DESIGNATIONS TO NEWLY URBANIZABLE LANDS; THE SPRINGFIELD ZONING MAP TO ASSIGN NEW ZONING; THE SPRINGFIELD DEVELOPMENT CODE TO ADD SECTIONS 3.2-915 – 3.2-930 ESTABLISHING THE AGRICULTURE-URBAN HOLDING AREA LAND USE ZONING DISTRICT (AG); AND ADOPTING A SEVERABILITY CLAUSE.** A joint work session with Lane County will be conducted prior to the hearing. Staff will present an overview of the proposed amendments at the work session.

ISSUE STATEMENT: Springfield has completed its evaluation of land needed to provide adequate employment opportunities for the 2010-2030 planning period consistent with Oregon Statewide Planning Goal 9: Economic Development; has prepared Economic and Urbanization comprehensive plan land use policies and land use regulations to support attainment of community economic development objectives; and has evaluated lands to be included in an expansion of the UGB to address land needs that cannot be met within the existing UGB consistent with ORS 197.298 and Oregon Statewide Planning Goal 14: Urbanization.

- ATTACHMENTS:**
1. Council Briefing Memo and attachments
 2. Ordinance and Exhibits:
 - Exhibit A: UGB, Metro Plan Diagram and & Springfield Zoning Map amendments
 - Exhibit B: Economic Element and Technical Supplement CIBL/EOA Final Report
 - Exhibit C: Urbanization Element and Technical Supplement
 - Exhibit D: Metro Plan text amendments
 - Exhibit E: Springfield Development Code amendment: AG Zoning District
 - Exhibit F: Staff Report and Draft Findings
 3. Testimony Received: Kloos/Johnson Crushers International
-

**DISCUSSION/
FINANCIAL
IMPACT:** Adoption of Springfield’s Commercial and Industrial Lands Buildable Lands Inventory and Economic Opportunities Analysis (CIBL/EOA) is critical to Springfield’s ability to plan, zone and develop land within the community consistent with the community’s livability and economic prosperity goals and redevelopment priorities. The CIBL/EOA Final Report provides empirical data to establish the amount and type of employment sites needed to accommodate forecasted employment growth and target employers. Springfield’s need for employment sites larger than 5 acres cannot be met within the existing UGB. The proposed UGB amendment adds approximately 257 acres of suitable employment land in two areas — North Gateway and Mill Race — to add suitable sites to meet the identified need for 223 acres of sites larger than 5 acres. Springfield’s final UGB may include some or all land described in the Ordinance or other lands identified through the 2030 Plan amendment public process, consistent with the prioritization requirements of ORS 197.298 and the Oregon Land Use Goal 14 Administrative Rule.

MEMORANDUM

City of Springfield

Date: 9/12/2016

To: Gino Grimaldi

COUNCIL

From: Anette Spickard, DPW Director
Linda Pauly, DPW Principal Planner

BRIEFING

Subject: Springfield 2030 Plan and Urban Growth
Boundary (UGB) Amendments
File No. LRP 2009-00014

MEMORANDUM

ISSUE: Springfield has completed its evaluation of land needed to provide adequate employment opportunities for the 2010-2030 planning period consistent with Oregon Statewide Planning Goal 9: Economic Development; has prepared Economic and Urbanization comprehensive plan land use policies and land use regulations to support attainment of community economic development objectives; and has evaluated lands to be included in an expansion of the UGB to address land needs that cannot be met within the existing UGB consistent with ORS 197.298 and Oregon Statewide Planning Goal 14: Urbanization.

COUNCIL GOALS/

MANDATE:

Council Goals: Mandate

Oregon Law requires cities to accommodate urban population and urban employment inside urban growth boundaries to ensure efficient use of land, and to provide for livable communities. The Urban Growth Boundary must be based on demonstrated need for housing, employment opportunities, livability or uses such as public facilities, streets and roads, schools, parks or open space, or any combination of these need categories. In determining need, local governments may specify characteristics, such as parcel size, topography or proximity, necessary for land to be suitable for an identified need. Prior to expanding an urban boundary, local governments shall demonstrate that needs cannot reasonably be accommodated on land already inside the Urban Growth Boundary.

BACKGROUND: Co-adoption by Springfield and Lane County of the proposed Springfield 2030 Plan and Urban Growth Boundary amendments to the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan (*Metro Plan*) (2030 Plan amendments) is the next step in Springfield-Lane County's multi-year land use planning process to address Springfield's 20-year land needs.

Since ORS 197.304 (HB 3337) required the establishment of separate Urban Growth Boundaries (UGBs) for Eugene and Springfield, Springfield has 1) conducted the land inventories and analyses required under Oregon law to evaluate land needs for the planning period 2010-2030; 2) prepared and adopted a separate Springfield UGB, residential land use policies and implementation measures to address housing needs; and 3) worked collaboratively with Metro Plan partners Eugene and Lane County to adopt "enabling" amendments to the Metro Plan supporting the incremental transition from one shared Metro area comprehensive plan to respective Springfield and Eugene comprehensive plans. Springfield's current UGB was acknowledged in 2011 to provide land to meet the city's housing needs. All of Springfield's 2010-2030 residential growth needs were met without expanding the UGB — through re-designation of land in the Glenwood redevelopment area and other efficiency measures.

Through the multi-year 2030 Plan public involvement process, including the 2008-2009 CIBL Technical and Stakeholder Advisory committee process, surveys, open houses, community workshops, public hearings, neighborhood meetings, and outreach to service providers and public agencies, the City received information from citizens, land owners and advocacy groups.

The City Council has considered a range of alternatives for accommodating employment growth within the existing UGB and in alternative locations around the UGB. Through extensive analysis, public involvement and Council direction, potentially suitable expansion areas for employment were identified. At the September 14, 2015 Work Session, Council directed staff to prepare the 2030 Plan and UGB amendment ordinance — as shown in Attachment 2 Ordinance and Exhibits — for adoption. The proposed 2030 Plan amendments were presented to the City Council, Lane County Board of Commissioners and Lane County Planning Commission at the June 27, 2016 Joint Work Session.

DISCUSSION: Co-adoption of the proposed 2030 Plan amendments by Springfield and Lane County will address Springfield's employment land needs for the 20-year planning period ending 2030. The amendments, as identified in Attachment 1-A and 1-B and as explained in Attachment 2, Exhibit F Staff Report and Draft Findings, establish the comprehensive land use plan designations, policies, land use regulations and amendments to the UGB necessary to provide a 20-year supply of land to meet Springfield's employment land and livability needs as required under Oregon law. The proposed Comprehensive Plan Economic and Urbanization Elements, as described in Ordinance Exhibits B and C will supplant existing Metro Plan land use policies applicable to lands within Springfield's jurisdiction of the Metro Plan. Upon acknowledgement by the State, these Springfield-specific policies will serve to guide future commercial, industrial and mixed-use employment land development and redevelopment activity within the existing Springfield UGB and within the two proposed UGB expansion areas – North Gateway and Mill Race. The proposed UGB expansion also comprises public lands accommodating Springfield's public water system facilities, parks, recreation and open space land needs. A summary of the proposed plan designation and zoning changes and acres of land affected by the proposed changes is included as Attachment 1-B.

At the June 27, 2016 Joint Work Session, the Springfield City Council, Lane County Board of Commissioners, and Lane County Planning Commission were provided with an update on the proposed 2030 Plan amendments and how the proposals have been revised over the past several years to address public input, recent court cases, Goal 14 rulemaking and legislation affecting UGB decisions.

Adoption of the 2030 Plan amendments will fulfill Springfield's comprehensive planning obligations under Statewide Planning Goal 9 Economic Development.

The Springfield Commercial and Industrial Buildable Lands Inventory and Economic Opportunities Analysis (CIBL/EOA) Final Report (Ordinance Exhibit B-2) is the required evaluation of land needed for employment opportunities for the planning period 2010-2030. The CIBL/EOA is a technical report prepared by the City's consultant ECONorthwest that provides empirical data to establish the amount and type of land needed to accommodate forecasted employment growth and target employers. The types of employment that Springfield wants to attract to meet economic development objectives are: high-wage, stable jobs with benefits, and jobs requiring skilled and unskilled labor. This includes a range of industries that will contribute to a diverse economy; and industries that are compatible with Springfield's community values. The CIBL/EOA includes:

- An inventory (supply) of land available for industrial and other employment uses. The inventory identifies lands within the Springfield Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) that are suitable for development and can accommodate employment growth (CIBL/EOA Chapter 2).
 - An analysis of Springfield's economic patterns, potentialities, strengths and deficiencies as they relate to state and national trends (CIBL/EOA Chapter 3).
 - An employment forecast, an estimate of how much land (demand) is needed to accommodate the 20-year employment forecast, and a description of the types of sites that are needed to accommodate industries that are likely to locate or expand in
-

Springfield (CIBL/EOA Chapter 4).

- A comparison of land supply and site needs (CIBL/EOA Chapter 5).

Adoption of the CIBL/EOA is critical to Springfield's ability to plan, zone and develop land within the community consistent with the community's livability and economic prosperity goals and redevelopment priorities. The empirical data contained in the CIBL inventory help the City and its citizens better understand how much and what kinds of land the city has designated for employment in Springfield's developed and vacant land base and how much land may be available for redevelopment. The EOA provides empirical data and analysis to identify which employment sectors and target industries are a good fit with Springfield's workforce and competitive advantages. Together, the CIBL/EOA information identifies the quantities and qualities of commercial, industrial and mixed use sites the City must designate within Springfield's UGB and Comprehensive Plan to provide a sufficient, suitable and viable land base to meet Springfield's employment needs and economic development objectives through the year 2030.

Much employment growth — including all employment requiring sites 5 acres and smaller — can be accommodated on land already inside the UGB. Springfield's land need determination is based on aggressive assumptions about redevelopment (22% of needed jobs), infill of existing built space (10% of needed jobs) and employment accommodated on non-employment land (14% of needed jobs). 77% of needed jobs will be located on land within the existing UGB. The proposed 2030 Plan Economic Element provides a policy “roadmap” for accommodating this amount of employment growth on land already in the UGB.

Revisions to the September 2009 Draft CIBL/EOA Report

The Final CIBL/EOA Report is a revision of the September 2009 Draft CIBL/EOA Report. These changes incorporate feedback about the report and address recent case law. The primary changes to the document are:

- Clarifications to the methods, definitions, and terms used in the buildable lands inventory, including clarifications about potentially redevelopable land in Springfield.
- Analysis of potentially redevelopable sites larger than 5 acres to determine which sites are likely to redevelop over the 2010-2030 planning period.
- Clarifications about Springfield's target industries and their existing site and other characteristics.
- Revision to the number of needed sites by using historical data to identify the number and size of needed sites instead of using a range of needed sites.
- Revision to the categories of needed site size to combine the largest site sizes into one category: sites 20 acres and larger.
- Additional information about the site needs of Springfield's target industries.
- Other clarifications that made the analysis and results clearer.

The Need for a Smaller UGB Expansion to Meet Employment Land Needs

Springfield's need for employment sites larger than 5 acres cannot be met within the existing UGB. 23% of needed jobs will be accommodated on sites in the proposed UGB expansion areas. The revisions to the CIBL/EOA analysis discussed above reduced the amount of suitable employment land needed in the UGB expansion from the 640-acre land need identified in the 2009 Draft CIBL/EOA to 223 acres. The comparison of land supply and site needs in the CIBL/EOA identifies a deficit of larger commercial and industrial land site needs that cannot be met within the existing Springfield UGB. As shown in the CIBL/EOA Table S-5 below, the City needs to expand the UGB to add 223 suitable acres of land to provide seven Industrial and Commercial and Mixed Use employment sites larger than 5 acres. The City assumes that all site

needs for sites smaller than 5 acres will be met within the existing UGB.

Table S-5. Employment site and land needs, Springfield UGB, 2010-2030

	Site Size (acres)			Total
	Less than 5	5 to 20	20 and Larger	
Industrial				
Sites needed	none	none	2	2
Land need (acres)	none	none	126	126
Commercial and Mixed Use				
Sites needed	none	4	1	5
Land need (acres)	none	37	60	97
Total sites needed	none	4	3	7
Total acres needed	none	37	186	223

Source: ECONorthwest

Employment Land and Public Land UGB Expansion Proposal

In determining employment land need, local governments may specify characteristics, such as parcel size, topography or proximity, necessary for land to be suitable for an identified need. Since 2009, the City studied alternative locations for expanding the UGB to identify potentially suitable land to accommodate the site needs of target employment uses that require sites 5 acres or larger.

The City's final selection of areas included in the UGB was prepared after conducting the extensive and prescriptive "Boundary Location Alternatives Analysis" process required by Oregon law (ORS 197.298 and Goal 14) to screen all potentially suitable lands in order of statutory priorities as explained in Ordinance Exhibit F Staff Report and Draft Findings. Cities are required to include lands of higher priority (urban reserves, non-resource "exception" areas and lands zoned "marginal" if those lands are determined to be suitable and serviceable within the planning period to meet the identified site needs. If such lands are not suitable and serviceable, cities next consider including resource (farm and forest) land. The statute requires cities to evaluate potentially suitable resource land sites in order of their soil capability, from least productive to more productive. Goal 14 Boundary Location Factors, (including environmental, economic, social and energy consequences) are applied to the evaluation process as explained in Ordinance Exhibit F Staff Report and Draft Findings.

Springfield's proposed UGB amendment adds approximately 257 acres of suitable employment land in two areas — North Gateway and Mill Race — to add suitable sites to meet the identified need for 223 acres of sites larger than 5 acres. Springfield's final UGB may include some or all land described in the Ordinance or other lands identified through the 2030 Plan amendment public process, consistent with the prioritization requirements of ORS 197.298 and the Oregon Land Use Goal 14 Administrative Rule.

Lands within the North Gateway and Mill Race study areas provide suitable sites that are serviceable within the planning period to meet the site needs of target industries described in the CIBL/EOA, consistent with the prioritization requirements of ORS 197.298 and the Oregon Land Use Goal 14 Administrative Rule, and consistent with applicable comprehensive plan policies. Both areas have large, flat suitable sites contiguous with the UGB and city limits, thus no inefficient or costly "leapfrogging" will be required for a property owner to annex and develop. Both areas are within ½ mile of I-5 or Oregon Highway 126 and are within ½ mile of the regions' existing and planned frequent transit network.

Employment Opportunity Sites Added - North Gateway UGB Expansion (Maps: Ordinance Exhibit A).

Adoption of this proposal would add two 50-acre sites to Springfield's UGB. The two sites (Wicklund Family Trust and Puzzle Parts LLC) are contiguous and could also be combined to create one 100-acre site. Both sites are immediately adjacent to the existing UGB and contiguous with Springfield city limits. The proposal would also add one 20-acre site that is not contiguous with the city limits (Johnson). The suitable employment land is proposed to be designated Urban Holding Area- Employment. Adopting a proposal that includes a large balance of the needed suitable land in one location will support an efficient and economical land use pattern and the ability to comprehensively plan and serve the area in relationship to the abutting Gateway/International Way employment center.

Natural Resource Designation of Land Within McKenzie River Floodway.

The McKenzie River frontage of the proposed North Gateway UGB expansion area, including the floodway portions of the Wicklund and Johnson sites, is proposed to be designated Natural Resource. This is in response to input from the Council and County Commissioners about extending Springfield's UGB and planning jurisdictional area to the river, rather than leaving a strip of Lane County-administered land between the UGB and the river. Including the floodway land in the UGB is logical in that it will facilitate consistent regulation of the floodway, riparian area and natural resources through application of Springfield Development Code standards, while avoiding division of parcels.

The EWEB property included in the North Gateway UGB expansion (developed with electrical transmission facilities and the Rainbow Water District wells) is proposed to be designated Public/Semi-Public.

Employment Opportunity Sites Added – Mill Race UGB Expansion (Maps: Ordinance Exhibit A). Adoption of this proposal would add large employment sites immediately abutting Springfield's UGB and contiguous with the city limits that are not in the 100-year floodplain. The proposal would add one 20-acre site (Johnson Family Trust) with frontage on South 28th Street. The Springfield Utility Board (SUB) site (formerly owned by Knife River) would provide 57.2 suitable acres. This SUB site abuts another SUB-owned industrial site that is already inside the UGB and the Swanson Mill property, and is accessible from M Street and through an easement on the Swanson site.

Staff included the smaller parcels located south of M Street in the UGB, rather than leaving an area of Lane County-administered land surrounded by Springfield's UGB. This will provide for clear jurisdictional boundaries and avoid creating a "doughnut" of Metro Plan/Springfield UGB parcels surrounding County-administered Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan parcels. The total acreage of the smaller parcels is approximately 50 acres of which approximately 46.6 acres are potentially developable (without absolute constraints).

Public/Semi Public Land Included in Proposed UGB (Maps: Ordinance Exhibit A).

The Mill Race study area includes 373.1 acres of public lands owned by SUB, City, and Willamalane Park and Recreation District. The area is developed with Willamalane's Clearwater and Georgia Pacific parks and Middle Fork Path and SUB's Willamette Well Field and drinking water treatment facilities. Additionally, three existing Willamalane parks that occupy a total of 72 acres along the northern edge of the UGB are included in the proposed UGB: Ruff Park, Lively Park, and Oxbow.

Proposed UGB Expansion and Land Use Designations

Area	Suitable Employment Acres Designated Urban Holding Area – Employment (UHA-E)	Acres Designated Natural Resource (NR)	Acres Designated Public/Semi Public (P/SP)	Gross Acres (inc. right of way)
North Gateway	132.1	53.3	9.7	212.4
Mill Race	125	0	373.1	508.1
Other Parkland	0	0	72	72
Total Land Added	Total Suitable 257.1	Total Natural Resource 53.3	Total Public /Semi Public 454.8	792.5
CIBL/EOA suitable land need	223			

Public Process 2009 to Present.

Notice of the proposed 2030 Plan amendments was provided to DLCD on December 31, 2009 and the first evidentiary hearing was conducted by the Springfield and Lane County Planning Commissions at a joint hearing on February 17th and March 16th, 2010 (Springfield File No. LRP 2009-00014, Lane County File No. PA09-6018). The hearing was closed on March 26th, 2010. The City Council and Lane County Board of County Commissioners were originally scheduled to conduct a public hearing on the draft 2030 Plan on July 26, 2010. However, many important issues were raised by the Department of Land Conservation and Development staff, the Planning Commissions and members of the public during the initial review process. Council directed staff to allow sufficient time to prepare thorough and comprehensive consideration of the input received and to prepare the second draft of plan documents for the next public hearing. Staff, in consultation with the City legal team, also recommended that the City pay close attention to pending Court of Appeals decisions and other legal rulings that will affect the State's review of Springfield Urban Growth Boundary amendment proposal. These matters led the City to adjust the 2030 Plan adoption schedule as necessary to:

- Adopt the Springfield UGB, Residential Element, Land Use Efficiency Measures and Glenwood Phase One plan amendments to address 20-year housing needs in a timely manner;
- Ensure efficient coordination with concurrent City and Metro partner comprehensive planning activities including necessary “enabling” amendments to the Metro Plan;
- Clarify and address issues raised in the hearing process;
- Address significant issues raised in recent and pending legal decisions regarding UGB expansions.

Subsequent to the 2010 Planning Commission hearing, notice of the proposed Agriculture – Urban Holding Area Zoning District (AG) code amendment was provided to DLCD on November 14, 2013. The first evidentiary hearing on the AG District code amendment was conducted by the Springfield and Lane County Planning Commission on December 18, 2013 (File No. TYP 413-00007). The record of File No. TYP 413-00007 is incorporated into the 2030 Plan amendments.

Given the length of time between the first evidentiary hearings and final hearing on the 2030 Plan and UGB amendments, staff prepared a summary of the Planning Commission hearing

process and recommendations (Attachment 1-C) to provide background information to the elected officials, Lane County Planning Commission and the public.

RECOMMENDED ACTION/OPTIONS

Conduct Council's first reading of the ordinance and joint public hearing to receive evidence in conjunction with adoption of proposed 2030 Plan amendments. After testimony is received, the Council and the Lane County Board may choose to:

1. Close the hearing but leave the record open for a certain amount of time.
 2. Continue the public hearing.
 3. Close the hearing and deliberate at a future date.
 4. Currently, staff has reserved October 10th and November 7th on the Council and Board's agenda calendars for this item.
-

Summary of Proposed 2030 Plan Amendments

The proposed Springfield-Lane County 2030 Plan Amendments include the following actions:

- Adopt **Exhibit B** Springfield 2030 Comprehensive Plan Economic Element and its Technical Supplement — the Springfield Commercial and Industrial Buildable Lands Inventory and Economic Opportunities Analysis (CIBL/EOA) — as Springfield’s comprehensive plan in compliance with Statewide Planning Goal 9, Economic Development. The Economic Element contains city-specific goals, policies, implementation measures and findings to address Springfield’s land needs for economic development and employment growth for the 2010-2030 planning period, replacing *Metro Plan* Economic Element policies applicable to lands within Springfield’s jurisdictional area;
- Adopt **Exhibit C-1** Springfield 2030 Comprehensive Plan Urbanization Element as Springfield’s comprehensive plan in compliance with Statewide Planning Goal 14, Urbanization. The Urbanization Element contains Springfield’s city-specific goals, policies, implementation measures and findings to address land needs for the planning period 2010-2030, replacing *Metro Plan* Urbanization and Growth Management policies applicable to lands within Springfield’s jurisdictional area;
- Adopt **Exhibit C-1 and C-2** amending Springfield Urban Growth Boundary (UGB),¹ Springfield UGB map and UGB Technical Supplement depicting and describing the UGB. Amend Metro Plan Boundary to be coterminous with the UGB. (Lane County will amend the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan (RCP) boundary to be coterminous with the UGB and Metro Plan Boundary to reflect the boundary change.)
 - Expands the Springfield UGB to add approximately 257 suitable acres of employment land on 273 gross acres in two expansion areas – North Gateway and Mill Race.
 - Expands the Springfield UGB to include approximately 455 acres of existing public land, parks and open space.
- Adopt **Exhibit D** amending Metro Plan text:
 - Amend Chapter II, Section C Metro Plan Growth Management Goals, Findings, and Policies to add the following paragraph: “Sub-chapter II-C no longer applies

¹ All references in this report to amendment of “Springfield UGB”, “UGB amendments” or “UGB expansion” also reference concurrent amendments to the Metro Plan boundary and Lane Rural Comprehensive Plan Boundary to be coterminous with the amended Springfield UGB.

to Springfield. In 2016, the City of Springfield and Lane County adopted the Springfield 2030 Comprehensive Plan Urbanization Element, Ordinance No. XXXX and Lane County Ordinance No. XXXX, as Springfield’s comprehensive plan in compliance with Statewide Planning Goal 14, Urbanization. The Urbanization Element contains Springfield’s city-specific goals, policies, implementation measures and findings to address land needs for the planning period 2010-2030.”

- Amend Chapter II, Section E Metro Plan Urban and Urbanizable Land to add the following paragraph: “Sub-chapter II-E no longer applies to Springfield. In 2016, the City of Springfield and Lane County adopted the Springfield 2030 Comprehensive Plan Urbanization Element, Ordinance No. XXXX and Lane County Ordinance No. XXXX, as Springfield’s comprehensive plan in compliance with Statewide Planning Goal 14, Urbanization. The Urbanization Element contains Springfield’s city-specific goals, policies, implementation measures and findings to address land needs for the planning period 2010-2030.”
- Amend Metro Plan Chapter III, Section B Metro Plan Economic Element to add the following paragraph: “Sub-chapter III-B no longer applies to Springfield. In 2016, the City of Springfield and Lane County adopted the Springfield 2030 Comprehensive Plan Economic Element, Ordinance No. XXXX and Lane County Ordinance No. XXXX, as Springfield’s comprehensive plan in compliance with Statewide Planning Goal 9, Economic Development. The Economic Element contains city-specific goals, policies, implementation measures and findings to address Springfield’s land needs for economic development and employment growth for the 2010-2030 planning period.”
- Amend Metro Plan Chapter II, Section G Land Use Designations to add a new land use designation applicable to Springfield’s jurisdictional area of responsibility — the Urban Holding Area-Employment (UHA-E) plan designation;
- Amend Metro Plan Chapter II, Section G. Metro Plan Land Use Special Heavy Industrial designation page II-G-8 to delete the Springfield-specific reference to the Natron Special Heavy Industrial (SHI) site; and
- Amend Metro Plan Chapter II, Section G, footnote 7, to add a reference to the subject UGB amendment ordinance.

- Adopt **Exhibit A** amending Metro Plan Diagram² to assign Metro Plan designations to lands added to the UGB:
 - Assign the “Urban Holding Area – Employment” (UHA-E) Metro plan designation to approximately 273 acres to meet Springfield’s long range employment land need for 7 employment sites on 223 suitable unconstrained acres;
 - Assign the “Natural Resource” (NR) Metro plan designation to approximately 53 acres of land within the McKenzie River Floodway in the North Gateway area;
 - Assign the “Public/Semi Public” (P/SP) Metro plan designation to approximately 455 acres of existing publicly-owned land, parks and open space.
- Adopt **Exhibit E** amending Springfield Development Code Chapter 3 Land Use Districts establishing Section 3.2-900 Agriculture—Urban Holding Area (AG) Zoning District to implement the Urban Holding Area – Employment plan designation and Natural Resource plan designation.
- Adopt **Exhibit A-3** amending Springfield Zoning Map to assign Springfield zoning to lands added to UGB
 - Assign Agriculture—Urban Holding Area Zoning District to lands designated Urban Holding Area- Employment (UHA-E) and Natural Resource (NR);
 - Assign Public Land and Open Space (PLO) Zoning District to lands designated Public/Semi Public.

This proposal also requires concurrent actions by Lane County to amend the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan. These actions are addressed in Lane County’s staff report File No. 509-PA13-05393.

- Amend Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan boundary to be coterminous with the UGB and Metro Plan Boundary to reflect the boundary change.
- Amend Lane County’s plan designation and zoning maps to reflect the 2030 Plan Metro Plan Diagram and Springfield Zoning Map amendments.

² The Metro Plan boundary, Lane Rural Comprehensive Plan boundary and Lane County plan and zoning maps are amended concurrently to reflect the amended UGB, plan and zoning designations shown in Exhibit A and C.

Comprehensive Plan map amendments

North Gateway gross acres (including right of way)	From	To
139.4	Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan (LCRCP) Agriculture	Metro Plan Urban Holding Area-Employment
9.7	LCRCP Agriculture	Metro Plan Public/Semi Public
53.3	LCRCP Agriculture	Metro Plan Natural resource
Mill Race acres gross acres (including right of way)	From	To
133.2	LCRCP Agriculture	Metro Plan Urban Holding Area-Employment
1.8	LCRCP Parks	Metro Plan Urban Holding Area-Employment
224.6	LCRCP Parks	Metro Plan Public/Semi Public
148.4	LCRCP Agriculture	Metro Plan Public/Semi Public
0.1	LCRCP NR Mineral	Metro Plan Public/Semi Public
Willamalane Parks acre gross acres	From	To
16.4	LCRCP Agriculture	Metro Plan Public/Semi Public
55.6	LCRCP Parks	Metro Plan Public/Semi Public
TOTAL GROSS ACRES	From	To
272.6	Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan (LCRCP) Agriculture	Metro Plan Urban Holding Area-Employment
0.1	LCRCP Parks	Metro Plan Urban Holding Area-Employment
53.3	LCRCP Agriculture	Metro Plan Natural Resource
174.5	LCRCP Agriculture	Metro Plan Public/Semi Public
280.2	LCRCP Parks	Metro Plan Public/Semi Public
0.1	LCRCP NR Mineral	Metro Plan Public/Semi Public

Zoning map amendments

North Gateway gross acres	From	To
192.8	Land County (LC) Exclusive Farm Use (EFU 30)	Agriculture- Urban Holding Area (AG)
9.7	LC Exclusive Farm Use (EFU 30)	Public Land & Open Space (PLO)
Mill Race gross acres	From	To
135.0	LC Exclusive Farm Use (EFU 25)	Agriculture- Urban Holding Area
238.3	LC Exclusive Farm Use (EFU25)	Public Land & Open Space (PLO)
93.1	LC Parks & Recreation (PR)	Public Land & Open Space (PLO)
41.6	LC Sand & Gravel (SG)	Public Land & Open Space (PLO)

Willamalane Parks (north) gross acres	From	To
55.6	LC Exclusive Farm Use (EFU 40)	Public Land & Open Space (PLO)
16.4	LC Exclusive Farm Use (EFU 30)	Public Land & Open Space (PLO)
TOTAL GROSS ACRES	From	To
192.8	Land County (LC) Exclusive Farm Use (EFU 30)	Agriculture- Urban Holding Area (AG)
135.0	LC Exclusive Farm Use (EFU 25)	Agriculture- Urban Holding Area (AG)
238.3	LC Exclusive Farm Use (EFU 25)	Public Land & Open Space (PLO)
26.1	LC Exclusive Farm Use (EFU 30)	Public Land & Open Space (PLO)
55.6	LC Exclusive Farm Use (EFU 40)	Public Land & Open Space (PLO)
92.8	LC Parks & Recreation (PR)	Public Land & Open Space (PLO)
.1	LC Parks & Recreation (PR)	Agriculture- Urban Holding Area (AG)
41.6	LC Sand & Gravel (SG)	Public Land & Open Space (PLO)

TOTAL GROSS ACRES IN UGB EXPANSION	792 ACRES
TOTAL GROSS ACRES DESIGNATED URBAN HOLDING EMPLOYMENT	273 ACRES
TOTAL UNCONSTRAINED URBAN HOLDING EMPLOYMENT	257 ACRES
TOTAL GROSS ACRES DESIGNATED NATURAL RESOURCE	53 ACRES
TOTAL GROSS ACRES DESIGNATED PUBLIC/SEMI-PUBLIC	455 ACRES
TOTAL GROSS ACRES ZONED AGRICULTURE – URBAN HOLDING AREA	328 ACRES
TOTAL GROSS ACRES ZONED PUBLIC LAND & OPEN SPACE	455 ACRES

MEMORANDUM

City of Springfield

To:	Springfield City Council, Lane County Board of Commissioners and Lane County Planning Commission
From:	Linda Pauly, Principal Planner
Date:	September 12, 2016
Subject:	Planning Commission Public Hearings on 2030 Plan amendments: Process Summary and Commission Recommendations

The Springfield and Lane County Planning Commissions conducted the first evidentiary hearings on the proposed 2030 Plan amendments. Given the length of time since these hearings, staff prepared the following summary to provide background information to the elected officials, Lane County Planning Commission and the public.

1. Public Hearing on Proposed Economic Element, Commercial and Industrial Buildable Lands Inventory and Economic Opportunities Analysis (2009 Draft CIBL/EOA), Urbanization Element and Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) Employment Land Expansion Concepts. (February 17, 2010 to May 4, 2010).

On February 17th and March 16th, 2010 the Springfield and Lane County Joint Planning Commissions conducted a joint public hearing on the 2030 Plan and UGB amendments. The subject 2030 Plan and UGB amendments were considered as part of a larger 2030 Plan package of land use policy and land use regulation amendments to address Springfield's land needs for the 2010-2030 planning period.

The City received 52 documents on this matter from interested parties and 22 persons appeared at the two public hearings; both oral and written testimony was entered into the record during the hearings. The staff report, the oral testimony, letters received, written submittals of the persons testifying at the hearing, and the public record for file # LRP 2009-00014 were considered and incorporated into the record. The joint hearing conducted by the Springfield and Lane County Planning Commissions was continued to March 16th, 2010, and the written record of the hearing was extended until March 26, 2010. Responses to testimony and to comments submitted by DLCD staff were provided in a 40-page memorandum from Planning Manager Gregory Mott, dated April 20, 2010. (Planning Commission Memorandum for April 20, 2010 Regular Session, Planning Commission Transmittal Memorandum Attachment 2). For complete documentation of the hearing process, see Springfield File No. LRP 2009-00014 and Lane County File No. PA 09-6018.

The Planning Commissions were asked to consider the evidence in the record and forward recommendations to their respective elected officials regarding co-adoption of the proposed policy package, which included the 2009 Draft CIBL/EOA and 2009 Draft 2030 Plan Economic and Urbanization

Element policies to provide a 20-year supply of commercial and industrial sites consistent with Springfield's community development objectives.

At the April 20 and May 4, 2010 meetings, the Planning Commissions began their deliberations of the proposals. As documented in the meeting minutes, the commissioners discussed a series of action items including:

- Action Item 2: Economic Element and 2009 Draft CIBL/EOA
- Action Item 3: Urbanization Element and Springfield Urban Growth Boundary. The Planning Commissioners were asked to review and discuss three UGB expansion concepts and to select a preferred alternative for expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). The Planning Commissions were asked to recommend one or a combination of the three concepts or another alternative.
- Question 18: Urban Holding Area Plan Designation

As documented in the meeting minutes, the Planning Commission recommendations are summarized as follows.

Action Item 2: Economic Element

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 Lane County Planning Commissioners opposed stated the following opinions:

- McCown: Skeptical of need for 640 acres, preferred to see rezoning or upzoning of existing sites to meet need for larger sites.
- Arkin: 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. Study did not adequately account for a majority of employment in the small business sector and for the growth of small farms. Study assigned too few jobs per acre and was not a good use of highly constrained land. Cost of developing large parcels and extending City services was a questionable use of funds.
- Goldstein: Uncomfortable with lack of goals for the land use, needs better focus on infrastructure needs.
- Nichols: Did not see a need for 640 acres, but the addition of some larger sites was justified. Policy should encourage redevelopment.
- Siekiel-Zdzienicki: Concerned about the amount of constrained land. Requested FEMA maps that showed the location of the floodplain related to development along the river.

Action Item 3: Urbanization Element and Springfield Urban Growth Boundary

An employment land UGB expansion of about 640 acres was proposed, based on the 2009 Draft CIBL/EOA. At the February 17, 2010 meeting, the City's consultant Robert Parker of ECONorthwest presented three UGB expansion concepts for consideration. The purpose was to solicit comments and direction on UGB expansion concepts and to move toward a preferred alternative. Mr. Parker reviewed the CIBL Stakeholder and Technical Advisory Committees process and recommendations, the five Planning Commission and Council joint work sessions, the public workshop and open houses conducted 2008-2010, the technical analysis conducted by ECONorthwest, and how the CIBL stakeholder and technical committees had identified study areas that were potentially suitable to meet the identified employment land need. Mr. Parker explained the key statutes, goals and rules applicable to UGB amendment decisions, and how Goal 14 Urbanization is interpreted by LCDC rules and decisions, LUBA opinions, and court decisions. Mr. Parker described the Boundary Alternatives Analysis process as it applies to employment lands. He stated that the three concepts were developed to comply with state rules. Using a series of maps, he showed how study areas around the UGB were analyzed based on zoning, distance, constraints and soils. He stated that the UGB expansion concepts emphasized areas identified by the committees and were "intended to be different enough to demonstrate trade-offs."

- Concept 1: North Gateway, Seavey Loop, South of Mill Race
- Concept 2: North of 52nd Street, South of Mill Race and Seavey Loop
- Concept 3: North Gateway, Seavey Loop, North of 52nd Street.

The commissioners deliberated the merits of each Concept.

Concept 1 support:

- Lane County Planning Commission: Arkins, Dignam, Sullivan.
- Springfield Planning Commission: Kirschenmann, VanGordon.

Concept 2 support:

- Lane County Planning Commission: no support
- Springfield Planning Commission: no support

Concept 3 support:

- Lane County Planning Commission: Dignam, Goldstein.
- Springfield Planning Commission: no support

Combined Concept 1 and 3 Support:

- Lane County Planning Commission: Dignam, Goldstein, McCown, Nichols, Sullivan.
- Springfield Planning Commission: Beyer, Kirschenmann, Moe, Moore, Smith, VanGordon

Modified Concept 1 support:

- Lane County Planning Commission: Noble, Nichols.
- Springfield Planning Commission: Beyer.

Support for moving forward with 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.

Thus, the Commissioners chose to forward their individual opinions rather than unified recommendations to the elected officials. The minutes from the April 20 and May 4, 2010 meetings are attached to this memorandum.

Question 18: Urban Holding Area Plan Designation

- 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

Question 19: Urban development Urban Holding Area Plan Designation must be consistent with CIBL/EOA site needs criteria for inclusion in UGB.

- There was consensus that this was strictly a City of Springfield issue on which the Lane County Planning Commission would not vote.
- Springfield Planning Commission: Unanimously supported Question 19, 6:0.

Question 20: Proposal to preserve large “newly urbanizable” sites.

- There was consensus that this was strictly a City of Springfield issue on which the Lane County Planning Commission would not vote.
- Springfield Planning Commission: Unanimously supported Question 20, 6:0.

Springfield Planning Commission 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.

Lane County Planning Commission Motions:

- 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. 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. The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Lane County Planning Commission subsequently conducted a work session with the Lane County Board to convey their individual recommendations and concerns to the Board.

The Planning Commissions were informed that the final decision on adoption of the Springfield Commercial and Industrial Buildable Lands Inventory and Economic Opportunities Analysis shall be made by the Springfield City Council and the Lane County Board of Commissioners and that subsequent action would rely in part on the 2009 Draft CIBL/EOA document, a variation of this document, or entirely new documentation. The staff report of the April 20, 2010 meeting stated: "The adoption of a UGB is an iterative process, and depending on how the record develops, the background assumptions, analysis and determinations in the Springfield Commercial and Industrial Buildable Lands Inventory and Economic Opportunities Analysis may change."

The Joint Planning Commissions concluded their proceedings on May 4, 2010.

2. Public Hearing on Proposed AG Zoning District.

On December 18, 2013, the Springfield Planning Commission conducted the first evidentiary hearing on "proposed Springfield Development Code (SDC) Amendments to implement the propose Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) Expansion" (Springfield File No. TYP 413-00007). The proposal was reviewed during a Planning Commission work session held on November 19, 2013. The proposed AG Zoning District was presented in the Staff Report for the December 18, 2013 meeting as Attachment 2, pages 1-5.

One person testified in favor of the proposed code, no persons testified against or neutral. The Planning Commission found that the proposed amendments are consistent with the criteria of SDC Section 5.6-115A-C, supported by specific findings of fact and additional information submitted for the December 18, 2013 public hearing. The Planning Commission forwarded a recommendation for approval to the Springfield City Council and Lane County Board of Commissioners for their consideration.

Attachments

- 1-C-1 Minutes from April 20, 2010 Joint Planning Commission meeting

- 1-C-2 Minutes from May 4, 2010 Joint Planning Commission meeting
- 1-C-3 Springfield Planning Commission recommendation – AG Zoning District